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ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

P. 12, l. 5; read: Nr. 24 and 31, instead of Nov. 24 and 31.

P. 18b, l. 32; read: 1890; Nr. 1, instead of Nov. 1, 1894.

P. 38b, l. 4; from hence: the words "The Bostlin...and" are to be cancelled.

P. 76b, l. 23, instead of 1385, to be read 1386.

P. 88b, l. 30, instead of Nov. 2, to be read: Sept. 3.


P. 89b, l. 49; instead of Nablus, to be read: Nablus.

P. 112b, l. 46, 63, instead of v., to be read iv.

P. 203b, l. 23, 20, 37, instead of Kaffa, to be read: Kaffa.

P. 234b, l. 45; to be added: or: insuIity.

P. 258b, l. 9, instead of 275, to be read 255.

P. 330b, l. 62, instead of x.v., to be read: della nascita.

P. 350b, l. 33 and 39, read: third, instead of second.

P. 374b, l. 46, instead of Khallikân, to be read: Khallikân.

P. 408b, l. 28, to read: instead of a.

P. 308, addition of the author to the art. SHAMJAM. Palgrave may be relied on for the main facts. He certainly went to Shammar, Kašhim and Ryûd; Daughety was convinced of this. He is untrustworthy in details. He sketched in times, distances, incidents very imperfectly remembered. (Kindly communicated by Dr. D. G. Hogarth).


P. 314b, l. 6, instead of Constantin, read: Constantin.

P. 330b, l. 33, 36, instead of Dūrâbâh, to be read: Dūrâbâh.

P. 385b, Art. 997b-7. The last sentence is to be read as follows: In the year 1700 of the era of the Seleucid (989 a.d.), according to al-Bīrûnî, the stars of the 9th and 10th stations set on the 3rd of Sha'âbân, those of the 23rd and 24th rose on the 15th of that month.

P. 314b, l. 3, instead of 434, to be read: 454.

P. 306b, l. 10; Add: The place occurs on a map by Rawlinson, in J. R. G. S., x. (1841).

P. 8, beneath, insert: According to R. Bell (cf. his The Origin of Islam in its Christian Environment, London 1848, p. 32, note) shirā is derived from Syriac shirā, also found in the forms sharâ and sharâr, which is used in the sense of "writing", especially as a portion of scripture.

P. 612b, l. 38; instead of: naivete of his language, when expressing terror, read: naivete of his dialectal language.

P. 636b, l. 5, instead of: Mutahdâh, to be read: Mubadâh.

P. 666b, l. 2; instead of: 1201, to be read 1099.

P. 679b, l. 44, instead of Khâlîn, to be read: Kâlîn.

P. 688b, l. 18, instead of: Cerny and, to be read: Cernyvev.


P. 824b, l. 62, instead of: Origin, to be read: Origins.

P. 825b, l. 45; instead of: Ghât and Ghadames, read: el-Barkât and Fehout and an important reculization of the frontier in the region of Ghât and Ghadames.

P. 885b, l. 9, instead of: 'Ushâ, to be read: 'Ushâl.

P. 976b, l. 42; instead of: Nûh I., to be read: Naṣr b. 'Umayd.

P. 985b, to the first lines to be added: The building of the monument of Firdawâs has been taken in hand by the Committee for the Preservation of National Monuments (Mujâmmalshībā-ru milâf).

P. 987b, l. 28; instead of: Ahwâs, read: Ahwâs.

P. 988b, l. 7; instead of: 826, read: 282.

P. 990b, l. 17, add: Sâmândi (1813), Fâриd (1843), von Schack (1863), Bursch (1918), Singer, Aâzî (1919) and Nykl (1931) have made enquiries into the possibilities of contact between Orien and Occident regarding this point.

P. 158, add: Finally the "shâhîr" love became an abstract idea of beauty.

P. 205b, sp., read: Zâhir; Aînâl al-Zâhirûn; extracts have appeared in my Recueil de textes (Paris 1939), p. 247—249; the text will be edited by Nykl, who has also translated the Firdawâs, (The Dove's Nest-egg, Paris 1931).
P. 994, l. 43, to be read: Umayyad period. Creswell thinks that it was rebuild by the "Abbadid prince副校长. This would lead to its identification with Ksar el-Makhlil, which was one of the last stations of Tunis before Kairouan (cf. my Mission, l. 47, vol. i).]

P. 1049b, l. 35, instead of Saller, to be read: Saller.

l. 37, after "by," insert: G. R. Potter (London 1929, following Drenthweg and Schimmelpenninck) and by.

l. 68, read: many, instead of any.

l. 69, to be added: cf. al-Malik ibn Musa, xxiiv. (1008), p. 308 sq.

P. 1049b, l. 3, instead of Saller, to be read: Saller.

l. 9, to be added: and Ph. Hitl, in R.A.A.D., x. (1920), p. 513-525, 592-603.

l. 52, instead of 1200, read: 1130.

P. 1050a, l. 52, to be added: a Wuskil-Produit Direction ("Vakatake-unenougha direkkiea").


P. 1177a, art. X. "IKIES, Bibliography. To be added: Turkmen 'Asherch, ed. by the General direction of the affairs of the nomads and the emigrants, Istanbul 1934 (by دیدنیزکی ترکمن "ویرینگ" and the addition: "translated from German"); esp. p. 32-45 and p. 178-184; Ahmed Refik, "Anabolu'da Tork Asheri" (190-1900), Istanbul 1930 (contains several documents concerning the Turkish nomadic tribes in the period between 1550 and 1780); All Cica, "Conquests Turkmens Commenced," l. Istanbul 1931-1933 (review by F. Kostaki, in Archiv Orientalni, xli, 295-306); E. M. Hoppé, "The Timbuktu," in T.F.A., 1923, p. 18-28; vol. ii and iii. of the work of All Cica have been published at Ankara in 1933; they contain further interesting discussions and photographs regarding the Yezidie.

(F. NAIKATOSI)

P. 1183, l. 22, to be read as follows: and Zabun are ruled by the same king, 'Abd al-Hadi, d. in 907, mentions, etc.;

l. 34, instead of Saller, read: Saller.

P. 1183b, l. 24, in stead of Waz, read: Wadi.

l. 32, in stead of eastern, read: western.


l. 37, in stead of Malayu, read: Malayu.

P. 1213b, Bibliography. To be added: Malatt (d. 377-987), Kitâb as-Farâ'id wa l-Abid, Mr. Damascus (private copy. Makes the chief of the Z. as Zaidi, a political opponent of the sayyids and the Arabi); Ibn Abî 'l-Hadi, Zahr al-Da'î (973-974), Cairo, n.d. II. 310-362. — The Shîb's author: Ahmad b. al-Mu'allî, Ammi, from Bata, has written a Kitâb Alhâr al-Luatî, which is lost (A. Zararudî, Mawâqif al-M=kâî, lith. Teheran 1306, p. 30). The orthodox Shîb's emphasis, as an apocalyptic coincidence, the skills of this rebel and the Khâb of their mawlid (Ibn Zainab, Nu'mânî, Kitâb al-Shâb, lith. Teheran, p. 73-75).
§3. (Skez: 2, m. αη. 5. in Arabic) a measure for grain, "of the value of a mound (modius) according to the custom of Medina" (Lahm. If the cubital contents of the \(\alphaη\), like that of the \(\alphaη\), varied with town and district, so far as commercial transactions were concerned, the value of the \(\alphaη\) was from the canonical point of view fixed in religious law by the Prophet in the year 8 A.H., when he laid down the ritual details of the orthodox form of \(\alphaη\) (\(\alphaη\) al-\(\alphaη\)), which carried with it the compulsory giving of alms called Zakat al-\(\alphaη\), the value of which in grain was one \(\alphaη\) for each member of a family. It was, of course, the \(\alphaη\) of Medina that was chosen as the standard measure and the \(\alphaη\) of Medina henceforth was called \(\alphaη\) al-\(\alphaη\).

This primitive \(\alphaη\) of orthodox Islam was standardized by Zaid b. Thabit; and it is from this standard that the \(\alphaη\) and \(\alphaη\) made henceforth for religious use seem to have been copied more or less accurately. This is, at least, what I have been able to prove from various documents. According to these documents, the official capacity of the \(\alphaη\) al-\(\alphaη\) would be approximately 5 gills and that of the \(\alphaη\) 5 gills.

The Muslim jurists give the following estimates of this measure. For the sake of the \(\alphaη\) in 26 \(\alphaη\) (26 \(\alphaη\) 2/5 \(\alphaη\)), the \(\alphaη\) being equivalent to 128 Macedon drams and the dram 50/3 grains of barley. We see how lacking in precision this definition is. If there is no \(\alphaη\) or \(\alphaη\) available, the quantity of grain to be distributed for the Zakat al-\(\alphaη\) is measured with the hands held together, half-open, with palms upwards.

Lastly, besides this one of the \(\alphaη\) and of the \(\alphaη\) al-\(\alphaη\), these measures are further used in certain measurements required by religious law: 1. to calculate the Zakat and 2. to measure the minimum quantity of water necessary for an ordinary ablution (\(\alphaη\) 'ibd, a \(\alphaη\)) and for general (\(\alphaη\) 'ibd, a \(\alphaη\)).

Bibliography: The Arabic dictionary, especially the Arabic-Slovenian (Beyrouth 1870), II, 1211, col. 2; the treatise on Mahomedan law and the collections of Hadith, Alfred Bal, "Note sur trois anciens manuscrits de la collection personnelle des frères et frères à Fâ et écrivain du manuscrit l'identique du sez (Ball, Archéologie, Paris 1917, p. 350-357, Illustrations), where further references are given. (Alfred Bel.)

\(\alphaη\) (\(\alphaη\)), a time, a period of time, especially the hour. Following the custom of the Greek astronomers, a distinction is made between the equal or astronomical (sunlight) hours and the solar, which corresponds to a revolution of the heavens of the fixed stars through 365° and is also called \(\alphaη\) (\(\alphaη\)).
an account is given by Tāhī al-Dīn in a work composed in 1523. The clocks of King Alfonso of Castile owe their perfection to Moorish skill.


SA'ĀDA (h.) felicity, good fortune. The root 2-3-d and some of its derivatives is associated in various connections with pre-Islamic Arab conceptions. Its general meaning is given as *auspicious, fortunate* (2-a-n, opposite 2-a-d). The proper name Sa'd (female Sa'da, see the article Sa'd) may therefore be synonymous with Hebrew names like Benjamin and God. Sa'd is also found as the name of a god; Wellhausen (Reise arabischen Heidentums*, p. 65), suggests that al-Sa'da (a house round which the Arabs used to run) was originally an epithet of al-Urab. Sa'd followed by the genitive also often occurs as the name of a star (cf. also the articles Sa'd, al-Sa'dan) and as the name of a tribe.

The form Sa'da (in the tābla formula (which is the name of the tribe but also in the ṣalāt, see the article TALIBA) may be very closely connected with the root meaning (2-a-n); cf., however, the Arabic dictionaries under 2-a-d.

Sa'da (also with a following noun in position, in the proper name Sa'dat Ali Khān; see this article) seems to be a specifically Muslim term (opposite: ʻarshām). It is not found in the Korān; in Ḥadīth it has an eschatological colouring (cf. yarım al-sa'da, day of the resurrection, Dory, Supplément, s.v.), especially in connection with predestination. It is said, for example, that the people of sa'da are helped by God towards works of sa'da (al-Bukhārī, Ẓidāt, bāb 83; Muslim, Kābul, Kashf, al-Tirmidhī, bāb 83). As a result of a development of a train of thought common to monotheistic religions, the word in the combination abd-al-Sa'da := the Muslims (cf. Dory, op. cit.), assumes a less exclusive meaning. In court language it means majesty, highness and Dār al-S. court (Dory s.v.). Dār Sa'dat is a name for Constantinople and Sa'datullā a title in the Turkish official hierarchy.

Bibliography in the article itself.

SA'ĀDAT ALI KHĀN, a swāb of Oudh (Q.v.), from 1776 to 1814; on the death of his brother, Aṣaf al-Dawla, in September 1797, a reputed son, Waṭr al Khān, who had been purchased by the late Nawāb but never formally adopted, had been appointed to succeed, but four months later he was set aside as incompetent, and the British Governor-General, Sir John Shore, installed in his place Sa'ādat Alī Khān, who had been living under British protection in Benares since 1776. His reign is noteworthy for the extension of British control over the Oudh territories. A treaty concluded with the late Nawāb in 1777 had placed these territories under the protection of the East India Company, which undertook to provide troops for their defence in return for an annual subsidy; in 1798, a fresh treaty increased the subsidy to 76 lakhs a year and transferred the fort of Allaḥabād to the Company as an arsenal. The Company undertook to maintain a body of 10.000 men for the defence of the Nawāb's dominions both against internal and external enemies. The mutinous behaviour of the Nawāb's troops prompted the new Governor-General, the Marquiss Wellesley (1738-1805), to propose that this useless and dangerous force, which Sa'ādat Alī Khān had himself declared would be useful only to the enemy, should be disbanded and replaced by the Company's troops. Alarméd by the dangers that threatened his person, Sa'ādat Alī Khān was at first eager for this reform, but afterwards it appears only in 1801 yielded to pressure and signed the Treaty of Lucknow; this relieved him from all pecuniary obligations to the Company, by the cession of six districts yielding a revenue equal to the cost of the Company's troops, and the Nawāb undertook to introduce into his territories a system of administration conducive to the prosperity of his subjects and calculated to check the rule that threatened the resources of his country. He carried out his promise so effectually as to leave behind him the reputation of having been the wisest and strongest administrator that Oudh had ever known. He died in 1814 and was succeeded by his second son, Ghāzī al-Dīn Haidar.

Bibliography: Sājīd Ghulam 'Alī, 'Aliy al-Sa'ādat, p. 159-174 (Lucknow 1897); Dārūghi, Britān-i Awadh, pp. 99-109 (with portrait; Lucknow 1892); Sir C. U. Alitoun, Collection of Treaties relating to India, I, p. 118-137 (Calcutta 1909); Sir John Malcolm, The Political History of India from 1764 to 1823, I, p. 170-177, 273-283 (London 1826); A Selection from the Despatches of the Marquiss Wellesley, ed. by S. J. Owen, p. 188-207 (Oxford 1877); H. C. Irwin, The Garden of India, or chapters on Oudh history and affairs, p. 100-117 (London 1880). The following sources appear to be still unpublished: Harshuk Kān, Mūṣaffa' al-Maḥfūz, (Bṛt. Mus., Or. 1624); Muhammad Mubāṣṣir Khān, Dārūghi; Mubāṣṣir Khān, ed. 45; Nāshī al-Kurān, bāb 4, Musā'īb, al-Muṣaffa, tr. 270-274; Abū Dāūd, Witr, bāb 22; Nāshī, Iṣṭiṣāb, bāb 22.
37 etc.; cf. Goldscheider, Die Richtungen der islamischen Koranauslegung, Leiden 1920, p. 37.) In matters relating to ritual purity the figure three has as a rule the preference (cf. Thalhî). We are only told that soiled vessels should be cleansed seven times (e.g. Muslim, Tahâra, trad. 89—93; Abû Dâ'ûd, Tahâra, bâb 37). Ritual proscription should take place on seven parts of the body (Bukhârî, Al-Bukhârî, bâb 133, 134, 137, 138; Muslim, Sahîh, trad. 227; Abû Dâ'ûd, Sahîh, bâb 150 etc.). In another case seven alternates with four; namely, in the grouping of commands sung, e.g. (Al-Maghâlim wal-Chibdâ, bâb 5; Muslim, Lhîhî, trad. 3 etc.; cf. Bukhârî, Tahâra, bâb 40; Hadîq, bâb 26, etc.); in the dating of the Lailat al-Kadr seven is found as well as the, in this case more frequent, numeral ten (Bukhârî, Lailat al-Kadr, bâb 2). On the Christian model the deadly sins are limited to seven (Bukhârî, Wuqûf, bâb 23; Hâdîq, bâb 44; Muslim, Inâm, trad. 144); but other classifications are also found.

In cosmology also the number seven is a favorite, one which may be partly due to borrowing. There are seven heavens and seven earths (Tûrûs, b. bk. 6; Bukhârî, Bad' al-Khalq, bâb 2). Each has seven gates (Tûrûs, bâb 44; Medina also ultimately has seven gates (Bukhârî, Fitan, bâb 26). Cf. further the article Sâ'îna. The number seven is particularly frequent in medicine and magic. Water was poured over the sick Muhammad in seven waterskins (Bukhârî, Wuqûf, bâb 145); elevated parts of the body are cauterized seven times (Bukhârî, Tammûnû, bâb 6). In Dousté, Magic et religion dans l'Afrique du nord (Algiers 1909, p. 154), there is an account of a ritual consisting of 7 × 7 squares, of which the upper row contains the “seven seals”. In the same work the text of the amulet of the sâfu ‘shûd is given (p. 112). Cf. further the same book, p. 91, 100, 118. Numbers like seven, thirty, one hundred, etc., have also a special significance. Earthly fire is described as one seventieth part of hell-fire in strength (Bukhârî, Bad' al-Khalq, bâb 10). The sweat of the children of men on the Day of Resurrection will permeate seventy sills into the earth (Bukhârî, Rîhûf, bâb 47). When a sevenfold istikhâfah is mentioned, we are probably to assume New Testament influence in this case (Tûrûs, b. 81). Seventy thousand members of Muhammad’s Ummâ will go straight to Paradise without a day of reckoning (Tûrûs, Bukhârî, Bad' al-Khalq, bâb 8; Muslim, Inâm, trad. 316; Tirmîdî, Khayûm, bâb 12, 16); seventy thousand vessels with radiant countenance (Bukhârî, Lisâq, bâb 18; Rīhûf, bâb 50, 51; Muslim, Lena, trad. 14—17); seventy thousand land through the intercession of a member of the community (Dârîmî, Rîhûf, bâb 87); seventy thousand in Paradise will be the equivalent to the liver of the seal to eat (Bukhârî, Rîhûf, bâb 44; Muslim, Sîfat al-Munâhûsûn, trad. 30). The Bât al-Ma’ûrî is entered daily by seventy thousand angels, who never return there again (Bukhârî, Manânî al-Ma’ûrû, bâb 42).

We may safely assume that the number seven was regarded as a rounded whole; but it is going too far, following out this conception, to try to derive with Hein the root sâ'î and its equivalents in other Semitic languages from the root sâ'î (work quoted below, p. 91 sqq.).


SABA', the name of the people and kingdom in South-western Arabia in the first millennium B.C., frequently mentioned in the Old Testament, in Greek, Roman and Arabic literature and especially in the South Arabian inscriptions; the old Arabic sources, which are mainly inscriptions, and isolated references, give us further information regarding the history of Saba in the first centuries A.D. down to the period of Muhammâd. In Assyrian, on the evidence of the cuneiform inscriptions down to the eighth century, Sîdû was the name of a country, as was Shakkât (also Shabbât, Shabbâh) in the hieroglyphic texts, although of a comparatively late date. In the Bible, Sâheb was the name of a people and country and in the South Arabian inscriptions also Saba' means the land or kingdom and people (which is in keeping with the Sabean constitution). The oldest known literary references to Saba are, of course, the Semitic, especially those in the cuneiform inscriptions. While the oldest certain mentions only date from the eighth century, historical documents from Mesopotamia of a much earlier period seem to refer to Saba'. For example Sâfu in a Sumerian inscription of Arradananu, Patesi of Lagash, a contemporary of the last kings of Ut, the second half of the third millennium B.C., is perhaps a name for the “land of the Sabaeans”, Hommel (in Hilprecht’s Explorations in Bible Lands, Philadelphia 1903, p. 739) speaks of Sôbûm of the time of the kings of Ut (after 3500 B. C.) as the Saba of the Old Testament (“in Central Arabia”, on this see also Die altasiatische Überversetzung, Munich 1897, p. 37). In the inscriptive narratives of the campaigns of Tiglath-Pileser III (745—727) against North Arabia, among the tribes who offered their submission we find Sabaeans mentioned, the oldest certain reference for this people. Sargon II (722—705) in his Annals (for the year 715) mentions the Arabs of the desert dwelling afar off, the Queen Samat of Aribi already mentioned in the narrative of Tiglath-Pileser just quoted and the Sabacan It’umar, who along with others brought rich gifts of tribute (gold, frankincense, jewels, etc.). With the latter name Lenormant compared It’umar, the name, known from inscriptions, of several rulers of the oldest period of Saba’. Schrader’s Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament, I, (henceforth quoted as K. A. T., p. 55) and Kiepert’s (Lokal d. alten Geogr., p. 187) suggestion that the reference here is not to the South Arabian Sabau has been rejected by D. H. Müller (Bürgen und Schlöser des Sündabentuent, ii. (1881), p. 989 (in Sabische Denkmäler, 1883, p. 108 against Delitzsch, Wo lag das Paradies? Leipzig 1881, p. 303, who sought to locate the Sabu of Sargon’s inscriptions in North Arabia; cf. Winckler in the M. V. A. G., 1896, p. 18; but see also W. M. Müller, Studien zu F. Fisches dissertationen Geschicht, ibid., p. 360; Glaser, Skize der Geschichte aus Geographie Arabiens, II, Berlin 1890, p. 153 and Grimm (Mohammed, Munich 1904, p. 18) from the fact that the tribe consisted of regular South Arabian products deduced that even in Tiglath-Pileser’s time, as in Sargon’s, the Sabaeans were South Arabs;
others have more recently been inclined again to transfer Itîmar’s abode to North Arabia (cf. M. Hartmann, "Die arabisch-iranische Frage in der islamischen Geschichte", II, Berlin 1909, p. 124, 458). From Sprunger’s point of view, which maintained it to be certain that Arabia was the original home of the Semites (Leben und Lehre des Mohammadei, i. Berlin 1869, p. 247 sqq., and *Die alte Geographie Arabiens*, Bern 1875, p. 293 sqq.; following him Schrader, Z. d. M. G., xxvii. 421 and other notable authorities), which is still the view most generally held (cf. E. Meyer, *Gesch. d. Altertums*, p. 2, p. 366 sqq.), one can understand his untenable suggestion that the Sabaeans and the Minæans came from Hi育儿 and that the kingdom of Saba was founded by *Shabadda* (cf. Schröder, p. 162, 230, 246, 248, 301). More recently Winckler (cf. K. A. T. J., 1903, p. 7, 11, 126 sqq., 166; *Die Völker* Vorderasiens in *Die Altertum*, i. 3, 1, 10) and Weber (Arabien vor den Islam, p. 3 sqq.; *Westasien in Helmholtz’s Weltgeschichte*, iii. 3, 1, 220, 225) have categorically declared Arabia to be the original home of the Semites. Hommel (*Grundriss der Geogr. u. Geschichte des alten Orient*, i. Munich 1904, p. 10 sqq., 24, 50, 132) more cautiously sees in Eastern Arabia (including Chaldæa) at least the last starting point for the migration of all the Western Semites. Hartmann, *ibid.*, p. 93 sqq. has adopted a decided position against this theory of the original home. There are well-founded reasons against believing that Arabia should be regarded as the cradle of all Semitic peoples. Even with this hypothesis and the assumption of an Arab migration based upon it (see most recently *Westasien*, p. 226, but also the admission there p. 242) the relation between Arabia and Babylonia does not become absolutely clear. The reverse is really more probable, that the superfluous population of the fertile Euphrates region was forced towards Arabia, in the first place to the pasture-lands bordering it on the west, from which Semites naturally found their way back from time to time. In spite of Nöldeke’s arguments (Die semitischen Sprachen, Leipzig 1859, p. 11) it is as little probable that North Africa is the home of the Semites as that it was Germany (*ibid.*, p. 6 sqq.;humorously and other writers) or that there was a south-northward tendency in the immigration of the Sabaeans towards Africa. On the contrary there are indications, according to Guelz’s view (Dei popoli primitivi dei popoli semitici, in the Atti della R. Accad. dei Lincei, 1879), which is defended by Jacob (Altorab. Bedaumismol), Berlin 1897, p. 28 sqs.), that the southern Euphrates territory was the oldest known home of the Semites, from which in the course of centuries migrations took place towards west and south. The way in which Arabia was populated from there cannot, of course, be more definitely ascertained. Probably the Semites did not penetrate into Arabia by a single route but by two main routes; the one, which may have been taken by the tribes out of whom rose the Minæans and Sabaeans of the historical period, seems to have led through the arable lands along the west coast to the south, somewhat on the line of the later caravan route, and the other along the western shore of the Persian Gulf to 'Oman and Hadramot, roughly in the direction of the later eastern frankincense route. The Sabaeans, or their mother-stock, would naturally keep to the west and south coast regions, which offered the most suitable areas for settlement on account of their good soil and water-supply. According to Hommel, the Sabaeans probably first entered South Arabia from Dīrīf in North Arabia in the eighth century B.C. (see Grundriss, p. 142).

The Old Testament (Gen. x. 7; 1 Chr. l. 9) calls *Saba* the eponym of the land and people of South Arabia, the first son of Raʾmū, therefore a Kūḥite, but in Gen. x. 28 (1 Chr. l. 22) he is called a son of Yāqūt and in Gen. xxv. 3 (1 Chr. l. 52) a son of Yāqūt, son of Abraham. These are not, however, references to three different Saba: a people with such extensive trading connections had obviously intermarried a good deal with neighbours on the sea, on the caravan routes or in the stations and could therefore easily be given different genealogical classifications (Dillmann in Gen., x. 7). According to some, *Saba* is originally identical with *Shēba* and only dialectically differentiated from it to distinguish the African Sabaeans (e.g. v. Kremer, *Die isdurbischische Sage*, Leipzig 1866, p. 100 sqq.; D. H. Müller in the tenth edition of Gesenius’s *Hebr. Wörterb.*).

The etymology of the name *Saba* is not certain (on the best known attempts to explain it, — those of Kremer, Hommel, D. H. Müller and Glaser — as well as on other points see my more comprehensive treatment of the subject in Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll’s Reallex. der klass. Altertumswiss., s. v. *Saba*, henceforth quoted as R. E., col. 1499). The Bible shows that the Sabaeans supplied Syria and Egypt with spices, that they traded with frankincense, and also exported gold and jewels thither (cf. Psalms, lxii. 15; Ezek., xxvii. 22; Isaiah, lx. 6; Jerem., vi. 20) and the Greek and Roman accounts (see below) agree with this. Other Biblical passages, which describe the Sabaeans as a wealthy trading people — the essential feature of the Biblical account of Saba — are Ezek., xxviii. 13; Ps., lxii. 10; Job, vi. 19 (referred to Sabæan caravans), i. 15 (where the Sabaeans appear plundering in North Arabia; according to D. H. Müller, *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 1869, article Yemen, p. 738, colonists or caravans, which occasionally combined robbery with trading, at any rate according to a good source (K. A. T., 1903, 151) and the present work is not held to be of that opinion as W. M. Müller, *Studien*, p. 36, note 1 suggests); according to Winckler, *ibid.* (cf. Hommel, *Explorationen*, p. 748), in the passage in Job the Sabaeans are thought of as Beduins of the North Arabian desert. Joel, iii. 8, mentions the Sabaeans as "a people far off" to whom the sons and daughters of Tyre and Sidon will be sold by Judah (cf. the mention of sacred slaves, e.g. from Gara in South Arabian inscriptions; see Hartmann, *op. cit.*, p. 421). — To appreciate properly the much discussed story of the Queen of Sheba (I Kings, i. 1, 2, 10, 13; cf. II Chronicles, ix. 1 sqq., 9, 12), who is said to have visited Solomon, it is decisive that all that we know of Saba and Maʾain contradicts the supposition that there were queens there (K. A. T., p. 237). In any case we may not be sure of any evidence of the existence of the rule of queens in Saba, in which Glaser still believed (*op. cit.*, p. 360, 384 sqq., 403); also E. Meyer, *Gesch. des Altertums*, i. 2, p. 233, still less a support for the assumption that the oldest Sabæan inscriptions belong to the 5th or 6th century, or that in the time of Solomon there was only one great land of the Sabæans stretching far to the north (Gla-
trees unnecessary (cf. Periplus: Muriis Erythraei, p. 33); concerning the temple of Helios, the most ancient in the land of the Sabaeans, which was used as a place for keeping the whole harvest of myrrh and frankincense, an inscription testifies to the worship of the sun among the South Arabian tribes. For further details, as well as for information regarding the actual occurrence of these spice-trees in South Arabia see R.E., col. 1507 sqq. and the quotations from and collocation of the travelers' reports in A. Grohmann, Sabarabia als Wirtschaftsgebeit, Vienna 1922, p. 128 sqq., 136 sqq.; lastly on the attempt to connect Saba' with the land of frankincense, Punt, see R.E., col. 1312 sqq.

The next most ancient Greek authority on Saba' is contained in the much more copious statements of Eratosthenes preserved in Strabo, iv. iv. § 2, still very important for the historical side of Sabean studies, which in combination with the Theophrastus passage give a fairly clear picture of the oldest configuration of the South Arabian kingdoms as known to the Greeks and Europeans in general in the time of Eratosthenes. According to this authority, who, like Theophrastus, was able to make use of the results of the campaigns of Alexander as well as itineraries of sailors and caravan-travelers, there lived in South Arabia four main peoples: the Melitaus on the Red Sea with their capital Hapat, next to them the Sabaenes with their capital Majlid, then the Arrageus down to the straits and passage into the Arabian Gulf with the capital Tidmus, and farthest east the Karatagae with their (chief) town (τος) Xabhares. All these towns were under absolute rulers (kings) and were prosperous. This passage (with the others in Strabo) contains the oldest known account of the respective topographical situation of the four South Arabian kingdoms with a complete list of the four principal nations and the capitals. The Sabaeans, according to Eratosthenes, were neighbours of the Mineaeans (see the article MAEN for further information). It does not follow from his statement that the latter lived in the territory on the Red Sea, that he thought the Sabaeans did not also live on the sea, as Glaser (Sittant, 169) noted. (In the main text) it was also inclined to conclude. The correct interpretation is in agreement with the evidence of Arabic sources and of other Greek and Roman authors, for example Agatharchides (Diodorus, iii. 46) and Pliny (vi. 145) on Sebaean places on the Red Sea and the reference in Stephans Byzantium, Μαλίταις μεγάλας Σαβαΐνας πάντας τους Ἔχων ἴππας, referring expressly to the passage in Strabo, in which we can still see the correct idea that Saba' stretched down to the sea. According to the description of Eratosthenes, which naturally begins with the north (this disposes of W. M. Müller's doubts, Studien etc., p. 36, note 2), Saba' was in his time bounded on the north by the kingdom of Ma'in, on the south (and south-west) by Katabah and by Hajramaz in the east. At that time the land of the Sabaeans stretched to the west and south coasts, as it did in the time of Pliny (vi. 154; ad ururas maris ioracriti geographi); only their territory on the south coast, concerning which D. H. Müller, Burg. ii. 1857, was rather doubtful, was larger. It apparently included the Raddian coast between 'Aden and Hawar (according to Glaser, p. 20). Glaser's disbelief in the statement of Theophrastus to the effect that the Sabaeans also owned a part
of the frankincense coast, was unfounded and quite wrong, as well as the alteration in the text which he proposed to suit his hypothesis in two passages in Theophrastus Ψαριτώ for Ψαριτής (Glaser, "Punt", p. 45 sq.; cf. above). Plyn also (xii. 92), which Glaser, following Sprenger, had also to alter, repeats that the Sabaeans had possession in the frankincense region, which Sprenger himself acknowledged (Bevortellungen etc., Z D M G, xlv. 505). Μαμαλά, the name of the capital of the Sabaeans according to Eratosthenes and Artemidoro, reproduces the Arabic name (inscriptions Maris, Mārib, in the author's Mārib) as accurately as possible with the different sound of a. Laws x time of Eratosthenes, the part of the west coast south of Saba' and the most western part of the south coast was inhabited by the Κατάβαννης; the eastern neighbours of the Sabaeans were the Χαραγωνίται whom he mentions last (see RE, col. 1334 sq. and the article Κατάβαννης).

A comparison of the passage in Strabo with the list of South Arabian peoples in Theophrastus (see above) shows that three of them are mentioned by both authors, the peoples of Saba', Ḥaḏramūt and Κατάβαννης, while our two authorities differ regarding the name of the fourth people, whom Theophrastus calls the Μαμάλα (vitr. Mā Política) and Strabo the Μαμαλά. The assumption of a corruption in the text would easily restore perfect agreement between the two. Mordtmann for example in the Ζ D M G, xxx. 323 has explained Μαμάλα as a corruption of Μαμάλα and D. H. Müller also (JR. in the articles Arabia, ii. 348 and Ταχαρανίς, where Eratosthenes is confused with Pliny, and Anzinger Al. Wien, 1909, p. 4) has assumed that the reading ΜΑΜΑΛΑ may be restored with absolute certainty for ΜΑΜΑΛΑ in Theophrastus; that is to say both authors are referring to the Minaeans. But this proposed alteration in the text, which would take the oldest mention of the Minaeans among the Greeks back to the time of Alexander the Great, need not be considered absolutely necessary (Hommel, p. 190, 199, and the wynne against the Short). The two Greek authors are writing from different points of view: the botanist is not so concerned as the geographer with giving a full list of South Arabian kingdoms but is only interested in those regions which yield spices. The form Μαλα also finds support in the Μαμάλα σουρά of Toblemey, vii. 7, S. Sprenger who sticks to Μαλά (cf. cfr., p. 92, 263, 266) identifies the latter without giving any evidence with Maha (as does Hommel, cf. cfr., p. 137: "probably the Maha coast"). Hartmann, cf. cfr., p. 420, simply takes Mal for the land of the Minaeans without giving the slightest proof.

Following the passage from Eratosthenes, we have in Strabo xvi. iv. § 33 (map B) an account by a later authority, Artemidorus, of the land of the Sabaeans. The people — very fortunately (cf. Agatharchides in Photius, § 97 and K. Müller, Géogr. Græc. Minorèz, i. 180) — are called "a very powerful people" in whose land myrrh, frankincense and cinnamon grow and on the coast — a fact confirmed by modern travellers — balsam tree also (cf. Theophrastus, iv. 4, v. ἡ ἁπάντης) and other aromatic trees and plants. Then follows information regarding the abundance of fruits in the land, regarding the capital Maribah, laws and duties of the king, commerce and the wealth gained by the Sabaeans through trading, as well as their agriculture and other details, which are repeated in almost the same words by Diodoros (iii. 47) from Agatharchides, who was also Artemidorus's authority — a fact which does not seem to have been appreciated by modern writers, who regard Artemidorus as an independent source. The above quoted reference to the occurrence of frankincense among the Sabaeans seems to be contradictory to Strabo's (xvi. iv. § 33) "τότε δὲ ἐπιδεύσθην μήτε ἐκ Καραγωνίτων μήτε ἐκ Χαραγωνίτων οὖσαν δὲ σάρκα τὸν" following Eratosthenes; to remove the difficulty it has been assumed sometimes that there was confusion on the part of Eratosthenes and sometimes, as in quite recent writers, that the Katabanians had lands in the frankincense region and that there was a change in their ownership by which part at least of Kataban passed to Saba'. However possible this may be and however little misgiving one may have about it in this case, it must also be borne in mind that Strabo's sentence cannot be taken from its context and placed in another context as an argumentum ex silentio. From the statement that Katabani produced frankincense it does not follow that Katabani alone produced it and that it was not found elsewhere in South Arabia. Besides the substance of Eratosthenes's remark is only found in Strabo's version.

Strabo (xvi. iv. § 23) goes on to give an account of the campaign against South Arabia of Aelia Gallus in the year 24 B.C., based on direct information; he is the earliest authority on the campaign (cf. also ii. 118, xvii. 819; Pliny, vi. 160 and Dio Cassius, liii. 29 (= Zonaras, x. 33.) The complete failure of this campaign, which was the first and most important direct contact between Rome and distant Saba' and which had been undertaken by Augustus, as Strabo tells us, in the hope of winning the wealth of the Arabs, especially of the Sabaeans, was, as Glaser (op. cit., p. 45 sq.) has already emphasized in contradiction to Strabo's version, the result of the ignorance of the Romans regarding the country and people and the weakness of any previous observations (on the specialist literature on the subject and modern criticism of the eastern policy of Augustus like Flügel, Mommsen, Winckler, Glaser, Weber, Hartmann, on the accounts of the fighting in Strabo and Pliny, the route of Gallus's march — which Sprenger for example gives wrongly — and the minor military successes of the Romans regarding which the accounts differ cf. RE, col. 1344 sq., 1350 sq.). In disagreement with the usual accounts (in d'Anville, Gibbon, Karl Müller, Sprenger, whom almost all recent writers followed, Kiepert, Mommsen, Zehme, Mordtmann, Ang Müller, D. H. Müller, Winckler, Weber) I only mention here that the fortress point reached by the Roman expedition, which Strabo (§ 44) calls Μαμάλα, the town of the Μαμάλατας who were ruled by IIabarah, the Monumentum Ancevarum, v. 22 and Pliny vi. 160 call Marib, was not the Sabean capital Mārib, as, following Vincent, Forbiger and Ritter, Glaser has again recently (op. cit., p. 57 sq. rightly emphasized and Landberg also according to whom (Arabica, v. 82) Strabo's Μαμάλα (as it has generally been written since the time of v. Kramer instead of Μαμάλα, although without any justification) is undoubtedly the Maryama the ruins of which lie in the district of Baybān al-Ḫabs on the Wādī Bābān (south-east of Mārib; see the description in Landberg, op. cit., p. 21 sq.; full information
regarding this district *ibidem*, p. 3—63; the old contrary view is still championed by Grimaux, *Mohammed*, p. 20). Glauser was, however, wrong in his attempt to locate this town exactly, which he, thinking of Carpita in Pliny, vi. 160 which, as Fresnel had already pointed out, recalls the Arabic *karshā* `ruins', saw in the later Sabaean capital *Sirwā* (west of Mārib). Carpita, however, goes back not to *karshā* but to the place-name *Harīt*. Much more worthy of attention is Landberg's connection of the Romanite city, — the name of which, it is true, he wrongly reads *Marib* and erroneously considers to be the Marib Baramalacum in Pliny, vi. 157 — with the Arabic *Maryama* and with *Ma'yāza* in Ptolemy, vii. 7, 37, as well as with *Marilym* in the inscriptions, with which is to be identified the *Ma'yāza* of Ptolemy, vii. 7, 38 presumably the modern Maryama in Ḥadīmīt (not as Mordtmann—Müller, *Sabiostische Denkmäler*, p. 104, thought). But he wrongly records it as a city of the *Māʾrā* the Arabic *Maʿmā* (p. 24). Landberg is wrong also in his location (in Bahīn al-Dawla, a district south of Bahīn al-Kaṣībī) of the limit reached by the Roman expedition, mentioned by Dio Cassius, the name of which he wrongly (following Glauser) considered to be Adula. — *Ma'yāza*, as the name should rather be written, is, according to D. H. Müller's suggestion, the *Vīlā* (usually read Yathil) of the Minaean inscriptions. Monsma wrongly (Monshaneom *Ancyraeum*, v. 22) found a contradiction between the statement of Augustus regarding the terminus of the campaign ("enque in Sabaeorum ibur") and those of Strabo and Pliny and sought to modernize it by assuming that Augustus was describing South Arabia with a generalising but not correct expression as the "land of the Sabaean". The farthest point reached by the expedition was actually — as Augustus rightly says — in the land of the Sabaean and, according to Strabo, in the land of the Romanità i.e. of the Radamn or the Radan of Pliny, which is in agreement with the *Memontum*. Ilasār, whose name and person have been wrongly interpreted, is the Iklār Yaḥdib, whom we know from inscriptions, regarding whose attitude to the political situation in Saba' during the Roman campaign Hartmann (p. 155 sq., 173 sq. etc.) has made erroneous suggestions (see H. E., col. 1371 sq.).

The reports of this campaign, the military and political importance of which for the history of Saba' has been very much overestimated by Spengler, Dillmann and Fabričius, brought the Roman world a better knowledge of the land and people of South Arabia — among other information a correction of the Greek statements hitherto current regarding the spices which Arabia exported. As a result of the information obtained from Gallus, Strabo (§ 24) was able to distinguish the divisions of South Arabia according to the predominant activity or quality of its inhabitants — in contrast to the earlier political division of South Arabia based on Eratosthenes (Strabo, § 2) —, a distinction made from the social and economic point of view which is included for example, the estate which still exists today in Arabia, similar to Pliny's account, vi. 161, which also refers to Gallus. Strabo goes on to deal with family life in South Arabia, including community of women, a testimony, with which passages in the inscriptions have been compared, as evidence for polyandry in Saba', the occurrence of which Hartmann (op. cit., p. 7) has wrongly denied; it must be granted, however, that many inscriptions, when properly interpreted, can no longer be used as evidence for the existence of polyandry.

Copious information regarding the land and the capital, the customs, mode of life and constitution of the Sabaeans and about South Arabia generally are contained in the two excerpts from Agatharchides (epig. 76, *Geograph. Sacratnum*, vol. 5, probably concluded about the year 152/1) preserved in almost identical terms in the *Bibliotheca* Ptolemais and in Diódoros (iii. 38—48). Agatharchides was the source used by Artemidorus also. The statements regarding spices which filled the whole land with natural, pleasant odours may be compared with Herodotos, iii. 113, Pliny, xii. 86, and Wrede's report (*Reise*), p. 80 on the Wādī Muntigh, p. 77 on the *Dīqāl Shidār*, p. 82 on the Wādī Khīlīfāt). Noteworthy also is the information he gives regarding the Sabaean royal city *Sāflan*, on the constitution, on the laws and duties of the kings, whose rule was hereditary in a particular family (which is confirmed by the South Arabian inscriptions), regarding customs and activities of the people, who are praised as brave soldiers, industrious tillers of the soil and traders and skilful sailors, and regarding the trade with Egypt, Syria and Phoenicia and the resultant wealth and luxury of the Sabaean which surpassed that of all other Arabs (cf. the above mentioned statements of Strabo following Artemidorus). *Sāflan* and *Mārib* in Strabo, xiv. iv. § 2 following Eratosthenes), § 19 (following Artemidorus), in Stephanos Byzantinus, *v. v., as well as *Marsathē* (corrupted from *Marisaba*, according to Mordtmann) in Pliny, vi. 155 are. (What Glaser, op. cit., p. 58, 62, 153, 287 has not noticed) only two different names of the same town, the capital of Saba', Mārib [q. v.]. The name *Sāflan* finds an analogy in the fact that Arab writers also sometimes call the Sabean capital Saba', e.g. al-Idrisī, Abu 'l-Fidasī, as well as Ibn Khordāḫbeh and the Turks (see Mordtmann, *Sabiostische Denkmäler*, p. 3, note 1). The statement in Phoīnīs that the capital stood on a not high hill has been erroneously doubted by doubt, but is confirmed by the observation of modern travellers, like Arnaud, Halāsī and Glaser (Strabo's remark; "on a hill covered with trees" may be considered a sign of the decline in vegetation). — From the statement in Phoīnīs (§ 101, middle of the page) Ritter (*Erdbundige, xii. 249), Kremer (op. cit., p. 9) and Glaser, op. cit., p. 9) have wrongly deduced that the Sabaeans sent out colonies or at least trading settlements into foreign lands, especially India; we are rather to understand trading voyages by sea by *phṓnēs* (intransitive *átp elu̇d*).

The literary references to Saba' and Arabia in general, as well as the reports of merchants and travellers, influences the later literature of the Greeks and that of the Romans from the first century A.D. It is to them — particularly to poets of the time before the expedition of Gallus — that we owe the typical conception of the rich and fortunate Sabaeans in a remote Eldorado. I shall here pass over these references in poetic literature, as they have not the importance of independent sources and only observe that as a result of this conception of Saba', the chief country in Arabia, — as is intelligible with poetic lan-
guage — Sabaean gradually came to be used, not with the limited application to Saba', but in the general sense of "Arabian," so that even expressions like Vergil, Georgica, i. 57, melius esse tene Sabaee (mutandis) II. 117, volo est tene virga Sabaee, etc., are not to be used as arguments in the reconciliation of apparent differences in the nomenclature of South Arabian areas, that produced frankincense, and it cannot be deduced from them that Vergil allotted the frankincense tree to the Sabaeans alone as distinct from other South Arabs.

The amplification of the previous knowledge of the country from first-hand accounts as a result of the Horn article is also reflected in Pliny's references, which augment the exacting preserved from the older Greek writers by many details, although they are in parts confused and corrupt. The majority of the towns mentioned by him in vi. 160, which Gallus is said to have destroyed, can be proved to have existed from the South Arabian inscriptions, or from al-Hamdani, the first author who mentions them after Pliny, or from other geographical sources. Pliny's account, based on new information regarding Arabia, which goes back to Gallus or reached Rome by other ways from time to time, is of historical importance in as much as it mentions a people, not mentioned by Strabo or Agatharchides, who produced a haltin alteration in political conditions in Saba'. After giving (probably from Juba) in vi. 158 the Hecatomites after the Minaeans (Ma'in) and Rhadamaei (Radman) among the Arabian peoples, in 161 Pliny, expressly quoting the explorations of Gallus as his authority for this period, calls attention with the words numerum non esse Hecatomites to a fact which forms a turning point in the history of Saba', the rise of the Himyars (Homeriteae), the Quayardae of the Greeks). This is the oldest reference preserved to the Himyars and their strength. At the time of Gallus, as Pliny tells us, South Arabia no longer had the hands of the Sabaeans under the ancient dynasty of the "Kings of Saba", but had passed to the Himyars under rulers with the title "Kings of Saba" and Dhu Ra'idah. The definite report of Gallus, who says that the Himyars were a predominating people in South Arabia and the legitimate conclusion that they were at this time already in possession of the hegemony, agrees at once and convincingly with Glaser's deduction (cf. Die Abkunft, p. 31) from the inscriptions that the beginning of Himyar rule is to be placed in the second or at least in the first century B.C., and that evidence against the attempt (made by Mordtmann, Mommern, Hartmann and others) to shift the beginning of the Himyar period in an earlier date after the beginning of the Christian era, does not even help the endeavours of others, like Kremers and D. H. Müller, to place it towards the end of the first century B.C. (Glaser, cf. cit., p. 38) would not pronounce definitely for this date of about 70 B.C. and talks of "somewhere after 175 B.C., but certainly not after the birth of Christ" if it is tempting, he says, to take 115 B.C., but there are objections (p. 38 sq.; cf. also Weber, Arabien vor Islam, p. 33; Hommel, Geschichte des alten Morgenlandes, Sammlung Göschens, Leipzig 1908, p. 148 and cf. ibid. here the article Arabia, i. 377 sqq., etc.). Sprenger's (op. cit., p. 76 sqq., 225), Dillmann's (op. cit., p. 204) and Hartmann's (op. cit., p. 469, note 1) hypotheses of the contemporaneity of and even of a causal connection between the rise of the Himyar power and the Roman campaign thus lose any basis.

A further reference to the kingdom of the Himyars is in Pliny, vi. 104, intus oppidum, regis sive, appellativo Saphirat, i.e. Zafar, the capital of the Himyars. We see, however, from Pliny that the Sabaeans in the time of Juba still held an important position — although they were no longer the lords of Southern Arabia — and the land ruled by them was no smaller in area than in the time of Kronteis. Of minor points we shall only mention here that of Pliny's reference (vi. 161) to their economic life and their wealth the expression, regum riga, finds confirmation in the testimony of the inscriptions to the old irrigation works of South Arabia (wells, canals, dams and cisterns) and in the statements of al-Hamdani regarding irrigation (see below), the mention immediately afterwards of melis cerino preventus (cf. Strabo, vii., iv. 8) agrees with the fact that almost all the mountain regions of South Arabia are rich in honey (cf. Sprenger, op. cit., p. 249); Glaser, op. cit., p. 69 — evidence for honey and wax in the Baidan district; also Landberg, Arabia, v. 236; Bent, Topographia, p. 330, Southern Arabia, p. 147; Harris, Iraq, no. 12 and of travellers' narratives; cf. the statements in al-Hamdani, Qisrash at-’Arab, p. 192, 104, 123, 194). The words preceding in Pliny, aliunam fertilitas vini vivesera (cf. Agatharchides in Phoebus, §§ 95 and 96) also refer to the Sabean wealth in the frankincense region (Sprenger, op. cit., p. 250), aurum metalla to the occurrence of gold, namely in the coast regions (cf. Agatharchides, § 95, on the land of the Deben rich in gold; Strabo, vii., iv. 8); Pliny, vi. 150 on the aurum metalla of the Ilus Homamann and especially al-Hamdani, p. 135, 177 etc. on gold mines in South Arabia and modern travellers such as Halévy and Glaser (Glaser, op. cit., p. 111, Punt, p. 77) would look for the gold mines in "Anir only or in Hajar (East Somalliland), but there can be no possibility of a reference to East Africa in the Pliny passage. Sprenger, op. cit., p. 249, would also locate the mines in the interior of the country (see further discussion below). Pliny's note (xii. 58) on the gathering of frankincense may be compared with the statements of Yākūt: (Muḥaddis, iii. 577). Of importance for the history of civilization also is the fact reported in xii. 54 that the collection of frankincense was considered a religious act, that only the Sabaeans as lords of the land of frankincense and with them the Minaeans were allowed to look upon the frankincense tree (when it was being ceremonially re-cropped), that these were said to be not more than 3,000 privileged families who claimed the hereditary right to the sole possession of frankincense trees for themselves and their descendants: sancta aulaeae: ad iudicium congressum fimoneum, cum spondycosus in arboribus uincut aut polluant, where Sprenger (op. cit., p. 92) and Glaser (op. cit., p. 31, Punt, p. 44) proposed quite unjustifiable alterations in the text. Congressum fimoneum are to the present day in Islam more or less connected with qanūtā (pollution; cf. Sprenger, op. cit., p. 219); Hartmann, op. cit., p. 415 remarks that the passage in Pliny appears to throw some light on the aversion of the Muslims to burning fragrant spices etc. at funerals, which is discussed
Saba' is to be identified with the sun-god, as do Ritter, Sprunger, Glaser, etc. The name also, in these identifications, would remain unexplained. Probably Saba is a form of name which appears to have arisen neither through a misunderstanding nor through a corruption of the text, but is simply the (Lord, God) of Saba. (Saba; at other times Shewat or regularly “Shab(swt)” or “R.B., etc., v. Saba). It is not the above quoted mention of the Homeric in Pliny that is to be regarded as the oldest known reference to literature to the Hymyar, but the Peripis Maris Erythraei, which is older than Pliny’s work, but younger than his principal literary sources, and, indeed, as I have endeavored to show in R.E., col. 1462 sq., differing from previous dates proposed by Dillmann, Mommaen, Harnack, Glaser, etc., seems to have been composed between 40 and at latest 51 A.D., probably between 40 and 45. A light is thrown on the political situation by the statement in the Peripis, § 23, that Charibert, the lawful king of two peoples, and the Homerites and their neighbors, the Sabaite i.e. Sabaena, was ruling in the capital Saphar. Saba’; therefore, was under Hymyarite rule at the time of the composition of the work. Saphar is Zafir (near Yatim), the capital of the “Kings of Saba’ and Dhu Raudan,” an identification which Landberg, A.Br., v. 50, could not accept. Muth was no longer the royal capital. Saba, the Egyptian form for Saba’ is also found in the Axum inscription and this too supports the manuscript reading Saba at the commencement proposed by the editor (Fabricius, p. 60 following Salmasius). The Hymyarite king Charibert is probably the Kharib’el Water Yudham, King of Saba’ and Dhu Raudan, known from inscriptions and coins. Harnack’s attempt to identify him (ep. cit., pp. 1454 sq., 173 sq.) collapses with his baseless premises. A tremendous revolution in the history of Saba’ took place in the period between the erection of the inscription of Adulis (Cerpius inscr. Geuc, iii. 3127 B) in about the first third of the second century A.D., about 127, and that of the bilingual inscription of Axum of the middle of the fourth century (before 350). In the former the text of the Axumites mentions that he had waged war from Axum ad gainst (al-Hawz) coastwards as far as the land of the Sabaenes. While he was thus forced to halt in his campaign on the northern frontier of Saba’, Atanana (‘Azana), who erected the bilingual inscription, already calls himself “King of Axum and Hymyar and Saba’,” etc. The most important parts of South-West Arabia had therefore been conquered by the Axumites since the beginning of the second century A.D. The disputes of Dillmann, Hartmann and others regarding the actuality of this conquest, with the inscriptions for which the mention of ambassadors ad gentem Axumitarum at Hymyaratam (Cod. Theod, xii. 57, 8) agrees, were unfounded. The fact that Hymyar occurs before Saba’ in the series of titles enables one to deduce that the former was the kingdom proper, besides which Saba occupied the second place, having not yet sunk into insignificance. With the official title of the inscriptions may be compared the double title of the Hymyar king in the Peripis. The testimony of the Abyssinian inscriptions, that Atanana was king of Hymyar and Saba’, agrees, as Glaser (Die Aethiopier, p. 5 sq.) emphasizes,
with the fact that the South Arabian inscriptions from the end of the third to the last quarter of the fourth century mention no Yemeni rulers; the latter do not appear again until 378 A.D. and then occur uninterruptedly until the first quarter of the sixth century, when (525) the Abyssinians again conquered Saba. The foundation of the power of the Axumite kingdom was an interruption of the last period of the South Arabian kingdom; from the beginning of which, about 500 A.D., the kings assumed the longer title "of Saba, Dhib Râdân and Hadsâmût and Yemeni" in place of the previous title "of Saba" and Dhib Râdân.

From the statements of Ptolemy, who, apart from unimportant references, is the Greek literary source for Saba' that follows the Monumentum adullamum in order of time, it may be deduced that in his map the Sabaens (vi, 7, 25) no longer occupied so large an area as they still did even in the time to which Strabo and Pliny refer, but seem to have become limited to the northeastern half of their former territory; the Himyarites, on the other hand, occupied a considerable part of the south coast, and other smaller peoples are also mentioned as inhabiting the South Arabian territory, which must have belonged to the Sabaens as late as the end of the second century A.D. Quite recently the words of Ptolemy: Κοσταμπού μέχρι τον "Ασ-βαντινος το, ἵνα δὲ η λαμπαδοφωνὸς κόχρων έχεται been erroneously interpreted to mean that after the Sabaens the frankincense region was under the rule of the Kahtâbâni, and further assumptions were based on the statement that Katabhani were still settled there although an independent kingdom of Kahtân then no longer existed. The facies syntax and the linguistic practice of Ptolemy, according to which ὁσ with the accusative means "south of", "situated below", shows that it is just the reverse that is the case. Ptolemy separates geographically the frankincense region and the homes of the Kahtâbani. Sprenger (p. 209 etc.), from his likewise erroneous point of view, has difficulty with the statement that the Kahtâbâni in the time of Ptolemy were "out of this possession" (cf. the article Kâthâbân).

In agreement with the Arabic sources, Ptolemy introduces us to a period of progressive decline of Saba'. The occasional mentions of Saba' in the Greek toponymographers of the first centuries A.D. are of no independent value. The name Saba' disappears from Greek and Roman literature from the end of the fourth century A.D. After this date we only have an occasional isolated reference to the Homeritos, whose name became gradually applied to the whole of South Arabia.

Only half a century ago, Sprenger (cf. cit., p. 246) was able to say that the Greeks and Pliny were the only sources that gave us information regarding the Sabaens. Our knowledge of the history of ancient South Arabia which, until quite recently, could only be supplemented by a little by the isolated references in the Old Testament and the Arabic inscriptions, became insufficient, because utterly unlike materialistic, traditions of the Arabs, was increased in an extraordinary fashion by finds of inscriptions, principally in South Arabia, and the increasing progress in the study of the ancient history of the east has also thrown new light on the history of Saba'.

Yet the explorer Glaser (cf. cit., p. 159), famous for his epigraphical finds, does not hesitate to say that the correct interpretation of the few statements in the classical authors is no less necessary than the elucidation of the inscriptions of Saba', and that the latter and the passages in classical writers supplement and explain one another. In any case we must not lose a sense of perspective in face of the decisive importance of the inscriptions for the study of political and cultural history; being the only direct historical source they form our most important material for a reconstruction of the past of Saba' and South Arabia generally. The history of the opening of this rich and still unexhumed mine of material for research is associated with very few names. Carsten Niebuhr, a member of the expedition sent out by the Danish government in 1763, who travelled through South Arabia from Lobanya to Mokha, Ta'izz and Ṣan'a', being more particularly engaged in geographical, ethnographical and natural history work, first reported, as the result of enquiries, the existence of old inscriptions in the ruins of Zafir (south-west of Yamin) near Ṣan'a' (Beschreibung von Arabien, Copenhagen 1772, p. 94), without having seen the text itself, except for a copy of an inscription which a Dutchman had sent him; after him the first knowledge of South Arabian inscriptions was brought to Europe by Seetzen, a native of Oldenburg, who, stirred by Niebuhr's information, copied inscriptions in and around Zafir on his return from Ṣan'a' to Aaden (1810). The copies sent by him to Europe of five short, unimportant, Sabean texts were published in 1811 and, though at first not understood, formed the humble beginning of the science of Sabean studies, the future importance of which was as yet quite unrealised. Further progress was made by Wellsted (1834/5): (discovery of the inscription of Ḥim al-Qurâbah on the Ḥadâsmût coast and of Ṣan'ā'), both Englishmen, by Weede (1843); but the report of his travels in Ḥadâsmût and the copy of the Ḥadâsmût inscription of Obâne were only published in 1870 from his papers after his death by Malraux and others, among whom special mention must be made of Arnaud who in 1843 was the first European to visit Ḍür and to pave the way for later more successful discoveries (ignorantly by Glaser, Petersmann's Mitteln, 1857, p. 27), and there as well as in Ṣan'a' and Ṣirâh prepared copies of 56 inscriptions in all, mainly short ones. A valuable addition to our knowledge was the acquisition of inscribed stones and bronze plates from Ṣamrah by Choghlân (1860). Gesenius (1841), Rödiger (1841, 1842) and Olsander (1856, 1862) then gained renown by deciphering and elucidating the material found. The Eben Sâfîr is only of importance as a description of Yemen; this is the Hebrew account of the travels of Jacob Saphir (1, 1861; ii, 1866) who went from al-Ḥodâdah via Ṣan'a' to Ṣamrah and then back to Aaden; the book was first made generally known through D. H. Müller (Burgers, i. 6, vii) and formed a kind of guide-book for Hâlêve. A new epoch in the study of inscriptions is marked by the rich results of the memorable journey of Jos. Halevé, who, one may say, was the first European since Adkins Gallas to succeed (in 1856) in travelling from Ṣamrah right up to the Wiht Nadâm and entering the land of the South Arabian Tīsîr, the centre of the ancient Minean country, and visiting several very ancient Arabian sites, rich in inscriptions, which so far no other European since him has seen. The con-
cretic scientific yield of this journey of exploration, not sufficiently appreciated by his immediate contemporaries, consisted of 686 copies of inscriptions of which about 50 (some 30 Muzenian) were fairly long (published in the J. As., 1872), the most important addition to our store of inscriptions yet made, which, marking a tremendous advance on the initial stages, helped to lay the true scientific foundation for Sabean research and the knowledge of the sources for the study of the ancient history of South Arabia. Some new inscriptions were made known through the 'Journey to Sabæa' (Werner Munthe) in the Wldh Maflsâ' (1870). The travels of Heinrich von Maltzan (1870), in the coast regions of Yemen and Hadramaut, Millingen, (1873, from al-Idhâdâ to San as), K. Mazzoni (1877—80, between 'Ain Sanâ and al-Idhâdâ), Schaepia (1879, from 'Ain to San as) and district and back to al-Idhâdâ) and Harris's more recent journey through the Yemen (London 1893) are not of interest from the epigraphical point of view but from the geographical; Mazzoni's work and Maltzan's later contributions are also valuable for the study of dialects. The Austrian S. Langer (1882), who sacrificed his life to the investigation of his subject, travelled from al-Idhâdâ first to San as, then to 'Ain, as did Sceetazen before him and Huber after him, gained copies of 32 inscriptions (Nos. 19—32 only odd letters). Further details of the history of discovery in Arabia are given in Weber's monographs, Arabien vor dem Islam, p. 109 sqq. (which also contains information regarding the history of civilization and religion, contents, alphabets and language of the inscriptions) and more especially his Forschungen in Südara in zum Aufriete Edward Glaser's Uber Alt Orient, viii, 4, 1907 and Hommel's account in Hilprecht's Explorationes, p. 644 sqq. (see also his Christomathia, p. 63 sqq. with bibliography). A new era in this branch of research was introduced by the Arabian travels of the Austrian Glaser whose epigraphic discoveries (in all over 2,000 inscriptions) far surpassed all previous efforts in this field. D. H. Müller's prophecy (Bergen, I. 340): "There will still be courageous men, who will place themselves in the service of science and undertake the exploration of the country and collection of inscriptions", was realised in Glaser in an undreamed-of fashion. On his first three journeys alone, 1882—1884 (from al-Idhâdâ to San as) and from there three tours of exploration north and west from this neighbourhood, 1885—6 (from al-Idhâdâ to San as and back to the south-eastern coast as far as 'Ain, exploration of the ruins of Zafrâ), 1887-8 (from 'Ain to San as) and thence to Maflsâ', where alone he copied nearly 400 inscriptions, while Arnaud and Halévy together only got 44 copies mostly of small fragments), he enriched our knowledge by some 1032 inscriptions, by sketch maps and philiological observations and some 616 Arabic manuscripts. A portion of the manuscripts was published by the French Academy (C. T. S., I, IV, I—III), numerous inscribed stones (mostly Muzenian) are in London, others in Berlin (published by Mordtmann in 1893). The manuscripts for the most part went to the British Museum ('See C. R. R. Suppl. to the Cat. of Arcaic MSS. in the B. M., London 1894). Of his epigraphical discoveries Special mention may be made of the Hâdâsh inscription, one of the most important historical documents from South Arabia (on his fourth journey he brought back a further and perfect squeeze of it), and the two great inscriptions from Maflsâ' relating to the burning of the dam. His fourth journey was the most successful (1892—1894, from 'Ain to San as), from which natives were sent out to prepare squeezes; among the new inscriptions were nearly 100 Kâthânian, linguistic studies; acquisition of 251 Arabic manuscripts. A portion of the treasures acquired for Vienna, a valuable collection of 39 inscribed stones, coins, numerous sculptures and other antiquities, was published by D. H. Müller. Further particulars are given by Weber in Edward Glaser's Forschungen in Südarabien in Der Alt Orient, II., 2, 1909 (cf. Hommel, Explorationes, p. 717, 720 sqq.). Glaser could not make further use of the opportunity he still had for further journeys and discoveries because he no longer found the necessary comprehension of the importance of scientific work at the Ministry concerned. Immeasurable treasures were thus irreversibly lost to science. Working on the epigraphical material that has been gradually made known since Halévy's time, Halévy, Pretorius, Mordtmann, D. H. Müller, Glaser and others (for details see Bibliography) have made important contributions to the elucidation of the language and contents of the inscriptions. As to later journeys of exploration in South Arabia, A. Deiter's journey in Yemen in 1887 was only planned to study botany. L. Hirsch, who in 1893 was, so far as we know, the first European to visit Shibân, the modern capital of Hadramaut, and Tarïm, was only studying natural history, with toponomy and ethnography. Soon after him in 1893—4, J. Théodore Bent, whose wife travelled in Hadramaut as far as Shibân and in 1895 in the frankincense country (Zafrâ to Mirbat), likewise without being particularly interested in epigraphy, Carlo Landberg in 1896 took a squeeze and photograph of the already known inscription of Hijâj al-Churgh; the results of his enquiries made in 'Ain in 1895—97 regarding previously little known regions between Yemen proper and Hadramaut, particularly regarding Dathina, 'Awâli, al-Islâm and also regarding Bainân, Matyama, Kailâm, Harib, Timam and even Shibân are given in his valuable work Arabica (IV. and V.). The South Arabian expedition of the Vienna Academy in 1898—9, which was also supported by the King of Sweden, only succeeded in reaching 'Azâz in the Wldh Maflsâ' and did not get to Shibân. While the epigraphical results of this expedition fell below expectations, its members took the opportunity in 1899 of making linguistic and natural history researches on the island of Socotra (see Brotex) (G. W. Hury, who went to Baihân on behalf of the expedition, brought back from Kohlân (Katah) squeezes and photographs of inscriptions). In 1902 W. Hein collected linguistic material in Gâilân in Hadramaut on behalf of the Vienna Academy and, at the same time, collected information there and later in Vienna from natives regarding Hadramaut. His collected notes, published without any editing in 1914 after his death, contain much that is new and noteworthy. Hartwig Derenbourg was able from squeezes obtained by the French Academy to publish a few Nouveaux textes yéménites inédits in the Rev. d'Asyri. et d'Arch. Or., v. 117 sqq.
Glaser's finds, epoch-making of their kind, are not yet completely published (a survey of the inscriptions discovered by Glaser was given so far as they are known by Hommel, *Chronologie*, pp. 59—62; see also Glaser, *Algemeene Nieuwsbrieven*, i. 1908, i. A 82). The great work prepared by him on Sabaean (announced, for example, in Hommel, *Explorations*, p. 722, and Weber, *Glaser Forschungen*, p. 11, on Glaser's authority) has not yet been published. The great mass of documents left by him (consisting of copies of about 1,000 inscriptions, paleographical notes, diaries, sketches and maps), the importance of which may be summed up by saying that it is the first duty of Sabaean studies to arrange them methodically and publish them scientifically, was handed over to D. H. Müller to edit. But neither was he spared to publish this material. After his death in 1910, N. Rhodokanakis in Graz was given the task. The latter calls his treatise *Der Grundriss der Öffentlichkeit in den südaborischen Urkunden* (S. B. Ak. Wien, cxlvii. Abh. 2, 1915; interpretation of inscr. Glaser No. 390 = Halévy 49, Gl. 904 = Halévy 51, Gl. 1548 b [Sabaean], Gl. 1549 b [Katabani], and Osliander 4, with systematic discussion of the forms of date, ownership and legislation raised by the inscriptions) the first preliminary study to the *Corpus Glaserianum*, the publication of which the Vienna Academy has in hand; he describes as a second preliminary study the first part of his *Studien zur Lexigraphie und Grammatik des Abgorischen* (S. B. Ak. Wien, cxlvii. Abh. 4, 1915; explanation of passages in the Habib inscription, Glaser 1976 and Gl. 480 [cf. above] and especially a grammatical essay on the so-called parasitic a in South Arabic, for the phonetic explanation of which he postulates a double accent in Minaean-Sabaean; the appendix contains annotations to various inscriptions). Next came his *Die Bodenwirtschaft im alten Südarabien* (Am. Ab. Wien, 1916, No. xxvi., a survey of the results of the researches contained in the second part of his *Studien zur Lexigraphie etc.*) and the second part itself (S. B. Ab. Wien, clxxx. Abh. 3, 1917; discussion of Minaean-Sabaean inscriptions relating to buildings, boundaries and irrigation, and of inscriptions relating to agriculture with explanatory notes on the dedication and erection of buildings, on legal questions relating to water supplies and the possession of land, on taxation and administration). The next three publications of Rhodokanakis contain hitherto unpublished Katabani inscriptions: *Katabaniische Texte zur Bodenwirtschaft* (S. B. Ab. Wien, clxxiv. Abh. 2, 1923; five inscriptions from the Glaser collection; list of Katabani kings on the management of state properties, with a thorough investigation, into Katabani economy and administration) and *Katabaniische Texte zur Bodenwirtschaft. Series 2* (S. B. Ab. Wien, cxviii. Abh. 2, 1922; three inscriptions with far-reaching investigations, particularly as regards thethrill, Glaser 1603 [concerning date, location and character of the language of the text] with observations on the Hamanida and dynasties in South Arabia, especially on the Katabani and, lastly *Die Inschrift an der Mauer von König- Timna* (S. B. A. Wien, cc. Abb. 2, 1924; discussion of the inscription Glaser 1404 [remains of a building protocol]), 1397 a. [criminal and taxation law] and, to explain the makhribi title among the Katabani
A survey of the essential points in the lively controversy raised by Glaser's bold proposals has been given by Weber, *Studien*, I., and he has at the same time collected everything that seems to support Glaser. Immediately after the appearance of the first part of Glaser's *Skinne*, Halévy, in his objections to this Minæan theory; D. H. Müller than reiterated his views (*Beihefte zur Monats-zeitung*, 1890, Nov. 24 and 31; *W.Z.K.M.*, iv. 6, 161). The following also declared themselves against Glaser: Mordtmann (*Anzeige*, p. 182 sq.; *Z.D.M.G.*, xxvii. 400; *Revue*, p. 105 sq., 115); Spranger, *Bemerkungen*, p. 50 sq.; E. Meyer, *Geschichte d. Alterthums*, ii. 382; Lagrange in the *Revue hist.*, 1902, xi. 256 sq.; Lichthein, *Ephemeris f. semit. Epigraphik*, i. 101 sq.; Hartmann, *Z. A., x. 25 sq.* and in his main work, p. 4, 131 sq.; Hartn, *Geschichte der Araber*, i. 46 sq. etc. Meyer further pointed out that all previous inscriptions regarding the history of the Semitic alphabet would be upset by Glaser's placing the Minæan inscriptions in the second millennium B.C. We can hardly place the origin of the Phœnician alphabet before 1000 B.C.; the date of origin of the Minæan script, which is characterized by the regular, almost technical formation of geometrical figures, is certainly not earlier. This seems at once to take the ground from Glaser's theory. We must describe the dating of this alphabet to 2000 B.C. (Hommel, *Grundriß*, p. 109, 146; Weber, *Wort-lexikon*, p. 163; cf. Hommel, *Exploration*, p. 730) or even "at the latest far back into the third millennium" (Weber, *Arabien*, p. 15), as a quite improbable hypothesis, in spite of all that has been ascertained in recent time ranging the oldest form of the Hebrew alphabet. Nor have the speculations regarding the South Arabian epigraphy which have been renewed by the discovery of what are known as the Kenmite Sinai inscriptions led to anything. Against the views of Hommel, Weber, Winckler, etc. Hartn also says regarding the supposed age of the alphabet that the date 1500 B.C. is certainly much too high for the period of Minæan rule.

Greek-Roman tradition also affords arguments on the Minæan question, notably the above quoted testimony of Eristosthenes in *Stobaei*, xvi. 768, which has already been cited against Glaser by Halévy, D. H. Müller and others and of which Mordtmann has said that he cannot see how this passage is to be explained away. Weber, *op. cit.*, p. 9 betrays the precariousness of his case when he says that he must assume without giving any reason that Eristosthenes was probably "mistaken"; i. e., in his account true and false, past and present conditions are confused. Glaser, *op. cit.*, p. 15 had previously sought to dispose of the contradiction between his views and the clear evidence of Eristosthenes by asserting without proof that the latter was wrongly informed. For the interpretation of this passage, for suspecting which neither Glaser nor Weber gives any ground of proof or probability and, indeed, none can be given, it is decisive that according to it all four leading South Arabian peoples— including, of course, the Minæans whose author mentions first, as well as the Sabæans and the other two— were under absolute rulers (*monarkhës*). The fact that Eristosthenes gives for the time of his authority irrefutably the same kind of constitution, namely the real, for Minæans and for Sabæans, cannot be disposed of by any artifice. It also shows what value there is in Glaser's assertion (Weber, *op. cit.*, p. 7 sq.). *That the classical authors nowhere mention a kingdom, but always only a land of Minæa*, or in Winckler's
(op. cit., p. 453) statement that between 500 and 200 B.C., there were no Minaeans in North Arabia because there had never been any at any time. 

Grimme's doubts (op. cit., p. 17) as to whether the Minaeans of the Greeks are the people in question in the inscriptions are also unfounded.

Glasier's theory in the circumstance is also decisive (cf. Hartmann, op. cit., p. 137 n. 156) that, as we can deduce with absolute certainty from the mention of kings and kingdoms together in the inscriptions, there were kings of Mina' and kings of Saba' reigning alongside of one another. To Glasier's argument that the two kingdoms practically never mention each other in their inscriptions, even Weber (op. cit., p. 18) was forced to confess that *the Minaeans actually brought themselves on two or three occasions to break the mysterious silence*, and the Sabaeans likewise. But this means confessing the impossibility of holding this theory in any form.

Glasier's view that the Minaeans had already begun to decline soon after the Hyksos period (op. cit., p. 453) and had sunk into barbarism towards the end of the first century B.C. (p. 226, 69, 93, 95, 232), or were actually an extinct people (Weber, Archief, p. 31) is disposed of by the statement of Artemidoro (Strabo, xvii, 776f.) and extracts by others from Agatharchides (§ 87, 97, in the middle) on the commercial activity and the wealth of the Minaeans and further by Pliny's statement regarding their independent position - along side of Saba' and their competition with the Sabaeans in the frankincense trade (see above), which is more palpably by the significant fact that Procopius calls the Minaeans alone *a very great people* out of all the peoples of Southern Arabia.

The inscription of the Minaean sarcocephalus of Gis, which shows that Minaeans were still supplying spices for the Egyptian temples in the Ptolemaic period, and the Minaean and Greek inscription on Delos of the second century B.C., which records the erection of an altar to Minaean gods, are likewise, as Praetorius has rightly observed (Z. D. M. G., ii. 114, 220), unfavourable to Glasier's theory, and, agreeing with the Greek and Roman evidence, are proofs that the people, language and culture of the Minaeans survived into the second century B.C. and certainly to a still later period.

The palaeography and grammar of the inscriptions likewise give no support to the Minaean theory. D. H. Müller was the first to point out that the Sabaeans inscriptions those written hystrophedon belong to the oldest period of Sabean history and at the same time show the earliest forms of letters. Contradicting Hommel's (A. A., p. 22 sqq. Christomathis, p. 2, 6) suggestion that the Minaean inscriptions are older in grammar and epigraphy than the Sabaeans, Mortd- mann (Beiträge, p. 107) held that the Minaean inscriptions that have survived to us are later than the oldest Sabean texts and older than the Sabean texts of the later period (ibid. p. xiv, note 2) and that Hommel's deductions from the palaeography of the Minaeans inscriptions were very wide of the mark.

He also insisted (op. cit., p. 106, Z. D. M. G., vii. 400) that the fact that only one of the extent (or so far known) Minaean inscriptions is written hystrophedon, is not very much in favour of the claim for a very high antiquity for these inscriptions in contrast to the Sabaeans. It must, of course, be remembered that there are texts written hystrophedon which are later than normal ones written from right to left. But although the Minaeans alphabet may show occasional less developed forms, it is recognised (e. g. by Weber, p. 17) that the forms of the Minaean letters on the whole agree perfectly with the Sabaeans of the earlier period. In spite of the archaic features of the Minaean language in comparison with the Sabaeans (on the dialectical distinctions between the two see D. H. Müller, Burgos, p. 128), specially thorough, especially from the lexical point of view, is Morttmann, op. cit., p. 107, Z. D. M. G., xlii. 400. Hommel, Grundzüge, p. 153, note 31, Hommel, A. A., p. 23, asserted that the Minaean inscriptions might nevertheless be later than the Sabaeans or contemporary with them, as in other forms - as happens elsewhere - might have survived into the latest period (see also Morttmann, p. 115 on the more conservative retention of the older vocabulary in Minaean and (p. xii.) of archaic forms of the script); we need not take account of mixed forms of earlier and later periods occurring in one and the same text.

None of the grounds on which Glasier bases his theory are conclusive (they are detailed in Weber, op. cit., p. 7). That Sabaeans are so often mentioned in Minaean texts and Minaeans even more rarely in Sabaean sources, facts on which Glasier and his supporters lay so much stress, is explained partly from the relations of the two rivals (D. H. Müller, Burgos, p. 1037; Hartmann, op. cit., p. 135), partly from the fact that the "subject matter of the inscriptions, which are not in any sense annals, afford little opportunity for mentioning such matters" (Morttmann, op. cit., p. 115, note 1), as the texts preserved from this period deal mainly with the buildings and religious matters, being occasional or ad hoc inscriptions, and only rarely touch on foreign affairs (Lidsbaski, op. cit., p. 1062). But these few references are quite sufficient to settle the main question. It is noteworthy that, although Grimne (op. cit., p. 17) still proposed to put the date of the first Minaeans kings far beyond 1500 B.C., other champions of this theory, in calculating the earliest initial date for the Minaean kingdom, have now gone in the other direction and put it much below Glasier's figure. While Weinckler in the first edition of Helmont's Westen, p. 244 still held that the Minaean period could hardly have begun after 1500 B.C. (cf. p. 245), Weber significantly wrote in the second edition in the same passage (p. 235) "hardly after 1200 B.C." (cf. p. 237, "from about 1500 B.C."). Hommel, although he still put the collapse of the Minaean kingdom about 650 B.C. (ibid., p. 396), and, according to him, the South Arabian (p. 394) inscriptions begin from at least 800 B.C., but more probably many centuries earlier, also later (ibid. 399, 399 a B.C.), says that Glasier's assumption would place the placing of the Minaean kingdom from 1200 to 700 B.C. at least (in Explanations, p. 729) that at most it may be granted that *the oldest Sabaeans inscriptions were contemporary with the latest Minaeans* (above l. 399 a B.C.). On Weber's clever defence, Lidsbaski (p. 104) says that it will hardly gain further adherents for the Minaean theory and Weber himself has to confess (Glasier...
At the theory, in perfect agreement with the Greek and Roman authorities and the ancient South Arabian sources, most readily agreeing with them, and following D. H. Müller, we must insist that the kingdom of Ma'in existed contemporaneously with that of Saba' and at the very earliest began in the eighth century B.C. (see, for example, Mordtmann in W.Z. K. M., viii. 371; Hartmann, op. cit., p. 152 etc.). Its end did not come about 316 B.C. (as Hartmann, op. cit., xxxv. 321 dates it), but must be dated a little later, probably about 220 B.C. (cf. Ptolemy, Erythraea, 326). This is the Christian era, which is in agreement with the ancient and the Islamic sources. The kingdom of Saba' had its first capital at Ma'in, and the ruling house of the dynasty of the kings of Ma'in was the same as that of the kings of Saba'.

Therefore, it is clear that the kingdom of Ma'in existed contemporaneously with that of Saba'.

The period of transition from its oldest period, the so-called nakarrir period, the period of the priest-kings and the next epoch, whose rulers residing in Ma'rib, contemporaries of the kings of Ma'in and Hadramot, bear the title 'kings of Saba' (expressing the emancipation of the kingship from the priesthood) and whose beginning may be placed about 500 B.C., is represented for us by the great Sirwah inscription (Glaser, No. 1006). The following (the Himyarite) period, that of the 'kings of Saba' and Hadramot (from the hill or ancestral citadel of Ridad, the name occurs in Sanskrit as a Dvaripālas) in the second period of the Malakāhara) and the last period (from 300 A.D. to the end of the independence of Hadramot, and the 'kings of Saba' and Hadramot and Yemeni') have been sketched above.

At the period of the rise of Islam, Saba' was beginning to disappear from the memory of the Arab world. For Islam, which kindled new wars in the land and brought about the final collapse of the ancient, the decline of which had been by the Persians and Abyssinians, Saba' soon became an echo of the past; indeed, the name of the Sabean or Saba' period, with which only scholars, still concerned themselves.

The new creed had the greatest interest in obliterating all recollection of the pagan period, not only in the stone monuments which still survived, but also in literature, and even in consigning the ancient language to oblivion. This explains why, as Sprenger (op. cit., p. 244) rightly remarks, it would be useless labour to seek for any reliable information regarding the Sabaeans in Arabic sources. The relative value of the various sources for our knowledge of Saba' was examined with equal accuracy by the most successful discoverer of inscriptions (Glaser, Sibiya, I. 159) in his verdict that it was not the legendary tradition of the Arab, containing very little matter of value and usually misleading, and not the poetry of the time shortly before and after Muhammad, which would give us a true picture of the past, but 'simply and solely the ancient inscriptions and the few statements in the classical authors'. The relatively scanty references in Arabic authors may be divided for our purpose into two main groups. The one consists of valuable geographical and historical statements regarding architectural remains of Saba's past and details of ancient Sabean history, including archaeological matter and the other far less valuable legendary elements, which survived in tradition after the disappearance of Sabean culture which has nearer in point of time. The supreme author for the location of the first category, who, of all Muslim authors, gives us the most minute and most valuable items of information regarding Saba', is al-Hamdani whose 'Description of the Peninsula of Arabia' is our main literary source for the geography of Arabia in general and who (he was a Yemen, a native of Saw') out of patriotic interest in the old buildings and other antiquities of South Arabia which still existed in his time, has collected everything associated with them, often, indeed, already interwoven with legends in his Jall, a history of Yemen and a description of its antiquities. The part of the eighth book of the Jall, which still exists, describing the citadels was, edited for the first time (Arabic text and German translation with explanatory notes) by D. H. Müller (Die Burgen und Schlösser Süd-Arabiens nebst einem Teil des Hadramaut, S. 172, Al-Wehr, 1877, xvii, 335 sqq. and xxxv, 1897, p. 953 sqq.), who added additional notes from the tenth book, which deals with the genealogy of the Hadram, as well as illuminating passages from the Sefa Qishārat al-'Arab, Part I, given in the first place al-Hamdani's account of Quhmadan and Saw'; al-Hamdani quotes verses on Quhmadan and then gives the story of the foundation of the building by Shem and South Arabian traditions regarding Saw'; he goes on to give further information regarding the population of the country, the preservation of food in it; details regarding the topography of Saw', the ruins of the citadel of Quhmadan, and quotes verses relating to it, which reflect the legends clinging to the castle as a wonder of architecture. He went on to deal with Shibān-Yabhūm, the old monuments and great palaces in Shibān, Shīhām, Bait Akūṣa (cf. the descriptions in the Qishārat and Yakhū, Meдоров, iv. 437, iii. 248 sqq.). Next comes the district of Daher, Bait Ḥanaba (cf. al-Bakrī, ed. Wöntenfeld, p. 196 and the Qishārat), Ḥadrasan and Kūdā, Sirwā to one of the most celebrated castles of Yemen (verses are quoted), Ghazān (the Himyar tradition regarding Ḥaḍrāb, quoted, given in full in Kremer, op. cit., p. 86 sqq.), Dūmūgh, Zafīt, and other citadels. This is followed by a short list of the citadels of Sawr (highlands of the Himyars) and Hadramot. Al-Hamdani's description of Ma'rib and Saba', is important for its subject matter, on the basis of which Müller (in Part II) endeavours on several points to throw a light on ancient Saba' and in particular to show that it is the inscriptions which must be relied on for the reconstruction of the lists of Sabean kings, rather than the statements of Arab tradition. Al-Hamdani's description deals with the state of the remains of the dam, the inundation which spoiled the dam, the citadels of Ma'rib (with quotations from the poets). Al-Hamdani's unhistorical statements regarding the builders of the dam (Lāḥmīn, b. ʿAd, a mythical personage) are corrected by the evidence of the inscriptions which mention Ḥadrami b. Bāṣir as the builder. It is worthy of note that Arnaud's description of the remains of the dam and Halévy's report agree with al-Hamdani's account in the main details. Of
the Yemetic citadel of Rauhika (between al-Djṣf and Mr ’ib) al-Hamadani says that it at one time belonged to the family of the Naṣāḥ (on which he also gives information in the tenth book; following him also Naṣāḥ, Glaser, al-Mullār; Müller, p. 10, note 3). In the Minaean era he mentions the citadels of Banakūš and Ma’mūn (with quotations from the poets).

The Eṣārah also contains geographical details regarding the territory of Saba’, which, however, no more enables us to form a comprehensive impression than the scattered notices in later Arabic geographers, because they consist almost entirely of isolated names; and it is difficult to form a general idea from them. D. H. Müller, in editing the text (2 vols., Leiden 1889-1951) had therefore to struggle with extraordinary difficulties. Glaser, who, like Sprenger before him, had made very great use of al-Hamadani, was later able to test the readings of this edition on the spot for the areas in which he travelled from his own observations and the evidence of natives.

The few memories of the history of the Sabean period that have survived in the prose or poetic traditions of the Arabs are beyond the range of our consideration, as they have more or less assumed the form of legend. A. v. Kremer, op. cit. (cf. his Altäthiatische Gedichte über die Völkerung von Jemen, Leipzig 1867), has collected the essential matter on the subject. In tradition also we find analogies to the Greek stories (cf. e.g. von Kremer, p. 350 on Ḥūl Fāsh), the building of the dam of Ma ’īl and at least some improvement was attributed to Queen Bīlāb (cf. above); legends also became associated with the foundation. In the division of the pre-Muḥamadan history of Yemen in the Arab historians into three periods (the first down to Tāhba’ Aḥ ṣ Karibi, the second to Dīḥ Nuwaṣ and the third to Ismā’ils) still reflects the actual division into Sabean, Himyarite and Abyssinian-Persian epochs (Müller, Dārjūn, i. 338). Even the lists of Himyarite kings preserved by these historians have no scientific value and at most give us a few old names which were adopted by the genealogists, but can have no claim to historical accuracy. Besides, these lists of kings refer only to the later period of Himyarite history (ibid. ii. 981, 997).

More important for us are the items of information found in Muslim literature regarding the social and economic life of ancient and more modern Saba’, which link up with the inscriptions and Graeco-Roman sources. The finds made in the country itself are in harmony with the various classical literary sources, which agree in showing that the Sabaeans attained the greatest importance of all Arab peoples of the pre-Muḥamadan period, in particular of the four leading peoples of South Arabia who were known even to the Greeks; these still extant monuments of the once highly developed civilization, to which Sabaeans mainly owed its historical importance, consist of the inscriptions found since Arman’s journey of exploration, sculptures and remains of colonnades, palaces, temples, city-walls, towers, public works, especially water-works etc., which confirm the brilliant picture of Sabaean culture given by Agatharchides and the writers after him (see above) at the same time show that even the legends of Islamic tradition concerning the former glory of the Himyaric kingdom have a historical basis.

Striking evidence of this in Arabic literature is the above mentioned description of Ghmaidin in al-Hamadani and the poetic references to this much admired citadel (see Müller, Dārjūn, i. 345 sqq.) as well as to other citadels in Saba’, e.g. Salṭūn and Batrūn. Agatharchides’ remarks on the splendid buildings of the kings and private individuals in Saba’ and the descriptions of Sabean castles by the Arabs are confirmed by the testimony of the inscriptions, which to a great extent corroborate the building of houses (palaces) and fortifications. Of public works built to assist agriculture like barrages and dams, the most celebrated was the dam of Ma’mūn. The ancient South Arabians achieved great things in the way of irrigation works in view of the dependence of their agriculture on artificial irrigation. In the South Arabian inscriptions these are frequently mentioned (cf. the references collected by Hartmann, op. cit., p. 356 sq. and the discussions in Rhodokanakis, Simlar, ii. (e.g. p. 78 sq. etc.). Citizens of the Himyar period may still be seen in South Arabia to-day.

This civilization, on which since Arman’s time the finds and observations of Halyvry and especially of Glaser have thrown new light, owed its rise to the industry and commerce of the Sabaeans, in particular to the cultivation of frankincense, the land offered all the necessary conditions for its cultivation. According to al-Hamadani (Dārjūn, p. 51, 4) Yemen was called al-Khajah “the green”, on account of its wealth in trees, fruits and crops (cf. Ibn al-Faṣḥ, Kitāb al-Buldan, II A. vi. 34). Even Agatharchides’ description of the richness of the flora of Saba’ is quite satisfactorily explained by the natural formation of the country. The healthy, temperate interior of Yemen and Hadramawt produces a rich vegetation on the slopes of the hills and in the valleys. Accounts of modern journeys also bear testimony to the fertility of the soil of Yemen, and also to illumination in its woods, al-Mas’udī’s description is quoted by older authorities, of Saba’ as “the most luxuriant and most fertile part of Yemen, rich in gardens, plantations and meadows”, with a “splendid climate” (cf. Kremer, op. cit., p. 10, note 1) is in close keeping with Agatharchides’ praise of the wealth of Saba’.

The uniformity of the temperature in the region of Saba’ is emphasized by al-Hamadani (Müller, Dārjūn, i. 343). Glaser and other travellers record that the temperature of the higher regions of Yemen is temperate and favourable to vegetation.

A parallel to the statement of Agatharchides that the Sabaeans provided the Ptolemies and Syrians with gold and the Phoenicians with costly wares of the most varied kinds, is found in the Biblical passages already mentioned, relating to the Sabaeans exports of frankincense, gold and jewels to Egypt and Syria. South Arabia from the earliest times had been the very land of frankincense and the Sabaeans in particular, as inhabitants of the most fertile parts of the southern part of Yemen and owners of the frankincense country, were naturally destined to trade especially in spices. This trade — expressed in Strabo (xvi. iv. § 19, 22) — that the trade in spices was the source of the wealth of the Sabaeans is already found in 1 Kings, x. 4 sq. Adana was the great centre for trade with India and Egypt (Babason’s Agamem,
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ancient Sabaean-Ifriyiyah kingdom which roughly corresponds to the modern Yemen (from about 9th N. Lat., Jebel Tathlit, to the south coast and in the east as far as Harna): Zwemer, Arabia, Chicago 1901; Raif Fuad-Bey, und Leute im heutigen Yemen in Peter Mitt., 1912, iviii... part 2; E. Behrens, Yemen, Grund- sätze der Bodenkultur und ihr Einfluss auf Klima und Lebenswelt, Diss. Marburg 1910, apart from meteorological, astronomical and natural history researches and several monographs by Glaser, Bent and others. W. Schmidl's and A. Großmann's books have been already mentioned. On commercial activity on the south coast at the present day information is given by the Report of the Aden Chamber of Commerce (Aden from 1898 onwards). To the works mentioned in the beginning of the bibliography we may here add the following: J. Halévy, Études Sâbêennes, J. A., 1873, series 7, vol. iii.; R. Chome, Arabien and die Araber seit 200 Jahren, Halle 1875; D. H. Müller, 1) Südarabisch-Studien, Diss. R. Ab. Wien, 1877, lxxvii. 193 sqq., 2) Epigraphische Denkmäler aus Abessinien, Denkm. Ab. Wien, xliii. (1894); E. Glaser, 1) Zwei Inschriften über den Dammbruch von Mârly, M. V. A. G., 1897, 2) Altjesothische Nachrichten, Munich 1908, 3) Die Abessinier in Arabien, Munich 1895, 2) Part and the südarabischen Reiche, M. V. A. G., 1899, p. 51 sqq.; H. Grümme, Mohammed, Munich 1904; Hogarth, The Penetration of Arabia, London 1905; J. Teix, Saba (R. E., s. v., cols. 1298-1511) where this material has been dealt with by me with special reference to Greek and Roman literature.

The earlier publications of inscriptions (Bird, Fresnel [to supplement the statement P. E., col. 1400, reference should be made to col. 1402: the copies as well as the transcriptions of the inscriptions with the philological observations 194 sq. in letters to Mohr are from Fresnel), Prideaux, Rehtake, Langer [published by D. H. Müller, Z. D. M. G., 1885, xxxvii. 319 sqq.), Mordtmann, Derenburg, etc.) are given in greater detail in the Paris Corpus (see above) and in the more recent publications. Of these we will mention the more comprehensive here: J. H. Mordtmann, 1) Himyarische Inschriften und Altertümmer in den König. Museen zu Berlin, Berlin 1893, 2) Musée Imperial Ottoman, Antiquités Himyaritiques... Constantinople 1898; D. H. Müller, Südarabische Altertümmer im Kunst- historischen Hofmuseum, Vienna 1893; H. Derenburg, 1) Les monuments sabinès et Himyarites du Musée... de Marseille, Rev. Archéol., 1899, series 3, vol. xxxv.; 2) Repert. d'Epigraphie ab., i. (1901 sq.), il. (1907). Of the Inschriften der südarabischen Expedition des Akademie in Wien (collected in 1899) so far only a few have been published (in the publications of Rhodokanakis). — For Sabaeas studies, the researches made on the modern dialects of South Arabia are also important. Beginnings were made as early as H. v. Maltesen in the Z. D. M. G., 1873, xxvii. and others have followed him. Charles C. Landberg, Études sur les dialectes de l'Aрабie meridionale, 1. Hammapolit, 2. Bejima (Leiden 1901—1913) are valuable. Rich material is contained in the 'Schriften der südarabischen Expedition' of the Academy in Vienna.
The project of the canal (see above) was discussed several times, but without success, in the Muslim era, e.g. during the reign of Murad III in 999/1591 (the year 909 in Hâdidî Khâlîf, Dîkhânnumâ, p. 666, 12 is due to a printer’s error and has given rise to mistakes, cf. J. v. Hammer, Gesch. d. Osmanischen Reiches, iv. 200 note; further during the reign of Mustafa III in 1578 and later also (cf. Baron de Tol Töth, Memoires, i. 97); Cf. further the

Biography: On Sâbânja: Ewîlyâ Celebi, Skyûkûlîname, 1314-II, ii. 171 sqq., 459 sqq., v. 74; Hâdidî Khâlîf, Dîkhânnumâ, p. 666, 673, 11; transl. M. Norberg li. 493 (cf. J. Otter, Voyage ii. 45); Le voyage de M. d’Arason par Jean Chautem, Paris 1887, p. 61 sq.; J. B. Tavernier, Voyages i. 6; P. Laca, Voyages i. 204 sq.; Fr. la Boulaye-de-Gour, Voyages et observations, Paris 1653; Sacabangi; R. Pococke, Description of the East, London 1745, ii. 95; C. Ritter, Kleinasië li. 669 sqq.; J. A. Cramers, Asia Minor, Oxford 1832, i. 185; James Morier, Journey through Persia etc., London 1814, p. 406 (on the projected canal under the vezir Koprulu); Remy Eloy, Relation des voyages de M. D’Arason, Paris 1843, ii. 376; W. Ainsworth, Travels and Researches, London 1842, ii. 25; J. v. Hammer, Umblöh von einer Reise, Pesth 1818, p. 128-147 (with copious materials on the projected canal); Ch. Texier, Description de l’Asie Mineure, i. 51; X. Hommaire de Hell, Voyage en Turquie, Paris 1859, i. 23 (cf. Courrier de Constantinople, May 20th 1847 and Das Asienland, 1855, p. 415—418); an illustration in Léon de Laborde, Voyage de Syrie etc., Paris 1838, opp., No. xvii, plate —. On the projected canal, cf. J. Solich in Mitteilungen des Vereins der Geographen der Universität Leipzig, i. (1911), p. 31-56; C. Ritter, Kleinasië, i. 669 sqq.; Revue historique ottomane (T.O.E.M.), ill. (1328), p. 948 sqq.; J. B. Tavernier, L. 6; Alberi, Relazioni, 3rd series l. 420; Wäffl l. 164 (year 1177/1758) also in J. v. Hammer, Umblöh, p. 177. — In Selimiâ’s Ta’rikh, Constantinople 1281-l. 277, 282 sq. the lake is called Ajaq gûlî instead of Iyân gûlî; cf. lacus Iuvanius in Leucadius, Hist. Musulm., p. 57, 18 (from this form preceded by the usual ‘Î the name could be derived as well); J. v. Hammer, Geschichte d. Osman. Reiches, l. 24, 578; iv. 200 (after Selântîk); F. Tausen- ner, Der unmontschnie Wagen, Leipzig 1824, p. 93 sqq., 245; W. M. Ramsay, Historical Geography of Asia Minor, London 1890, p. 188. (Franz Babinger)

SABBÎ, title of Sûra lxviii. of the Qur’an, which is also called al-Àli, after the last word of the first verse.

AL-SABÔ, and ESFÂN IBRâHIM b. HILÎ. E. IBRAHIM b. ZÂHRÎN AL-ÀRÎKÎN was an adherent of the sect of Sâbî’âns [see the art. SÂBÎ] and was born on the 5th of Ramadân, 313 A.H., according to the most trustworthy authority, his grandson Hilît, while the Fihrist gives the year 320, which is certainly too late a date. His father Hilît was a skillful doctor and in the science of Tûrûk, who died in 344 A.H. Ibrahim was brought up to the same sciences as other members of his family, who were all skilled in medicine, astonomy and mathematics. He is stated to have made an astrolabe of the size of a large silver coin for al-Mu‘taphbâr b. âbd Allîh, the Wâizr of the Bûyîd Amir ‘Audâd al-Dawla. At an early date, however, he gave up these pursuits and became
a secretary in the State-chancellery, and here he came into prominence when the Bayyid Mu'izz al-Dawla (died 359 H.) sent a message to the Wazir AIII al-Mu'allal asking him to draw up without loss of time a letter to Mu'Mammad b. Illyâs, governor of Kirman, to ask his daughter in marriage for Prince Ikhwîyyân, the later Amir 'Izz al-Dawla. The Wazir, his friends and secretaries had been having a heavy drinking-bout and only Ibrahim al-Sâbi was capable of drawing up the desired document, which found general approval. He must have come prominently to the notice of Mu'izz al-Dawla, who in the year 349 a.H. on the death of Abu 'Isâkh Ibn Thawâsh appointed him chief-secretary of the Department of State-documents (Dâwûn al-Jâoûtâ). The Amir tried his utmost to convert him to Islam, offering him even the post of Wazir as a reward, but he refused and remained true to his religious convictions till his death. However, he was a man of good manners and compiled as much as possible with Muslim customs and fared during the month of Ramadan, besides, his knowledge of the Qur'ân was perfect and he quoted from it frequently in his official letters. Upon the death of Mu'izz al-Dawla he retained his post in the Chancellery under his son 'Izz al-Dawla, who when the latter uncle 'Ajjul al-Dawla came to Baghîdad it was part of Ibrahim's duty to draw up the contract for an amicable settlement about their respective positions. 'Ajjul al-Dawla had at first been very favourably disposed towards Ibrahim and invited him to come to Shîtriz, which he refused to go as he feared his relations during his absence might be converted to Islam.

The document, however, contained terms which offended 'Ajjul al-Dawla, especially as 'Izz al-Dawla was given the prerogatives of his father Mu'izz al-Dawla, which incensed the hatred of 'Ajjul al-Dawla. The quarrel between the uncle and his nephew was disastrous for Ibrahim, for when 'Izz al-Dawla was killed in 357 a.H. and 'Ajjul al-Dawla entered Baghîdad, he was apprehended on Saturday, the 26th of Ihh 'il-Ka'dân. 'Ajjul al-Dawla had vowed that he would have him 'trampled to death by elephants, but several prominent persons, among them the Wazir al-Mutâhhar b. 'Abd-Allah intervened for him and he was cast into prison, where he lingered several years. To give him a chance to regain the favour of 'Ajjul al-Dawla he was ordered while in prison to write a history of the Bayyid dynasty, which was to have the title Kitâb al-Tâ'âfi, after the new title of 'Ajjul al-Dawla, Tâṣî al-Mulla. The Amir made it his business to read the sheets of the work himself as they were composed and to make such corrections as he desired. Ibrahim, annoyed at the mode in which the work was composed, had the audacity to tell a friend upon his enquiry how the work was proceeding, that what he was writing was lies and bagatelles which he was scribbling. This remark was conveyed to 'Ajjul al-Dawla and only the death of the latter saved Ibrahim from violent death. After the accession of Shirâf al-Dawla he was released from prison on the 20th of Djumâdâ I 371 a.H. He was compelled to fire the remainder of his days in retirement and died on Thursday the 13th of Shawwâl, 384 at the age of 71 years. Some authorities state that he attained the age of 91 years, but both the date of his death and his age are confirmed by the superscriptions of the elegy which the Shirâf al-Ra'dî composed upon his death (ed. Beirut, i. 294; British Museum, Add. 25750 and Add. 19410). He was buried in the Shâfi'ite cemetery at Baghîdad. The elegy of al-Ra'dî was a token of a long and sincere friendship and when reproached about mourning an unbeliever, he replied that he mourned him for his personal merits. The poem is also quoted in extenso by Thâlibî in the Yatimah (ed. Damascus, ii. 81-85).

Of the works of Ibrahim the Kitâb al-Tâ'âfi is lost, but it is quoted occasionally by later historians e.g. Mirkhwâdî, Gharîb al-Saltûnât an-dh-dm Gîbah (ed. Wilcken, Berlin 1852), p. 13 of the Persian text, and anonymously by Ibn Miskawî, Arabic text ii. 21-27, 23, 33, 59, 86, 87, 404. The genealogy of the Bayyids quoted by Mirkhwâdî e.g., seems to confirm the statement of Ibrahim. Ibn Abu Usâkhî (i. 224, 225) attributes the Kitâb al-Tâ'âfi erroneously to Simon b. Thâlibî. Ibrahim's other works are: a) a history of his own family, which is also lost. His reputation rests rather upon his 31 Kawnî or official letters which are collected and have come down to us (MS. Leiden 345, Paris 3514) and of which many examples are quoted in the Vaticano, the Irshâd of Kallâghanî and the Mâ'allîd al-Tâ'mîlî. They are historically of the highest importance; as they supplement our knowledge of the period of the decline of the caliphate. Though the Persian influence is noticeable in the finess of its style, it is free from Sâfî, and lucid when compared with later specimens of the same art. 4) His poems, of which ample specimens are quoted in the works mentioned above and in many anthologies, are not to be distinguished from the productions of other poets of his time. They contain verses in praise of notable persons of the age, among them the wazir al-Mutâhhar (died 358 a.H.), al-Majbshar b. 'Abd Allah, wazir of 'Ajjul al-Dawla (committed suicide in 359 a.H.), 'Ajjul al-Dawla, Sâbir b. Ardushir, wazir of Bâhâ al-Dawla (deposed 381 a.H.), 'Abd-al-'Arîf b. Yûnûf, successor of Sâbir, Shân al-Dawla (reigned 372-388) and others; among his elegies is one upon his son Sinan.
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2. Hîlîl b. MU'MâSIN AL-SâBI, the grandson of Ibrahim b. Hilal was born in Shawwâl 359 a.H. and reigned as a Sâbian like the other members of his family. His mother was the sister of the physician and historian Thâlibî b. Sinan b. Kurra. He was the first member of his family who forsook
his old faith and became a Muslim. This was in the year 399 in consequence of a dream he had. He was secretary of Fakhr al-Mulk Abī Ghailī Muhammad b. Khalaf, who at his death just with him on deposit the sum of 30,000 dinars. He was afraid to make use of the money, fearing the interference of the wazir Maʿṣūyiyy al-Mulk al-Ḥasan al-Rukhkhāli (died 430 A. H.) but when the latter found it out, he allowed him to keep the money. He did not use it, however, as he was in step-employ and left it to his son Ghara al-Nimaz. He died on Thursday the 17th of Ramaḍān, 448 A. H. The nine works which he composed have all been lost except the fragments edited by H. F. A. Medersa, Leiden 1904. They consisted of the following:

1) Tūrīkā, a history in continuation of that of his father-in-law Thabit b. Simān, containing the events of the years 560–447. Of this the fragment published contains events of the years 589–393 only, and the portion preserved makes us regret the loss of the remainder. He relied for the earlier parts upon much valuable information supplied by his grandfather, who for so many years had access to all the most important documents. 2) Kīth al-Wṣurā, a continuation of the works of al-Sulān and al-Dalīl al-Badī. Of this only the beginning is preserved in the printed edition and some of the most important lives of saints are lost. This work is quoted under the title Kīth al-Āṣyā' wa-l-Mabībī by Ibn Ẓāhīr in the Badī's al-Badī al-Badī (Cairo 1316, i. 63, 169; ii. 102), where fragments of a later portion are preserved. Ibn Khallīkān calls this work by the longer title Kīth al-Āṣyā' wa-l-Mabībī wa-l-Mutanaqda 'l-Āwā Windsor and states that it is in one volume and contains pleasant stories and rare anecdotes, a) Gharār al-Baṣālā al-Ḳudsī, a collection of his own epistles. 4) Kīth Rihāt or as al-Malik al-Wṣurā, a collection of official letters, resembling that of his grandfather. 5) Kīth Farīdān wa-l-Kalijā, probably an exposition of the various public offices in Baghdad. 6) Kīth Akhrar Baghādād, chronicle of the city of Baghdad. 7) Kīth Maṣṣīr Aṭabī, chronicle of his own family. 8) Kīth al-Kalīḥ, a manual for secretaries, probably after the model of the work with the same title by al-Sulān. 9) Kīth al-Sulān.


Other members of the family according to the following genealogy were:

Zahrān

Thabit (d. 365) [beneath No. 3]

Hillī (beneath No. 4)

Thabit (d. 384)

al-Muhāsib (alive 399) [beneath No. 6]

Sīnān

Hillī (d. 448)

Muḥammad Ghara al-Nīmān (d. 480) [beneath No. 7]


4. Hillī b. Ibrāhīm b. Zahrān Abī ʿUṣaynī, the father of Ibrāhīm, was a clever physician and in the service of the amīr Thānī, Khīṭāt, Ḥuṣāmī (ed. Cairo 1320), p. 356.

5. Thānī b. Ibrāhīm b. Zahrān, also a physician, was an old man when Abū ʿAbd Allāh came to Baghādād in 364 A. H. Though at first not well received he was later granted a pension and died the 11th of Dhuʾl-Qaʿdā, 365 A. H. He was born at al-Ruṣāf on the 27th of Dhuʾl-Qaʿdā, 283 A. H. Ibn Abī ʿUṣaynī, I. 277–278; Thānī, Khīṭāt, I. 341.


7. Muḥammad b. Hillī Abī ʿUṣaynī Gharā al-Nīmān, son of the historian Hilāl. He was born in 416 A. H. and inherited at the death of his father valuable property which was valued 12,000 dinars; he lived a very quiet life and by improving his wealth he was worth 70,000 dinars when he died in 480 A. H. His children soon squandered this wealth, and with him the glory of his family ended. He had founded a small library of 400 volumes of which Ibn al-ʿAṣfāl was made librarian, but the latter proved to be dishonest and sold many of the books. Gharā al-Nīmān was also for a time in the chancellery of the emīr al-Kāmīn. He tried to continue the history of his father, but it was only a small volume which became towards the end very ancient; probably because he dared not write all he wanted to say. Accordingly to al-Safādī, Hilāl-Allāh b. al-Musṭāfā accuses him of including many falsehoods in his history. We cannot verify this as all his works have been lost. His other works were a) al-Raḥṣāf b. Nāṣirī, min al-Maṣṭūḥīn al-Madīḥīn wa-l-Ṣaḥābī al-Raḥṣāfī min al-Muṣṭafīn al-Maṣṭūḥīn which contained historical tales, and b) Kīth al-Raḥṣāf which was after the model of the Muḥṣīr al-Muḥṣīrīn of al-Taḥṣīlī. Ibn Khallīkān, ed. (Cairo 1310), ii. 201; Ibn al-Kīlīṭ, Ḥuṣāmī (ed. Cairo), p. 77; Saʿādī, Wāṣīl b. Wāṣīlī, British Museum, MS. Or. 5320, fol. 110v.

F. Krenkow

AL-SĀBĪʿA, the Sabaeans. This name has been given to two quite distinct sects. 1. the Mandaeans or Sabaeans, a Judæo-Christian sect practicing the rite of baptism in Mesopotamia (Christians of John the Baptist); z. the Sabaeans of Harān, a pagan sect which survived for a considerable period under Islam, of interest for its doctrine and of importance for the scholars whom it has produced. The Sabaeans mentioned in the Korān, who are on three occasions placed along with the Jews and Christians among the people of the book, i.e. possessors of a revealed book, are apparently the Mandaeans. The name must arise from the Hebrew root p-š, "to pour", to immerse", by loss of "ain and must mean "baptists", those who practise baptism by immersion. The pagan Sabaeans, who did not know this rite at all, may have adopted this name as a measure of precaution to secure the advantages of the toleration accorded by the Korān to Jews and Christians.
Arab writers from the fourth century A.D. onwards very frequently mention the Sabaeans of Harran and always with interest. Al-Shahristani devotes a very long section to them and the exposition of their doctrines. He classifies them among those who admit spiritual substances (al-rūḥānīyyān), especially the great astral spirits. They recognize as their first teachers two philosophical-prophets "Aḥīdānān (Agathodaimon = the good spirit) and Hermes who have been identified with Seth and Idris respectively. Orpheus was also one of their prophets. They believe in a creator of the world, wise, holy, not produced, and of inaccessible majesty, who is reached through the intermediary of the spirits. The latter are pure and holy in substance, in act and state; as regards their nature, they have nothing corporeal, neither physical faculties nor movements in place nor changes in time. They are our masters, our gods, our intercessors with the Sovereign Lord; by purifying the soul and chastising the passions, one enters into relations with them. As to their activities they produce, renew and change things from state to state; they cause the force of the divine majesty to flow down towards the lower beings and lead each of them from his beginning to his perfection. Among them are the administrators of the seven planets, which are like their temples. Each spirit has a temple; each temple has a sphere and the spirit is to his temple as the soul is to the body. Sometimes they call the planets fathers and the elements mothers. Their activity consists in moving these spheres and in acting upon the elements and the physical world through them; from this result the mixtures in the compositions, then the corporeal faculties. The general beings proceed from the general spirits and the particular from the particular spirits; thus rain in general has its spirit, its spiritual master, and every drop of rain has its own. They preside over the phenomena of the world, winds, storms, earthquakes and gale to affect its faculties and lay down laws for it; their condition is very spiritual and analogous to that of the angels.

Al-Shahristani distinguishes between the Sabaeans who worshipped the stars, called temples, directly and those who worshipped idols made with hands (mashkhālī, persons), representing the stars in temples made by men. There is a very curious note on the temples and idols of the Sabaeans, as well as on their ceremonies in al-Dimīthā. (Cemographie, ed. A. F. Mehren, 1856); the shape of the temples, the number of the degrees, the color of the ornaments, the material of the idols, and the nature of the sacrifices varied with the planets, and this is interesting for the history of the liturgy. Here and elsewhere we find the custom of human sacrifices made, which undoubtedly is not to be maintained. The Jewish philosopher Maimonides says he had seen idols which resembled those of which al-Dimīthā speaks. Al-Shahristani further tells us that all the Sabaeans had three prayers; they purified themselves by ablution after contact with a corpse, forbade the flesh of swine, dogs, birds with talons and pigeons. They did not have circumcision, allowed divorce only by decree of the judge and forbade bigamy.

The Sabaeans were at first scattered throughout the north of Mesopotamia and had their principal centre at Harran, the ancient Carrhae; their liturgical language was Syriac. The Caliph Ma'mūn thought of persecuting and destroying them; but their intellectual merits gained them toleration. Towards 295 (872) the celebrated Thabit ibn Khārīṣa, having had a quarrel with his co-religionists, was excommunicated at Harran and came to Baghdad, where he founded another branch of Sabaitism. The Sabean community in Baghdad lived for some time in peace; but the Caliph Khārīṣ ibn Khādīr began to persecute them and forced Sima, son of Thābit, to embrace Islam. In about 364 (975) the Sabean Abī Ṣnāh b. Hīlī, who was secretary to the Caliph Martha and Ṣa'īd, caused an edict of toleration to be issued in favour of his co-religionists of Harran, Kākū, and Dāyi Moṣṭār and protected those of Baghdad. In the 11th century A.D. there were still many Sabaeans at Bagh-
dad and at Harran. In 424 (1033) there was left only a temple of the moon, which formed a citadel at Harran; this temple was at that time taken by the Alīids Egyptians. After the middle of the 12th century A.D. all trace of the Sabaeans of Harran is lost; we still find them at Baghdad till the end of this century.

The great men who have rendered this sect illustrious are: Thābit b. Khārīṣ, the eminent geometer, original astronomer, translator and philoso-
pher; Sima b. Thābit, physician and meteorologist; other physicians and astronomers of the same family; Thabit b. Sima and Hīlī b. al-Muḥsān, historians; Abī Ṣnāh b. Hīlī, visier, and other members of the family; al-Batūra (Abu Bakr), the celebrated astronomer; Abū Dja'far al-Khāṣīn, mathematician; Ibn al-Walīshīya, the author of Nebaeanum Agricultura, although professing to be a Muslim, in every way belonged to the Sabean school; Ṣa'īd (Gibry), the famous alchemist, about whom, it is true, there is very little known for certain, was probably a Sabean. Finally it may be mentioned that these scholars are quoted on mineralogy by al-Dimīthā.


SABIL. A way, road, or path, is used in the Korān (1) literally, e. g. wan islāmu'l islabān (Sta. ii. 196), "he who is able to journey thither"; (2) figuratively, as in the expression wa'l-Adhā, for which see Ṣuqā; (3) figuratively, in the sense of the true way, the Apostolic way, as in the passage fa'salatun fahadha ba'sa'il al-raisīl tablīn (Sta. xxv, 29) "Obl that would I had taken with the Apostle a path!" e. g. his
path, or the true path; (4) figuratively, in the sense of a means of attaining or acquiring an object, or a way out of a difficulty or trouble, as in the passage "to rush into the destruction which is on the road," that is, to travel, or wayfarer, mentioned as a sign of object of compassion, or charity. The word is now applied also to a public drinking fountain. The great merit naturally attached in arid countries and tropical climates to the provision of wells, cisterns and fountains for thirsty travellers is recognized in Islam, as in most oriental religions, and it is possible that the use of sabīl in this sense is suggested by the expression Sabīl-Allah, applied to any work undertaken for the sake of God.

Bibliography: The lexicon a. v. (T. W. H. H.)

SABĪL ALLĀH. [See ِهِجگیهکی.]

SABTIYA "Seveners," the name of various Shi'a groups, who restrict the number of visible Imams to seven. Confusion came to the legitimists who believed that the character of Imam Ismail was transmitted by divine providence from father to son, when about 145 (762) Isma'il, the (eldest) son of the sixth Imam Ja'far al-Sadiq [q. v.] died before his father. While the majority replaced Isma'il by another son of Ja'far, Musa al-Kazim, the seventh in the series of the twelve Imams of the Imami-Schisists [q. v.] twelve, and others attached themselves to the otherwise less prominent sons, Muhammad, 'Abd Allah and 'Ali, the strictest legitimists remained faithful to Isma'il. They denied that he died before his father's death. The evidence brought forward in support of this view seems to have impressed even their opponents, for the latter found it necessary, in order to dispose of Isma'il, to attack his character; they said that, on account of his evil life, his father had withdrawn from him the right of succession at first intended for him. These accusations, particularly that of wine-drinking, can be explained as an attack on the slackening of the law by the Seveners directed back against the Imam who gave them their name.

From the first the Sevener movement was not a united one. A Muḥarrakiya sect "stood fast" by 'Isa'il, so that for them he is the last Imam and the Mahdi [q. v.] but the majority continued the imitation down to his son Muhammad, who becomes Khālus al-Zamān [q. v.] with the official title of al-Tāhir "finishing," a title which, in some of the minor systems, seems to be explained by the fact that his imitation was followed by invisible Imams, known only to the initiated. In spite of the position of Muhammad al-Tāhir, however, the name of Isma'il remains attached to the main groups. In their hierarchic view therefore the Seveners belong to the many "Wāḥid-iyya" "those who stand fast." This is, in part, naturally, explained by the political conditions of the period. In 145 the 'Abbasids were defeated by the Caliph at Medina, who led by al-Nazi al-Zakīya, Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah b. al-Hassan b. 'Ali; in the following year, the latter's brother, Ibrahim of Basra, also fell. The 'Alian question was thus disposed of for the time and with such success that even in those activist circles, who chose their Imams from the vigorous 'Abbas, who actually took to the sword a 'Djārūkatya sect "stood," by al-

Nās al-Zakīya as the concealed Mahdi. The tendency to hope for a return increased still further among the legitimists, who were bound by their dogma to definite persons, as it would have been useless to carry on into active history an imitate which had really become hopeless. There were those who stood fast by each of Isma'il's brothers; the Mawṣūl-iyya, nicknamed Mawṣūl-iyya, "ruined upon," often called simply the Waṣīliyya, because of some importance. Strictly speaking, such groups also come under the head of Seveners. But, as a rule, Sabtiyya is used identically with Isma'ilīyya [q. v.]. For them steadfastness did not develop into the abandonment of political aims — although it was over a century before this became apparent — but rather into the very shiftable plan of retaining the very effective idea of an Imam given by sacred birth and yet rejecting the individual that chance brought forward in the person of the often very incapable first-born of the seed of 'Ali and Hujja. The Sevener movement thus attained considerable importance in secular history also, through men who appeared as dā'i [q. v.] of the hidden seventh Imam, Muhammad b. Isma'il, like Handān Karmat, or his successor, who came forth as concelebrant, like the Fatimids Sabt b. 'Abd Allah b. Mūsā, or his "return" himself, as Ṣabtīh b. 2218, the narrates of the Karmatian missionary Yahya b. Dakhrawd, Karmatians, Fatimids, Assassins and the Ismai'is of India, Persia and Central Asia are the groups through which the Sevener movement finds its place in secular history, but the Druzes also and in a way the Matwila and Naṣiris also may be traced back to the old Sabtiyya.

The Sabtiyya itself, however, is quite as much a religious — and an independent religious — movement as a political one. The remarkable feature that the number of Imams was fixed at seven at the same time with the different sons of Ja'far is more simply understood if we assume that the political reasons already mentioned were further supported by a point of view which periodized all cosmic and historical happenings by the sacred number of seven. The example of the Khatibiyya, who worshipped Isma'il's father, Ja'far, as a god, shows that in the early days of development of the Sabtiyya the deflection of Imami was not entirely unprecedented. We cannot, of course, in the circumstances deal with the theology of the Seveners. We can only know of a single one out of the different systems and even that is often obscure, through being known only from hostile representations. We may claim for the Seveners as their individual contribution to theology a cosmic cosmogony in which names and things are often, however, not used consistently. The steps of emanation are (1) God, (2) universal intelligence (țefeq), (3) universal soul (mafs), (4) primordial matter, (5) space or the pleroma, (6) time or the cosmos, (7) the world of earths and man. This number seven recurs in the lower worlds in the 7 prophets or Ṣâ'ilīk "speakers" in the redemption story; Adam is the first, but as a rule not the first man, then follow Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus, Muhammad and Muhammad al-Tāhir. Between each two of these Ṣâ'ilīk there are inserted seven "silent ones," ūmīd, of whom the first, as special helpers of the Ṣâ'ilīk, under titles like fuqih, "referee," or asālī, "foundation," are particularly
important because it is only through the esoteric exposition attributed to them that the teachings and laws of the mufik receive their true meaning or are completely explained. These mufik are the Seths, which the reconstruction of the grunds of the Seths was done by Isma'il the son of Haggar. Aaron, Peter, W. and the seventh is the author of the particular Sevener group, in question, e.g. 'Abd Allah b. Min‘im. Alongside of the Imams, there is a further lower hierarchy arranged in seven or twelve, notably the Isma‘ili [q.v.] and the Sufis. The system is, however, very much upset by a theory of reincarnation which actually equates the seventh Imam to God; thus Ibn Tahir al-Baghda'di, p. 288, reports, on the authority of a man who had been for a period engaged in Isma‘ili propaganda, that the latter had been expected to see in Muhammad al-Tamm Him who had revealed himself to Moses. In several groups, e.g. the Indian Isma‘ili, the cosmogony and with it the periodisation after the sacred number seven has fallen into the background and ‘Ali has become God as the first Imam. The way thus leads from the Sevener on to the ‘Ali b. Abi Talib [q.v.]. Starting with ‘Ali, they come right down to the 47th Imam, Agha Khaja Muhammad Shih. Next to the Imams and in history often surpassing him in importance here is the jaidj. Muhammad the Prophet appears as the jaidj of ‘Ali. But he is substituted for political reasons for Sadim al-Persi, who is really intended.

For salvation of the concealed Imam known only to the initiated is absolutely necessary; consequently the “instruction” of them attains increased importance and they are accordingly also called Ta‘limiya. Initiation into the esoteric religion takes place through 7 or 9 initiatory stages. Ibn Tahir, i.e., 282 sqq. mentions (1) the ta‘lim, the “exact instruction”, a psychological method not particularly skilled, or almost a means of working oneself entirely into him who is to be won and of placing oneself on common ground with him. Then (2) the adept is “shown” in the tajdid the whole “honesty” of his previous belief was an illusion, a suggestion that it is much more splendid than he has supposed hitherto, after which (3) in the tajdid he becomes “shaken by doubts” that he is not yet fully conscious of his belief. After such anthroposophical spiritual guidance, the moment arrives at which the novice is “bound” and “attached” to the secret authority with the formula that real knowledge only exists in the Concealed One and his organs through (4) the radd and (5) the ta‘lim. In (6) the ta‘lim the real esoteric meaning is by allegorical explanations brought out of the external covering of the letter, under which all religious prophecies and laws are “obscured”. (7) The “transference” of the adept can now begin in a novitiate proper of some length, after the expiry of which the disciple (8) subscribes himself body and soul by agreements scaled by our own will and as a bond in return for which he is “released” in the (9) khat and wukuf from all earlier dogmatic restrictions and all external legislation outside these obligations.

The whole system is deliberately supported for Isra’s sake on Koranic passages, which is the more easily done in consequence of the frequently obscure allusions made in the sacred book. Thus the adept is supposed to learn from Koran x. 99, serve thy Lord till certainly comes to thee”,

that his previous worship of God has only been a preliminary step. The passages in which the words “inner” occur are made to supply dica probantias for an extravagant, and of its kind not exactly original, system of allegory, including an extensive alphabetic katibala, which is not limited to the mysterious passages of the Sura’s end to names of Imams or dogmatic formulae. It has not contributed to the elucidation of the relations of Muslim sects that one group is called after many features and that, for example, the Sevener are also included as Isma‘ilis [q.v.] along with other bodies of quite different tendencies, like the Kharamis (see Kharamiya) and Mawdis, and often even described as the Isma‘ilis and on this account called by their opponents by the corresponding nickname Ma‘arifis, “empties, nihilists”.

The actual origin of the speculative ideas of the Sevener is, so far, hardly better known to us than to the Muslim authors, whose opinions must be taken with particular caution as their point of view was vitiated by hatred of the heretics. The Sunni symbolists usually insist on Jewish or Christian, still more Sabean and especially Parsi, origins; but as a matter of fact they already suspect also a connection with Hellenistic philosophy and Hermetic writings. The point still requires investigation as to how Neo-Platonic speculations, Parse mysteries and such myths as are found in the Christian “treasure-caves” came to be clothed in a Koranic covering and developed into Islamic groups. The part played as an intermediary by the “Pure Brethren”, Ihama al-Sufi [q.v.] remains also to be investigated.

All classes of Sevener are very unfavourably criticised by the Muslims, even by the Shi‘is. They are regarded as extreme “exaggerators”, ghulat [q.v.] and usually are considered to be beyond the pale of Islam, so that some symbolists do not quote them at all. The main reason is that they drop the divinity of Allah and the divinity of Muhammad’s prophethood. It is, however, due to the great elasticity of Muslim names of sects, and to a polemical rather than matter-of-fact frame of mind that they are also called Dahris [q.v.] and associated with the materialists, who are essentially different from them. A contributory cause of the unfavourable opinion held of them was, of course, the bitterness felt at their revolutionary aims and their underground political propaganda in the name of the seventh Imam, but still more at their casting off the external law of religion, which is usually dismissed as sheer libertinism; the accusations commonly made against secret sects of sodomy and nightly orgies with wine and community of women also play a great part in the charges made against them. The charges of religious, moral and political nihilism made against them have also found a way into the European literature of the subject. Further investigation, which does not refuse to consider the possibility of syncretism, recognising that every religious system that has become concrete is a syncretic formation with modifications, will alone be able to show how far the theology, or if one prefers the term, the thorough of the Sevener movement represents an intelligible reaction against the theology of the God of Islam, so aloof from man, and in how far the libertinism, said to be general and certainly existing in many, is an attempt to
meet the disjointed total of the prescriptions of the Shari'a with a system of ethics, such as is taught by Nisai-i-Khuwar, for example, in verses 372 ff. of his 'Ishqan-i-Shata, regarding the seven sins of character and the seven cardinal virtues; in this investigation it will not much matter whether the "book of illumination" was written when the poet had already attained a very important place in the hierarchy of the Severans as muqaddas of the Islamists, or whether it was written before he joined them, and reveals the ability of mind which definitely decided him to join this body. Individual bodies of the Severans, like the A'mirahs and Karaitans, were certainly extremely intolerant to other Muslims; but in contrast to this we have the tolerant and wise administration of many of the Fatimids in Egypt. Some groups are occasionally said to have been communist, but this is certainly not a general feature. While in the fourth and fifth centuries the Muslim writers report their spread and their propagandistic activities in the whole Muhammadan world, the old groups have long become consolidated. But their ideas continued to be effective and were carried from Persia far to the north and from India especially to East Africa. In spite, however, of the consciousness of connection with the old Severans, the nature of their beliefs has been essentially transformed. The political aspect has disappeared and the religious side is not so aggressive. It is noteworthy that the modern Sab'iyas are often just those who are the strongest supporters of the feeling of solidarity in Islam.


(R. STEINMANN)

SABR (A.). The significance of this conception could hardly be conveyed in a West-European language by a single word, as may be seen from the following. According to the Arab geographers, the root סב, of which sabr is the second action, means to restrain or hold, hence dasum sabr as "to bind and then obey someone". The slayer and the slain in this case are called סב and musfur respectively. The expression is applied, for example, to martyrs and prisoners of war, even to death; in the Hadith often to animals which — contrary to the Muslim prohibition are tortured to death (e.g. al-Bukhari, Dhadhib, tab. 25; Muslim, Sunnat, trad. 5. Ahmadi b. Hanzali, Musnad, iii. 171). The word has a special technical application in the expression muhim sabr, by which is meant an oath imposed by the public authorities and therefore taken unwillingly (e.g. al-Bukhari, Musnad al-Ahmadi, tab. 25; Ahmadi, tab. 17; Muslim, Sunnat, trad. 175). In the حسain derivations from the root סב frequently occur, in the first place with the general meaning of being patient. Muhammad is warned to be patient like the Apostles of God before him (xxxviii. 16, xlvi. 34; "for Allah's threats are fulfilled", is added in xxx. 60). A double reward is promised to the patient (xxvii. 113, xxviii. 54; cf. xxx. 75). In xxvi. 16, if it is even said that the sabrul shall receive their reward without ġilis (which in this case is explained as measure or limitation).

The conception is given a special application to the holy war (e.g. iii. 140; viii. 66); in such connections it can be translated by endurance, tenacity. The eighth stem is also used in almost the same sense, e.g. Sura xii. 66: "Serve him and persevere in his service". The third stem is also found (vili. 20; cf. below).

The word is next found with the meaning resignation (e.g. in the Joseph. xii. 18) where Jacob, on hearing of the death of his son, says: "Now Goodly resignation is fitting" ('iqaf atqawat).

Sometimes sabr is associated with ġilis (ii. 42, 148). According to the commentators, it is in these passages synonymous with fasting and they support the same words sabr al-ğilis given to the month of Ramadan.

As an adjective we find sabr in the Koran, associated with ġilis (Sura 14, 3 etc.); cf. the Noble al-Tahoor, Tafsir: "It is well with the man who is resigned when misfortune afflicts him, grateful when gifts of grace become his"; and Muslim, Sunnat, trad. 64: "Wonderful is the attitude of the believer; everything is for the best with him; if something pleasant happens to him, he is thankful and this proves for the best with him; and if misfortune meets him, he is resigned and this again is for the best with him." The ideas of sabr and ġilis are also associated in al-Ghazzali, below.

Below development of the conception is, of course, also reflected in the commentators on the Koran; it is difficult to say in how far these interpretations are already inherent in the language of the Koran. In any case, the conception sabr, in all its shades of meaning, is essentially Hebraic in so far as it includes the ḥaram of the Stoic, the patience of the Christian and the self-control and renunciation of the ascetic, cf. below. In place of many other explanations of the commentators, we will give here only that of Fakhr al-Din al-Kahf, Fussah al-Ghaza, Cairo 1278, on Sura iii. 200. He distinguishes four kinds of sabr: (1) endurance in the laborious intellectual task of dealing with matters of dogma, e.g. in the doctrine of ġilis, nold, wakawatan, ṣahih and disputed points; (2) endurance in completing operations one is bound or recommended by law to do; (3) steadfastness in refraining from forbidden activities; (4) resignation in uncertainty, etc. Fussah is, according to him, the application of the word sabr to one's former gesture (like neighbours, people of the Book), refraining from revenge, the Anil bidayat min musir bani Isma'il, etc.

The high value laid upon sabr is also seen in the fact that Sabur is included among the beautiful names of Allâh. According to the Lisan (s.v.
Şabır is a synonym of ḥalām — with the difference that the sufferer need not fear any retribution from the Ḥaļ, but he is not sure of such leniency from the Şabır. Allah’s ẓabir is in the Ḥaļid.in to the highest degree in the saying that no one is more patient than He, towards which wonld His hearing (al-Bahhār, ṫawfi, bāb 3).

In the Ḥaļid, ẓabir is, in the first place, found in general, connections like: to him who practices ẓabir Allah will grant ẓabir. ẓabir is the greatest charisma (al-Bahhār, Zāhār, bāb 50; Ẓāf, bāb 20; ʿAbd al-Ḥamid, aṣb. 93); in the Ḥaļid also, ẓabir is applied to endurance in the holy war. A man asked Muḥammad: "If I take part in the Ḥaļīb with my life and my property and I am killed ẓabir and resigned, rushing forward without seeing, shall I enter Paradise?" And Muḥammad answered: "Yes." (ʿAbd al-Ḥamid, aṣb. 325); the word is found in other passages in the sense of a duration, e.g. towards the public authorities: "after my death ye shall suffer things, but exercise ẓabir until ye meet me at the heavenly pool" (Ḥaṭṭi, al-Bahhār, Ẓāf, bāb 53; Ẓāf, bāb 2 where. ṽāb 4; ʿAbd al-Ḥamid, bāb 4; ʿAbd al-Ḥamid, ṫawfi, bāb 3, 36 etc.). The word usually has the meaning of resignation as in the oft recurring saying: "The (true) ẓabir is revealed at the first blow (inna ẓabir 'indu ẓabir 'inda, or 'indu ẓabir 'inda, or 'indu ẓabir 'inda, al-Bahhār, ṫawfi, bāb 53, 43; ʿAbd al-Ḥamid, ṫawfi, bāb 22 etc.).

Significant, in other respects also, is the story of the epileptic woman who asked Muḥammad for his ẓabir in order for her healing; he replied to her that if she refrained from her request and exercised ẓabir, paradise would be her portion (al-Bahhār, Ẓāf, bāb 6; ʿAbd al-Ḥamid, al-Bahhār, bāb 34). The word is often found in this connection as associated with the proper word for resignation viz. ḥalām (e.g. al-Bahhār, ṫawfi, bāb 9; ʿAbd al-Ḥamid, ṫawfi, bāb 11; with this should be compared the following ḥadīth): "If my servant is deprived of the light of both his eyes, I grant him paradise in compensation" (al-Bahhār, Ẓāf, bāb 67; ʿAbd al-Ḥamid, aṣb. 283).

In conclusion we may remark that in the canonical Ḥaļīb the meaning renunciation is exceedingly rare, which receives so great an importance in ethicisco-mystical literature; this has been the case since the days of the second great era of thought. As with other fundamental conceptions (see the series of definitions in Śāhī and Sīhām in Nicholson's essay in the J. R. A. S., 1905), we find numerous definitions of ẓabir, definitions which often point rather to the facility of imagination than give an exhaustive exposition of the idea, but are of great value for the light they throw upon the subject like lightning flashes. Al-Khaṭābī, in his Risālah (Ṭabāk, 207, p. 99 sqq.) gives the following collection: — "The gulping down of littleness without making a very face" (al-Dżahāli); — "the refraining from unpermitted things, silence in suffering blows of fate, showing oneself rich when poverty settles in the courts of subsistence"; — "steadfastness in fitting behaviour (hājīma al-sādab) under blows of fate" (Ibn ʿAbī); — "his bowing before the blow without a sound of complaint"; — "he ẓabir is he who has accustomed himself to suddenly meeting with forbidden things" (Abū ʿUṯmān); — "the ẓabirists in welcoming illness as if it were health" — "steadfastness in God and meeting His blows with a good countenance and equanimity" (Amm b. ʿUṯmān); — "steadfastness in the ordinances of the Book and of the Sunna (al-Khawāṣī'); — the ẓabir of the mystics (literally: lovers) is more difficult than that of the ascetics" (Yahyā b. Maʿṣūd); — "refraining from complaint" (Rūwām); — "seeking help with God" (Ibn ʿAbī Nūn); — ẓabir is like His name (Abū ʿAlī al-Dūkhi); — "there are three kinds of ẓabir, ẓabir of the mutanabbir, of the ẓabir and of the ṭabir (Abū ʿAbd Allāh b. Khafīf); — ẓabir is a steel that never stumbles" (Abū b. Abī Taḥlīl); — ẓabir is not to distinguish between the condition of the trial and that of trial, in peace of spirit in both, ẓabir is calm under blows, while one feels the heavy trial" (Abū Muḥammad al-Dżahāli; cf. arāğāzā'ī).

This literature, besides play on words and definitions, is also food of producing shades of meaning by prepositions. Al-Shāfīḥ asked a man: "what kind of ẓabir is the most difficult for him who practices it?" He answered: "al-ẓabir yiḥlāb". Then al-Shāfīḥ said: "No". The man: "al-ẓabir liṭāḥah". Al-Shāfīḥ: "No". The man: "al-ẓabir maṭaʿa ʾlālik, ʿal-Shāfīḥ: "No". The man: "But what is it?" Then al-Shāfīḥ said: "al-ẓabir 'an ʾlālik", and he added an explanation which threatened to drive his interrogator crazy (al-Khaṭābī, ṫawfi, p. 100).

Al-Ghazālī treats of ẓabir in the fourth part of the Ḥaļīb, which describes the virtues that make blessed, Book II. We have seen that already in the Korān ẓabir and ẓabir are found in association. Al-Ghazālī discusses the two conceptions in the second book separately, but in reality in close connection. He bases the combination, not on the Korānic phraseology, but on the maxim: "Belief consists of two halves: the one ẓabir and the other ẓabir." This again goes back to the tradition: "Ẓabir is the half of belief" (cf. the tradition given above which also associate ẓabir and ẓabir).
be given here. Jah, like all religious words, consists of three parts, "Jah", "Alah", and "Samal." The first two are like the tree, the body of the branch and the head of the fruit. Out of the three classes of beings man alone may possess "Jah." For the animals are entirely governed by their desires and impulses; the angels, on the other hand, are completely filled by their longing for the deity, so that no desire has power over them. And as a result no "Jah" is necessary to overcome it. In man, on the contrary, two impulses (m'khir) are fighting: the impulse of desires and the impulse of religion; the former is kindled by Satan and the latter by the angels. "Jah" means adherence to the religious as opposed to the sensual impulses.

Types of two kinds: (a) the physical, like the endurance of physical ills, whether acute, as in suffering, blows, etc.; this kind is laudable; (b) the spiritual, like renunciation in face of natural impulses. According to its different objects, it is called by synonyms like: 'Jah, sel', sel-naf, khalda, daya, wahta al-dar, hojat al-dar, manah, faddia. From this wide range of meaning we can understand that Muhammed, when asked, could answer: "Jah is 'Jah". This kind is absolutely laudable (maknina dawani).

As regards the greater or less strength of their "Jah", three classes of individuals are distinguishable: (a) the very few in whom "Jah" has become a permanent condition; these are the "Jahnilin", the "Jahrosalim"; (b) those in whom animal impulses predominate; (c) those in whom a continual struggle is going on between the two impulses; these are the "Jahdilabin"; perhaps Allah will bless them. One of the gnostics (sayas al-Ghazali) distinguishes three kinds of "Jahdilin": those who renounce desires, these are the "Jahsilin"; those who submit to the divine decree, these are the "Jahnilin"; those who delight in whatever Allah allows to come upon them, these are the "Jahrdubin".

In section VI, al-Ghazali shows how the believer requires "Jah" under all circumstances: (a) in health and prosperity: here the close connection between "Jah" and gratitude is seen; (b) in all that does not belong to this category, as in the performance of legal obligations, in refraining from forbidden things, in whatever happens to a man against his will, either from his fellow-men or by God's decree.

"Jah" is an indication of the struggle between the two impulses, its salutary effect consists in all that may strengthen the religious impulse and weaken the animal one. The weakening of the animal impulse is brought about by asceticism, by avoiding whatever increases this impulse, e.g. by withdrawal, ("asak") or by the practice of what is permitted, e.g. marriage. The strengthening of the religious impulse is brought about (a) by the weakening of the desire for the fruit, i.e. "Jahdilin"; (b) by means of the reading of the books of saints or prophets; (c) by gradually accustoming this impulse to the struggle with its antagonist, so that finally the consciousness of superiority becomes a delight.

Bibliography: Besides the references in the text, see also: Spranger, Diec. of the Techn. Terms, 1. 299 sqq.; M. Aslan Palacios, La mystique d'al-Ghazali in the M.F.O.B., vii. 75 sqqq.; K. Hartmann, al-Ghazalis Darstellung des "Jah".
SABT—SABUR

SABT. (See CEUTA).

AL-SABTI, AHMAD b. DAIYAN AL-KHANZIRI. A holy man famous for his virtues and his miracles. Born at Ceuta in 540 (June 24, 1145—June 12, 1146) and died on Monday Djamad al 6, 601 (Jan. 31, 1205) at Marrakesh. He was buried near the Tariq gate. He studied more particularly under Abu 'Abd Allah al-Fakhrkhil, the pupil of the celebrated Kadi 'Iyyad of Ceuta. He was eloquent and had no difficulty in convincing his questioners; he was very pious and used to recite the Qur'an by day and night; he recommended the giving of alms. He himself kept nothing out of the numerous gifts he received, except what sufficed for his needs and those of his family for one day only. He returned good for evil and showed compassion to widows and orphans. At the beginning of his career he lived in a 'udthub, where he taught and with his fees provided for the wants of foreign students. He used to go through the streets of the town reproaching and even beating those who did not say their prayers.

The memory of the saint remained very vivid among the people, but became surrounded by numerous legends. Thus he is said to have prophesied the capture of Ceuta by the Christians to punish his compatriots for their ill-treatment of him; legend relates that after his departure from this town, he was very highly received by the holy men of Marrakesh who feared that his cult would one day eclipse theirs; he has actually become the principal patron saint of this town. But his power extends much farther. The popular belief in Morocco sees in him the master of the winds which is invoked at sea to calm a storm and to raise the necessary wind during a calm.

In many places in Algeria as well as in Morocco, the first measure of new grain is given to the poor in his honour.


(MOH. BEN CHENNED)

AL-SABU, SABUR AL-SABU, the constellation of the Wolf, and SABUR, saba 'Sabur al-Hasr, constellation of Ceuta, Kair (cf. al-Hasr, al-Khair in Marsbxy, Ber. Ms. of. 8°, 257, p. 207 and 208). The Saurat al-Sabur with the Arabs (just as with the Poisons) consists of 19 single stars, none of which is of more than the third magnitude (according to modern star catalogues the brightest are of 3.8 and 3.9 magnitude). The Greeks called the constellation (undefined) ri Stele (= the beast); but even among the oldest Babylonians the suggestion of a ravenous beast seems to have been present. The name is in Babylonian badi ur-din (= madl Ur-iddin), but in Sumerian: z (kakak) kallo qqegi, which means "raging dog" (Wolf probably = Lupus + Centaurus to the north-east); cf. F. X. Kugler, Sternkunde und Sternkunde in Babyl., Ergänzungen, Münster 1134, p. 28, 33, 223; al-Sabur, which is also used for liyan in Arabic probably the direct reproduction of the Greek: ri Stele. J. J. Scaliger, as a matter of fact, is said to have found on his Turkish plasosphere the name al-Aswad, the bear, applied to it.

The animal was formerly thought of in close connection with the centaur. The latter was thought to hold the animal by the forefoot. The Arabs then called the stars of the two configurations, on account of their accumulation al-Shuqil (branch of palm with bunch of dates, or a bunch of grapes).


(S. SCHON)

SABUN soap (cf. English soap), has penetrated through Latin soap and Greek eva pron as a loanword to the East also. According to Pauly-Wissowa, Rhelens. d. kl. Altert., second series, iii. 1112, the ancients were not acquainted with our soap; in Phrygian soap means laxi-ya (laxativum capillitii) and also medical salves; for cleansing purposes certain poor earths were used, which were sometimes perfumed. There can, however, be no doubt that soap came into use in the middle ages along with other laudatory lotions and in addition to its use for cleansing the person and for washing was much used for external application in medicine. The statements made regarding its manufacture in Luscin, Leisun, iv. 1649 sound quite modern; the *Maghribi* soap, which is not cut into pieces but looks like boiled starch, is apparently our soft soap.


(J. RIMBA)

SABUR. (See SABUR).

SABUR or ARABSABUR, ABU NAGE, vassal of the Buoy Bahl' al-Dawla [q. v.]. Sabor was appointed vizier in 380 (990—991). He did not, however, remain long in office, for he was dismissed in the following year, but in 382 (992—993) was restored to his former rank. At the same time Bahl' al-Dawla also appointed Abu Mansur b. Suhaila vizier and the two then acted jointly as viziers of the Buoy Emir. After some time, however, the Dailawa troops began to show their dissatisfaction with Sabor; his house was sacked and he had to go into hiding (383 = 993—994). As his colleague Ibn Suhaila was not inclined to fill the office alone, Abu 'L-Kasim 'Ali b. Ahmad was given the post of vizier; but as soon as the Dailawa had settled down again Sabor came back. In 386 (996—997) Bahl' al-Dawla again appointed him vizier; this time he remained only two weeks in office and then went to al-Bahr. His public career did not come to an end with this, however, for by the year 390 (999—1000) we again find him in Baghdad as vizier of Bahi' al-Dawla. In Mahuram of the following year (December 1000) the Turkish mercenaries mutinied and demanded that...
they should be paid before taking the field. Salah had to fly; hostilities developed between the Turks and the rest of the populace in which the Sunnis took the side of the former and it was only after much bloodshed that the vultures were quieted. After Salah had fled, he wrote to Baalbek. al-Dawla and laid the blame for what had happened on ‘Ali’s, Abu l-Hassan b. Yahye, and his companions and thus appeared before Ishak’s al-bakhshis and secured permission from him to arrest them. But when he went to Waqi’ to carry out this plan, he was outwitted and had to abandon it. In the meanwhile Abu l-Hassan had made his peace with Baalbek al-Dawla and when in the beginning of Djumada I, 302 (end of March, 1002) Salah appeared in Baghdad, the latter had the last card, so that he left the city within the same month and estabished again to al-Mu’tasim. He died in 416 (1025–26). In the first period of his virile age — in 381 (991–92) or, according to another statement, not till 383 (993–94) — he had founded a great library, in which he is said to have presented over 10,000 volumes. This existed down till Turhal’s entry into Baghdad when it was set on fire.

SAD, the fourteenth letter of the usual Arabic alphabet (numerical value: 90; cf. the article ARAB). How the usual form of SAD developed out of the Nabataean is still closely resembling the primitive Semitic form; form of the letter may be seen from plate I of the article ARAB, ARABIC WRITING. As to its pronunciation, SAD was even in ancient times and still is an unvoiced, velarised (and according to Meinhold “stopped”) alveolar aspirant, in which a groove is formed on the front part of the tongue. All these elements (except perhaps the last) were recognised and described as early as by Shiahawi. Of our European sounds the French  in is nearest to it, if we add the so-called (velarisation: according to Meinhold, with “stopping” at the same time. Shiahawi only notes the transition from  to  (and farther into ) before (for example, maykat instead of maykar); at the present day it is also found before other voiced consonants (cf. Egyptian Arabic  < maykar). For further information see Schanda, Shiahawi’s Handbuch (see Index). Cf. also Mattson, Studien phonologiques sur le dialecte arabe vulgaire de Beyrouth” (Updahl 1911), p. 24 sq. and especially C. Meinhold, “Was sind emphatische Laute, und wie sind sie entstanden? in the Zeitschr. f. Eingeborenenforschung, XI. 81–108 (especially p. 85–90). — SAD is also the title of Sitzungsber. des Kuria.

(A. Schanda)

SAD, constellation of good fortune, a common name in Arab astronomy for small groups of stars. They are all in the three adjoining constellations of Pegasi, Aquarius, and Capricorn and usually consist of two, sometimes of three or four stars of low magnitude. Four groups form four successive stations of the moon, namely: 23. SAD al-lajali = α in Capricorn, 33. SAD balad = μ in Aquarius, 34. SAD al-lajali = β in Aquarius, and 35. SAD al-lajaliya = γ in Aquarius. A further four belong to Pegasi: α of

al-balad to al-καλωδων of ZE), sad al-καιρος (4) and sad al-μαθητής (e). Lastly sad al-malak = α in Aquarius.

Bibliography: J. Heeres, Untersuchungen über den Ursprung und die Bedeutung der Sternnamen, p. 114, 191l., 2nd ed.

(J. RUSKA)

SAD, a Abdul-Wahab, an Arab general. His father’s full name was Malik b. Wahab b. ‘Abd Manaf b. Zahr b. Kili b. Murra. Sa’d, who had become a convert to Islam at the age of seventeen (cf. al-Bukhari, Musnad al-Adabi, 1: 25; Ibn Majid, Sunan, introductory chapter, l: 11), was one of the old companions of the Prophet, being a special favourite of his and one of those who had been promised Paradise (Al modifier b. Hasbal, i: 193, ii: 222); he took part not only in the battles of Badr and Uhud but also in the campaigns that followed. When al-Mu’tasim b. Harun, who assumed command in al-Jazira after the death of Khald b. al-Walid, in view of the danger threatening an encounter with the Persians, asked the Caliph ‘Omar for reinforcements, the latter at first declined to take command of the army himself, probably simply in order to stir up the enthusiasm of the Muslims; in the end, however, he did not do so but gave the post of commander-in-chief to Sa’d, according to one version because Djafir b. ‘Abd Allah al-As-Saffari, who had already been sent to the ‘Iraq to support the hard-pressed Muslims, would not consent to be subordinate to the Bakri al-Ma’tamm. In spite of his proved bravery and ability, the Beduin al-Ma’tamm, who had been adopted Islam till after the death of Ma’mun, would, in view of the well-known jealousy among the Arab tribes, probably have proved less suitable as commander-in-chief than Sa’d who belonged to an old Meccan family and was known to be one of the most faithful followers of the Prophet. Sa’d advanced against the Persians with a large army and encamped at al-Kadiya (q.v., ii: 611 sqq.) on the frontiers of Persia and Arabia. Here — probably in the first half of the year 16 (summer of 637) — a great battle was fought, which is said to have lasted several days; the details of it have been much elaborated by the Arab historians. Illness prevented Sa’d from taking part in the battle personally and he had to confine himself to directing the whole operations, which, however, was not quite in accordance with the traditional Arab custom. After the Sasanian leader Rustam had fallen, the slaughter ended in the complete defeat of the Persians and Sa’d was now master of the whole of ‘Iraq al-Arabi; nor were the Persians able to hold permanently al-Madi’in (q.v.), the capital of the provinces east of the Tigris. The young Sasanian king Yazdijir had to flee and abandon his capital to Sa’d. When the latter entered the city, he obtained countless booty and made al-Madi’in his headquarters for the time being. At the end of the same year his nephew Hushin b. ‘Uba b. ‘Abd Waqqas again inflicted a disastrous defeat on the Persians at Bzall (q.v.).

To this period also belongs the foundation of Kufa. To Sa’d likewise is due the credit of having made a strong military camp here, which in course of time grew into an important city; Sa’d was appointed first governor of the rapidly growing settlement. He seems, however, not to have paid
due attention to the Caliph's insistence on the maintenance of old-fashioned simplicity. At any rate we are told that Sa'd built a splendid palace in Kufa modelled on the Taq-i Kisra at al-Mada'in; but when 'Omar, who feared the injurious influence of Persian luxury on the simple habits of the Arabs, heard of this, he is said to have administered a sharp rebuke to Sa'd, and even to have had the palace burned by Muhammad b. Maslama. Sa'd was dismissed from his post as early as the year 20 (640/641) because the rich and turbulent inhabitants of Kufa — of all possible elements, Arabs and Persians, Jews and Christians - accused him of being unjust and tyrannical. When, however, Maslama b. Maslama appeared in Kufa by the Caliph's order to investigate Sa'd's conduct in his office, only one or two individuals dared to appear against him. Nevertheless Sa'd was dismissed and 'Amr b. Yazid appointed his successor; but the latter only remained a short time in office and was followed by al-Mughira b. Shubba [q. v.]. The great military and administrative services of Sa'd were, however, later fittingly recognised by 'Omar. When on his deathbed the latter enquired of six of Muhammad's most trusted companions to choose a new ruler within three days, he chose Sa'd as one of his six faithful servants. It was said to have been added that if Sa'd was not given the office himself, he would recommend the future Caliph to compensate him with a governorship, because he had been removed from his post neither for incompetence nor for treacherous conduct. Following this suggestion, 'Uthman b. Sa'd restored to him the governorship of Kufa; again, however, he was dismissed after a short period of office and his place given to al-Walid b. 'Utha b. Abi Mu'ait. After the assassination of 'Uthman, Sa'd was requested to come forward as a claimant to the throne; but declined, because he wished to live in peace; nor was he inclined to take any steps to take vengeance on the murderers. When 'Ali was chosen Caliph, Sa'd declined to pay homage to him and retired to his estate in al-Ask, where he lived till his death remote from politics, which out of his son's made a reproach against him: (Mushtim, Zuhd, trad. i.; Ahmad b. Hanbal, Musnad, i. 185, ef. 177). According to the annual statement he died in 670 (67/671) or 59 (674/675), aged about 70. He is said to have left vast wealth behind him and was buried in Medina.

behind as his deputy in Medina. In the battle of Badr, according to the most reliable authority, he did not take part, but he had ridden at the battle of Uhud where he was wounded by Tughril. In the 7th month of the year 1346 he was elected the second caliph. In the summer of 1347 he distributed among the rich those who were under the influence of the Prophet. In the winter of 1348 he distributed among the poor those who were in need of food and clothing. He was considered the most learned and the most pious of all the caliphs.

The reign of Sa'd b. Abi Bakr was marked by the great wealth and power of the caliphate. He was also a great patron of the arts and sciences.
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SA'D AL-DIN KÖPEK or GÖBEK (in early texts and inscriptions: Q-r-d b-n Muhammed), a very important personage in the history of the Seljuks of Asia Minor. There is a tradition according to which he was himself a convert to Islam, but this is contradicted by the fact that his father was called Muhayyib. His origin and date of birth are unknown. He first met with him as amir in the palace of Ala' al-Din Kaikubad and next, in connection with "Ala" al-Din’s building operations at Kabadshah (on this place and its buildings see Khalil Edhem, Kaligrafi Shihri, Constantinople 1334, p. 50), as amir and as amir-dehshir. As the office of amir dehshir was of considerable importance in the Seljuk palaces, we may deduce that in the reign of "Ala" al-Din, Sa'd al-Din was already one of the most important personages in the state. Indeed, there still stands in a plain three hours from Konya on the road from Konya to Al-Sarai a large mound which Sa'd al-Din built, the interior of which was completed in the last year of "Ala" al-Din (638 = 1240); at that date then he already occupied an important position. It is not, however, till the early years of the reign of Ghiyath al-Din Kaimkhwaja that we find Sa'd al-Din playing an important part in history. He had attached himself to Ghiyath al-Din and supported the latter’s claim to: the throne against Ya'qub al-Din Kastal Arslan; it is to his influence also that we must attribute the fact that Husam al-Din Kast Khan, one of the Astras of Kastorn, who had taken refuge with the Seljuks and who was governor of Nies, was accused of belonging to Jez al-Din’s party and imprisoned. As a result of that event the Amin of Kastorn, settled in Asia Minor, lost his empire with thousands of people and went out of Syria and Mesopotamia where after numerous adventures he was finally shot and wiped out completely (cf. Kastal al-Din, Hiddekeh al-i, ed. Breschat, Paris 1900, p. 21); Kaptulla Zade Fuad, Amadullino Nofalh, p. 60). With the principal emirs of the time of "Ala" al-Din, Sa'd al-Din was an accomplice of this Sultan in the execution of his mother-in-law, Malik "Adilayna and her two sons; in this way he obtained considerable influence. Ibn Bidi and the historians who follow him are wrong in making Sa'd al-Din exclusively responsible for these crimes, which were repeated in 634 (= 1238). As public opinion was greatly shocked by these happenings, Sa'd al-Din Kopek was appointed commander of the military expedition; in the month of Dhu-l-Hijjah 635 (July-Aug., 1238) he captured Shambalhut. Protesting by the influence, which this victory secured him, he succeeded in having awarded him great honors like Haym al-Din Kaim and Kaim al-Din Kamyr put to death. But the Sultan, who, on the one hand, wished to clear himself of the general repugnance which he had inspired by putting all the responsibility on Sa'd al-Din and, on the other, was anxious to get rid of an accomplice who threatened to become dangerous, had him put to death treacherously. Ibn Bidi gives a detailed account of this.

The great kada of Sa'd al-Din already mentioned is known among the people as the "Nizitiye." This imposing structure measuring 200-200 feet long and 200 feet broad is now in ruins. At the outer gate is an inscription of 634 a.d. dedicated to Ghiyath al-Din Kaimkhwaja. Tradition says that Kopek Oghlu, who played a certain part in the history of Asia Minor during the era of Sultan Mehmed I, was a grandson of Sa'd al-Din and that at the place now called Kopek Kory in the vicinity of the town there is a "Hedhi," which belonged to the family. This tradition, however, is devoid of definite proofs.

Bibliography (besides the works mentioned in the text): Houtman, Revue et Textes relatifs à l'histoire des Seljoukides, vol. III and IV, Leiden 1902, Index; Khalil Edhem, Kaligrafi Shihri, Constantinople 1334, pp. 73-118; Nizhit Oghlu, "Nizitiye," Othmanli Tarhi, Constantinople 1335; 443; Konya Rehberi, Constantinople 1328. (KÖRÜLLU ZADE FUAD)

SA'D AL-DIN is the name by which a large section of the tribe of Taimim is known. The curious name Fier has received no satisfactory explanation and the philologists Abul Masuh al-Azbari asserts that he never met any person who could explain it. Some lexicographers explain it as meaning "more than one," others as "goats," but we may assume that Ibn Duraid is correct when he derives it from the verb "fazara" with the meaning "to split" and that "fier" means "a chip" or "fragment." The Arab genealogists give the name of the common ancestor as Sa'd al-Din Manahi, b. Taimim and relate tales to account for the curious name which amounts to the following: Sa'd had much cattle which he offered his son by different mothers, to take to pasture; they refused and he invited the kindred tribesmen
of Malik b. Zaid Manṣūr to come and rob the camels. Then when only goats remained he gave his sons the same order and they again refused to take them to pasture. In his anger he called Arabs of every tribe together (or, according to another version, took his animals to the fair of Ḫaṣṣ), and asked them to take each one goat as pledge (muḥādā), but allowed no one to take more than one. Thus the goats were scattered all over the country and this is said to be the origin of the proverb: "I shall not do that till you take my goats (are collected agan into one herd)". The goats are probably imagined to have had the same or brand-mark of his clan. The underlying idea appears to be that the "divisions of this tribe were found scattered over the whole of Eastern Arabia. The tribe of Tamīm is mentioned in the remotest antiquity, centuries earlier than the Arab genealogists can imagine, and the genealogies in their case are more fictitious than with other tribes, and all they can serve is to show which of the clans shortly before and after the introduction of Islam felt to possess a certain relationship. The poet al-Akhraj says: "In every wild are Sa'di pointing to their wide distribution. Of the many subdivisions mentioned by genealogists only those derived through his sons Ka'b and al-Fārisī appear to have had a claim to pure descent, while the descendants of the other sons, 'Abd Shamsa, 'Uqayla, 'Awf, 'Uqayla and Mālik were called the "Aban". There were doubts as to the purity of their descent; they were settled in Bahrain and had largely intermarried with the Persian settlers when this province was under Persian rule. They were as regards numbers perhaps the largest Arab tribe and for this reason played an important part in the war shortly before Islam and during the conquests and many persons mentioned in the early times of Islam were members of the various clans of Sa'd al-Fāris. They sided with 'All during the struggle for the caliphate and were most prominent among the unruly tribes in the eastern part of the later Omayyad and appear to have settled in Persia in large numbers. Others emigrated to North-Africa and the Aghlabīs' rulers of Ifriqiya claimed descent from them. The many subdivisions cannot be enumerated here, but it must be stated that the genealogists are far from unanimous in their statements of the various sections, and their names disappear early from history under the general name of Tamīm. Importance may be attached to the tribe of Sa'd al-Fāris and their nearest kindred class for having spoken that Arabic which forms the basis of the classic Arabic of literature, as the earliest philologists seem to have framed the rules of Arabic grammar upon the dialect of Tamīm. This was no doubt on account of their widespread diffusion through which their dialect was understood in most parts of Arabia. Bibliography: Arabic Lexica s. v. Fa'ir; Ibn Duraid, Khita'a al-Abshīfī, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 150 sqq.; A. A. Bevan, The Nabiyy of the Sājja and al-Faraj (Leiden 1915-12), p. 68; H. F. Koppelman, Qalb al-Afrār (Baghdād) 1905; J. Niebuhr, Notizen zur Arab. (Cairo 1834), ii. 344-51; Ibn 'Abd Rabbīhī, Muḥādāt al-Kahīf (Cairo 1831 ed.), xii. 42; Khita'a al-Ashīfī, p. 563; Wüstenfeld, Genealogische Tabellen, 1. and Register, p. 396; also almost every work dealing with the capital of the district of the same name in Yemen. It lies on the pilgrim road from Mecca to Sa'da, 60 parasangs (180 miles) or five journey days' journey from the latter town. In the days of paganism the town is said to have been called Līmān or to have been built on the site later occupied by Ḥun 'Alamun built by the Imam al-Mutasawakkīl 'alā 'Ilīb Ahmad b. Sulaimān b. al-Muṭahhir. According to al-Hamdānī, the name Sa'da owes its origin to the following circumstances: — a man from the Ḥilās, who was passing by the siring castle that stood in Līmān or laid down exhausted beside it. Its height called out twice lāhūd sa'da "he has raised it in fine fashion". Similar popular etymologies are found in other places. Six minutes south of the modern Sa'da lay the village of al-Khurayl, where the ruins of a great reservoir for irrigating the land and of other buildings survived into Muslim times. Near Sa'da is also the town of al-Qayth, which name al-Birūnī would regard as the ancient name of Sa'da.

Sa'da was and — in spite of the catastrophes that have overwhelmed it — still is a flourishing, populous and wealthy town, in which merchants from all parts, especially from al-Baqa, met. The principal industry of the city has always been the dressing of hides and sole-leather which was exported mainly to the Hijāz and Yemen, and the manufacture of leather water-skims of particularly fine quality. For Sa'da lies in the very centre of very vast plantations of the karaj tree (acacia Arabica IV.), the leaves of which are used in dressing leather. In Sa'da excellent lances (sab'ār) and spear-heads used also to be made. Iron, which was brought to Sa'da from the vicinity in the form of dust and was purified there, must have been used for the latter. Iron is still found near Sa'da. Gold used also to occur in the neighbourhood — at al-Ka'a. — The flourishing trade of the town and the busy caravan traffic as well as its native industry yielded large sums in duties and taxes to the treasury of Zālid Imāms, whose capital it was. Vyshii estimated the yield at 100,000 dinars. The Imāms al-Hādī Yahiyya b. al-Husain (d. 598 = 910/911) and Yūsuf b. Yahiyya (d. 430 = 1012/13) are buried in Sa'da.


ṢADAK. [See MIR].

ṢADAKA, al-ṣida, is so called, according to the Arab writers, from the verb ṣadaqa, because the Muslim's almsgiving shows the sincerity (ṣidd) of his religion; but it is, in point of fact, merely
transliteration of the Hebrew word שדוק, which meant originally "honesty", but was used by the Pharisees for what they considered the chief duty of the pious Israelite, namely almsgiving, a meaning which it still retained at the time of the coming of Islam and afterwards. Its proper sense is, therefore, voluntary or spontaneous almsgiving or what we call "charity".

Arabic authors, however, use the word سدى in two different senses. In the first place it is frequently employed as synonymous with زكاة [q.v.], that is, the legal poor-rate, which is involuntary, and of which the amount is fixed. It is so used in the Koran, e.g. 9:36, 24:34, andLane, s. v.). It is so used also in the Mafahim of Mâlik ibn Anas, in which, in the Kitab al-Zakât, سدى is substituted for زكاة. He does this apparently when it is a case of Zakât upon quadrupeds (ماعز, camels, flocks and herds), but also in other cases. But if this is the other hand, سدى seems to be put for زكاة quite indiscriminately, and the two words are used simultaneously as synonyms. Instances will be found in the notes to Hooda and Marçais' translation. Thus in 61:31 of the Kitab al-Zakât the two words are used indifferently. Bahîrî uses سدى instead of زكاة where Mâlik uses سدى (cf. e.g. 6:43.) He quotes the tradition "There is no سدى on less than five shekels of she-camel" in the same form as Mâlik, yet speaks of the سدى at the-Fâr where Mâlik uses the usual زكاة at the-Fâr. The same failure to distinguish between the two words is found also in later writers, both legal and historical (e.g. Ibn al-Ashârî, al-Tahâfî, ill. 42, after Tahârî).

If there were no doubt as to the identity of this سدى and زكاة, it would be removed by the fact that the six or seven classes of persons who are entitled to benefit by them are the same in each case, namely, the poor and needy, those engaged in the work of distributing the سدى or زكاة, Muslim captives in enemy hands, debtors, those engaged in the دؤاذ, travellers, and (originally) the مولى or the Mâlik.

The proper use of the word سدى is, however, as has been said, in the sense of voluntary almsgiving. In this sense ید is, for the sake of distinction, called سدى and زكاة "Zakât al-Sâdiq" ("alms of "spontaneity"). Ibn al-Arâfî thus defines this سدى, "Voluntary سدى is an act of worship arising from free choice mixed with authority; and if it be not so then is it "al-Sâdiq. For the man makes it obligatory upon himself, just as God makes mercy obligatory upon Himself towards those who repent, and corrects those who do ill in ignorance".

سدى appears to be used in this sense in the remaining passages of the Koran where it occurs, other than the two cited above. Alms may be given openly (II. 273), so long as this is not done for ostentation (II. 266); but alas given in secret are better. There is more profit in alms than in money (II. 277), but they must be given with good will (II. 265). Those who are disposed to be charitable must not be discouraged (IX. 50), but the reverse (IV. 114). Voluntary alms, of which the amount was left to the giver, were prescribed to be given before interviewing the Prophet, but this impost was remitted provided the interviewers had paid their Zakât (VIII. 13, 14). Alms might also be given in place of some other obligation, such as that of shaving the head after the pilgrimage (II. 192). These passages naturally form a basis for much that is found in the succeeding writers. In the Kitâb al-Zakât of his Mafahim Mâlik ibn Anas frequently cites a certain "Letter" of 'Umar ibn al-Khattâb in regard to the سدى. This unfortunately refers to the سدى in the sense of Zakât only. Mâlik himself treats of the سدى in its etymological sense along with a variety of other matters in the closing paragraphs of his work. He does not use any distinctive term such as سدى al-Fasâwa. What he says is as follows. Under the heading "Inviting to almsgiving" he records a saying of Muhammad: "Whoever gives an alms out of honest gain (and God accepts only the honest) is only placing it in the palm of the Merciful, and He will make it grow for him, just as one of you lets his wasanling foal or camel grow until it becomes like a mountain". Anas ibn Mâlik (q. v.) used to tell how Abu Talîb, who was the richest of the Meccans, prizsed above all his wealth a well beside the mosque, from which Muhammad was in the habit of drinking. When the verse "You shall never win piety until you spend of what you love" (VII. 56) came down, he wished to give this well. Muhammad, however, persuaded him to keep it in his own family. Zaid ibn Aslam is the authority for the prophetic saying: "Give to the beggar, as if he came upon a mine". The wives of the believers are exhorted not to look down upon the alma given by their neighbour, even if it be the burnt leg of a sheep". 'Aâsha (q. v.), when fasting, gave to a beggar the only loaf she had with which to break her fast. She received the timely present of a sheep. To some who were ever begging Muhammad gave, but with the reproof that "the best of gifts is sustenance". It was when speaking from the pulpit about almsgiving and about refraining from begging that the Prophet used the oft-quoted saying: "The upper hand is better than the lower hand", Mâlik interprets that the upper hand is the hand that spends and the under hand is the hand that asks. 'Umar even refused his stipend on the ground that Muhammad had advised them not to take anything from another. Muhammad explained that he was speaking of asking for gifts. 'Umar replied that he would never ask; nor would he refuse what came without asking. Muhammad also said: "By Him in whose hand my life is, it was better for one of you to take a rope and gather fuel upon his back, than to beg from one to whom God has given of his bounty, whether he give or refuse". A certain Asadl who had encamped in the Bârî al-Ghârik (q. v.), was urged by his family to seek something of Muhammad. He went and found another applicant being sent away with the words: "The beggar who possesses an ounce of gold or its equivalent is guilty of improvidence" (سکف), the Prophet adding that he had nothing to give. Mâlik explains that an ounce is 40 dirhams. He adds that the Asadl returned to his family without begging, but when the Prophet received fresh supplies, he was not forgotten.

Under the headling "What is disliked in regard to alms" Mâlik notes that the family of Muhammad may not accept alms, which are called the "offcoursing of mankind" (جذب‌العند). It was not lawful for Muhammad to give alms out of the سدى (that is, the Zakât). He might give only of his own. So too Aslam wished a man to
requisite of 'Umar to let him ride one of the she camels of the "Sadaka," but the other asked him if he would like to drink the water in which a person had washed himself. He exclaimed, "God forgive you! Do you say the like of this to me?" The other replied: "Alms are but the offscouring of men, which they wash from off them." There is some slight confusion here between the two senses of 'Sadaka.' So far Malik.

Al-Bukhari in the following century deals with 'Sadaka' in both its senses in the sixth book of the Sahih, on Zakat, without perhaps being aware that he is speaking of two different things. Of the voluntary almsgiving he says in various places, that alms is the duty of a Muslim. If he lack the means to give alms, he must work and gain them. If he cannot find work, he must at least refrain from ill, and this will be counted to him for alms. The alms given should be according to his means, out of the means of his possessions. They must be given with the right intention, even to the wrong person. A wife may give alms out of her husband's substance, and a slave out of his master's. Begging is not to be indulged in; but alms may be taken from the rich and given to the poor. Almsgiving atones for sin.

Al-Ghazali discusses almsgiving in the kirba arra al-Zakat of the Thawr al-Ulim, especially in the 8th waqaf, in which he defines the proper recipient of alms. He must be ascetic, learned, truthful, uncomplaining, necessitous, and related to the giver. In the 4th waqaf he talks up 'Sadakat al-Tzanimun.' After recounting sayings ascribed to Muhammed and others, he comes to the question raised in the Koran, whether it is better to do alms in secret or openly. Those who prefer to give in secret, say that this preserves the self-respect of the recipient, and does not cause people to talk, not excite the envy of others. Others hold that alms given openly prevent mistakes and misunderstandings, promote humility, and so on. Ghazali, like Sir Roger de Coverly, decides that much may be said on both sides, and that all depends on circumstances and motives. He then turns to the question whether it is better to accept, Zakat or 'Sadaka.' Some prefer the former because it is a legal due, and does not place those who accept it under an obligation. On the other hand, the recipient of the Zakat may not be worthy of help, and the element of friendliness is eliminated. Once more Ghazali decides to make a general rule. Cases differ.

His al-'Abari deals with this matter in the Fatih al-Mahfzah. In Kitab 70, on "the secrets of the Zakat," he also discusses the question of secret or open alms. His definition of voluntary alms has been given above.

The Shi'ite views of 'Sadaka and Zakat are similar to those of the Sunnis, but, while both debar the family of the Prophet from benefit of Zakat, the Shi'ites permit them to share in the 'Sadaka.'

Care for the poor is a characteristic of the Semitic peoples, but the Arabs were not troubled by the feeling of pity. It is possible, therefore, that the provision made for those in need, whether by voluntary or involuntary aid, may have been borrowed from the Hebrews. Cf. Tobit, xii. 4-5; Matt. vi. 3, which certainly appear to be quoted. Alms are not a feature of Arabia before Islam, but Freytag gives (xxiv. 5) the proverb: "The best alms are words."
Barkeyáry and his brothers. It was not till after the death of Barkeyáry that Sultan Muhammad was able to think of dislodging Ismá'il from it and in 499 (1105/1106) he asked Sádáka to fight him. In Djiýmad I of the same year (Jan.-Feb., 1106) Sádáka took the field against Ismá'il, who was soon forced to surrender, whereupon Sádáka appointed one of his grandsons Dabba's Mamlíks named Alláthásh to govern Baṣra. But as the latter was very soon surprised and captured by Beduín bandits, the Sultan himself appointed another governor in his place. In Saláh, 500 (Oct. 1106) Kájibábáh b. Hasánáš al-Durámí, lord of Tákrit, had also to yield. After the death of Barkeyáry, Muhammad had sent the Emir Áyánschá al-Bírsáli [q.v.] to Tákrit to occupy the town. As Kájibábáh would not obey, he was besieged.

After several months had passed, he saw the impossibility of holding out any longer, and sent to Sádáka and surrendered the city to him. Wárim b. Abl Fihrás was then appointed governor of Tákrit. But Muhammad could not always look so quietly while Sádáka's power kept growing, especially as the latter never had any scruples about affording shelter to anyone who had fallen into disgrace with the Sultan. When Abduláuf Surkháb b. Kájibábáh, lord of Síwa, took refuge with him and Sádáka refused to hand him over, long negotiations between Sádáka and the Sultan only resulted in an open breach between suzerain and vassal. The Sultan set out in person from Baghádád with a large army and in the fierce battle which was fought (according to the most usual statement) in the latter half of Radájah, 501 (beginning of March, 1108) Sádáka was killed at the age of fifty-nine. Like his ancestors he bore the title "Malik al-'Arab"; the highest praise is given him by Arab poets and historians for his virtues, notably his liberality and readiness to give assistance, and he is rightly described by A. Müller (Der Islam im Morgen- und Abendland, ii. 122) as "a true Beduin, brave, stubborn, and witty."

Bibliography: Iblískálím (ed. Wiistenfeld), ii. 361; ibe Sáme's tâbabb, i. 634; ibn al-Albán, al-Kámí (ed. Tornberg), x. passim; Abu 'l-Farág, Jaméel, ii. 534, 535, 538, 587; Houssain, Recueil des textes vot. à l'hist. de Sádákánédés, i. 270, 259; Recueil des hist. des écrivains, Hist. or., ii, 9, 247-252; iii, 497, 517, 531; Well, Geschichte der Chalíffat, iii. 156-159.

(K. V. Zettmar) al-Sá'dán, the two lucky stars, Júpi ter and Vénus in contact to the two unlucky stars, Mánub and Msrá. Jupiter is called the great fortune, "al-Sá'd al-akharr; whoever is born under his rule will be among the happy ones in the future life and distinguished for devotion that fear of God, uprightness and continence. Venus is called the little good fortune, "al-Sá'd al-asháger; whoever is born under Venus may expect good fortune and success in this life, in all worldly pleasures, such as food and drink and especially in all love and matrimonial affairs."

Bibliography: for the Greek views see F. Boll, Phönix; Enn'li' Thw'li' al-Sá'dâ (ed. Busch), ii, 711; Dierici, Propyläen der Araber, p. 70; al-Kawmí, "Abúl-Mámlík", ed. Wiistenfeld, ii, 22, 26; transl. by H. Ebre, Die Wunder der Schaffung, i. 48, 57. (J. Rücks)
In the short stories of Guištān and Bizītān (also called Sa'di-nāme) there occur many personal recollections of the author. In his monograph on Sa'dī, Masʿūd has tried to restore a biography based on those informations. But he seems to have trusted Sa'dī's veracity too much. The truth of many of these stories has been doubted before (Barthier de Meynard, Rücker) and Sa'dī himself declares that whoever has been much about in the world, may lie a good deal. If we are not wholly to distrust the author, he must have lost his father in an early age, being old enough, however, to remember some of his wise lessons. The anecdote in the Guištān about the poet's visit to Kūshgar, when he was still very young, sounds rather improbable and has put many orientalists; certainly the easiest way is to consider the whole story as fantastical (cf. Schulten in Der Islam, xiv, 187). To the period of Sa'dī's youth must equally have belonged his sojourn in Syria as a prisoner of the Franks in Tripoli (Masʿūd suggests of the siege of that town in 1221) and his ephemeral marriage with the daughter of a paternal friend who redeemed him from slavery. It is impossible to follow him closely during the period of his long journeys (1226–1255); it seems probable that he visited Central Asia, India, Syria, Egypt, Arabia (many of the short stories relate experiences in the desert on the way to or from Mecca), Abyssinia, Morocco. In India Sa'dī pretends to have passed through the well-known adventure in the temple at Somanāt, where he discovered the priest's trick in deceiving the people and afterwards killed him in order to escape his vengeance. This story, too, however, has many intrinsic improbabilities (Bizītān, ed. Graf, p. 383 sgg.). Sa'dī’s second marriage in Yemen is also to be placed in this second period. In the last period of his life he was, as the Kāpida’s prove, in relation with the Atabak Abd Allāh ibn Sa’dī bin Zangi, on whose death he composed an elegy († 1260) and whom he has celebrated in the first pages of the Bizītān. There is the Arabic Markhāja on the fall of Bagdād and in the same period his panegyric on the Mongol conquerors and their satellites. The Tūshītān are dedicated to the last Atabak of Fārs, Sai’djāshāh. There are also Kāpida’s dedicated to Anjīzānī, the Mongol governor who succeeded that prince, and also to Sa'dī’s exalted patrons 'Aṭā Malik and Shams al-Dīn Djiwānt (an anthology of these panegyrics is to be found on p. 67–70 of the Persian introduction to the Gībū Fund edition of the Ijāhān-Guḥā). As in Sa'dī’s works there is no allusion whatever to the tragic death of both the brothers Djiwānt (1282 and 1283). Masʿūd thinks that the poet must have died before or very shortly after these events; in that case the informations of the biographers, varying between 1291 and 1292 give too late a date. Now, if, as most authors do, the year 580/1284 is adopted as the year of Sa'dī’s birth (Browne, Lit. Hist. of Persia, 189), he may not yet have reached 100 (solar) years.

Sa'dī’s tomb is outside Shirāz, a little farther off than that of Haftū. The tombstone is not old, the original one having been destroyed by a fantastical mudžāhayd, as Sa'dī is generally believed to have been a Sunnī. It is probable for this same reason that Sa'dī’s tomb lies rather deserted, whereas many Shirāzians have chosen for the place
of their last repose the neighbourhood of Hāfa (Brown, A year amongst the Persians, London 1893, p. 281). According to the colophons in the oldest MSS., the name of the author was Hasūn Allah. The anonymous Muḥall al-Dīn Ḥusayn ibn Ṭāhir, his friend, was Muḥall al-Dīn Abū-Allāh (Rieu, Catalogue of the Persian MSS. in the British Museum, ii. 595).

Ethis (Grandrix des 4 Phil., ii. 292) counts Sa’dī among the poets that first have combined the originally separated mystical and didascalic tendencies in Persian poetry. With Sa’dī the didascalic, moralising element is predominant; to this it is that he owes his great popularity.

There is no doubt that he was well versed in the “science” of mystics. Besides Abū al-Ḳadr al-Dījālī, Shāhāb al-Dīn Shahrwārdi was his teacher in Baghdad (Dabestān, ed. Qal’ami, p. 150). According to an anecdote told by Akbār (transl. by Huart, i. 238), he even might have met with Dījālī al-Dīn al-Rūmī (cf. Dabestān, p. 165 sqq.). For him as for other poets the often paradoxical mystical ideas must have been valuable literary material. The question whether Sa’dī was himself susceptible of mystical feelings is probably to be answered in the negative, as his practical nature made him more inclined towards a moralising attitude, in which he made mysticism only serve a higher moral conception of earthly life. In many instances he puts moderate common sense against exaggerated zeal for the life to come. In his Ḥaft-e-Motābur the lofty mystical sentiments of the Muharram or the Motābur al-Tair should not be sought for. Sa’dī often speaks of the Sūfī’s, but his attitude towards them is always more that of a moralist than of a fellow-mystic. His practical mystical ideal is realised in the Ḥaft-e-Motābur, where truly wise people who do not care for the outer appearances of this world, without, however, despising it wholly. For it is precisely the world’s perishability that makes it valuable as a rare ruby, and in many places Sa’dī shows himself a good Muslim, when he finds in the variety and beauty of earthly existence a reason for great thankfulness towards the Creator. He preaches a moderate fatalism and disapproves of exaggeration in the religious life: “Don’t be more pious than Muhammad.”

As a moralist Sa’dī gained much profit from the vicissitudes of life through which he passed. His knowledge of the world gives to his ideas and opinions a cosmopolitan character, reached by no other Persian poet. It is due, probably, to this fact, together with the elegance of his style, that he has earned his great popularity in his own country and abroad, so that he has been compared with Horace, Rabbesal and LaFontaine. Sa’dī looks upon the world with sympathetic humour and is seldom satirical; and he can never enough exhort his readers to follow his moral counsels. Now the moral precepts, chiefly to be found in Gullistān, Būrjat-Nāma and Pānč-Nāma, are far from being uniform. For some moralists the author cites in the Pānč-Nāma a number of virtues and vices; as the chief virtue he seems to regard “goodness” (nafīs), great sympathy for our fellow-creatures without any egotistic view. He that obtains the qualification of good is really immortal. On the other hand Sa’dī’s social mores are sometimes quite different; here revengefulness is sometimes recommended instead of meekfulness, insincerity instead of veracity. Mum is admonished to guard by all means his independence from other people. Especially for princes several machiavellian precepts are given (the third part of the Gullistān is a short treatise on politics, dedicated to Aḏarḵān), and for derwish again other moral norms exist.

The different aspects of Sa’dī’s morality make it difficult to believe in his sincerity, the more so as his morality is considerably compromised by the obscenities uttered in some chapters of the Gullistān and in the Ḥaft-e-Motābur, though, in an introduction to this collection, he tries to excuse himself in saying that he could not withdraw from an order given to him to compose these poems. However, with a Persian poet it is often difficult to separate what belongs to himself and what must be regarded as a concession to the taste of his patrons and of the public. The favour he has met with all through the eastern world should always be taken into serious consideration before judging too severely his character. In any case he has shown himself in all his community and he has amply satisfied the predilection for moralizing in literary form, which the Persians have had since pre-Islamic times.

Moreover, his elegant style, his ease of expression, the way in which he knows how to make attractive the most tedious moral maxims, in short his art, would have been enough to gain him the admiration of his countrymen. The Gullistān are considered to be his most perfect compositions; the Arabic Ḥaft-e-Motābur are less appreciated by orientalists. Arabic and Persian lines follow alternately in his Mutammidāt, and in one of his poems he uses 16 different languages and dialects (Bauch in the Z.D.M.G., xxx. 89).

In Persia Sa’dī’s Dībnān is more read and appreciated than the Gullistān and the Khalilīn (Brown, A year amongst the Persians, p. 281). Still, nowadays, many Persians know one of both these works by heart and quite a number of Persian poets have followed Sa’dī in writing similar works. They are enumerated by Ethis in the Grundzüge der Iranschen Philologie, ii. 297. The most famous of the imitations of the Gullistān is Dībnān (q.v.) Baharīstān. But none of them has been able to surpass the originals in popularity.

Outside Persia Sa’dī’s influence has been great in Indian and in Turkish literature. After the Calcutta edition the poet’s works have often been printed in India, without and with commentaries by Indian scholars. The Gullistān has been translated several times into Hindustānī, the best known being the translation of Aḥsa’ (1802). García de Tassay’s translation that Sa’dī must have been the first Hindustānī poet has been definitely refuted now (cf. Brown, Literary History, ii. 533). But a certain relation between Sa’dī’s way of composition, especially in the Gullistān, in which a prose story is everywhere followed by a short poem, and the well known literary form of Indian tales, admits on the one hand of the supposition of Indian influence on Sa’dī himself and may explain on the other hand his popularity in Hindustān.

Turkish translations of Sa’dī’s works were made at an early date. The Būrjat was translated in 1354 by the learned Taherīn (Gibb, History of Ott. Poetry, i. 202) and there exists a translation of the Gullistān, made in 1391 by
Sa'dī al-Sarayī in the Turkish dialect of Egypt (MS. Loeben, No. 475 in Dozy's Catalogue, i. 235; cf. also Alī ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb, Muqaddima, Sept.-Oct., 1833, p. 139). The Turkish poet Kəzməl Pāīšā Ẓāhir (1534) imitated the Gultūn in his Persian Nīghtūrūn. Sa'dī belonged to the poets whose works were much studied during the early period of Ottoman literature. In a way he has even been of some influence on the development of modern literature in Turkey, as Žiyā Pāša, in his autobiography, tells us that it was only when he read the Gultūn that he discovered that language was (Gībb, Hist. of Ott. Poets, p. 53).

In his Khašāhī (ed. Constantinopole 1291, i. 22 of the introduction) Žiyā Pāša puts Sa'dī above all other Persian poets: "When one reads the Bišūn, then only does one understand what the world is!" He does not doubt of Sa'dī's sincerity and admires in him the fact, that even in his panegyrics he is still courageous enough to remind the mighty of the earth of moral precepts. During the sixteenth century several other Turkish translations have appeared. Turkish scholars have also undertaken to write commentaries on Bišūn and Gultūn; such are Sūfu (1561), Shamsī, Sīdī (both at the end of the eighteenth century), Ḥakim, al-Īsawī, and others. In the nineteenth century some of these commentaries were printed.

The existing translations of the Gultūn and the Bišūn and sometimes of other of Sa'dī's works, in all modern languages, prove sufficiently the great renown he has obtained beyond the boundaries of Islam. First, the Gultūn became known through the French translation by André du Ryer (Paris 1634), followed by several editions in Latin (by Gentius, Amsterdam 1651), German (by Olearius, Hamburg 1654), Dutch (transl. from Olearius) and English (by Sullivan in 1774). The Bišūn appeared later. In the nineteenth century Thomas Hyde is said to have made a translation of it. The oldest printed translation is in Dutch (Amsterdam 1688) by D. Huyvat. So in Western Europe Sa'dī became familiar as early as the sixteenth century; much need only be added here to the works of Lafontaine, Voltare and Goethe.

The latest monograph on Sa'dī is Henri Massé's Essai sur la poètes Sa'dī (Paris 1919), a dissertation for the doctorate of the Alger University. In his Thèses Complémentaires, called Biographie de Sa'dī (Paris 1919) Massé gives a very valuable bibliographical survey, to which reference may be made here. Since that date a new edition of Sa'dī's odes has begun to appear: Sir Lucas White King, The Odes of Sheikh Multān-i-Din Sa'dī, Bishār Part I (Tāyistān), Fasc. 1 (1919), ii. (1920), iii. (1921), published at Calcutta in the Bibliotheca Indica, New Series, No. 424.

AL-SA'DI, "Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Abd Alīh b. 'Imām b. Amīr, the historian of the Songhai kingdom in the Sudan, belonged to an old family of scholars in Timbuktu where he was born on the 11th Djumādā II, 1002 (1596); here he received his education from Ahmad Bahā (q.v.). On the conclusion of his studies he sought with his brothers a sphere of activity in Djenne (q.v.), the old commercial town which at that time rivalled Timbuktu as a commercial and intellectual centre. Here in 1536 (1636) he succeeded in obtaining the post of imām of the Sankore Mosque, i.e. of the mosque in the foreign quarter, having previously acted as deputy for his predecessor in the office. He extended his knowledge of the world at the end of 1039 (July 1630) by a journey to the Fülbe kingdom of Māsina north of Djenne on the left bank of the Niger, which at that time included the island of Djiboula in the Niger. It was the Kūfī there who had invited him, but he received such an honourable reception from the Sultan himself and the notables of the kingdom, that he repeated his visit three years later. On this occasion he rendered diplomatic services to the Sultan by settling a feud between him and one of his vassals. He and his family, however, suffered a good deal from the tyranny of the Moroccan governors in Djenne. In 1044 (1634) one of his brothers was banished from his home to Timbuktu and he had to go back there to intervene on his behalf. Two years later he himself was even dismissed from his office. On complaining to the Pasha in Timbuktu, the latter gave him this much satisfaction that he dismissed the Kūfī who had been his enemy. But he gave up further claim to his office and preferred to live as a private individual and occasionally placed his knowledge at the disposal of the smaller vassals in the southern Songhai kingdom as secretary and teacher. In 1056 (1646), however, the Pasha of Timbuktu, Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Olyunsa, summoned him to be his Secretary of State, and he seems to have held this office under Muhammad's successors also till his death. On several expeditions on which he had to accompany the Pasha, he became acquainted with the north and east of the Songhai kingdom which he did not hitherto know. He then decided to write a history of his native land which he entitled Taʾfidh al-Sudān. He introduced his work with the early history of the tribes of the Songhai, Melli and Tuarég, and of the towns of Djenne and Timbuktu. In 1853/54 Barth was able to make extracts from the smaller half of this history in Timbuktu and published these in a translation in the ZDMG., i. 178 (1881). He interspersed these remarks with numerous ethnographical digressions — introduced as ihtilāl — which Barth omitted. In chapter x he gives a survey of the scholars of Timbuktu as a supplement to Ahmad Bahā's Fštāl al-Dībāqī. The history proper begins with the establishment of Muslim rule by the Kharījīs, the Alī in the ninth (fifteenth) century. He then describes the role of the orthodox Aškūyā dynasty and the conquest of the kingdom by the Moroccans and their dominion until the death of the author. The style is much interspersed with colloquialisms and is faulty in other respects also. The date of completion of the chronicle is given by him as Monday, Dhu'dhul Hijja 5, 1063 (Oct. 28, 1653). On the following day he added a list of officials as an appendix. In a further appendix he detailed happenings down to Džumādā I 16, 1066 (March 14, 1656). He seems to have died soon afterwards. A continuation to his work, a history of the Moroccan governors in the Songhai kingdom entitled Taʾdhhīr al-Nasīrūn was written in 1084 (1751) by an unnamed author, who was born in Timbuktu in 1112 (1700) and was a grandson of the Emir Muhammad b. Shāwī.

Bibliography: "Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Abd Alīh b. 'Imām b. Amīr al-Sa'dī, Taʾfidh al-
Sādī was a poet and statesman known for his poetry and his role in the government of Marrakesh. The

the text continues about the role of Sādī in the government of Marrakesh and his contributions to the city. It mentions that he was a poet and statesman, and that his poetry was highly regarded.

The text then moves on to discuss the role of Sādī in the governance of Marrakesh. It mentions that he was known for his poetry and his contributions to the city's culture and history.

The text then shifts to discuss the role of Sādī in the political landscape of Marrakesh. It mentions that he was a statesman and played a key role in the governance of the city.

The text concludes with a summary of Sādī's contributions to Marrakesh, highlighting his role as a poet and statesman and his impact on the city's culture and history.
1) The figures in brackets give the date of the first proclamation of the ruler.
The Arab tribes and the Berber tribes, never quite reconciled to one another, favoured sometimes one and sometimes the other pretender. Like the Christians, the Turks charged dearly for their services; and sometimes, to weaken their neighbours still more, lent their help to several competitors at the same time.

Mülay Malik, supported by the Turks of Algiers, was proclaimed ruler of Morocco. But Muhammad al-Mutawakkil attacked him with Portuguese assistance. A famous battle took place at Wad Makhammar (battle of the three kings) in which the king of Portugal, Don Sebastian, his ally Muhammad al-Mutawakkil and Mülay Malik were all three killed. The ex-pretender Ahmad was then proclaimed sovereign of Morocco with the support of the Turks (1578 = 986).

The latter is known as Ahmad al-Mansur, or Ahmad al-Dhahabi. He kept on good terms with the Turks and took advantage of the respite offered him by the Portuguese and Spaniards, who were exhausted or occupied in Europe, to conquer the Sudân. This was the most remarkable episode in the history of the dynasty. This ruler died of the plague in 1603 (1012). His three sons at once disputed the succession; the one, Muhammad Shaikh, known as al-Ma'mun, was the candidate of Philip III; Zidan, proclaimed at Fès, was supported by the Turks while Abu Fâris was proclaimed at Marrakech. The latter succeeded in defeating his rival of Fès, who took refuge with the Turks, then tried to reconquer Morocco from the south. But the people of Fès preferred to submit to al-Ma'mun who was proclaimed in 1604 (1013). The assassination of Abu Fâris by 'Abd Allah, son of al-Ma'mun, disposed of one of the rivals but the struggle between the two surviving brothers continued. Zidan was proclaimed and dethroned three times in all. The marabouts, to whom the Banû Sa'd had at first owed their elevation to the throne, took advantage of the situation to strengthen their personal power in their sphere of influence. Their attitude forced the Sultan to take action against them. In 1610 (1018) the encroachment of Lâcheche to the Spanish way of Ma'in became the signal for general risings. Fierce against the Christians developed at Tetuan and at Salé (Sis) [q. v.]. An adventurer, Abu Mahallât, seized Tafialât, Dra'a and Marrakésch. He was threatening to occupy the whole of Morocco when he was killed in 1613 = 1021. In the north-west the town of Sis and the surrounding country accepted the rule of a marabout, al-Áyshâ.

Sultan Zidân continued to reign, buffeted about by all these troubles, and died in 1627 = 1038. His three sons, 'Abd al-Malik, al-Walid and Muhammad Shaikh al-Aghgar, were equally the playthings of the Christians, Turks and marabouts for over nine years. The latter reigned at this time quite without restraint: a certain 'Ali Bû Domaïa was master of al-Sis; Tafialât was ruled by a creature of the Turks, Muhammad b. Isma'il; the marabouts of the Zawiya of Dîla ruled Tetula and the region of Fès; al-Áyshâ, champion of the holy war against the Christians, had added al-Qarb and al-Hasa to his territory. Muhammad Shaikh al-Aghgar succeeded in getting himself proclaimed at al-Marrakech in 1635 (1045) but he was confined to this one town of his. Even there Karrüm al-Álâli, a kind of mayor of the palace, seized the power on the death of the Sultan. He imprisoned Ahmad al-Ábbâs, son and successor of the ruler Muhammad Shaikh, and put him to death (1654 = 1064). With the latter the Sa'dian dynasty disappeared, after lasting about a century, just at the time when that of the 'Alawi Sharifs, originally of Taifaît, began to establish themselves in the north of Morocco.

Order of succession:
1. al-Kâ'im, proclaimed in 1599 in al-Sis;
2. Muhammad al-Mahdi, proclaimed with his brother in 1534;
3. Ahmad al-Áragi, proclaimed with his brother in 1534;
4. Muhammad al-Mahdi alone; he was proclaimed at Fès in 1534;
5. 'Abd Allah al-Maghribi, proclaimed in 1554;
6. al-Mutawakkil, proclaimed in 1554;
7. Ahmad al-Mansur, proclaimed in 1578;
8. Abu Fâris 'Abd al-Azîm, proclaimed in 1605;
9. Zidan, proclaimed in 1605;
10. 'Abd al-Malik b. Zidan, proclaimed in 1630;
11. Muhammad Shaikh al-Aghgar, proclaimed in 1606. He died in 1654. His son, Ahmad al-Ábbâs, never reigned but was assassinated in the same year; with him the line became extinct.


SADIK, the name given by Tippu Sultan of Mysore (1197—1213 = 1782—99) to a gold coin of the value of two pagodas, weighing 106 grains (6.86 grammes). The name is derived from the well-known epithet of 'Abbât Bakr [cf. the art. SINTON], in accordance with Tippu's custom of naming his denominations after khalifas or imams.

(J. AllâN)

SA'DIYA or DZHARIYYA, an order of dervishes named after the founder 'A'SAD AL-DIN AL-DZHARIYY, i.e. of Džar, "between the Hawra and Damascus."
His death-date is variously given as 700 and 730 A.H.; and the accounts which we have of him are clearly fabulous. According to the Khwâser al-Aghgar, l. 34, his father was the Shaikh Yûnus al-Áfghi, a pious man, whom in his youth he disobeyed, becoming a leader of banditti in the Hawra; owing, however, to his father's prayers he was favoured with a vision which resulted in his conversion. The authority followed by Depont and Coppolani makes him practice severe asceticism, and visit various sanctuaries, including Mecka; after this he returned to Syria, and founded in Damascus the order which bears his name, but which is traced by a sülûh through
The ḍūsra resembles performances by Ṣūfis of a much earlier period, who were supposed to override natural laws in a variety of ways. Egyptian historians do not appear to allude to it. Similarly al-Dījābārī has it in mind when he recommends the ḥalawīyya system for not enforcing on its members more than they can bear (1 294 al.). It does not therefore seem possible at present to say when or whence it was introduced. The practice of snake-charming, whereby followers of the order are said to make their living still in Egypt, is attributed to the founder and explained by fables connected with his conversion.

Writers on Ṣūfism pay little attention to this order, though it is just mentioned in the Dāmī al-Qīlī, without any specification of its doctrines or practices. The founder is mentioned neither in the Tuhštāt of al-Shaʾrīnī, nor in the Naṣṣāf al-Um of al-Dījābārī, who suggests that one Saʿd al-Dīn al-Hamawi, d. 650 H., was the founder of a society. It would seem then that the society began with a medico-magical aim, and by process of development became a mystical order.

Bibliography: (a) Mahībbī, Khalīṣat al-Āthar, Cairo 1294; (b) Depont and Coppolani, Conferences religieuses musulmanes, Algiers 1897; E. W. Lane, Manners and Customs of the modern Egyptians, London, 1871; J. P. Brown, The Dervishes, London 1886.

(D. S. Margoliouth)

SAJD, the teak tree, tectona grandis, a large tree belonging to the Verbenaceae with broad lance-like leaves, "like the shields of the Dālīm". It is found principally in the drier parts of Further India, in Burma, Siam and Java and, according to Arabic sources, also in East Africa (Zanj). The dark coloured hard wood resists, as no other does, the effects of sea-water and has therefore from ancient times been the best wood for ship-building. Nor is it attacked by insects. The main markets for it were Bengal and Egypt. Ibn al-Baitār (transl. Leclerc, 8.) p. 253, mentions the use in medicine of the powdered wood and of an oil obtained from the fruit.

Bibliography: O. Warburg, Die Pflanzenwelt, iii. 166, 167 (with illustrations); al-Mashidī (ed. Paris), iii. 12, 56. (J. Ruska)

SAJD is the name given to a peculiar mode of rhetoric in which at short intervals words occur which rhyme, though it is distinguished from poetry (Shara) by not being bound by a regular rhythm or metre. Probably this was the earliest mode of elevated expression practised by the Arabs before the development of the regular metres. There is ample evidence that it was this mode of expression practised by the Khāsimīs, as well as the Pagan Arabs for their oracles, though the examples cited in the Sīra of Ibn Hīšām and in the traditions can hardly have been handed down correctly. We can safely believe Ibn al-Kalbī that the Arabs remembered nothing of their ancient poetry except that which was composed very shortly before Islam (Kidāb al-Askāmī, ed. Cairo 1332, p. 12, 3) and we must assume from this, that the very ancient Sājd has been preserved. I believe, however, that we are safe in allowing that the various Talibiyāt, or shouts uttered by pilgrims to the many shrines, as recorded by Talibiyāt al-Kalbi (Qarnā, p. 5) and elsewhere, are handed down correctly as they must have been in vivid memory at the beginning of Islam. Such Talibiyāt were, no
doubt, ancient ritual property of the tribes and go back to remoter antiquity, than the Sādjī-speeches of Kuṣ b. Sā'd and other rhetoricians of pre-Islamic times. We are told that Dāmm b. Dāmm, al-Akra' b. Ḥābib and others used to give their judgments in Sādjī when they acted as judges (Djāhiq, Bayām, l. 113, 3). Muhammad reproved a man who used Sādjī by saying: *Do you speak Sādjī like the Kūhins of Paganism?* (Djāhiq, Bayām, l. 112, 19, 20). He also prohibited it to be used in prayers (Ḫuḫḫār, ed. Juybollī, iv. 194, 2). The most striking of Sādjī is the Korān itself; especially the older Sādjī's are kept in the same tone as the specimens of the oracles of the Kūhins quoted by Ibn Ḥīhām, e.g. the oracles of Shīkh and Sādī (Sitām, p. 11, etc.). Later authors, Dīnārī, al-Kašf and others delight in citing descriptions of weather, persons etc. in Sādjī attributed as a rule to anonymous Bedouins. These quotations are probably in all cases inventions by philologists to enable them to explain the many difficult words, which could not have been accumulated as easily in a forged poem of regular metre. There was, however, from early time a predilection for this style of prose, which found its fullest expression in the Mašāḥif of Bāḍī al-Zāmān, Ḥarrītī and their imitators. The style unfortunately found its way into letter-writing, and while the earliest specimens of letters, both private and official, are remarkably free from Sādjī, with progress of time its use increased to such an extent, that both private and official correspondence became conspicuous for the volume of rhymed sentences with very little meaning. It was considered the height of accomplishment in a secretary to write in Sādjī. The style was called Mannādīj but the matter was the same. Sādī invaded other branches of literature, even the chronicles, of which conspicuous specimens are in Arabic the Tārijj al-Yamīnī and Ḥāmid al-Din's writings in the history of Wasjīf. In both these works everything is sacrificed for the juggling rhymes. This exuberance of Sādjī may be due to the bad taste of the Persians who from Abbasid times increasingly took a larger share in Arabic letters; the disease seems to spread gradually towards the West and has become one of the main causes why so much of Muhammadan literature, whether Arabic, Persian, Turkish or any other language under their influence, does not appeal to European tastes.


(S. F. Kiekkow)

SĀDJĪH, Umm Įašūr bint Awa b. Ḥākim b. Usāma, or bint al-Harīṣī b. Suwād b. Ḫufān, prophetess and soothsayer, one of several prophets and tribal leaders who sprang up in Arabia shortly before and during the *rida*. The genealogy, which her history proves to be the true one, shows that she belonged to the Banū Tanūm. On her mother's side she was related to the Taghibbhīb, a tribe which comprised many Christians. She was a Christian herself, or at least had learnt much concerning Christianity from her relatives. Next to nothing is known concerning the import of her revelations and doctrines; she delivered her messages from a minbar, in rhymed prose, and was attended by a mu'āfaqāt and a ḥāgbīb. Her name, or one of her names, for God was "the Lord of the clouds" (rabī al-sāđīb).

Sādījih came to the fore in Ḳaṭa‘ī, after Muhammad's death. One account of her exploits describes her as a Taghibbih upstart, who had arrived from Mesopotamia at the head of a band of followers belonging to Khān’s Taghibbih, the Banū al-Num, the Banū Yāqūt, the Banū Shabīb; she found the Tamīm divided, in consequence of the Prophet's death, by deep internal strife between apostates, Muslims and those who wavered between revolt and allegiance to Medīna, and succeeded in converting by her revelations and uniting under her command both branches of Ḳaṭa‘ī (the Banū Mālik and the Banū Yārābǐ), which she intended to lead against Medīna. The extent of her influence on the Tamīm seems, however, to have been much greater than this version, intended to minimize their share in the *rida*, would have us believe. The prophetess was no outcast, she really belonged to the Tamīm, as the end of her career implies, and had gained, probably for some time before Muhammad's death, the support of her whole tribe, whose conversion to Islam was mainly a matter of expediency, easily shaken off.

Sādījih's forces began by attacking the Banū Ḳībīb, in obedience to one of her revelations, and were severely beaten. Repairing to al-Nabiبد (in Yamāmah) they suffered a second defeat at the hands of the Banū Ḳāmir, and Sādījih had to promise that she would leave the territory of the Tamīm. Followed by the Yārābǐ, she decided to join the prophet Musallima, who still controlled most of Yamāmah, in order to unite their fortunes or to restore her own. Their encounter happened at al-Amwāth or at Ḳalīr. Musallima was menaced by the Muslim army, and the neighbouring tribes threatened to shake off his authority, so that the arrival of a vanquished, ambitious and desperate colleague, accompanied by many armed followers, proved a trying, indeed a dangerous visitation. There is no reliable account of the meeting: according to one version, the strange couple came to an understanding, recognized each other's mission and decided to unify their two religions and their worldly interests; they were actually married, and the prophetess stayed by Musallima to the hour of his tragic death.

Al-Tahārī preserves obscene and very probably fictitious details concerning this union, which must have been rather a political alliance than a lustful orgy; the wedding, according to these legends, was celebrated in the same walled garden where Musallima was to meet his death.

Other accounts of the meeting are that Musallima, after having married Sādījih, cast her off, and that she returned to her people; a third version does not mention the marriage, and says that the prophet tried to persuade his rival and would-be ally to attack the Muslims, hoping thus to get rid of her; on her refusal he offered, if she consented to depart, half the year's crops of Yamāmah; she declined to go unless he promised half of the next year's harvest as well, set off with the first part of the booty, and left her representatives with Musallima to wait for the rest, repairing to her kinsfolk. The second part of the ransom was never collected, as Musallima was vanquished and massacred by Khālid before the next harvest.

Whatever the outcome of Sādījih's relations with
SADJĀH — SADJDJĀDA

Muallima, her own career was either merged into his, or cut short by repulse, and we hear nothing more of her mission. According to all accounts, she went back to her native tribe, and lived obscurely amongst them. On Ibn al-Kalbī's authority we learn that she embraced Islam when her family decided to settle in Bāṣra, which had become the principal centre of the Šamī in the Umayyads, and died there a Muslim, and was buried with the customary prayers and ceremonies.


(V. VACA).

AL-SADJAWĀNDI ABU 'L-FAḍl (according to others ABU 'ABD AL-LĀH OR ABU Djadi) MUḥAMMAD R. TĀFIR AL-GHAZNAWI, READER OF THE Kūrān, died about 560 = 1164/5. While he also occupied himself with Kūrān exegesis and grammar, he is mainly known by his works on the recitation of the Kūrān. At quite an early period a beginning was made with distinguishing different kinds of pauses in reciting the Kūrān [see the article KIYĀ]. Al-Sadjawandi further developed the system in his work on this subject entitled Kītāb al- Wasāf 'alā l-Dīdān. He did however, possess the possibility of allowing a pause to intervene into 5 categories and in addition instituted an abbreviation for each letter of the alphabet: 1) wasāf li'a'n (w); 2) wasāf muʃāf (d); 3) wasāf dā'wān (g); 4) wasāf muʃāwān li'umāfān (g); 5) wasāf muʃāwān dā'wān (g). His system was soon generally adopted in a somewhat extended form and therefore in the later eastern versions of the Kūrān (except the Maghribī) we find pause marks, which are either placed according to his system or are at least dependent on it.


(R. PARET)

AL-SADJAWĀNDI SHĀḪRĪ AL-DĪN ʿABD AL-ḤdıB MUḤAMMAD B. ʿABD AL-RAṢĪH, JURIST, belonging to the Ḥafta school and flourishing about the year 1200 A.D. His Kitāb al- Farā'īfī, known as al-Farā'īfī al-Sirāḥīya or briefly al-Sirāḥīya, which deals with the law of inheritance, is celebrated and widely used and regarded as the principal work on this field. The author himself was the first to write a commentary on it and since then it has been frequently edited and annotated by other scholars down to the present time, sometimes also in Turkish and Persian.

**Bibliography:** Ḥamdīl Khalīfa, Kashf al-Zanjūn, ed. Flügel, l. 445, ii. 207 et sq., 562, iii. 325; 376, 384, 482, lv. 399–406; G. Flügel, Ibn Kūtaibah's Tahāḥot al-Hašītān (Abhandlungen der D. M. G., vol. ii., No. 3), No. 106; R. Basset, Lex. universale arabæ de la


(R. PARET)

SADJDA. Prostration (see Sujūd). The word has almost the same value in practice as our "adoration". It is used as the title of two surās’ (xxxi and ali) which are distinguished from one another by the opening letters; the second is called ẖ-m al-Sadjda, because it begins with the letters ẖ-m. The ideas and the subject in these two surās are analogous; the Prophet presents the revealed book, praises the pious who believe, gives alms and perform the ṣalāt, threatens the impious and reveals the signs of God in nature. Nöldeke puts these two surās down to the third period; in the second the Prophet is said to have had in view the conversion of the Meccan notable "Otha b. Kāthīb. Surā xxxi was also called al-Muṣafījī couches" and al-Djumārī "barren soil", Surā xlii Fuṣṣāl. "They believe only in their verses when they are recited to them, they fall prostrate or rise from their couches calling upon their Lord". Latin renderings and night prayers were already in use among the devout at the period when these surās were published.

**Bibliography:** The Kūrān and its commentaries; Th. Noldeke-Schwally, Geschichte der Qurān; Brockelmann, G. A. L. i. 387 sq.

(C. CRECHE DE VAUX)

SADDJĀDA (A., plural sadjādāt, sadjādāt, masedjādāt), the carpet on which the ṣalāt is performed. The word is found neither in the Kūrān nor in the canonical Ḥadīth; the article itself, however, was known at quite an early period, as may be seen from the traditions about to be mentioned. In the Ḥadīth we are often told how Muhammad and his followers performed the ṣalāt on the floor of the mosque in Medina after a heavy shower of rain with the result that their noses and heads came in contact with the mud (e.g. al-Bukhārī, Adhān, bāb 135, 151; Muslim, Ṣahih, trad. 214—215, 218 etc.). This shows that at the time when such traditions arose the use of these carpets was not so general that people dated their origin as far back as the time of the Prophet. With this may be compared the fact that in a series of traditions the saying is put into Muhammad's mouth that it was his privilege, in contrast with the other prophets that the earth was for him maṣṣāfūna fāhār (e.g. al-Bukhārī, Tāhāwī, bāb 121, 130 etc.). Al-Tirmidhī (Ṣahih, bāb 130) also tells us that the ṣalāt is called ṣalāt on the bare earth and in modern Egypt and Morocco persons of the lower orders do not use these mats at all.

The canonical Ḥadīth gives us the following picture. Muhammad performed the ṣalāt on his own garment, protecting his arms against the heat of the soil during prostration with one of its sleeves, his knees with one end and his forehead with the 'imāmān or ṣulamūn (al-Bukhārī, Ṣahih, bāb 22, 23; Muslim, Masedjādī, trad. 191; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Mawṣūd, i. 320). On the passage quoted from Muslim, al-Nawawī observes that, according to al-Shāfiʿī, it is forbidden to prostrate oneself on the garment one is wearing. Al-Bukhārī (Ṣahih, bāb 22) tells us that Muhammad performed the ṣalāt on his quilt (fīrād).
The Ḥadīth also informs us that the ẓalīṭ was performed on mats; e.g. al-Tirmīdī, Ẓalāt, bāb 131, where a biṣūṭ is mentioned (so also Ibn Mādīja, Ḥanāfī fi Ṣalāmāt, bāb 63; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, i. 232, 273; iii. 160, 171, 184, 212); in the latter passage it is observed that this biṣūṭ was made out of palm-leaves, ḥayr al-naḥāl. Al-Tirmīdī adds that most scholars permit the ẓalīṭ on tūnsūs or biṣūṭ. A similar mat of palm-leaves on which the ẓalīṭ was performed is called ẓalīṭ (e.g. al-Bukhārī, Ẓalāt, bāb 20; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, iii. 52, 59, 130 sq., 145, 149, 164, 179, 184 sq., 190, 226, 201). This tradition is also found in Muslim, Maṣā'id, trad. 266; al-Nawā'il observes on this passage that the fāṣids generally declared the performance of the ẓalīṭ permitted on whatever grows out of the earth. It is, however, evident from Abū Dā'ud, Ẓalāt, bāb 91, that at the end of the third (ninth) century dressed skins of animals were already being used (farwā maṣā'id).

At the same time we frequently find it mentioned that Muhammad performed the ẓalīṭ on a ḥayr (al-Bukhārī, Ẓalāt, bāb 21; Muslim, Maṣā'id, trad. 270; al-Tirmīdī, Ẓalāt, bāb 129; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, i. 269, 308 sq., 320, 338;
The distinction between ḥamra and ḥajr appears to have lain not in the material of which they were made but in the size. According to Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah al-'Alawi's marginal glosses to Ibn Mādžja, Ḥāmra, bab 63, 64, the ḥamra afforded just sufficient room for the prostration, while the ḥajr was of the length of a man.

The word sadijāda is found a century after the conclusion of the canonical Hadith literature. Al-Dhawartari, Ṣahih, s. v., explains sadijāda to be synonymous with ḥamra. In his Supplement, Dozy quotes passages from the 1001 Nights and Ibn Battūta. The latter mentions among the customs of the inmates of a certain Shafiyya in Cairo that the whole body went to the mosque on Friday, where a servant had laid his sadijāda ready for each one (ed. Paris, I. 73; cf. 72). The same traveller tells us something similar regarding Makkah, where every one sends his servant with his sadijāda to the mosque to lay it ready on his place. He adds that they were made out of the leaves of a palm-like tree (iv. 422).

In modern Mekka, every one in the great mosque performs the qatāt on a sadijāda, usually a small carpet, just large enough for the sadijād. After use it is rolled up and carried off on the shoulder. The lower orders believe that it is not advisable to leave the sadijāda unrolled after use as iblis would seize the opportunity to perform the qatāt on it. Well-to-do people have sometimes their sadijāda kept by a servant of the mosque, but even among them this is not at
all general. In place of a carpet a towel is sometimes used, for example the one which has been used for drying oneself after the ṭuṣq. The lines woven in the carpet are not symmetrical but run to a point on one of the short sides which is placed in the direction of the ḫība [q. v.]; cf. below Lane's "niche" (this information has been given me orally by Prof. C. Snouck Hurgronje).

In Morocco the common people do not make any use of the S; the middle classes favour small felt carpets (ṭūba) like saddle cushions, just large enough for performing the ṣadḥād. These are especially used by the faṣāda, so that they have almost become one of their distinctive marks. They fold them and bear them under their arm in an ostentative way, wherever they go, and sit down on them especially when visiting Christians. Certain faṣāda from Morocco, when travelling in Algeria, even refuse to sit down on anything besides their ṭūba, a pretentiousness which hurts the feelings of people in Algeria. In the latter country the S is very rarely used, except among
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the heads of the prayers and various wrappings. Here the Sajiada's usually consist of simple skins of goats or gazelles. The common people ascribe miraculous powers to these skins; in legend the wrappings are often represented as using them in order to have themselves transferred thence to Mecca or to walk on the waves. Occasionally the pilgrims bring home from Mekka Wajid's analogons to those described above by the government house at Cairo, which are nowadays often imported from Europe. The pilgrims do not seem to attach to them any particular value (this information has been given me by Prof. H. Reuss).

According to Lane, Wajid's (carpets) are imported from Asia Minor into Egypt and used there only by the rich to perform the iqtada upon and also as saddle-covers. They are about the size of a wide hearth-rug. A "nich" is represented upon it, the point of which is turned towards the qibla. Persons of the lower orders often perform the iqtada upon the bare ground simply; and they seldom immediately wipe off the dust which adheres to the nose and forehead as a result of protrusion (cf. the well-known traditions regarding the traces of the Wajid); but when a person has a cloak or any other garment, which he can decently take off, he spreads it upon the ground.

The usual practice in the Dutch Indies is described by Snouck Hurgronje. A number of long narrow mats and carpets are placed broadside on the floor of the mosque before the beginning of the services. After the service these are rolled up and laid aside (Der Islam in Niederländisch-Indien, Basier, p. 109, Fernreisegeschafien, iv/1, 366). But it is usual here also to bring one's own mat to the mosque.

As Dr. J. H. Kruiner tells me, the carpet which covers the floor of the Aya Sofya is divided up by patterns into separate sagidjas'jjas, but in performing the iqtada this separation is not observed.

In the chapel in the Sadjada in Constantinople, in which are preserved the relics of the Prophet, the alleged sagidja of Abu Bakr is preserved (d'Oisselin, Tableau de l'Empire Ottoman, Paris, 1822, p. 207). In Barbier de Meynard, Dict. Turco-français, we find, e.g., a number of Turkish phrases in which the sagidja plays a part.

The sagidja has assumed special significance in the religious societies and in the Dervish orders. Among the latter—at least in Egypt—the word has become synonymous with order in the expression shukh al-sadjada, which is applied to the head of an order in Egypt.

In the terminology of these societies, sagidja alternates with iqtada (cf. above) and expressions borrowed from other languages. According to the hierarchic legend, Gabriel brought Adam a sagidja made out of the skins of the sheep of Paradise, on which he had to kneel during the shahad ceremony. This sagidja al-shahada was the one used by all succeeding generations in the same ceremony; Muhammad, Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman and Ali are especially mentioned. From Ali it has been passed on to the shahad of the order down to the present day. The Shahids therefore sit on this sagidja during the shahad ceremony and the expression shukh al-sadjada makes the sagidja in a certain sense the throne of the whole order. Before the beginning of the shahad ceremony it is spread by the shahid whose duty this is. The Shahid sits down ceremonially after his seal, as it were, has been broken by its being spread out. The candidate on whose account the ceremony is being performed stands, on the other hand, on the shukh al-shahada. From the description it is not always clear, whether by candidate is meant an ordinary novice or rather a shahid.

A whole series of mystical interpretations is associated with the sagidja or iqtada. Head, foot, etc. are ascribed to it as to a living animal; it has four letters, which are connected with the elements; references are found to the sagidja of the path of salvation and the shahad profession is called the sagidja of the shahads. Accounts are given of the material of which the sagidja of various people were made or are made, as well as of their colour (cf. the picture in Der Islam, 1916, vi. 170).


(A. J. Wenzinger)

SAJIDS, a family which takes its name from the throne of the dynasty. Abu l-Sajid, and which ruled in Adhsharshidk under the nominal suzerainty of the 'Abbāsid Caliphs at the end of the third (ninth) century and the beginning of the fourth (tenth). It comprised five rulers:

1. Abu 'l-Sa'īd Dā'ūd b. Yūsuf Dā'ūd, a native of Qushruan, a Turkish general in the service of the Caliph al-Mutawakkil, who was appointed to take charge of the road to Mecca in 243 (856), returned to Bagdad in 245 (866) and was then sent to recover the taxes in al-Sawādī on behalf of Muḥammad b. 'Abdallāh b. Šahī; he was then appointed governor of Aleppo and Kinnaird under al-Mu'izz in 254 (868) and of al-Ahwās in 261 (874—875); in this capacity he wished to fight the Zanjī, who, having defeated his son-in-law, 'Abd al-'All al-Iṣfahānī, had seized al-Ahwās. Having taken the side of Ya'qūb b. Laidh al-Qaffālī, he lost his estates after the defeat of the latter by the zāhid al-Muwaqqūt in 252 (875—876). He was then recalled to Bagdad, but died on the way at Dūnāl-Sabāh in 266 (889—890).

Dā’ūd in Persian means "given by the demon" and Dā’ūdī "he who has the hands of a demon". The alternation of īd which is sometimes found in the manuscripts indicates an old pronunciation dā’ūdī, dā’ūdī.

2. His son Muḥammad Afāḥ in Abu l-’Umayd took Mecca from the lieutenant of the chief of the Zanjī, Abu l-Mughtira Ithā b. Muḥammad al-Maghfūrī in 266 (880). Three years later he attacked Dūnāl and captured two ships filled with money and munitions from al-Muhājīn. He was given the governorship of Basbūr, Tuṣ, al-Furāt and Ṣalāḥ. On the death of Aḥmad b. Ṭabūla in 270 (883—884) he tried to conquer Syria in alliance with Ḥishāb b. Kandāshī. They were assisted in this enterprise by the army of the Caliph, which consisted of the Egyptian forces at Shālah, but was itself defeated as the result of an
ambuscade at the battle of the mills (tamažca). After a quarrel with Ḥabib b. Kendarīj, Muḥammad turned towards Ḥumāzawalī, defeated his former ally on the Euphrates and conquered Mawšil. In 274 (888) he quarrelled with the Egyptian, lost a battle near Damascus in Muḥarram, 275 (May-June, 888), lost Ḥims, Aleppo and al-Rakah and retired to Tahtī. He took the field again and defeated, before Mawšil, Ḥabib b. Kendarīj, who was pursuing him.

In 276 (889-90) al-Muwaṣṣaṭ appointed him governor of Ṣaḥrā Ṣamāp, who then took Marāḡa from Ḍālib b. Ḥanān al-Rushāḍ (280-893) and was sent by the Caliph to carry gifts—a royal crown and other presents—to the Bagratid Sempad, king of Armenia. His brief rebellion against al-Muwaṣṣaṭ in 284 (897) ended in his prompt submission and cost him nothing. He took Ḥazān, which belonged to Sempad, as well as his capital Tovin. They then made peace. Muḥammad died of the plague at Barda in Rabī‘ I, 288 (March, 901).

3. Yūḥān, brother of Muḥammad Ṣafāḥ, after having forced his nephew Duwad, son of No‘a, to betake himself to the Caliph’s court, entered into friendly relations with Sempad, and made an alliance with him; he then took the side of Kākī Ṭatrūf, captured several fortresses; put Sempad to death who had surrendered to him, captured Ḥaswān, Zandānān, Abhar from Muḥammad b. All Šalāh, governor for the Sāmānīd Neqīr b. Ḍāyān. He defeated the troops sent against him by the Caliph in 295 (917-18). He was, however, forced to give up Ḥatī. He defeated Muḥān, who took refuge in Zandān in 302 (919), but the latter defeated him before Ardabīl, took him prisoner, treated him with consideration and brought him to Baghdad. He was set free in 310 (922) and was granted the governorship of Ra‘b and Izābārījiyān. The Caliph appointed him to fight the Kirmānīs, but he was defeated and taken prisoner in the first battle, in spite of his valour. He was put to death with all the prisoners.

4. In 311 (923) al-Muhaḏḏib, 315 (Feb., 928) Abu ‘l-Ṭālī‘a Fāṣāth, son of Muḥammad Ṣafāḥ, was given his uncle’s governorship and remained governor till his death; he was poisoned at Ardashī by one of his slaves in Shaḥān, 317 (Sept., 929).

5. His son Abu l-Farras was a general of the Caliph’s and a friend of the first Amir al-‘Umārī, Ibn Rāqī.


(ČL. Heart)

šaṭḏ aṣ’ām (for šawād aṣ’ām), strictly "the greatest of the high dignitaries", a title which from the time of Sulaimān the Magnificent has been borne by the first minister or "grand vizier" of the Ottoman empire, also called pārā-šī-a, qāšī-š-šarī-e, ṭabarqānī-š-šāhān, pārā-šī-a (from the name of the legendary minister of Solomon), etc. (cf. below). Earlier he was called waṣī (see Waṣī‘ī), then wāṣī-š-ṣīwar (aṣ’ām, eṣeber). After the suppression of the "viziers of the dome" (ṣābhe waṣī‘ī ‘alī) under Ahmad III, the Šadr aṣ’ām were appointed by no fixed rule, at the Sultan’s pleasure. The official chosen received and kept always by him a gold ring with the Sultan’s seal. In his capacity of qašī-š-ṣauqī, he was the plenipotentiary (waṣī‘ī-š-ṣīwar) of the sovereign in civil and military matters and made appointments to all the military (šāhī-ṣūrā‘) and civil (šīhī-ṣawmān) offices. The legal officers (štawān) were under the Shāhī al-īslām (q.v.), appointed, like the Šadr aṣ’ām, by the Sultan himself.

The Šadr aṣ’ām presided over the Dīwān, held monthly audiences, received the principal officials twice a week, made rounds (qal) periodically and rendered assistance in case of fire. He had the right to eight guards of honour (qalā‘ā), twelve mounted horses (qalā‘ā), a barge with thirteen pairs of oars, with a green canopy. When he appeared in public the šawmāt shouted acclamations (šalā‘), the formula of which was Byzantine in origin. He had the privilege of being able to go to the Sultan personally at any hour of the day or night.

In case of war, the Šadr aṣ’ām could become commander-in-chief—Serdar-i-ōṣ̄āh (f. qalā‘ā) and carried with him the standard of the Prophet (ṣawmān-i-ṣahīf-e) (q.v.). A deputy (ṣawmān waṣī‘ī) replaced him in the capital.

Like the Khedive of Egypt, the Šadr aṣ’ām had the right to the honorary epitet of ṭabarqānī fakhrī, or "Highness", besides the other epithets to which he was entitled: sām, "all sublime" and waṣī‘ī. Like the ṣawmāt qalā‘ā, before the reforms of Muhammad II, he wore a white hat (qalā‘ī fakhrī) shaped like a truncated pyramid with rounded corners, adorned with an oblique band of gold.

The office—šawmān waṣī‘ī (qalā‘ī)—was insecure and ephemeral. The dismissed Šadr aṣ’ām handed over his seal at an audience and went into exile, when he was allowed to live. Not being hereditary, the office was only exceptionally continued in the same family (the Čeikri). After the constitution of 1908 the Grand Vizier became responsible to parliament; the Sultan continued to nominate the Shāhī al-īslām as well as the Šadr aṣ’ām and it was the latter who chose his other colleagues. These two dignitaries, however, disappeared with the Sultan himself in 1922 (law of Angora of Nov. 1). The last Šadr aṣ’ām, Dāmād Fêrūd Pâšâ, died at Nice on Oct. 6, 1925. The President of the Council is now called Ṣāhān Wehâl, a title which Mahâmid II had tried to establish in 1838.

SADE AL-DIN, MUHAMMAD B. IBRAHIM, known as MULK SADEK, a Persian theologian and philosopher of the Safavid period. He was the son of a governor of Fars and owed his epithet to his superior merit; he is still called Akhund, "master." Born at Shiraz, he spent a long time in retirement among the mountains of Kurna, travelled in Persia and was a pupil at Isfahan, of Shâhi Bahâ'î and of Amir Muhammad Bâjîr Dâmûdî, after the instructions of Saiyîd Abu l-Kâsim Firdawsî.

When Allah-Wardikhan, governor of Fars, had finished building the minarets erected by him in Shiraz, he asked Sadâr, then at Kurna, to return to his native land and made him professor in his new foundation.

Mullah Sadâr restored the teaching of Ibn Sinâ (Avicenna); to escape persecution from the muqelfs, he concealed his doctrines by the use of the ûrûna or utterly obscure expressions. Among his pupils were Mâjân Fâlî, 'Abd al-Râziq and Kâfi Saiyid al-Kurnan. He seven times made the pilgrimage to Mecca and died at Basra in 1050 (1642) on his way back from the seventh. A prolific writer, he wrote some twenty volumes, of which some are commentaries on different chapters of the Korân, a dissertation on authentic traditions, fifty treatises on theology, forty-four works on obscure points of doctrine, written in the mountains of Kurna, and four books of travels quoted by Râzî-Kolî Khân. The British Museum possesses the Tâ'zir al-muqelfîn, a polemic against the teachers of canon law and the sharî'ah at al-Wâridât al-Kâfîyya "the intuitions of the heart."

Biblilography: Râzî-Kolî Khân, Rawdat al-safa'ât al-mibâr (Teheran 1274), viii. (not paginated, penultimate page), where several of his works are given; Ch. Rim, Catalogue Pers. MSS. Brit. Mus., London 1881, ii. 239, No. ix.; (quoting the Zoniar al-marâshîk of Râzî Tīrîsî and 'Abâ al-Karîm al-Shahâvari, Ms. P. 534); Cl. de Gobineau, Religion et Philosophie dans l'Art Central, Paris 1900, p. 50 sqq.; E. G. Browne, History of Persian Literature in modern times, ii. Index, Cambridge 1924. (Cl. Huart)

al-Sáfâ, a mound at Mecca which now barely rises above the level of the ground. The meaning of the name is like that of the name of the eminence al-Marár, which lies opposite to it: "the stone" or "the stones" (cf. al-Tâbit, Tafsîr to Sura ii. 153). Is well known, Muslims perform the su'y between al-Sáfâ and al-Marwâ in memory, as the legend relates (e.g. al-Bukhârî, al-Abî'î, bab 9), of the fact that Hâjîl ran backwards and forwards seven times between these two eminences to look for a spring for her thirsty son. — It is certain that wells were located at al-Sáfâ and al-Marwâ even in the pagan period. According to most traditions there were two stone idols there, Una on al-Sáfâ and Nâlî on al-Marwâ, which the pagan Arabs on their su'y used to touch. On the origin of these images the following story is given in the commentary of Nâshîr on Sura ii. 153, and al-Shârî'î gives its approval to it: Una, the Nâlî were guilty of indecent conduct in the Ka'ba and were therefore turned into stones, which were placed on the two pieces of raised ground al-Sáfâ and al-Marwâ to be a warning to all. In course of time the origin of the stone figures was forgotten and people began to pay them divine worship. — According to another tradition there were copper images there (cf. Snouck Hurgronje, Het Meckhanische Feest, p. 26); according to a third story demons lived on the two hills who shrieked at night (given in al-Tâbit, Tafsîr)."
Under the Mamluks Safad remained an important center. It was the capital of one of the large manatscha's or miyâba'a into which Syria was divided. The miyâba of Safad comprised the whole of Galilee with 'Akka. The town itself was the seat of a miyar and was a center of literary life, as the nabba at-Safadi of several Arab authors shows, notably that of the biographer Khalil b. Alikâs, who was born there in 696 (1296); the geographer al-Dimashqi said he had died there in 1327 (Mehr, p. vi, infra). In this period there also flourished al-Ulujmi, chief Kâfi of the manatscha of Safad (d. 780 = 1378; cf. Brockelmann, Gesch. Arab. Litt., iii. 91), who wrote a Tarikh Safadi now lost. Safad was at the same time an important center of Kabbalistic learning.

The town gradually began to lose in importance. After surrendering to the Ottoman Sultan Selim I in 1516 without striking a blow along with other towns in Palestine, the old miyâba of at first remained intact but later, in the xviiith century, the whole of Palestine belonged to the great paşalimâni of Damousa. Safad was the capital of a sandjak to which also belonged 'Akka and Tyre (Hadjjî Khalîla). During this period Safad several times belonged to the sphere of influence of the Druse Amir Fâhr al-Din of the Lebanon, who used it as a fortress to protect his possessions in Galilee. At Safad in 1633 is also said to have taken place the battle in which "All, the son of the Amir, was killed.

When about 1750 'Akka again became important under Shâlik Zahir, the strategic importance of Safad also increased once more. Zahir himself came from Safad where his father, Shâlik 'Umar al-Zâlînâni, had been representative of the Amir Bashir; under his rule the town was almost completely destroyed by an earthquake (1750). Aymad Dżasîr, who succeeded Zahir in 'Akka in 1775, at the same time conquered Safad, and Bonaparte before his unsuccessful siege of 'Akka had to take Safad (1799), where he entrusted the authority to a son of Zahir. Dżasîr later revenged himself on the town by completely destroying the Jewish quarter.

The most important events of the xixth century were the earthquakes of 1819 and 1837 which wrought great damage. After the Turkish administrative reforms of 1880 Safad became the capital of a kâfi in the sandjak of 'Akka in the wilyet of Filût. It is now within the mandated area of Palestine.

The population has varied greatly in course of time. In the xviith century it was a town of average size (Alix-Fidès). After the earthquake of 1750 it was an arid deserted village (Volney). The later figures vary very much, which is probably due to the fact that the figures of the town and the kâfi' were not kept separate. The population of the town in 1900 may be put at 15,000, of whom about a third are Jews. In 1912 there were still about 10,000 Jews there. After this their numbers declined very much down to the middle of last century, when a great influx of Mooroccan, Algerian and Persian Jews took place, which has been increased since 1880 by Zionist immigration. Safad is also a place of pilgrimage for Jews. According to Hadji Khalîla (p. 585), when the Jewish tribes immigrated the tribe of Zabulon was said to have lived near Safad. In the vicinity of the town there are now many Druzes (according to v. Oppenheim, 15,000 in the district of 'Akka and Safad); their immigration from the Lebanon had already begun in al-Dimashqi's time.

The town itself is built on three hills, of which the Jews inhabit the north. The Mâhmu'dian part has four fair-sized mosques. In the valleys between the hills and on the slopes down to the lake of Tiherias lie fields and gardens belonging to the town, which yield rich crops of wheat, maize, olives, tobacco, cotton and many kinds of vegetables. The splendid view over the lake is generally admired. The ruins of the fortress lie high up the hill and are called al-Kâfû or al-Kâfû. Practically nothing is left of the castle of the Crusaders; of the more recent defences there are still to be seen only the foundations of a strong round tower, probably that which was built by Bâbaris (according to al-Dimashqi, while Conder and Kitchener consider it one of Zahir's buildings).

Below, close to the fort, is a well, of which al-Dimashqi gives a detailed description.


(J.H. Kramer)

**SAFADI, SALAU'D-DIN KHALâL b. Alikâs.**—Abd Allah Abu 'l-Sâfâ was born in 696 or 697 = 1295/97 (Dumur al-Kâmî, MS. B.M., Or. 3034) has about the year 694 A.H. He was of Turkish descent and, according to his own statement, his father did not give him a good education and it was only when he was 20 years of age, that he began the pursuit of studies. He wrote a very nice hand as is proved by several autographs which have come down to us. He attended the lectures of the very best teachers of his time, among whom are named the grammarian Ahi Haiyân and the poets Shikhab al-Din Mahâlî, Ibn Sâyîd al-Náhirî and Ibn Nâhirî. Later he became an intimate friend of the renowned authors Shams al-Dîn al-Dhahâbî and Tâdji al-Dîn al-Sabî. His first post was that of secretary in his native town.
of Safadi, then at Cairo, later he was secretary at Halab, al-Balhia and finally he was in charge of the treasury at Damascus. He was of pleasant manners but towards the end of his life became careless. He died at Damascus on the 30th of Shawwal 764 = 1363/64. He was a most prolific author and stated himself in his autobiography that his compositions would fill 500 volumes and that the amount he had written as secretary would come to at least double that quantity. His biographies content themselves with mentioning only the most important of his works, many of them being nearly worthless compilations of verse and prose from modern authors. Besides a preponderance of quantity of verse in his own anthologies and works of contemporary and later authors, the following works have come down to us either complete or in part. All are practically compilations from earlier authors, which are very frequently states faithfully. 1) At-Wafā fi At-Wafayat, an enormous biographical dictionary in about 10 volumes, of which some volumes are found in many libraries, though I doubt whether the complete work has been preserved. Some volumes are numbered, but volumes with the same contents have at times different numbers, from which it appears that the material of the work was divided into volumes of varying size by different scribes (for the contents of some volumes see Harwita, M.S. O.S. As., xi, p. 455; while the newer MSS. in the British Museum contain: Or. 6527 4th, Or. 6635 Muhammadin, 5320 other Muhammadin). We find in the Wafi many biographies for which we should look in vain in other works of a similar nature and a full index of the names of the persons of whom biographies are found in the known volumes, would form material for a volume of considerable size. The introduction to this work was published by Ammar, J.A., 1911-12, in vols. 17-18 and 19. The most exhaustive account of the Wafi, based upon all known manuscripts is that by G. Gahidi in R.R.A.L., Series 5, vols. xx to xxx, 475. From this it appears that the work is preserved practically complete, except for two gaps and the preserved parts contain over 14,000 biographies. 2) Atfis al-Afar wa Ahmad al-Nafe, an extract from the preceding work in six volumes, containing biographies of contemporaries. This work has been largely extracted by Im Haddar for his Daur al-Kutub, MSS. are probably in the Escorial (No. 1717) and Berlin, while the volumes in the Aya Sophia (No. 2962-79) appear to be parts of the Wafi. It is quoted in the printed edition (Cairo 1305) of the Tabakh al-Kabir at-Siyas of Abū al-Rajīn al-Wakāri under the title of Tarakhim Aya al-Afar. Mālik al-Afar wa Maamid al-Limā, a book on geography, a MS. of which is in the Stadlyia library in Turin. 3) Tarikh al-Wafā, probably another extract from the Wafi, also in MS. in the same library as the preceding. 4) Tabakh Dānāt al-Abād, an Urdu in the rulers of Egypt to his own time, abbreviated from a work of Ibn 'Askir. 5) Nukh at-Humayūn fī al-Vukh at-Umānak biographies of celebrated blind persons. This work has recently appeared in print in Egypt in a very careful edition, based upon 4 MSS. It was edited by Ahmad Zeki Pasha and dated 1911. After explaining that Safadi was induced to write this book through finding a short account of blind persons of note in the Kitāb al-Ma'ārif of Ibn Kātab and a work of al-Dinārī, he enlarges on the etymology of blindness and its limits. The principal portion of the work is occupied by a large number of biographies arranged in alphabetical order, among which figure a number of valuable notices of many of all ages of Islam. 7) Kitāb al-Sharīf fī ʿArba' biographies of persons who had lost one eye. 8) Aṣaqq al-Samawāt min al-Nabī wa-l-Sāhib, containing letters addressed by him to and him, giving in many cases the dates. The first letter in MS. (Brit. Mus., Or. 1205) is dated 745 A.H. 9) Musahhat, a collection of his own epistles. 10) Tajlabin al-Silūk, a collection of extracts from other works, interspersed with his own compositions. It is difficult to ascertain of how many volumes the work consisted; the good old MS. (India Office, Arab. 3799) contains vols. 48 and 49. From these it appears that each volume commenced with the exposition of some verses of the Qur'a, then was followed by extracts of the most varying character. For example B.M., Or. 1353, the contents of which were given by Flügel, Z.D.M.G., xvi. 538-544, contain the Kitāb al-Ilm fī al- Masānagha of Ibn Fāris, not used by Brunnnow for his edition of that work, on fol. 534-774, examples of the poetry of al-Bakhtari on fol. 775 following; MS. Brit. Mus., Or. 7301, named on title-page Kitāb al-Maṣāni wa-l-Abād, contains extracts from the medical work of Dīnārī al-Din Ibrāhīm b. Mahmūd al-Aṣqā, entitled Ṭabakh fī al-Mafaṣṣa wa-l-Dīnārī (fol. 553). MS. (India Office, Arab. 3799), contains in vol. 48 extracts from the autograph Duṣūd of Amin al-Din Dīnālī al-Kawāki entitled Naqq al-Wafā wa Kaf al-Waṣf (fol. 205-203), extract from the book al-Taqāṣim al-uṣūl bi Fadl al-Maṣūm al-Abī 'All ibn Faradājī (fol. 719), extract from the Khanlīnī of al-Ṣāḥī fī l-Dīnārī ibn 'Abād (fol. 907). Extracts of this work are found printed in the Thamurdi at-Anwar of Ibn Hālidī (Cairo 1304), vol. ii. 185, 186 and 192. 11) Duṣūd al-Fawāṣa bi Turqimān al-Bulaghā, an anthology composed for Malik al-Aṣqā, 12) La'ār al-Ṣāḥī wa Duṣūd al-Bisrī, life of a pauper with poems to the boy he loved. This worthless composition has been printed repeatedly, first 1274, then 1290 in Tunis; later in Constantinople and Cairo, showing that the work is appreciated in many countries of Islam. 13) al-Nūr al-Sāhib fī Mīrāt al-Mālik, another worthless anthology containing a hundred poetical quotations by contemporary poets and the author himself upon pretty youths. 14) Raṣaf al-Hāf fī Waf al-Abād, another small collection of poems containing words which have different meanings when vocalised differently. 15) Laddābī al-Sanī fī Sifat al-Dīn, a similar collection of verses of the author and contemporaries on tears in 37 chapters. 16) Al-Raṣaf al-Nasīm wa-l-Thaqīl bi-Futūs, a similar collection of erotic extracts. 17) Kitāb al-Tanbīh ʿalār-Waf fī al-Thagābī, anthology of metaphorical verses. 18) Raṣaf al-Zulf fī Waf al-Hālī, anthology of verses on the New Moon (vide No. 33). 19) Raṣaf al-Khāf fī Waf al-Hāf, a collection of poems on wine. 20) al-Qādī al-Maṣūmī wa Mabrūq al-Sāhib wa Līwāt al-Maṣūmī, commentary on the poem of Ṭaghrī. He explains first every word, then the rhetorical figure quoting many verses, principally by modern poets. The work has also the title Ghāthī al-Abād al-Ṣāhib inṣādī fī sharī' Līwāt al-Maṣūm (printed Cairo 1305 in two vols. 20). 21) Kitāb al-Abād min Ghāthī al-Abād, extract of the preceding work.

Bibliography: Ibn Ḥajar, Durar al-Mašnûqa, B. M., Or. 3064, fol. 120v. Ibn Ḥajjâ Shaka, Ṣuṭt̄alî, B. M., Add. 23562, fol. 155v. Subkî, Ṣuṭt̄alî (ed. Cairo), vii. 94–101; Khād̄̄zam, Ṣuṭt̄alî al-S̄̄yârî (ed. Bombay 1857), ii. part 2, p. 91. Amar, F. A., series 10, vol. 17–19; Brockelsmann, Der arab. Lit., ii. 31–33; Hartmann, Mūnawwîr, p. 81; Wustenfeld, Die Geschichtsche, der Araber, p. 423; Hooghiel, Dis. Script. (Leiden 1839), p. 152–155; Notice sur al-K̄hitī, F. A., series 9, vol. 5, p. 392. Verses of Šafādî are quoted in nearly every anthology later than his own time; he is extensively cited in the Ḥalâf al-Kumârî of Nawmâdî and the Muhk̄am al-Ta`mûtî of `Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ša`bî. 26. Al-Jāmirī B. Abî Muhammād Abî Alâʾīr al-Haqq̄mî al-Šafāwī appears from casual remarks in his work to have been an intimate contem- plator of the Egyptian Sulṭān al-Naqīr b. K̄âlbīn. It has been impossible to find any biography in any of the accessible works dealing with the history of his time. He must have died early in the eighth century of the H̄îd̄q̄a; the last events recorded in his history are dealing with the year 711 = 1311/12 or perhaps as late as 714. From a statement fol. 68v. Brit. Mus. It appears that he composed the history in the year 716. He probably had held earlier an appointment in the office of the waṣf for he tells (MS. Brit. Mus., fol. 69v.) that in the year 694 he received instructions from the waṣf for Ibn al-K̄ašīlî to investigate a case of cannibalism during the famine which prevailed in Egypt during that and the following year. He composed a short history of Egypt which in the Paris MS., No. 1706 has the title: N̄iyāt al-Mawâ'ir wa[l-Muḥāqqaq al-Muṣ̄ayr wa[n-mawā'ir Mawâ'ir wa[l-Muḥāqqaq, while in the other Paris MS., No. 1931, it has the erroneous title of Fuq̄r al-Mawâ'ir, yet the London MS. has another title from which it appears that probably the first is the correct one. The earlier part beginning with the natural and other advantages of Egypt gives a very succinct account of the earlier rulers consisting mainly of anecdotes, but the chief interest lies in the portion which deals with the Turkish Sultanate; here he gives exact dates and facts which supplement our knowledge of the closing years of the 7th century of the H̄îd̄q̄a. Perhaps the account of the great flood in Ba`abak in 717 found in the London MS. may be by him, but it is not found in the other two copies. The MS. in the British Museum written for the Egyptian caliph al-Muṭawakkil probably gives events down to 795, but from fol. 113v. it contains only a notice concerning the family of the owner of the manuscript, first a genealogy of al-Muṭawakkil (fol. 113v) and then a long list of his children, first the boys then the girls, indicating in each case the date and hour of their birth, and in cases where they died before 794, the dates of their death. The last entry by the same hand but with different ink records the birth of a son, in 795 A. H., the 25th of Sa`bān. The three MSS. all contain the same work in spite of their varying titles: Brit. Mus., Add. 23326; Paris 1706 and 1931, 22.

Bibliography: in the article.

Sha`fāwī, name of the second month of the Muhammadan year, also called Sh. al-lh̄ir or Sh. al-mawâ`ir because of its being considered to be unlucky (C. Snouck Hurgronje, The Achemenid, i. 206; do., Mekka, ii. 56). The Muhammadan Tiḡrī-tribes pronounce the name Shafāwī, the Achemenide Thapa. According to Wellhausen in the old-Arabian year, Sha`fāwī comprised a period of two months in which Mah̄gūra (which name, according to this scholar is a Muslim innovation) was included. As a matter of fact, tradition reports that the early Babylonian called Mah̄gūra Sha`fāwī and considered an "umma during the months of the Ḥaḍ̄j̄a as a practice of an extremely reprehensible nature. They embodied this view in the following saying: "Bah̄a hara`a 'l-adhar wa-all-afā 'l-adhar wa[Ϻa`al̄a Sha`fāwī Ṣumâ`r il-mun Tūmar, i.e.: When the wounded backs of camels are healed and the vestiges of the 'pilgrimage are obliterated and Sha`fāwī has passed, then the Ummâ is allowed for those who undertake it."


(Doon de Smidt)

Sha`fāwīs, the most famous and glorious of the native dynasties of Persia since the introduction of Islam, which takes its name from Sha`fāwī Sa`d al-Dīn Il̄āq [q. v.], from whom its founder, Ima`m Sha`f̄āwī [cf. fam.` È], was sixth in descent. The family had long been settled at Ardabīl [q. v.] as hereditary spiritual instructors of the people, and at
the end of the sixteenth century Isma'īl, after the death of his two elder brothers, extended his authority by degrees over Shīrāz, Aḏharbājān, ʿAšḵābād and the rest of Persia, "the ground having been assiduously prepared by widespread political-religious propaganda". The Shiʿa doctrine had always been popular in Persia, but Isma'īl was the first ruler to make it the state religion, and to propagate it among the Turkish tribes of the north, whom he enlisted in his service and distinguished by giving them red hats, whence they were known as Kızılbaş (Red-heads). He virtually extinguished the Sunni religion in Persia. He died on May 24, 1524, and was succeeded by his son, Tāhmasp I, who repeatedly expelled the Uzbeks from Khurasān, waged a number of unsuccessful wars against the ʿUlamāʾī Turks who, under Ṣalūm I, had defeated his father, and helped Hamzayūn to recover his Indian throne. On his death in 1536 the throne fell, after a contest, to his fourth son, Isma'īl II, a worthless and debauched tyrant, during whose shameful reign the kingdom was a prey to intestine strife and foreign aggression, but on his death he was succeeded by his youngest son, Shāh ʿAbbās I (1585–1629), justly entitled the Great, who restored Persia to her legitimate place in the Islamic world. He inflicted on the Turks a defeat which deterred them from molesting his kingdom, he drove the Uzbeks and Tūrkmāns from Khurasān, and he recovered Kandahār from the emperor of India. He was just and tolerant, he imported an industrious colony of Armenians from Djufla [q.v.] on the Araxes to Isfahān, where they built and inhabited the suburb of New Djufla, he encouraged trade and intercourse with western nations, and he was a liberal patron of architecture. His grandson, Saḥīf I, who succeeded him, and reigned for fourteen years, was a bloodthirsty tyrant who disgraced the throne of his ancestors and was devoid of either justice or humanity. His armies repelled the raids of the Tūrkmāns in Khurasān, but in his reign Kandahār was recovered by the emperor of Dīlūl. The Turks, encouraged by the disorders which his tyranny engendered, recovered Bagdād and even occupied Tābriz, but were compelled by the severity of the winter and the scarcity of supplies to withdraw from Aḏharbājān. Saḥīf recovered Erīvān from the Turks, and died in 1642, when he was succeeded by his son, ʿAbbās II [q.v.], then only ten years of age. ʿAbbās recovered Kandahār from Shāh Ejlālān of Dīlūl, and a movement of his troops against an Uzbek chief on the Khorāsat frontier caused the Indian forces to evacuate Balkh. The relations of Persia with Turkey were greatly improved in his reign, and intercourse with the western powers was extended. He died on Oct. 26, 1666, and was succeeded by his elder son, Saḥīf, who frustrated an attempt of the amirs to exclude him from the throne, and assumed the name of Sulaimān. He was an enlightened and tolerant monarch and welcomed the ambassadors of European powers, even of the Russians, whose habits disgusted him. His health was always poor, but he reigned for twenty-nine years, and on his death in 1694 was succeeded by his son, Shīrāzī Husain, a weak prince who permitted ecclesiastics to conduct all affairs of state. Those who refused to conform to the state religion — that of the Shiʿa — were persecuted, and this fatuous policy provoked the hostility of the Afghāns who held Kandahār for the King of Persia, so that in 1769 Mir Wais, governor of that province, proclaimed his independence. In 1722 Muḥammad, son of Mir Wais, invaded Persia and besieged Isfahān. Famine compelled the city to surrender, and Muḥammad deposed Shīrāzī Husain but died soon afterwards. In 1729 Abū al-ʿAbbās, the brother and successor of Muḥammad, was expelled from Persia, and Nādir Khān [see the art. ʿAbd al-ʿAbbās III] placed Tāhmasp III, of the Safawī family, on the throne, but shortly afterwards deposed him as being unfit to reign, and caused his son, then only eight months old, to be proclaimed under the title of ʿAbbās II. The child died soon afterwards and on Feb. 16, 1737, Nādir Shāh's assumption of the royal title extinguished the Safawī dynasty.


(T. W. Hall)

AL-SAFFFĀH. [See Abū ʿAbbās III.]

ṢAFFĀRĪDS, a dynasty founded by Yaʿqūb b. Laʾīth al-Ṣaffār which originated in Sadjistān and reigned in Persia for thirty-three years. Yaʿqūb, who was a coppersmith (ṣaffār) by trade abandoned his handicraft and became a brigand, but his chivalrous conduct in his predatory calling, attracted the favourable attention of Sālīḥ b. Naṣr (or Naḏr), and he gave him the command of his troops. Yaʿqūb rebelled against Dīrām b. Naṣr. In 253 (867) he was master of the whole of Sūstān. Having thus established himself in Sūstān he captured Herāt, and Muhammad b. Tāhir b. Ahmad, governor of Khurasān, attempted to divert his attention from this town by beseeching on him the government of Kirmān. In 253 (867), however, he recaptured Herāt and took some Tāhirīds prisoner. He sent an embassy with magnificent presents to the Caliph al-Muʿtasim, tried to take possession of the province of Fārs, defeated the governor ʿAll b. al-Ḥusayn and entered Shīrāz, without injuring the population. Then he returned to Sadjistān without establishing his power in Fārs. — He then turned to the domain of the princes (ruṭūl) of al-Rukhšāh. In 256 (870) he conquered Balkh, Bīmiyān [q.v.] and Kābul. In 257 (871) Yaʿqūb again tried to take possession of Fārs. In order to turn his attention from this province, al-Muwaṭṭāf gave him this attention: al-Tūķhāristān and Sīnā in chief. In 259 he marched against Najaḥibāb, which he captured in Shavwāl. There he took Muḥammad b. Tāhir prisoner. After an unsuccessful expedition in Tābaristān, he finally duced him to conduct his army through Khūṣtan against Baghādād, after having defeated the governor of Fārs. He was in his turn defeated at Dār al-ʿĀqīl, retired to Khūṣtan and died at Dījūndāl Shāhāb (Shawwāl 265 = June 879) where his tomb is still shown.

He was succeeded by his brother ʿAmm [q.v.], whose descendants maintained themselves in Sūstān till 1165.

(T. W. Hajo)

AL-SAFFFĀT, title of Sīra xxvii of the Kūfī, after the first word wālat-Saffī-

SAFī, more accurately Asfī, ethnic Masfūrī, a port in Morocco on the Atlantic Ocean, a few miles south of Cape Cantin, at the top of a very open bay. Safi has about 21,000 inhabitants of whom 3,000 are Jews and a thousand Europeans.

Safi does not seem to date back to any great age. Al-Bakri (13th century A.D.) mentions it without attributing any great importance to its Al-Idris in the next century says it is a fairly busy port but the roads are not all safe. In the beginning of the thirteenth century, a riot arose there. But the importance of Safi really dates only from the coming of the Portuguese, who, continuing their progress along the Moroccan coast, settled there in 1507. There they established a stronghold which in 1530 resisted a vigorous attack, with the help of a local chief, Yahyā ben Tafīf, who seems to have been a personage of considerable importance, the Portuguese for several years maintaining Safi the principal centre of their operation. They established a regular protectorate there, gradually winning over the neighbouring tribes and daily advancing their outposts and their rasais further afield. They ultimately reached the very gates of Marrakṣa. But Portuguese, with her hands full elsewhere, especially in the Indies, could not long sustain such an effort; on the other side too, the holy war movement gradually increased in force and the administration, in difficulties for funds, forced to exploit more and more the subsidised country, became worse and worse. In 1516 the governor Lope de Barriga was taken prisoner; in 1517 Yahyā b. Tafīf was killed in an ambush on the way back. The attacks of the Shafsers became more and more serious and after 1534 the question began to be considered of evacuating Safī and arsenical (which had been occupied in 1513), to concentrate the defence on Masagān. They were forced to this solution of the problem in December 1544 after the loss of Agadir in March of that year. The evacuation was made in good order under the direction of Joan de Castro.

The Safī Shafsers having occupied Safī made it their principal port; as a matter of fact it was the nearest to Marrakṣa, which was their usual residence. Safi thus attained great importance in the 16th and 17th centuries; a considerable part of the Christian trade was centred there. When the ‘Alawīs secured the power and moved their capital to the toward of the north, Mehκes or Fès, Safī became the busiest port and Safī lost a great deal. In the 18th century, however, Christian merchants were still numerous there; the representative of France, it may be noted, lived there for several years. In the 19th century its decline became more marked. It is now a fairly busy little town from which are exported the agri-cultural products of the rich country of the ‘Abdān, of which Safī is the centre. Of the ancient rihā it has retained the name of one of its two quarters while the name of the other is commemorated in walls for the most part Portuguese.

Bibliography: Besides the geographers and historians of Morocco (al-Slàwī in particular — cf. the bibliography to the article MOROCCO see the Portuguese chronicles; Pedro de Salazar, Historia en la cual se cuentan muchas guerras entre christianos e infieles (1559); Diego de Torres, Historia de los Cheřīfī; Marmol, Péllet, Ablancourt, Paris 1607, ii. 78—113; Chénier, Recueil historiques sur les Mors, Paris 1787; among contemporaries see especially de Castries, Sources historiques de l'histoire du Maroc (in course of publication), passim; cf. also Welt, Die Saïfids of Morocco in the XVIIth Century, London 1904; Cour, Les Bezi Bertiufs, Constantine 1920.

(HENRI BASSET)

SAFī, FAJKER AL-DIN ‘ALĪ b. AL-HUSAIN AL-WAYĪ al-KHĀSHĪF, with the name Fakhr al-Dīn ‘Alī b. al-Jāhilī al-Khāshīf d. 910 = 1504/5, a Persian author. From the preface to his work Lāfī al-Tūnūfī it appears that he was a prisoner in Herāt for a year and in 939 (1532/3) entered the service of Shaḥ Muḥammad, prince of Ghur in which he composed the Lāfī al-Tūnūfī. He must therefore have died after 1533; the exact date is not known any more than that of his birth.

Works: 1) a romantic poem, Maḥmūd u Ayāh, as far as is known the only poetic version of the theme; 2) Raschkhāt-i ‘Allī b. Fakhrī, a taqhirā of the Naqshbandī Shākhī, ed. Teichmann 1599, finished in 919 (1513/4); a Turkish translation of it appeared at Constantinople in 1526, at Balkh in 1526 (Ethē in the Grundr. der Iran., Bibl., ii. 365); 3) the above mentioned Lāfī al-Tuṇūfī, also called Lāfī al-Zarāfī, a narrative work found in a considerable number of manuscripts in European libraries, which contains in 14 bands anecdotes regarding individuals of various classes of society (extracts in Schefers Christ. Pers., i. 100 sqq.).


(V. F. BÜCHNER)

SAFī AL-DIN (Shāhīk), ancestor of the Safawīs [q.v.] in Persia, was born at Ardabil (q.v.) in 650 = 1253/4, the son of Khwādja Kamīl al-Dīn ‘Arabī al-Shīrāzī and Dawlat, said to be the twenty-fifth line of descent from ‘Alī and in the thirteenth of Mīn al-Khīrīn, the seventh Imām (on his genealogy see E. G. Browne in the J.R.A.S., 1921, p. 397). Shīrāzī al-Nasabī (Safavīyot, Berlin 1924), He was the fifth of seven children and his father died when he was six years old.

He is described as a serious youth who grew up without comrades and early devoted himself to religious exercises. As he found no one among the learned men of Ardabil who pleased him as
a teacher he went to Sanda with the intention of attending the lectures of Shaikh Nadjib al-Din Burghulji (d. 678 = 1280), but the latter died before he arrived there. He made the acquaintance of pious devots and devout men, including Shaikh Rukn al-Din al-Baidawi and Amir `Abdallah, who finally referred him to Shaikh Zahirid, i.e. Tadj al-Din Ibrahim b. Rawshan Amir b. Washil b. Shaikh Bandis al-Kurdi al-Sanjari of Galin, who was reported to live on the Caspian Sea. He is said to have spent four full years searching for him and ultimately discovered him in Hiyakurin in the Kuhabat district of Galin. Shaikh Zahirid gave him a kindly welcome and Saif al-Din remained 25 years with him until Zahirid died at the age of 85. Saif al-Din then became his successor in Zahirid's brotherhood until he in turn passed away, likewise aged 85, on Monday, Muharram 12, 735 = Sept. 12, 1334. Shortly before his death he had made the pilgrimage to Mecca and had previously designated his son Sadir al-Din as his successor. On his return he became ill, lay for twelve days in bed and then passed away. He had two wives, Bibi Fatima, daughter of Shaikh Zahirid and the daughter of Ali Al-Salimian of Gentum. The former was the mother of 1) Mansur al-Din, who died 744 = 1344, 2) Sadir al-Din (born April 27, 1306 = 704 Hegirah, died 794 = 1392), Shaif al-Din's successor and 3) Abul Sa'id. The second wife bore him two sons, Ali al-Din and Sharaf al-Din, as well as a daughter, who was given in marriage to Shaikh Shams al-Din, a son of Shaikh Zahirid.

Saif al-Din was the founder of the Dervish order of the Safasas which later attained political control of Persia. The organization and history of this brotherhood have not yet been thoroughly investigated. It is clearly connected in its political and religious history with the dervish bodies which later appeared in Anatolia and became powerful there, like the Agha and the Bektashis. Its members later wore as a badge a twelved gown of scarlet wool (later called Shap-i Bairad; cf. Islam, i. 83), from which comes the Turkish name Shap-i Bairad "red head". Of the religious system of the order it is certain that in its later stage, as it is today, Shaif al-Din himself, the founder, was a Sunni (cf. E.G. Browne, Persian Literature in Modern Times, p. 43 sq.). Following the Agha's Aghas, Saif al-Din received numerous adherents from Persia and especially from Anatolia (cf. J.R.A.S., 1921, p. 403-4) and it is to him that the order owes its present prestige in Shafi circles and its later great extension, which was ultimately to prove almost fatal to the Ottoman Empire.

Bibliography: The principal source is Ibn al-Bazzaq, Sufanat al-Safa, lith. Bombay 1329 = 1911; MSS. in the British Museum, Add. 11745 and in King's College, Cambridge (cf. E.G. Browne, op. cit., p. 35); this work, of which Browne, op. cit., p. 38 sq., gives an excellent survey, deals exclusively with Saif al-Din's influence and neglects almost entirely the merely "biographical" data of his career. The Sitihath al-Milah, extracts of which have been given by E.G. Browne in the J.R.A.S., 1921, p. 395-418 (cf. thereon F. Babinger in the Islam, xi. 231 sq.), and published by him in Persian at the Kaviani press in Berlin in 1924, is also important; on it see the earlier article by von Ebnikoff in the Melanges Antiques ... de St. Petersbourg, i. 850-853. On further Persian literature see P. Horn in the Grundriss der iranischen Philologie, ii. Strassburg 1896/1904, p. 856 sq., and v. Ebnikoff in the Melanges Antiques ..., i. 543 sq. On Shaif al-Din's influence, especially the very full account of E.G. Browne, Persian Literature in Modern Times, Cambridge 1924, p. 3-44; on his order, the Khilab, and their connections with Anatolian dervish orders see F. Babinger, Schijch Bedar al-Din, Leipzig and Berlin 1921, p. 78 sqq. (Isf., al. 78 sqq.), with the sources there quoted and also do., Marmo Samnata's Tagebuecher als Quelle zur Geschichte der Sasaswai in A Volume of Oriental Studies presented to Edward G. Browne, Cambridge 1922, p. 28-50.

(Franz Babinger)

**SAFIYA BINT HUYAIY** b. ARIJAH, MUHAMMAD'S ELEVENTH WIFE, was born in Medina and belonged to the Jewish tribe of the Banu 'Najjar; her father and her uncle Abul Yasir were among the Prophet's most bitter enemies. When their tribe was expelled from Medina in 4 A.H., Huyaiy b. Arijah was one of those who settled in Khabar, together with Khunah b. Al-Kalbi, to whom Safiyya was married at the age of 6 or early in 7 A.H. She was about 17 years of age. There is a tradition that she had formerly been the wife of Sallam b. Mashkaq, who had divorced her. When Khabar fell, in Safar 7, Safiya was captured in a fortress, al-Kamils or Nizar, together with two of her cousins. In the division of the spoils she had been assigned, or actually given, to Dhiya b. Khalfi al-Kalbi, but when Muhammad saw her he was struck by her beauty, and threw his mantle over her as a sign that he had chosen her for himself. He redeemed her from Dhiya against seven heads of cattle, and induced her to embrace Islam. Her husband was condemned to a cruel death by Muhammad for having refused to give up the treasure of the Banu 'Najjar; the desire of marrying Safiya may have influenced the Prophet, who was at that time not permitted to settle with another wife, either in Khabar itself or at al-Sahba', some 8 miles from it, on the way back to Medina. Safiya's dowry consisted in her emancipation, and she assumed the veil (hijab), thus establishing her position as a wife, which at the beginning appears to have been questioned. In Medina Safiya received a cold welcome: A'isha and Muhammad's other wives showed their jealousy with ights upon her Jewish origin. She seems to have lived aloof from her surroundings, for she finds no further mention of her in the years preceding Muhammad's death, except in an episode that shows how, during his last illness, she expressed her devotion to him, and was criticized by the other wives. With the Prophet's daughter Fatima she was, however, on good terms.

In 35 A.H. Safiya aided Uthman; while he was besieged in his house she made an unsuccessful attempt to reach him, and she used to bring him food and water by means of a plank bridge placed between her dwelling and his. When A'isha asked her to be present at Uthman's last interview with 'A'ishah and al-Zubair, which took place in her house, Safiya went, and tried to defend the unfortunate Caliph.
She died in 30 or 52, during Mu’awiyah’s caliphate, leaving a fortune of 100,000 dinars in land and goods, one third of which she bequeathed to her sister’s son, who still followed the Jewish faith. Her dwelling in Medina was bought by Mu’awiyah for 400,000 dinars.

In Cairo there is a 12th century mosque dedicated to Sitt Safiya, which gives its name to the surrounding quarter. 


Al-Šaḥāba. [See Aṣyā’iṣ.

SAHARA (Al-Šaḥāra), an African desert. Safira’ is the feminine of the adjective ṣafara, “of a lawn colour”. The word is applied by some writers to a combination of stony soil, steppes and sands (cf. al-idrâî, ed. de Goeje, p. 37 note), while the word muṣafidâ is more particularly applied to the desert. When sandy and absolutely devoid of water (cf. Abu 1-iDîbâ’, Taqâwṣar al-Bul’dân, ed. Reinaud and de Slane, p. 137; transl. Reinaud, ii, 190). Leo Africanus uses it as a synonym for desert in general (Schefer i, i, 5).

The Sahara lies between Barbary, Tripolitania, Cyrenaica and Marmarica in the north, the Sudan in the south, the Atlantic in the west and the Nile valley in the east. Some geographers even extend it as far as the Red Sea, and thus link it up with the Arabian deserts. Its area, if we leave out Egypt, may be estimated at three million square miles, or a quarter of the total surface of Africa.

The Sahara, as a whole, may be regarded as an ancient “plain” concealed in many parts by more recent geological formations. Its surface, far from being uniform, presents considerable variations of level. Some parts, in the vicinity of the Egyptian border, in the south of Tripolitania and in the south of Tunisia, are below the level of the sea; in other parts, however, there are high plateaux, and mountain ranges, for the most part of volcanic origin, tower up (Tibesti, Air, Hoggar), some of whose summits are over 10,000 feet high (Tibesti). On the whole, we may say that lowlying areas predominate in the western Sahara and the highlands in the eastern.

The desert character of the Sahara is primarily due to the climate of this part of Africa. Rain is very rare and irregular there; the extreme dryness of the air produces an intense evaporation, which reduces to a minimum the rising of springs to the surface. The great variations of temperature and violence of the wind’s result in the break up of the rocks and the denudation of the surface. The conditions of animal and vegetable life are, in consequence, extremely precarious. It is, however, right to make a distinction in this respect between the desert zones and the desert strictly speaking. In the north, indeed, the fairly abundant rainfalls have allowed the development of a zone of steppes suitable for stock-rearing, of which the high plateaux of Algeria show the most perfect type; in the south a border of savannah and bush rolls almost without interruption from the Atlantic to the Nile basin, and forms the transitional link between the Sahara and the fertile regions of Equatorial Africa. This is the ‘Sudânese Sahâra’, in which the desert character lessens gradually as one goes southwards. The Sahara, properly so called, occupies the whole area between these two zones and even in the north reaches to the Mediterranean in the region of Sidra and Marmarica. It presents very different aspects in its different parts. Sand-planes cover enormous tracts (cf. the article Arego), separated from each other by rocky plateaux (Hamada), bounded by steep slopes. In other parts we find river valleys, usually dried up, called wa’dâ’ (wads) or flat plains of a soil sometimes perfectly uniform (Reg) as in the Algerian Sahara, sometimes filled with pebbles which makes walking very difficult, as in the Libyan desert. The most desolate parts are the “Tanezzour”, absolutely sterile regions and totally without springs. On the other hand, wherever we find surface water and wherever sheets of subterranean waters are sufficiently near the surface to be reached by wells or irrigation channels, there have arisen centres of population and cultivation, known as “oasis”, some isolated, others grouped like the islands of an archipelago: Fezzan, going towards Râgîsh, Zîlân, Tidikelt, Tuṭṭ, Qarara, Tafilt etc.

The Arab authors only give us fragmentary and often vague information regarding the Sahara. The only region that they know with any exactness is the northern zone, adjoining Ifriqiya and the Maghrib, the zone in which Ibn Khaldûn (Les Berbères, ed. de Slane, i, 120; transl. de Slane, i, 190) includes Tafilt, Tuṭṭ, Qarara, Fezzan and even Ghadames. The Arabs, however, do not agree as to the bounds of the Sahara. Al-Bakrî, for example, says that the sands mark the beginning of the “lands of the blacks” (Ma’dûdî, Algeria, 1911, p. 21; transl. de Slane, p. 49).

Ibn Khaldûn, on the other hand, makes it clear that this country is separated from Barbary by a vast region of deserts, “in which one is in danger of dying of thirst”; here and there we find some notes on the parts of the deserts traversed by caravan routes (cf. the western Sahara; cf. the description of the desert called Nitâr or Tisâr by al-Idrîsî, Yaww by Abu 1-iDîbâ’”) or on the accounts of commercial centres like Tadmakka, Audaghoût (Al-Bakrî, op. cit., p. 339).

Leo Africanus gives a resume of the data supplied by his predecessors. He identifies the Sahara with the Libya of the ancients (Bk. i, 5) and attempts a division into regions based on their populations. He distinguishes five different areas in the Sahara: (1) the desert of the Zenaga (x232), from the ocean to the salt beds of Tegaza; (2) the desert of Wazaghâ from the salt-loads of Tegaza at the Air in the east to the desert of Sidjilmas in the north; (3) the desert of the Targa (x232 = Tuareg), bounded in the west by Ighidi, in the north by Tukh, Garara and Mbâr, in the south by the kingdom of Agades; (4) the desert of the Lamta bounded on the north by the deserts of Wargila and Ghardama, in the south by deserts which reach as far as Kano; (5) the desert of the Bardawî lying between the desert of the Lamta in the west, the desert of Ardjila in the east, Fezzan in the north, Bornou in the south (Leo Africanus, Bk. viii; transl. Schefer, iii, 267 sqq.).

In spite of the sparsity of its resources, the Sahara has always been the home of man. The discovery on numerous places, at a great distance from one another, of wrought flints, pottery, rock carvings, etc. testify to the presence of man there.
at a very remote epoch. The ancient gaves these Saharan people the name of Ethiopians (Hesi- datum) or Libyans. They peopled the Sahara in the strict sense of the word, while Fessâz was occupied by the Garamantes, negroids, perhaps related to the present day Bornòs. In the northern border zone, Berbers of a white stock lived, gradually, however, the negroes were pushed southwards by the whites, and gave way to the whites. And according to E. Gautier (Le Sahara, p. 93 seq.), this ethnic change was the result of the introduction into North Africa in the Imperial period of the camel which supplied the Berbers with the indispensable means for the conquest of the Sahara. In any case, from this time onwards the Berbers never ceased to advance into the interior. When the Arabs came, the Zanata were already settled in the oasis of the Wed Rir, while the Sanhadjas were leading a nomadic life to the south of the great Atlas as far as Senegal. In the fifth century A.D. the Almoravids [q. v.] ruled the whole of the western Sahara. Three centuries later the Berber tribes (Grunada, Lamûna, Uriga, Matlûf, Lamta and Targa) formed from west to east a cordon stretching to the borders of the land of the negroes (Ibn Khaldûn, Les Berberes, ed. de Sane, L. 21; transl. de Sane, p. 104). The advance continues in the centuries following. In the sixteenth century A.D. the Tuareg occupied the Air, in the seventeenth and eighteenth they settled in Adrâr and reached the banks of the Niger. The penetration followed the Berber penetration. In the first century A.D. the Arabs first arrived in Fessâz; during the period following, they found their way into the central Sahara and into the western Sahara, as missionaries and merchants. But it was the Hûlî invasion that brought in whole tribes, who, finding the Maghrib too small for them, overflowed into the desert, thrusting forward the Berber tribes and forcing them to go farther south, so that by the time of Ibn Khaldûn, Arab tribes were occupying the border country north of the desert. Certain later happenings contributed to the diffusion of the Arab element, for example the expulsion of the Moors from Spain, which brought refugees even as far as Shingît in Adrâr, and the conquest of the Sudân by the Sudanians at the end of the sixteenth century A.D. The Arab expansion has gone on since our own times; witness, for example, the settlement in Bordj about 1820 of the Awad Sulaimân (Uled Sliman), who came from the shores of the Gulf of Sîdra. The existence of fairly active commercial relations between the two sides of the Sahara has always contributed to facilitate this infiltration. From the early centuries of the Hûlî, caravan routes connected Fessâz with Tchad, Southern Tunisia with Nigeria, and the extreme Maghrib with the empire of Ghûna. In the seventh century A.D., Walata was in regular connection with Morocco and Tuttî, Kanem with Ifiriya. In the sixteenth century A.D., Timbuktu traded with Morocco and Tunisia; in the nineteenth the routes from Tripoli to Bornû and Walâti were still busy and Arab traders were settled at all the caravan stations.

This Arab and Berber penetration has, however, been checked from time to time by return offensives by the Sudanese. At more than one period, indeed, negro empires have extended over the Sahara. The Soninke empire of Ghûna stretched over all Mauritania; the Mando empire reached to Tukt; the authority of the Sultân of Kanem has been recognised around Wargla, that of the Askia of Gao even to beyond Timbuktu.

This ebb and flow of peoples has left its trace in the present ethnography of the Sahara. We find in it the elements of white and black, either pure or altered by mixture in different degrees. The first, numerically the most important, is represented by the Arabs and the Tuareg [q. v.] In spite of the differences of origins and of language which distinguish them, they both present some features in common. They lead the same kind of life, a purely nomadic one, to which a kind of secular selection has wonderfully adapted them; as regards politics, they have not advanced beyond the rudimentary organisation into tribes and confederacies of tribes. Their geographical areas, however, are quite distinct. The Tuareg predominate in the Central Sahara from which they have advanced, gradually mixing more and more with black blood, as far as the bend of the Niger. The Arabs predominate on the frontiers of the Maghrib and especially in the western Sahara, where they have arabised, and where their intermarriage with the Berbers has given birth to a mixed population, the Mourn. The families who have preserved their Arab descent almost intact and who bear, as a rule, the name of "Hassan", constitute an aristocracy among them, while the other sections of the population, with the exception of some groups of Sanhadjas and Almoravids, are treated as an inferior caste (cf. the article MAURITANIA).

The black population also includes elements of various origins. The aboriginal population, gradually thrust back by the whites, seems to be represented at the present day only by the Tibu [q. v.], who, numbering barely 10,000 or so, occupy Tibesti and the neighbouring regions (see the article TIBESTI). The vast majority consists of individuals of different origins (Hausa, Bornûs, etc.), whose ancestors were settled in the Saharan as the result of the Sudanese conquests, or who have been brought into the country as slaves. The intermarriage of these negroes among themselves and with Berbers seems to have given birth to a particular type, the "hartam" (plur. : harratim), among whom black blood predominates; they play a very important part in the economy of the Sahara, especially in the villages and oases of the Northern Sahara. In contrast to the essentially nomadic white, the black is a settler; he cultivates the oases, a work for which the whites are unapt by their inclinations as well as their physiological organisation. The black tiller of the soil secures for the nomads the means of subsistence, without which they could not do, but he is kept by them, whether Arab or Berber, in a state of dependency and service.

If it has not opposed an insurmountable obstacle to the relations between the Mediterranean region and the Sudân, the Sahara has been no more a barrier to the diffusion of Islam, the progress of which coincides with that of the white element in the desert. Introduced into Fessâz in the first century A.D., Islam was spread by the Arab traders, who frequented the caravan routes and commercial centres, and by the nomad Berbers, like the Lamta and the Lamûna. The conquests of the Almoravids gained for Islam a vast
area in the western Sahara and up to the borders of the Sudán. This Islam, quite superficial by the way, like that still professed by the Tuareg, allowed traces of previous beliefs and practices contradictory to Korânic law to go on; on the other hand, it met with centres of resistance like the Tuat, where Judaeo-Berbers maintained themselves till the fifteenth century a.D. At this period the religious revival which began in North Africa had its repercussions in the Sahâra. Maraboutism and Shâhi were coming for the most part from Morocco, appeared in all places of any importance, exterminated all who differed from them, preached the orthodox doctrine and themselves became founders of Marabout flocks, whose members enjoyed great material and moral prestige. The activity of these religious brotherhoods became added to that of individuals, and is still felt at the present day. The western Sahara is under the influence of brotherhoods attached to the Kâdiriya order and, in a smaller degree, to the Tijânîya; the eastern Sahara to that of the Sâdia.  


(SAHARANPUR, a city of northern India, situated in 39° 57′ N. and 77° 33′ E., was founded about 1740, in the reign of Muhammad b. Tughluq, and was named after a local Muhammadan saint, Shâh Harûn Ûthî. The city and district suffered severely during the invasion of Timûr; and in 1356 Bâdur traversed them on his way to Pântapat, and some local Mogul colonies traced their origin to his followers. Muslim influence gained much by the proselytising zeal of Abd al-Kuddus, who ruled the district until the reign of Akbar. In the reign of Dâlahângar and Shâh Dâštân, Saharanpur was a favourite summer resort of the court, owing to the coolness of its climate and the abundance of game in its neighbourhood. Núr Dâštân had a palace in the village of Nàrâmag, which preposterous beef, and the royal hunting seat, Pâdshâh Mâshâl, was built for Shâh Dâštân. After the death of Avrangzib the district suffered severely from the invasions of the Sikhs, who massacred Hindus and Muslims indiscriminately, until, in 1710, they were temporarily crushed by the imperial authority. The upper Dâtâb then passed into the hands of the Sayyids of Bûra, and on their fall in 1721 into those of several favourites. In 1754 Ahmad Shâh Durrân conferred it on the Rohil, Nadîg Kûta, as a reward for his services at the battle of Kotla. Before his death, in 1770, it was overrun by Sikhs and Mârâthás. His son Zhâhid Dâštân revolted from Dâtâb, but was reconcile, and his son Ghâtân Kûta, who succeeded him in 1785, established a strong government and dealt firmly with the Sikhs. He was a coarse and brutal chief and in 1788 he blinded the emperor Shâh 'Alâm and was justly mutilated and put to death by Sindhya. Saharanpur remained nominally in the hands of the Mârâthás, but actually in those of the Sikhs, until its conquest and occupation by the British after the fall of 'Alighâr and the battle of Dâtâb in 1803.  


(SAHB, the partiparitale form of pâ-bû, to be the companion of, meant originally to be on equal terms of friendship, and was especially used of all those who came into contact with Muhammad, and died in the faith of Islam (cf. the art. Afsâh). But also in Muslim literature it often has the common meaning of companion. Muhammad calls himself sahid-àkun when he addresses his companions; and the Kaiser is called sahib al-Kâm, the governor of al-Bâr sâhib al-‘dra, by 167 = 783/84 the Caliph al-Mahdî created an inquisitor and gave to him the title of sahib al-Za ‘müdâhî. Still later, the term Kâm was preferred. It is probable that the sacred musâmah, a tradition with the Prophet's Companions led to this preference.  

The term Sahib is used universally in India to-day to designate Europeans, and is a formal mark of respect. When applied to Indians of high station it is an added honour, e.g. Khan Sahib. Curiously enough the Arabic feminine form is seldom in use, and not in an honorific sense. In the Creed of Al-Ash'ari (Sûrta, Zur Geschichte Al-'Utric, p. 133-144) he says of God: "He has taken to Himself no companion (sahiba)". This use, however, is very exceptional. In India at present the feminine is obtained by prefixing Madam, with an elided ð, and pronouncing mânzah and this is the form by which all European women are addressed.  

On the use of sâhib in the Mekkan dialect, cf. SÂHIB, the title, meaning "Lord of the (suspicous) conjunction". Sâhib means a conjunction of the planets, Sâhib al-sâdân (cf. the art. Sâdan) a conjunction of the two conspicuous planets (Jupiter and Venus), and Sâhib al-mâlahid means a conjunction of the two insidious planets (Saturn and Mars). In the title the word refers, of course, to the former only. The Persian i of the sâhib is omitted, as in Sâhib-ûl, by sâhib-ûl, the title was first assumed by the Amir Timur, who is said to have been born under a fortunate conjunction, but with whose assumption was, of course, an afterthought. After his death poets and flatterers occasionally applied it to lesser sovereigns, even to so insignificant a ruler as Bârhû Nîmad Shâh II of Ahmadnagar, but it was officially assumed by Timur's descendant, the emperor Shâh Dâlahângar, who styled himself Sâhib Sâhib al-‘Zâhî, "the second Lord of the Conjunction".  

Sâhib-Sâhib was also, in Persia, where it has since been corrupted into Sirâh or Sirân, the name of a coin of 1000 dinârs, the tenth part of a tâmil.  

(SAHIB KIRAN, a title, meaning "Lord of the (suspicous) conjunction". Kiran means a conjunction of the planets, Kiran al-sâdân (cf. the art. Sâdan) a conjunction of the two conspicuous planets (Jupiter and Venus), and Kiran al-mâlahîm a conjunction of the two insidious planets (Saturn and Mars). In the title the word refers, of course, to the former only. The Persian i of the sâhib is omitted, as in Sâhib-ûl, by sâhib-ûl. The title was first assumed by the Amir Timur, who is said to have been born under a fortunate conjunction, but with whose assumption was, of course, an afterthought. After his death poets and flatterers occasionally applied it to lesser sovereigns, even to so insignificant a ruler as Bârhû Nîmad Shâh II of Ahmadnagar, but it was officially assumed by Timur's descendant, the emperor Shâh Dâlahângar, who styled himself Sâhib Sâhib al-‘Zâhî, "the second Lord of the Conjunction".  

Sâhib-Sâhib was also, in Persia, where it has since been corrupted into Sirâh or Sirân, the name of a coin of 1000 dinârs, the tenth part of a tâmil.  

(SAHIB QIRAN — SAHIB KIRAN)
SAHIB KIRAN — SAHIR

Bibliography: Sharaf al-Din 'Ali Yazdi, Zagari-nama, Bibliotheca Indica series of the Asiatic Society of Bengal; Muhammad Khadijé Firdaúsi, Gulshan-ı-İshqíyé (Bombay lithographed edition of 1832); 'Abd al-Hamid Láhórí, Pişdaghi-nama, Bibliotheca Indica series of the Asiatic Society of Bengal; Standard Arabic and Persian lexica, s. v. 'Sirin.

(T. W. HAW)

SAHIR, sound, free from defect or blemish, is the name given to (a) a tradition whose chain of guarantors or transmitters is unassailable; and (b) the collections which contain nothing but saḥiḥ traditions, namely those compiled by al-Bukhári (p. v., l. 783) and Muslims b. al-Hashim in distress.

(a) The saḥiḥ tradition, according to al-Qudróbí (d. 816) embraces categories so wide apart as the šamás (supported by authorities resting on the prophet) and the fard (peculiar to one district or one reporter).

(b) The šahih of al-Bukhári contains 7,397, or, according to other authorities, 7,295 traditions. These were selected by the author from the 600,000 hadith current in his day and the 200,000 it is asserted that he memorized. A remarkable feature of his šahih is the chapter heading or tamúluna which is often tendentious and sometimes misleading; e.g. when he prefaces a tradition which professes to record the equal efficacy of a pilgrimage to the mosques of Mecca, Medina and Jerusalem with the words: "The superiority of prayer in the mosques of Mecca and Medina". (Bibl. Fedé al-Salat, ed. Krech, l. 299).

The contents of Muslim's šahih are practically the same as al-Bukhári's except that the šahih differs considerably; and instead of the chapter headings so characteristic of al-Bukhári, the author gives us a valuable preface in which he discusses the conditions which a tradition must fulfill before it can be regarded as authentic.

Both works (al-Bukhári's more systematically) are planned to provide, where possible, apostolic hadith on which to ground the existing laws and regulations of Islam. So great was the reputation of al-Bukhári's šahih that it was regarded as a charm against shipwreck and other calamities and the author's tomb became the resort of believers in distress.


(Alfred Guillaume)

SAHIR is a reversed word, of the measure faṭīl instead of the measure muḥāl, and its original meaning is "abraded (by the sea)". Hence, the shore of the sea or of a great river, a seashore, sea-coast, or sea-board; also a tract of cultivated land, with towns or villages, adjacent to a sea or great river, and the side of a valley.

Bibliography: The lexica s. v.

(T. W. HAW)

SAHIR, TURKISH, a notable modern Ottoman poet and author. Born in 1853 in Constantinople, the son of Ismail Hâkı Pasha who died in Vomou, he early showed literary inclinations and a talent for declamation. Through his writings he was very soon able to procure for himself a prominent position among Turkish men of letters. He acted as a teacher of French and of belles-lettres and was for a time employed in the Foreign Office. Later he acted chiefly as editor of various periodicals, e.g. the literary part of the Tercvet-i Şay numérique, the ladino newspaper Doveté (the Nogayev), founded by him in 1909 but which expired after 4 numbers, the Fedî-i-Allî, the Türk şahâne, the Mecâmmê Muhi, the monthly Bitig (knowledge), also founded by him (1915) — he was president of the Türk Bitig Derneği — the İsrâ'illî Mecâmmê (a journal of national economy) (1916), etc. His undeniable flair for practical business is in remarkable contrast to his sensitive, elegiac, very tender style of poetry. He takes first place among the younger poets as regards perfection of language and depth of feeling. The euphony of his verse is fascinating. As a prose writer a simple and brilliant diction best suits him.

With a sure instinct he at once attached himself to the modern school of the Tercvet-i Şay numérique (Tercvet-Fikret — Eşrefi Yue). He actively championed the simplification of the language. As regards prose, however, he adhered strictly to the old classical form (tarâkû). That for a period he also wrote in the national metre which consists of the syllables (parmak-hiyye), obeying the national tendency, was only an interlude. His early period of extravagant and fantastic descriptions of nature was followed by a transition to psycho-analysis. His true sphere, in which he is considered a master, is woman and love, which he sings in an inexhaustible variety of ways. He celebrates them in inspired, indeed fervously tender poems. For him "the poem is a woman and woman a poem". This praise of woman is done in a perfectly pure, morally noble and ideal way. Only reluctantly does he turn to other themes, although here also he has produced many fine poems. A certain tendency to the morbid, to wistfulness, to foreboding of death and longing for death is strongly marked in him. It is no wonder that many, while fully recognizing the merits of his charming personality, cannot regard him as a poet such as the poem with the name "New-Turkey needs in her period of transition.

With the constitution a somewhat more vigorous national tone entered his work. Since then he has been above all a champion of women's rights, for which he fights with tongue and pen. He was president of the Fedî-i-Allî (the coming dawn), Surm and Drang club, which, comprising about 20 men of letters of the Tercvet-i Şay numérique circle, endeavoured to control the direction of development of Turkish literature but collapsed owing to internal dissensions after only seven months. Besides numerous poems and articles in the most varied papers and periodicals he has published the following books: a collection of poems entitled Ebeli Naligiter (*White Shadows*) (1855) and the collections of mingled prose and poetry entitled Bahtın (*Crises*) (1855) and Siêh (*Black*) (1855); all in the series, so important for modern literature, called Edibeti-i Gâfûlê Kâşât-i Şer-i Emir (*Nov. 15, 19 and 27*); and a work entitled Şimlit. His {Suar}wan mehî helî mi-nâdîni, published anonymously in 1835, contains political and satirical verses.

Bibliography: Şahid ed-Dîn Sâ’il-Minot, Turkiyesi Edibeti-i Gâfûlê Kâşât-i Şer-i Emir (Nov. 15, 19 and 27); and a work entitled Şimlit. His {Suar}wan mehî helî mi-nâdîni, published anonymously in 1835; contains political and satirical verses.
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(Fromian influence on Modern Literature, transl. from the Russian of M. Isenbergs by G. K. Neiman, Honolulu 1918, p. 34, 169 sq.)

J. H. Kramers

SAHL AL-TUSTARI, ABDU MUHAMMAD. B. 'ABDULLAH IBN 'UYBAN, a Sunni theologian and mystic, whose language was Arabic, was born at Tustar (Al-Ahwaz) in 203 (821) and died in exile at Basra in 283 (896).

A pupil, through his master Ibn Sawsur, of strict Sunni like Thawri and Abū 'Amr b. 'Ala', Sahil was above all an ascetic of a very strict moral discipline. He was also a theologian with a vast store of intellectual knowledge.

Of his life, apparently quiet and solitary, only one detail is known: his exile to Basra at the time of the rise of the Zanj (about 261-274) when the 'ulama' of Al-Ahwaz condemned his doctrinal treatise on the obligatory character of contrition (bawd farid).

Sahil wrote nothing, but his "thousand sayings" collected and edited by his pupil, Muhammad Ibn Sallam (d. 297/909), presented sufficient dogmatic coherence to give rise to a theological school, the Sallimiyya [v. w.]. It is from Sahil that this school derives its characteristics: experimental introspection, practicing the rites of worship and a technical semi-geometric vocabulary tending to monism.

Sahil's argumentation is purely dialectic (futūd, ajl. farid), like that of the mu'tazila'ilmānīn he does not and yet argue in syllogisms in the Greek fashion as his old pupil Hallaj [q. v.] was to do after leaving him. In psycho-physic he teaches that man is composed of four elements (hayār, rūh, sūr, guf), that the rūh is superior to the sūr (against the view of the Hellenisers) and that it survives after death (against the view of Malārād).

In Kūrānic exegesis each verse has four meanings, literal (ghār) allegorical (hilāl), moral (badl) and axiological (mu'tāla), he admits the usual theory of ghafar. The examples of the prophets should be meditated upon in order that we may gradually attain their state of soul.

For Sahil, as for Ibn Karrān and al-Ash'arī, the Islamic community' comprises all believers, provided they turn towards the ḍīna (the Suuni view) opposed to that of the Mu'tazilite and 'Ilmānī. The word "faith" (imāma) signifies at once succession with the lips (farid), conformity of conduct (fayd) identity of intention (āja) and inner enjoyment of the real (yāni).

The true worshipper of Godought first to obey the state and strictly observe the rites: "to love is to extend obedience" (al-Tustari, also, see "profession of faith"). He is bound to produce actions, in imitation of the Prophet (semi-Mu'tazili notion of ibtihād: opposed to the quietist inamāt of Shāfi'i and Ibn Karrān), but he ought continually to turn towards God (Allah) (hiyār al-ma'ānī with incessant contrition (tawbah) farid fi halī mana). The analysis that Sahil makes of the stages of the voluntary act, derived from that of Al-Muhāsib and adopted by Al-Qazwīnī remains classic. In the supreme degree is the ecstatic "expatriated" from the world, in order to possess the essential reality (yāni), beyond the rites of worship (ghafar bi 'l-ma'īdāh 'aṣa al-ḥār), an adumbration of the Hallājī doctrine of mystic union.

In eschatology Sahil uses with discretion the semi-geometric data of Imānī origin; the "columns of light" (zann al-ḥār, 'al. maqādik ʿālā), a kind of "mass of primordial adoration", composed of all the souls of saints to be (as opposed to ordinary men, adammā), an adumbration of the "nur muhammadīya of the later mystics. The saints alone are predestined to possess sīr al-rūḥānīya or sīr al-anwār, "mystery of the sovereign personality", or "divine right to say "I"." This idea is an adumbration of the hawa huwa [q. v.]. From it Sahil deduced the probability of future rehabilitation for Sātan; an idea later developed by Ibn Al-Arabi and "Abd al-Karim Dīji [q. v.].

The ōhār formulae which Shāhī Suṣanāt ascribes to Sahil (Salawāt, n. v. Suṣanāt) is of modern origin.


AL-SAIHM, the arrow. a. Geometrical term. If one erects a perpendicular s at the middle of a chord of an arc, which reaches to the arc, this is called al-sainhm, the versed sine (al-diżāf al-muṣūlīh) of the arc s; the sine (al-diżāf al-muṣūlīh), which corresponds to our sine, is a c (see — in addition to many other passages — Muṣfīth al-Uṭūn (ed. v. Vloten), p. 205. The versed sine played a much more important part in the older mathematics from the Hindus onwards than it does in modern mathematics (cf. e. g. A. von Brannmühl, Geschichte der Trigonometrie). Sine and versed sine are measured in the parts of the radius of the circle, the latter being taken as equal to 60 parts or 1.

b. Astronomical term: Ibn al-Kūfī says that the expression sahain al-diżāf (the arrow, the hitting of the secret of the future, see sp. al. v. p. 327, 338, 410) is astrological. (E. Weidemann)

c. Astronomical term: Šarāt al-Kūfī, constellation of Sagittarius, and also al-Kawā, bow of Sagittarius, (cross-bow), a southern constellation of the ecliptic, which, according to Ptolemy and the Arabs, consists of 31 stars mainly of southern latitude, which arc among all of the 3rd to 6th degrees of magnitude. Ptolemy gives only star 24 of Sagittarius (Arabic: rubūs al-yaẓir al-yuṣayr, elbow of the left arm) the magnitude 4—3, while al-Birūnī (al-Kawsī al-Marāṣīl, Berl. MS. 275, fol. 205v) gives magnitude 2 for stars 24 23, (kūb al-yaẓir al-yuṣayr = knuckle of the left hand); of Sagittarius in Ulug Beg, however, except star 3 of Sagittarius (ahla 'l-shīb al-yaẓir al-yuṣayr, the one mouth of the bow), which, according to him, is 3—2 in magnitude, they are only of the 3rd or lower degrees of magnitude. This 24th Sagittarius is really of 1.9 magnitude (on 'Urūlā al-rūm see C. A. Naillino, Opus astronomicon, ii. 165). The following stars of Sagittarius are also noteworthy: Naṣāl al-šahīm...
Mâlik and Saḥnûn had brought with him from Kâraânân the portions of the Murâwîţa of Mâlik which Anûs b. al-Fârûq had heard under the master. When some questions arising out of the study of the Murâwîţa were discussed before Abîd al-Rahmân b. al-Ḳâsim, Saḥnûn required further information and he was asked why he did not travel to hear Mâlik himself. He replied that his poverty and lack of money alone prevented him. This association with Abîd al-Rahmân was of far-reaching consequences for the spread of the Mâlikî school of law in the West. Most authorities place the journey of Saḥnûn to the East in 450, but this is an evident error, as it is also recorded that he went there during the life of Mâlik, who died in 179 a. H. He later had the gratification of travelling further and performed the pilgrimage in company of Abîd al-Rahmân, Aqîhâbâb and Ibn Wâbî riding on the camel behind the latter. Later he visited also al-Âdâmân and Syria studying under the most prominent followers of Mâlik. He returned to Kâraânân in 451 and made it his calling to spread the doctrines of Mâlik. Some of his biographers state that he was the first who introduced these doctrines into the West, but before him Abî b. Zîyâd, Al-Buhîlî and Anûd b. al-Fârûq had taught the Murâwîţa or at least parts of it. Saḥnûn worked out the doctrines in a large work, the Mudawwannâ, the basis of which was the text of Anûd b. al-Fârûq, which he commented by questioning Abîd al-Rahmân b. al-Ḳâsim upon the most trivial points. Here the acumen of Ibn al-Ḳâsim and Saḥnûn come into prominence. Saḥnûn asks: "Is this point confirmed by tradition or the teaching of Mâlik?" and Ibn al-Ḳâsim answers: "This was the teaching of Mâlik" or: "This is my own opinion" (hadîth 'ainî). We see that great scope was given in the Mudawwannâ to rational judgment and no attempt is made to introduce genuine or forged traditions to affirm a point of law. In consequence the Mudawwannâ is quite a readable book in clear language and a safe guide to the genius of the compiler and his teacher. When Wâbî, a foster-brother of Saḥnûn, died, Ibn Abî l-Djâwâdî, who preceded Saḥnûn in the office of judge, is reported to have asked Saḥnûn and Saḥnûn refused to say then after him because Ibn Abî l-Djâwâdî was a Muṯâzî. When the aûlî Ziyâdat Allâh (reigned 201-223) heard of this he commanded the governor of Kâraânân to give him 500 stripes. His wife Abî b. Ḥâmâdí hearing this stopped the messenger bearing the order and went to the aûlî to get the sentence revoked. He pointed out that Al-Buhîlî had succumbed to a similar punishment (in 403) inflicted by order of the governor Muhammad b. Muḥâsitî. Ziyâdat Allâh then forgave him. During the short usurpation of Abîmâd b. al-Aqîhâbâb (232-234) he introduced the inquisition about the creation of the ʿarîfîn and Saḥnûn fled from Kâraânân to the heritage of an ascetic named Abîd al-Rahmân at Kâ'far Ziyâdî. Aqîhâbâb sent a courier named Ibn Sulṭân to meet Saḥnûn, because he knew that the latter hated the Muʿtazîs, like most courtiers, on account of his severe criticism concerning the licentious life at Court. The terrible violence of Aqîhâbâb, however, made Ibn Sulṭân to lean towards Saḥnûn. He was apprehended and led captive to Kâraânân, but when they were about a mile from the city they received news that Muhammad b. al-Aqîhâbâb had regained his
power and that Ahmad had been killed. This caused Sahlun to be liberated. One of the first acts of Muhammad b. al-Aghlab was to debase the Kalbi 'Abd Allah Ibn Ah! Uqba. This act met with the approval of Sahlun, who exclaimed in the presence of both: "May God reward the Amir for freeing the people of their oppressors." Muhammad now, in 335 A.H., offered the office of judge to Sahlun who for a whole year, refused to accept it but finally accepted it in Ramadhn 334. He said on that occasion to his daughter Khulud: "To-day thy father has been stabbed without a knife." Others had proposed Sulaiman b. 'Umar for the post, but he refused, saying that while Sahlun lived no one else was competent to fill the office. Sahlun accepted no presents or salary from the Amir, but defrayed his expenses and those of his officials from the poll-tax imposed upon non-Muslims. To perform his duties as judge unstintingly, he had a room built adjoining the mosque and admitted only the litigants and their witnesses. One of his first acts was also to exclude all heretical sects from the mosque, as there were many Sahlun, Bidah and Mu'tasils at Kairwan; he was also the first to appoint a regular Imam for the mosque and the first who placed pledged property with trustworthy persons in the town, while up to his time pledges had been kept in the house of the judge. Sahlun, as a judge treated all parties with the utmost courtesy and did his utmost to appease any fears of litigants and witnesses by telling them to say frankly what they knew. In answering legal questions he was very careful, as he believed that hasty replies led to more trouble than anything else. Biographers of later times know of many charitables (blessings accruing through his influence), which proves the veneration in which he was held. He died on Sunday the 6th or 7th of Rajab, 240 A. H. and his death in spite of his great age caused general consternation in Kairwan. Brockelmann in his History of Arabic Literature says that it was due to Asad b. al-Furqat and Ibn al-Kasim that the doctrine of Malik spread in the West, but, as already mentioned, the merit is principally due to the work of Sahlun in arranging and publishing the Masnadun, which, though based upon the Maswatta of Malik, is a much more comprehensive work. Manuscripts are comparatively scarce, but the work has been printed in two editions in Cairo, one in 4 volumes 4to printed 1324/5 and the other in 16 parts dated 1905/6 in 8v. There exist in private hands seven parts written on parchment in Kairwan about the year 400, which I have been able to consult and which I hope will find their way into a public library.

The work of Sahlun being too large for quick reference was abbreviated by Abu Muhammad 'Abd al-Aghlab b. Abu Zaid (died 380 A. H.), whose work has been printed several times. I have also seen an early manuscript written before 400 A. H., in private ownership, entitled Muqlad or Mawwaran. This work contains also a few additions by Ibn Abi Zaid. Another abbreviation is by Abd Sa'id Khalaf b. al-Kalun al-Ardi: al-Barari, who was one of the principal pupils of Ibn Abi Zaid. He re-arranged the abbreviation in the order of the Masnadun and omitted the additions of Ibn Abu Zaid. This work has found many commentators (Ibn Farahun, ed. 4to, p. 116). Among the many commentators written upon the

**Mashadun** is one by Sahlun's son Muhammad, 2) by Abu 'l-Kasim 'Abd al-Khalil al-Suyuti, who died in Kairawun in 405. 3) By Abu Muhammad 'Abd al-Rahman b. Abu 'l-Hasan al-Abd al-Rahman, who died in Sifin in 418. 4) Abu Muhammad 'Abd al-Mu'min al-Khadi, who died in Sifin in 418. 3) Abu Muhammad 'Abd al-Mu'min al-Jazairi, who died in 719. The latter's commentary consists of 12 volumes. Abu 'l-Walid Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah b. Rashid wrote an exposition of difficult passages of the Mawwaran entitled al-Muqaddamat al-annawari, which has been printed in Cairo (1243) in two vol. 4to.


**SAHUL, a village in South Arabia, in M'dt al-Kala' in the Yemen, half a day's journey from Zafin. Sahul, which was called M'dt al-Yemen on account of its wealth in corn, was celebrated for its cabbages (sahulja) made thereof of white cotton.


**SAHYUN. [See SIYAWN]**

**SA'IB, MIR'AH MUHAMMAD ALI, whose nickly was SA'IIB, a Persian poet, born about 1012 (1603) near Isfahan, where he was appointed hokhamad of the merchants of 'Abbasid. Hakan Rukh'ayl Kashif and Hakim Shirs Isfahani are mentioned as Sa'ib's masters in poetry. He spent a considerable time in India, where the governor of Khand, Zafar Khan, his benefactor and patron, obtained his introduction to the court of Shah Jahan. He afterwards followed Zafar Khan to Kash- man, where he ultimately returned home to Persia. Sa'ib 'Abbasi II gave him the title Malika-i-Isfahani. He died in Isfahan in 1080 (1677) but other dates are also given (see Catalogue Hainisperm, p. 148).

Sa'ib was one of the most prolific Persian poets of the later period; Oriental critics place him very high; according to them, he was the creator of a new style. His works are, in addition to a romantic poem, **Mashadun o Ayat** (Kith in the Granada, die Iran. Phils., 350), hokans, his ghazals (in Perisan and in Turki), mathn aw's and shorter
but when he reached Marr al-Zahrān on, according to another authority, Thābit 'Aṭā', he declined to accompany the others any further, because he did not believe in the honourable intentions of the two leaders of the enterprise, Tālha and al-Zahāri, and endeavoured to dissuade the others from the project. Marwān b. al-Hakam contradicted his assertions, but al-Maghūra b. Shu'āb joined Sa'id, whereupon these two with a few others separated from the other members of the party. Sa'id then settled in Mecca and did not take part in the battle of the Camel nor in the battle of Ṣiffin. During the reign of Mu'āwiya he was governor of Medina alternately with Marwān b. al-Hakam. Marwān filled the office first; then came Sa'id's turn and when he was dismissed the former received the post again. But after a time he was again dismissed and Sa'id once more appointed his successor. Sa'id died on his estate in al-Ṭablī, according to the most usual statement in 59 (678/679), according to others, as early as 53 (674/675) or 57 (670/671) or 58 (671/672).


SA'ID ibn 'AWS (See also ZAID).

SA'ID ibn DAMI' (See also al-SA'ID).

KA'B ibn LUTAYY, ONE OF MUHAMMAD'S EARLIEST COMPA NIONS. His mother was Fatima bint Abī Ṭalha b. Umayya, daughter of the clan of Khālid. His Küsra is Abu 'A'āwar or Abu Thawr. He was one of 'Umar b. al-Khattāb's cousins and at the same time his brother-in-law through his wife, who was 'Umar's sister, as well as through 'Umar's wife who was his sister. He assumed Islam before Muhammad entered the house of Zaid b. al-Askām and 'Umar's conversion is said to have taken place under the influence of Sa'id and his family.

His father, Zaid b. 'Amr, was one of the ḥafīl; he was much interested in monotheism, refined to worship the Kūsa, warmed his contemporaries against idolatry and confused the religion of Abraham (cf. ZAID b. AMR). It is said that he died in the year when the Kūsa was killed and executed in which also Muhammad is said to have taken part.

Sa'id migrated with the Muslims to Medina, where Muhammad allied him with Rāfi' b. Mālik al-Zurqālī, or, according to others, with Chani b. Ka'b. When the rumour of the return of the kūsāghī caravans from Syria reached Medina, Sa'id, together with Talha b. 'A'idh Allah, was sent on scouting service. They met the caravan at al-Hawra and hurried back to Medina to report the news. But Muhammad was already on the way to Badr and the battle took place without their taking part in it. They nevertheless obtained their portion from the booty. Sa'id was present at all the other maṣāḥid and distinguished himself in the battle of Adrādīn (13 A.H.), where he was at the head of the cavalry, in the battle of Fīrūn (13 A.H.), where the infantry was under his command, and in the battle of the Yarmūk (15 A.H.).
At 'Umar's death Sa'id belonged to those who
promoted 'Uthmān's election as Caliph. Yet he
was not content with his government, though he
did not join the 'Alīd party.

He died in 50 or 51 A.H. in 'Akhī near Medina,
where he was buried. It is said that he reached
the age of 70 years. According to others, he
died as governor of al-Kufa under Mu'āwiyah.

Sa'id never played the first role in the Muslim
community. He was honored because of his early
conversion and belongs to the ten who were
promised Paradise (ṣaḥāba mustawābihum), Muḥammad
is sometimes (Ahmad b. Hanbal, Mustad, i. 907
ce) represented as ascending mount Hūs or 'Uthmān
with some of his companions. As the mountain
begins to tremble, he says: "Stand fast, oh mountain,
for on thee walk a prophet, a qādī and witnesses.

Then he proceeds to beatify his companions, among
whom Sa'id mentions himself in a veiled manner in
some traditions. Some of the forms of this report
remind us of Jesus' transfiguration on the mountain
(Matthew 17).

Sa'id belonged to those whose curse (dā'ma) is
efficacious. This is illustrated in the story of a
woman who, being cursed by him, became blind and
was drowned in a well into which she fell to save
herself from being killed.

Sa'id's manumid, i.e., the traditions handed down
on his authority, is to be found in Ahmad b.
Hanbal's Mustad, i. 187-190.
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SA'ID PASHA, called KOCÜK (the "little", not
so much to indicate that he was particularly small
in body as simply to distinguish him from numerous
other Sa'ids), was with the reformer and organizer
Ahmed Midhat Pasha the greatest statesman in
Turkey of the last half century. He was born in
1254 (1838) in Erzerum and died in Constantinople
on March 1, 1914; he was the son of 'Abd
Namık Efendi, at one time "controller of expendi-
ture on the eastern frontier", and trusted adviser
to the governor of the day, who had been for a period
consult and later Turkish Chargé d'affaires in Teheran
(d. Oct. 4, 1853); Sa'id came from a pure Turkish
family of Angora, the Selâzad family. He is buried
in the cemetery in Elifg near the Harrešt Khalîl
mosque. His twin brother 'Abdî died prematurely
and his younger brother Mehemd Ferid at his death
in 1882 was Tabârī-ı Emâlî, Midhat.

Sa'id received his early education in Erzerum.
When 16 he entered the civil service there, in
which he was destined to have a brilliant career
and pass through all stages up to the very highest
office. Two years later he was moved to a post in
the military administration of Anatolia, then
came of his course of his duties to Constantinople,
where his versatility procured him a post in the
office of the Supreme Council. He accompanied the
Imam General to Salonica, Monastir, Jannina and
Trikala. He next became general-secretary for
Janina, and then for Salonica, after which he filled
successively the offices of Director of the Imperial
Printing Press in Constantinople, Manager of the
official newspaper, Ta'kvim-i Wâhiyye, General
Secretary to the Council of State, to the Ministry
of Commerce, to the Grand Vizierate, to the
Ministry of Education and in 1875 Councillor of
the Ministry of Commerce and Agriculture and
Member of the Commission on reforms. From Sept. 1,
1876, to Jan. 10, 1878, he occupied the important
and influential position of Trustee of First Secretary
of 'Abd al-Hamid.

After acting for a short time as Wall of Angora
and of Brusa (Kâhâkhândigar) he became Grand
Vizier in 1879, an office which he held nine times in
all, a record attained by no other Grand Vizier,
although, as regards length of tenure of the office,
many others have considerably exceeded his total
period of 7 lunar years and 15 days. He was also
the different times Minister of the Civil List, of the
Interior, of Foreign Affairs and of Justice.

The list which he himself gives of his first seven
periods of office as Grand Vizier, in his Sa'îd-i
Midhat Sa'id Paşa'nın devezlari ve ziyti tarihi ve møşereti: 1834 (1908), a
collection of his articles published in the Tanbin and
in the Sa'dâ, contains a number of discrepancies in
the dates which we shall endeavour to remedy
here. The dates are not without importance for
the history of the Young Turk movement.

Sa'id Paşa was Grand Vizier (after the introduc-
tion of the so-called Constitution of Midjat the
title "First Minister" was used until Sa'id in 1882
again introduced the traditional title Grand Vizier,
Sa'id Paşa [q.v.]) as follows:
1) October, 1879—June, 1880;
2) September, 1880—May, 1882;
3) June, 1882—November, 1882;
4) December 2, 1882—September 25, 1883;
5) June 9, 1895—October 3, 1895;
6) November 18, 1901—January 15, 1903;
7) July 22, 1908—August 6, 1908: restoration of
the Constitution;
8) October 4, 1911—December 30, 1911;
9) December 31, 1911—July 17, 1912.

Sa'id was a trustworthy guide in his country
at a very difficult time; the period of continual
endeavour to link up with modern European
development, although his abilities as statesman
and organizer could not obtain full scope in view
of the special conditions of the times. He was
a statesman of the old school, conservative, but
quite friendly to reforms. To 'Abd al-Hamid he was
a faithful and indispensable councillor and he seems
to have brilliantly succeeded in his aim of gather-
ing all power into his own hands and making the
Yildiz the political centre of gravity to the exclusion
of the Sublime Porte. At all events he is silent in his "Memoirs" regarding his activities as First
Secretary to the Sultan, although the Young Turks
for a time laid special emphasis on his work during
this period. He seems also to have been not un-
connected with the notorious document in defence
of 'Abd al-Hamid's regime by Ahmed Midhat Efendi
(Civîl Ta'kvim and supplement Zâhid-i Hasanî,
1877 and 1878). Except for Ahmed Wâri Paşa,
Sa'id was the only real personality among the
creatures of the Sultan and he was able to retain
the respect and esteem of both friends and opponents.

In a way quite unusual in a Turkish statesman
he laid stress on his pure Turkish blood and on a
specifically Turkish patriotism. He sought to
make as possible to limit the spread of foreign
influence in Turkey although he was regarded as an Anglophile
and progressive. On Dec. 4, 1895, he had to seek
refuge in the British Embassy at Constantinople
to escape an order from the Sultan for his arrest,
until Abd-al-Hamid gave a written guarantee of safety. He spent the next six years, however, in his "hoca" in Niğde, in a retirement which was practically confinement to the house until he was again summoned to power.

During his "English flight" he drew up his scheme for writing his reminiscences, although he could hardly expect to publish such a work during the regime of Abd-al-Hamid.

In spite of many attacks by the court camarilla, among whom he had many opponents, and the open enmity of Paşa, his great antagonist, from 1886 to 1891, he had been able to make himself indispensable; in any situation of particular difficulty they always came back to him, who possessed an unusual degree of energy and an unfailling breadth of vision in matters of policy, in spite of his inquisitive disposition. He never prejudiced himself in the slightest but retired as soon as his own views became too much in contrast to those of the Sultan. As early as 1896 he had had no cause to demand an independent responsible ministry.

At the outbreak of the revolution of 1908 he was summoned by Abd-al-Hamid with the restoration of the constitution. But he settled as soon as the Young Turks demanded an entire change of system and complete breach with the past and handed over the Grand Vizierate to Kemal Paşa. But when the Italian campaign in Tripoli had to be settled and the Balkan War, which had taken an unexpectedly tragic turn as a result of the destruction of the whole organisation of state and army in Turkey by the doctrine of Young Turks, seriously threatened the stability of the Empire, it was again Sa'd who was called upon to save what was still left to save. His power of adaptation was so great that he was now regarded as a Young-Turkish statesman.

In the three sessions of the new parliament he was President of the Senate. In this capacity also he presided over the National Assembly in S. Stefano on April 22, 1909, which declared that the proceedings of the besieging army were in accordance with the wishes of the people, whereupon Abd-al-Hamid was deposed on April 27, 1909.

When the Young-Turk party came to political power, he became President of the Council of State but later handed over this office to Khalil Bey and retained only the presidency of the Senate, which he had received after the assassination of Mahmut Şevket Paşa in succession to the Albanian Ferid Paşa on June 11, 1913. He was still President when he died after a month's long illness at the age of 76.

Sa'id is probably the first Turkish statesman who left his memoirs, a work of the first historical importance. It was published in 3 volumes in Constantinople (1828) under the title Sa'id Paşahînî Kâhiyânî, but this does not seem to be complete. The circumstances of the time prevented these reminiscences being fully utilised; although biased in many directions, they form documentary material of inestimable value for contemporary history and were published to defend his policy, when he took refuge in pecuniary poverty. Only Kemal Paşa, whom he exposed more than any other of his opponents (d. Nov. 14, 1913 at Larnaca in Cyprus), at once replied in his pamphlet A'mmîl Paşahînî Ayân Nâsîlî Sâid Paşahînî Qayyûlî, and ed., Constantinople 1328, and followed this up with his own memoirs, Sâid-i Âlâî Kâmil Paşahînî Kâhiyânî, Constantinople 1339; Turhalî siyâsî-i Dînîlî âdîn. Zihni Paşa also replied ("Presentation of the Truth"), Constantinople 1327.

Bibliography: In addition to the works already mentioned, especially the memoirs and letters of Sa'id Paşa, see N. M. M., 1908, v. 733, from the İhâmi of July 24, 1908; Hercule Diamantopulo, Le Réveil de la Turquie, Alexandrie n. d., p. 94,312 (Hommèl-Festschrift, v. 11); M. Djihan, Weltk. Östliche Späte, Constantinople 1334; the respective years of Schultess's Europ. Geschichtsblecher, Munich; passim in Mehemd Murâd, Le Palais de Vilâyât et la Sublime Porte, Paris 1895; Paul Feuch, Constantinople aus dem letzten Jahr d'Abdul Hamid, Paris 1907; Siex, Geschichte des Machtnachteils der Türken, Vienna 1908; Paul Eyel, Histoire politique de l'organisation seljoukides, Paris 1914; W. Feltmann, Kriegstage in Konstantinopel, Strassburg 1913; Snouch Harghorne, Verspr. Geschicht, ll. 337, 337.

Sâ'D PASHA, Viceroy (Kâdîîve) of Egypt from 1854 to 1855. Muhammed Sa'id, youngest son of Muhammed Alî Paşa, was born in 1822. His father had a very high opinion of this, his fourth, son whom he sent when only 19 to Constantinople to conduct negotiations regarding the tribute to be paid by Egypt.

Sa'id, who was francophile, was not on good terms with his nephew and predecessor, 'Abdulla (q.v.). The latter had done everything possible to induce the Porte to alter the law of succession formulated by the Sultan's firmâna in favour of Muhammed Alî and to secure the succession in direct line for his own descendants by abolishing the law by which the eldest living descendant of the founder of the dynasty was always called to succeed to the throne. Sa'id would thus have been excluded but 'Abdulla died before he could realise his project. By an intrigue, however, the death of 'Abdulla was kept secret for a week and it was only then that Sa'id was able to enforce his claim to the throne (July, 1854).

Sa'id was a well-intentioned prince and quite popular, although he had not the energy of his father, perhaps on account of his indifferent health. In November, 1856, he created a kind of Council of State, composed of princes of the blood, four generals and four high dignitaries. He relaxed the extreme centralisation of the administration instituted by Muhammed Alî and contributed considerably to relieve the economic position of the people by promulgating an agrarian law which granted all the subjects the right henceforth to own landed property and to dispose of it freely (1858). It was he who first attempted to abolish the trade in negro-slaves (visits to Khartum in 1857). In the reign of Sa'id as in that of his predecessor the policy of expansion southwards was not continued. The Sudan received certain privileges and prince Halîm in appointed governor. Sa'id kept up the Egyptian contingent of 18,000 men which 'Abdulla had sent to reinforce the Turkish army in the Crimean War and he also allowed a regiment of falâtnî to take part in an expedition sent by Napoleon III to Mexico. By making it, however,
the division into paganaries, which they called 
ērā's, a transcription of the Greek ξώρα. Upper 
Egypt corresponded to the dechies of Arcadia 
and the Thessal, a memory of which is still 
retained in the division of the Ṣud into a'īs (Upper) 
and adīb (Lower); Yāsīt even makes three 
divisions: Ẓal'īd a'īs from Assuan to Aḥshum, 
an intermediate region stretching northwards as 
far as Bahmasūt and the Ḥaštīt adīb which 
stretcht to Fīrsāt. As a matter of fact there were three 
yladantine dechies, of which two were in the Thebäi, 
and the frontier between the latter lay south of 
Panopolis (Aḥshum).

If we compare the layout of the nārū's preserved 
by al-Maqrūzī with that of the paganaries given 
by Hierocles, we find that the alterations are 
quite insignificant. In course of time certain towns 
fell into decay and gave place to younger ones; 
for example Philai which became supplanted by 
Assuan. An administrative redistribution took place 
under the Fātimids. They introduced a division 
into large provinces (ṣīlah) which has survived 
to this day in its main lines to the present day; of 
ten provinces of the Fātimids, the Ayyūbids and 
the Mamluks, corresponded to the eight marditeriyā's of 
to-day. The most notable differences were the 
following: the provinces of Aṭṭī'iyya and of Hūs 
sirya combined into one province from the Mamluki 
period under the name of Aṭṭī'iyya have given 
place to the marditeriyā of Bani Ṣa'bī. Minya has 
 succeeded to Bahmasūt, now an insignificant town. 
The former districts of Ašāmatān and Man풀āt (the latter intermittently) have gone to increase 
the province of Aṣyūt. In the south we still find 
the two mediæval subdivisions but their capitals have 
been removed from Aḥshum and Kūt to Gīrgā and Kenīs. On account of the frequent 
Nubian invasions, Assuan down to the end of the 
Mamliik period was considered as a limen (thargh) 
without administrative autonomy, being under the 
governor of the province of Kūt, whose authority 
extended eastwards as far as Aṣhāb. The Oasis 
sometimes formed an independent province and 
sometimes were administered by officers who held 
them as ḫāʾif (as part salary).

Although we find under the Fātimids the title 
ʾal-Sād al-ālā'ī, we cannot say with certainty 
that the reference is not to the governor of the province of Kūt, which was in the middle ages 
the most important in Upper Egypt. It is certain, 
on the other hand, that under the Mamluks the 
various provincial governors were under a gover-
nor-general of Upper Egypt called at first ʿl-khākh 
al-ʿarkīf al-ālā'ī, then ʾaḥā ṣar al-reṣāla when 
Barḫās took office the chief of al-ʿārāf, al-Kāliqānī gives the following account of the administration of Upper Egypt at 
the beginning of the ninetieth century: two governors of different ranks shared the authority there; 
alongside of the aḥāf, who administered the Nile 
valley, there was a ʿl-khākh, who governed the Faiyum and the province of Bahmasūt, the latter having at 
its head a ṣarīf. Below the aḥāf, who lived at 
Aṣyūt, there were three governors of the first 
class, at Aṣhāmatān, Kūt and Aḥshum, and three of 
the second class, at Gīrgā, Aṭṭī'iyya and Man풀āt.

Under Turkish administration Upper Egypt comprised 24 kağīflik, a list of which is given us 
by Vaneehelen.

The population of Egypt has almost doubled in 
the last 35 years;
development has been improved in recent years by the construction of the barrages of Assuan, Esna and Asyûf which allow more perfect use to be made of the waters of the Nile. Industry is almost non-existent here and here again we have a contrast with the prosperity in the middle ages. The looms (wool for clothes and carpets, cotton, silk and linen) were then extremely numerous: we may mention those of al-Ashmûnîn, Akhîm, Asyûf and Bahnaîs.

Muḥammad ʾal-Ḥârî art is poorly represented in Upper Egypt: at Madīnat al-Fâyiym, Asyûf and Gîrgî, however, we find mosques with a certain amount of character. We must also mention the mosques of al-Bâb and Bilîl, south of Assuan, built of unbaked bricks which have a minaret surrounded by a small dome — a fairly frequent type in this region even in the villages (e.g. Ḥaḥîrît, south of Kûsâ). The Fâyiym minbars of Kûsâ and Bahnaîs should not be omitted. As toigraphy, Asyûf, Kûsâ and Sohag have preserved Kifîc inscriptions and we find Mamliq decrees at Edâfî, Minya, Madīnat al-Fâyiym, Asyûf, Sohag, Kûsâ and Kûsîyâ. This is not the place to enumerate the monuments of ancient Egypt: it is sufficient to say that the Arab authors describe the temples in their fashion and have localised here a series of legends. We may note, however, that they paid no attention to the buildings of Thebes-Carnac and that in compensation we have a fine description of the temple of Akhîm, destroyed in the xth century.

Djâfar Dafûwî, a writer of the viii<sup>th</sup> century A.H., composed a dictionary of famous men of Upper Egypt, preceded by a brief geographical summary, the Tâlî al-Šaʿîd (publ. in Cairo 1333 = 1914); its interest is not great. In the domain of folklore, we may quote the stories of Ibn al-Ḥawâdî at Assuan, of Abu al-Ḥâdîjî at Ḭârîî, of the princess of China at Gîrgî, to which we may add the legend of the serpent of the Ḫâbîl Harîh.

Without going into details, the following is a rapid enumeration of the main historical facts relating to Upper Egypt. The conquest of Egypt by the Arabs became an established fact after the fall of Babylon and Alexandria. Al-Balādîrî mentions tentacles made with certain towns of Middle Egypt. The Arabs seem to have taken no notice of the Fâyiym for some time and their advance towards this region must have been impeded by very heavy fighting which gave rise to the historical novel, the Fâṣîh al-Bahnaîs. In 634 (644) there was an unsuccessful invasion of Nubia which was resumed in 667 (656) and concluded in 51 (652) by an advantageous treaty, which ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz renewed in 100 (719). A census of the population was taken in 722 (730); the governor of Egypt, al-Walîd ibn Rûkh, took charge of this person and conducted a six months' tour of inspection of Upper Egypt as far as Assuan and we possess a papyrus containing his instructions. During the Umayyad period, the Saʿîd seems to have enjoyed more peace than the Delta which was often agitated by risings; one is noted for 711 (730). It was in Upper Egypt that the Umayyad dynasty collapsed in the person of its last Caliph, Marwânî, There was a rising of the Umayyad pretender Dîrîya ibn Muḥîb who became master of the whole of the Saʿîd in 167 (784); he was defeated and put to death in 169 (785); Upper Egypt felt the consequences — though less than the
Delta — of the struggle between al-Amin and al-Ma'mun. There was a rising of the Bedja in 841 (1853) and a successful expedition against them under Muhammad al-Kummi. Some years later 'Abdallah al-Umar invaded the gold-mining area and ultimately declared himself independent there; he was put to death but the contingents of the Rabi'a which he had taken there remained amalgamated with the Bedja. In 256 (870) there was an unsuccessful rising led by Ibn al-Saff at Eṣn and Akhmin. In 308 (920) a Fātimid invasion; fighting at al-Ashmaitain and Bahuau. The king of Nubia invaded the oasis in 339 (950), took Assuan in 345 (956) and in a third expedition in 353 (964) advanced as far as Akhmin. Towards the end of the 14th century, Abu Rakwa rose against the Caliph al-Hākīm. Order was disturbed after the great dearth in the reign of al-Mustansir: Badr al-Djamālī set out in person for Upper Egypt to re-establish peace (inscriptions at Asyūt and Eṣn). Towards the end of the Fātimid period, several state men, like Ta'īn ibn Rustāk and Shawkār, used their apprenticeship to political life in Upper Egypt, and they fought against Shawkār, who was assisted by a body of Franks, that Shirkūth fought the battle of al-Başia near al-Ashmaitain. This region continued to be much disturbed by Fātimid propaganda, which was kept up in the extreme south by the Banu 'l-Kanz. Saladin subjected them in 568 (1173) sending his brother Türān Shah against them, who advanced as far as Ibrīm. Other risings were crushed with great severity in 570 (1174) and in 572 (1176). There was a very serious rebellion in the whole of the land in 651 (1253), led by an important individual, the Shārīf Ḥṣān al-Dīn Thā'rib, which was an episode in the struggle between the Arab tribes and the Mamluk government. In 671 (1273) and in 674 (1275) Ba'bars intervened in the domestic affairs of Nubia and sent an army which reached Dongola, which was again occupied by a second expedition in 686 (1287). Upper Egypt in 701 (1302) suffered from the brigandage of the Arab tribes which necessitated the despatch of a powerful force against them. They were suppressed in a most bloody fashion. During the anti-Christian movement of 721 (1321) churches were destroyed in the provinces of Ṭabīb and Bahuau, at Minya, Asyūt, Khūr and Assuan. Violent disturbances are again mentioned in 815 (1412), mainly at Assuan, and again in 825 (1422). The reign of ʿAbīl-Bey was filled with risings by the Hawwāra tribe which it took three years to subdue (883-884 = 1476-1478). As to the events after the Turkish conquest and especially the rising of ʿAbīl Bey and the French occupation, information will be found in the European travellers and historians.


SAI'DA, a town in Algeria (department of Oran), 110 miles from Oran and 60 miles S.S.E. of Mascara, 2900 feet above sea-level, on the Wādi Saida, a branch of the Habra, in a fertile and well-watered country, suitable for the cultivation of cereals and vines. Population: 12,312 inhabitants of whom 5,410 are Europeans. Saida is the chief town of a mixed commune of 42,469 inhabitants of whom 39,500 are natives.

Owing to its position on the very edge of the high plateaux, Saida has always been of considerable military importance. There was a Roman station here. 'Abd al-Ḳādir built a fortress here in order to control the nomad tribes of the district, but it destroyed on the approach of the French in 1841. In 1844 General Lamoricière, struck by the advantages of this position, built a stronghold 1/4 miles north of the Saida of 'Abd al-Ḳādir, around which the modern town has grown up. (G. Veyer)

SAI'DA. [See Sidos.]

SAIF b. DHİ YAZAN, of the Ḥimyarite royal line, played a part in Arabic history in the expulsion of the Abyssinians from South Arabia, where they had held sway since the time of Dhī Nawās. Native tradition records that he first sought assistance against the foreign yoke of the Abyssinians at the Byzantine court and later at the court of the Persian Khusraw. The latter, however, would not risk anything in an enterprise with such hopeless prospects; so he only gave Saif a number of criminals out of the jails under a leader named Wahriz to assist him. The Abyssinians under Mawṣīk were defeated and driven out of the country by them and Saif's countrymen who rose against the foreign yoke, whereupon Saif was installed by the Persians as king. From this tradition and several Arabic poems relating to the story there results as a certain historical fact that Saif b. Dhī Yazen conquered the Abyssinians with the help of the Persian king Khusraw Anāshirwān, broke their rule over Yemen and held sway over the land of his ancestors under a Persian protectorate. His victory over the Abyssinians may be dated about 570 a.d. The victory over the Abyssinians is wrongly ascribed not to Saif himself but to his son Mawṣīk.

That South Arabian history and with it the story of Saif b. Dhī Yazen was studied and transmitted among the Muslims from the beginning of the Islamic period onwards we know from certain sources. It is therefore no wonder that Saif b. Dhī Yazen found a place in the Arab saga on account of his successful struggle with the Abyssinians, who in the period of Islam particularly became dangerous and lasting enemies to the new international movement starting in Arabia. In the romance which bears his name, the Strait Saif b. Dhī Yazen, the war between the Muslim Arabs and the pagan negroes and Abyssinians occupies considerable space. The king of the latter, whose conflict with Saif b. Dhī Yazen runs almost throughout the book and forms a considerable part of the subject matter, gives us a clue to the date of origin of the Sira. He is called Saif Ar'ad and corresponds to the Ethiopian king Saif Ar'ad whom we know from history and who reigned in
Abyssinia from 1344–72. From this reference we may deduce with considerable certainty that the existing versions of the Sira date from about the 14th century, in any case not earlier than the end of the 16th century. The rest of the positive and negative data agree with this, while telling practically nothing separately and having only some value when taken cumulatively; among them are several clearly discernible borrowings from the cycle of the 1001 Nights. It does not, of course, follow that the whole romance arose at this time; individual parts may very well have been composed and put into circulation earlier. The place of origin of the Sira is Egypt, to be more definite Cairo. This is clear from the many personal and place-names which all point to localisation mainly in Egypt and in part even presuppose an accurate knowledge of its topography. This statement is not invalidated by the occurrence of a few place-names from Damascus and its neighbourhood.

As regards contents also, Egypt is the most satisfactory place of origin of the romance; the strong undercurrent of superstition and belief in the marvellous is perhaps also an indication of an African birthplace for the romance.

The contents of the book are in keeping with the fact that it was composed and related, if not by the people, at least for them. It is therefore easily explained why we find alongside the good Muslim general tendency so many ideas which are rather to be described as pagan, and which can only with difficulty and superficially be brought into harmony with Muslim principles. The new religion of Islam did not by any means penetrate so quickly or thoroughly among the masses as among the educated classes, whose intellectual sustenance was for the most part confined to a science and literature permeated to a great degree by Islam; among the masses the old beliefs and customs did not have any counterpart great enough to have driven them out. As has already been mentioned, in the Sira Saif is a great part played by the war of the Muslim Arabs against the pagan Abyssinians and negroes. As it is composed to be known by every one that the hero of the struggle, Saif b. Dhi Yazan, lived in the pre-Islamic period, he has first of all to be transformed into a warlike predecessor of Muham- mad and a professing Muslim. The generally accepted possibility of obtaining a glimpse into the future by magic oracles, dreams, etc., and by the guidance of pious sheikhs, disposes of the difficulty. Saif, like his father Dhi Yazan before him, becomes convinced of the truth of Islam before Muhammad's coming and is won over to the new religion. In his struggle mainly directed against the Abyssinians and negroes the antagonism of race now gives place to that of religion. On his many wanderings and campaigns in the lands of men and djinns he spreads by force the religion of Islam, often with the support of helpful spirits. As Muhammad has not yet appeared, in place of his name in the profession of faith we find that of Ibrāhim, the ‘Abdul-Azīz. The campaigns thus are no longer waged for the satisfaction of the ambitions of Saif and the Arabs but with the object of gaining recognition for the unity of Allāh and his ‘friendship’ with Ibrāhim. As soon as the Muslim enemies satisfy this demand by repeating the profession of faith, they are accepted into the Muslim community. The superiority of the Semitic over the Hamitic race is, of course, not thereby done away with. It is the South Arabian in particular and in them the alleged ancestors of the later Muslims of Egypt, who have the honourable task of preparing the way for the last and greatest prophet, while the Abyssinians and negroes either remain in their ancient paganism and thus show themselves unworthy of Islam or with their adoption of Islam play a passive rather than an active role in the religious movement. It is further remarkable that in the whole romance there is not the slightest trace of the Abyssinians professing Christianity. While the worship of Saturn is ascribed to them, the other non-Muslim religions are traced back to the worship of fire, of idols, rulers claiming divine worship, and of different animals (a ram, an ostrich, cows, bugs, hens). Many of these notions may have originated in the unlimited fancy of the narrators; but in part at least vague memories of the old Egyptian mythology may have crept in. The mention of fire-worship points to the old Egyptian religion. A knowledge of Christianity gleams through only in the mention of crosses, sometimes of stones which are worshipped and at which oaths are taken. The motives of the Sira are not exhausted with the stories of the spread of Islam. The common people are also interested in profane history and in stories of events with as much action as possible. Thus in the romance we find stories of the origins of famous towns, places and buildings, of the bringing of the river Nile into Egypt etc. We further find an account of the many travels and adventures which Saif b. Dhi Yazan and his sons, paladins and spirits have to go through, of the love affairs of Saif and others which continually appear in the guise of the splendorous buildings, regal and men which are described to the hearers and of much else. The imagination that is called upon to arouse the astonishment of the public becomes unbounded towards the end of the Sira, as the extraordinary is in the end no longer effective and must be surpassed again. Considerable space is further taken up as already mentioned — by magic and superstition and all connected with it. Mention is very often made of divination by sand to ascertain the unknown past, present and future. Purely magical also is the oft recurring idea that from the act of Saif's marriage with his first wife Shina the destruction of the Abyssinians and negroes will result, and the latter therefore endeavour to prevent the marriage at any cost. Numerous are the magic treasures mentioned in the course of the story, the possession of which assures wonderful powers or control over powerful spirits. Dangerous magicians form the greatest obstacles to the spread of Islam. Their power is not denied, only they are weaker than their colleagues on the Muslim side, and if this is not the case, ‘al-Khaldīn, the helper of the Muslims in need, takes up the cause of those commended to his charge and overcomes the powerful magicians. When they are converted, their activities do not cease, but they place all their skill and knowledge at the disposal of the new religion. Belief in spirits is exceedingly prominent in the Sira. Endless troops of djinns of all classes fight for or against Islam. They are in much closer relationship with men than in the period after Muhammad's preaching and constitute a considerable if not the greatest part of Saif's followers. If we were to cut out of the Sira all the passages that deal with or are
connected with spirits or magic, we should have barely half of left.

Taken all in all, the Strat. Saif b. Dhi Yazan gives a faithful picture of the popular mind in Muslim Egypt at the end of the middle ages and forms therefore a valuable source for the history of Islam in its widest sense.


(R. Paret)

**SAIF B. 'UMAR Al-ASAIH Al-TAMLIT, an Arab historian, who, according to the *Phíkrít* (ed. Flügel, i. 94), composed two books: Kithb al-'Anfús al-Khāhir wa l-Ridda and Kithb al-Hambāl wa-Maqā'ir 'Arab allātī. Neither of these books has survived to our time. Al-Tabari, however, was still able to use Saif as principal authority for the period of the Ridda and the early conquests (ed. Goeje, i. 1794–3255) i.e. from 11–36 A. H. A fairly full discussion of Saif's value as a historian is given by Wellhausen, *Bibl. und Vorderasien,* vi. 3–7. He is not favourable to Saif. Although he impresses us by the wealth of his details, it is evident from a comparison of his data with those of other Arab historians and with the Christian chroniclers that his *Itār* tradition is less reliable than that of the *Ridżār.* Cahtani makes a critical use of the fragments of Saif in the course of his *Annals,* indices to vols. iii., iv. and v., v. Saif b. 'Umar.

**Bibliography:** see the references in the article; cf. also Brockelmann, *Gesch. der arab. Litt.*, i. 516.

**SAIF AL-DIVALWA, Abu 'l-HASSAN 'Ali b. HAMĐANS,* the most important ruler of the Hamdání dynasty, lord of Aleppo, famous for his military activities, his struggle with the Greeks and the protection which he gave to scholars; he was born in 303 (915/16) or perhaps in 301. He was the grandson of Hamdán, who owned the fortress of Mardin and rebelled against the Caliph al-Mu'tasid in 281. His father Abu 'l-Haidjā in 302 received the governorship of Mawṣil and of Mekopotamia from the Caliph al-Muqtadir, he fought against the Karmášān in 315 and saved Baghdad by having the bridge of al-Anbār destroyed. His power increased under al-Kahidj; he perished during the troubles in Baghdad in the course of which the Caliph was deposed.

Abu 'l-Hassan 'Ali at first owned Wasiq and the country round it; his eldest brother held Mawṣil. In 330, under al-Muttaqī, these princes took part in the murder of Ibn Raḥf, who was entitled Amir al-Umrān; the Caliph then gave this rank to the prince of Mawṣil; he gave him the surname of Naṣir al-Divalwa and to his brother 'Ali that of Saif al-Divalwa. Naṣir al-Divalwa, Naṣir al-Divalwa only held the office of Amir al-Umrān for thirteen months in Baghdad; he was dispossessed of it by the Turk Turks. The situation of the Caliphate was then very precarious and the empire divided into numerous factions. The Caliph, wishing to escape from the tutelage of Taṭān, asked for the protection of the Hamdání princes. He took refuge with his harem and all his court at Mawṣil and went from there to al-Raṣid in 332. Taṭān begged him to return to his capital and made him promises of loyalty. The Caliph consented against the advice of Saif al-Divalwa; but hardly had he reached the neighbourhood of Baghdad than he was seized by Taṭān, who deposed and blinded him in 333. The Caliph's stay with the Hamdání princes had cost them enormous sums.

The same year Saif al-Divalwa took Aleppo from a lieutenant of al-Ikhdāḥī, who was ruler of Egypt. The latter sent against him an army commanded by Kāfūr: Saif al-Divalwa met this army near Ḥims and then besieged: but did not take Damascus. In the following year 334, al-Ikhdāḥī having died, he attacked Damascus, Kāfūr, the negro eunuch, went back to Egypt. Saif al-Divalwa seized the opportunity to attack Damascus again, which he captured. He then advanced on Egypt, took Ramla, but encountered the Egyptian forces, which defeated him on the Jordan. A peace was concluded between him and the Ikhdāḥīs; the Hamdání prince retained Aleppo and the Egyptian promises of loyalty.

In 337, Saif al-Divalwa carried war into the land of Rūm and from this date till his death, a period of nearly twenty years, never a year passed without his invading Greek territory or fighting some battle with the Greeks. He was defeated this year; the Byzantines took Marqāsh and massacred the inhabitants of Tarsūs. In 339 he advanced a considerable distance into the land of Rūm, captured several strongholds and great booty; but as he returned, the Greeks closed the passes against him and regained the baggage and prisoners they had lost. Saif al-Divalwa, with a few companions, succeeded in escaping (al-Maṣṣūs expedition). In 342, he took the field against the Praetorian-prefect Barros Focas, who had collected a large army which included Russians, Bulgars and Khazars, and defeated him outside Marqāsh. He captured Constantine, son of Focas, and brought him to Aleppo. The latter died in captivity. By this and al-Divalwa the Christians gave him a magnificent funeral. In 343, Saif al-Divalwa again defeated Focas near the castle of al-Hadāth, which he rebuilt. This fortress was destroyed again three years later. In 347, the Greeks Basili and Yānis, sons of Tsalmatis, captured Sumāsāt and inflicted a severe defeat on Saif al-Divalwa near Aleppo. Seventeen hundred Muslim homen men were taken captive to Constantinople.

In the same year, Saif al-Divalwa arranged a peace between his brother, Naṣir al-Divalwa, and the Būyids who had taken Mawṣil. He guaranteed them the payment of an annual tribute and kept Mawṣil for his family along with Raḥfa and Diyyār Bahrā.

In 351, Nicephoros, now Praetorian-prefect, advanced on Aleppo with 200,000 men; a battle was fought near the town before the gate of the Jews, in which Saif al-Divalwa was defeated. The town was captured, except the citadel, which held out, defended by Dailamites. The Greeks took 1,250 prisoners, whom they put to death at once, ravaged the country, plundered and destroyed the palace of Saif al-Divalwa which lay outside the town; after a week they retired.

Next year Saif al-Divalwa was paralysed in hand
and foot. Nevertheless he continued to fight the Greeks and defeated them, notably in the vicinity of Aleppo, to which they had returned in 353. In 355 he presided over an important exchange of prisoners on the banks of the Euphrates. He died at Aleppo in 356 of retention of the urine. His body was brought to Mayyafürkün and buried in the turbe of his mother outside the town. He had given orders for a brick made of soil that he had won in his campaigns to be placed under his head in his coffin.

Saïf al-Dawla was a strong-minded prince, little liking advice, but brave, generous and eloquent; like other members of his family he was a poet. Abu 'l-Mahasin and Ibn Khalilik quote a delicate little poem on the rainbow by him, which gives a very high idea of his talents. He surrounded himself with poets and scholars. The most celebrated are the poetical prince al-Mutanabbi, who was his panegyrist and afterwards that of Kâfur, and al-Farabi, the great philosopher and musician, who died while accompanying him on a journey to Damascus. The author of the "Book of Songs" (Kitâb al-Aghâni) dedicated to him the autograph manuscript of this celebrated work.


(B. CARRA DE VAUX)

SAÏF AL-DAWLA. [See SADDAK B. MANSUR.] SAÏF AL-DIN AL-BâKHRÂZI. Abu 'l-Mâ'rani Shâhî; Sa'd al-Dîn Sa'd b. Muqaffar al-Bâkhrâzi, a native of the Bâkhrâz district between Nishapur and Herât (Le Strange, Limits of the Eastern Caliphate, Cambridge 1905, p. 337). After having finished his studies, he joined the great Saïf Nadîm al-Dîn Kubrâ at Khânâyân. The latter after interrupting Saïf's second retreat (arbâ'în) sent him to Bâkhrâz as shâhi. Al-Bâkhrâz occupies an important place among the shâhis of Nadîm al-Dîn Kubrâ; he lived for a considerable time in Bâkhrâz where he attained great fame and gathered round him a large number of disciples; he even took the surname of Shâhi 'Alam. The mother of the Mongol emperor Mangi Bâgh, Sirkhâsty Biki (or Sirkhakshisti Biki, according to Blochet) (d. in Abu 'l-Hidâyi, 649 = Febr. March, 1252; see Turbîh-î Bâkhrâzshâh, ed. Gibb Mem. Series, ii. 256), had, during her son's reign, given 1,000,000 dirhams of silver to build a madrasa at Bâkhrâz and had entrusted its administration to Saïf al-Dîn al-Bâkhrâzi (Howorth, History of the Mongols, London 1876, i. 188). This shows the fame of the Shâhî in his life-time, just as some anecdotes in the Nafaqot al-Dîn testify that he was an object of veneration on the part of the great men and princes of his time. Well-known Saïf's of the period, like Khâlid Bâgir and Hassen al-Bulgâr, showed him respect (al-Kâfi, Râshîdî, 'Alî al-Hayyât, Turkish transl., p. 37–38). His mystic Persian quatrains are very popular among the dervishes. The death of the Shâhî, according to the most probable tradition, took place in 658 (1260/61). His tomb is at Bâkhrâz, at Fastâshâd, the place where his madrasa is situated. His poems are preserved in several manuscript collections: 51 of his quatrains have been published in the Z. D. M. G., 1905, lxxx. 345–354 by S. Khuda Bakhsh.

This monastery of the Shâhî in the suburb of Fastâshâd remained famous for centuries. His descendants have held the rank of shâhî, Ibn Bâghtî, who visited the zâdâr in the eighth century A. H., found as Shâhî there Yâhâyâ al-Bâkhrâzi, grandson of Saïf al-Dîn, and relates that a repast was prepared for him at which the principal inhabitants of the town gathered together; and Turkish and Persian songs were recited in addition to the recitation of the Korân and sermons. A Persian writer who visited Bâghtîrâ in 316 (1098/9) says that the tomb and the monastery of the Shâhî are half a farshâ from the Karshî gate (ed. the article Bâghtîrâ) and face the east, and that the zâdâ and the monument were built in 788 (1385) by order of Timûr, and ornamented with tiles of precious faience; since then, however, these tiles have been sold, and he adds that the descendants of the Shâhî are buried there along with the calligrapher Mîr 'Alt. The tradition of the Yasawîs, according to which Saïf al-Dîn al-Bâkhrâzi was a follower of Ahmad al-Yasawî, is contradicted by historical facts.


(KÖPPPEL ZADE FRÂ'ID)

SAÏF AL-DIN GHÂZI. [See GHÂZI.]

SAÏFî, Mawliânâ, of Bâghtîrâ, is also known as 'Arîdî, "the Prosodist," from his work 'Arîdî-Saïfî. Little is known of his life, but he lived for many years at Hîrât, at the courts of the Timûrids, Sulţân Âbî Sa'id (1459–1469), great-grandson of Timûr and grandfather of Bâbûr, and Abu 'l-Ghazi Sulţân Husîn Mirâz (1472–1506), great-grandson of Timûr's second son, 'Umar Shâhi Mirâz. As a poet he was of little consideration, and his poems are trivial. His fame rests on his work 'Arîdî-Saïfî, ed. Blochmann, Calcutta 1867 ("Saïf's Prosody"), also known as 'Arîdî-Khazâ (the ample sufficient Prosody) and Mirâz al-Aqfâr (the Measure of Poems), written, as he tells us, to supply the want of a work on an art which was a favourite subject of discussion between him and his friends. The poet Dîjân had already written on this subject, but Saïf's work is the fuller and more detailed of the two, and is one of the best works on Persian prosody which we have. Saïf died in 1504.

2. Saïf was also the 'âkhâshâ or pen-name of
a poet of Nightyar, the encomiast of Takāž Khan, Khwārezm Shah.

**Biographies**: Dastūrshī, Taḥṭīšārīs al-
Shārī, ed. E. G. Browne (London 1901);
Lutf 'Alī b. Ābā Khan, 'Aṣīqkān, MSS.; Ḥādiqī
Khāliṣa, Kāṭīf al-Zāmahā, ed. Fluenzel, ill. 419;
Rīv, Cat. of the Persian Manuscr., in the Brit.
Museum, ill. 528.\(^2\)

(T. W. HAO)

**SĀIḤĀN**, one of the larger mountain rivers in the south-east of Asia Minor, the Saros of the ancients. It rises on the Kōramān Dasht far not from Kāsārīya (cf. Mehmēd Edīd, Manāṣī al-Ḥadījī, Stambuli 1312, p. 41; also al-Maṣūdī in the B.G.A., viii. 58, 22 qv. 183, 23 qv.*
*\(\text{at the town of Saiḥān ... not far from Malāyā)*), enters the Cilician plain of Adana, which lies on its bank, whence it makes straight for the sea, receiving a number of tributaries on its way; it enters the sea by several mouths (the Cēfīta Suri of the ancients below Tarsus. On the course of the river which remained for long uninvestigated see Tsch-
batschew, Aitie Mināte, i. 293-299, and C. Ritter,
*Kokinasion*, i. 133. The name Saiḥān is most probably, like the name of the neighbouring river, Ezištān, of Cilician origin (cf. Noldeke in the Z.D.M.G. alliv. 700), an assimilation to the Muslim names of the two Central Asian rivers Osus and Jaxartes. The Saiḥān was considered one of the rivers of Paradise (cf. al-Maṣūdī, ed. Paris, ii. 538 sqq., B.G.A., vii. 205: Yakūt, i. 179, ii. 82, iv. 558, 579; al-Iṣṭākhūrī, B.G.A., i. 63, 64; Ibn Hāwkal, B.G.A., ii. 122; al-Baladī, ed. de Goeje, p. 165, 166, 168). Under the Umayyads it was one of the rivers on the frontier against the Byzantine empire, at which prisoners taken during the Arab wars of conquest were ransomed. There was a famous bridge over the Saiḥān between al-
Maṣīqya and Adana called Diyar al-Walīd, which dated from the time of Justinian and was renovated in 125 (743) and again in 225 (840) (cf. G. Le Strange, *The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, Cambridge 1905, p. 131 sqq.). See also the article DAIḤĀN.

**Bibliography**: Abu 'l-Fida', Taḥfūn al-
Būdān, ed. Renan, p. 50; al-Dinārā, Nihāḥat al-Dahr, ed. Mehren, p. 107, 214 (important);
Bello Persico*, vol. i. 17 (ed. Bonn, i. 84) 

Ch. Teixier, *Voyage sur les eaux sacrées*, ii. 40-44; Ritter, *Klima-

**SĀIḤĀN**. [See *Śir Darya*].

**SĀIMARA**. [See *Simeere*].

**ṢĀIN-KAL'A**, a little town and district in southern Khazarbājān, on the right bank of the Djiḡāhān. In the south the boundary runs a little over the river Sārū, a tributary of the river of the Djiḡāhān. In the north it is bounded by the desert of Adjār, in the east by the province of Khamseh. The name is derived from the Mongol *ṣain* = good.

*Population*: The Turkish Afsahr tribe, of which a part had to emigrate to Ermiya to make room for the Čardawī (Cdawīli) tribe of Lur origin (the district of Čardawī in the Seimeere) whom Fath 'Alī Shah brought from Shurbā at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The chief of the Cdawī lives at Mahūmdīk and commands about 5,000 men. The town of Ṣain-Kala has about 2,500—3,500 inhabitants and a small bazaar. In 1830 it was destroyed by a Kurdish invasion under Shāh Ḥabīdālāsh. Ṣain-Kala, formerly occupied by a Persian garrison, guarded the entrance to Adharbudjan through the Djiḡāhān valley. The caves of Kereslī with a Greek in-
scription described by Ker Porter (Travel, ii. 535-551; Ritter, fa. 501, as well as the site of *Aḥkāl Sulaimān* (the ancient Gazaka; al-Sha of the Arabs; cf. Marquart, *Erzähler*, p. 108) are in the territory of the Afsahrs of Ṣain-Kala. The lake of Çami Göl (near the village of Bādeh) with a floating island is likewise well known. A section of the Afsahrs belong to the Aḥl Ḥāk' sect (cf. the article *Aḥl Ḥāk*) the local chiefs of whom in Bant's time lived at Nanar-hāla and Gendžālāh (cf. V. Minorsky, *Notes sur la secte des Aḥl Ḥāk*), (R.M.M., 1920, x. 19-97; reprint of the R.M.M., 1922, p. 53. 76).

Another fortress of the same name on the river Alhar, east of Suljuqīya, and mentioned in the fourteenth century by Mustawīl (see Le Strange, *The Lands of the East Caliphate*, p. 223) should not be confused with this Ṣain-Kala.


lungen*, 1905, p. 33 (with a map of the district and indications of its mineral wealth); Jackson, *Persia Past and Present*, p. 121 sqq.

(V. MINORSKY)

**ṢĀĪF**. [See *Ṣāīn*].

**ṢĀĪFĀN** (Ṣ̱īn, S̱wīn, S̱wīn, S̱wīn), a town in Taḥrāmūt in South Arabia on the side of the hill of the same name, four hours' ride from Shībān on the right bank of the Wādī Masfā. The town lies in the centre of luxurious vegetation;
the Ka'bah sect [q.v.]; but not did he expect with them the return of their Imam, Muhammad b. al-Hanafiyya, but held the doctrine of metempsychosis etc. in both forms, belief in the 'Isa (return in human form) and the 'Isa Nhābi (change his animal form). He even proclaimed himself the reincarnation of the Prophet Jonah. His attitude on religious and political questions sometimes forced him to move from Bagra to Kābū, but did not prevent him, after the rise of the 'Abdaids, from offering them poetical tributes also: he enjoyed the favour of al-Mansūr in particular. He also placed his art at the service of provincial governors, e.g. Ali Bu'djair of al-Ahwāz. Poetical talent was hereditary in his family; his grandfather Yasād had been a preacher, who had lashed the governor Ziyād with his lampoons.

He himself was distinguished not only as a prolific composer (over 1,000 kāthās by him are said to have been current among the Banū Ḥashim), but also for the gracefulness of his language. When Abu l-ʿĀshīya, he avoided embellishing his poems with strange words, but aimed rather at being generally understood. With the latter and al-Baghdādī, he is considered the most distinguished of the later poets, but the peculiarity of his political and religious views prevented the wide circulation of his poems, of which not even a Dīwān has survived. He died in the 173 (789).


Buckelman

AL-SĀK, the leg, the thighbone, is used in several senses in Arab geometry: (1) Sāk means the perpendicular of a right-angled triangle; (2) the side of an equilateral triangle. Thus we find in al-Būrānī for example (al-Kūln al-Mārūnī, yūl Mākūla, Ch. 1): mathallathu HBC, al-maṭālāštu saḥī H, H; (3) Sāk means the foot or the leg of a pair of compasses and is then synonymous with rīḍī (foot). This is shown by the following text: And you place the compasses’ foot on the line on the wall which is near the meridian and this span is the curve of the intersection. Here this arc in the compasses in such a way that one of its legs stands in one and the other in the other end of the angle (arc) (Muh. Sīb al-Māridūnī (1493 Cairo), On the calculation of tables for the construction of Monqāf (inclining quadrilaterals) (Oxford MS., Bodl. Lib. II, No. 285, fol. 26, 70). (4) The Western Arab astronomer Abu l-Ḥasan ʿAlī al-Murāshī (c. 1260 in Morocco) speaks in his Dīwān al-Mawla ʿul-Māliqī (transl. by J. J. Sedillot and published by L. Am. Sedillot under the title: Tractés des instruments & phénomènes des Arabes, Paris 1834—35, p. 446) of a Sāk al-nūrūd (locus-leg) and means by this an hour-line traced in the plane by a cylinder, whose course in the plane has some resemblance to the shape of a locust’s leg. (5) In names of constellations we also find the word Sāk used to name a star, in the leg of an animal (or man), e.g. Sāk
disastrously in the catastrophe of Simancas and Alhama and the pursuit of the Muslim army by the forces of Ramiro II and his allies of the kingdom of Navarre.

'Abd al-Rahmān III's successor, al-Hakam II, allowed the Saqaliba a no less important role in his empire and his indifference to them more arrogant or even insolent conduct did not fail to arouse the wonder of the chroniclers of the reign of this enlightened prince. At his death the Saqaliba felt themselves masters of the situation. According to the author of al-Bayān al-Maghribī, there were then in the palace over a thousand eunuchs and at Cordova a body of Saqaliba guards was entirely at the disposal of two very important individuals, Fātī al-Nisāfī, grand master of the wardrobe, and his assistant Ḫawwārī, grand jeweller and grand falconer. These two Saqaliba eunuchs kept the death of al-Hakam secret and tried to prevent the proclamation of the heir-presumptive, who was still an infant; but they were opposed by the viziers al-Mu'ātha and Ibn ʿĀmir, whose popularity was only increased by punishing them.

Space will not allow me to trace in detail the part played by the Slavs during all the period of the decline of the Umayyad Caliphate of Spain; we find them taking part in all the plots hatched at Cordova, or in the rest of Andalusia, sometimes on the winning side, sometimes on the losing, but showing always the same spirit of initiative, the same ambition and the same despotism; we may mention from among them the eunuch Khaṭrīn who, at the beginning of the eleventh century A.D., was the leader of the Saqaliba party in the capital.

After the end of the Caliphate of Cordova, the Arab historians are much less detailed regarding the political and social role of the Slavs in al-Andalus; but it is probable that the latter, having by now been Muslims for several generations, became absorbed in the rest of the population and lost, along with the memory of their foreign origin, the importance which they had been able to claim in the period of decline of the Umayyads of Spain.


E. LEVI-PROVENÇAL
way. Farther on, towards the north, the Saharya receives on its right bank the Kirmir Su and then taking a sudden turn it runs westwards to Lefke, traversing the wilds of Kutahia and Kudut-wendigdar. At Lefke the Saharya is joined on the left by the Gok Su from Bursa. After Lefke it turns sharply to the north, entering the sandjak of Izmid near Mekejel, having now run 250 miles. The most flourishing part of its course now begins, and we have fine crops of cotton, wheat, vegetables, besides vineyards and the rearing of silkworms. It now runs in a north-easterly direction through the kiad's of Geiva, Ada Basar and Kandere, to enter the Black Sea near Indjiri. The stretch of its course in the sandjak of Izmid is 90 miles; near Ada Basar it receives the waters of the Mudimi Su from Kastamuni on the right bank and of the Caruk Su from Lake Sabandja on the left. 1/4 miles north of Geiva is a bridge of six arches built by Sultan Bayazid I and at Lefke Ewliya Celebi (III. 11) also mentions a fine bridge of wood. The train crosses the river four times between Izmid and Biledek.

The Saharya is the ancient Sangarius (see Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Enzyklopädie, Ser. 2, 1, col. 2259) it has changed its course since the Byzantine period, as is shown by the great bridge built by Justinian over it in 541, which is now two miles from Ada Basar. This bridge is now called Besh Koprs (in classical times Peingeophyra or Pontogophyra; see Ramsay, The Historical Geography of Asia Minor, London 1890, p. 314, 315), but at the present day the river no longer runs below its arches.

The Saharya is not navigable; its lower course is only used for transporting to the Black Sea the wood from the thick forests of the neighbourhood. In prehistoric times the river ran westwards into the Sea of Marmara; the lake of Sabandja and the Gulf of Izmid mark the track of its ancient course. In 909 (1503) Sultan Selim I conceived the idea of re-establishing communication between the Saharya, the lake (the level of which is above that of the river), and the Gulf in order to bring more easily to his capital the wood required for the building of his fleet. Being convinced of the feasibility of the project by the report of experts, he gave orders for its execution but the opponents of the scheme were able to frustrate it by the argument of the rizk-er (Hadjidji Khalifa, Listihannouni, Constantinople 1114, p. 660).

For a period, in the reign of Osman, the Saharya formed the frontier of his territory on the west and south and for his conquests he had to cross the river (for example for the capture of Ak-Jazar in 1368; see 'Abd-Allah Fakhr-ud-Din, Tarikh, Constantinople 1334, p. 12, 24). Since then the Saharya had not played an important part in Ottoman history until the famous battle on the Saharya from Aug. 24 to Sept. 10, 1911, when the Greek army was defeated in a last great effort to reach Angora. By the counter-offensive of Sept. 10, the Greeks were thrown back to the west of the Saharya and forced to take up the line Eski-Shen-Bayaz-Karsa-Jazar. In August, 1922, the Turkish army was victorious for a second time near the Saharya; this was the beginning of the Turkish offensive which ended in the complete reconquest of Anatolia.


AL-SAKINA is a loan-word borrowed from the Hebrew (šeklina). There it signifies the presence of God, in the purely spiritual sense, sometimes made clear by a sign like fire, cloud, or light, which can be appreciated by the senses. Muhammad was apparently not quite clear regarding the true meaning of the word, when he says (Sura ii. 249) that the sakina along with some others was in the sacred ark of the Israelites. Possibly he was associated with this Hebrew loan-word conceptions from pagan demonology; many Kur'ani exegesists at any rate give here quite a djinn-like description of sakina (cf. al-Šaraf, Ta'ifir, ii. 385 sq.; it is noteworthy that on this point Wab b. Munabbih relies on a Jewish source; he also confuses the ark of the covenant with the oracle of the 'Urum Wtumman). Where else the word is found in the Kur'an, it is generally explained by the commentators as the subjective condition of peace of soul and security (see the commentaries on ix. 26, 40, and xviii. 4, 18, 26). From this a secular meaning of the word gradually develops: sakina means the quality of calm and dignity in character (e.g. al-Bukhari, Bud' al-Šalih, bab 15) and then simply: to keep quiet, e.g. at the qubat (al-Bukhari, Qumma, bab 15) or at the ṣafīda (al-Bukhari, Ṣafa, bab 94). Besides this there is a change of meaning of the word in its religious sense as the Jewish meaning of the word gradually penetrates into Islām. Thus the sakina is said to come benevolently down when the Qur'ān is recited (al-Bukhari, Ṣafāt al-Qur'ān, bab 11 and 15). As among the Jews the Rušā Ḥakbōdeōsh, which rests on the Prophets, gradually develops out of the šeklina, so we find in Islām writers also sakina occasionally used with the meaning "Holy Ghost" (see Goldscheider, p. 149 sqq.).


SAKIZ, the Turkish name of the island of Chios (corrupted from the Greek Ἀἰος) and at the same time the word for mast (ναυσιπότης) which is only found on this island and is obtained in excellent quality from the Pistacia lentiscus L. and was very popular in the East as a valuable drug in the middle ages and, indeed, still is in modern times. How old the term is, is shown by the occurrence of the word as an apppellative in Kuman and Old Turkish (Hautam, Teurkec-Araticheh Glosar, p. 37) and in Persian (Joseph Barbaro, Viaggio in Persia — Anno 1471 — Venice 1545, p. 59): Syo e luogo molto nominato ne la Persia, e in tutte quelle parti & chiamato Seghews, che wu dir in nostro idioma mastico; Vullers, Lexicon Persico, t. v. sectz). In Syriac also mastico is called syiā t.e. Chios from its place of origin (Low, Ara'mäische Dichterammanen, p. 70). By the reverse process the Arabs have named the island from its best known product "mastic island" (Dhēnāt el-Masṭikt); Abu 'l-Fida', Ta'ifir al-Buldān,
In the middle ages Chios had attained very great importance as a station on the sea-route for pilgrims and merchants to eastern lands (Palestine, Syria and Egypt). On the decline of the Byzantine empire in the second half of the middle ages the rich island became exposed to the raids of the petty Seldjuk princes of the opposite coast of Asia Minor and in 1089 Trachas, father-in-law of Kilij Arslan I and lord of Smyrna, which is not far away, succeeded in establishing a temporary footing there (Anna Comnena, Alexias, vii. Ch. 8). In 1118 the Emperor entrusted the Catalan mercenaries with the defence of the island against the raids of the Turks (Muhtaner, Chremv. Cl. 203 and 206; Pachymeres, ed. Bonn, ii. 344, 345). A few years later — in 1307 or 1308 — and after the Genoese Benedetto Zaccaria had usurped rule over Chios (from 1304) 30 "Turkish" ships laid waste the island (Pachymeres ii. 510 and Martino Zaccaria, who had succeeded Benedetto Zaccaria in 1314, had much hard fighting with the Turks; in 1329 he was dispossessed by Andronicus III but by 1346 another Genoese, the Admiral Simone Vignosi had seized the island, which remained till 1566 under the rule of the Giustiniani, the family of the Genoese "Manne" of Chios, as the legal successors of the conquerors called themselves. But in order to maintain their position the latter were forced to pay tribute to the local Turkish dynasts in Asia Minor and later to the Ottoman Sultans and occasionally to support them with their fleet. They paid the Ailk-oghlu 500 ducats yearly and the same to the Şarkhân-oghlu of Magnesia. The first intercourse with the Ottomans was of a hostile nature: after the overthrow of the petty princes of Aikin, Şarkhân and Mentêsh, about the year 1397, Bayazid I stopped the export of corn from Asia Minor to the islands of the Archipelago and with 60 ships undertook a campaign against Chios and laid the island waste with fire and sword (Ducan, ch. xiii). After the capture of Smyrna by Timur (Dec. 1402) the Manoean, like the Frankish lords of Lesbos, did not fall to pay homage to the conqueror (Simon de Zafarani, Supplement, ii. 482; Ducas, ch. xvi; Historia del Gran Turco, Madrid 1782, p. 230). They repeatedly lent their galleys to Sultan Mehemmed I and his successor Murad II for the defeat of Djanizdari and the yearly tribute was fixed at 40,000 ducats. After the defeat of Constantinepole the Manoean hastened to pay homage to Mehmed the Conqueror; the Sultan left them their autonomy but raised the tribute to 6,000 ducats and some years later, as the result of an encounter of the islanders with the admiral of Gallipoli, to 10,000 ducats, with 2,000 in addition to dignitaries of the Porte. The island was able to retain its independence for over 100 years but when it fell two years in arrears with the tribute, this omission and the fact that it served as an asylum for escaped Christian slaves was used as a pretext for sanctions. At Easter 1566 the Admiral Pâle Pasha landed unannounced on the island and took possession of it without a blow being struck. The churches in Castro were destroyed or turned into mosques and the Genoese dignitaries led away into a miserable captivity. It was said that the Greek population, disillusioned with Frankish rule, had called in the Turks. On the intercession of the French ambassador, the exile received permission to return a few years later and the island was granted a limited degree of self-government (Hajjâji Khalîf, Tâhirî al-Kühîr, p. 374 sq.; Leunclavius, Annalcs, p. 110 sq.; Gerlach, Tage-Buch, p. 50, 123; Zinkeisen, Gesch. der Osm. Reichs, ii. 900 sqq.). Very serious conclusions, especially for the Frankish inhabitants, followed the disastrous attempts of Virginio Orsino, Duca di Bracciano, who landed in April, 1599, with five Tuscan galleys in Castro, but had to begin an ignominious retreat a few hours later. The efforts of the French ambassador were successful in securing for the Catholics the preservation of their churches; the skulls of 400 soldiers whom the Tuscan admiral had left in the lurch on the mainland on his retreat, long adorned the battlements of the fort of Castro (Na'àma, Tâhirî, ed. 1280, i. 212; Saadys, Travailles, London 1658, p. 9 sqq.; Des Hayes de] Courmenin, Voyage de Levant, en l'année 1621, Paris 1632, p. 346 sqq.; Sagredo, Memorie istoriche de Monarchi Ottomani, p. 766 sqq.; v. Hammer, Gesch. des Osm. Reichs, iv. 297 sqq.). In July, 1681, the harbour of Castro was the scene of an encounter between a French squadron and Tripolitanian corsairs, in which buildings in the town and several mosques were destroyed by the fire of the ship's guns (Zinkeisen, op. cit., v. 43; von Hammer, op. cit., vi. 371 sqq.). During the great war of the allied Austrians and Venetians against Turkey at the end of the xvith century, the town of Chios was temporarily occupied by the Venetians under Antonio Zeno; the port of Castro capitulated after a short resistance on Sept. 21, 1694; but after a few months the Venetians were forced to retreat after the unfortunate naval battles at the Spolmadore islands, 9 and 18 Feb., 1625. The Roman Catholic inhabitants were accuseed by the Orthodox of having brought about the foreign invasions and they lost what remained of their privileges; their churches were closed and handed over to the Greek Orthodox (Râghid, Tâhirî, l. 1996 sqq., 2057 sqq., 2058; Nycust, History of the Turks, London 1891, ii. 1185, 339 sqq.). The island was far more seriously affected by the Greek War of independence. On March 22, 1822, Samiot irregulars landed on Chios and besieged the Turkish garrison in the fort of Castro; on April 11, the Kapudan Pasha Naşîç Zâde 'Ali appeared with a strong fleet, relieved the besieged garrison, who had put up a heroic defence under the Muğâzâ Wahid Pasha, and drove out the Samiotis. The defenceless island was terribly punished and, although only a few natives had joined the Samiotis, it was ravaged like an enemy country, with fire and sword. Of the over 100,000 inhabitants which Chios numbered at the beginning of the century, 23,000 are said to have been massacred and 47,000 carried off into slavery. The responsibility for these excesses was assumed by Wahid Pasha in his report to the Sublime Porte; the Kapudan Pasha, who had in vain opposed them, was blown up by Könaris in the night of 18/19 June before Çeşme with his flagship; Wahid Pasha was degraded and banished to Alâay (Djawdat, Tâhirî, xii. 40-48; K. Mendelsohn Bartholdy, Geschichte Griechenlands, Leipzig 1870, i. 250 sqq.).
The prosperity of the island was destroyed and to this day it has not recovered from this catastrophe. Chios was visited by a severe earthquake on April 3 and 11, 1851; the number of dead was estimated at 3,000, that of the injured at 1,000 (C.B. Fr. Ac. V, 1884, p. 561 sqq.). As a result of the Balkan War the island was ceded to Greece in 1822.

Under Turkish rule Chios in the older period was under the jurisdiction of the Kapudan Pasha; later it formed a sanjak of the vilayet of the archipelago (Qusan'ir Bayda' Safi'd); in 1910 its population (almost exclusively Greek, a few Jews) was estimated at 80,000 souls.

The Chloétes have been famous from early times for their intelligence and enterprise; especially as merchants and bankers; but also as physicians, apothecaries, and skilled gardeners, they were scattered all over the Levant; of their scholars the learned León Altaitas and the Hellenistic Koraïs have attained a European reputation. The products of their industries (silks, the so-called chalkis, a cotton cloth) were much in demand; among the products of the island we might mention mastic and southern fruits of all kinds.


J. H. MOLLEIMANN

AL-SÄKKÄKÎ, AME BAKKE VUSIB B. AME BAKKE B. MUHAMMAD SIRJID al-Din al-Khwarizmî was born in Transoxiana on the 2nd of Dhu'l-Qa'da 555 a. H., was originally a metal-worker and excelled in engraving dies, from which art he received his taqul al-Säkkäkî, and making intricate locks. One day he had made an inkstand furnished with a lock, the whole weighing no more than a šâra'i, which he presented to the ruler of his country, whose name is not mentioned by the biographer. He was suitably rewarded, but soon another man came to the audience and gave him a golden chain, which the modest Säkkäkî, and upon enquirer, he was told that the man was a person of learning. Seeing that learning was in greater honour than his craft he decided to become a scholar himself. His first studies were far from successful and his ill success made him lose heart and only when he saw how the perpetual dropping of water had made a hollow in a rock, did he take up his studies again. There is exceedingly little known of his life; the names of neither his teachers nor pupils are known, no doubt on account of the Mongol invasion of his native country towards the end of his life. He is reckoned among the Hanafi jurists; two of his teachers were in that branch, Sa'id al-Khayyat and Muhammed b. Sa'id b. Muhammed al-Ihtishi, are mentioned and also one of his pupils, Muhammed b. Muhammed al-Zâhi, the author of the Hanafi law-book entitled al-Khwa'ya. He died in the village of al-Kindi near the town of Almahhîr (Almaherr of the geographers) in Fergâna in the year 626 A. H. As a Turk he is credited with some Turkish poetry, but his reputation rests upon his work in Arabic, the 'Miflîh al-Ulûm', which is the most comprehensive book on rhetoric written up to his time. In spite of its great reputation, manuscripts of the book are scarce, as it was early superseded by the abridgement and commentary of the third part of the work written by al-Karwint under the title of Tâliqâ' al-Miflîh, which has become the standard work on the subject and has in turn become the subject of numerous commentators. Another reason why the Miflîh al-Ulûm became superseded is, no doubt, its very difficult language which at times is quite obscure on account of long sentences which are unusual in Arabic, and which might point to Greek influence if such could be assumed. It may be that Säkkäkî had also studied the translations of Greek philosophical books, being a contemporary of the celebrated N�lîs al-Dîn al-Tîsî, and it is perhaps not without signifi-
cance that, sparing as he is in mentioning any authorities, he frequently refers to statements of Al-Rumânî, who is reported to have indulged in philosophical theories on grammar. The book is fortunately accessible in two printed editions (Cairo 1317 in 4° and Cairo 1318 in 8°), which, though printed without points, so necessary for this work, enable us to study it. The original plan of the author was to divide the book into three principal sections: morphology, grammar and rhetoric, to which he has added other branches akin to the subject. The part dealing with morphology is preceded by a chapter on phonology, treating theoretically the proper pronunciation of the Arabic words, while in the part dealing with exposition and rhetoric he embodies chapters on Poëtry, though he attempts to classify the subjects scientifically, his divisions vary both in their titles and in the numeration. The first book is divided into three parts, the second is divided into several parts, and the third into seven, the titles of these works being, the end not being numbered. The chief portion on rhetoric is divided into three main and these again into three parts. The part dealing with Bayân or eloquence has two parts and five parts again and several unnumbered chapters. The third part of the Metaphorical expressions is divided into six parts and at the end some additional chapters are numbered. Here the author says he was not able to finish his book, but as what follows really belongs to the art of rhetoric, he adds long expositions on the art of Reasoning by deduction and a lengthy account of the art of poetry, with the usual details of the metres etc. The work was too extensive and too badly arranged to serve as an easy hand-book; in consequence the abbreviations and commentary of al-Kâmil under the title of al-Miškâh al-Miṣrîh soon superseded this work and the latter with its many commentaries, especially those by al-Tabâṣûsî, entitled al-Muhannâl al-Muhammadi and al-Muhammadi, have held sway in Arabic literature till the present day. The Miṣkâh al-Ümân has been the subject of numerous commentaries; in addition to those named, among others by Maâshûr b. Maâshûr al-Šâbî (died 526 A.H.), which deals with the third part only; another commentary on the third part is by al-Qâdirî, who has written on it in 541 A.H.

Bibliography: al-Kâmil, Qâmilî, al-Mâkhûkî, al-Mağlûbî (Hasârâbâdî), ii. 223; Ibn Kullâbî, p. 250; al-Suyûtî, Bûgîyth al-Wâsî (Cairo 1326), p. 425; Muhammad Bûkrî, Rûqâz al-Dînutî (Teheran 1304), pages not numbered; Brockelmann, Gesch. der arab. Lit., i. 294; Mehren, Rhetorik der Araber (Vienna 1855).

(F. KEENIO)

AL-SâKKÂ, an Eastern Turkî poet, born in the last quarter of the eighth century, was celebrated in the first half of the ninth century at the court of the Timurids in Transoxania. The only information regarding this poet of whom we know is that he died in 797 (854). He is said to have been buried in the vicinity of Samarcand. He is believed to have been buried in the vicinity of this town. The name Al-Sâkkâ in the Mughâshî affirmations that Al-Sâkkâ's poem does not justify his fame. In the introduction to his Khânaqî Datehâ, the same author says that Al-Sâkkâ composed a complete Dînutî and is famous in Turkestan. On the other hand, in his Muhannâl al-Ümânî, he says that al-Sâkkâ cannot be compared with the Persian poets, although he acknowledges his claims as one of the most famous poets in Transoxania. The resemblance regarding his life and the period in which he lived has led several modern writers to confuse him with the famous scholar Abû Ya'qûb Yâsîn al-Sâkkâ, who is said to have lived in Transoxania (see e.g. Nâdhîr al-Asim and Mehmed al-Arif), though he attempts to classify the subjects scientifically, his divisions vary both in their titles and in the numeration. The first book is divided into three parts, the second is divided into several parts, and the third into seven, the titles of these parts being, the end not being numbered. The chief portion on rhetoric is divided into three main and these again into three parts. The part dealing with Bayân or eloquence has two parts and five parts again and several unnumbered chapters. The third part of the Metaphorical expressions is divided into six parts and at the end some additional chapters are numbered. Here the author says he was not able to finish his book, but as what follows really belongs to the art of rhetoric, he adds long expositions on the art of Reasoning by deduction and a lengthy account of the art of poetry, with the usual details of the metres etc. The work was too extensive and too badly arranged to serve as an easy hand-book; in consequence the abbreviations and commentary of al-Kâmil under the title of al-Miškâh al-Miṣrîh soon superseded this work and the latter with its many commentaries, especially those by al-Tabâṣûsî, entitled al-Muhannâl al-Muhammadi and al-Muhammadi, have held sway in Arabic literature till the present day. The Miṣkâh al-Ümân has been the subject of numerous commentaries; in addition to those named, among others by Maâshûr b. Maâshûr al-Šâbî (died 526 A.H.), which deals with the third part only; another commentary on the third part is by al-Qâdirî, who has written on it in 541 A.H.

Bibliography: al-Nâhidî, Mağlûbî al-Nâhidî, second mağlûbî (manuscript); al-Šâbî, introduction to the Khatâbî al-dawâlî wa (MS. of Nâhidî Othmânî, No. 3890); al-Qâdirî, Muhammâd al-Muhammâd, Der-i Sâdid, Constantinople 1315, p. 64; al-Shâirî, Catalogue of the Turkish MSS. in the Brit. Mus., p. 284; Köprüli Zade Fuad, al-Muhammâdî, Constantinople 1918, p. 198.

(S. KOBUKLU ZADE FÜAD)

SÄKKÄRÄ, an Egyptian village, 15 miles S. W. of Cairo, Lat. 29° 7' Long. 31° 13', situated near the left bank of the Nile halfway between Dijaz and Dahilah, it measured 370 feddans (according to Ibn al-Dînârî, al-Dihâna al-saniyya, p. 144; see also de Suèye, Relation de l'Égypte, p. 675) and its valuation (according to Ibn Dukmâsh, Khatâb al-Itimâ'î, Bulkî 1309, lv. 135) was 10,000 dinars. Pococke in his travels found it a rather poor village at the foot of the hills, with a mosque and a few clusters of date-palms. The name in Arabic means "falcon's nest"; but it is no doubt a corruption of the name of the old Egyptian god of death, Seker or Sokar (Sichara), "the confined one," who presided over the great cemetery on the Western Plateau. The extensive ruins (5 miles in length and 1 mile in width) of this famous necropolis exhibit every conceivable variety of sepulchral monument, notably tombs of the Ancient Empire (described by Mariette, Recherches Archéologiques, 2nd series, xxx. 8 sqq.).

Of the twenty odd pyramids of the Sakkâra group an outstanding one is the so-called Step Pyramid (al-haram al-muṣâlama), which is in reality a transitional mastaba. This, which is regarded as the oldest extant monument of its kind, was designed, it is believed, by Inhotep (*Imouthes*)
the prime minister of King Zoser of the third dynasty (H. R. Hall in The Cambridge Ancient History (1953), I. 276). It is 197 feet high, and is roughly constructed of small stones quarried in the neighbourhood, and having eleven successive layers of masonry with six steps with sloping sides. It is not oriented (though Egypt under the Pharaohs, London 1891, p. 28). The interior is a congeries of chambers and branching passages, many of them the work of Arab tomb-robbers. One of such depredators named Alymut al-Najdijar ("The Carpenter"), c. 520 a. d., has left his name in red ink behind him on the walls of a neighbouring pyramid. The Pyramid of Pepi I is known locally as the Pyramid of Shakhit Abub Munsur, while the Pyramid of Teti is believed by the natives to be in the vicinity of the place of Joseph's incarceration, and for that reason is known as the "Pyramid of Joseph". Another tomb in the same pyramid field is named by the Arabs Matbea Firdawus, "Pharaohs' Throne".

Regarding the "Prison of Joseph", there is a tradition to the effect that it is at Buity (al-Sidr), whose pyramids "Al-Latif describes (see the art. egyptia). But De Sacy (op. cit., p. 207) considers that these include the pyramids of Sakkarah as known to us (De Sacy mistakenly writes the name as Sakkara; although he afterwards corrects this in a foot-note, ibid., p. 675). This would agree with the textual addition (see De Sacy, p. 671, note 6) which states that Sakkarah is one of the dependencies of Buity. The "Prison of Joseph" was a regular place of pilgrimage. The Fakih Aba Isajik al-Marwazi said: "If a man comes from "Irak to visit it I shall not reproach him for undertaking the journey" (al-Makrizi, p. 610). And there is a tomb in al-Mashri's Chronicle of the month of Rabi' al-Awwal, 415 A. H. (May 13 June 1, 1024) that the populace of Cairo throned the streets with drums and trumpets demanding from the merchants money to take them to the "Prison of Joseph". On the merchants refusing, the matter was laid before the Khalfah ("Ali jum al-Hasim bi-amri 'l-lah) who ordered the merchants to pay the customary annual sum for the purpose. Thereupon the processional march to the "Prison of Joseph" took place led by the grand Kazi or Dawla (al-Makrizi, ibid., p. 610 sq). Near the Sakkarah pyramids are to be seen the remains of the celebrated Serapeum or Apis Manoeum, where, in the rock-cut tombs below, the mummified carcases of the sacred Apis-Bulls worshipped at Memphis were enshrined in huge sarcophagi of Assuan granite. The chapels built above the vaults formed the Serapeum proper. Thither a wonderful Drumor or Avenue of Sphinxes led. Fresh excavations in 1911-12 revealed the remains of the early Coptic monastery of Apa Jeremias (see Annales du Service des Antiquites de l'Egypte, Cairo, register). The well-known wooden statue of Bullaq, of the Shafiik al-Balad, came from Sakkarah (see F. B. Ziecke, Egypt of the Pharaohs and of the Khedives, London 1871, chap. ix.).


Sakkiz, a town and district in Persian Kurdistan, administered sometimes from Senne, sometimes from Tabriz and situated on the upper Daghstain east of Baneh. The inhabitants are Kurds (Mukri). In religion they are Shii'ta Sunnis; there are also adepts of the Naqshbandi Shirkah. The family of local Khans is related to that of the Wills of Arildan. The town has 1200 houses, 2 mosques, a bazaar, etc. The district (with its dependency Murede) comprises 360 villages. According to the census of 1296 A. H., there were 34,024 people in the district. The government taxes amounted to 6309 tumans a year. Cf. Ali Akbar Waqfi 'night, Khudra al-Naziriyya (manuscript history of Persian Kurdistan, written in 1509 A. H.).

(V. Minorsky)

Sakzin, a place on the Dnieper (according to Ibn Saud, quoted in Abu fi-Fida', Taqwin at-Buldun, ed. Reinaud and de Siane, p. 205), also located on other rivers e. g. on the Jal (cf. Dorn, Caiphe, p. 116) and on the Volga (according to Westphel; cf. Marquart, Osteuropische Blattstudien, p. 50). It is situated in 67° E. Long. and 53° N. Lat.; a town, without sq, is said to exist in 162° 30' E. Long. and 40° 30' N. Lat., but this must be another place. East of Sakzin lies the town of Soa (v. I. SYR) which belongs to the territory of Sakzin (Abu fi-Fida', op. cit., p. 202). According to Yaquti, Muidjam, iv. 670, the fortress of Manshaghlah is between Khirasun and Sakzin and the lands of the Rus on the sea of 'Tabarestan (Caspian Sea). Further information is given in Hamdat Mustawfi (cf. The Geographical Part of the Nushat al-Qulub, ed. G. Le Strange, Gibb Mem. Series, xxviii). Sakzin and Bulghur (this combination is frequent among other authors also) are in 32° 47' 750 farsangs distant from Mekka (text, p. 10; transl., p. 10); the eastern frontier of Iran, which begins in Sindh, runs to the frontier of Sakzin and Bulghur (p. 21 = 23 of the transl.); KHwabat, Sakzin and Bulghur are east of the Caspian Sea (p. 239 ge. 221); Sakzin and Bulghur are two small towns in the sixth chine; much land belongs to them and they export fur (p. 259 and 252). Al-Vardzadi in Ibn Isandiyar (Gibb Mem. Series, ii. 33 sq.) says that in his time Amul was the market for the wares of Sakzin. Merchants from the Trak, Syria, Akhsarin and India came to Amul to purchase there. The voyage by boat from Amul to Sakzin took three months but the return journey only one week because the former was up stream and the latter down. Ibn Isandiyar wrote probably at the beginning of the xivth century. We see that there is no agreement regarding the situation of the place on the one hand it is said to be on the Dnieper and on the other east of the Caspian Sea; while Yaquti seems to place it among the Rus, al-Kafrin in Asfi at-Buldun, ed. Wustenfeld, ii. 402 sq., calls it a town in the Khazar; he says it is large (contrary to Mustawfi), inhabited by 40 tribes of the Ghuzz, with a large amount of strangers and merchants in addition. The climate is cold, the inhabitants are Muslims, for the most
part Hamats, although there are also some Shaj'a. The houses are covered with roofs of pine-wood. The river of Şakṣin is larger than the Tigis and rich in fish of a kind only found there, which is sold at the rate of 100 madda for a half damaq; these fishes yield train-oil and isinglass. The currency there is lead, of which three Baghdad madda = 1 dinar. Sheep cost 1/4 damaq each, rams 1/4 (passûq); there is also much fruit. Al-Gharnâṭi relates that the river is frozen in winter and can be crossed on foot. So far al-Kâzimîn's account of the place, an excerpt of which is given by al-Bakîwî, a geographer of the fifteenth century (quoted by d'Ohsson, Hist. des Mongols, i. 346, note 1); but al-Bakîwî adds that in his time the town no longer existed (op. cit.: *Sacasin est à present surnumérée; il n'en reste aucunes traces; mais précis de là existe maluntenant une autre ville, le Sérâf de Bâres, résidence du souverain de cette contrée*).

In the history of the Mongol period Şakṣin is several times mentioned: conquered by Cuqis al-Khân (Ta'rîkh-i Gustda, Gibb Mem. Series, vol. xiv., part i. 572; cf. Yâkût, Mu'ajjam, i. 255), it belonged to the territory of Tîgî, his eldest son (Ta'rîkh-i Dîjahângîsh, Gibb Mem. Series, vol. xvi., part i. 31; Ta'rîkh-i Gustda, i. 375). Ogotai shortly after his accession sent an army to Kîpîk Şakṣin and Bûghûrî (Ta'rîkh-i Dîjahângûsh, i. 150), the Lînûnî Şakṣin now Bûghûrî is mentioned as Bâ'în's territory (ibid., i. 205). The descendants of Khân Bârkâh (d. 1626 A.D.; Abu 'l-Fidâ', op. cit., p. 209) afterwards lived there. We have already seen that it no longer existed in the fifteenth century. The *Secret of Bocias*, mentioned in al-Bakîwî in connection with it, is probably called after the reigning family. The combination Şakîn-i Rûm is found in a Persian poem, which the rebel Atâ'î sent to king Sandjar (Ta'rîkh-i Gustda, i. 488).

The name Şakîn may — at least in European sources — also denote the inhabitants of the place. This is perhaps the case with the Sâsî in JOzannes de Plano Carpini, vii. 3, although the Mongols could not conquer them according to this writer, which is contradictory to the Persian sources. In the passage from a Russian Chronicle which is quoted by Dorn, Carşî, p. 21 in the note — here also there is a reference to the Mongol wars — we find Şakînî alongside of Polovtsi as the name of a people.

**Bibliography** (besides the Oriental sources already quoted): Ritter, Erdkunde, viii. 545; Ch. d'Ohsson, Hist. des Mongols, the Hague—Amsterdam 1834—1835; i. 246, 446, ii. 15, 113 (in the last two passages as the name of a people); d'Averac, Relation des Mongols ou Tartares par le frère Jean du Plan de Carpin, Paris 1838, p. 180 sq.; Dorn, Carşî, St. Petersburg 1875, p. 21, 116 sq.; Bretschneider, Medieval Researches, London 1888, i. 296, 300, 305; Hammer-Purgstall, Geschichte der Goldenen Horde etc., Pesth 1840, p. 7, 9, 15, 28, 89, 99; da, Geschichte der Khachen etc., Darmstadt 1842, i. 419, ii. 246 sq. (V. F. Rüchker)

**SâL** (?), a year, a word also used by the Turks. It is normally the time that elapses between two successive passages of the vernal equinox by the sun, the astronomical year; but the word is also used to designate anniversaries of births, of arrivals, etc. Solar, lunar, astronomical and civil years are distinguished; the civil year is 365 days, the astronomical year 365 days, 5 hours, 49' (Handley)

**SâL-nâmë** (r. and t.), literally: yearbook, annual, almanac, calendar; the term *SâL-nâmë* from rîz "day" is also used; the Arabic word for calendar is *tâbînah*. The Turks make great use of tables whether annual or perpetual; the latter cover a period of 80 to 85 years; they are in the form of little rolls or tiny volumes usually written with great care and in ink of several colours. They give the year in the era of Alexander, of Christ, of Diocletian and in the Djalâlt era, the era of the Sâlûlîs, Sûlfân Malik Šah, the name of the year in the Turco-Mongol animal cycle, a horoscope table, the Muslim, Jewish, Christian and Persian feasts, the correspondence with the Syrian months, astronomical and meteorological predictions, the dates at which the principal agricultural operations should be performed, as well as other operations. The *Mu'âshârûm* uses tables called *tâbînah* or *tâbînâm* to know the canonical hours and the new moon. M. d'Ohsson quotes a highly esteemed calendar from the xviiith century A. D. made in Turkey by Dârendwî which covered the period 1192—1277 A. D. *SâL-nâmë* is also the name of the official annuals (gazetteers) of the Ottoman Empire.


**SâLâ**, in dialect Slâ (ethnic Sâłowët, dial. Slâwi), or, following the official French orthography commonly used, Salê, the English Salê, Salëh or Sâlëcos, is a town in Morocco on the Atlantic coast at the mouth of and on the north bank of the river El Bârag. On the other bank just opposite stands Rabât, the estuary of the river serves as the harbour of the two towns. Salê, the less important, has about 20,000 inhabitants of whom 2,000 are Jews.

The name is ancient, but the Panic Sala, and the Roman Sala Colonia did not stand on the same site; the remains of the Roman Sala can still be seen near the modern Şkia (Chella), a few miles up the river and on the other bank. It is not till the Idrîsîl period (19th century) that the new Salê (Salë) first appears, distinct from old Sâlë (Chella) then in ruins. At the beginning of the xivth century it was the capital of a little Idrîsîl kingdom, which fought with the Barghâwjât (q. v.), heretics settled to the south of the El Bârag. They were already at this time a ribât built against these heretics on the south bank, where Ribât al-Fâṭîs was afterwards built (Ibn Hawrá). In the middle of the xivth century, Salë, if we may believe al-Idrîsî, was a fine and strong town with rich harsars, a harbour frequented by Spanish ships, which brought oil in exchange for foodstuffs; entrance into the river was already very difficult.

The building of Rabât by the Almoçâdîs opposite Salê does not seem to have done much harm to the latter. It is from this period that the great mosque dates and Salê remained prosperous while Rabât declined after the death of Ya'kûb al-Mansûr. It fell into the power of the Marinids in 649/1251 and after several vicissitudes Ya'kub b. 'Abd Allah, a member of the reigning family of the Marinids, declared himself independent there. The
Christians from Spain entered it by surprise in 658/1260. The Sultan Abū Yūsuf Yaḥyā the Marinid drove them out again after a few days, closed its ramparts and built the Sea-Gate still visible to-day. The Marinid sovereigns on several occasions mobilised on the left bank of the Rūr Rāgrāq the troops intended for the holy war, had an arsenal at Salé where ships were built, and beautified the town. We may specially note the beautiful madrasa built by Abū l-Ḥasan. A little later, Hān al-Kaṭāh spent several years there and wrote of its charm.

In the course of the great wars waged by the Spanish and Portuguese in the xvith and xviith centuries, Salé was one of the few points on the Moroccan coast where they could not gain a footing. In the beginning of the seventeenth century when expelled by the edicts of Philip III (1609) the Spanish Moors took Rabat; Salé, slipping from the rule of the Sherifs, became independent under the Muḥāṣīlī al-ʿAyyashī in 1627. It became its base for attacking al-Mamora (al-Maghīya) which was held by the Spaniards. Salé played a part in the feuds which divided the town and ʿajbah of Rabat, then fought unsuccessfully against one and the other, until when al-ʿAyyashī was killed and the three towns fell into the hands of the Marabouts of Dīlī (1641). Salé recognised the authority of Ǧhaïlān (1660) and after the defeat of the latter by al-Raḥīf became finally incorporated in the lands of the Filali dynasty in 1666.

This disturbed century was also the age of piracy. The corsairs of Salé were famous; but under the name of Salé at this period the Europeans comprised the three towns and the pirates in reality almost all came from the ʿajbah of Rabat and from Raḥāt. These three towns, strange as it may appear, formed at the same time the principal commercial port of Morocco. Down to the end of the xvith century this was the usual route by which travellers and merchandise from Europe went to Fās and it was on several occasions the residence of diplomatic representatives of the Christian powers.

As compared with Rabat, the administrative capital of Morocco, Salé is now a quiet little town where many scholars live. It is also a market for the tribes who live on the north bank of the Rūr Rāgrāq.


(Henri Basset)

SALADIN, AL-MALIK AL-NĀṣIR ŠALĀD AL-DIN YUSUF I., was the son of the Amir Nādīn al-Dīn ʿAyyāth ash-Shādī (see above), born in Tarqit in 532 (1138). His father moved shortly — according to others a few years — after his birth to Syria and was appointed governor of Baʿalbek by Zangī [q. v.] and remained on there (with one third of the town and its appanages as a fief) after the Būrid ʿAṭībthe ʿAḥāb [see above] had seized the town. Salādīn and his brothers were brought up there. When 17 years old he came with his father to the court of Nūr al-Dīn when the latter had captured Damascus in 549 (1154) (on the occupation of Baʿalbek and Damascus see the introduction to Baalbek in Islamischer Zeit in vol. iii. of Baalbek, Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen und Untersuchungen in den Jahren 1899—1905, Berlin 1925). It is remarkable how little is known regarding Salādīn's youth and education; he played no part at the court of Nūr al-Dīn; the Amir ʿUmar, the half-brother, who resided there, did not even know him as we see from his biography. He first came into the public eye when in 559 (1164) 'in spite of his reluctance' (as Abu Shāma reports without giving any reasons) Shīrkhūn [q. v.] took him with him on his first campaign against Egypt. Shāwār, the vizier of the Caliph al-ʿĀdîd [q. v.], had been displaced by a rival, ʿ-dirghām [q. v.], and had applied for assistance to Nūr al-Dīn, Atābeq of Syria. He promised the latter a third of the revenues of Egypt, while ʿ-dirghām had asked king Amaury I of Jerusalem for support and had promised him a vast tribute. ʿ-dirghām was defeated and slain before Amaury could give him any assistance, and Shāwār restored to the vizierate. As the latter did not fulfill his promises, Shīrkhūn, to gain his good, ordered Salādīn to occupy Bīlibīs [see above] and the district and collect the taxes there. Fierce fighting was the result. Shāwār, finding himself in a tight corner, called in king Amaury to help him, so that Shīrkhūn and Salādīn were forced to entrench themselves in Bīlibīs. The town was so well defended by the two that Shāwār and Amaury could not take it. While this was going on, Nūr al-Dīn captured the important fortress of Ḫārim and advanced on Bānīyān so that Amaury was now forced to retire to Syria in order to prevent Nūr al-Dīn from making further captures. He had agreed with Shīrkhūn that the latter should withdraw from Egypt and leave Shāwār in possession. Shīrkhūn arrived in Syria with Salādīn in the beginning of 560 (towards the end of 1164) with his forces intact. The main result of the campaign was that it gave Nūr al-Dīn and his men a clear idea of Egypt, its wealth and relative strength. Shīrkhūn was attracted by the idea of conquering the land and settling there but Nūr al-Dīn did not wish to split up his forces in view of the war with the Crusaders. It was only three years later when Shāwār made a new alliance with Amaury that Shīrkhūn received orders to begin a second campaign against Egypt and again he took Salādīn with him (October 1168) 'in spite of his reluctance at first'. His first objective was the occupation of the bank of the Nile; after overcoming the difficulties of the march and eluding the Franks he reached the south of Cairo and built a fortified camp near Dījār; soon afterwards, Amaury arrived with his troops and encamped opposite him at al-Fustāṭ. At the same time he concluded an agreement regarding subsidies with the Caliph himself. Amaury then attacked Shīrkhūn and forced him to retreat to Upper Egypt. At Bābāz he forced Shīrkhūn to make a stand and the latter, after some hesitation, gave battle on the advice of Salādīn and some of the Amir; he succeeded in beating Amaury, while
Saladin put to flight the Caliph’s troops. Shirkuh was not in a position to follow up this victory; he retired with Saladin to Alexandria and left the latter there with half his army while he himself went to Upper Egypt to collect tribute. This was Saladin’s first independent command. Amaury advanced on Alexandria with his own and the Egyptian forces, while the fleet of the Crusaders watched the coast. Saladin had difficulty in holding the town against the Franks, who put up huge siege artillery, and therefore called upon Shirkuh for assistance. The latter returned by forced marches and never pitched his camp until he was before Cairo. He then entered into negotiations with Amaury for peace which was concluded in the middle of Shawwal, 562 (beginning of August, 1167); he bound himself to return to Syria with Saladin, prisoners were exchanged; Saladin was received hospitably in Amaury’s camp and the Christians visited Alexandria. Both sides claimed the victory; Amaury left a garrison in Cairo as well as an office for the collection of his tribute. The fear of Nūr al-Dīn’s successes may have been the main reason for the conclusion of the treaty. Amaury did not take this into consideration as he was old and his trusted advisers induced him to invade Egypt only 14 months later and his garrisons in Alexandria and Cairo advised him to take possession of Egypt definitely. He therefore advanced on Bilbāīs, took the town on Muharram 29, 564 (Nov. 2, 1168) and had nearly all its inhabitants put to death. This act of barbarity estranged the Egyptians from him. He next marched against Cairo. To protect the town the vizier Shīwar had the suburb of al-Fusṭūjī (cf. above l. s. 177 377) set on fire. It is said to have burned for 54 days and the smoke which it raised prevented Amaury from besieging Cairo from an advantageous position. The Caliph had with all speed sent messengers for assistance to Nūr al-Dīn, while Shirkuh negotiated with Amaury. Nūr al-Dīn sent Shirkuh and with him Saladin, who was still impressed by the sufferings during the siege of Alexandria and only with reluctance decided to go. He was supplied with men, horses and arms. Amaury sought in vain to intercept Shirkuh and on Rabī’ II 1, 564 (Jan. 2, 1169) he began his retreat; a few days later Shirkuh appeared before Cairo and was hailed as a rescuer; Shīwar, however, remained hostile to him and plotted to take him and his Amir prisoners on the occasion of a feast. When Shirkuh and his men learned of this treachery, Saladin decided to get rid of him. He seized Shīwar when riding in the vicinity of Cairo and had him executed. The Caliph, delighted at being freed from his tyrannical vizier, appointed Shirkuh his successor on Rabī’ II 17, 564 (Jan. 18, 1169). But Shirkuh died only two months later and the Caliph, who thought that Saladin, with his good nature, would be a compeient servant, appointed him vizier with the title “al-Malik al-Nṣūrī” (March, 26 = Djamādā II 25). In a letter of congratulation Nūr al-Dīn recognised him as commander of the Syrian troops. Henceforth the greatness of Saladin is revealed. The power, that had become his through favourable circumstances, found a highly gifted man who knew how to use it. If he had hitherto hesitated to devote his life to warfare, so that Nūr al-Dīn had almost forced him to take part in the campaigns against Egypt, if he had hitherto cared for nothing so much as theological discussions and appeared in public as little as possible, as we saw, and had even indulged in forbidden wine, all this either ceased (like wine-drinking) or (like the theological discussions) was only exercised as a pastime in hours of recreation. His path lay clearly marked before him: to secure power for himself and his family, to put down the Shi‘a and to fight the Crusaders to the utmost. He was able to attain these aims to a great degree, because, quite apart from his own ability and valour, the ground was prepared for him to march for the previous work of Nūr al-Dīn, and the diplomatic ability of his father Ayyūb, but for the decline of the Fāṭimid Caliphs and the sluggishness of the Egyptian people, but for the internal feuds of the Crusaders, he could never have achieved the great successes of his life to the same extent, in view of the initial lack of unity among the Muslim rulers. He was a politician rather than a general, amenable to the advice of capable advisers, clever and fortunate in the choice of his colleagues, without ever allowing power to leave his own hands. Two men of learning, al-Kādji al-Fadīl [q.v.] and later Imād al-Dīn al-Kādji al-Iṣwānī [q.v.], both noted for the style and grace of their correspondence, conducted his political and war measures and were in constant correspondence with the highest officials and with rulers who were Saladin’s friends. The number of Saladin’s letters and the fulness of the political reports contained in them is overwhelming. At a later date, from 584 (1188), the Kādji Ibn Shaddād [q.v.], his biographer, entered his service as private secretary.

In Egypt, Saladin took a firm grasp of the reins of government and aroused the enmity of the black guards (Nubians and Abyssinians) who had been brought to Cairo as mercenaries, had risen to power under the weak Caliphs and filled influential positions at court and in the government. They were joined by all, who, being ardent Shi‘a, were predisposed to be dissatisfied with Saladin as a Sunnite. The Caliph’s major dūnas sought to king Amaury for help; but as the messenger was captured, the plan fell through. The eunuch was executed and the Caliph’s palace placed under the protection of men who could be relied upon. The negro guards thereupon mutinied in Cairo and Saladin to overcome them had their quarters burned down. They escaped to Dijzā and were there wiped out by Saladin’s troops. The Franks, who could not reconcile themselves to his rule, as they with good reason regarded it as a threat to Jerusalem, had sent envoys urgently begging for assistance to France, Germany, England, the Byzantine Emperor and the Pope and had succeeded in getting a fleet with troops sent from Constantinople and an auxiliary force from South Italy. The Byzantines and the Franks decided by mutual agreement to capture Damietta [q.v.] first and then to march on Cairo. Saladin sought assistance from Nūr al-Dīn, as he had to defend himself on one side against the Franks and Byzantines, on the other possibly against the always turbulent Egyptians. He also asked that the reinforcements should be sent under the command of his father, just as he had already called other members of his family to his side in Cairo. The successes of the Franks and Byzantines would perhaps have been greater if the siege had not been too far prolonged by the energy of the defenders. The Byzantine army began to suffer from shortness of commissariat and Amaury, doubting if he could gain a complete victory, preferred to
negotiate with Saladin and to conclude peace for a considerable sum of money. Envoy and force may have worked together upon him. In the meanwhile Nūr al-Dīn had invaded the Ḥūrām [q.v.], prepared himself against the counter-attacks of the Franks, but a terrible earthquake in the summer of 565 (1170) which wrought tremendous devastation in the Syrian cities forced Franks and Muslims alike to lay down their arms and take up the task of rebuilding the shattered cities. In the following year 566 (1171) Saladin made a raid into Palestine and advanced as far as Ramlah and Asqalān [q.v.], then retired to Egypt to prepare for the taking of the port of Aila [q.v.] on the Red Sea and gradually to secure communications between Egypt and Palestine; in the same year he succeeded in taking Aila. In the next year (567) he fulfilled Nūr al-Dīn’s desire by omitting the mention of the Fātimid Caliph in the Friday sermon and continuing to name the Abbasid Caliph. Soon afterwards the Caliph al-Afdīd died, whether in fact his natural death is uncertain; Christian writers say that he either committed suicide or was put to death by Saladin’s brother, Tārān Shālī, by the former’s orders. Nūr al-Dīn is said to have been very pleased at the end of Fātimid rule. When the news of the extension of his territory was conveyed to the Abbasid Caliph he sent robes of honour to Nūr al-Dīn but not those bestowing the latter’s position (as a vassal), so that, although he did put them on, he immediately sent them on by the Caliph’s envoy to Saladin.

The relations between Saladin and Nūr al-Dīn were soon to become clouded. Saladin in Cairo was too independent for him; his father and his brothers were what Nūr al-Dīn said he had no hostages in his power. When Saladin wanted to take up his scheme for securing the communications between Egypt and Palestine, he proposed to Nūr al-Dīn to besiege Shawbak and Kerak [q.v.] and set out to do so; but when Nūr al-Dīn departed for Kerak Saladin was advised by his Amirs not to go to him, as they feared for his safety. Taking their advice, he turned back and excused himself by pleading the unsettled condition of Egypt. Nūr al-Dīn was furious at this and collected troops against Saladin. When this became known at Saladin’s court, a section of his Amirs advised him to fight, but his father, who feared the great prestige of Nūr al-Dīn, advised him to write a submissive letter so that tolerable conditions were once more restored. But their mutual mistrust was not overcast, so that the two cities mentioned (Kerak and Shawbak) were not captured, nor did Saladin at this time support his suzerain against the Crusaders to the best of his ability. In the next year Saladin went to Kerak, but withdrew again, pleading his father’s illness, when Nūr al-Dīn approached. In this difficult situation Saladin resolved to create a position of security for himself and his family in a way which would satisfy Nūr al-Dīn. In 569 (1173/4) he sent his brother Turān Shāh against the senator Abū al-Nabi, who had taken possession of the Yemen. Turān Shāh succeeded in driving him out and conquering the Yemen. He had himself mentioned in the Aqūfa as ruler next to the Caliph and sent messengers to Saladin, who in turn notified Nūr al-Dīn and the Caliph. Nevertheless Saladin’s position was still threatened, especially as he had again to face a rising in the spring of this year. Nūr al-Dīn now decided to take the field against him, especially as it vested him that the strength of the Crusaders was increased because Saladin held back. He had already collected an army (see Al-Malik al-Salih, the Zangī) when he was attacked by a severe illness in Damascus and died in a few days on the 12th of Shawwāl (May 15). Saladin was thus relieved of a great anxiety and was now free to develop his power. He then recognised Nūr al-Dīn’s eleven-year-old son al-Malik al-Salih Ismai’il (see Al-Malik al-Salih, the Zangī) and devoted himself to fighting the Normans of Sicily, who had appeared before Alexandria with a strong fleet at the end of the year 569 (1173/4). They landed their swarms but within three days they were defeated and for the most part killed with the help of troops sent to reinforce the strong garrison. Saladin captured enormous booty, King Amalric also had died shortly before, so that Saladin was left secure in possession of vast power and could devote himself entirely to the object of his life, the struggle with the Crusaders. He began by turning his attention to Syria, to which he was summoned by the Amir in Damascus in 570 (1174). He found the position there unsatisfactory in as much as there was no single guiding will among the Muslims. He rightly considered it, as Nūr al-Dīn had done before him in a similar situation (see Būrīds), absolutely necessary to gain the real power in Syria, even if for the time being it was as vassal of Salih Ismai’il, whose guardians he had to become. Things went against him at first when he took the field against Ismai’il’s Amir from whom he claimed to be going to liberate Ismai’il, Aleppo itself resisted him as did Hamā, Hims and Ba’albek. Ismai’il’s uncle al-Ghāth came from Mesopotamia with a large army so that Saladin was ready to make a peace favourable to Salih Ismai’il. As his conditions were not accepted, Saladin found himself forced to fight. He declared himself independent and dropped Salih Ismai’il’s name from the Aqūfa. The decision was in his favour, for the enemy were completely defeated at Kurān Hamā. Saladin behaved with great moderation: he left Salih Ismai’il, who seemed quite harmless to him, in possession of Aleppo and gave Hamā, Hims and Ba’albek, which surrendered to him without a blow, to relatives as feuds. Then, in June ‘Eid al-Adha, 570 (= May, 1175) he was, at his own request, granted by the Caliph ruqūd (4 ‘ulūj-man) over Egypt, Nubia, the Yemen, the Maghrib from Egypt to Tripoli, Palestine and Central Syria and henceforth considered himself as Sultan, as Abū ‘l-Fida’, strictly speaking, was only a catchword, and was also regarded as such by his contemporaries. He did not, however, adopt the title as such; he calls himself Sultan al-Islām wa l-Muṣlimin. A last attempt by the Zangī party to overthrow Saladin ended after several battles and a third siege of Aleppo with a peace towards the end of 571 (end of June, 1176) by which Saladin was finally left in possession of the lands conquered by him. He next besieged in his citadel an ally of Ismai’il’s, the so-called Old Man of the Mountain, the Šāfiʿī Sinūn of the Assassins [q.v.] in Masyad, who had sent his Assassins against him several times; but he could not take it as the fanatical Assassins defended it vigorously. He raised the siege and received from Sinūn a promise that he would not attack him again. This danger also was thus disposed of and Saladin returned to Egypt.

He considered the building of the Citadel, which
he began in this year, a very important task in Cairo (see the art. CAIRO, i. 324 n.). In Djuinmādī I, 573 (November, 1177) he made a rapid march into Palestine and laid waste the country round Gaza and Ascalon. King Baldwin IV opposed him, but had to withdraw in face of Saladin's apparent superiority. Saladin's troops took up the bridge over the Jordan and dispersed to plunder the country while Baldwin collected the Templars and many Knights under the leadership of Raymond of Kerak and again appeared upon the scene. Saladin had first of all to collect his numerous forces. The armies met to the south of Ramla. The Knights distinguished themselves by great bravery so that Saladin suffered an annihilating defeat by the 14th of Djuinmādī, 573 (1177) in spite of his superiority. The victory was so surprising that the Crusaders ascribed it to a miracle. Saladin himself is said to have escaped capture; his nephew, other leaders and learned men of his regiment were taken prisoners. A great thanksgiving was held in Jerusalem in honour of the victory. One consequence of this defeat was that in the next year (574 = 1178) King Baldwin built a fortress at the Banūt Yamṣīt bridge over the Jordan, which gave him control over the river Jordan and the plain as far as Bāniyās, without Saladin being able to prevent him, Saladin, who had in vain offered the king an indemnity of 200,000 dinars if he would leave off building, had to attack this fortress. He sent his ablest general, Iṣa al-Dīn Farāḥ Shī ḫ, his nephew, against Baldwin, who suffered a reverse at the end of 574 (May, 1179). A year later, Saladin succeeded in inflicting a severe defeat upon him at Masdīj 'Aylin on Maḥṣarām 2, 575 (June 10, 1179); a large number of distinguished Franks were captured. Two months later Saladin took the fortress at Jacob's Ford and levelled it to the ground. The next year brought no fighting on a large scale. In Muḥarram, 576 (June, 1180) Baldwin concluded a two years' truce with Saladin. Next year Nūr al-Dīn's son, Iṣa al-Dīn of Aleppo, died. His successor, in keeping with his dying wish, was his cousin Iṣa al-Dīn Mas'ūd, a capable soldier, who, however, exchanged Aleppo for Sīnjar with his brother Zangī II to obtain a consolidated dominion. In the meantime war had broken out between Saladin and the Franks as a result of the continued raids made by Raymond de Châtillon, prince of Kerak, on caravans going to Egypt. Zangī II, on the other hand, made peace with the Franks. Saladin, however, endeavoured to obtain sole control of all the Muslim lands and used the next few years to conquer the rest of Syria (Aleppo), in Şafar, 576 (June, 1183), and to gain the supremacy of Muzaffaridamis by occupying the most important towns and restoring them as sīfs. While there was no lasting peace with the Crusaders, fighting on a large scale was avoided by both sides and in the same year a four years' peace was concluded between Baldwin V, guardian of Raymond III of Tripoli, and Saladin. Soon afterwards Baldwin V died and his successor, Guy de Lusignan, ascended the throne in the following year in spite of Raymond's objections. Peace was again disturbed by Raymond de Châtillon, who from Kerak fell upon a large caravan and refused to give any satisfaction or compensation. Saladin was exceedingly angry and at the end of 578 (Feb., 1187) invaded the region of Kerak and summoned his Egyptian troops to protect the pilgrims returning from Mecca, while his Syrian troops concentrated at Hīram. The Crusaders reinforced the terrible danger. Guy collected Raymond, troops arrived from all sides so that Guy was able to collect an army of 20,000 men and take up a position in Saffūrīyā. On Rabīʾ II 17, 582 (June 26, 1187) Saladin arrived south of Lake Genesareth and captured the town of Tiberias after six days' siege; the citadel alone held out. Raymond in vain warned the Crusaders against leaving their well sheltered position with its ample water supply during the frightful heat. His enemies, who believed that he had come to an arrangement with Saladin, advised the king to attack the Sūfīān. He ordered an advance to be made towards Tiberias and encamped the night at Ḥastīn, in the affluent source of the Jordan, where the army did not even find sufficient water. In spite of very great bravery the Crusaders were completely defeated, the king and a considerable number of his Knights captured. While Saladin gave the king a friendly reception, he slew with his own hand Raymond, the disturber of the peace, and had all the Templars and Knights of St. John executed by his Amir and ʿAbd. Just as the battle of Kurīn Ḥanāk had secured him rule over Syria, the decisive battle of Ḥastīn gave him Palestine with Jerusalem. The fortress of Tiberias, Nazareth, Samaria, Sīdīn, Beirūt, Bārūr, ʿAkkā, in Ramla, Gaza and Hebron fell. He then advanced on Jerusalem and took Bethlehem, Bethmia and the Mount of Olives in Rabīʾ II, 583 (Sept., 1187). Saladin first of all encamped to the west of the town, the inhabitants of which fled, but later attacked the city from a more favourable position in the north and used the catapults and ballistae it had to capitulate at the end of the month. People of means were able to ransom themselves; those who could not pay were sold into slavery but several thousands were released on the intercession of Muslim and Christian persons of standing as were a large number of the poor by Saladin himself. Only a few sick people were allowed to stay as well as those who pledged themselves to pay a poll-tax. Everything associated with the Christian religion was destroyed, the ʿAbbāsīah al-Salāmī (Dome of the Rock) and the Aqṣā mosque were restored and hospitals and schools built in memory of the great event; numerous Asfār and princes increased the splendour of these days by their presence and their rich foundations. It may be said that the whole of Islam jointed in celebrating the capture of Jerusalem, which had been so ardently desired. The consequence of this victory was that Saladin gained possession of the cities and fortresses still Christian by force or by capitulation; only Antioch, Tripoli, Tyre and a number of smaller towns and castles remained in possession of the Christians. The remisider of the year was unfortunate for Saladin; he made the mistake of giving his weseht, overtitned army no time to recuperate but went on to besiege Tyre. Here he suffered a severe reverse owing to the brave defence of the garrison and his mishaps at sea. ʿAkkā was re-militarized and fortified for him after long consultations by his Amir al-ʿAbd al-Muḥammad, who had already proved his worth by building the citadel at Cairo. Saladin, after a futile attempt to take Kasbah, then went to Damascus and in Rabīʾ II, 584 (June, 1188) he summoned the
Muslim princes of Syria and Mesopotamia with their troops for a new campaign. In the course of the fighting that followed Lāthabīya, Djabala [q. v.], Şahyūn, Sarmin and Buziysa were captured and a seven months' truce was concluded with Bohemund III of Antioch. Saladin on the 1st of Ramadān of the same year returned to Damascus and dismissed his allies from Mesopotamia but kept his own forces under arms in order to conquer Safa [q. v.], Kawkāb, Kerak and Shabbak. This campaign was long but successful and ended on the 1st of Dhu 'l-ʾKaʿda, 585 (Dec. 11, 1189) with the capture of all these places.

On learning of the capture of Jerusalem Gregory VIII proclaimed a Crusade and after his death Clement III continued his efforts. All hostilities between European rulers ceased and steps were taken to secure a rapprochement between Philip II of France and Richard I of England. The first reinforcement sent by the new Crusaders was a fleet despatched by William of Sicily, which relieved Tripolis and henceforth formed a support for the Palestine seaports. Gradually larger and stronger fleets set out from Europe for the Holy Land and all landed in Tyre. The Emperor Frederick I undertook a Crusade with numerous, well equipped troops; he went via Constantinople after he had in vain challenged Saladin to hand over Jerusalem. The Emperor Isaac of Constantinople, who had made an alliance with Saladin which proved ineffective, could not prevent his passage. The Franks, reinforced by the continued new arrivals, began the siege of ʿAkka on Radjab 14, 585 (Aug. 28, 1189), which is considered one of the greatest military operations of the Middle Ages. King Guy de Lusignan and the Count of Montferrat, who had been taken prisoners at the taking of Jerusalem, had been released by Saladin at the request of Queen Sibyl as early as Dżumādā I, 584 (July, 1188) on pledging themselves not to fight again against him; after having been released from their oath by the patriarch, they began the siege of ʿAkka relying on the help of Frederick I of Germany, Richard I of England and Philip II of France and supported at first by continual arrivals of Crusaders from many countries of Europe. Saladin's army was now revealed in its fullest development and in this several years' struggle the Crusaders learned to know and appreciate the great Sultan.

King Guy led the Franks up to ʿAkka after two months' preparations and Saladin arrived next day. The struggle for the city was waged by land and sea. The Crusaders had the advantage that the garrison was almost always cut off from the sea and suffered from lack of food. Besides, although the Crusaders at ʿAkka were joined by only very few German Knights owing to the death of Frederick I, they were given a decided superiority over the Saracens by the arrival of the army of Philip and more particularly that of Richard I and by the regular arrivals of ships with food and soldiers. They also had very fine siege artillery while the Muslims on their side had very clever artificers to make their fire-bombs. Saladin had the management of the single command, although his army was weakened by the long years of war so that even the relief of the garrison in ʿAkka could not be of much avail to him and his own army finally mutinied. The Crusaders were hampered by their quarrels with one another and the rivalries of King Guy and the Count of Montferrat as well as those of Richard and Philip. The succeeding years were full of fighting by land and sea. Saladin in vain endeavoured to get new forces from the East through the intervention of the Caliph. On the 7th of Dżumādā II, 587 (July 13, 1191) the garrisons capitulated on his terms: without waiting for Saladin's decision. The fortress and all the prisoners in it were to be handed over and the garrison released on payment of 200,000 pieces of gold. When the money had not been paid at the end of a month, Richard had 3,000 prisoners put to death. This cruel deed, which was condemned by Christian chroniclers also, resulted in all the Christian prisoners in the hands of the Muslims being slaughtered. Richard soon afterwards captured Kaštrīya [q. v.], and fortified Jaffa, while Saladin destroyed the fortress of Ramla. Negotiations for a peace henceforth went on almost without interruption between the two combatant parties; the principal agent in them was Saladin's brother, al-Malik al-ʾAdil. The principal demands were the cession of Jerusalem and the surrender of the Holy Cross; Richard, who was full of romantic ideas, afterwards proposed that his sister Bertrancia marry ʾAdil, who was to rule over Jerusalem; he followed a policy of reconciliation which gradually led to peace. He knighted al-Malik al-Kāmil [q. v.], ʾAdil's son. After several more battles peace was concluded on Shawwāb 23, 588 (Nov. 2, 1192). Lydda and Ramla were divided, Ascalon was given to the Crusaders and the Crusaders allowed to make pilgrimage to the Holy Places unarmed. The main cause of the conclusion of peace on Richard's side was his illness and his desire to return to England, as well as the cessation of reinforcements from Europe. In spite of the exertions of the whole of Europe the greater part of Palestine had become Muslim under Saladin, except for the strip along the coast, and communication between Palestine and Egypt secured; Saladin was on friendly terms with Bohemund of Antioch. Saladin was able to enjoy peace during the few months that he still had to live; he strengthened Jerusalem, then went leisurely to Damascus, where he was welcomed with rejoicings by the people towards the end of Dhu 'l-ʾKaʿda (end of November). He spent the winter there with his family; he fell ill in Safa, 589 (February, 1193) and died 14 days later at the age of 55. His eldest son received Damascus, his second Aleppo, another Egypt and his brother ʾAdil North Arabia and Mesopotamia. The unity of his dominion disappeared within a few years after his death. It is not likely that, even if he had lived longer, he could have induced his family to come to an intelligent arrangement. During his lifetime, however, he hardly ever had to fight against one of his own family. His authority, based on his ability, kindness and piety, could not be assailed. Coo"seousness was removed from his character; twice — at the death of the Fāṭimid Caliph al-ʾAdid and at the death of the Ayyubid Nūr al-Dīn — he had an opportunity to acquire great wealth. He distributed the Caliph's treasure to his troops and retainers and did not touch Nūr al-Dīn's wealth but gave it to his son. He was fanatical against the Crusaders as a body but not as individuals and not against the subjected Christians of his empire, although when he came to the throne he at first enforced more strictly the regulations regarding dress for Christians and Jews, He followed
the same course as Nūr al-Dīn and may (see the art. AYUBI) be claimed as a champion of the Sunni reaction against Shi‘ī (Ferisian) faction in architecture, style, and writing of official documents. In the last years of his reign the personal relations between Muslims and Christians were good; it appears that some Muslims were actually knighted by Richard, e.g. al-Mālik al-Kāmil, son of al-Mālik al-ʿAdil. Salādīn was beloved and respected by his people and with Sūlān Baibars [q.v.] and Ḥūrin al-Rashīd [q.v.] to this day the most popular figure in the East. In Europe he is considered the pattern of chivalry and, as a matter of fact, he never was unnecessarily cruel but was often magnanimous in releasing prisoners and bestowing gifts (e.g. the citadel of 'Akkā to the young sister of al-Ṣāliḥ Ismā‘īl, several villages to Bohemund of Antioch after the peace with Richard I). The Arabs have with only one exception (a chapter in the romance of Baibars) not given him a place in ballad or romance, whereas very soon after his death he touched the fancy of English minstrels in connection with Richard, although they depicted him in an unfavourable light; in the poetry of the French and Italians he is described more favourably. Modern novelists like Scott in his Taṣlīm and Lessing in his Nūḥān al-Walī have introduced him into their works; to the former he is a vigorous Oriental ruler while the latter depicts him with as fine feelings as a European. He was a friend of theological learning, a patron of scholars and a builder on a grand scale as he showed in the Citadel of Cairo and in the restoration of the buildings in Jerusalem.

The epigraphical materials concerning S. have been treated in a detailed study by G. Wiet, Les-inscriptions de Salādīn (Syria, iii. 307—329).

Bibliography: The still unprinted manuscript sources are quoted by Blochet in the introduction (p. 1—55) to his translation of al-Makritzi's Sulṭān (period of the Ayyūbidīs, Paris 1908) in most commendable fashion; numerous extracts from the Musafirī al-Karhān of Ibn Wāṣil and from the "History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria" are also given there in notes in French: translation; the printed literature down to 1889 is given in Dernbourg, Oudāna Ibn Mūṣafīkh in the F.E.L.O., xxx/1, Paris 1889.—Contemporary Arabic and European sources are to be found in the Recueil des historiens des Croisades, Historiens orientaux, i.—vi., Paris 1872—1906, and Historiens occidentaux, vii.—xii, Paris 1844—1886, and in Reinaud's Extraits des historiens des croisades, etc., suivis des guerres des Croisades and in other parts of Michaud, Bibliotheque des Croisades, Paris 1829. — The best and most thorough utilization of early sources is that of Röhrich in his Geschichte des Königreichs Jerusalem, Innsbruck 1908, where Röhrich's other works and many bibliographical references are also quoted. Cf. also van Berchem, Notes sur les Croisades in the Jour. As., series 9, 1902, vol. xix. 385 sqq. Of bibliographical works in addition to Dernbourg's edition of the Oudāna there are the biographies by Ibn Ḳhallīkīn and Bahā’ al-Dīn Ibn Shaddā al-Dīn Ibn Shaddā (both also in the Recueil des hist. orient., vol. iii.); the last named in English as The Life of Salādīn by Behā al-Dīn, ed. by C. W. Wilson, London 1897, by Von Hammer-Purgstall in the Gewänd- en: des Lebensgeschichte geiger, sanctae missionis versch. Teile, Leipzig 1858, etc., and by Stanley Lane-Poole's brilliant and lucid Salādīn and the Fall of the Kingdom of Jerusalem in the Heroes of the Nations Series, London 1898. On the siege of 'Akkā see Norgate, Richard Lion-Heart, London 1924, Index, s.v. Acre and Salādīn. On the European legends relating to Salādīn see Lane-Poole, op. cit., ch. xxiii. 377 sqq., where the pertinent passage in the romance of Baibars as well as Scott's and Lessing's characters of Salādīn are fully discussed (Lane Poole was not aware that the passage quoted by him belongs to the Baibars romance). On European legends of Salādīn see Gaston Paris, La Légende de Salādīn in the Journal des Savants, 1853, and the reprint; cf. also Röhrich in his Geschichte des Königreichs Jerusalem, p. 351, note 1. (SCHEMNICH)

Salāf (A.), or Salām (A.), is regarded by law as a permissible purchase (ba‘īt). The purchaser in this case has to pay the purchase money in advance while the seller, on the other hand, is only required to deliver the article purchased after the expiry of a definite period. That which is sold must be a thing which can be replaced, not simply mentioned by kind but accurately described in the contract. The place where delivery is to be made must also be exactly defined. According to the Shī‘ī school it is not necessary to define the date of delivery expressly in the contract; if this has not been done, delivery can be demanded immediately. In the view of the other Fīqh-schools, however, it is absolutely essential to state a short period at least for delivery. The fāhā in the Hadīth usually called this kind of purchase salām but in the 'Aṣr the name salām was usual.


(Th. W. JüniHoll)

Salām (A.), verbal noun from salām, "to be well, uninjured", used as substantive in the meaning of "peace, health, salutation, greeting"; on the statements of the older Arab lexicographers see the Li‘ān al-‘Arab, xv. 181—183, passim.

The word is of frequent occurrence in the Korān, especially in the Sūrah, which are attributed to the second and third Mekkan periods. The oldest passage that contains salām is Sūrah xxvii. 5, where it is said of the Lailat al-Kadr, "It is peace until the coming of the dawn". Salām is also to be taken in this meaning in Korān l. 33, xxv. 46, xxi. 69, xi. 50. Salām means peace in this world as well as in the next. In the latter meaning we find it used in the expression Dār al-Salām, "the abode of bliss" for Paradise (Sūrah x. 26, vl. 127). In the Medina verse v. 18 which is addressed to the Abīl al-Kālid we find the expression Subhān al-Salām, the paths of bliss (cf. Isaiah, lix. 8: Dārīk Shālīm).

But salām is most frequently used in the Korān as a form of salutation. Thus in Sūrah lxi. 90 (first Mekkan period) the people of the right hand are greeted by their companions in bliss with Salām lakā "Peace be upon thee" (according to al-Balḏūrī;
laid down a law of mercy for himself"; and in xiv. 27: "O ye believers, enter not into dwellings which are not your own before ye have asked leave and said: salatu ( composite for salat + tilawatin) on the inhabitants etc.; similarly xiv. 61: "If ye enter dwellings, say salam upon one another (jaatulitum) etc. (cf. a similar prescription Matth., x. 12, Luk., x. 5); iv. 88, where the mores general expression for greeting (karena) is used, is also referred to the salam salutation. But Goldsbery has pointed out (Z. D. M. G., xlv. 22 sq.) and quoted passages from poets in support of the view that salam was already in use as a greeting before Islam. The corresponding Hebrew and Aramaic expressions Shalom ḫaš, Shalom ṭaḥ (ṭoḥ), Shalom ʿal šal Shim, which go back to Old Testament usage (cf. Judges, xix. 20, 2 Sam., xvii. 25, Dan., x. 19, 1 Chir., xii. 19), were also in use as greetings among the Jews and Christians (cf. Dalman, Grammat. d. jüd.-paläst. Aramäisch 2, Leipzig 1905, p. 244); according to Ta'anit Pugadum, iv. 35, Ṣalām ʿal šal was the Prophet's greeting. Cf. also Sahitta Mat. x. 12, xxvi. 49, Luk. v. 5, 2 Sam., xii. 18, 26, and Payne Smith, Thee, Sprachk., col. 4189 sq.). A very great number of Nalatukian inscriptions further show the use of ṣallahu to express good wishes in North-west Arabia and the Sinai Peninsula (C. I. S., II., Inscriptions Aramaeotae, 1. No. 288 sqq., twice repeated in No. 244, 539, thrice repeated in No. 302) and the Arabic ṣalām frequently occurs in the Safaitic inscriptions as a benedictive term. Cf. E. Littmann, Zur Entstehung der Safaitischen Inschriften, Leipzig 1901, p. 47, 52 sq.; 55, 56, 57, 59, 61, 64, 66, 67, 70; do., Semitische Inschriften, New York—London 1905, Safaitische Inschriften, No. 5, 8, 12, 15, 69, 128, 134. If the line salamana rabbanu fi halti faqrān quoted in the Liitū al-ʿarb., xv. 183-3 from below, were genuine and really by Umayya b. Abi-Šlāʿ, one might perhaps conclude from it that there was a benedictory use of the salāmun formula in the morning service in certain monothetic circles of North Arabia. Presumably the usage suggested by Christian and Jewish views, had given the word a special significance in the region of Aramaic culture. Liez–Jahrbik’s suggestion (Zecher, für Semitistik, i. 85 sqq.) that salām reproduces the idea expressed by swarga need not be discussed here but his explanation of Liitū as the infinitive of a denominative verb salama formed from salam–swarga (“to enter into the state... of salama”), cannot be reconciled with such expressions frequent in the Korān as salama waṣṣāma li-Wahy salama il-Rabbi al-šalimat in etc.

Muhammad must have placed a high religious value on the salāmun formula as he considered it a greeting given by the angels to the blessed and used it as an auspicious salutation on the prophets who had preceded him. A salām like that in the tassahhun (see below) or like the salutation of peace which closes the salât and has its parallel in the Jewish misbaha (cf. E. Mittwoch, Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des islam. Prets. u. Kultus in der Ahb. Pr. Abh. W., ph., Abh. K. I. 1932, no. 2, p. 18), may have been from the first an essential feature of the ritual of divine service. According to a tradition (al-Bukhārī, al-Tirmīdī, bāb 3, al-Aḥbāb, bāb 148, 150), originally they uttered the salām at the close of the salât on Allāh, on Djabrīl, Mīkān and other angels. With the

for other explanations see the Liitū al-ʿarb., xvi. 184 sqq.; and the art. ALEKH). Salam (Sūra xxxvi. 58, xiv. 28, x. 10, xxxii. 43) or Salam ṭalakum (s. xvi. 34, xviix. 73, xili. 24) is the greeting which is given in the blessed in Paradise or on entering Paradise (cf. s. 75); Sūra i. 25 (other readings Salamun ṭalakum; cf. xiii. 63) is presumably also intended as an auspicous exclamation (other interpretations in al-Baidawī). Those on the Ḍarf (q. v.) call to the dwellers in Paradise salam ṭalakum (vii. 44). Salam is also the greeting of the guests of Ibrahim and his reply (li. 25, xi. 72; cf. xv. 52). Ibrahim takes leave with Salam ʿalakum (s. xix. 48) from his father, who threatens him. In Sūra xx. 49 Mūsā in his address to Firʿawn is made to use the expression al-salam ʿalā man illa abbi aḥ-ḥuda ʿesbeer be upon him who follows the right guidance". According to the first explanation in al-Baidawī, al-salam here means the greeting of the angels and guardians of Paradise; but as those words are not at the beginning of the speech, an other interpretation prefers to consider it as an affirmative sentence and to take salam as "occurred from Allāh's wrath and punishment" (cf. al-Baidawī) on the passage and the Liitū al-ʿarb., xv. 183, 1 3. Salam ʿalakum "peace be upon you" is found in Sūra vi. 54 at the beginning of the message which the Prophet has to deliver to the believers in Sūra xxviii. 60 a salam is uttered over Allāh's chosen servants. As a benediction salam is also used repeatedly in Sūra xxxvii., where at the end of the mention of each prophet a salam is uttered over him (verses 77, 109, 120, 130, 181; cf. also xiii. 15, 34). Salam may be used in an invocational sense in Sūra xlix. 89 at parting from the unbelievers and salam ʿalakum in Sūra xxviii. 55 (other interpretations in al-Baidawī). This might perhaps hold of salamun, Sūra xvi. 64, also, with which the servants of the Merciful reply to the ignorant (jihālim), but the commentators take it in the sense of salamun or barakum. In Sūra i. 23 (Medinese al-salam occurs as one of the names of Allāh, which al-Baidawī interprets as māṣūr used as sūba in the meaning of "the Faatless" (for other explanations cf. Liitū al-ʿarb., xv. 182, 7 sqq., 79 sqq.). Al-Salam in the expressions Dōr al-Salam and Sahil al-Salam is therefore also interpreted as a name of Allāh (cf. al-Baidawī on Sūra vi. 127, x. 26, v. 15; Liitū al-ʿarb., xv. 182, 7 sq.). The word has even been taken to mean Allāh in the formula al-salam ʿalakum (Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, Mafātīḥ al-ḥiṣāb on Sūra vi. 54, Cairo 1278, isl. 54, 1 sq.; Liitū al-ʿarb., xv. 182, 7 sq.). It is also probable that the greeting is intended in al-faṣil ʿal-salam in Sūra iv. 96; another reading is al-salāma as in the similar expression in iv. 92, 93, xvi. 30, 89.

The denominative verb salamān is first found in the Medina chapters, namely Sūra xxxix. 56, where it is recommended to utter salāte (q. v.) and salam over the Prophet, and in xiv. 27, 51 (see below).

At quite an early period the view became established among the Muslims that the salām greeting was an Islamic institution. This is, however, not necessarily correct in so far as the Korān recommends the use of this greeting in a late Meccan passage and in two Medina passages: in vi. 54 it is commanded to the Prophet: "If those come to you who believe in Our signs say: *Peace be upon you* (Ṣalāma ʿalakum). Your Lord hath
remark that Allah is himself the salām (cf. Korān, ix. 23), the Prophet disapproved of this and laid down what should be said in the tashahhd (q.v.); the salāt utterance belongs to it in the form given below. On varying traditions regarding the tashahhd see al-Shāfi‘ī, Kif. al-Umm, Cairo 1321, i. 169 sqq.; cf. also Goldziher, Über die Eusegien etc. in the Z. D. M. G., i. 102).

In the salāt as legally prescribed the benediction on Allah and the salām on the Prophet, on the worshipper and those present and on Allah’s pious servants precede the confession of faith in the tashahhd (al-salātum al-a‘lāka, ‘uuyyin ‘l-absāb, wa-ra‘mahatu ‘l-‘ākhi wa-barakātihi; al-salātum ‘alāna al-‘ālītī ‘l-‘āuliya). Among the compulsory ceremonials of the salāt the salām is there also at the end of it the taslimat al-nīn, the full form of which consists in the worshipper in a sitting position turning his head to the right and left and saying each time al-salātum al-a‘līkum wa-ra‘mahatu ‘l-‘ākhi. Cf. al-Badājīrī, Hādīkāy ‘alā sharī’ Ibn Khissīr al-Ghara‘īn matn Abī Sjdīrī, Cairo 1321, i. 168, 170.

The preference of the Korān for the salām formula and its liturgical use may have contributed considerably to the fact that it soon became considered an exclusively Muslim greeting (tashahhd al-Islām). As already mentioned above, the Korān prescribes the salām on the Prophet to follow the taslim. Tradition reports that the latter endeavoured to introduce it when ‘Umar b. Wahhāb was brought before him and gave him the pagan greeting (‘salāmit galab‘ān), the Prophet said: “Allah has given us a better greeting than thine, namely al-salām, the greeting of the dwellers in Paradise.” (Ibn Hāshām, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 472 infra 474; al-Tabarī, ed. de Goeje, i. 1553, n. 919). Those around him are also said to have been eager to introduce this greeting. Al-Wāṣīdī relates that ‘Urwa b. Mas‘ūd, who immediately after his conversion wanted to convert his own townspeople in Ti'if to Islam, called the attention of the Ti'ifīs, who saluted in the heathen fashion, to the greeting of the dwellers in Paradise, al-Salām (Ibn Sa'd, al-Tawākhtūt, n. 369; Sprenger, Das Leben... der Mohammed, iii. 482; Goldziher, Mub. Stud., i. 264). According to Ibn Ishaq, al-Mughāra b. ‘Abn ‘as instructed the deputation from Muhammad from the Ti'ifīs how they were to salute the Prophet, but they would only use the greeting of the Ti‘ifīs (Ibn Hāshām, p. 916, 9 sqq.; al-Tabarī, i. 1290, 9 sqq.; Sprenger, op. cit., iii. 485; Goldziher, loc. cit.). The Jews are said to have disputed this greeting with respect to Muhammad saying, “We do not understand the meaning of ‘play you’, whereupon the Prophet answered wa-salātim “and to you” (al-Bukhārī, al-‘Istī'ī‘ām, bāb 22; al-Bukhārī, b. 38; Ibn Sa'd, al-‘Arab, x. 206). According to Ibn Sa'd (op. cit., iv. l. 163, 13), Abī Dhrār was the first to greet the Prophet with the Muslim greeting. In the same author (op. cit., iv. l. 82, 2) we find salām salātim at the beginning of a letter from Mu‘awīya to Abī Mūsā al-Ash‘ārī.

The expressions which could be used were salām or salātim al-a‘lāka (‘a) or al-salātum salātim. Umm Aliman is said to have used simply (al-)salātim to the Prophet (Ibn Sa'd, op. cit., viii. 163, 7 sqq. and 9 sqq.). In the Korān the use of salātum salātim preponderates. Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī endeavours to explain the indefinite form as preferable and expresses the conception of perfect greeting (ep. cit., ii. 500, 25 sqq., iii. 512, 11 sqq.). Following him al-Shāfi‘ī is said to have preferred salātim al-a‘lāka in the tashahhd (ep. cit., iii. 512, 33); but the Shāfi‘ī school also allow a substitute form here (al-Badājīrī, op. cit., i. 168; Ibn al-ʿArabī, al-‘Arab, xv. 182, 23 sqq.). The formula al-salātum salātim was, however, much used as a greeting. This undetermined form is expressly prescribed in the taslim (Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, ep. cit., ii. 501, 3; al-Badājīrī, op. cit., i. 170; Ibn al-ʿArabī, al-‘Arab, xv. 182, 17 sqq.). As a return greeting wa-salātim became usual (for further details on this see Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, ep. cit., ii. 500, 25 sqq., iii. 512, 17 sqq.). According to Ibn Sa'd (op. cit., iv. l. 115, 9 sqq.), “Abd Allah b. ’Umar replied with salātim salātim. According to some traditions, Muhammad had described the expression ‘ala‘ka ‘wa-makka the salutation to the dead and replied on being greeted with al-salātum al-a‘lāka (al-Tahānī, ii. 3295; Ibn al-ʿArabī, al-Nihāyāt fi Gharb al-Ḥadīth wa-l-Athār, Cairo 1311, ii. 176 below). The first named form of the greeting is actually found in elegiac verses (op. cit., ii. 177; Ibn Sa'd, al-ʿArab, xv. 182). But there are also traditions in which the Prophet greets the dead in the cemetery with an expression beginning with (al-)salātim (al-Tahānī, iii. 2403, 10 sqq.; Ibn al-ʿArabī and Ibn al-ʿArabī, loc. cit.). ’Abd Allah b. ’Umar also on returning from a journey is said to have saluted the graves of the Prophet, of Abī Bakr and of his father with al-salātum al-a‘lāka (Ibn Sa'd, ep. cit., iv. l. 115, 9 sqq.).

The salātum formula was very early extended by the addition of the words “wa-ṣalātim ‘l-ākhi wa-ṣalātim ‘l-‘ākhi” and became used in the taslim and the second in the tashahhd (cf. above). Applying the Korānic commandment (iv. 88: “when ye are saluted with a salutation, salute a person with a better than his or at least return it”) it is recommended (summa) in the return greeting to add the wish of blessing and benediction or occasionally, when replying to a simple salātum, only the former (cf. al-Bukhārī, al-‘Istī‘ām, bāb 16, 18). If anyone is saluted with the threefold formula, he must reply with the same (Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī on Sīta iv. 88, 23 sqq., 502, 14 sqq.). According to Lane (Manners and Customs, l. 239, note), the threefold formula was very common as a return greeting in Egypt; cf. also Nāhillī, L’Arabo parlaite in Egitto, Milan 1913, p. 121. In Mecca, it is comparatively rarely given; the reply usual there is wa-salātim (salātim wa-ṣalātim wa-ṣalātim ‘l-‘ākhi wa-ṣalātim ‘l-‘ākhi); cf. Snouck Hurgronje, Mecklenburgische Sprichwörter u. Redensarten, The Hague 1886, p. 118. Landberg (Études sur les dialectes de L’Arabie méridionale, ii. 786, note) thinks that the longer form recalls the priest’s blessing in Num., vi. 24—26. The application of salātim to a single person is explained by saying that the plural suffix includes the two accompanying angels or the spirits attached to him (i.e. the person; Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, op. cit., ii. 501, 19 sqq.; cf. iii. 515, 17 sqq.).

At the conclusion of a letter the expression wa-salātim (‘ala‘ka, ‘um) is often used, e.g. Ibn Sa'd, op. cit., i. l. 27, 17, p. 28, a. 9, 99, 89, 13, x. Al-Jarrah (Durrel al-Ghamūtī, ed. Thober, p. 208, 3 sqq.) disapproves of the use here of the indefinite form (salātim), which, according to the more correct use, should only be used at the beginning. — Wa-salātim has occasionally the meaning of “and that is the end of it” (cf. Snouck Hurgronje, op. cit., p. 92).
In keeping with Korān xx. 48, it became usual to use the form ál-salāmú 'alā man ītābā' ḫuḍūd to non-Muslims when necessary (cf. Fakhhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, op. cit., ii. 501, 89 sqq.; iv. 705, 10 sqg.). It is found, for example, in a letter attributed to Khārijī (al-Bukhārī, al-Iṣlāh al-Muḥarrar, bāb 24; Ibn Sa'd, op. cit., i. 61, 28, 3 sq.; cf. line 6 there at the beginning of the letter: salāmu 'alā man Ismā'īl). Papyri of the year 91 (710) bear early testimony to its use (Papyri Schott-Reinhardt, i, ed. by C. H. Becker, Heidelburg 1906, l. N°. 22, ii. 42 sq., iii. 83 sq., x. 11, xi. 7, xvii. 9). A letter from Muḥammad to the Jews of Maḥbūb concludes, however, with salāmū (Ibn Sa'd, op. cit., i. 61, 28 sq.); similarly a letter to the Christians in Allā (ibid., p. 29, 16 sqg.). In Ḥadīth also a tendency is noticeable not to deny the salām greeting; at least as a reply, to unbelievers and the Alī K̄īṣā (cf. al-Ṭabarī, al-Tafsīr, v. 111 sqg.; Fakhhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, les cits.).

On the rules and limitations regarding salutation cf. the article ṬASTLI. The As-salām means also a ṣalāmī litany, which is pronounced from the minarets every Friday about half an hour before the beginning of the midday service before the ṣalāh. This part of the liturgy is repeated inside the mosque before the regular ceremonies by several people with good voices standing on a ἱδων (Goldziher, Über die Einlogen, etc. in the Z.D.M.G., l. 105 sqg.; cf. Lane, op. cit., l. 117). The same name is given to the benedictions on the Prophet which are sung during the month of Ramadān about half an hour after midnight from the minarets (Lane, op. cit., ii. 264).

The ambiguous formula al-salālī 'l-ṣalāmū, which, according to the strictly orthodox opinion, like the ṣaḥāqa, should only follow the names of Prophets, but was more freely used in the earlier literature (cf. also al-Bukhārī, al-Ībād al-Muḥātā, bāb 43; Fāṭima al-Qāṣīa 'l-ṣalālī), was used by the Shi'īs without limitation of 'Alī and his descendants also (Goldziher, op. cit., Z.D.M.G., l. 121 sqq.; Fakhhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, op. cit., iii. 511 sqg.).

The Saun's of British India make a magical use of the so-called seven 'alānū which refer to Sūrā xxxvi. 58, xxvii. 77, 109, 120, 130, xxxix. 73, xcviii. 5. In the morning of the festival of Aḥād al-Ṣuḥārāh (see Aḥād) they write the seven 'alānū's or have them written with saffron, water, ink, or rosewater on the leaf of a mango-tree or a sacred fig-tree, or of a plantain. They then wash off the writing in water and drink it in the hope that they may enjoy peace and happiness (Dżafar Şarif-Herklotz, Islam in India or Ǧumāl-Ǧumāl, new ed. by W. Crooke, London 1921, p. 186 sqg.).


Bibliography: al-Ṭabarī, ed. de Goeje, iii. 492, 493; Ibn al-_province, Kāmil, vi. 38, 39; Corpus Papyrorum Raineri, iii, Series Arabica, i. A. Grohmann, iii. 111, 120. (A. Grohmann)

Salāmā b. Djaandal, a poet of pre-Islamic times, was a member of the clan al-Ḫātīb, which belonged to the large division Sa'd al-Fīr of the tribe Ṭamīm. He is numbered among the excellent poets of the Dāhilīyā of whom only few poems are preserved. He must have flourished during the second half of the sixth century of our era, as the most prominent event in his life recorded is about his brother Aḥmar (sometimes misspelled Aḥmaud). When A'am b. Kūthīm, the chief of the tribe of Taghūt, made his raid south, Aḥmar was made a prisoner by A'am, but released without ransom upon the petition of Salāmā (Divān of A'am, Introduction to poem N°. 2; Aḥmaud, lx. 185, 18). Whether there is an error on the part of Arab tradition is not certain, but in the biography of Salāmā we are told in the notes on poem N°. 8 edition Cheikho, something happened to Aḥmar with a certain Ša'wa b. Marīkh b. "Amm b. Ṭamīm. The latter probably belonged to the Ḥassān clan of "Amm who resided as allies (ḥalaqna) among the tribe of S̱īhān, or he may have belonged to the celebrated Yamanite family of Ṭamīm. In his longest poem Salāmā refers to the death of al-Nṣām, king of al-Hira, who was trampled to death by elephants at the order of the Persian king Parwaž (Divān, N°. 3, v. 39; Aḥmaud, N°. 53, v. 39). Further the Nāba'ī of Djarār and Faradaḍāa give two poems by Salāmā, not in the Divān, in which he celebrates the victory of Ḥaḍīd, in which the clan of Minṣār, also a division of Sa'd al-Fīr, defeated the tribe of Bāk b. Wa'il. These two events place the life-time of Salāmā towards the end of the seventh century. The time of his death cannot be fixed; he did not live to the time of Islām and none of his descendants appear to be named in the biographies of early Muslims.

Cheikho is mistaken when he assumes that Salāmā is identical with the renowned chief Salāmā b. Djaandal b. Naḥṣalā, the latter being of the clan Nāba'ī b. Dārīm and related to Mudjābāh, the ancestor of the poet al-Faradaḍā. Salāmā is reputed to excel in the description of horses. His collected poems have come down to us in two old manuscripts, which were edited by Cheikho in 1920. This Divān contains only nine poems or fragments of such, 135 verses in all, to which the editor has added a further 36 verses collected from various sources and to which I can add only one verse quoted in the Kitāb al-ʿAin (ed. Baghādād), p. 105. We have no reason to doubt the genuineness of most of the verses. The poet speaks most of departed youth which unfortunately is not a guide to his age, as such statements belong to the ordinary phraseology of such poems. That he mentions Aḥmar (N°. 1, v. 12) I should not take as a sign of later interpolation, as I believe that before Muḥammad the form of monotheism through the influence of Christianity and Judaism was widespread in Arabia, though the form al-ỉlāh is probably the correct form in earlier times. He mentions swords of Buṣra and al-Maḍīn, which are seldom or never mentioned in verses of later times, as swords were no longer obtained from there. That he mentions writing or even inkstands and parchments (N°. 778).
3, v. 2) is not at all strange as these things were more widely known than is generally admitted. His poetry has otherwise the stamp of what is called Bedouin poetry, a rather unfortunate designation as it gives a wrong impression (cf. the art. سُبُر). The text of the دُنْسَة is a combination of the Başran (Asma) and the كِنْف (Abū 'Amr al-Shāhiš) school, of whom the latter will generally be found more reliable, but unfortunately the recensions are not kept apart in this case to discern any differences. It would be wrong to assume that they collected the poems; their work was the commenting of the text which they found from the work of Kifār. The edition by Cl. Husart (1 F. A., 1910) is superseded by that of Cheikho (Beyrouth 1920), which contains all that is known about سُلِامَة.

**Bibliography:** Mufādhalīyy, ed. Lyall, N. 22, text and translation; ed. Cairo, L. 54; ed. Thorbecke, N. 20; 'Aṣma'īyy, ed. Ahlwardt, N. 53; Muḥammad b. Sulaymān, ed. Hel-Deiwn (1916), p. 36; Nābīrī, ed. Devan, p. 147-148; Ibn Kanūlāb, Kifār al-Su'd, ed. de Goeje, p. 147; Pučēs Chrētien, ed. Cheikho, p. 486-491. Verses of Salamān are cited in most books dealing with ancient Arabic poetry e.g. in the ليد في العربية 40 times.

(F. Krenkow)

**SALAMANCA,** the capital of the Spanish province of Salamanca, on the right bank of the river Tormes, 173 miles by rail N.W. of Madrid, with a population of 25,690 (1900). In the Roman period the city was constituted a military station, being the ninth on the Via Lata, which was the great highway of Spain, running from Merida to Saragossa. Trajan built a magnificent bridge there, the original piers of which still exist. Like the rest of Spain the city suffered from the Gothic invasion.

It was a greater change for the city, when Mu'tah, the governor of Africa, appeared with 18,000 picked men in Southern Spain (712), and began a methodical campaign in the Peninsula. Capturing Seville, Carmona and Merida, he covered the road that many a Roman legion had traversed before him, until he came before Salamanca. The city, which once had the dignity and defiance of a Roman fort, offered but a poor resistance to the Muslim warriors. But although the district was now in the hands of foreigners, the inhabitants found their masters not impossible tyrants. If they paid their tax, and followed their faith, without unduly propagating it, their lives and their property were safe. Indeed, they soon found that a new intellectual life had come to the city, and they had to bow before the classical and oriental learning of the invaders. It is by no mere chance that Salamanca boasts of the oldest and largest university in Spain. Its foundations were laid by the unpromising pioneers of Islām.

Ibn al-Asrī states that in May 737 A.D. (24 A.H.) King Alphonso opened an attack on the Moors, and drove them out of Salamanca, but this does not seem to have been anything more than a preliminary raid. The city, however, was never a Muslim possession in the sense that Cordova or Seville was. It certainly was considered an admirable piece of work of Ibn Abī 'Amr, when in Sept. 977 he succeeded in capturing the suburbs of the city from the Christians, for he was rewarded with the title of Ibn 'l-Wisāratān and a princely salary. So the fate of Salamanca wavered from decade to decade, until finally through internal disunion, and the more determined hostility of the Spanish Christians, Moorish pride and power were swept from the city in 1055, never more to be re-instated.

The University, founded officially in 1220 by Alphonso IX of Leon, was in itself sufficient to give distinction to Salamanca, through all the succeeding centuries, until the great battle of 1812, when Wellington settled the fate of the French in the Peninsula.

**Bibliography:** — Ibn al-'Aṣrī, al-Kūnī, index; Villar y Macías, Historia de Salamanca, 3 vols., Salamanca 1887; H. Rashdall, Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages, 3 vols., London 1895; Lapuny, La Universidad de Salamanca y la cultura española en el siglo XIII, Paris 1900; Dous, Histoire des Musulmans d'Espagne, Leiden 1861; Al-Makkari, History of the Muhammadan Dynasties in Spain, transal. by P. de Gayangos, O. T. F., London 1840.

(T. Crother Gordon)

**SALAMIYA,** a small town in Syria in the district east of the Orontes, about twenty-five miles S. E. of Hamah and thirty-five (a day's journey) E. N. E. of Hims (for the exact situation of Joseph's map in Oppenheim, Tabul Mittelm. vom Persischen Golf, i. and part ii. 401). It lies in a fertile plain 1500 feet above sea level, south of the Djabal al-'Azā and on the margin of the Syrian steppe. The older and more correct pronunciation was Salamūya (al-ṣaṭākhi, B. G. A., i. 61; Ibn al-Fakhīr, B. G. A., v. 110) but the form Salamiya is also found very early (al-Muṣafaddān, B. G. A., iii. 190; Ibn Khordādbeh, B. G. A., ii. 76, 98) and it is now the form almost universally in use (cf. also Yākūt, Maqāmāt, ed. Waṭensfels, iii. 123, and Littman, Semitische Inschriften, p. 169 sq.). The nisba from the name is Salami. The town seems to be the ancient Salamis or Salmisinos, which flourished in the Christian period, but the references of the classical authors to this place are uncertain. Yākūt (iii. 123) gives a popular etymology. The term, he says, was originally called Salam-ma, after the hundred surviving inhabitants of the destroyed town of al-Ma'taika.

The situation of the town was important as an outpost of Syria, where main routes from the steppe (Palmyra) and the Irāk joined; but it was never of any great military importance. It was conquered by the Arabs in the year 15 A.H. and became one of the towns of the Ḫādż of Hims; it was only after 1500 in the Mamlūk period that it was placed in the district of Hamah for administrative purposes. In the second century of the Hijra, after the victory of the 'Abbāsids, the descendants of the 'Abbasīd Šāhī b. 'Alī b. 'Abd Allah b. 'Abbās settled in Salamiya. The town is said to be most indebted to Šāhī's son, 'Abbās Allah, who rebuilt it and made arrangements for the irriga-

the town of the neighbourhood. This 'Abbās Allah was held in high esteem by his cousins, the Caliphs. He married the sister of al-Mahdī and became governor of the Irāk. This Caliph visited him in Salamiya and was astonished at 'Abbās Allah's dwelling there (al-Ṭabarī, iii. 500). There are also other references to the fact that many 'Iljāhīms lived in Salamiya.

Almost nothing has survived of this period. There is the foundation inscription of a mosque.
on a stone (not in situ) at the entrance to the citadel. It is probable that this inscription is dated 150 (769) and that it belonged to a mosque founded by those Hashimis, which may have been destroyed about 290 (902/3) by the Karmatians. Still another inscription dating from an 'Abbasid has been found in the citadel; according to Littmann’s probable suggestion, it belongs with two other inscriptions to the period from 280 (893) (or, for another view, see M. Hartmann in the Z.D.P.V., xxiv. 55). The fact that Salamiya was the centre of an important branch of the Hashimis and the isolated position of the town perhaps account for the fact that about 255 (671) it became the secret centre of ‘Abbasid propaganda. It is difficult to ascertain who was the first Grand Master of the Ismai‘iliya to settle in Salamiya; in any case it does not seem to have been so early as ‘Abd Allâh b. Mâmin himself (as de Sacy, Exposé de la Religion des Druses, Paris 1838, Introd., p. 71, 166 supposes), for the latter, as de Goeje (Ministère sur les Carmathes du Bahreïn, Leiden 1886, p. 19) makes probable, was probably never in Salamiya. The first leader to be sent here was apparently Husain b. ‘Abd Allâh b. Mâmin (de Goeje, op. cit., p. 21), whose son, Salâd ‘Ubayd Allâh, destined to become the first Fâtimid Caliph, was born in Salamiya in 259 or 260 (873/4) (Ibn Khallikân, Wa‘âyûr al-A‘yân, ed. Wustenfeld, N°. 365); according to a biased statement in Ibn al-A‘lî (vii. 23), ‘Ubayd Allâh was the son of a smith in Salamiya, whose widow afterwards married Husain. When Husain died about 270 (883/4) his brother A‘mad b. ‘Abd Allâh b. Mâmin, also known as Ibn Shâlaqshah, became Grand Master and guardian of his nephew ‘Ubayd Allâh, till his death (about 280 = 893/4). ‘Ubayd Allâh continued to reside in Salamiya till 289 (902) when he set out on his successful journey to North Africa (de Goeje, op. cit., p. 64). In the next year the town was practically wiped out by the Karmatians from Irak under their leader Husain, who had assumed the title of Malâkî. Of all towns in Syria, Salamiya, as home of the former companions in faith and later bitter enemies of the Karmatians, was treated the worst (de Goeje, op. cit., p. 50). Soon afterwards, however, the Syrian towns were reconquered and occupied by the Caliph. It is not impossible that the quadrangular citadel in the centre of the town goes back to the Ismai‘ili period; according to van Berchem, it belongs to an early period architecturally.

In the fourth (Xth) century, Salamiya must have been in an area inhabited by Beduins (Sa‘îf al-Dawla’s campaign; cf. Hartmann in the Z.D.P.V., xxiii. 175, 176). At the end of the fifth (XIth) century, it was included in the possessions of the brigand chief Khalâl b. Malik (M. Hartmann reads Malikb, who acknowledged Fâtimid suzerainty. It is difficult to say of this in an inscription in Kufic characters on the door beam of the mosque of 481 (1088). According to Ibn al-A‘lî (x. 184), Khalâl took Salamiya in 476 (1083); he was then already master of ‘Hims. But in 485 he lost ‘Hims and the lands that went with it to the Salûqûd, brother of Malik Shâh. In the inscription Khalâl says that he has erected a maqṣūd on the tomb of Abu 1-Hassan ‘Ali b. Djarî, whose servant (fâ‘ir) he calls himself (Khalâl is very fully dealt with by M. Hartmann, Z. D. P. V., xxiv. 58–65).

During the Crusades Salamiya is never mentioned as a fortress but frequently as a meeting-place for the Muslim armies. Politically it has always shared the fate of ‘Hims [q.v.]. Thus it passed to Rûqayyâ, son of Tûnush, in 490 (1102/3). In 533 (1143/4) the Atâ‘îeg Zang, who was then besieging ‘Hims, set out from Salamiya on his campaign against the Greeks at Saläzir (Ibn al-A‘lî, xi. 36 sq.) and in 570 (1174/5) Saladin obtained the town together with ‘Hims and Hamä from the Amir Fâhîr al-Din al-Zâ‘farání (Ibn al-A‘lî, xi. 276). In 626 (1229) we find al-Malîk al-Kâmil in Salamiya as a starting point for ‘Irak; the lord of Hamä came there to submit to him. Two years later, al-Kâmil gave the town to Asad al-Din Shira‘î, who rebuilt the fortress of Shumaimish on it one of the peaks of the Djabal al-‘A‘lî (Ibn al-A‘lî, xii. 318, 349) which had been destroyed by the earthquake of 1157 (Kamât al-Din, Histoire d’Afîn, transal. Illochet, Paris 1900, p. 21).

In 1259, the Egyptian army was defeated at Salamiya by the Mongols under Ghârân; the battle was followed by the brief Mongol occupation of the city of Damascus.

In the eighth (XVth) century, Salamiya was part of the important frontier lands (called al-Shariqîya) of the manâdž of Damascus. Abu 1-Fâhîr, in whose territory as lord of Hamä the town lay during the Mamlûk period, mentions an agreement between Salamiya and Hamä. In 776 (1376) he went with his troops to clear out this chanel (autobiography of Abu 1-Fâhîr in the Rec. des Hist. des Crois., Hist. Orient., i. 168, 185). This aqueduct no longer exists. Perhaps it is the same as is mentioned by al-Dimashqî (p. 207) as existing between ‘Hims and Salamiya and built by the ‘Abbasid ‘Abd Allâh b. Shâbî. At this time Yâkût (iii. 123) speaks of seven prayer-niches near Salamiya below which some tabûnts were buried; he also mentions the tomb of al-Nu‘mân b. Bashîr, the companion of the Prophet.

Under Turkish rule, the town ceased to be of importance. In the middle of the nineteenth century it was entirely deserted, probably on account of the lack of adequate protection against the Beduins. But an Ismai‘î Shâhî from the Nusairi mountains settled there and succeeded in settling the place with his followers. The Shâhîs were received by the beyliks and referred without meeting. Ismai‘îls from a short time made the town very prosperous, which induced the Turkish government (in 1894) to create a special kâdâ of Salamiya in the sandjak of Hamä in the wilâyet of Bâlût. The population of the kâdâ is given by Cuiinet (1896) as 53,084, of whom the smaller half are Muslims and the larger Christians. The town itself is said by the same authority to have 6,000 inhabitants, in addition to the Druses (by whom he probably means the Ismai‘îls). The irrigation is excellent; the crumps of the district consist mainly of corn and legumes.

On the fortress of Shumaimish see van Berchem and Falio, Voyages en Syrie, i. 171, 173.

Bibliography. The Arab geographers originated in the text from the Bibl. Geogr. Arab.; R. Hartmann, Die geographischen Nachrichten über Palästina und Syrien in Halbt. ug-Zähliert "suladat half al-ma‘alûkî", a Tübingen dissertation of 1907, p. 42 sq., 60; Gaudfroy-Demombynes, La Syrie à l’époque des Mamelouks, Paris 1923, p. 75; G. Le Strange, Palestine under the
SAŁAMIYA — SALAMLIK

1) Reception-room in Turkish houses of the upper classes, derived from *salam*, greeting, welcome. In the general plan of this type of house (*joumā*) there is an ante-room or court behind the main door, at one side of which a stair-case leads up to the *salamlık*, *mirdab* [q.v.] and to the corridor (*jezāf*), which together form the part of the house allotted to the males. On the other side of the court is the entrance to the harem [q.v.]; there also is the swivel-box (*deka*) through which the women communicate with the harem kitchen. Although Salamlık originally meant only the room in which the guests are welcomed, the word has now come to receive the wider general meaning of the whole of the men's apartments as opposed to the harem or hareemlik. It therefore coincides more or less with the *avdas* or *dövγarah* of the Greeks, Barbier de Meynard, *Dict. Turc.-Français*, Paris 1856, mentions a room called *harem-salamlık*, which is situated between the two parts of the house and cannot be entered by strangers; it is therefore probably another name for the *mirdab*.

In Turkish houses of the lower classes it seems that strangers were not admitted at all (Hans Dernschwam's *Trockenbuch*, ed. Babinger, 1923, p. 134); there was therefore no salamlık there.

In northern Mesopotamia where wood is scarce the rooms of the houses are hollowed out of sandstone and a kind of dome of stone and clay is put over them. Mulkhe, *Briefe aus der Türkei*, Berlin 1893, p. 242, describes this type of house where one of these domed rooms is salamlık, another hareem, another a stable, etc.

2) A ceremony in Constantinople on the occasion of the ceremonial visit of the Sultan to a mosque for the Friday service.

That the Ottoman Sultans were accustomed to pay a ceremonial visit to a mosque on Friday is often mentioned by travellers. Every Friday they visited one or other of the so-called Sultan's mosques (Sultan-i *Salāfiyn*), where they had their boxes or stalls, while at an earlier period the high officers of state used to accompany the Sultan, but the time of Ibrāhīm I has only expected the court officials to go. The streets through which the procession went were usually guarded by Janissaries and the reception in the mosque by the Aga of the Janissaries and the administrator of the mosque was very ceremonious. In winter it was usually the Ayā Şofya, as the mosque nearest the palace, that was visited.

D'Ossian assumes a connection between the Sultan's visit to the mosque and his dignity of *Imām* in his capacity as caliph at the jāmā'at of the *ijtihād* but adds that the Sultan never himself appears as *Imām*. This view is quite in agreement with D'Ossian's ideas on the caliphate, but perhaps this ceremonial visit to the mosque should rather be regarded as an imitation of similar ceremonies at the Imperial Byzantine court.

Down to the beginning of the nineteenth century the Sultan always appeared on horseback on this occasion (picture of the year 1788 in Joussain and van Gaver, *Turquie*, Paris 1840). Only a very few Sultans omitted the ceremony, as their non-appearance would have aroused resentment among the populace. From the time of Mahmūd II it was the custom for the Sultan to drive in a carriage (cf. von Motlke, *Briefe aus der Türkei*, Berlin 1893, p. 11x).

The name *salamlık* for this ceremony seems only to date from the second half of the sixteenth century. The word has presumably nothing to do with the meaning "reception room" but is rather to be connected with the expression *selam durmāk* "to present arms"; it belongs therefore to military terminology. Ahmed Wāsy Pāša in his *Şemild-i *Oltumāni* (1306 = 1889) paraphrases it as *bincik jānūn's 35yi*.

The ceremony became particularly important in the reign of ʻAbd al-Hamid II. The Sultan was surrounded by a brilliant body-guard, of which his faithful Albanians in their costly uniforms formed the centre, along with the Exoghrul regiment mounted on white horses. From the time he lived in the Vişdīç palace the Salamlık was usually held in the Hamidiye mosque. Formal audience were held after it, to which great political importance was attached, while the display of pomp and splendour was intended to impress the foreigners invited. The holding of the ceremony was announced on each occasion in the official gazette *Taḥzīm-i Wâliyât*.

It became less important after the reign of ʻAbd al-Hamid II and after the abolition of the sultanate by the General National Assembly in November, 1922, in Angora, ʻAbd al-Majīd, who now retained only the dignity of Caliph, retained the salamlık ceremony, which fact is of significance for the character given to it since d'Ossian's day.

The last salamlık took place on Febr. 29, 1924 (1342) in the mosque of Dolma Bagliche and was little more than a parody of its former splendour. There was not even music and the carriage was drawn by only two horses (the *Watson* newspaper of March 1, 1924).


(J. H. Kramers)
SĀLĀR (v.), commander. From the older Pahlavi sarlav there arose as early as the Sassanid period the form sālār with the well-known change of rd to l and compensatory lengthening of the a (cf. Grundr. d. Asern. Phil., i. 357, 274). The analogous word in modern Persian (sordār) is not a survival of the ancient sarlav, but is a modern formation; indeed, the elements from which the ancient word was composed still exist in the modern language. The old Armenian took over the Pahlavi sālār in the form salār; the form sarlav which would give sordār in Armenian is not found in the latter language. A latter, probably modern Persian loan-word in Armenian is (spa) salār with ă instead of a. On this and on other late Armenian forms cf. Hübschmann, Aram. Gram., i. 335 and 239. In the first of these two references the Pahlavi combinations of the word are also given. On the etymology cf. also Horn, Grundriss der neun. Etymologie, p. 153; Flückiger, Kolbei, Die persischen Hymnen, The Fraktur i. Pahlavik (1912), p. 37 and 79.

The term which is primarily military (cf. sipāḥ-sālār, commander of an army; sālār-i-djang) is transferred to several court offices, e.g. sālār-i-khanı (and hūnān-sālār), Steward; sālār-i-bār, Marshal; sālār-i-rūf, Master of Horse. We need not trouble here with what else the native Persian lexicographers say about the word (cf. Vullers, Lex., s. v.); it may be noted, however, that expressions like ḥādūn-sālār for "king" belong to the language of poetry and the meaning "old" (hānuv sālārāt) (which, as far as I know, has not yet been found anywhere) is perhaps based on an incorrect etymology which connects the word with salāt (year).

(V. F. Büchmann)

SĀLĀR DJANG is the title by which Mir Tūrkāli, a Sayyid of Persian descent and one of the greatest of modern Indian statesmen, was best known. He was born at Haidarābād in the Dākan on January 2, 1829, and, his father having died not long after his birth, was educated by his uncle, Nawāb Sirjād-ul-Mulk, Minister of the Haidarābād State. He received an administrative appointment in 1848, at the age of 19, and on his uncle's death in 1853 succeeded him as Minister of the State. He was engaged in reforming the administration until 1857, the year of the Sepoy mutiny, when the Nīsār, Nisar al-Dawla, died and was succeeded by his son Afjāl al-Dawla. The news of the seizure of Dillī by the mutineers greatly excited the populace, and the British Residency was attacked by a turbulent mob, aided by some irregular troops, but throughout the darkest days of the rebellion Sālār Djang not only remained true to the British, but strengthened the hands of his master and suppressed disorder. The services of the State were recognized by the rendition of three of the districts assigned in 1853 on account of debts due to the Company, and by the cession of the territory of the rebellious Kādžā of Shorāpur. In 1860 and again in 1867 plots to estrange the great Minister from his master and to ensure his dismissal were frustrated by two successive British Residents, and Sālār Djang remained in office. In 1868 an attempt was made to assassinate him but the assassin was arrested and executed, despite Sālār Djang's efforts to obtain a commutation of the sentence. On the death of Afjāl al-Dawla in 1869 Sālār Djang became one of the two co-regents of the State during the minority of his son and successor, Mir Mahbūb 'Alī Khān, and on January 5, 1871, he was invested at Calcutta with the insignia of the G. C. S. I. In November, 1875, he and other nobles represented the young Nīsār at Bombay on the occasion of the visit of H. R. H. the Prince of Wales to India, and in April, 1876, he visited England and was presented to Queen Victoria. He received the honorary degree of D. C. I. from the University of Oxford and the Freedom of the City of London. In January, 1883, he was engaged in making preparations for the contemplated visit of the Nīsār to Europe, but on February 7, after entertaining Duke John of Mecklenburg-Schwerin, who was visiting Haidarābād, on the Mir 'Alām Lake, he was attacked by cholera, and died on the following morning, regretted by all. Though always known by his first title, Sālār Djang, he bore the higher titles Shujā' al-Dawla and Mubārak al-Mulk.

(T. W. Haid)

ṢALĀT, the usual name in Arabic for the ritual prayer or divine service. The translation "prayer" simply is not accurate; the Arabic word ṣalāt corresponds to the conception prayer (Snouck Hurgronje has several times drawn attention to this distinction; Vorspruchs-Geschr., i. 213 sq., ii. 90, iv. 56, 63 sq., etc.). The word does not seem to occur in the pre-Korānic literature. Muhammad took it, like the ceremony, from the Jews and Christians in Arabia. In many Kūfic copies of the Korān and often in later literature also in connection with the sacred book it is written حملة. It is very often assumed that this orthography represents a dialeastic pronunciation (Nöldeke, Geschichte des Korans, p. 355; Wright-de Goeje, Arabic Grammar, i. 12 A; Brockelmann, Arabische Grammatik, p. 7). The writing of a māt in place of the alif which one would expect is found, it is true, in several other words belonging to the language of the Korān; but with the exception of ṣā’at (رو) only in the termination āt (or ăt), so frequent in Aramaic. The view that in forms like حملة, حملة etc. Aramaic influence has been at work should therefore always be borne in mind (Frankel, De vocab. in antiquis Arab. terminibus et in Cora. pereg. p. 21).

The etymology of the Aramaic word ṣalāt is quite transparent. The root ẛ-lṭ in Aramaic means to bow, to bend, to stretch. The substantive ṣalāt is the noun actionis from this and means the act of bowing, etc. It is used in several Aramaic dialects for ritual prayer, although it can also mean spontaneous individual prayer, which in Syriac at least is usually called ṣalāt. Muḥammad took over the word istringstream in this sense from his neighbours and the Muslim ṣalāt shows in its composition a great similarity to the Jewish and Christian services, as will be shown in greater detail below. — The verb jango is a derivative derived from the substantive jango with the meaning "to perform the jango".

(For detailed etymology and applications, see the articles ünsār, ṣalāt, ṣalāt, ջև, ջև, ջև, etc.)
Every Muslim who has attained his majority and is competens mensis is bound to observe the five daily salāts (al-mahi'ta, in contrast to the voluntary salāts, which are called nāfisat or salāt al-ta'awun). The obligation is suspended for the sick. Salāts omitted must be made up (qadar). The theories of the Shā'ī school on this point are given in al-Nawawi's commentary on Muslim, Musāhirīn, tr. 309—316 (ff. 178 sqq.). According to the strict theory (which in Islam has in very many cases little or nothing to do with practice), any one who deliberately omits the salāt because he does not recognise it as a legal duty is to be regarded as ṣāfī. Even deliberate neglect without any such theoretical basis makes him liable to the death penalty (cf. Kātib, see his Musāhirīn, Muhājirīn, ed. by d. Berg, ii. 202; cf. Abu ʿIyāḥ al-Shirāzī, K. al-Tūnīh f. ʿīshān, ed. by Juyshboll, p. 15).

Several preliminary conditions must be fulfilled for the performance of a valid salāt.

The requisite ritual purity must be restored, if necessary, by wuduʾ [q.v.], ghusl [q.v.] or tayammum [q.v.]. The dress worn should fulfil the legal regulations which aim at the "covering of the privy parts" (nawār al-awrār). This means that in men the body must be covered from the navel to the knees, in free women the whole body except the face and hands. The latter regulation is remarkable, because it is in striking contrast to the popular European opinion regarding the compulsory veiling of Muslim women (cf. Snouck Hurgronje, Twuip jipjë. 1. 1. 1. Brought in the Fertepreut Gesetmerfn, i. 295 sqq.). In the Hadith the question of dress, like so many others, has not yet reached a uniform formulation. Sometimes only the covering of the privy parts is mentioned (e.g. Abu Dāūd, Sahih, bāb 10), and sometimes the saying is ascribed to Muhammad that the shoulders also should be covered (e.g. Muslim, Sahih, trad. 175); sometimes the use of the scantly 'umul is expressly mentioned in this connection (e.g. Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Musnad, iii. 322 etc.) and at the same time we are told that the salāt in one ḥanāb is permitted or even quite common (e.g. Abu Dāūd, Sahih, bāb 77, 80—82); on the other hand it is said that one who owns two ḥanāb should put them on at the salāt (e.g. Abu Dāūd, Sahih, bāb 82; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, ii. 148).

The salāt need not be held in a mosque but may be celebrated in a dwelling-house and any other place; the authority given for this is the saying of Muhammad that he was granted
the privilege that for him the earth was mansāfīd wa-sā-hārū (e.g., al-Bukhārī, Sallt, bāb 56). Tomba are excepted (e.g., Muslim, Salāt al-Mustafirin, trad. 208, 209) and unclean places, like slaughterplaces etc. (e.g., al-Tirmidhi, Munāzīt al-Salāt, bāb 147).

The place where the salāt is performed is marked off in some way from the surrounding area by a suḥrah; on this cf. the article SUTRA. A siyāfū hūd [q. v.] is used as a rule. Attention has also to be paid to the direction of Mekka; cf. the article ḲIYLA.

The salāt proper consists of the following elements, our description of which is based on the Shāfi'i practice.

The ṣamā' = intention, q. v.) is pronounced aloud in a low voice, with an announcement of the salāt which one intends to perform: it corresponds to the Jewish ma'amarah (cf. Mittwoch, op. cit., p. 16; A. J. Wensinck, De intentione in rite, etic et mystica der hebräischen volken in the V.M.A. W., series 5, vol. iv.). Then are pronounced the words Allāha akbar, the labbār al-ḥārim, which begins the consecrated state (cf. the article ṬĪRĀM), Mittwoch has compared this formula with the benedictions of the Jewish sijilla (op. cit., p. 16 sq.). The salāt is performed standing. Mittwoch points out that the Jewish sijilla is called 'amīnā (op. cit., p. 16). It is sunna to utter a dōr or a ṭawwawwah after the labbār (see Mināzīd, l. 78). Then follows the recitation which usually consists of the fātāha. In the Ḥadīth the importance of this fātāha is expressed in the maxim: 'āllā qaṣa lisan tam yāsira bīlarṭārīkh l-'ātalā (e.g., al-Bukhārī, Adhūn, bāb 95; Muslim, Salāt, trad. 34–36, 42).

In a congregational salāt it is customary only for the fīlikā to be recited along with the Ṭīrām if the latter begins with the second ḍhūrā, those present have to listen (cf. Mināzīd, l. 80). In the Ḥadīth there are numerous statements as to whether recitation should be loud or low; e.g., al-Bukhārī, Khūl, bāb 19; Abū Dā‘ūd, Ţāḥīrā, bāb 89; al-Nasa‘ī, Ḳaffālī, bāb 27–29, 80, 81 etc.; cf. al-Bukhārī, Adhūn, bāb 96, 97, 108; Muslim, Salāt, trad. 47–49; al-Nasa‘ī, Ḳaffālī, bāb 27, 28, 80 etc.

Then follows the ṣalāt; which consists in bending the back till the palms of the hands are on level with the knees (the Jewish bērāk; Mittwoch, op. cit., p. 17 sq.; cf. also the pictures of the various attitudes in the salāt in Lane's Manners and Customs in the chapter on Religion and Laws and in Juyonboll, Handbuch, p. 76). The upright position is then resumed (ṣū‘alāt); as soon as the head is raised after the ṣalāt, the hands are uplifted and the worshipper pronounces the words: "Allāh heed him who praises him." This is found quite early, even in Ḥadīth (e.g., al-Bukhārī, Adhūn, bāb 52, 74, 82; Muslim, Salāt, trad. 25–28, 55, 62–64 etc.).

There have been differences of opinion regarding the raising of the hands in salāt and ḍhūrā. Some say that Muhammad used to lift up his hands at the salāt (e.g., al-Bukhārī, Adhūn, bāb 83–86; Muslim, Salāt, trad. 21–26; Abū Dā‘ūd, Ṭīrām, bāb 114–125; al-Nasa‘ī, Ḳaffālī, bāb 1–6, 85–87). Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, l. 93, 255, 259 etc.; Importance is attached (as may be seen in the passages just quoted) to giving the height to which it is permitted to raise the hands. Besides raising the hands the spreading out of them also occurs (al-Bukhārī, Adhūn, bāb 130). It is also evident from the passages of Ḥadīth quoted that the raising of the hands took place not only after the ṣalāt but also in other parts of the salāt. This ritual gesture was made with special preference at the salāt for rain (e.g., al-Bukhārī, Dījan’s, bāb 34, 35; Muslim, Ṭīrām, trad. 5–7; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, l. 104, 153, 181 etc.). Occasionally the ṭarāf al-yadmān is declared permitted for no ḍhūrā except the Ṭīrām (e.g., al-Nasā‘ī, Khūl al-Lail, bāb 52; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, l. 243). What value was given this rite may be seen, from the fact that Muhammad is made to perform the ṭarāf before raising the hands in the ḍhūr (al-Bukhārī, Ma‘ālī, bāb 55). This all becomes quite clear when we reflect that the raising of the hands is, as it were, a measure of coercion used by man towards the Deity, as Goldscheider has shown in his Zauberelemente im islamischen Gebet (Nīkāch-Farbtschrift, l. 320). The Sunna further associates with the ṣalāt the ṭarāf (q. v.), which in parts falls into the same category as the raising of the hands, as Goldscheider has also shown in the essay just mentioned.

The next "pillars" of the salāt in order is the prostration (ṣu‘alāt), which was also one of the rites of the Jewish (Mittwoch, op. cit., p. 17 sq.; Ḳaffālī, Ṭīrām) and of the Christian service (Wensinck, Mohammed en de Joden te Medin, p. 104 sq.); for further details see the article ṢU‘ALĀT. Next the worshipper assumes the half-kneeling, half-sitting position, which in Arabic terminology is usually called ṭanīr (cf. Juyonboll, op. cit., p. 76, fig. 7). Then comes another ṣu‘alāt.

The ceremonies from the recitation of the fātāha to the second ṭarāf inclusive constitute a ṣu‘alāt. It is to be noted that in the Ḥadīth literature at least this terminology still varies a good deal. Sometimes ṣu‘alāt seems to be used in the same sense as ṣalāt, sometimes (and this is the usual usage later) ṣu‘alāt is the more comprehensive term, applied to the middle part just described of the whole salāt. Only the history of the Muslim ritual, which has still to be written, will make clear the exact state of affairs. The most usual (in Ḥadīth also) terminology gives the number of ṣu‘alāt s for each salāt, viz., for the ṣu‘alāt al-ḥarrāf, 3; for the ṣu‘alāt al-ṭarāf, 4; for the ṣu‘alāt al-Ṭūn, 4; for the ṣu‘alāt al-maghrib, 3; for the ṣu‘alāt al-‘Īd, 4. Muslim tradition even says that the salāt originally consisted of two ṣu‘alāt s, that this number was retained for the salāt on holidays, but four was fixed for the normal salāt. (e.g., al-Bukhārī, Salāt, bāb 1; Muslim, Salāt al-Mustafirin, trad. 1–3, etc.). Mittwoch (op. cit., p. 18 sq.) assumes Jewish influence on the original choice of two ṣu‘alāt s.

The statement that this or that salāt consists of so many ṣu‘alāt s means that the introductory rites which precede the first ṣu‘alāt s and those which follow the second ṭarāf (see below) need only occur once in the salāt in question while, on the other hand, the ceremonies in between are repeated so many times. The rites which follow the second ṭarāf are the ṭanīr, the profession of faith, which is pronounced sitting. That the rule just mentioned for the repetition of certain parts of the salāt only developed gradually is evident from a tradition which ascribes to Muhammad the pronouncement that the ṭanīr should be repeated at every two ṣu‘alāt s (Aljad b. Ḥanbal, l. 211).

Then comes the salāt on the prophet which
It is clear that at first Muhammad had not the material available in ample measure for the ritual. The texts which were recited and sung in the solemn litanies of the Christians and Jews in their services were lacking to him. This may still be deduced from the celebrated tradition which relates the revelation of Sura xxvi, according to the common view, the first that was revealed to him. To the command of the angel urging him to recite he replied: "I have nothing to recite". The divine part of this dialogue, which so troubled Muhammed, is now said to have at once become the first text for recitation, and it was followed by others with longer or shorter pauses.

Although the salat is nowhere described or exactly regulated in the Koran, it can be assumed that its characteristic features have not changed in the course of development of the worship. The indications in the Koran of its various component parts lead us to believe this. The standing position is everywhere presupposed in the salat, although a sitting position (masjíd) and prostrations (rukūn) are mentioned. How closely the salat was bound up even in the Meccan period with the recitation of the Koran is seen from the fact that in Sura xxvii. 80 the morning salat is called Koran al-Wādi. On the other hand we find the recitation of the Koran itself also associated with prostration (Sura lixxxiv. 21).

That at this period praises already constituted a very considerable part of the salat is clear from Koranic passages like Sura xx. 130 and xxiv. 41, where tahmīd and tasbih are mentioned in the closest connection with the salat.

From the mention of the salat and the verb salātha in the oldest Sura's (e.g. lixxv. 31, lixx. 23, xvii. 5, lixxiv. 44, xviii. 2) it may be further seen that we can assert that this rite was an accompaniment of Islam from the earliest times and that Caesarii's sceptical reflections and hypotheses do not give sufficient weight to the Koranic evidence (cf. Annali, Introduzione, 219 note — in part in connection with similar views of Grimm). How much Muhammad disturbed the Mekkans with his new religion may be seen from Sura xvii. 110, where he is recommended by Allah not to perform the salat too loudly, which is interpreted by tradition — and, no doubt, rightly — to mean that his unbelieving fellow-citizens molested him for holding his services too noisily. This is in agreement with the fact that in the period during which Muhammad is continually advised to imitate the example of the earlier prophets and model himself on their patience, attention is regularly called to their also having summoned those around them to hold the salat (e.g. Sura xxi. 73, xix. 32, xiv. 40, xix. 56, xx. 132).

In the Koran the salat is very frequently mentioned along with the sūrat; the two are obviously considered the manifestations of piety most loved by Allah (e.g. Sura ii. 77, 104, 172, 277, iv. 79, 160, v. 15, 60 etc.). In Sura ii. 42, 148 the believers are exhorted to seek help in salat and sūrat. Sāb [q.v.] is interpreted in this connection as fasting. There is further in the Koran no trace so far of the five "pillars" which later attained such an important position. The salat is an expression of humility (Sura xxxii. 3) which latter was considered throughout the Hellenistic world as the attitude to the deity most befitting man. Punctual observance (mabāfāt) of the salat is repeatedly enjoined (vi. 92, xxiii. 9, lix. 34; cf. lix. 22) and neglect (sakūh) is censured (cvii. 5).

In Sura iv. 104 a similar injunction is given the following justification: "for the salat is a kathib awdah i.e. "a ritual ordinance of religion", it is blamed in the Musnad that the Franks do not perform the salat without real and with eye-service only (Sura iv. 141). The limitation and later interdiction of the use of wine owed its origin to the fact that over-indulgence disturbed order at divine service (Sura iv. 46).

As has already been observed, we may assume that the essential features of the later salat were in existence from the very beginning. We know only very little about peculiarities of the salat and its accompanying phenomena in the oldest period of Islam. A ritual ablution (cf. the articles Wudu', Taharah, Wasq) before the salat is prescribed in Sura v. 6; the sādqa for the salat is mentioned in v. 63 and in xxii. 9 for the Friday salat. A special salat in case of imminent danger is prescribed in Sura iv. 105 (see below Under Salat al-Khunuz). Praises of Muhammad and the Tasbih form the conclusion of the later salat. This practice can be justified by Sura xxviii. 56, where it is written: "Allah and his angels bless the Prophet; ye who believe, bless him and bring him salutations of peace". The Friday salat is mentioned in xxii. 9 in the words: "O believers, when the call to the salat occurs on Fridays, hasten ye to the invitation (adābah) of Allah and quit trafficking. This is better for ye when ye know." In these circumstances it is intelligible that Muhammad laid great stress on those who showed themselves ready to adopt Islam being at once initiated into the practice of the salat. Tradition reports that he sent Asa'ā b. Zūrirah or Muṣāb b. Umair to the Medinese for this express purpose and that the latter was the first to hold the Friday service with them (see A. J. Wensinck, Muḥammad en de Joden te Medīna, p. 111 sqq., and C. H. Becker in Der Islam, ill. 378 sqq.). In Muhammad's messages to the tribes of Arabia the salat is frequently inculcated as a Muslim duty (see J. Sperber, Die Schriften Muhammedes an die Sūāmu Arabōn in the M.S.O.S. Abt. x. x. x., reprint, p. 10, 19, 38, 58, 77 etc.). According to Muslim tradition, the establishment of the number five in the daily salat dates back to the beginnings of Islam. It is connected with Muhammad's ascension to heaven (see the article Ibrahīm). When Muhammad is taken up to the highest heaven fifty salāts daily are imposed on his community by Allah. Muḥammad leaves the presence of Allah with this commission; on his way back he meets Muṣāf who asks him what Allah has imposed on his community. When Muṣāf hears the orders he says: "Return to thy Lord for the community is not able to bear this."

Allah then alters the fifty to twenty-five. On his way back Muhammad tells Muṣāf of the alteration and receives the same reply. The same processes are repeated until finally the number remains at five (al-Bukhārī, Salāt, bāb 1, Muslim, Imān, trad. 259, 263; al-Tirmidhi, Muwāṭi'-al-Salāt, bāb 45; al-Naṣṣī, Salāt, bāb 1; Ibn Māḏaj, Ḫudayr, bāb 104; Aḥmad b. Ṭambal, i. 315 (19): II. 144 sqq., 161; cf. Ibn Sa'd, ii. 47). The scene bears some similarity to Genesis, xviii. 23 sqq., where Abraham's intercession for Sodom and Gomorrah is described. — On the other hand, in a widely disseminated tradition we are told that
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consists of eulogies in which occurs the much discussed formula Šaltā 'Uthmān al-šahābi wa-ṣallama. These formule are pronounced sitting. The worshipper remains seated for the concluding ceremony, the salāt or tawāf al-ṣahāb, which ends the consecrated state. The fullest version of it is, according to al-Nawawi (op. cit., p. 91 sq.): al-ṣalāt 'alādīn wa-ṣalāma ʿl-bāb; but it may also be abbreviated. It is pronounced twice, once longer to the right and a second time to the left. It is considered a salutation to the believers; but it is also referred to the guardian angels present (cf. Sūra xvii. 80). On analogies in the Jewish service see Mittwoch, op. cit., p. 18.

The different ceremonies of the Šaltāt are classified according to their importance or their obligatory or sunna character. Al-Nawawi (op. cit., 74 sqq.) numbers the following among the arkān al-Šaltāt: niyā, takhrīṣ al-ṣāhih, ṣiyāṣ, ṣawwād, ṣaṭī, ṣalāt al-Ṣaḥāb, ṣaʿlāt, and (13) the correct order of succession (turūj). The other ceremonies, some of which are mentioned above, are considered sunna by him. Cf. Abū ʿIsākh al-Sirāsī, Tanbīh, p. 25.

It is the many sunna ceremonies which, according as they are abbreviated or carried through in great detail, give each Šaltāt its peculiar character and in particular affect its length. This is true especially of the eulogies interspersed (see Mavlī Muhammad ʿAllī, The Holy Qur'ān, 2nd ed., Lahore 1920, p. II) and of the ṣīṣāt, for the recitation of the ṣīṣāt may be followed by the recitation of further chapters from the Korān. The Ḥadīth has much to say on this subject. It appears that the great real of many imāms in this respect has often been a burden to the faithful. Complaints on the subject are said to have been made to Muhammad and he is said to have readily admitted their justice. *Reflect*: he is said to have warned the imāms, "that there are weak and old men among you" (e.g. al-Bukhārī, Umr, bab 28; Muslim, Šafār, trad. 179–190; Abū Dāwūd, Šaltāt, bab 122, 123 etc.). We even find him quoted as describing the imāms concerned as a ʿajāfī (teapot) (e.g. al-Bukhārī, Adhābin, bab 60; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, ii. 308). Praise is also given to Muhammad because no one went through the Šaltāt more completely and in a shorter time than he did (Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, ii. 279, 282 and many other passages).

It is natural that the correct order of the ceremonies in the Šaltāt is considered one of its pillars by the faḍḥā. But we are justified in supposing that there was still considerable variation in this long after Muhammad's death. Such unintentional deviations from the usual number and order of the ceremonies are discussed in the Fīkh and Ḥadīth — the enfant terrible of the Fīkh — supplies the historical background for them. Both say that these unintentional deviations in minor points are made good by the performance of additional ras'u's or sajudas'. With what painful accuracy the Fīkh deals with this subject may be seen, for example, from al-Nawawi (op. cit., p. 94 sqq.). Ḥadīth, on the other hand, is content, as a rule, to say that Muhammad, who was later also credited with such deviations, in these cases used to perform two additional sajudas', which are called sajudas ʿl-nabakā (e.g. Muslim, Muṣāfīlāt, trad. 85; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, ii. 12, 37, 42; al-Bukhārī, Šafār, bab 88; Ṣakāw, bab 4 etc.). Al-Bukhārī in the heading to bab 32 of the chapter Šaltāt preserves the memory of less minutely regulated conditions.

The Fīkh also defines quite minutely what actions and contingent states of body destroy the validity of the Šaltāt (al-Nawawi, op. cit., p. 103 sqq.; Abū ʿIsākh al-Shirāṣī, p. 28 sqq.). The Ḥadīth records that at first the believers used to talk freely with each other during the Šaltāt and greeted Muhammad and one another, but that the Prophet put an end to this licence (al-Bukhārī, al-Amal fi ʿl-Šaltāt, bab 2–4). The old state of affairs is strikingly illuminated in the oft told story of how Muhammad performed the Šaltāt with Zainab’s little daughter hanging round his neck; when he came to the ras'u he, it is said, put down the child and took her up again when he arose (e.g. al-Bukhārī, Šafār, bab 706; Muslim, Muṣāfīlāt, trad. 41–44; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, bab 19). In another tradition it is related how ʻUthmān b. Ḥassan jumped on Muhammad’s back during his ras'u (e.g. Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, i. 513). These were the good old days which the faḍḥās clearly did not wish back again.

III

Besides the five daily Šaltāts there are some that are not compulsory; al-Ghazālī divides them into three categories: sunna, mustahabbah and taṣawwur (fīṣīṣ, Cairo 1302, 1: 174); some of them may have come into use after Muhammad’s death and were therefore never given legal force, others had already fallen somewhat into desuetude in Muhammad’s lifetime.

The latter is true of the night-Šaltāt (al-Šaltāt al-Šalāt). This name is the most usual in the Ḥadīth, while in the Korān ras'u al-ṣaḥābī (Sūra xvii. 80) is used. The etymology (the “waking”) of this word suggests a close connection with the Christian vigils and especially with the custom of keeping awake (Syriac šahāb), which was much cultivated among ascetics and mystics of Western Asia. We have quite a knowledge of this rite from Syriac ascetic literature; in it the keeping awake is in itself a very meritorious work; it is usually combined with the reading of scripture, meditation and ritual prayer. We must imagine the ras'u al-ṣaḥābī to have been something similar. In the description of the nightly exercises in the Lāhil al-Kāfīrī, and in the nights of Ramadan in general, the name ḥāwar is preferably used, which shows that great value was put upon standing and waking in themselves.

That such nightly exercises were zealously carried through in the oldest Muslim community is clear from the Ḥadīth. For further details see the article TAṢAWWUR. Here we shall only say that even in Muhammad’s lifetime these exercises has been deprived of their obligatory character (Abū Dāwūd, Taṣawwur, bab 17, 26; al-Nasāʾī, Ḥāwar al-Layl, bab 2; al-Dārimī, Šaltāt, bab 165).

The night-Šaltāt is closely connected with the witr. This word means “uneven” and the rite really consists in the addition of one ras'u to the even number of ras'u's in the night-Šaltāt. For further information see the article WITR. How varying the practice was in the oldest community with regard to the daily Šaltāts may be seen from the statements regarding the Šaltāt al-ṣaḥābī, the only one in the forenoon. In Ahmad b. Ḥanbal,
One is recommended to go quietly to the ṣalāt (al-Bukhārī, Advān, bāb 20, 21, 23; Muslim, Maṣādīd, trad. 151—155). It is also considered particularly meritorious to take one’s place some time before the commencement of the ṣalāt and to wait some time after its conclusion (Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, ii, 266, 277, 289 sq., 301). If anyone comes so late that he can only take part in one rak‘a he has nevertheless “achieved the ṣalāt” (al-Bukhārī, Maṣāḥih, bāb 29; Muslim, Maṣāḥih, Trad. 161—165; etc.; the opposite view is held by Mālik, Wujūḥ, trad. 15). Even if one enters the mosque after already performing the ṣalāt concerned by oneself, one should take part in the ṣalāt with the congregation (Abū Dā‘ūd, Ṣaḥīḥ, bāb 56; al-Tirmīdī, Maṣāḥih, bāb 49). The opposite view, however, has also its supporters (Abū Dā‘ūd, Ṣaḥīḥ, bāb 57). The frequently mentioned rule is that one should make up in private for what one has missed in the ṣalāt (Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, ii, 237, 238, 239, 270 etc.).

The worshippers arrange themselves in rows (ga‘f) on the closed and good order of which much stress is laid (al-Bukhārī, Advān, bāb 71, 72, 74—76, 114; Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ, trad. 122—128; Abū Dā‘ūd, bāb 93—100; Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, ill. 3, 112 sq., 114, 122, etc.). The places in the front row have special advantages (al-Bukhārī, Advān, bāb 9, 73; Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ, trad. 129—132); within this row again the places on the right of the Imām are especially recommended (Ibn Māḍīja, Ḥumāna, bāb 34). This, however, is true only of men; women are advised to take their places in the last row (Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, ill. 247, 336, 354, 370). The ṣalāt al-ṣa‘īda is conducted by an imām who takes up a position before the front row, or, if there are only two individuals present besides him, between the two or so that one is on his right and the other behind him (Abū Dā‘ūd, Ṣaḥīḥ, bāb 98; al-Nāṣir, Tadḥīḥ, bāb 1; Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, l. 451). It is laid down that one should copy the Imām exactly (al-Bukhārī, Advān, bāb 51—53, 74, 82 etc.). Anyone who neglects this rule exposes himself to punishment from God (Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, ill. 445; Mālik, Niṣāḥ, bāb 57).

Mittwoch (sp. cit., p. 22; cf. thereon Becker in Der Islam, ill. 386 sqq.) has pointed out that the Imām corresponds to the sheikh az-zikhrūr at the Jewish service. At the latter as in Islam the duties can be carried through by any member of the community qualified to do so. In Muḥammad’s lifetime the position in Medina was that it only happened exceptionally that the Prophet did not conduct the ṣalāt. During his last illness and also on other occasions when he was absent Abū Bakr is said to have usually represented him. The Ḥadīth loves to expand itself on this point; in this we have probably to consider many things as reflections of the events after Muḥammad’s death. The conducting of the ṣalāt was then of tremendous importance and is clear from the manifold meanings of the word Imām. The leader of the ṣa‘īda in the mosque of the Prophet was naturally also the leader of the community in political matters. Gradually there came about a separation of the functions but the Caliph and the leader of the smallest village ḥār al‘āke retain the title of Imām.

While the Imām — at least in the days of the early Caliphs — was appointed to the mosque
of the Prophet, in the provinces an alternation in the exercise of the duties was more to be expected.

In the canonical Ḥadīth we look in vain for a regular usage in the provinces. Perhaps it may be concluded from this that in the first century of the Ḥijra no regular usage had yet developed. If a number of persons assembled for the ḍjanūn, sometimes it is said that the oldest (al-Bukhārī, Adhūn, bāb 17, 18, 35, 49, 140; Ḥajjāb, bāb 42; al-Nasāʾī, Adhūn, bāb 7 etc.), sometimes one with the best knowledge of the Korān should conduct the salāt (Muslim, Maqāsid, trad. 289—291; al-Nasāʾī, Adhūn, bāb 8; Ahmād b. Ḥanbal, iii. 34, 34, 36 etc.). Slaves and freedmen could perform the duties (al-Bukhārī, Adhūn, bāb 54). In a Zaidi tradition there is even a mention of women as īmām (C. Corpus Juris' di Zaid ibn 'Abbās, ed. Griffith, No. 189). The question behind whom one may perform the salāt is also discussed in the Fīkh books and in the collections of traditions (al-Nawawī, cf. p. 134 sqq.; al-Bukhārī, Adhūn, bāb 56; Abū Dāwūd, Salāt, bāb 65). The responsibility of the īmām (Ahmād b. Ḥanbal, ii. 254, 253, 377 sqq., etc.) as well as his heavily reward was laid stress upon (Abū Dāwūd, Salāt, bāb 58; Ibn Mājah, Ḥuṣnā, bāb 47). One should retire if some one is there who has greater authority in religious matters (al-Nasāʾī, Aīmama, bāb 3, 6). No one should thrust himself on the people (Abū Dāwūd, Salāt, bāb 62; al-Tirmidhī, Mawṣūlat, bāb 149). The īmām is not to be a stranger but a local man (Abū Dāwūd, Salāt, bāb 65; al-Tirmidhī, Mawṣūlat, bāb 147; Mālik, Salāt al-Ṣalātun, bāb 15). The direction of the ḍjanūn gradually developed into more or less definite offices. In Egypt the īmām is often a small tradesman or a schoolmaster (Lane, Manners and Customs, p. 96 sqq.). In the larger mosques there are two īmāms appointed who are paid out of the funds of the mosque. In Mecca we find the most distinguished scholars and quite insignificant individuals alike acting as īmām (Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca, ii. 234, note). In the Dutch East Indies the duties are often performed by the pāngku, who also holds judicial offices (cf. Snouck Hurgronje, Verslagen en Geschriften, ii. 116 sqq., 177; De Asijkers, i. 89). See further the article Ḥajjāb.

Besides the five daily salāts there are special services to be held by the community on certain occasions. The first place among these is occupied by the Friday salāt; for a description of which see the article Ḥajjāb. For the salāt on the two fasts see the article Ḥarām, for the salāt for rain see Ṣīmash and for the Salāt al-Kubā'ī, see Kubā'. Here we shall only say that much ancient and popular matter has survived in these divine services.

Of quite another kind is the special or short form of the true Muslim salāt, the salāt on journeys, which consists of two rakā'āt. The jurists naturally devote much attention to the question of what is meant by a journey. Another alleviation on journeys consists in the combination of two or more salāts into one (Ṭalib). The Hadith has much information on journeys (e.g. al-Bukhārī, Tadhkīr al-Salāt, bāb 6, 13—19; Muslim, Salāt al-Musafīn, trad. 42—58 etc.). As mentioned in section 1, it is said that Muhammed combined several salāts in Medina; on the significance of such statements cf. what is said there and also al-Nawawī, op. cit., p. 159 sqq.

A special salāt, already described in the Korān, is that which is held when danger threatens from the enemy (Sūrat iv. 102—104). The deviation from the usual ritual consists mainly in the fact that the believers are arranged in two rows of which one keeps watch with weapon in hand during the muṣjīd of the other; they repeat this in turn until all have performed the muṣjīd. The tāḥīb is then recited by them all together, if the enemy is to be expected from another direction than that of the kiblah, the ritual is modified as conditions demand (for further information see cf. al-Nawawī, op. cit., p. 181 sqq.). In this case also the salāt may be abbreviated (Muslim, Salāt al-Musafīn, trad. 4, 5; al-Nasāʾī, Salāt al-Kubā', bāb 4, 7, 23, 24, 26, 27). There is even mention of a Salāt al-Kubā'ī of only one rakā' (Ahmād b. Ḥanbal, i. 357, 423).

In conclusion we must here deal briefly with the salāt for the dead (al-salāt 'ala l-mawṣūl, salāt al-qiyāmāt). It is a common duty (ṣaraf al-kifaya) which can only be omitted in exceptional cases (cf. Snouck Hurgronje, Verzam. Geschr., i. 138, note 3). In some traditions the salāt is ordered for every dead Muslim (Ibn Mājah, Dīwān, bāb 31; al-Nasāʾī, Dīwān, bāb 57). In the Ḥadīth (al-Bukhārī, Dīwān, bāb 23, 85; Tāfṣir, Sūra 9, bāb 12, 13; Muslim, Fadilāt al-Sahlīn, trad. 25 etc.) it is related how Muhammad held the salāt for the dead. 'Abd Allah b. Umayā, the arch-enemy, was reproved by 'Umar for doing so. Therefore Sūra ix. 85 was revealed: *and never perform the salāt for one of them who dies and stand not at his grave, for they are unbelievers against Allah and His Messenger and they die as fāsiqīn* (on the legal definition of the conception of fāsin see Snouck Hurgronje, Verzam. Geschr., ii. 97).

In the Ḥadīth it is further related that Muhammed omitted the salāt in cases where the deceased had committed suicide (Muslim, Dīwān, trad. 107; Abū Dāwūd, Khārāj, bāb 46). Al-Nawawī, op. cit., p. 225, says, however, that no exception was made in this case. The Hadīth also tells us that Muhammad refused to hold this salāt unless the debts of the deceased had already been paid (al-Bukhārī, Hewatīl, bāb 3; Abū Dāwūd, Buwāl, bāb 9; Ahmād b. Ḥanbal, ii. 290, 399). In law therefore the mourners are recommended to settle this matter quickly (al-Nawawī, i. 221). In the Ḥadīth we find contradictory statements regarding the question whether Muhammad held the salāt al-qiyāmāt on behalf of those who had been legally executed (Abū Dāwūd, Dīwān, bāb 47; al-Nasāʾī, Dīwān, bāb 63, 64). We shall hardly be wrong if we suppose that this salāt also retained certain pre-Muhammedan customs (cf. A. J. Wenckst, Some Sentitl Rites of Mourning and Religion in the Perk. A.W., New Series, xviii., No. 1, Chap. 2 and 3). According to Abū Iyāk al-Shīrāzī (ed. Jaynholl, p. 47 sqq.), the following is the order of the salāt for the dead: the īmām stands at the top of the hill in the case of a man, at the bottom in the case of a woman (this is the old tradition; cf. al-Bukhārī, Dīwān, bāb 63; Muslim, Dīwān, trad. 87, 88 etc.); he pronounces the ṣuṭūr and utters four takhrās with hands raised; at the first he recites the Fātiha, at the second he utter the sutiya on Muhammed, at the third he pronounces the adhā'
for the dead man, at the fourth a daw' for those who take part in the service; the two ta'ajhib'a conclude the ceremony.

Difference of opinion prevails regarding the place where the ṣalāt al-qunūz is to be held, and there are indications that in the ancient Medina the waṣwāṣi (q.v.) was used, for example in the case of the service for Nadżāš (q.v.), who died in Abyssinia (al-Bukhārī, Dijānās, bab 4; Muslim, Dijānās, trad. 63, 64). In Ibn Iṣḥāq, if/1, 14, it is said that the ṣalāt was held by Muhammad in the home of the deceased. People therefore thought it an innovation when the body of Sa'd b. Abī Waqāṣa was brought into the mosque at the request, it is said, of A'ishah or of the widows of the Prophet. A'ishah is said to have replied to the complaints that were made: "How short is the memory of the people. Muhammad was indeed wont to hold this ṣalāt in the mosque." (Muslim, Dijānās, trad. 99—101). Muslim's commentator, al-Nawawi, gives on this passage (as al-Zukāfī does on Mâlik, Dijānās, trad. 22) the points of view of the different schools with reference to the legal category in which they place the holding of this ṣalāt in the mosque (on the question cf. also Sāmicī Rītās of Mourning and Religion, p. 2—4). In any case it is the custom in various parts of the Muslim world to-day to perform this ṣalāt in a mosque. (Lane, Manners and Customs, p. 526; Snouck Hurgronje, Mebâ, ii. 189). In A'lish, on the other hand, as is usually also the case on Java, it takes place in the front part of the enclosure before the house of the deceased (Snouck Hurgronje, The A'lishmen, i. 423; cf. Verspr. Geschr., iv, 1, 242). This is at least permitted by the law although not recommended (it depends on the muqâbbāh).

The body is not necessarily present at the ṣalāt. In Mekka it is the custom to hold the ṣalât al-qunūz for residents who have died away from home (Mekka, ii. 189). Justification may be claimed for this practice in the widespread tradition according to which Muhammad held a service in Medina for the dead Nadżāši (cf. above).

V

The question of the significance of the ṣalāt is usually approached in a one-sided fashion by European critics. They like, it must be admitted, to follow Ranke in placing a high value on the ṣalāt as a disciplinary measure and certainly it is difficult to appreciate this too highly. A considerable part of the life of the community must have centred in and around the ṣalāt in Medina in Muhammad's life-time and through it the transformation of the old Arab mind into the Muslim must have taken place. The same phenomenon was afterwards repeated in the provinces of the Caliphate. The ṣalāt must have been one of the most effective formative elements in the communities.

The European, on the other hand, usually forms his judgment of the ṣalāt from his own point of view; the Protestant misses the intensification, the Roman Catholic the imposing ceremonial.

Both attitudes are wrong from scientific standpoint. Whoever wishes to gain a clear idea of the significance of the ṣalāt must ask the question: "what does it mean to the Muslim?"

This question may be partly answered by observing the enthusiasm for the ṣalāt displayed by Muslims in different countries. The results of such

observations almost everywhere go to suggest that there are few Muslims who regularly observe the five daily ṣalāts (Lane, op. cit., p. 84; Snouck Hurgronje, Verspr. Geschr., iv/1, 8, 16). In the Dutch East Indies the 'Achchens so prominent in the Ḥijāb (q.v.) only take part in small numbers in the congregational ṣalāt; in Banten (Java), in Palembang (Sumatra) and in isolated parts of the Archipelago on the other hand we find it much more religiously observed (Snouck Hurgronje, Verspr. Geschr., iv/i, 343 sq.; De Afro-Indië, i. 89 eq.). Lane's remarks regarding the ṣalāt in Egypt (Manners and Customs, p. 98) are important: "The utmost solemnity and decorum are observed in the public worship of the Muslims. Their looks and behaviour in the mosque are not those of enthusiastic devotion, but of calm and modest piety. Never are they guilty of a designedly irregular word or action during their prayers. The pride and fanaticism which they exhibit in common life, in intercourse with persons of their own or of a different faith, seem to be dropped on their entering the mosque, and they appear wholly absorbed in the adoration of their Creator — humble and downcast, yet without affected humility or a forced expression of countenance."

A rich source for the study of the significance of the ṣalāt in the religious life is to be found in the literature. For the first two centuries it is mainly the Ḥadīth that we have to use. In the enumeration of the five pillars of Islam the ṣalāt always appears in the second place (al-Bukhārī, Imām, bab 2; Muslim, Imām, trad. 19—22; in passing it may be noted that the first pillar is variously given). In the so frequently recurring story of the untaunted Beduin who suddenly asks Muhammad the question: "How shall I be saved?" the latter answers with a list of the duties imposed by Islam upon the believers, viz.: five ṣalāts daily, fasting in Ramādān and zakāt (al-Bukhārī, Imām, bab 34; Muslim, Imām, trad. 8). In other traditions also, which enumerate the obligations of a Muslim, e.g., for example, in the commission given to Muḥammad b. Dījābal when he was sent by Muhammad to Yemen, we find mentioned besides the tawâf or the service of Alī the five ṣalāts and the zakāt (e.g. al-Bukhārī, Zakāh, bab 1; Muslim, Imām, trad. 29—31). Here the Ḥadīth and the fasting in Ramādān are omitted. In the scale of the most meritorious works the ṣalāt often appears in the first place (al-Bukhārī, Mawâbic, bab 5; cf. Ibn Mālik, Tāhāra, bab 4; al-Dârimi, Wâsafi, bab 2). The strict observation of the five daily ṣalāts secures admission into Paradise (al-Nasā, Ikhâna, bab 6; Mâlik, Ṣalāt al-Lāl, trad. 14 etc.). The omission of the ṣalāt is a bridge to disbelief and unbelief and lies "between man and polytheism and unbelief lies the neglect of the ṣalāt" (Muslim, Imām, trad. 134; cf. al-Nasā, Ṣalāt, bab 8).

The cleansing power of the ṣalāt is allegorically described in Tradition: "The ṣalāt is like a stream of sweet water which flows past the door of each one of you; it is a great blessing for every member of the community. After ṣalāt the soul is in peace and he has not sinned, and the nimā is a protection against famine and the like."

The ṣalāt is like a fountain of life, to the neglect of which belongs the punishment of the sinners.

The ṣalāt is like the foundation of the house of the believer. Would to God that all the believers would have it!" (Mâlik, Kāf al-Ṣāliḥ fī izhâr al-Qareb, bab 91; cf. Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, i. 71 eq., 177; ii. 375, 426, 441, iii. 393, 347 etc.). It is described without allegory in the equally well-known tradition: "an obligatory ṣalāt is a cleansing for the sins which are committed between it and the
following one” (ep. cit., ii. 229); as is well known, grievous sins are usually excluded from the cleansing effect of pious exercises (op. cit., ii. 359).

We have just quoted the tradition according to which the observation of the daily salah secures entrance into Paradise. The following utterance goes still further: “He who knows that the salah is a compulsory duty will enter Paradise” (op. cit., l. 60). At the final reckoning on the Day of Resurrection the more or less faithful observance of the salah will be a consideration of the first importance: “The first thing to be dealt with is the salah; if this point is in order, the man has attained bliss; if not then he is lost” (cf. al-Nasâ‘î’s Sahih, bâb 9; al-Tirmidhî’s Musnad, bâb 188; Ahmad b. Hanbal, l. 161 sq., 171, ii. 290 etc.).

The salah should be performed devoutly with concentrated attention. It is often related how Muhammad put away one of his garments because figures woven on it distracted his attention from the salah (al-Bukhârî, Sahih, bâb 14; al-Nasâ‘î, Ḵ̄fûl, bâb 12; cf. bâb 10).

That the salah does not, as is sometimes said, imply only the performance of a duty but that the heart is in it too is seen from the following tradition: Muhammad said: “Of worldly things women and perfume are nearest to me and the salah is the comfort of my eyes” (Ahmad b. Hanbal, iii. 128 bis, 285). Weeping at the salah is also sometimes mentioned (Abû Dâ‘ûd, Sahih, bâb 156; al-Nasâ‘î’s Sahih, bâb 18; Ahmad b. Hanbal, i. 185, iv. 25 bis, cf. 26). By far the most significant characteristic of the salah is the one which we find in two different settings, namely that the salah is intimate conversation with Allâh. On the one hand it is found in the Hadrât, in which spitting in the direction of the kiblah during the salah is forbidden, as the reason given being that the salah is intimate conversation with Allâh (al-Bukhârî, Sahih, bâb 39; Muslim, Ma’sûmîyat, trad. 54; Ahmad b. Hanbal, ii. 34 sq., 144, iii. 176, 185, 199 sq., 254, 273, 278, 291 etc.). On the other hand we find it expressed in the following form: “If one of ye performs the salah he is in confidential converse with his Lord; at that time he ought to know exactly what he says in this way with his Lord; therefore no one should drown the voice of another at the recitation” (Ahmad b. Hanbal, ii. 36, 67, 129). An illustration to this utterance is given in the following hadith: “Allâh says: ‘I have divided the salah into two halves between Myself and My servant, one of which belongs to Me and the other is for My servant and My servant obtains what he asks.’ The Messenger of God said: ‘recite’; when the servant says: ‘Praise be to Allâh, the Lord of the Worlds!’ Allâh says: ‘My servant hath praised Me’; when the servant says: ‘to the Merciful and Compassionate’ Allâh says: ‘My servant hath glorified Me’; when the servant says: ‘to the Lord of the Day of Judgment’ Allâh says: ‘My servant hath praised Me’; when my servant says: ‘Then do we serve and Thee do we beseech for help’. Allâh says: ‘This verse is between Me and My servant and he receives what he has prayed for’; when the servant says: ‘lead us in the right way, the way of those whom Thou hast favoured, with whom Thou art not angry and who do not err’ Allâh says: ‘This belongs to My servant and he receives what he has prayed for’ (Ahmad b. Hanbal, ii. 460).

That the salah was also used as a means of healing is not remarkable in view of similar phenomena in other religions (Ibn Midjâd, Tâhib, bâb 10; Ahmad b. Hanbal, ii. 390, 403). At the same time we may mention the salah al-‘ifādâh, which is observed to secure the attainment of some ardently desired object (al-Tirmidhî, Witr, bâb 17) and the salah al-mâ’ânîyyah [see Nîkhîrâ] before a more or less important decision (al-Bukhârî, Ḵ̄fûl, bâb 25; Abu Dâ‘ûd, Witr, bâb 31; al-Tirmidhî, Witr, bâb 18; Ahmad b. Hanbal, iii. 344 etc.).

The description of the salah as mawjûdîyat is characteristic of the meditative tendency, found even in the oldest salah (cf. especially L. Masson-Georget, Étude sur les origines du lexique technique de la mystique musulmane, Paris 1922); it has certainly been one of the main avenues by which mysticism entered Islam from without.

One of the oldest Muslim mystics, al-Mâdhûbî (d. 243 = 857), wrote a treatise on the significance of the salah (cf. Masson, op. cit., p. 259, note 1) and the philosopher al-Tirmidhî (d. 285 = 898) expounded the mystical side of the salah in 42 aphorisms (quoted in Masson, op. cit., p. 259). Among the more modern mystics the salah gives place in importance to Dhikr and Wîrd. Al-Kâshârî does not devote a separate chapter to it in his Ksûla. In al-Hudjwîrî it appears as especially suitable for novices, who are to recognise in it to some extent a reflection of the whole mystic way. To them the takâra represents the conversion, the fiqâ the dependence on spiritual leadership, the recitation the dhikr, the rakûn the prostration self-knowledge; the kâfûl the mussal, the takârâ renunciation of the world. Of the real mystics everyone sees something different in the salah: to one it is a means to faqîr with God, to another to gâhîn (al-Hudjwîrî, Kaqîf al-Mâdhûbî, transl. Nicholson, Gîbîh Mem. Ser., xvii. 301 sqq.). Al-Hudjwîrî, however, also emphasises the affection of various sûrs for the salah.

Of the philosophers Ibn Sînâ (Avicenna) is only to be mentioned here, who wrote a short treatise on the salah (Fi’l-Kâfîf dan mâ’îyat al-Salât wa-sûrâma Tahârâkà in Li‘lâm, al-BAŠî, Cairo 3355 [1917], p. 2–14). According to him, the essence of the salah is the recognition of God in His existence and necessity of it. It is esoteric or exoteric according to the character of the believer who performs it. The law-giver knew that not all men can ascend the steps of the spirit. Such men therefore require corporal discipline and compulsory mortification, to keep their natural impulses in check. This is the exoteric side of the salah. Its true esoteric significance is the musâjibât al-faqq with pure heart and a soul which is liberated and purified from desires (amûl). Ibn Sînâ then proceeds to deal with the saying that a man at prayer is in intimate converse with his Lord (see above). This can, he says, only happen outside of the material world. Those who are in this state of mind are spiritually in the presence of God and they gaze upon the deity (al-Ilâh) in a real vision. The salah is therefore a real musâjibât and a pure worship, i.e., the real divine love and spiritual vision.

Al-Ghazâlî’s chapter Salat has in the Kûfî in the Kûfî al-Jamâ‘î a position between Takâra
and Šalāt (as in the Fīkh). As with the other Ṣalāt, it should be observed in this case also with what painful accuracy he describes the legal regulations (ed. Cairo 1302, l. 140 sqq.) and how on the other hand he raises the Šalāt to an ethico-mystical level which sufficiently meets all the demands of intensification. After what has been said above in II and III, we need only briefly survey here the latter side of his exposition. The inward mukābāl which brings the life of the Šalāt to perfection are the six following: the presence of the heart (ḥāyuṯ al-khālid), understanding, respect (tawqīm), reverence (khābīr), hope and humility (lāzīma).

Particularly significant are his remarks on the presence of the heart (p. 145). The ʾakīma demands the presence of the heart only at the ṭahārā; according to the Ṣuḥāiṭ al-mutawwarrīn and the Ulama al-ʾAbḥira, on the other hand, the heart should be present at the whole Šalāt. But only very few succeed in achieving this. The ideal ʾakīma is that of Ḥātim al-ʿAṣūm, who said: “When the time for the Šalāt arrives, I perform a copious ṣuṣūrūf and go to the place where I want to perform the Šalāt. There I sit till my limbs are rested, then I stand up, the Naḥṣah straight in front of me, the ṣirāt under my feet, Paradise on my right, and Hell on my left and the Angel of Death behind me; and I think that this Šalāt is my last. I then stand waving between hope and fear, join in the Ṭahārā and Ṭahākāt, recite with Tawīl, perform the Ṣafāhah in submission and the Ṣuṣūrūf in humility, sit on my left thigh, spread out the upper part of the left foot and fix the right one on the great toe and accompany this with Ṭahākāt. Then I do not know whether my Šalāt has been graciously accepted by Allāh or not” (p. 159, 7 sqq.).

Al-Ghazzālī lays down his ethical point of view in the sentence: If his Šalāt does not restrain a man from evil and wrong-doing, he only obtains estrangement from God by it (cf. Sūra xxvi. 9).

In the chapter on the useful remedies for securing the ʾuṣūf al-khālid, distraction thoughts are given as the principal obstacle which divert attention from the Šalāt. These enemies are to be overcome by fighting their causes. These are of two kinds, external and internal. The external causes of distraction (ṣayfūt, in the Syriac mystics fchajā) come from the organs of sense. One therefore ought to prevent these from being distracted. The mutaʾʿaddīdūn therefore perform the Šalāt in a dark cell with only sufficient room for the ṣuṣūrūf. Ibn ʿUmar is said not to have allowed a single object in this cell. The internal causes of distraction exercise a much stronger effect. They have their root in earthly cares, thoughts and occupations. But desires have the most powerful influence. They are to be fought by meditation on the future world. All preparations for the Šalāt and all its parts should be connected with the Ṣuḥāfīn. At the ʾuṣūf one should think of the Šalāt on the way of the Resurrection. At the covering of the ʿawrā one should enquire whether there is no internal ʿawrā etc.

The highest goal of the Šalāt is complete absorption in the Deity by humiliating oneself. Sufyān al-Ṭhawrī is reputed to have said: “If a man does not know humility, his Šalāt is invalid.” This is laid down in two special sections (Bayān lāhirat al-Khulūb wa-Ḥujrī al-Kalb, p. 145 sqq., and Hikayāt wa-ʾAbḥīr fī Šalāt al-

Kaḥṣārīn, p. 157 sqq.). In the latter he shows by several examples how much the great leaders used to be absorbed in their Šalāt.

(A. J. Wensinck)

**Salghurids**, one of the dynasties known as Atābaks, or Regents, which arose on the ruins of the empire of the Saldjaks. Salghurid chief of a band of Türkmen who migrated into Khūrāsān and attached themselves to Ṭaghīrī Beg (q.v.), the first of the Gre Saldjaks. Būzābā (q.v.), one of Salghur’s descendants, was killed in battle by Sulṭān Qhīyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Manṣūrī, the fourth of the Saldjaks kings of ʾIrāq and Kūrīdān, and his nephew, Sunqūr b. Maḥmūd, rose against the Saldjaks and in 1148 established his independence in Fars, where he founded a dynasty which ruled for more than 120 years but seldom enjoyed complete sovereignty, being tributary first to the Saldjaks of ʾIrāq, then to the Shāhs of Khwārizm, and lastly to the Mongols. Sunqūr died in 1161 and was succeeded by his brother, Zangi b. Mawdūd, who was molested at the beginning of his reign by his cousins, the Atābaks of Shāhīk, who claimed the throne of Fars. After overcoming them he led homage to Arslān b. Ṭaghīrī I, Saldjaks of ʾIrāq, who confirmed him as ruler of Fars. On his death in 1175 he was succeeded by his elder son, Takla, who remained tributary to the Saldjaks of ʾIrāq and reigned for twenty years. On his death in 1194 the throne was claimed both by his cousin Ṭaghīrī, the son of Sunqūr, founder of the dynasty, and by his younger brother, Saʿd b. Zangi (q.v.). Ṭaghīrī first gained possession of the capital and assumed the royal title, but Saʿd maintained the contest for eight years, during which period the kingdom was devastated and depopulated. In 1203 Saʿd captured Ṭaghīrī and ascended the throne. During the early part of his reign he was occupied in restoring prosperity to his country, which had been wasted by famine and pestilence. Meanwhile the Saldjaks of Ṭaghīrī had been overthrown by the Shāhs of Khwārizm, who in 1194 had annexed their country. Saʿd attacked Atābaks Tād Šūkhām Shāh, but was defeated and taken prisoner by him, and as a condition of his release was obliged to cede Iṣṭākhr and Ushkhunwān, and to agree to pay the tribute which had formerly been paid to the Saldjaks. He is famous as the ruler from whom the great poet Saʿdī took his tashkultūt or pen-name. He reigned for twenty-eight years, and on his death in 1231 (but cf. Saʿd b. Zangi) he was succeeded by his son Abū Bakr, who had attempted to usurp the throne during his father’s captivity and had been for this offence condemned to imprisonment, from which he was released at the instance of Djalāl al-Dīn Manghobartī, Shāh of Khwārizm. He extended the boundaries of his kingdom, but was obliged to pay homage and tribute first to Oqūṭī Khān, supreme Khān of the Mongols as son and successor of Cingī Khān, and afterwards, in 1256, to Hulagū, the Mongol Il-Khān of Persia. Oqūṭī Khān conferred on him the title of Kūltugh Khān. Abū Bakr died in 1256, and was succeeded by his son, Saʿdī Il, who reigned for no more than twelve days, when he died and was succeeded by his infant son, Muḥammad, whose nominal reign was ended by his death in October, 1262. The child was succeeded by his cousin, Muḥammad Shāh, son of Salghur, the younger son of Saʿd I. Muḥammad Shāh was overthrown and put to death on July 18, 1263, and
was succeeded by his younger brother, Salikiq Shāh b. Salghur, who was defeated and slain by the Mongols in December, 1264. Fars had been tributary to the Mongol Il-Khan of Persia since 1256, but Shāh’s cousin Aḥmad Khānšah, daughter of Salīh II, was raised to the throne and permitted to reign, alone for a year, at the end of which time Maung Tintir, the fourth son of Hulagu, married her, and ruled her kingdom in her name, and it was not until her death, in 1284, that the dynasty came to an end.

**Bibliography:** Hamd Allāh Mustawfi al-Kashwī, Ta’rīkh-i-Gusāda (Gibb Memorial Series); Mr. Khân Nawżād, Ḳawātul Uṣūlā (Thrān lithogr. ed.); cf. The History of the Assassins of Syria and Persia by Mirthänd, ed. by W. H. Morley, London 1848, p. 23 sqq.; Hunter, Recueil de textes rel. à l’histoire des Seljoukides, indices. (T. W. Haig)

**SALJIN, SALTIN, the residence of the Saljins in Mārib in South Arabia, the capital of the kingdom of Saba’. The name of this castle is already mentioned in the ancient South Arabian inscriptions. In the foundation inscription Glaser 482/3, which is placed on the temple of Almaskāh (called Haram Bīlīḳa by later generations and lying due S.S.E. 50 minutes from the modern village of Mārib), King Karibāl’s Wātir Yūhānīm of Saba’ and Hālik’amar, son of Karibāl’s, speaks of renovations in this temple, which were undertaken for the good of the castle of Saljian (Sīhān) and of the city of Mārib (Māryān). The inscription Oslander 31, speaks of a dedication in favour of the donors of the inscription, who are obviously to be regarded as lords of the castle, and of the castle of Saljin. In the inscription of King Ilīḥarūḥ Yalḥīlī (Bibl. Nat. No. 2) Saljin is mentioned along with the ancient castles of Ghūmān and Sīrāw. The SAFAHAN inscriptions Glaser 828–829, 870–872, 1075, 1082, 1085, 1087, 1082, 13 are very interesting. They record a treaty of friendship concluded between the Sabaean king Aḥāhn Nalḥān and his sons on the one side and king Gadarat of Habashât on the other. The passage in question runs: ‘and that Saljin and Zurrānīn and Aḥāhn and Gadarat shall be like brothers in truth and fidelity’ D. H. Müller (Epigraphische Denkmäler aus Assianien, p. 75; Südarab, Altertüm. p. 9) has rightly pointed out — against J. H. Mordtmann and M. Hartmann — that this juxtaposition is to be interpreted to mean that Saljin and Zurrānīn represent the ancient residence of the kings of Saba’ and Habashât. The suggestion put forward by M. Hartmann (Die Arabische Präge, p. 158) that Saljin is the modern Haram Bīlīḳa is further disposed of by the fact that the latter has been proved to be the ancient temple of Almaskāh and is called ‘Amm al in the inscriptions (N. Rhodokanakis, Studien, ii. 7) and has therefore nothing to do with Saljin.

The importance of this ancient royal palace of the Sabaean kings is also shown by the fact that the Ethiopian king Ezānak (Aṣṭan, about 350 A.D.) in the great inscriptions of Aksum (No. 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13) bears the name of that part of Saba’ among his official titles, just as the Emperors of Austria used to call themselves Counts of Habashat. The name Saljin appears there in the Greek text as Σαλτίν (Stamno), in the Ethiopic as Saljīn, in Sabaean Shāh and Sīhā. There was therefore a twofold pronunciation, Saljīn and Saljin, even in ancient times. E. Oslander, Z. O. M. G., 1856, x. 26, shrewdly connected the former name with that of the town Ṣālih in the tribe of Judah (Joshua, xv, 33). The form Ṣūk is of interest because the same name is also found in the great inscription of Sīrāwīh (Glaser 1000 B, 59) which is perfectly preserved and contains over 1,000 words (baitku zīw) and presumably indicates likewise the royal castle of Mārib. Poetry and folklore have woven their legends round the ancient castle as round many others. To the successors of the ancient Sabaean it seemed the work of demons or devils, who built it in 70 years by Solomon's command for the Ḥamdanid king Dūh Bātā', when Solomon married Bīlīḳa. This is, however, only one story. According to others, Saljin was built in 80 years by order of one of the Himyar rulers (Ṭalḥa).[4] Others again say that a castle was built in the royal residence of Saljin and Sīrāwīh, which belonged to the kings of the Himyars; it was built by order of Bīlīḳa, queen of Saba’, daughter of Ḥahdāl, and in it her wonderful throne stood which is mentioned in the Koran, Sura xxviii. 23. It was also said that Solomon built the palace for Bīlīḳa. It should be mentioned that al-Ḥamdānī as well as Nashān al-Himyari expressly describe Saljin as a royal residence or capital of Mārib.

There was no longer anything left of this castle in the Muslim period. The waves of the Ethiopian conquest (525 A.D.) no doubt swept over this ancient royal residence, which had already lasted most of its former importance with the transference of the capital of the kingdom from Mārib to Zāhir. Saljin, as well as Rainūn, Ibn Ḥighām tells us, was destroyed by the Ethiopian general Ṣawā Ṣawā. A friend: his (Al-Ḥamdānī, Injīl Muhammad, p. 106, 107).

AL-SALIH (A., plural Salih, Salîhîn), the cross.

This general meaning covers several special applications, e.g. the main branded in the skin of camels in the form of a cross etc. In the sense of the chief Christian symbol the word may have been taken over from Aramaic where it has the same form. It does not occur in the Qur'an.

In Hadith it is used in eschatological descriptions. Isa (Jesus) will appear in the last days, combat the Antichrist (al-Dajjal), kill the swine and break the cross into pieces (al-Brûhat, Amidya), 'Abd Allah ibn 'Abbas, bab 491; Muslim, Judía, Trad. 242, 243; Ibn Mādīka, Fītân, bab 235; 'Abd Allah ibn Hanbal, Manwād, ii. 240, 272 etc.). On Doomsday all religious communities will appear before Allah with their symbols or idols. The Christians will follow the cross and, on their confession that they did worship the Māshī ibn Maryam, be thrown into Hell (al-Brûhat, Tuhfāt, bab 24).

Further al-Brûhat speaks of a qamur muqallid, a garment or cloth into which the form of the cross was woven, and which 'Alīja removed on Muhammad's order, because it distracted his attention from the Qur'an (Salîh, bab 15).

Lexicographers call the cross the kibla of the Christians; apparently they were acquainted with the Christian custom of praying before the crucifix.

In 'Umar's treaties with the inhabitants of several towns of Palestine a special amân for their churches and crosses was granted them (al-Fābar, i. 2405 sqq.). A document belonging to a late period of tradition and of doubtful authenticity prohibits the public use of the cross as a Christian symbol (Hamaker, Incerti auctoris liber, p. 165 sqq.; Muir, The Caliphate, p. 137; cf. Castani, Annali dell' Islam, Anno 17, § 174 sq.).

In the debate between Christian and Muslim doctors at the court of al-Ma'mûn the Christian worship of the cross is one of the controversial points between the combatants (cf. A. Guillaume, A. Debate between Christian and Muslim Doctors in the Centenary Supplement to the J.R.A.S., October 1924, p. 242).

In the battle of Hadda in 583 (1187) the Muslims captured the Šâlih al-qâlibât "the cross of the crucifixion", a cross in which a piece of the true cross was incorporated (Historiens du Croisés, Historiens orientaux, i. 685). See further the articles Isa and Nasr. In Christian Arabic literature the Christian legends concerning the cross have very found their place. The verb qâbalâh denotes the Oriental form of crucifixion as a capital punishment.

On the diminutive form Šâlib cf. this article.


(SALÔKH HAMMÂN)

ŠALIH, a prophet who was sent to the Arab people Thamûd. He is, as usual, depicted as a sign and a warning in the style of Muhammad; he demanded that his countrymen should turn to him and pray to Allah alone (Sūra 71: 11, 14, 15, 16), he called their attention to the benefits received from God (71: 20, 21, 43) and prided himself on seeking for no reward from them (26, 143). But they rejected him abruptly, called him bewitched (26, 143), a man like themselves, who could make no claim to revelations (54, 63); they could not surrender the religion of their fathers (11, 62) and scorned the idea of a day of judgment (69, 4). His appearance produced a schism in the people (37, 46) for only the weak believed in him, while the strong scoffed at him (71, 72). The only new feature was that they had placed their hope in him before he irritated them by his preaching (11, 63), which, if based on some corresponding incident, would be an interesting connotation into the history of Muhammad. Then follows the special story of this prophet. Allah sent them as a sign a she-camel (17, 63) and Šâlih begged them to allow it to feed unharmed and to share water with it (7, 71, 26, 155, 54, 48). But they killed it and killed it (7, 72, 11, 48, 26, 155) through the hand of a particularly godless individual among them (91, 49, 54, 38) and scornfully asked Šâlih to inflict the threatened punishment (7, 73). He told them to hide three days in their houses (11, 68); then a tremendous storm broke out (11, 70, 51, 48) according to 7, 76 an earthquake; cf. also 54, 31, 69, 6) and on the following morning they lay dead in their houses. In the later Muslim stories of prophets these brief features are elaborated in various ways.

This story has a certain amount of foundation in fact in as much as the Thamûd, according to 7, 76 the successors of the 'Ādīs, were an ancient Arab tribe known also from other sources (see the art. Thāmu'd). The dwellings which the Thamûd had built out of the rocks (89, 4, 71, 26, 149) often mentioned in the texts, the remains of which were still visible (29, 32), are undoubtedly the tombs, containing remains of human bones, hewn in the rocks of al-Ūla (see al-Ḥadr), which has led Philippe Berger to the further supposition that the word kāfrî (tomb) found in the inscriptions there may have been explained as kāfrî (unbelief). But whence Muhammad got the name Šâlih and the story of the camel cannot be ascertained. It is further remarkable that the stories of Šâlih and Hûd [q.v.] are in contradiction to the usual teaching of Muhammad in the Meccan period to the extent that no prophet had been sent to the Arabs before him (28, 46, 52, 54, 48, 36, 3). The stories of these two prophets are found in the earliest Meccan Sūras e.g. 53, 31 sqq., 85, 11, 109, 89, 9, 94, 91, 49 sqq., and frequently recur in the following sections; on the other hand they disappear in the Medina revelations except for the brief enumeration in 9, 71.

Bibliography: the Qur'ān commentaries on Sūra 7: al-Ma'mûn, Murâdī al-Dhahab (Paris, 1861—1877), ii. 85—90; al-Thâlthâ, Köse
which he finally captured the town and took the citadel also, when reinforcements arrived in the beginning of 745. Ahmad was taken prisoner. A few days later he was strangled in prison. The struggle with Ahmad had occupied all Isamîl's time and means, so that he had neglected everything else. He is a typical example of the decline of Oriental dynasties. His time and strength were entirely absorbed in wars against his brothers and in excesses. As a result of the great expenditure at court, the revenues of the state declined and often the requisite money was not available for necessary military expeditions. His weakness was taken advantage of by the regular enemies of the Mamlûk kingdom, the Amir of Mecca and of the Yemen, the dynasts of Asia Minor and the Beduin chiefs of Northern Syria, who rebelled against the governors in their lands under the Sultan's suzerainty. On the other hand the authority of the Caliph and of the Sultan remained unbroken in the remoter East and in India. Muhammad b. Ṭughlak of Delhi sent the Caliph an embassy to ask for investiture and declared himself vassal of the Sultan; he also asked those who had learned in the{108}law to be sent to him to enable his subjects to become better acquainted with the principles of Islam. His requests were readily acceded to. Sultan Isamîl was so deeply affected by the struggle with Ahmad and his execution that he could not recover; he died in 746 (1345) after two months' illness when still only 20.


AL-MALIK AL-SÂLIH NAJUM AL-DIN AIYÜB, the eldest son of AL-MALIK AL-KÂMIL MAHMUD, son of AL-MALIK AL-ÂDIL ÂBD BAKR, son of AIYÜB, was born in 603 (1207). His father designated him the authority of the Caliph and of the Sultan in 625 (1228) and made him his representative in Egypt, while he was away on his campaigns in Syria. At this time (Rabi' I, 626 = February, 1229) Al-Kâmil ceded Jerusalem to the Emperor Frederick for ten years. The relations between Aiyûb and his father were disturbed in 628 (1331) by the slanders of one of Al-Kâmil's wives who wanted to get the succession in Egypt for her son Al-Âdîl Abd Bakr. She accused Aiyûb in a letter of trying for the throne while his father was still alive, as he had enlisted over 1,000 Mamlûks of his own. Al-Kâmil, secured by the peace with the Emperor, returned to Cairo to take the reins of power into his own hands again. In 629 (1232) political conditions (the advance of the Tatars and of the Khwarizm on the frontiers of the Empire) caused him to go to Syria and gave the command of the army to Aiyûb in order to get him out of Egypt in this way. Al-Kâmil achieved his object on this campaign of getting Mesopotamia into his own hands as a strong bulwark against the Tatars and Khwarizm and, granted his son Aiyûb Husn Kalîf as a fief and later, in 633 (1336), the towns of al-Rûbî (Edessa) and Hârrân conquered by him in addition.

Aiyûb's position with regard to the Tatars and Khwarizm cannot have been an easy one. He allied himself with the latter and took them into his service with the permission of Al-Kâmil. In 635 (1338) he received Sinjâr and Naftân in addition to his other territory. So long as Al-Kâmil was alive, Aiyûb was master of the east and no one dared attack him. This state of
affairs was altered, however, when al-Kāmil died in the same year (635) in Damascus, which his brother al-Malik al-Šalih Ismā‘īl had ceded to him two months before in return for Ba‘albek and Boṣrā. Al-Malik al-‘Adil II was recognised in Cairo as al-Kāmil’s successor and al-Malik al-Dżawād Yūnus appointed governor of Damascus in his name. Ayyūb received the news of his father’s death while he was besieging Raḥsā; he at once raised the siege, but met with opposition from the Khārjīs who were in his service. Enraged at the thought of their booty escaping them, they were going to seize him and he had to take flight to the Saltān of Rūm. Only by an emergency capture of the towns which Ayyūb possessed between Syrian and Mesopotamian princes even before he had captured them. Lu‘lu', the ruler of Moṣul, was also hostile to Ayyūb. He besieged him in Sinjār, where he had taken refuge. In this perilous position, Ayyūb was saved by the intervention of his highly esteemed Ḳādī, who regained for him the help of the Khārjīs. This made it possible for him to relieve Sinjār and inflict a terrible defeat on Baydar al-Din Lu‘lu' Next he raised the siege of ‘Amid and routed the Saltān of Rūm. Mesopotamia was now secured to him. In the next year (636) he was invited by al-Malik al-Dżawād, governor of Damascus, to exchange Damascus for Sinjār, Raḥj and ‘Ana, as the latter did not feel his position safe from Saltān al-‘Adil of Egypt. Ayyūb handed over his eastern possessions to his son al-Mu‘ẓamm Timūr Shāh, while he granted the Khārjīs Hanīn, al-Ruḥān and the province of Dżazīra. He then accepted the invitation, went with his army to Palestine and occupied Damascus Saltān al-‘Adil and Prince Da‘ūd of Kerāk decided to take the field against him. But a number of the Amirats abandoned the Saltān, whose love of pleasure had made him unpopular, and decided to join Ayyūb. Da‘ūd himself offered his support on condition that he was given Damascus. When Ayyūb refused, he returned to al-‘Adil. The Caliph, continually threatened by the Tatars and Khārjīs, had a lively interest in the maintenance of Ayyūb’s power generally, and he sent an envoy to Ayyūb in vain to negotiate a peace. In 637 (1240) Ayyūb left Damascus with 5,000 men and went to Nābnīa to prepare for his advance on Egypt there. He had also endeavoured to secure the support of his uncle, Ismā‘īl, who pretended to agree but deceived him by false messages (see Sobernheim, Bodde zu islamischer Zeit, p. 9 of the reprint, and the account in al-Maqrīzī, travel. Blocchet, p. 445, and Abu l-Fida’ under the year 637). But Ismā‘īl made a secret agreement with the prince of Hims and by promises tempted Ayyūb’s troops to desert him and come to him in Damascus. Finally Ayyūb was left almost alone. In the meanwhile Da‘ūd of Kerāk had again quarrelled with Saltān al-‘Adil and had begun negotiations with Ayyūb. But when he learned that Ayyūb was al-āmil, he fled thither with his army, took him prisoner and sent him to Kerāk. He treated him well and refused to hand him over to his brother al-‘Adil. In the meanwhile the treaty between al-Kāmil and Frederick II regarding the occupation of Jerusalem had expired. Da‘ūd felt himself strong enough to take the city by force from the Franks, who would not hand Jerusalem over voluntarily. After a twenty-one days’ siege, he succeeded in taking it in Djiyādād I, 620 (Feb. 2, 1222); he destroyed its fortifications, which the Franks had rebuilt during the last months of their occupation.

Ayyūb’s fortunes now began to turn. When, in spite of long negotiations between Da‘ūd, Ismā‘īl and al-‘Adil, no alliance was achieved, an agreement was made between Ayyūb and Da‘ūd through the intermediary of the prince of Hims. Ayyūb was released in Ramaḫīn of the same year and went with Da‘ūd to Jerusalem, where they concluded a treaty. Ayyūb was to receive Egypt, Da‘ūd Syria and the eastern provinces. The combination of the two princes naturally caused al-‘Adil great anxiety. He persuaded Ismā‘īl of Damascus to take the field against the two allies, while he himself went with an army to Bīlān. A section of the Mamluks, the Asḥafīya (called after al-‘Adil’s uncle, al-Asfah Mūsā), were dissatisfied, deposed him and sent him as a prisoner to the citadel of Cairo; after some hesitation they offered the crown to Ayyūb, with the request that he should come at once to Bīlān’s. Ayyūb and Da‘ūd went at once to Egypt and everywhere received a hearty welcome from the Amirats. After Ayyūb had occupied Cairo, he was recognised as ruler in the Friday Khutba and later confirmed by the Caliph in a diploma. Al-‘Adil was kept prisoner in the citadel and not put to death till 645 (1247) when he declined to move to the fortress of Shawbak, as the Saltān ordered. Ayyūb was now secure in the possession of Egypt. In the East (Mesopotamia) his son Tūn Shāh guarded his interests. The third member, Damascus, was still lacking to give him practically the empire of Saladin once more.

He therefore did not hand over to the unreliable Da‘ūd the lands between Egypt and Syria which he had occupied, nor Shawbak and Jerusalem, but declared the treaty of Jerusalem had been extorted from him. He avoided an open breach with him; however, by promising him Damascus as an independent possession when they would have conquered it together. In the next year (638 = 1240) Ayyūb hastened himself securing the foundations of his rule in Egypt. He put down the rebellious Beduins in Upper Egypt, had the Amirats whom he could not trust arrested one after the other and gave their fiefs to his own Mamluks; it was then that he began the buildings on the present Nile (Baḥr) island of Rōja (which was then still a peninsula); his palace and the barracks for his Mamluks called Baḥrīs, who gave their name to the first Mamlūk dynasty (see the art. BAḤRĪ).

In the same year fighting broke out between Ayyūb and his enemies. Da‘ūd realised that he would never get any increase of territory from him and Ismā‘īl rightly felt himself threatened when Ayyūb sought to gain possession of Damascus. In the East Lu‘lu’, prince of Mosul, was reinforced and had taken ‘Amid from Ayyūb’s son, Tūn Shāh, so that the latter now had only Ḥijr Kāfīr and Ka‘fāt al-Ḥalītham. Ismā‘īl and Da‘ūd concluded an alliance with the Franks, in which they ceded them Tiberias, Shāfīt Arbūn and Sa‘fīd, and allowed them to purchase arms in Damascus. Relations between the Muslim and Christian leaders became so close that they did many things for each other. Thus the Franks handed over the prince al-Dżawād, who had taken refuge with them, for a sum of
money to Isma'il, who at once put him to death. Da'ud and Isma'il's turn came next. The Franks of a mutiny of Muslim prisoners in Shafak Atnun, so that they moved the prisoners to 'Akka and put them to death there. The Franks and Isma'il's troops now marched together against Ayyub. The armies met between Ghaza and Ascalon. But when the Muslim troops went over to Ayyub, the Franks were defeated and lost many prisoners, who were employed in the building operations on the island of Roda in Cairo. The prisoners, however, were liberated by the peace concluded in the same year, which was a very favourable one for the Franks. They were allowed to retain their possessions in Palestine and Syria.

While in the next few years, Ayyub kept out of Syria, fighting on a small scale went on with great cruelty between Da'ud and the Franks. In 643 (1245) negotiations were going on between Ayyub and Isma'il; Ayyub's son, al-Malik al-Maghthith, was to be liberated from his imprisonment by Isma'il and Ayyub was to be recognised as sovereign in the Friday prayer. But when Isma'il learned that Ayyub was secretly stirring up the Khuwarizm to help him against these allies and they came next year (642), temporarily occupying Jerusalem and causing frightful devastation, Ayyub sent an army from Cairo to support the Khwarizm. Isma'il in turn sent troops to the Franks who joined forces with them. The hostile armies met at Ghaza in a terrible battle, in which the Khwarizm and Egyptians won a decisive victory. The Khwarizm booty was countless. As a result of this victory, the Egyptian troops were able to conquer Jerusalem and Palestine again, and they remained in Muslim hands down to 1918. Da'ud could only retain Kerak, al-Salt and Ajdun. The Egyptian troops besieged Damascus, which held out for a long time. Isma'il did not capitulate till next year (643 = 1245), surrendered Damascus and limited himself to Baalbek, Bosra and their dependencies. In view of these successes the Khwarizm expected high pay and as this was not to their satisfaction they entered the service of Isma'il and Da'ud and laid siege to Damascus on their behalf, which was defended by one of Ayyub's generals and still held out at the beginning of 644 (1246). To put an end to the Khwarizm terror, the princes of Aleppo and Hims, who had so far shown little sympathy for Ayyub, sent their troops against the Khwarizm. They were thereby forced to raise the siege and to go to meet the Aleppo troops. In the battle of Kazab the Khwarizm were severely beaten; one of their leaders was killed and another put to flight. Isma'il sought refuge in Aleppo and enjoyed the protection of the ruler there, Yusuf II, but lost Baalbek to Ayyub; his sons and wives were taken prisoner to Cairo.

Da'ud also was deprived of all his possessions except Kerak and likewise sought refuge in Aleppo. He appointed his youngest son his deputy. The ruler of Aleppo cherished a continual distrust of Ayyub. He tried to secure himself against any further advance of the latter by getting prince al-Ashraf to hand over Hims to him in 646 (1248) after a two months' siege.

Ayyub, full of wrath, went to Damascus to fight Yusuf II and sent one of his generals to Hims to recapture the town from al-Ashraf. On his arrival in Damascus he heard of the arrival of the Crusaders, whom Louis IX had led against Damietta. This induced him to conclude a peace at once with Yusuf through the intermediary of the Caliph. Although he was very ill, he set off in a litter and soon arrived in Aghmatain. He could not prevent the landing of the Crusaders and the capture of Damietta, as the discipline of his army had become slack through his illness. The Bedouins of Kina, to whom was entrusted the guarding of the district, fled like cowards, because they thought they had been abandoned by the Sultan's troops. Shortly before his death Ayyub heard with joy that the older sons of Da'ud, who, dissatisfied with the transference of authority in Kerak to their younger brother, had attacked and taken prisoner the latter, were handing over the government of Kerak to him in exchange. He at once sent one of his Amirs thither with troops to take over the fortress. Ayyub died on Shaban 15, 647 (Nov. 23, 1249); on his successor and the result of the Crusade see the art. SHADUK AL-DURR.

He was a skilful politician but no general; at least he hardly ever led his troops in person. His great ambition was to found an empire like Saladin and al-Kamil, which should consist of Egypt, Palestine, Syria and Mesopotamia. By the end of his life he had achieved a considerable part of this, but the independent principality of Aleppo and the principality of Mosul were not under his influence. He strengthened his position by the formation of a corps of Mamlik, a measure of expediency for the moment, but which, as often in similar cases, brought about the ultimate fall of his dynasty (see the art. SHADUK AL-DURR). He himself kept his Amirs and officials firmly in control; they never dared speak unmasked in his presence. He took a great interest, indeed an extravagant pleasure, in building. His palaces on the Nile peninsula Roda, in Kebir and his mausoleum were famous in their day. He founded the town of Salahiya as a frontier-fortress in Egypt.

Bibliography: Weil, Geschichte der Christenheit, vol. iii.; also the literature of the Crusades quoted under SAUDIN. (M. SORENHEIM)

AL-MALIK AL-SALIH NUR AL-DIN ISMA'IL of the line of Zang, son of the Atabeg of Aleppo and Damascus, Nur al-Din [q.v.], son of Zang. He succeeded his father on the throne in 569 (1173) at the age of eleven. A few weeks previous to his circumcision had been celebrated with great ceremony and alms for the poor on a particularly large scale. His name was mentioned in the Friday prayer and put on the coins without opposition from the Amir in Damascus and Aleppo or from Saladin [q.v.]. Only his cousin Saff al-Din al-Ghassar of Mosul, who was about to come to Nur al-Din with troops which the latter intended to use against Saladin, seized the opportunity to occupy with his army the towns in the District belonging to Nur al-Din. The Franks likewise thought it a suitable occasion and advanced on the fortress of Baniya. In this difficult situation the Amir had either to appeal to Saladin for help or come to terms with the enemy. They did the latter, left
Saif al-Din al-Qhaz in possession of his conquests and made it clear to the Franks that they would only be unnecessarily irritating Saladin, who had suppressed the rising in Egypt and had no longer cause to fear Nur al-Din. The Franks received an indemnity in addition and then retired. By the alliance with al-Qhaz the centre of the administration was transferred to Aleppo and Isma'il brought there in security; the regency and the government were taken over by capable men. The Amir of Damascus, whose influence was thus lessened, called in Saladin; the latter, enraged at the weakness shown in face of the Franks and at the surrender to al-Qhaz, wrote Isma'il a letter full of reproaches for not having asked his assistance. Just as earlier it had to be Nur al-Din's endeavour to gain possession of Damascus in place of the weak Barid Abak (see the art. 299), so now it became absolutely necessary for Saladin to have the real power in his own hands. Formally he continued to profess himself Isma'il's faithful liegeman. When he reached Damascus the citizen was not handed over to him; Rashin, one of Isma'il's eunuchs, only surrendered it after several months' negotiations when Saladin again declared himself Isma'il's faithful servant. No arrangement was come to between Saladin and Isma'il; on the contrary the Aleppo government was secretly negotiating with the Franks. Saladin resolved to take the offensive. He captured Hama and Hims and in Djumâa 11, 570 (end of 1174) proceeded to besiege Aleppo. But al-Qhaz had asked Gümîshîtkin as Isma'il's ally for assistance. The latter sent troops which, united with the Aleppo force, advanced on Hama and threatened Saladin from the rear. Isma'il, who cannot be denied the possession of a certain natural ability, conjured the people to defend him, the orphan, to the utmost as an act of gratitude for the benefactions of his father. Moved by his appeal the citizens of Aleppo defended the town by sorties and held out on this occasion and later ones also; indeed, the people of Aleppo were unique in Syria in frequently showing a feeling of independence and a certain pride in their citizenship. The common term of both of these Gemîshîtkin, advanced on Hârim and in 574 reduced the town to great straits. Isma'il sent it reinforcements on the appeal of its citizens and finally induced the Franks to withdraw on payment of an indemnity and by threatening to surrender the town to Saladin. He then had the town transferred to himself and appointed a governor. In 576 Isma'il became very ill and designated Yez al-Din Marjânî, prince of Muzal, as his successor, as he was unmarried and without direct descendants (and al-Qhaz had died shortly before), because he thought him capable of withstanding Saladin. In the following year (577 = 1180) Isma'il died. At his accession he was so young that he could not have been blamed for having lost his lands. How far he was responsible for the particularist policy by alliances with the Franks, cannot be decided.

He kept possession of Aleppo with a strong hand. He seems from childhood to have been popular with his subjects and he was always bravely defended by them and his death was honestly lamented.


AL-MALIK AL-SALIH SALAH AL-DIN HADîDÎ, son of Malik al-Ashraf Shahâna (see the art. Shahâna) of the line of Saltân Kalân, succeeded to the saltânate on the death of his brother 'Ali as a boy of 6 in 783 (1381). Some months later he
was deposed on Ramazan 99, 784 (Nov. 26, 1322) by the Atabeg Barkilj, as the kingdom required a man but not a boy on the throne. Hadijji was sent back to the harem and Barkilj, as had been arranged before, was appointed Sultan (see the art. Barqis). In 794 (1389) Hadijji, who was now 13, was once more installed as Sultan but badly treated and not allowed to interfere in the government by his Atabeg Yelbogha. It is related how he appointed his tailor court-tailor and gave him a robe of honour. The latter was robbed of his robe of honour, then beaten and imprisoned and only with difficulty liberated by one of the great Amir's. The Sultan was very angry at Yelbogha's shameful treatment of him; even his father’s old Manilaks and the camuchs and chamberlains were removed from him. He was relieved when Mişûl (see the art. Barqis) came into power again and allowed him more liberty. When Mişûl afterwards began the campaign against Barkilj in Syria, he took the Caliph and the Sultan with him to show the rightfulness of his war against the rebel. This step was to prove his disadvantage. While Barkilj was beaten in the decisive encounter, he captured the insufficiently defended tent with the Caliph, the Sultan and the Khâqân. Success was therefore on his side and in addition he was victorious in a second battle. He hastened with his important prisoners to Cairo where in the meanwhile one of his supporters, the Amir Bâkhd, had seized the citadel and had him named as Sultan in the Friday prayer. Hadijji was deposed by the Caliph by Barkilj's orders. He was allotted an abode in the citadel but was honourably treated by Barkilj who frequently visited him. In later years Barkilj gave up these visits as Hadijji, who was of a cruel disposition, ill-treated his slave-girls and had music performed and songs sung to drown their cries. He also took to drink and heaped insult on Barkilj when he visited him. The family of the great Khâqân ended with this unworthy son.

**Bibliography:** Weil, Geschichte der Cheïfens, v. 358—448, 536—574; al-Manhal al-dâf, Paris MS. Ar. 2688—2673.

(M. SOBERNEHIM)

**AL-MALIK AL-SÂLIH SALAH AL-DIN SÂLIH, son of Sultan Muhammad al-Nâfîr of the line of Khâqân, was chosen Sultan when 14 years old in place of his brother Hâsm as a result of quarrels among the Manilaks in 752 (1357). The feuds between the Amir’s did not cease in his reign; the eternal quarrel between the governors of the Syrian provinces and the dignitaries of the court in Cairo was also an important factor. When on his campaigns in Syria he had succeeded by his prestige in withdrawing their supporters from the rebels and defeating them, the quarrelling among the cliques in Cairo but against his addiction of pleasure prevented him from conducting the government himself to prevent the predominance of anyone Amir with his followers. He thus fell a victim to the intrigues of the Amir’s; he was deposed in 755 (1354) and his brother Hâsm recalled to the throne.


(SOBERNEHIM)
Mahkam's daughter. He continued to have his residence in Julla, as Ibn al-Athir expressly mentions. In spite of the family links which united them, the friendship with Ibn Mahkam did not last. In the same year Salihi had his father-in-law murdered, seized Rahba and administered it in the name of the Faitunit Caliph in Cairo whom he recognised as his suzerain in the Friday prayer. In the next year (400 = 1000) he was involved in the affairs of Aleppo for the first time (see the art. JAMALIUS). Mansur Murad Al-Dawla, son of the Hamdanid Mamul Lahin, was ruling there but his position was challenged by the pretender Abu L-Abid, grandson of Salih Al-Dawla. The latter had taken the Kalbibi into his service but they had gone over to Mansur who had promised them large tracts of land. In consequence it was easy for Mansur to beat the Hamdanids. But when the Kilkbis became pressing in their demands for their reward and invaded and plundered his lands, he had recourse to an old stratagem. He invited the Kilkbis to a feast to discuss the matter, fell upon them and killed some and took the others prisoners. The story that 1,000 Kilkbis were killed on this occasion in addition to the chiefs may be an exaggeration. Salihi had so far humiliated himself as to declare his wife to be divorced in favour of Mansur. For three years he languished in chains. It was not till 405 (1014) that he succeeded in escaping, in chains, as some say, or as others report, after seeing them through with a file that had been smuggled unto him. After lying in concealment for some time he gradually collected the Kilkbis around him again and attacked Mansur. The latter was defeated, captured and put into the same chains, the story goes, as he had bound Salihi with. He was then released on certain conditions and handed over 5,000 dinars, 70 pounds of silver and 300 robes, but did not fulfill the condition that he should pay the Kilkbis half the revenues of Aleppo for the year 405 and marry Salih to his daughter. The Kilkbis then laid siege to Aleppo and Mansur, who could not trust Fahd, the commander of the Hamdanids, either in 405 (1014). Fahd came to terms with Salihi and delivered Aleppo over to Aba L-Abd, the Fatimid governor of Apamea. The Caliph, angry at the flight of Mansur, recognised 'Assal as governor, handed Fahd and Salihi to whom he gave the honorary title of Asal Al-Dawla and granted him the promised half of a year's revenue of Aleppo. (On the governors of Aleppo to the year 406-411 see above, p. 229 sqq.) The rule of the Fatimids with their continually changing governors aroused the discontent of the Beduin tribes, who combined against Fatimid authority in 414 (1024) (see above, p. 229 sqq.). Salihi conquered Aleppo, Hims, Hulub and Badin in the next two years and his authority stretched to beyond Anah on the Euphrates. When the power of the Fatimids increased again, the Caliph Zahir sent a new army in 420 (1029) under Anushkhatin Al-Dabiri against whom Salihi took the field. He fell in the battle of Ukhαnistan on the Jordan; his son Nasr (see the art. SALLI NASR AL-DAWLA) escaped with a portion of the army and retained rule over Aleppo. Salihi's importance lies in the fact that he led his tribe from Mesopotamia to Aleppo and gave them permanent settlements there.

Bibliography: Kamali al-Din 'Umar b. al-
Adiun, Zuhdi al-Halabi f Tertib Halab, St. Petersburg, Asiatic Mus., of the Asiatic Museum 522, Paris 1866, of which the part dealing with the Mirdāsid has been edited by J. J. Müller, História Mirdāsidum, Bonn 1830; Ibn al-Athir, Ḳamil, ed. Tornberg, ix. 148, 159 sq.; Ibn Khalīkān, transl. by de Slane, Paris 1842, i. 631; cf. also the articles JAMALIUS, above, p. 247 sqq. and HALAB, p. 237 sqq. (M. SOBERNEHEIM)

SALLI b. ṬARIF. We know very little definitely about this individual, the prophet of the Barghawata of Tanassāt (the western coast of Morocco) and the founder of their heresy, or at least it was he to whom it was attributed. According to the information collected by al-Bakri and which later writers simply reproduce, Tarif b. Shamsa Hb. Vašl P. Ḳalāḏ was one of the companions of Mūsaa, promotor of the ẁārid inscription in the Maghrib in the eighth century A.D. and the leader of a section of the Zanūt and of the Zawγar; then he was recognised as their chief by the people of the Tamassāt among whom he settled. His son Salihi succeeded him, declaring himself to be the prophet — the Ṣalihi al-shumā'īnīn of the Korān — sent to complete the mission of Mūsaa. He elaborated his doctrine, which he kept secret, then set out for the East to demonstrate his power in the lands of his father and brother and said that he would return after his seventh successor. Al-Ṭābi in his turn kept this teaching secret and was succeeded by his son Yūnos who preached it and spread it by force of arms in the course of the third century A.D. in the lands now comprised in western Morocco, but the chronology is extremely vague. The descendants of Salihi b. Tarīf continued to reign over the Barghawata down to the period of their defeat and the Ḳawāns of Salè (beginning of the eighth century), then by the Almoravids (end of the eighth century and lastly by the Almohads (middle of the ninth century). — According to other traditions, hostile in the Barghawata, Salihi was of Jewish origin and born at Barca in Spain, whence he returned to Barghawata given to his followers. But these traditions are of no value. It may be asked if this enigmatic figure Salihi is really the author of the heresy of the Barghawata or rather if Yūnos, who spread it, did not, in order to give it more prestige, place it to the credit of his grandfather who had mysteriously disappeared and whose retum was predicted. This would be quite in keeping with the psychology of the Berbers. An account of the teaching of Salihi b. Ṭarīf will be found in the article BARGHAWATA. 

Bibliography: The only really important Muslim source is al-Bakri, Description de l'Afrique Septentrionale, ed. de Slane, Algiers 1857, p. 135-141; cf. also René Basset, Revue Archéologique sur la religion des Barghawata, Pans 1910, p. 48-54. The remainder of the Bibliography will be found in the article BARGHAWATA.

(SHERI RASSET)

SALIH. Arab historians and genealogists are unanimous in stating that the tribe of whom Salih were the first Arabs who founded a kingdom in Syria, though the three princes mentioned by them appear not to be named on inscriptions or by Greek and Syrian authors. There is also doubt as regards their affiliation with other tribes; some reckon them to Ghasan, while others say they were a branch of Quda'a. Their first ruler is named al-Nu'man b. Ḳamr b. Mūlik who was succeeded by his son Mūlik after whom followed the latter's
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his class. One night, after a drinking party at court, Uwais sent a slave with a candle in a golden basin to light him home. The next morning the king sent for the basin and received a verse in reply:

"Last night the candle was consumed, and in my lamentation I too shall be consumed, if the king demands the basin."

The poet was allowed to keep the basin.

As a reward for an ode which he wrote in answer to the odes of Khwajâ Zahhâr Fârâyb, Salâmân received two villages in the Rul district and some land in the neighbourhood of Sâwâ, his native town, in Sâyâybâl, and in his old age he retired from court and lived in peace on his estate.

Uwais, who ruled over Irâq and Khâbarâlân, died in 738 and Salâmân emerged from his retirement and mourned for some time over his patron's grave, chanting an elegy which he had composed on him. Salâmân himself died at an advanced age in 778 (738).

[Salâmân wrote both epic and lyrical poetry. There exist of him two Mathnasûs, viz. Fârâybînâma, composed in 761 (759) on demand of his patron Sulân Uwais, and Dâjânâghî Khwâ-zârân, an imitation of Khwâzârân, written in 762 (759). His lyrical works contain Ghasals, Nakhatî, Kifār, and the genre in which he excelled, Kifâdas. In this latter kind of poetry, notable in the artificial Kifâda (Kifâda-i mawzû) he surpassed even his greatest predecessor, Dhu 'l-Fikâr of Shirwan. Of poetical figures of Salâmân's contains especially the Twâjâl l. e., the incorporation of a smaller poem into a longer one (cf. Ibn. Khâl, Mazîyân, Gibb Mem. Ser. x. p. 362 sqq.). Many of the Kifâdas are reflexes of historical events of the time, Salâmân's Ghasals could not, in the eyes of Persian critics, win the renown of his Kifâda."

A lithographed Bombay edition of his Kulliyât is mentioned by Browne, Hist. of Persian Lit. under Tartar Dominions, p. 367]


SALÂMÂN AL-FARÎSÎ, a companion of the Prophet and one of the most prominent figures of Muslim legend. According to one tradition, the most complete version of which among the many that exist goes back to Muhammad b. Isâkh, he was the son of a diwan of the Persian village of Qâdiyân (or Nâyân; cf. Yâbût, ii. 170) near Isfahân. According to other stories, he belonged to the vicinity of Bâmharum and his Iranian name was Mâhâm (Maybût) or Râbêh (cf. Justi, Iran. Namens- buch, p. 217, 277). Attracted by Christianity while still a boy he left his father's house to follow a Christian monk and having changed his teachers several times arrived in Syria; from there he went right down to the Wâli 'l-Karî in Central Arabia seeking the Prophet who was to restore the religion of 'Irâbîm, the inimiceness of whose coming had been predicted to him by his last teacher on his deathbed. Betrayed by Kâbîl Bedâiûn, who was acting as his guides through the desert, and sold as a slave to a Jew, he had occasion to visit the Wâli 'yâhûr where soon after his arrival the hâdîrî of Muhammad took place. Recognising in the latter the marks of the prophet which the monk had described to him, Salâmân became a Muslim and pressed his liberty from his Jewish master, after being miraculously aided by Muhammad himself to raise the sum necessary to pay his ransom.

The name of Salâmân is associated with the siege of Medina by the Mekkans for it was he who on this occasion advised the digging of the ditch (khândaq) by means of which the Muslims defended themselves from the enemy. But, as Horovitz (see the Bibliography) has shown, the earliest accounts of the yâwmu l-khândaq make no mention of Salâmân's intervention, the story of which was probably invented in order to attribute to a Persian the introduction of a system of defence the name of which is of Persian origin. The other references to the career of Salâmân (his part in the conquest of the Irâq and of Fars, his governorship of al-Madinîn etc.) are equally devoid of authority and almost all date from the historian Taifî b. Umar, the bias of whose work is well known. Indeed, the fame of Salâmân is almost entirely due to his Persian nationality: he is the prototype of the converted Persians (just as the Abyssinians and the Greeks are represented by Bûlûq [q.v., l. 718] and Şu'âbî respectively), who played such a part in the development of Islâm; as such he has become the national hero of Muslim Persia and one of the favourite personages of the Shâhâbûyâ (cf. Goldscheider, Muh. Studien, i. 117, 136, 153, 212).

What explains the majority of the traditions relative to Salâmân is the fact that the Prophet foretells to him that the Persians will form the better part of the Muslim community; he declares him member of his own family (sâh al-hâlî); his nationality is equal to that assigned to Hasan and to Husain, the grandsons of the Prophet etc. In reality, the historical personality of Salâmân is of the vaguest and it is with difficulty that one can even admit that his legend is based on the actual fact of the conversion of a Medina slave of Persian origin.

The figure of Salâmân has had an extraordinary development. Not only does he appear as one of the founders of Shi'ism along with the Aşıkâl-Şu'ûfâ (Kitâb al-Luma', ed. Nicholson, p. 134—135) but the alleged site of his tomb very early became a centre of worship (at latest in the 17th century A.D.); cf. Yâbût, Kitâb al-Budûnî in the Shahîkheh Geography or Arabistern, vii. 341): it is still pointed out in the vicinity of the ancient al-Madînî, at the place called after him Salâmân Pâk ("Salâmân the Pure") near the former Asbâhî suburb. His sepulchral mosque, which was seen in its older form by Pietro della Valle in 1617 (Viaggi, ed. Gancia, Brighton 1845, i. 394), was renovated by Sulûn Murût IV (1623—1640) and
recently restored (in 1322 = 1904—1905) (Herzfeld-Sarre, Archäol. Reise im Euphrat- und Tigrisgebiert, ii. 262, note 1, based on information given by the learned Mesopotamian journalist Kazim al-Dajjali; and cf. ibid., p. 51 [topographical sketch] and p. 58). It is the object of numerous pilgrimages, especially on the part of Shi'=is, who fail to visit it in return from Kerbelā (cf. Amin, La Perle d'aujourd'hui, Paris 1902, p. 426—428). Other traditions locate the tomb of Salāmān in the vicinity of Isfahān, where there is evidence of his cult in the 14th century (Yākūt, ii. 170), and elsewhere (for Lydda in Palestine cf. Clermont-Ganneau, Études d'archéologie orientale, ii. 108).

Salāmān plays a remarkable part in the development of the futilām and the workmen's corporations. He is venerated as a patron of barbers, whence comes the tradition, unknown in ancient collections of tradition, which makes him the Prophet's barber (H. Thorning, Studien zu Bas Mداد et Tināqī, Diss. Kiel 1913, p. 33—57 and 85—90 = Beiträge zur Geschichte der islamischen Vergeistigung, Thüringische Bibliothek, vol. 16; Goldziher, Abhandl. ii. arab. Philol., ii. iv., lex.),. He is also one of the principal links in the mystic chain (tīla) in various religious orders (Depont and Coppolani, Les Confréries Musulmanes, p. 91). The veneration accorded to Salāmān among the Sunnis is naturally exceeded among the Shi'=is: not only do they attribute to him a mass of hadīth in honour of 'Ali and his family but among the extremist sects he is placed immediately after 'Ali in the series of divine emanations. The Nuṣairīya make him the third member of the trinity formed by the three mystic letters A ('Alī), M (Muhammad) and S (Salāmān), of which he forms the gate (88) (cf. Dussaud, La Région des Nuṣairī, p. 63; Goldziher, A. R. W., xii. 88).

The death of Salāmān is placed in 35 or 36 A.H., a statement which has no value except to indicate that the historian's tradition had no note of his activity after the accession of 'Ali (end of 35 A.H.). Like many other individuals, said to have embraced Islam after long experiences of other religions, he is credited with an extraordinary longevity: 200, 300, 350 and even 553 years (Goldziher, Abhandl., ii. iv., lex.)


SALMĀS, a district in the province of Aqhar-bāldān in Persia, to the north-west of the Lake of Urmiyah and having an area of 25 miles (N. to S.) by 40 (E. to W.). To the south the chain of the Aqghān (Afghān)-dagh with its pass Wer gewit (6,150 feet high) separates Salāmāt from the district of Urmiyah (Urtmi); the eastern portion of the Aqghān-dagh forms the lofty promontory of Karā-bāg [q.v.] which runs out into the Lake; at the end of it is the fortress of Gwārīn-i-Kār. In the west the Hartwil range (in Turkish Aral) separates Salāmās from the Turkish district of Albeák; the pass of Khānāsur is 7,500 feet high. To the north Salāmās marches with Khol; in the north-east with the district of Günei (*exposed to the sun*); former administrative name Arwanās-ws-Anār) which lies on the north bank of the lake and has Ṭaṣōd as its capital. Salāmās consists of the fertile plain watered by the Zola-Cai and of the mountainous districts of Cahrā, Shīnatāl and Sherpinā.

The region of Salāmās has been inhabited since very early times to judge by the remains of Khiā (Vandik) buildings. Later it formed part of the province of Persermaia belonging sometimes to Atropatene and sometimes to Armenia. Fausset Byzantines recognize the region of Salāmās in the province of Kortōk. Constantine Porphyrogenetus mentions Salaman alongside of Ḫuʾr (now Khul).

Al-Muqaddas describes Salāmās as a fine town with good markets and a stone mosque; the population in the fourth (ixth) century was of Kuri origin. In Yākūt's time the town was in ruins; among natives of the place he mentions Mīnā b. 'Amrān, a learned man who died in 390. According to Hāmid Allah Mustawfi, the city wall, 8,000 paces in circumference, was rebuilt by the vizier Khāda Tāj al-Dīn 'Ali Shāh in the reign of Ghiyān. The taxes of Salāmās in the viiiith (xivth) century amounted to 39,000 dinars. At the present day there is no town named Salama. The present towns of Khāna Shahr (the old town) in the north-west of the district on the road from Albeák and Khojūr. There are at Khana Shahr about 1,000 families of Shi'is who speak the Azeri dialect of Turkish, 100 Armenian families and a Jewish colony, always the sign of an old established settlement in Persia. The fact that the tower of Mīr-Khātūn is situated near Khana Shahr is equally significant.

The modern capital is Dilmun (written Dilmān), the name of which seems to indicate some connection with the Dailamites of Gilan (cf. the art. DAILAM) some of whose little forts are at Shahrūn, etc. (cf. Yākūt, s. v. Dailamaṣf). There are at Dilmun 1,400 houses (in 1852 only 300) and 8,000 inhabitants (almost all Shi'is). The town advantageously situated at the intersection of the routes in the centre of the plain is surrounded by walls of earth and has 5 gates. It has 11 mosques (those of Aghā, of the Shāfi'ī al-İslām, of Ḥāfiz 'Ali Rūzb, Ḥāfiz Sādik Aghā, Kanī, Sullī, etc.), and a tekkeya of dervishes founded by Rawjan Efendi (who sealed the date 1231 A.H.); cf. Vellāminoff Zemor, Scherf-Nasch, 1860, i. 18).

The plain of Salāmās about 1850 (Cirtkow) had 51 villages with 3,310 houses. Their number towards 1900 had risen to 108 with a population of over 50,000 of whom 63.3% were Shi'is, 13.9% Sunnis, 22.5% Christians and 1.3% Jews. A Alongside of purely Muslim villages or those with a mixed population were Christian villages of fair size: Arman (Kaf-i-ar), Haftwān, Perzāvakdīk, Syriacs (Khosrowas, Patawûr, etc.). The Catholic (Chaldæan) Syriacs were found mainly at Khosrowna, a prosperous hamlet of 500 houses with
2 churches (one built in 1844), the seat of a bishop and of a Lazarist mission. As early as 1281 a bishop of Salmiak was present at the synod in the Nestorian patriarch Mar. Yalabaha (Assamani, ii. 456) at Bagdad. The inhabitants of Khınwía were converted to Catholicism in the course of the eighteenth century. Among the Muslims of Salmiak there are a few Lek, who came originally from southern Kurdistan but claim to have come to Salmiak from Ispahan. The representatives of the different races and religions agreed very well together and were only disturbed by the turco-of Kurd, who live down from the mountains to plain in the plains. The exports and imports of Salmiak before the war amounted to a million gold roubles. The exports consisted of wax, almonds, skins and cattle. The Russo-Turkish fighting and the period of trouble that followed the war from 1918 onwards have seriously affected the prosperity of Salmiak.

Čahrík, the administrative centre of the mountainous region inhabited by the Kurds, is a little fortress built on a rock rising up in the centre of the gorge of the Zala-CaI (see the photograph in E. G. Browne, Nagûra 'l-Kûfî, 1916). In 1828 Çahrík was occupied by the Russians. In 1848 the Bâb (q.v.) was mentioned there before his execution at Tabriz. At this date the governor of Çahrík was Yâhûd Kân, brother-in-law of Muhammad Shâh. After the assassination of his son Timûr Kân, Çahrík was occupied by the 'Awdî Kurdî. This clan belongs to the great tribe of Sîjkîkh, which occupies both sides of the Persian-Turkish frontier here. According to the 'Awdî, their ancestors came from Dîyrîshk to Urmiya towards the middle of the xvith century. The tomb of their chief Ismâ'îl Âghî (on the Nasîr Citadel) is dated 1231 (1816). His son, All Kân, seized Çahrík in 1864. The son of 'Ali Kân, Dî'âtûr Âghî, a bold bandit, was put to death at Tabriz in 1905 by order of the governor-general. His younger brother Ismâ'îl (known as Simkö) played a considerable part in the troubles preceding these matches. In 1918 the Nestorian patriarch was assassinated at Kuhna Shâhî in an encounter provoked by Simkö's men. In 1922 a Persian military force drove Simkö back into Turkey.

Among the antiquities of Salmiak there should be noted: 1) the Khâlsî (Urumiana) buildings discovered by G. Porter (Trans. il. 60) on the hill of 'Îsâflûl Kâf near the village of Tamar; 2) a basilica (Sassanian) on the rock of Pi Çâ'îsh, representing Galerius, Nares and Tridates (Ker Porter, Ibid.; Flandin and Coste, iv, pl. 204—205) or, according to another explanation, Ardashir Fâhîd and his son Shâhristân (Jackson, Persia Past and Present, p. 87; Saur, Iran, Forschungen, p. 246); 3) the fortress of Gûwerîn Kân ("Hostess of the pigeons") on the rocks, sometimes forming a peninsula and sometimes an island in the lake of Urmîya. Some parts of G-E. may date from the Khâlsî period. N. Khravko in 1852 discovered there a fragment of a Muslim inscription of a certain Abû 'Abîdûrâsîn Bâhadûr Kân (the newspaper Kamal, Tiflis 1852, N0. 22, 23); 4) the brick tower near Kuhna Shâhî. Its inscription dated about 700 (733) and deciphered by Max von Berchem attributes its erection to Mir Khâtûn, daughter of Arghun Azâ. The last named is known as governor of Khûnsû in the time of Hântsû and Alâûî (cf. Lehmann-Haupt, Mater-
The tribe Salul is not inconsiderable; divergencies are encountered, Ghśāra e.g. occurring in both, from which it seems safe to infer that, though the general membership was known the affiliation was more than uncertain in most cases, which the ingenuity of the genealogists has not been able to bring into one common scheme. The chief difficulty was, no doubt, that Salul was the name of a woman, not of a man, in spite of the "ibn" of the genealogists and we have a case of matriarchy, not uncommon in the genealogies of Arab tribes.


Salūl is the name of one of the tribes of the Oghūs which traces its name and origin to the eldest son of Dagh Khan, one of the six sons of Oghūs Khan; in the texts the orthography is spelled سِلْفِوْس (It occurs in a Persian Oghūs-nāma in manuscript in my private library) or سِلْفِوْس (Oghūs-nāma) is rarely found; the commonest is سِلْفِوْس or سِلْفِوْس. As in the case of many other Turkish tribes the historical data regarding their ethnology are very scanty and confused. This much is, however, certain for their early history that from the earliest times they shared the fortunes of the other Oghūs tribes, since they came from the lands of Ill and of Ilgh Gōl on the banks of the Salūn [q.v.] and then migrated into Transoxania, Khwarizm and Khorasan, and finally, at the conquest of Asia Minor, a part of the tribe settled in Eastern Anatolia (for details see Köprülü Zaile Fu'ād, 'Türk-i 'ubūdī, Constantinople 1923, i. chap. 5). It was during the time that the Salgharīsh dynasty [q.v.] arose after the fall of the Salūn empire ('Tā'kī, Gibb Memorial Series, vol. xxi. i. p. 503); the royal poet Ḥūrābī al-Din [q.v.] was also a descendant of the Salūl ('Aṣrā b. Ardāshīr 'Astarābādī, Paxiaux’s MS, of the Aya Sofia, No. 3465). Seeing that, according to the translation of the Salūn-nāma, the Salūl, who had come into Asia Minor, were in the army of Bahram Shāh, prince of Er-sinjān, of the family of Mengbek (Housma, Recueil etc., iii. 37), we may conclude that the Salūl played an important part in the history of the Salūn-nāma of Asia Minor along with the Kāšī, Bāyāntu, and Bāyāt tribes (see the index in vol. iv. of the Recueil and J. Marquart, Über das Volkstein der Komaun, p. 189 in the Abh. G. W., new series, vol. xxii. i. Berlin 1914). According to a Persian manuscript of the Oghūs-nāma in my private library, the Karamo Gudgul [q.v.] belonged to the Karamo branch of the Salūl. It is very probable that the villages bearing the name Karamo in Afghanistan in the Causcasus were originally formed by the Salūl. Among the solid bodies of Turkomans that we find in these regions in the 15th century A.D. (al-NAṣṣ al-Dīn Ṭabīb, Histoire du Sultan Ḥīṣāl al-Dīn Mustafā, transl. Houdas, Paris 1895, p. 964, 374, 383) there were certainly these...
Karaman. After a large part of the Salur had migrated westwards, as a result of Saldjik policy, which aimed at dispersing the Oghur tribes in different directions, those who had remained at Murw and Sarakhs played a part in later history under the general name of Turkomans. In the opinion of several scholars a certain number of these Salur went between 1380 and 1424, via Sumarkand, Turfan and Sou Tcheou, to Si Ning where they settled and became the present Salar of Kan-Su (it still remains to be ascertained whence and when these latter emigrated). The Salur, reduced in number and in strength by these two emigrations, became gradually weakened by their fighting with the other nomad Turkomans and particularly by their continual incursions into Persian territory; they finally ceased to be of any importance as a result of the great losses sustained against 'Abd-Allah Mirza, son of Fath 'Alt Shahr, during the latter's expedition to Sarakhs in 1381.

Present state of the Salur. The Salur regard themselves as the oldest and noisiest of the Turkomans who live clustered round Sarakhs and scattered along the Russo-Persian frontier near Harir-Rud. They are divided into three groups: Alauci, Karaman and Amabelghe; these groups again have their subdivisions. Even with the following divisions:


Kiraih Agha: 1) Kiraih Agha, 2) Bech Ourouk (all these names after the orthography of the R.M.M., lvi, 66, 67).

These subdivisions are again divided into clans. Their numbers are variously estimated. Dohben puts the number of the Salur around Sarakhs at 2,000 tents, Petrouchitch at 3,000, Vambery at 5,700 (which is an exaggeration). Recently J. Castagnet has put it at 3,000 tents.

The number of Muslim Salur in the originally Tibetan district of Kan-Su is put at 70,000 (according to Grenad, 50,000). They dwell on the right bank of the Yellow River in an area stretching from Ouroumov to Tsao-Ho with the little town of Sin-Hoa-Tung or Salar as its centre; on the left bank they occupy some villages on a rather desolate and mountainous road between Si-Ning and Hua-Tcheou. These Turks are readily distinguished by their physical type from the other Muslims of Kan-Su; they have retained their Turkish language. Grenad has published materials concerning their dialect and has drawn certain conclusions from it regarding the origin and time of emigration of the Salur but these materials are neither sufficient nor reliable. The Salur are Hanafi Sunnis; they have always been Na'ijahbands and the dhikr 'ahmi is common among them. They despise the Chinese and as a rule are brigands.


(KORULTO ZADE FU'I)
the root s-m- and means "hearing," often passing into the thing heard, like music and hearing music; also, like s-s-m, "listening" (Lane, Lexicon, pp. 1427, 1429; Lisan, p. 26 sq.); it does not occur in the Kur’ān but it belongs to old Arabic even in the meaning, "a singing or musical performance" (Lane, p. 1617, under waqāf and references there). In lexicology and grammar it means, with sama‘, what is received on authority, as opposed to ḥayā‘ "analogical" (de Sacy, loc. cit., and Lane, p. 1429). In theology it, and sama‘, are opposed, in the same sense, to ḍā‘ ḍ "reason" (Goldziher, Die Richtungen der islam. Kalamusäugung, p. 136 sq., 166). But its principal technical use is undoubtedly in Sunnism, in which it means the listening to music, singing, chanting, and measured recitation in order to produce religious emotion and ecstasy (waqāf) and also such performances by voice or instrument. To this on all its sides al-Hazzālī has devoted a Book of the ḥayā‘, the viihth in the Sections of Custom, vol. vii, p. 454-end in ed. with commentary, ḥayā‘ as-saatā, cf. Hazzali above. It has been translated with commentary and analysis by D. B. Macdonald in H.R.A.S., for 1901, 2, and is the locus classicus in Islam for the whole subject of the attaining and controlling of religious emotion by such means, on its legal, psychological, theological and esthetic sides. Al-Hazzālī considers it both as an advanced mystic and experienced ecstatic and as an orthodox Ash‘rite and Shāfī‘ite, and this Book by its subject forms the kernel of his ḥayā‘. Al-Hujwīrī, an earlier Persian writer and a theoretically more advanced mystic, although still holding to its professed orthodoxy—has given to the same subject a chapter of his Kashf al-muqabbil; the translation (Gibb Memorial Series, vol. xvii.) by R. A. Nicholson, p. 393-420; see also, Mystics of Islam and Studies in Islamic Mysticism by the same author, both by index: Massignon, La Passion d’al-Halaj, by index and especially p. 780, 795 sq. Al-Kujairī has also given a section to this in his Risāla, ed. with commentaries of al-Arīf and Zakariya (Būlāk 1920), iv., p. 122—146; cf. on this passage R. Hartmann, Al-Kujairī’s Darstellung des Sufismus, p. 134—139. There are two vivid descriptions of scenes by Ḧāfīṣe darrīgh for sama‘ in Ibn Baṭṭūṭa’s Travels, Paris ed., ii., p. 5—7.

Bibliography: has been given above.

ŠAMAD. [See Allān l. 303.]

AL-SAMAK, Fishes. There are numerous kinds, some so long that one cannot see both ends at the same time—a ship had once to wait four months till one of these monsters had passed—but others are so small that one can hardly see them. They breathe water through the covers of their gills and do not require air in order to live; air is injurious to them all except flying-fish. They are very voracious on account of the coldness of their temperament and because in them the stomach is very near the mouth. Like snakes they have great strength in their movements, because they have not to distribute their nourishment over many limbs. Many fishes pair; others are produced from sand and slime or decaying matter. According to al-Dhahīrī, there are migratory fish, which one only finds at certain periods of the year, like migratory birds. Al-Kasimī gives 79 names of fishes and 130 names of birds for Lake Menzelah in his ‘Adīyah al-Makhdūṣat (ii. 119). The eating of fish is permitted by law, in whatever way they may have perished or been killed but they must not be roasted or eaten alive. Fishes are considered to be cold and moist and therefore good for people of a hot temperament and they soften the thin. Freshwater fish have many bones but have a fine flavour; fishes which live on mud are forbidden. If a drunk man smells fish, he becomes sober. Eating fish makes one thirsty. Al-Razi deals very fully with the cooking of fish and their wholesomeness. Wonderful tales are given in the 1001 Nights and are also told by al-Damīrī.


AL-SAMAKATAN, Fishes; the more accurate name for the last sign of the Zodiac which is usually called al-Hūr, the fish. It consists of 38 stars of which 34 belong to the constellation and four lie outside of it (khārijūn). The two fishes are, according to the usual view, connected by a hand twisted between their tails, ṣalāma ṣawqalās. This is called al-Kašf or is described as a thread, ḥai‘, which connects the two fishes in its windings (ṣallat tā‘ird).


(S. RUSKA)

SĀMĀNIDS, a Persian dynasty, descended from a certain Sāmān Khudāt. The genealogy down to Ismā‘il, the first really independent prince, is as follows:

[Diagram of the genealogy of the Sāmānids, showing the positions of the various rulers and their relations to each other.]

Sāmān Khudāt, who traced his family back to the celebrated Bahram Cubin, that is to a noble
family of Ray (Ibn al-Â†hir, ed. Tomberg, vii. 192), was, as his name shows, lord of the village of Samânî (in the district of Balîkh; cf. Hamza Isufâni, ed. Gottwaldt, p. 237; Harbîr de Meynard, Dict. gén., de la Pers., p. 297). When Samânî-khâudt had to flee from Balîkh, he sought refuge with Asad b. 'Abd Allah al-Kastî, governor of Khurâsân (cf. the art. ASAD, i. 475). The latter helped him against his enemies; Samânî-khâudt then adopted Islam. He called his son after his protector, Asad (Narshakhî in Schefer, Descri., de Boukharâ, p. 57 sq.). The further stories of Samânî-khâudt given in the Ti'rîkh-i Gusâda (apud Schefer, c. c., p. 99 sq.) are obviously legendary. The story that his ambition was aroused at the recital of a certain verse was only later transferred to him from another connection (Gibb Mem. Ser., xi. 26, 123 sq.). The Ti'rîkh-i Gusâda also says that Samânî-khâudt gained possession of Ashnâk.

Asad b. Samânî-khâudt had four sons, who seem to have played a part in the political history of the eastern Caliphate even in the time of al-Ra'îshân. The future Caliph al-Mu'mân is said to have ordered the sons of Asad to assist the commander-in-chief Harthama against the rebel Râz b. Lâthî and the Sânâ'nîs were able to arrange an agreement between Harthama and Râzî (Narshakhî, p. 75). In any case, when al-Mu'mân succeeded his father, he commanded Ghassân b. 'Abhâd, whom he appointed governor of Khurâsân, to give the sons of Asad posts in the administration (Narshakhî, p. 57; cf. Ibn al-Â†hir, vii. 192; Hamza al-Isufâni, p. 257). In 204 (819) Ghassân appointed Nugh b. Asad to Samârâzand, 'Abham to Fârghânâ, Yahyâ to Al-Shâh and Ughârûsâma and Ilâya to Harthama. When later, Tâhir b. 'Abbas became governor of Khurâsân, he confirmed these appointments. The Sânâ'nîs were thus a kind of sub-governors of the Tâhirîs. An older source, Hamza al-Isufâni, only briefly states that Nugh spent some years at the court of al-Mu'mân and that the latter then appointed him over Mâwarâ al-Nahr min fisal al-Tâhirîya (237). The first of the brothers to die was Ilâya; his death took place in the reign of 'Abd Allah b. Tâhir. The latter allowed Ilâya's son 'Umaymâd to succeed his father in Harthama (Ibn al-Â†hir, vii. 193).

But this branch of the family is of less importance than the line of 'Abham from which the Samânî dynasty was descended. When Nugh, who seems to have been a loyal servant of the Tâhirîs - he had aided 'Abd Allah b. Tâhir at the instigation of the Caliph al-Mu'asam to enter in infamous fashion al-Hassan b. al-Â†fîq, son of the famous general of the Turks who had fallen from favour (al-Tâbâri, i. 107) - had died without heir, Tâhir b. 'Abd Allah gave his governorship in Transoxania to the brothers Yahyâ and 'Abham. 'Abham is praised in later sources for his unselfishness and other fine qualities (Ibn al-Â†hir, vii. 192) in the fashion usual among eastern historians, when dealing with the founder of a dynasty. 'Abham was succeeded in the governorship of Transoxania by the eldest of his seven sons, Nâsir (we hear no more of Yahyâ; perhaps he died before 'Abham; Hamza al-Isufâni only knows of 'Abham as successor to Nugh). From 261 (874-75) onwards Nâsir can be regarded as an independent prince; in that year he was granted Transoxania as a fief direct from the Caliph (al-Tâbâri, iii. 1889; cf. Ibn al-Â†hir, vii. 193); the star of the Tâhirîs was on the wane and danger threatened from the 'Ash'ârids. But just as it appears from the words of Ibn al-Â†hir that he regards Nâsir after the grant of 261 as a de facto autonomous ruler dependent only on the 'Abbâsid government, so Hamza (p. 237) seems to consider Ismâ'il the first actual prince (fisâlîn wîlâyât man taškhdama Ismâ'ilîn... wîn fisal al-Tâhirîn), in the same year, 261, Nâsir appointed his brother Ismâ'il Wâli of Bukhârâ. In this region anarchy reigned; an army sent by Nâsir against the 'Ash'ârid Ya'qub b. al-Latîh had murdered its leader and gone to Bukhârâ, where the soldiery, after Nâsir's mîlîh 'Abham b. 'Umar had retired before them, appointed and deposed rulers as they pleased (so Ibn al-Â†hir). Narshakhî (p. 70) speaks of an invasion of the Khwâiremîs (Khwîrî, li. 260 = 874) when great devastation was wrought in Bukhârâ. The leader of the Khwâiremîs, Husain b. Tâhir al-Râzî, was soon forced to take to flight, but the disturbances went on as before. Then the Fâqi' Abbas b. 'Abd Allah b. Abî 'Abbâs appealed to Nâsir to send a governor to restore order. He sent Ismâ'il, according to Narshakhî, by the first Friday of the month of Ramaqân, 260 (June 26, 874), the name of Ya'qub b. Latîh was replaced in the Khwâirc in Bukhârâ by that of Nâsir. The Samânîs soon rendered harmless, although by perfidious means, the Khwâiremîs. Ismâ'il cleared the robbers out of Bukhârâ, defeated Husain b. Tâhir of Khwâiremî and forced the turbulent Bukhârâ aristocracy to obedience. He further sought to strengthen his position by an alliance with Râzî b. Hartama, lord of Khurâsân. The latter also handed over to him the administration of Khurâsân (Ibn al-Â†hir, vii. 193). This must have been shortly before the outbreak of war between Ismâ'il and Nâsir (272 = 885/886) for it was only in 271 that Muhammad b. Tâhir was appointed governor of Khurâsân by the Caliph al-Mu'tasim in place of 'Amr b. al-Latîh, whereupon Muhammad installed Râzî b. Hartama as his deputy there (Ibn al-Â†hir, vii. 290). The power of the Samânîs was by then so well established that these events in Khurâsân did not affect their position in the least; Ismâ'il's treaty with Râzî b. Hartama was an offensive alliance against Nâsir. In the first war, which broke out in 272 (Narshâkhî gives as the cause that Ismâ'il had not paid the annual tribute promptly; Ibn al-Â†hir speaks in general terms of intrigues), Râzî did not distinguish himself as an ally. 'Umaymâd b. 'Abbâs, a general of Ismâ'il's, seems to have induced him to work for a rapprochement between Nâsir and Ismâ'il rather than for a vigorous campaign (Ibn al-Â†hir, vii. 194). Peace was soon concluded between the two brothers. The war was renewed 275 (888) and ended in favour of Ismâ'il. The latter captured Nâsir, but was not quite strong enough to send him back to Samârâzand with the honours befitting his suzerain. There Nâsir remained till his death in 279 (892) (al-Tâbâri, iii. 2133) while Ismâ'il remained as his brother's mîlîh in Bukhârâ, until he succeeded him on the throne. Ismâ'il is regarded the first proper ruler (amir) of the dynasty. The list is as follows:

Ismâ'il b. 'Abham

Abham b. Ismâ'il

Nâsir b. 'Abham

Nugh b. Nâsir

'Abham al-Malik b. Nugh

Mansur b. Nugh

279-295 (892-907)

295-301 (907-913)

301-311 (913-943)

311-343 (943-954)

343-350 (954-961)

350-365 (961-976)
Nūḥ II b. Manṣūr . . . . 365-387 (976-997)
Manṣūr II b. Nūḥ . . . . 387-389 (997-999)
'Abd al-Malik II b. Nūḥ . . . . 389 (999)

By the time Ismā'īl (cf. above, ii. 545 sq.) died, he had considerably extended his kingdom, in addition to Transoxiana and Khorāsān, which had come to him after the overthrow of the Saffārīd 'Amr (see the above article). He was, so far as we can judge, one of the ablest rulers of his dynasty, energetic but unscrupulous. His loyalty to the 'Abābidān is, however, commemorated (Bukhārī, p. 50) and, indeed, the Sāmānids always pronounced, outwardly at least, this sentiment, if 'Utbī is right when he says that only the princes of this dynasty bore the title wali amri 'lam- minān (cf. Schefer, Description, p. 160). Anecdotes of Ismā'īl's piety and philanthropy are given in Ibn al-ʿĀthīr, vii. 194 sq., viii. 4 sq.

Under the second prince, ʿAbd, there already appears a factor, which contributed not a little to the decline of the dynasty, namely the mutinous and ambitious spirit of the notables. Even at his accession ʿAbd was forced to put his uncle Isḥāk in prison; another noble, Ḥārūn al-Kahbīr, who had considerable sums in his keeping, fled to Bagdād. The new Amir seems in other respects to have been of a resolute character. Ibn al-ʿĀthīr (viii. 89) attributes to him a sound judgment and the knowledge of men indispensable in a king. Nāṣr al-Kahbīr emphasizes his justice; it is only in a later compilation that we find him unfavourably criticized (cf. Schefer, Description, p. 98). In 298 (910/911) ʿAbd's general, al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAṭī al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAṭī al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAṭī, conquered Sūrān; among the leaders of this expedition was ʿAbd al-Dawātī, the ancestor of the powerful family that held the governorship of Khorāsān under the Sāmānids. Sūrān was at that time in the hands of a Saffārīd, al-Muʿāwīya b. ʿAlī b. Ṭalḥa. The latter was defeated and sent to Bagdād along with a former ghulām of ʿAbd b. al-Ṭalḥa, who was taken prisoner in Fārs. But the conquest of the country was not final. In 300 (912/913) a rebellion broke out, stirred up by the Khorāsānīs blind. Harūm in favour of a Saffārīd pretender, ʿAmr b. Yaḥyā b. Muḥammad b. ʿAmr b. al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAṭī al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAṭī. ʿAbd again conquered Sūrān for the Sāmānids, but further troubles broke out after ʿAbd's death. In 301 (913/914) the governor of Tabaristān was driven out by an ʿAlī; shortly after the receipt of this news ʿAbd was murdered by some of his ghulāms' (Ibn al-ʿĀthīr, vii. 46, 52, 58).

In this we may see the hand of those notables who, for one reason or another, were tired of the strong hand of the Amir. Significant also are the words which are put in the mouth of ʿAbd's son Nāṣr (Ibn al-ʿĀthīr, viii. 58). That ʿAbd, as later compilations report, showed so much favour to learned men that the ghulām became jealous is probably an invention (Schefer, Description, p. 94, cf. 101).

The detailed histories of the succeeding rulers will be found in the articles on them (ʿAṣl al-Malik, Manṣūr, Naṣr, Nūḥ). The following is a general account of the dynasty, the capital of which was Bukhārā from the time of Ismā'īl. The kingdom of the Sāmānids, which grew out of a subordinate governorship in Transoxiana, comprised in the period of its greatest extent Sūrān, Kirmān, Djiurdjān, Ray and Tabaristān, in addition to Transoxiana and Khorāsān. The reign of Naṣr b. ʿAbd, the patron of Rūshād, marks the zenith of the dynasty (301-331), not so much on account of the imposing personality of the ruler (in respect he was far inferior to Ismā'īl) as on account of the fact that after his death the decline of the kingdom begins to make itself apparent. The same factors, as had proved fatal to older Iranian dynasties, the turmoil of the notables (in this case the military aristocracy) and the danger from the northern nomads, the Turkish tribes, increased in strength when powerful figures like Ismā'īl and ʿAbd no longer sat on the throne and finally brought about the catastrophe. Sooner or later ʿAbd died than his uncle Isḥāk contested the throne with his son Naṣr; Naṣr I had to defend his throne against his relative ʿĪbrāhīm b. ʿAbd. From the reign of the last-named prince dates the rise of Alpātīn, who later seized Ghazna, when he had been removed by Manṣūr I from the governorship of Khorāsān and replaced by Abū l-Ḥusayn Simūdīr, and became the founder of the Ghaznavid dynasty (cf. the article ALFARIZI). The war, waged with little success against the Būyids and ended in the reign of Manṣūr I, contributed as little to the prestige of the dynasty at home or abroad. Things did not improve under Naṣr II. He tried in vain to put down the rebellious governor of Sūrān, Khālīf b. ʿAbd. Abū l-Ḥusayn Simūdīr, whom he had relieved from the governorship of Khorāsān and sent against Khālīf, made common cause with the latter. This was the beginning of a series of troubles which did not cease with the death of Abū l-Ḥusayn; his son, Abū ʿAli Simūdīr, was an equally faithless subject, who finally incited the Turkish prince Bukhārī Khān [q.v.] against the Sāmānids kingdom. The Turks, who had not only been defeated by Ismā'īl but had had the war carried into their own territory (al-Tāhīr, ii. 2138, 2249), now came to the front again. The days of Ismā'īl were past, however. Nāṣr's armies were defeated — one of his generals played the traitor — and he himself had to flee. Only the premature death of the Turkish leader enabled the Sāmānids to return to his capital in a short time again. Fārik, the general, who was said to have allowed himself deliberately to be beaten by the Turks, made an alliance with Abū ʿAli Simūdīr, with the object of driving Nāṣr from the throne. The Amir, who could not trust the nobles, appealed for assistance to the Ghaznavids, who agreed to help him. Nāṣr's two opponents were forced to seek refuge with the Būyids al-Dawla. The governorship of Khorāsān was given by Nāṣr to the Ghaznavid Subuktāgīn; the latter and his son Muḥammad received in addition the titles Naṣr al-Din and Saif al-Dawla (331-354). The war with the rebels continued till Abū ʿAli met his death and Fārik escaped to the Turkish ruler Naṣr b. Abū Iḥeṣ Khān (cf. above, ii. 465 sq.). War with the Turks did not result on this occasion; it was agreed that Fārik should receive the governorship of Samarqand. The brief reign of Manṣūr II was similar in its course. Iḥeṣ Khān, with whom some members of the military aristocracy had made an arrangement, conquered Bukhārā and drove out Manṣūr. With the help of Fārik, Manṣūr was soon able to return. A quarrel broke out between Abū l-Kāsim Simūdīr and Bektāsīn over the governorship of Khorāsān; Muḥammad of Ghazna also intervened, but the definite conquest of Khorāsān by
the gharnawids did not yet take place. Mansur was deposed by Fathik and Bektiyin and blinded. His brother, 'Abd al-Malk, was put upon the throne. Mayshar now intervened. He drove 'Abd al-Malk out of Khurasan and conquered it. On these events and occupation of Transoxania in the same year 739 (999) by Ilek Khan, when 'Abd al-Malk was taken prisoner, cf. above, i. 500. Here the dynasty ends; on the fate of one member of the family, who was carried off by the Turks, Isma'il b. Nush al-Muntaqir, see above, ii. 546.

More important than the political history of the Samanids, which is very similar to that of other Oriental dynasties, is another aspect of their rule which can only be briefly touched on here. Not only did learning flourish under the aegis of this house (one thinks, for example, of Isfandiyar, the translator of al-Tahmuri's chronicle; cf. above, i. 613 sq.), but it is from this epoch that modern Persian literature takes its rise. It is sufficient to receive a name like Rada'i; Firdaws also began writing in the Samanid period. It may be mentioned as a curiosity that one of these rulers himself, Mansur II, has left poetical fragments (cf. 'Awh, Lubab, ed. Browne, i. 25).

Bibliography: Hamza al-Isfahani, ed. Gottwaldt, p. 236 sqq. (down to 'Abd al-Malik I); al-Tahmuri, Index under proper names, down to 301 A.H.; Ibni al-Athir, ed. Tornberg, Index of proper names; al-Gashan, Zain al-Akhbar (cf. ii. 137; extracts in Barthold, Turkestan, not available to me); Description topographique et historique de Boukhara par Mah. Nersihky, ed. by C. Schefer, Paris 1892 (contains Narshangi's Ta'rikhi Bukhara in an abbreviated Persian version with a continuation and the history of the Samanids from al-Kazwini's Ta'rikhi Guzida, a Persian translation of the sections relating to the Samanids in 'Utbi's Ta'rikhi Yamini, which found its way into a later compilation, etc.); Deltener, Histoire des Samanides par Mirhodj, Paris 1845. (V. F. Büchner)

SAMARITANS. The Samaritans were in all probability the very first nation to come under the sway of the Arabic conquest and under the domination of Islam, a domination which lasted uninterrupted for centuries. Slender as the contact had been between the dwellers in Nablus and the Western World throughout the period of Roman and Byzantine rule, they were now entirely cut off from any further intercourse and became practically an isolated island in the sea of Arabic civilization. It is of symptomatic interest to follow up the all-embracing influence and to draw some conclusions pertinent to the problem of the character and depth of the influence which one culture is alleged to have exercised upon the other. We have on the one hand the rise of a new culture from the desert and on the other as apparently stagnant literary life which is now stirred, and we have therefore every reason, as it seems, to anticipate some traces of such an influence. This is a point of no mean importance as it has almost become a dogma to assume that whatever parallel is found in two literatures of which one is Arabic, the priority and originality belong to the Arabic which is the other does nothing but borrow. It is forgotten, however, that the Arabs were the last of the eastern nations to appear on the horizon of civilization and culture; they were the last and did not originate much at the beginning. On the contrary, they were simply the heirs of hoary civilisations; true they were eager to enter upon that rich inheritance and quickly added to it. But the way in which they succeeded in adopting and assimilating the older civilisations is a proof of similar adaptability in any earlier period, however scanty the literary data may be. Still the desire of ascribing to the Arabs all initiative and originality has greatly obscured or impeded such investigations: the synchronistic character of the Koran alone should suffice to prove this adaptability. No one doubts the multiple origin of Muhammad's sources of information and Jewish and Christian influences have been freely recognised. The greater familiarity with these literatures favoured such conclusions, whilst one might say that complete ignorance of matters Samaritan favoured the prejudice on behalf of the Arabs. Insufficient knowledge of Samaritan traditions and literature prevented the suggestion of any possible influence from that quarter. Added to this was the aforementioned assumption that if anything were found in the Samaritan similar or akin to Islamic tradition and practice, the Samaritans must have borrowed from the former. Recent investigations of the remnants of Samaritan literature, however, have shown that this literature represents a tradition which is at least a thousand years older than Muhammad and which contains writings going back to the first centuries before and after the Christian Era. The Samaritans are characterised by complete fossilisation and a fixed determination not to change or alter anything. No difference of importance can be discovered between the teaching and practice of the first centuries and those of relatively modern times; their whole strength rested in this immutability and in their imperviousness to outer influences. Continuity of life in hermetic spot and continuity of worship warrant the assumption of reliability of tradition, and if, as will be seen, a strong similarity will be detected between Arabs and Samaritans in some important points, the presumption is justified that the Samaritan tradition is the older and the Muhammadan the later, these having borrowed it from the Samaritans.

The numbers of the Samaritans in olden times and the position which they occupied have been greatly underrated. They were the representatives of the Northern Tribes and were scattered in large numbers throughout the Babylonian and Persian Empires and moreover were always found side by side with the Jews. By their doctrinal opposition to the Jews they formed as it were a bridge between the latter and other heterodox movements. Occasionally Jewish by their strict adherence to the Law of Moses, they yet rejected the Prophets and withheld their allegiance from the house of David. They were the first to accuse the Jews of tampering with the Holy Scriptures, an accusation which was afterwards taken up by Christian, Muhammadan and Gnostic sects. For the Samaritans to have changed a single jot or tittle of their dogmas, to have modified their form of prayer, or to have introduced new angelological views and tenets was a sheer impossibility; only a new sect separating itself from the older stem could have ventured upon such changes thereby justifying the separation. There were indeed sects among the Samaritans but as far as can be ascertained from the information which can be gleaned from Samaritan Chronicles they belong to a period centuries older
than the date of Islam and have nothing in common with it. One cannot, therefore, insist too strongly, that generally speaking and for the older period, the Samaritans owe nothing to Islam and that the indebtedness lies rather with the latter.

The conquest of Palestine by the Arabs must have been hailed with joy by the Samaritans; it freed them from the vindictive and tyrannical persecution of the Byzantine rulers and the Church. The darkest period for the Samaritans was from the time of Hadrian, who, as stated above, destroyed their literature, down to the period when the Arabs put an end to the Christian domination. The relations of the new rulers and the Samaritans seem to have been one of friendly intercourse; freedom of faith and liberty of action were granted to them on the strength of documents purporting to have emanated from Muhammad himself and corroborated by 'Ali b. Abi Talib.

The very words of these documents are given by Abu 'l-Fath in his Arabic-Samaritan chronicle, the genuineness of which has never been disputed. In any case they seem to have been a source of protection to the Samaritans for many centuries. It was only the fanatical intervention of some of the local governors which caused some temporary loss and trouble. On the whole the relations remained friendly, for besides the documents the Samaritans also belonged to the "tolerated" religions. There is a story related by Abu 'l-Fath in connection with the granting of these documents. According to him, three wise men, astrologers, had seen that Muhammad would arise and would succeed. One was a Jew, one was a Christian and one was a Samaritan. All three went to Muhammad to foretell his future greatness. He was much impressed, accepted their prognostications gratefully and was able to induce the Jew and the Christian to embrace his faith. The Jew was the famous Ka'b al-Ahbar and the Christian Ab Samyla. The Samaritan, however, refused to embrace the new faith and was able to impress Muhammad more than the others by telling him that he had a blashm between the shoulders, like that of a leprous man. Out of gratitude for the prophecy, Muhammad granted liberty of life and freedom of conscience to the Samaritans. This document, written by Muhammad, was corroborated by 'Ali b. Abi Talib, the name of the Samaritan was Sassata (?), who afterwards assumed the name of Kabsa, being the ancestor of the family of Kabsa on whom more later on. These three persons typically represent the three faiths which contributed to the shaping of Islam.

How much did the Samaritans contribute? The claim now put forward on behalf of the Samaritans is a novel one and only a few points will be selected where a proof of Samaritan origin can be advanced. This proof consists of showing that the Samaritan dogmas or principles rest directly on a sentence found in the Pentateuch. Their contribution may sound exaggerated but it will not be found so when carefully investigated.

I start with the well-known Muhammadan proclamation of faith: "La ilaha illa 'llah": "There is no God but Allah". This corresponds so closely as religious doctrines will allow to the Samaritan formula repeated over and over again by Marka and his contemporaries, Aunram Dara and Nana: *Lit. ilaha illa 'llah* (or, according to their pronunciation, and) "There is no God but one." To the Samaritan as well as to the Jew, the Unity of God was the fundamental principle as was also the case with Muhammad who proclaimed: Allah as the real God in contradistinction to the heathen gods. The name of Allah was the chief element and decisive factor of the new faith and had therefore to be chosen instead of Elah. The above mentioned Samaritan writers belong to the third or fourth centuries, two or three centuries before Islam. There cannot be any question of interpolation, as the formula appears so frequently and is so interwoven with the contents that it forms an integral part of the poems. It is also found in the "Prayer of Joshua", which is unquestionably one of the oldest Samaritan hymns and which stands in close connection with that ancient Samaritan Book of Joshua of which so little is known and to which reference will be made later on. The Samaritans assume the origin to be known and the occasion when these prayers were uttered. But whatever the date may be which can be assigned to it, there cannot be any doubt that the Prayer of Joshua must be older than Marka and probably only a little less old than the Enpira or Opening Prayer.

We also have in the Enpira the proclamation: "there is no God but one", and the reference to the Biblical passage upon which it principally rests (Deut., iv. 39), where the Samaritan adds at the end *mulebade* meaning "none else beside him", i.e. there is no God but that one.

Further the very first word of the Koran is *Bismillah*, "in the name of God". A special value has been attached to this formula and it has been used by Muhammadans for all and every religious function. In fact every religious action begins with it. It is not an invocation of God direct but a call on His most powerful and efficacious Name. This is part of Jewish and Samaritan mysticism and lies at the root of most of the magical speculations and conjurations of the ancient world. Only through Jewish or Christian, but more especially Samaritan, influences could Muhammad have obtained that knowledge, and then used this formula as he did, placing it at the very beginning of the Koran. The Samaritans derive it from Deut., xxxii. 3, where they read: *Kai he'vem Adonai e'rev, "For I call on the name of the Lord"*. — The Samaritan reading *he'vem instead of e'rev*, as the Jews read, approximates this form to the Arabic *bis-millah* — and this phrase occurs over and over again during prayer and in fact proceeds every other portion, even the Enpira. Marka has devoted a special portion of his Commentary to it and Kabsa has written a special treatise (see below).

Now as it stands in the Arabic, it is quite abrupt; it has no end and no connection with the form of invocation. What does it mean? "In the name of God the All-merciful." There is no verb to complete the sentence and it is not sufficient to appeal merely to the imagination. It becomes intelligible, however, if compared with the parallel Samaritan invocation "In the name of God we begin and finish", or, according to the variant: "In the name of God we begin and prosper". This form is the one constantly used among the Samaritans; it stands at the head of the *Atmeq* which contains the collection of the most ancient prayers and hymns, it stands at the head of the ancient phylactery and is at every beginning. In time this formula in its entirety
became abbreviated through its constant use and reached Muhammad in this form, in which the second part was so well known and understood that it was omitted. But it is really the beginning of a formula without the completion of which it has no real meaning. And even so, it rests upon a theory new to the Muhammadan world, i.e. the mystic nature of the Names of God.

I do not wish to discuss here the other words, the attribute "*All-merciful," which corresponds to the Samaritan duplication of the same word in order to express the superlative: *Raḥman ha-raḥmna, just like the Arabic. Let us rather turn to the *Fāṭihā itself, also a kind of succinct Confession of Faith. We do not find any such confession standing at the head of prayers or of any religious liturgical books among Jews or Christians; a comparison with the Christian Paternoster misses the point. It has nothing in common with it, either in form or in contents. But if we turn to the Samaritan we find precisely the same practice. Reference has already been made to that Opening Prayer called by the Samaritans *Enṣīrā. It is a more elaborate Confession of Faith, a prayer for Divine Protection which is said silently. It contains the principal doctrines of the Samaritans and begins with the words: *Asmadī ḥamchebha al fataḥ raḥmehka, "I stand before Thee at the gate of Thy mercy." Fataḥ = Fāṭihā, Opening or Gate, and thus the very word *fataḥ stays us in the face. Standing by itself it might be looked upon as a mere coincidence, but taking it together with the other declarations in the *Enṣīrā and the fact that it occupies the same prominent position as has been assigned to the Fāṭihā, this must be something more than mere coincidence.

In the *Enṣīrā there is also the *Kībēla or turning in prayer to the Sacred Mountain. True the direction towards the Sanctuary was also known among the Jews. Daniel (iv. 10) turns three times towards Jerusalem when bending his knees in prayer. With the Samaritans, however, it is a fundamental dogma, forming part of their religious practice, in as much as the worship on Mt. Garzîm was the principal difference between them and the Jews. Muhammad may have borrowed this practice from the Samaritans; like them he invested it with a special religious character more stringent than the Jews. He also changed the direction when he broke with the Jews showing thereby the importance he attached to the kibla.

If nafṣa, hence maṣīṣa, are words borrowed by the Arabs to designate worship, i.e. divine worship, then, though this word is Aramaic, still none the less curiously, the Jews have refrained from making any technical use of it for any liturgical purpose, nor does it seem to have obtained the same general acceptance in Syrian. In the Samaritan, on the contrary, it is in the *Enṣīrā and is the standing technical expression for *Divine worship*, and occurs over and over again in almost every hymn and prayer.

Of a far greater importance is the parallelism between Muhammad and Moses in the conception of the Samaritans. He is the Only Prophet and is venerated in a manner approaching apotheosis. The most important attribute assigned to Moses is that of the Only Prophet, Faithful Prophet, the Messenger chosen by God to perform the miracles and wonders; moreover, there is none like him, nor will there be until the End of Days. Such a designation is unknown in Jewish literature, where Moses is always known as Moṣhe Ṛabbienu, *Our Teacher or Master*. Is-nābi ha-rē'man or ba-galāh is the standing phrase among the Samaritans and rests among others on the statements often found in the Bible where the words *prophet*, *sent* and *sending* occur in connection with Moses. The close parallelism between this title given to Moses and the corresponding Raḥîl Allâh attributed to Muhammad can be followed down to minute details, but this is not the place for such an investigation.

Special attention must still be drawn to one point of extreme value. It is the declaration found in the Fāṭihā in the belief in a Day of Requital and Punishment. The Samaritans derived it from the words in the song of Moses (Deut. xxxii. 35) where they read *"On the day of vengeance and reward"* (leyte) instead of the Massoretic reading *"To me belongs vengeance and reward"* (*ḥi*). The Samaritans ascribe great eschatological importance to this song. This reading is moreover corroborated by the Septuagint and is thus of very high antiquity. The *"Day of Judgement"*, no doubt, plays a very great role in Jewish and Christian Eschatology, but, as far as the Jews are concerned, it has never been introduced in any formal principle of faith nor is it found in the liturgy, whilst with the Samaritans it has assumed a capital importance, so much that it forms part of the *Enṣīrā. Mention may also be made of the curious parallel that both Muhammad and the Samaritan recognise practically four angels only who form the celestial hierarchy: the names are somewhat different (Gabriel occurring in both) but there is the coincidence that they are limited to four. Jewish and Christian angelology was ever so much richer at the time of Muhammad.

In view of what has been said before I am giving here a slightly abbreviated translation of the *Enṣīrā, particularly of the portion affected by this investigation:

*I stand before Thee at the gate of Thy mercy, O Lord my God and God of my fathers, to recite Thy praises and Thy numerous greatnesses according to this my strength. I, the poor and weak one, I know this day and I have taken it to my heart that Thou art the Lord God in the heavens above and in the earth beneath and there is none else beside Him. . . . Blessed be Thy holy name for ever. There is no God but One. O Lord, we will not worship any one but Thee for ever, and we will believe only in Thee for ever and in Moses, Thy Prophet, and in Thy Writing of Truth and in the place of Thy worship, Mount Garzîm, Bethel, the mountain of rest and inheritance and of the * shekinah (sanctuary), and in the Day of Punishment and Reward. Ebye ather Ebye. The Lord is our God, the Lord is One alone. How great is His goodness and mercy. I stand in Thy hands. I pray for Thy mercy and loving kindness, and I speak: *O my Lord!* with my heart and with my soul.*

If we now compare the first part of the Fāṭihā we shall find that it runs as follows: *Praise be to God, the Lord of all creatures, the most Merciful, the King of the day of judgment. Thee do we worship and of Thee do we beg assistance.* The parallelism between these two forms of prayer is so striking that one must be dependent upon the other. In both the same fundamental dogmas
are proclaimed and in language they are similar to one another. There cannot be any question which of these two is the more ancient and therefore the original. The Samaritans did not wait one thousand years and more in order to formulate their prayer and Confession of Faith; moreover, it rests in every detail upon the words of Scripture to which distinct reference is made. Again almost every one of these principles is found repeated over and over again in Marjah and in the most ancient prayers and hymns in the Samaritan liturgy. Not so with Muhammad, who had to have recourse to other older patterns and so worked that neither Jew, Christian nor Samaritan could take umbrage at them; at the same time these new principles enunciated by Muhammad marked a definite break with the pagan beliefs of his contemporaries.

No less important is the parallelism between the Arabic Mahdi and the Samaritan Taheb. According to Ith Kha'din, "the whole body of Muslims throughout the centuries have held that at the end of the age a man of the family of the Prophet must appear who will strengthen religion and make justice manifest. The Muslims will follow him and he will gain possession of the Muslim kingdoms and be called al-Mahdi" (Guillaume, Traditions of Isfahan, Oxford 1924, p. 89 sq.). So far Ith Kha'din; the rest, which is evidently borrowed from Jewish and Christian legends about the Messiah and the Antichrist, belongs to a later period of tradition. As it stands, the agreement between the Mahdi and the Taheb is absolute: in both cases he is either the Prophet Rehoboam or the descendant of Muhammad or of Moses or the tribe of Levi. He is the Restorer who will bring the people back to the old faith and old glory and who will cause the faith to triumph. It is a different type from that of the Jewish Messiah or the Christian Jesus and he does not descend from heaven. He is human born and probably in both cases will live only for a short time.

Another point, the significance of which cannot be overestimated, is the fact that Muhammad seems to know the Pentateuch and the Psalms only; he does not know any of the prophetic or historical writings. If he had obtained his information from the Jews, this ignorance would be very surprising indeed, but if he had it from the Samaritans, it would be quite natural. A knowledge of the Psalms may have come to him from Jews or Christians, although it must not be forgotten that the Samaritans also have hymns and psalms of their own. Again among the Biblical personages Adam, Noah and Abraham are counted as prophets. No such position is assigned to them, at any rate, nor to the first two, by the Jews, whilst to the Samaritans Adam and Noah are High Priests and in more than one old treatise Adam is considered as a Prophet who foretells the future Deluge and to whom is entrusted the secret of the calendar.

Among the ceremonies the peculiar forms of washing and ablutions which are obligatory before prayer are common to Muhammadans and Samaritans and in the practice of prayer, in the prostrations and in peculiar attitudes etc., Samaritans and Muhammadans again show so much similarity that a close connection between them cannot be denied. We must realize that an Arab who wished to become a Muslim had to change entirely his mode of life and faith; he had to give up all his heathen practices and adopt not only new principles but also new ceremonies and forms of prayer. To him everything was new. With the Samaritan, however, all his ceremonies were the heritage of a long past; to them the slightest change meant giving up his faith and forfeiting the claim to which his people have clung with so much tenacity as being the true keepers of the faith. Any deviation from tradition meant annihilation, nor was there any reason why they should have done so considering they have never been forced to abandon their ancient faith; on the contrary, they were treated with every possible tolerance and even the virulent persecution of the Church had not been able to affect their adherence to the old faith and practice. The Jews offer an example in point; they have lived for a far larger number of centuries in Christian environment; however, every attempt has been made to induce them to forsake the religion of their fathers and when blandishments had no effect they were subjected to cruel persecution. They mixed freely with the world around them and yet not a single trace of Christian influence can be detected in Jewish religious practices and in their ceremonies and principles. How much less could this, therefore, be the case with the Samaritans, who were left to themselves and who show, indeed, no perceptible change in their principles and ceremonies as far as can be ascertained in their literary tradition.

Reference may be made to one more point, I mean the mysterious words or complex of letters at the beginning of many a Sura. I venture to believe that the parallel practice of the Samaritans will offer a satisfactory solution. The Samaritans denote the single sections of the Law (Kitaab) by taking out from the contents a single word which is sufficiently characteristic to denote the whole section. Thus these words become catch-words and are used as headings in the Arabic translation and especially in the extremely ancient phylacteries and amulets. There are also special lists drawn up of these single words (so in any code). In the phylactery this process of abbreviation has been carried one step further; there the catch-words have been reduced to single letters, not necessarily the initial letter, but very often a medial or final letter which has been chosen for the purpose. This discovery of mine has enabled me to recognize the same practice in the Greek Magical Papyri and the Latin conjurations, thus solving a problem which has baffled scholars for many a century. But besides the magical application, its principal value was to serve as a mnemonic device to assist the reader in remembering the section in question. This therefore is probably the meaning of those words and letters which are found at the heads of the Sruras; they are either catch-words picked out of the context or are a combination of letters taken from such catch-words and placed at the head, as in the case of the Samaritan Kitaab. More space has been devoted here to the consideration of these points than might perhaps be warranted for a brief survey of the Samaritan literature and the relation in which the Samaritans stood to the new religion rising as late as the seventh century. No one can gainsay the importance henceforth to be attached to the value of the comparative study of Samaritan traditions and Muslim
principles of faith. The subject has hitherto not yet been touched upon by anyone, and I venture to think that a new field of research has been opened up; I submit that the further study of the Samaritan material as soon as it is made more accessible will strengthen the results here tentatively offered for the first time. But I do not hesitate to say that a comparison of Samaritan and Muhammadan religious principles will show that the Samaritans have exercised a deep influence upon the monotheism of Muhammad's religious system and upon the shaping of Islam. Far from being influenced by Muhammad, the Samaritans were those who exercised the influence upon Muhammad.

The situation, however, changed with the final victory of Islam. I do not wish it to be understood that even after that period the Arabic literature had any decisive influence upon Samaritan faith and practice. True the Arabic conquest was not only a political domination, but was a religious conquest as well. A new form of faith was forcibly imposed upon the conquered peoples with the grudging exception of the few so-called "tolerated" religions. A new Holy Book was substituted for the others cherished and venerated by the other nations. Arabic thus became the language of the Sacred Script, and, of course, not only were Sijras of the Koran, the Liturgical lessons, recited in Arabic, but prayers and hymns were now composed in that language exclusively and the people forced to learn it. It became the new language common to all the peoples under the Arab sway and the only means of intercourse, with the result that it gradually superseded all the other vernaculars among the nations being also the Jews and Samaritans.

In a way Islam proved a greater danger to the latter than Christianity or Mazdazism. There was much similarity in dogma and practice and above all there was the pure monotheism common to them. It was natural that they should feel attracted to it, and through being treated with great tolerance and forbearance would not hesitate to accept their old vernacular, Aramaic, for Arabic. Thus the Samaritans gradually gave up the Aramaic dialect which they spoke and learned to speak Arabic and later on used it for their writing. It must be mentioned that the vernacular spoken by the Samaritans was invariably Aramaic and not Greek; there is no trace of Greek in old Samaritan traditions. Jews and Samaritans had long before discarded any use of that language. All the ancient literary monuments of the Samaritans were written in that peculiar Aramaic which is characteristically their own. The only exception was the Biblical Lessons which they read on Sabbath and Festivals and also recited on special occasions; to these were also added the Florilegia or anthologies called Ketef which consisted of Biblical verses strung together according to a special system for liturgical purposes. On the contrary all the prayers, poems and hymns were written in that popular Aramaic dialect. They also translated the Pentateuch into this same popular language and the Targum therefore takes its place as one of the oldest writings.

The question arises: when was this language displaced by the Arabic? Here the parallelism with the Jews and especially Jewish sects who developed under almost similar conditions will prove helpful. As far as can be ascertained, it must have taken at least two or more centuries before the people had so far forgotten the old Aramaic as to use Arabic freely and to introduce it into the literature of the Divine Service. Very little, if anything, can be traced back before the ninth century. It seems that dissenting sects, just like the Karaites among the Jews, were among the first to break with the old language and practice, although 'Amman still uses Aramaic for his writings.

With the Samaritans it was a natural sequence of events which forced them to abandon Samaritan Aramaic for the Arabic language. The knowledge of the former was fast dying out. As its use was primarily for liturgical purposes, it seems most likely that the first things to be translated were the prayers and hymns. They were all in Samaritan, as mentioned before, and it is obvious that the first duty would be to make the people understand their own prayers; the translation of the Bible must have come much later as there was no pressing necessity for this; Hebrew was and is the sacred language and to this very day the Biblical Lessons are read in Hebrew; the Targum sufficed to interpret it to the worshippers. According to information obtained by me from the Samaritans, its use was continued in the Kinga down to the end of the seventeenth century. The man appointed to that post was called the Hafla who was the last one died about that time. Since then the recital of the Targum has ceased. It must be noted, however, that its place has not been taken by an Arabic translation.

A careful examination of the Targum enables us to realise the growing influence of Arabic. As remarked before, the knowledge of the Samaritan language was fast disappearing; it was limited to the small circle of the learned and this has remained so down to this very day. There are still a number of priests who are conversant with the old Samaritan, but the rest know Arabic only. In time the Targum became merely a religious tradition to which they adhered with their usual tenacity, for it had lost its meaning for the people. Slowly some of the expressions became obsolete even to the better instructed, and so we see a gradual change until it is entirely discarded. Arabic glosses were introduced to explain archaic words, and later on these glosses became part of the text. Through being in constant use they were much changed and altered that after the publication of the Targum they were classified as ancient so-called Kutehen words, remnants of the pre-exilic period. It was the merit of S. Koho to have exposed that fallacy and to have recognised in them corrupt Arabic words. Later on a complete translation into Arabic was made. There is a serious difficulty in determining the date of the translation and the name of the author, may whether there were not two translations which have been ascribed to two men of the same name Abih Sa'id, but too little is so far known about the different recensions to allow of a definite conclusion. But before trying to answer this question it is necessary to ascertain the dates of the translation of the prayers in the Vehieh or Deltar, as the collection of the oldest hymns and prayers is called. It contains unquestionably the old stock which has been handed down from ancient times and is used in the prayers all the year round. A comparison of the text found in the old manuscript Cod. Br. Mus. Or. 5054 of the middle of the xiiith century and the latest copies from the middle
and end of the last century written by the late High Priest Jacob son of Aaron shows no appreciable difference. Without exception, the Arabic is written in Samaritan script in all the books used for divine worship. They use the Arabic alphabet for profane writings alone and it is only in quite modern times that they have consented to write the translation of the Bible in Arabic characters to face the Hebrew text. In these translations we do not find classical Arabic but mostly the Palestinian dialect; moreover, they very seldom use diacritical points to differentiate between similar letters of the Arabic alphabet. For a detailed survey of the literature of the Samaritans the reader is referred to the separate article on this subject accompanying this fasciculus.

It must be emphatically stated that practically none of these books have hitherto been published with the exception of the Arabic translation of the Pentateuch (Gen.-Lev.) (Koenen, Texte, Leiden 1854-1855), the chronicle of the 5th-1st B.C. by Wilmer (Gotha 1865), the Book of Josua by Jubb (Leiden 1848), and the few grammatical fragments of Maimonides' "Guide to the Perplexed" in G.G.N. 1820. Continuing to publish them in Arabic would reduce to a large extent the number of those who are specially interested in the traditions of the Samaritans, whilst publishing them, as anticipated by me, in their Hebrew-Samaritan version, would at once make them accessible to a far larger circle of scholars interested in these studies. Besides this I have also obtained through my correspondence lists of books extant and as far as possible such information as they could give of a biographical character. The latter, however, is extremely confused and contradictory. Under these circumstances my reference to bibliography can only be very brief inasmuch as copies of most of these writings still exist and are accessible are in my possession (they are not being acquired by the British Museum). Mr. D. S. Sassoon also has acquired from the Samaritans a considerable number of valuable manuscripts, modern copies of the same books, and at the same time also the old copies of works of the aforementioned Munsela, Shana Al-din and al-Akjarat, which were up to quite recently in the possession of the Samaritans. Steinmehl has given full references to all the other Samaritan manuscripts in the European libraries. Further reference should be made now to the articles of A. Cowley in the "Jewish Encyclopedia", x. 676 sq., who gives most ample references and also to his "Samaritan Liturgy" (Oxford 1909), especially the introduction, in vol. ii. 17 sqq.; W. G. Monton in "Hastings's Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics", xi. 161 sqq.; Montgomery in "The Samaritans" (Philadelphia 1907), gives a brief sketch. Articles on the Samaritans and their literature in other encyclopaedias which have since appeared are more or less out of date and add nothing more to our knowledge.

(M. GASTER)

SAMARKAND, with Bukhara [q.v.], the principal town of Transoxiana (Sogdiana, Soghd [q.v.]; Mā warq al-Nahr), in modern times capital of the province of the same name in Russian Turkestan, on the south bank of the river Soghd (Wādi l-Soghd, Zārāfšāh) in a situation described by Oriental as well as Russian and European travellers as a veritable Paradise. The town — the second part of the name which contains the Eastern Iranian word for "town", ḵur, frequent in Eastern Iranian place-names (cf. Budhī-Soghd, 鞴, Christ-Soghd, hāth, kāth); while the first part has not yet been satisfactorily explained (cf. the attempts by Tomasek, "Centralasiatisches Studien", i. 133 sqq.) is first found in the accounts of Alexander's campaigns in the east as Maracanda, Marcand, Ariana (Pliny). Alexander occupied the city several times during the fighting with Sopotanes and, according to Strabo (xi. 11, 4), razed it to the ground (while Arab legend makes him founder of the city). Under the Diadochi — after the partition of 323 —, as the capital of Sogdiana, it belonged to the satrapy of Bactria and was lost to the Seleucids with Bactria when Diodotus declared himself independent and the Greco-Bactrian kingdom was founded during the reign of Antiochus II Theos; henceforth it was exposed to the attacks of the northern barbarians. From this time down to the time when the Arab conquest it remained historically and economically separated from Iran, although cultural intercourse with Western Iran only in the settlement of the eastern part of Transoxiana (cf. J. Marquart, W. Z. K. M., xii. 165 sqq.; the attempts made by E. West to refer Cnū and Chūstān in the Bundakhiṣṭān and Bahmanyyaḏ to Samarkand are very unsatisfactory). The only positive information is given by Chinese imperial historians and travellers (of which the former are unfortunately for the most part only available in obsolete translations). From the Han period the kingdom of K'ang-kū was mentioned, whose chief territory, K'ang, is definitely identified in the Tang Annals with Su-mo-kian = Samarkand (cf. the passages in C. Ritter, "Buddhist Records", v. 657 sqq.). According to the Annals of the Wei, compiled in 437 a.d. (cf. F. Bühler in J. Marquart, "Das Chronologium der altdrucken Inschriften", p. 65 sqq.), the Can-wu dynasty related to the Yüe-chi (Kūghan) had been reigning here since before the Christian era. Hūan-chang visited Su-mo-kian in 639 a.d. and briefly describes it (St. Julien, "Mémoires sur les contrées Orientales", i. 1857, p. 18 sqq.; S. Beal, "Śi-yuçū, Buddhist Records", i. 1884, p. 32 sqq., with valuable bibliographical note on p. 101).

The Arabs, who did not begin to penetrate systematically into Transoxiana till the appointment of Kūtaiba b. Muslim as governor of Khurāsān, found Samarkand ruled by the Tārkhan (Chin. To-ho). With regard to the statement in al-Birûnī, ᾽Αλβάρ, ed. Sachau, p. 101, (cf. Ibn Khurāfādhilīh, B. A. G., vi. 40, 5), that the native rulers of Samarkand bore the well-known (Turkish) title ṭarāqī (torun in the Orkhoon inscriptions), we are forced to see in this appellation a title and not a name as might appear from the Arabic sources. The reference is to a representative of one of the local Turkish dynasties, which in the last centuries before Islam had disposed of Epiphānīte rule in Transoxiana.

In 91 (709) the Tārkhan made peace with Kūtaiba on paying tribute and handing over hostages (al-Ṭabātib, ii. 1204); but was soon deposed by his subjects who were angered thereby. His place was taken by the Ḥāfez al-Ghārak, Chin. U-le-kia (al-Ṭabātib, ii. 1229), who was forced by Kūtaiba to capitulate in 93 (712) after a long siege of the town (ib. cit., p. 1247). He was left on the throne but an Arab governor was put in the town with a strong garrison; along with Bukhāra the town became a base for the further conquest and
Among native products — as Bābur tells us — the paper of Samarqand, the manufacture of which had been introduced from China, was specially famous. The most celebrated sanctuary of the town, also specially mentioned by Bābur and still held in high honour, is the tomb-mosque of Kāsim b. Aḥmad who is said to have converted the city to Islam in the time of ʿUthmān (cf. F. Goldscheider, Vorlesungen über den Islam II, p. 218).

Among the famous men of Samarqand of the period one at least must be mentioned, the theologian Abū Mansūr al-Mūtarrīdī (d. in Samarqand in 333 = 944; Mūtarrīd or Mūtārīd is a quarter of Samarqand; cf. al-Samʿānī, Ansāb, fol. 498v) who exercised a decisive influence on the dogmatic development of Eastern Sunni Islam.

After the fall of the Samānids, Samarqand was ruled by the Karakhanids (Ileq-Khāns; q.v., ii. 465 ff.). In 495 (1102) the Karakhanid Arslān Khān Muhammad owned the sovereignty of the Saltjūq Sandjar [q.v.]; his descendants remained in power when forty years later, after the great victory of the Karakhanī over Sandjar at Kātīn in 536 (1141) the Gurkhanīs became masters of Transoxiana. About 1170 Benjamin of Tudela visited the town and found 50,000 Jews in it (M. N. Adler, The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela, London 1907, p. 50). The Gurkhanīs were overthrown in 1200 by the Khwārizmshāh Muḥammad b. Takaşāb. The latter's terrible opponent, Čingīs Khān [q.v.], laid siege to Samarqand only a few months after he had crossed the Jaxartes, on his way from Bokhāra which he had completely destroyed. Fortunately for the city it surrendered in Bahīr I, 617 (May, 1220). Although the city was plundered and many of its inhabitants were deported, a number of its citizens were allowed to remain under a Mongol governor. For the next 150 years it was but a shadow of its former self. Ibn Batūta (iii. 52 sqq.) about 1350 found a few inhabited houses among the ruins.

The revival of the town's prosperity began when Timur after about 271 (1369) became supreme in Transoxiana and chose Samarqand as the capital of his continually increasing kingdom, and began to adorn it with all splendour. In 808 (1405) the Spanish envoy Huy Gonzales de Clavijas visited it in its new glory (cf. the Spanish-Hispanic edition of his itinerary by I. Szeornska, ed. Ruszk. Jev., 1881, xxviii. 325 sqq., etc., with a valuable French Index). He gives Cinnamoni as the native name of the town, which he explains as alde grucsa "a large (lit. thick) village"; in this we have an echo of a Turkish corruption of the name of the town based on a popular etymology which connects it with awma "thick". Timur's grandson Ulugh Beg (d. 855 = 1449) embellished the city with his palace Chīl Sūtan and built his famous astrological observatory there; on him cf. W. Hilgheim, Ulugbek 1 ege ovrom (Каи. Акад. Наук., 1918). A very full description of the city in Timur's day, which may be justly described as classical, is given by the memoirs of Bībīs (Bibowinima, ed. Halmovski, p. 55 sqq. ed. Beveridge, P. 54 sqq. transl. Pavét de Courtellie, i. 96 sqq. transl. Beveridge, p. 74—86), who captured Samarqand for the first time in 903 (1497) and held it for some months. In 906 (1500) it was occupied by his rival, the Orzhg Khān Shābānī. After his death, Bābur in alliance with the Safawī Isḥāq Shāh succeeded
in 916 (1510) in once more victoriously invading Transoxiana and occupying Samarkand, but by the next year he found himself forced to withdraw completely to his Indian kingdom and leave the field to the Ozbeks. Under the latter, Samarkand was only the nominal capital and fell completely behind Bukhara.

A new era began with the Russian advance across the Sir-Darya. On Nov. 14, 1868, General Kaufmann entered the old Timurid capital which was now finally lost to the Amur of Bukhara, Muraffar al-Din (1860-1885). Since 1871 a new Russian town has arisen in the west of the city, which has been linked up to the Transcaspian railway. In 1882 the citadel was restored. In 2000 the population was about 260,000. We have no reliable information regarding Okrugs since 1917. Unfortunately there is also a complete lack of historically accurate and complete descriptions of the architectural monuments (cf. W. Barthold, Die geogr. u. hist. Erforschung d. Orient., p. 173, 179) so that we cannot give any list of them here.


(H. H. Schäfer)

al-Samarkand. See AL-LATIFI.

al-Samarkand. See dust.

AL-SAMARKANDI. See [BAHM].

al-Samarkand. See [NIGARD ARUJL].

SAMARRA. I. Historical Topography. Samarra, which is now a mere village, lies on the east bank of the Tigris half way between Takrit and Bagdad.

The original form of the name is probably Iṣťrā. The following etymologies have been proposed: Sām-rā, Sām-Amorra, and Sāmorra; the last two meaning the place of payment of tribute. On the coins of the Caliphs Samarra is written Suṣa u ma'rār, i.e. "delighted is he who sees (it)."

Samarra was founded in 221 (836) in the reign of al-Mu'taṣim by one of his Turkish generals, Aḥmād, two parasangs south of the village of Karkh-Fairūz. The Caliph, perpetually threatened in Bagdad by the mutinies of his Turkish and Berber mercenaries, sought to settle in a less threatened capital.

Between 221 (836) and 276 (886) seven 'Abbadid Caliphs lived in Samarra. The references in the historians of the Caliphate and in the Arab geographers, Yaḥṣabā' and Yaḥṣāb, enable us to reconstitute with sufficient exactitude the development of this ephemeral capital during the fifty years of its existence. Built on the eastern bank of the Tigris at a corner where it turns to the south-east, Samarra lay between the villages of Karkh-Fairūz (or Karkh Bājaḍda) to the north and Maṭrā to the south-east. Two canals — one, the Kātal Kisaṭi, leaving the Tigris above Karkh-Fairūz, near Dūr, ran to the south-east to rejoin a second canal, the Yaḥṣābi, which, leaving the Tigris below Maṭrā, ran to E. S. E. — thus isolated Samarra and its eastern suburb into a kind of island. On the west bank of the Tigris opposite Samarra lay several castles cut off by a canal parallel to the Tigris, the Išāḳī Canal, entering the Tigris below Maṭrā, a little above Balkuwārā.

The town of Samarra proper lay on the east bank; its principal streets were the Sarāja Street which ran past the police office and the prison leading to the quarter which bore the name of the vizier Ḥasan b. Šahī; then came the street of Abū Ahmad b. Ṭāḥā, leading towards the village of Išāḳīya built on the Kisaṭi Canal; this village, which at first bore the name of a Turkish chief, was later called Mūḥammadiya. Five other principal streets (ṭārīs; this term applied to a main street is the same as has been revived in modern times for the streets of Cairo) are recorded: al-Hair, Barghamunah Turki (Turkish quarter), Ṣalīf (leading to the military camps or 'asār), al-Hair al-Djaddal and al-Khalaj. The historians give us numerous details regarding the important buildings in the vicinity of the castle and certain buildings in existence before the capital of the Caliphs was moved thither: the eight Christian monasteries, of which the principal were the Dair Ṭawawī*/ or monastery of the peasants*, the Dair Mār Mārī and the Dair Abī l-Sufrā. But the most famous buildings were the palaces. Al-Muṭaṣim, who lived at first in Samarra itself, had built there the palace called al-Djawsak; the Caliph Wāḥīb built there the castle called Ḥarrānī after him. The Caliph al-Mutawakkil, who lived at first in the Harrānī, built or enlarged twenty-four other palaces of which the best known are the Balkuwārā, Ṭurīs, Māḥrāt and Wāḥīb. Nine months before his death he was planning a new town to the north halfway between Karkh-Fairūz and Dūr: this town was called Djawsak after his praenomen. The historians, who record many details of the history of the palaces of al-Mutawakkil, say that he brought from Persia to use as timber the sacred cypress venerated by the Mazdaens at Kishmar. Other historians, noting that nothing remains of the splendid buildings of al-Mutawakkil, see in this so swift destruction a punishment from heaven, as retribution for his having ordered the destruction of
of the tomb of Ḥusain at Kerbelā in 236 A.H. After the death of al-Mutawakkil, Muntasir brought the court to Sāmarrā itself and took up his abode in the palace of Dūnakūs. Muṭamid, the last Caliph to live at Sāmarrā, built the palace of Mašālī on the east bank (255 A.H.).

Since the tenth century A.D., the majority of these buildings have fallen into ruins. The great mosque of Sāmarrā alone survived, which stood near the military camps, whence the name ʿAskar Sāmarrā frequently given to this part of the town. The piles of the Shiʿa very early located beside the great mosque the site of two tombs of their Imāms—the tomb of their eleventh Imām, Abū Muḥammad Ḥasan called al-ʿAskarī because he died in Sāmarrā in 260, and the ʿcave’ (jirāth) in which his youthful successor, Abū l-ʿAskar Muḥammad al-Mahdī, disappeared in 264 (878). We know that for a thousand years past, the Shiʿa pilgrims have been visiting this cave of Sāmarrā, believing that al-Mahdī will re-appear there at the end of time. Al-Samʿānī gives a list of individuals who bore the ishka Sāmarrā or Sarāmūrī. Another ishka also refers to Sāmarrā, namely Karkhī, applied to men born in Karkh-Farīsh.


SĀMARRĀ. II. Architecture

Sāmarrā is at the present day a vast area of ruins lying on the left bank of the Tigris about sixty miles north of Raghdād. These ruins cover the site of one of the richest and most prosperous cities of the ʿAbbāsid period, the building of which cost vast sums.

It was begun in 838 in the reign of the Caliph al-Muṭaṣim, son of Ḥarūn al-Raṣīd, reached its zenith under Dūnakūs al-Mutawakkil (847–861) and died with him.

It is a brilliant but ephemeral existence gives these ruins a special interest for the student of the origins of Muslim art. Unfortunately, for centuries past, the Arabs have been using the ruins as a quarry for building material, and have hastened the work of time, and in the end nothing has been left standing. Nevertheless, excavations recently undertaken have recovered sufficient information regarding the main lines of construction and decoration to give a very clear idea of the beauty of the Muslim civilization which was then shedding its lustre over the world, and was given expression in this “Abbāsid city of the 8th century.”

The most remarkable remains still standing are:

To the south of the old town on the bank of the Tigris, the great mosque built by al-Mutawakkil with the magnificent palace of the Caliph (Balḵawrawā) near it on the north. Opposite on the right bank of the Tigris, and built a little later, is a strong castle (Kasr al-ʿĀqīf) the imposing ruins of which are still visible. About half a mile south of this castle is a sepulchral monument (ubbat al-zulābīyya).

Near the ruins of the caliph’s city survives a modern Sāmarrā with a golden dome, which commands the desert. It contains some venerated Shiʿa sanctuaries.

The great mosque of al-Mutawakkil was built between 846 and 852. It is an immense rectangle with high walls of baked bricks, fortified with round towers. Within it on the south is the principal chamber (ḥaram) with twenty-five naves oriented towards the Ribba and three other smaller chambers on the other sides. All these naves, which were over thirty feet high, were supported by marble columns. The miḥrāb was also flanked by two pairs of marble columns and the prayer-niche was probably covered with valuable carved wood. The four chambers opened on to a large court, the centre of which was occupied by a fine fountain. Outside, against the north wall of the mosque, rose the minaret (māṭiyya), a kind of huge tower of Babel on a base 100 feet square. Around it outside wound a spiral stairway. This tower was visible more than a day’s journey away.

The ruins of Balkuwrawa, the Caliph’s palace, cover a vast rectangle over a thousand yards each way. On the west front there still stand three arches built of brick (ābjaql), the only remains which are now to be found. This palace was built by al-Mutawakkil for the prince al-Muthadi billah.

These three arches, facing the river, audience chamber and guest chambers (tawārīkh), open widely out on the valley. Terraces and fountains descend like cascades from them. Behind them are three inner courts which are succeeded by rooms in the form of a cross: throne rooms, numerous smaller rooms and private apartments with luxurious baths. On the east was a large rectangular garden with water-falls surrounded by walls with pilasters on to which open richly adorned little pavilions. To the north was a large creek with stairways of access, with caves and docks cut out in it. Finally behind all this was an agglomeration of houses sheltering the harem, others for the courtiers, a little mosque, and large barracks etc. for the caliph’s guard and his cavalry.

The various and diverse elements, which constituted the whole of this immense palace were harmoniously arranged. They formed a beautiful composition conceived on a vast scale in the form of a rectangle (of which the long axis perpendicular on the river terminated in the three vaulted rooms of the façade, richly ornamented with sculpture and mosaic.

The general composition of this palace is, however, of a type well known in the tradition of Irānian architecture. Around the Caliph’s palace were sumptuous and richly decorated residences. The richest as well as the most modest homes of the city are almost all built on the same plan. Built on the ground floor only they consist of a series of inner courts with fountains into which open the tawārīkh and the living rooms. This type has been perpetuated in certain parts of the east down to our day. The decoration of the interior is an important feature. High carved panels and very probably a decorative frieze always ornamented the public rooms and sometimes all the rooms in the house. The courtyards also were sometimes ornamented but the outer walls were never decorated.

The ornamental carving of the palaces and houses of Sāmarrā is of the same technical skill and gives a high idea of the development of the art at this period. Elaborate panels run
all round the rooms at a height of three feet. Above them are ornamental alcoves (Pers. takhla). The frames of the doors and the embrasures of the windows are ornamented. The ceilings are adorned with cornices and friezes. The majority of these decorations are in plaster finely designed and executed, sometimes set off with paintings. The designs are of very different types; some simple, with large veins somewhat coarse in workmanship. Others are more finely chiselled in the flat without relief, others again, accentuating the relief, treat the principal motif in round bosses.

Some of these decorations were carved out of the mass in situ, others were cast in a mould on a bed of matting (especially motives continually repeated), and then fixed to the wall. The forms of the designs are very varied. Some are very simple and severe, in straight lines without arabesques. These are the ones found most frequently at Samarra and which are, so to speak, the prototype. Others, on the contrary, often inspired by the fauna or flora, are more elaborate and richer; conventionalised flowers occupy the centre of geometrical figures repeated again and again and connected by ribbands, headings which come to a stop or intertwine, taking the shape of a vory of lyres or a vascuoepide. Others again were filled with movement unfolded in arabesques around bunches of grapes and vine branches.

It has been proposed to make a rigorous classification of the ornamental designs at Samarra into three distinct categories: Style I: Coptic character; Style II: Persian character; Style III: Mesopotamian character. A classification as methodical as this with labels of origin seems to us dangerous, premature and a source of error. One impression that can be retained from a study of the ruins of Samarra, the discovery of which is valuable for the history of Oriental art, is that several artistic influences met together in this past of Asia without conflicting or seeking predominance. It was a centre that attracted numerous artists from all parts of the globe, drawn thither by the wealth of the court of the Abbasid Caliphs and the protection they afforded. Samarra was to be the cradle into which Hellenic, Syro-Coptic and Indo-Persian art were fused together and a new art, Muslim art, was produced.


(H. Violett)

AL-SAMAW’AL b. ‘ADWY, more accurately AL-SAMAW’AL b. GHARIB b. ‘ADWY, a Jewish-Arab poet, whose residence was in the strong castle of al-Abak [q.v.] near Taim. Being a contemporary of Imru’-l-Kais [q.v.] he must have flourished about the middle of the sixth century A.D. One of his grandsons is said to have adopted Islam and to have lived into the Caliphate of Mu’tawiya when he was then very old. Except his name there is hardly a trace in tradition of his being a Jew; it is not even certain that he was of Jewish descent.

All the poems ascribed to al-Samaw’al have been collected by Cheikho in his edition of the Divana. Of the few pieces said to have been composed by him a considerable part cannot be considered genuine, including those which most readily suggest that they were written by a Jew. The few remaining ḏa’tā, the genuineness of which there is no reason to doubt, contain no indication of the fact, which is not, however, to be doubted, that al-Samaw’al professed the Jewish religion. They much rather breathe the spirit of the old Arab poetry and show in form and matter clearly that he, like his co-religionists, had become in external matters assimilated to the surrounding Arabs and in poetry followed Arabic forms. Poems have also been handed down that are attributed to a son and a grandson of al-Samaw’al.

Al-Samaw’al owes his fame less to his poetry than to his devotion in fulfilling his pledges to his guest Imru’ l-Kais, which has become proverbial (‘more faithful than al-Samaw’al’).

After Imru’ l-Kais b. Hudjir—the story seems quite reliable in its main facts—had been leading an unsettled life of adventure in his fight to avenge his father and had lost most of his followers while fleeing before al-Mundhir, king of al-Hira, he sought refuge in al-Samaw’al’s castle and was hospitably received with his few followers. When, some time later, he went to the court of Byzantium he left his daughter and his cousin with al-Samaw’al along with his valuable armour and the remains of his paternal inheritance, and asked him to guard them. During the absence of Imru’ l-Kais, al-Samaw’al was besieged in his castle by an army, which had presumably been sent by al-Mundhir, because he would not obey the demand to hand over the property of his guest. By chance it happened that the leader of the hostile army captured a son of al-Samaw’al and threatened to kill him if Imru’ l-Kais’s property was not handed over. As al-Samaw’al steadfastly refused to betray his trust he had to see his son die before his eyes. The besiegers then withdrew without achieving their purpose.


(R. PARÉ)
SAMBAS, a Malay kingdom on the island of Borneo in the N. W. of the Dutch residency of "Westerveldtland" van Borneo. In the west and north-west from Cape Data to the mouth of the river Durii it is washed by the China Sea, in the S. and S. E. it is bounded by the districts of Mampawa, Landak and Sanggau (the Durii river forms the boundary for part of the way), in the E. and N. E. by Sarawak (British North Borneo); some of the islands off the coast also belong to it. The country is mountainous, especially on the eastern frontier; the ground slopes gradually to the W. and N.; the coastlands are almost everywhere low, flat and swampy, but not unfertile. Of the rivers the largest is the Great Sambas; Sambas, the Sultan's capital, lies on the Little Sambas. At the end of 1915 the number of inhabitants had risen to 123,600 of whom 26,000 were Dyaks, 67,000 Malays and 30,000 Chinese; the two first classes are under the Sultan (at present Muhammed 'Ali Saft al-Din) who, very much dependent on the Dutch officials, rules the land with his four ministers (voort). The Chinese are direct subjects of the Dutch government. It should be noted that the term Malays does not signify a single ethnic group; the deciding factor here is the Muslim religion: as soon as the heathen Dyaks become converts to Islam, they are counted as Malays and the fairly numerous Javanese and Buginese are also usually counted as Malays. The steady advance of Islam is no more to be ascribed here than elsewhere in the Malay Archipelago to definite missionary activity but primarily to the many marriages of Malays with Dyaks, which has led the government further to the fact that the social position of the Malaymadans is better than that of the still unconverted natives. The Dyaks are no longer nomads and live on good terms with the rest of the population; they are engaged in the collection of jungle products and carry on a primitive agriculture, mainly on dry fields. The agriculture of the Malays on the coast is also of little importance. The Chinese form the most industrious part of the population; their methods are on a much higher level in every way: they grow rice on well tilled, wat fields and grow other produce also for export. Their position in W. Borneo was for long a very peculiar one. The first immigrants into Sambas (about 1760) were gold-diggers and their number increased so rapidly that they soon formed an important element in the population. They organised themselves into numerous societies and even managed to attain a certain political autonomy; it was only in the latter half of the sixteenth century that the Dutch government succeeded in breaking up these societies. Gold-washing no longer pays and the majority of the Chinese now live by trade and agriculture.

We have no reliable data regarding the early history of the land and the beginnings of the spread of Islam; the kingdom was probably founded by Malays from Djohore; about the middle of the sixteenth century it was subject to the Javanese kingdom of Madjapahit. In the early years of the sixteenth century, about the time when the Dutch East India Company concluded its first commercial treaty with Sambas (1600), the kingdom was under a Malay chief, Ratu Sapodak (Fangaran Ratu), who recognised the suzerainty of Djohore. Ratu Sapodak had only two daughters and after his death he was succeeded by his son-in-law and nephew Ratu Anom Kusuma Yuda. The latter had only a brief reign; he was soon driven from the throne by his brother-in-law, Radin Sulaiman, a son of a chief of Brunei (Radja Tengah) and of a sister of the Sultan of Sukadana. After his accession Radin Sulaiman took the name of Sultan Muhammad Saft al-Din. He was the founder of the present reigning house.


W. H. Van Rees
and their instruction. He died on Thursday the 13th of Dhu 'l-Qa'da, 911 A.H., and was buried in the Bâkî (cf. the art. Bâkî, AL-GHARADA) cemetery between the grave of Saiyid Ibrahim and the Imam Mâlik.

Among his numerous works composed during his residence in al-Madina the principal one is his History of the City. He had originally composed it upon a large scale under the title al-Fâsid ibi-Alâhâr Dîr al-Muçuifâ. At the request of a patron he had made an abbreviation of this book to which he gave the title: Wâfih al-Wâfi. This abbreviation he had completed on the 24th of Rajab, 847 A.H., and sent it with him in Mecca when his library in al-Madina was destroyed by the fire. This fortunately saved the chief contents of the work. Later he made a further edition contended from the abbreviation, which he编, according to some manuscripts and the printed editions (Bâlîq 1285 and Mecca 1316). In the year 893 and called Khâlîquzat al-Wâfi. This work has become our principal source of information in the history and the topography of the city and the rituals for the visit of the grave of the Prophet. In addition he composed a number of other works of which nine are enumerated by Brockelmann in his G.A.L., to which Arab biographers add several more which may have been lost. They comprise books on grammar, tradition, theology, law and the rituals of pilgrimage. Special mention is made of his collection of Tawâbit in one volume collected by himself on all branches of legal knowledge. They appear to contain the arid discussions which form the favourite theme of Arabic authors of his time.

**Bibliography:** Al-Samî ah b bût b, l., M. Mem. Add. 16, 644, fol. 192; editions of the Khâlîquzat al-Wâfi, Bâlîq 1285 and Mecca 1316; Wüstenfeld, Geschichte der Stadt Medina nach Samhudi, Göttingen 1860 (an abbreviated translation of the Khâlîquzat); Wüstenfeld, Die Geschichtsschreiber der Araber und ihre Werke, p. 507; Brockelmann, Geschichte der arabischen Literatur, II. 173.

(F. KREMKOW)

**SâMÎ, Shams al-Dîn, SâMî Bey FRASHERI,** a Turkish author and lexicographer, born at Frâsher in Albania on June 1, 1850, of an old Muslim Albanian family whose ancestors are said to have been graved at this place as a sib by Sulthân Mehmed II. He was educated in the Greek lecture at Janina, at the same time receiving instruction from private tutors in Turkish, Persian and Arabic. He then came to Constantinople, where he devoted himself to journalism and founded the daily paper Salâm about 1875. He began his literary career about the same time and attached himself to the new school founded by Kemal and Shinâst. From this period dates his novel Tawâhîsh-b-Tawâlit wa-Fisîm, which contains an indictment of the Turkish marriage system (1872), and the drama Beît (the scene is laid in Albania, produced in 1874), Šâtî Yekhî (1875) and Kâms. The production of this last piece, which describes the Persian revolution against the tyrant Daâkhtâr, resulted in its being banished for two years to Tripoli in North Africa. After his return he devoted himself almost entirely to his famous lexicographical works. These are the Kâmüni-ı Frâseuti (French-Turkish, 1882, and Turkish-French, 1885), the six-volume encyclopedia Kâmüni-ı Alâîm (1889—1898) and the Kâmüni Türkî in two parts (1899 and 1900).

Although in his latter years he suffered a good deal in body and in spirit, his great industry never left him till his death. He died in Constantinople on June 18, 1904. He had spent the greater part of his life in his study. In the last years of his life he looked 75, although only 54.

In the literary field Sâmi could not claim a place beside his contemporaries Abd al-Ḥaqq Hâmid, Ekrem Bey, etc. Besides the newspapers themselves, we have as evidence of his journalistic work a series of pamphlets which appeared in the Lijîh Kûşbûbahî and are in part taken from his newspaper articles (Medeniyet-ı Islâmîye, Kândî, Kâmüni, etc.). He also made several translations from the French (Sâvîlî, Sâvîlîn F. Vâlîhîn, etc.). He also published select poems of Bâkî and an edition with commentary of the poems ascribed to 'Alt b. Abd Tâlib. But his greatest merit lies in his great work in lexicography and philology. This includes several school-books on Turkish and Arabic grammar, and an unfinished Arabic dictionary of which he speaks in the preface to his Kâmüni-ı Türkî.

This last work is important in several respects. In the first place the order is strictly alphabetical and the arrangement of the different meanings clear and lucid; it is a great advance on previous lexicographical work by Turkish scholars. Sâmi Bey's Lijîh was also influential. Secondly the choice of the words included is of importance in so far as it represents a compromise between the different views prevailing in his time on the development of Turkish. Sâmi himself urged a far-reaching Turkish purism (as is evident from his contribution in the introduction to Meşmed Emin's Türkî Ş sûreti of 1898) and would have liked to replace most Arabic and Persian words by Turkish words that had fallen into disuse. He adopted of the latter those whose revival seemed indispensable, but by the adoption of a great mass of Arabic and Persian material he made great concessions to the literary language. His dictionary is therefore a true picture of the educated Turkish of his time. Sâmi, however, does not seem to have had any traceable influence on the development of Turkish.

Among his unpublished material, of which the unfinished Arabic dictionary has already been mentioned, there are also comprehensive studies on the Kûşbûbahî Bâlîq and on the Orkhou inscriptions, as well as works on Persian and Eastern Turki.

He also worked at Albanian. He produced an Albanian alphabet and a grammar. He left poems in this language and a book on the future of Albania. His drama Beît, already mentioned, also shows his love for the land of his birth.

On Sâmi Bey's brother Nâ'sîn Frâsîrî (1846—1900) who was a great Albanian poet cf. Bâhîber in Itt., 1921, xi. 99.

**Bibliography:** Biography of Sâmi by Ismâ'il Hâkî in the 'Otkûmanî moğhâbih iktîsâlî series; Paul Horn, Geschichte der türkischen Modernen, Leipzig 1900, p. 38; Revue d'Orient et de Hongrie, Budapest Jan. 20, 1902. The unprinted and unfinished works of Sâmi are in the possession of his family to whose kind information the writer is indebted for some of the above-mentioned facts. (J. H. KRAMER)

**AL-SAMIRA.** [See SAMARITANS]

**AL-SAMIRI,** "the Samaritan", is the name in Kur'ân, xx. 87, 90, 96, of the man who tempted
the Israelites to the sin of the golden calf. This sin is twice mentioned in the Qur'an. The first narrative, Sura vii. 146—153, tells of the sin of Israel and Aaron as in Exodus, xxxii., but with the elaboration that the calf cast out of metal lowered. The second version, Sura xx. 85—97, which is shown to be later by its additions and was considered by Muslim tradition also to belong to the Medina period (Nöldeke-Schwally, Geschichte der Quellen, p. 124, 125), makes al-Samiri the tempter of Israel. At al-Samiri's bidding they cast their ornaments into the fire and he made out of them the lowing calf, which was worshipped by the people although Aaron advised them not to. When challenged by Moses, al-Samiri justified himself by saying that he saw what the others did not see, the footsteps of the messenger (according to Muslim tradition: the tracks of the hoof of Gabriel's horse). Moses then announced his punishment to him: "As long as thou livest, thou shalt call out to those that meet thee ðæ mīlāka "touch me not".

Abraham Geiger thought that Muhammad had perhaps confused al-Samiri with Sammael, the prince of darkness. According to one view, Sammael lowered concealed in the calf to lead the Israelites astray. In reality this feature in the Firās Ṳabbī Eīṣer is imitated from the Muslim legend and the otherwise unknown proper name al-Samiri replaced by the name Sammāl of somewhat similar sound. S. Fraenkel (Z. D. M. G., i, 1917) derives the story of al-Samiri in the Qur'ān from a lost Jewish midrash which aimed at diverting the grave sin of making the golden calf from Aaron to a Samaritan.

The figure of al-Samiri was first put into its true light by Goldscher (see below). Goldscher explains him as the representative of Samaritanism through the story of the Samaritan accession. We have already evidence of this accession in Sirach, L. 25, and the Gospels Luke vii. 50, John iv. 9. Goldscher collects Jewish, Christian and Muslim references, which show that the Samaritans considered contact with those not of their stock as impurity. What Muhammad or rather his presumed Jewish source knew as a ritual principle of the Samaritans is put back into earlier times and explained as a punishment of al-Samiri for having incited the Israelites to make and worship the calf.

Goldscher's convincing arguments can be reinforced by the early Muslim interpretation of the Qur'ān. Al-Ṭabarî himself following an earlier tradition sees in al-Samiri a prominent Israelite of the Samaritan tribe as a punishment for his sin Moses forbade the Israelites to have social or commercial relations with him and this has remained the case. Similarly al-Zamakhsharīs al-Samiri belonged to a Jewish tribe called Sāmiri, whose religion differed somewhat from the Jewish. Al-Samiri was forbidden to have social and commercial intercourse with men; it is said that his people still observe the prohibition. Al-Tha'labbī similarly concludes his very full story of the golden calf.

Al-Samiri thus is the representative of Samaritanism, which keeps apart from mu-Samaritans. In a segregation of this kind—as in the Jewish law—regarding eating (Kūr'ān, iv. 158)—Muhammad sees a divine punishment. What has al-Samiri (as the Samaritans) to atone for? For the sin of the golden calf.

**Bibliography:** al-Ṭabarî: Tafsīr, and al-Zamakhsharī, al-Najḍīyatūn, x. 87—97; al-Tha'labbī, Kitāb al-Ḍarūrīya, Cairo 1282, p. 82; Geiger, Was hat Mohammed aus dem juden-thume angenommen, Frankfurt 1902, p. 162—165; S. Fraenkel, Der Ṣamīrī, in the Z. D. M. G., 1902, iv. 73; I. Goldscher, La Miṭḥāl al-Maṣūmīn, in the Revue Africaine, xvi. 269, Algiers 1908, p. 23, 28. (Bernhard Heikell

**SAMMĀ, the name of a Rādūḥūt clan of Sind. As the bold of the Charsawi kings on Sind relaxed, the Sumārū, a Rādūḥūt tribe converted to Islam, established their rule in that country in 1053, and made Tur their capital. They persecuted the Summā, a rival Rādūḥūt tribe which adhered to Hinduism, and drove many of them to take refuge in Kāčch, where, in 1320, they ousted the Cavas prince who had protected them and seized his throne. This branch of the Summā, known as Dūndūls or the children of Dūdūla, is still represented by the Rās of Kāčch and the Ḍīṃs of Nānmār or Nāhmār, who in 1026, accepted Islam, and after the Summās had been overthrown by the troops of Alī al-Dīn Khālīfī of Dihlī, founded in 1335, a dynasty which ruled Sind for nearly two centuries, with its capital at Thathā. The ruler, like the head of the branch which acquired the state of Nānmār, assumed the title of Ḍīṃs, a word of doubtful signification which Abū l-Ḥaṭṭāl Fīrūz and other Muslim historians derive, on insufficient grounds, from the name of the semi-mythical Persian king Dīmānū. Umar, the Hindu name of the first Dīmān, suggests recent conversion to Islam. His brother and successor, Dīmūn, took Bakhar in Upper Sind, which had hitherto been included in the imperial dominions, and harboured a rebel who was fleeing from Gūjārāt before Muhammad b. Taghlaḵī of Dihlī. Muḥammad invaded Sind but died on the banks of the Indus in March, 1351, before he had time to punish Dīmūn. His successor, Fīrūz Ṣīfī, succeeded to the command of an army disorganised by its leader's death, and with difficulty extricated it from Sind, from which it retreated, massacred and harried both by the Sindīs and by their allies, the Mughals. Fīrūz attempted, eight years later, to avenge his discomfiture but again failed and saved a portion of his army only by a disastrous retreat into Gūjārāt. Returning in the following year he defeated the Summās and carried the Dīmūn, Dīmūna, and his nephew, Bāṣaṇīya, prisoners to Dihlī, but permitted Dīmūn's son and another nephew, Tāmūdī, to govern the province as his tributaries. Later in the reign Tāmūdī rebelled and Dīmūn was sent from Dihlī to reduce him to obedience, and sent him to India. After the accession of Taghlaḵī II in 1388, Bāṣaṇīya was permitted to return to Sind, but died on the way thither. He was succeeded by his brother, Tāmūdī, and after his reign the succession appears to have been as follows:—

Dān, (8) Šaṅdīrā, (9) Nīṣām al-Dīn II, known as Dīmūn Nānda, (10) Fīrūz.<br>

The history of the Summās after their accession to power is of interest by reason of the ability with which they held their own in several campaigns against the forces of the imperial government, and by reason also of the conversion
of large numbers of the people from Hinduism to Islam. The disintegration of the empire of Dhlath after TmÎur’s invasion restored independence to Sind, and the Sammama regained their former untrammeled by allegiance to any higher power. The greater of them was Nisam al-Din II, known as DÎsam Nanda, who died in 1509 after a reign of forty-seven years. The line ended with his son and successor, Firuz, who in 1520 was defeated by Shahr Beg Arghuãn, ruler of Kandahar, who founded the Arghuãn dynasty in Sind.

The Sammama tribe now numbered over 500,000 in Sind.

Bibliography: Mir Muhammad Ma‘sun of Bakhar, Tarih al-Sind, MSS.; Isma‘il ibn Ishab ‘Afni, Tarih al-Sind; Shâhî Shâhî Abû ‘l-Fadl Abû l-Ahmar, text and translation by Bloechmann and Jarrett, both in the Bibliotheca Indica Series of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

(T. W. Hato)

AL-SAMMAM. [See AL-SAMMAK.] AL-SAMMAM (A.), butler made from cows’, goats’ and ewes’ milk, more especially cooked or melted butter, cleansed from impurities and preserved by the addition of salt, for example. Fresh butter and cream are called sahab. These are used not only in the kitchen but also in medicine, externally and internally; — externally for wounds, abrasions and boils, internally as an antidote against snake-bite and poisons, against retention of the urine, etc.


AL-SAMMAK (J. RUSKA), an island in the Aegean Sea; the Greek name is Sisam-desa, “the Island of Sesame,” for which Sisam-desi was written at an earlier period (Bihisht, Irshad [MS. No. 260 of the Berlin Library], i. 191; Khâthí Celebi, Tâhirî al-Khârî; Sisam in Tavernier, Les six Voyages, i. 359), while the Arab geographers give the Greek name in the forms Sâmî (al-Istâq, Géographie, ed. Jaubert, i. 127, 301), Sâmî (Vâdi, Mawqûf, i. 211) or Shâmî (Abû ‘l-Fadl, ed. Reinaud, p. 193, 193). In the middle ages Samos was repeatedly raided by the Arabs in their incursions into the Aegean Sea, notably in the years 889 and 911. It was only with the expedition of the Arabs from Crete about the middle of the tenth century that Byzantine rule was restored over Samos and the other islands of the archipelago. Later the island was exposed to the raids of the Sellipta and their vassals. Techas, lord of Smyrna, captured the island about the year 1090 and kept it for some time (Anna Comnena, Alexiad, ix. Ch. 4); in the xivth century it was ravaged by the Alimoghlu Unur Beg (Ducal, Ch. vii). From the end of the xivth century it belonged to the Geneos Moons of Chios (cf. the art. a.ÎRÎT). Friendly relations were maintained with the people of the adjoining mainland. It is, for example, related that at Tmîur’s invasion numerous Turks fled thither (Buondolmente, ed. Sinmer, Ch. 54) and the fanatic Birkdhul Mu‘jad, who provoked a communist rising on the Byzantine peninsula about 1320, maintained communication with the monks of Chios and Samos. After the fall of the Byzantine empire, Mehmed the Conqueror granted Samos to the Geneos of Chios, but they were not able to hold it and therefore induced the greater part of the population to migrate to Chios in 1476. Probably as a result of this, Mehmed II in 884 (1479) had Samos occupied by the Beg of Bigha; to repopulate the deserted island the new colonists were promised freedom from the state imposts (Turkhiy-i dinvâniyeh) (Bihisht, Tâhirî, i. 2909 of the Brit. Mus. MS.; cf. Sa’d al-Din, i. 567 sqq.). Later, probably after the peace with Venice in the reign of Bâyazid II in 1502, the Genoese seem to have regained control of the island; at least, Belou, who travelled in the Archipelago 1500 after 1547, expressly states that it belonged to the “asiegnarie de Chio” (Les observations de plusieurs singularites, etc., Paris 1555, p. 849); but a few years later they evacuated it for a second time and left it to its fate (Boschini, L’Archipelago, Venice 1558, p. 72). The islanders used to retire into the impenetrable mountains of the interior before the corsair raids, where they led the lives of savages. The Kapudan Pasha Kîlimdî ‘Ali Pasha, on one of his voyages in the Archipelago, was then attracted by the abandoned island and had it given to him by the Sultan in 1562. He endowed the great mosque built by him in Top-khane on the Bosporus with the revenues from the taxation of the island. — A Turkish voivod usually called Agha governed the island; a grand vezir exercised judicial authority; they lived in Chora, the principal place on the island, where also the titular of the throne newly founded (Greek orthodox) bishopric of Samos took up his residence. Except for these two officials and their subordinates there were no Turks on the island. But even under Turkish rule the Samiotes continued for long to suffer from the raids of pirates of all nations, Maltese, Frank, Algerian and Tripolitan, who, like their contemporaries, the filibusters and buccaneers in the West Indies, and the Panphylgian pirates conquered by Pempay, made this part of the Mediterranean unsafe for a century. Samos, which had neither fortresses nor a permanent garrison, was invaded and repeatedly occupied for some time by the Venetians in the wars between the Sublime Porte and Venice in the xvith century. The occupation by the Russian fleet lasted for several years, 1771—1774. The Samiotes played an important part in the Greek war of liberation: at the end of the war they passed again under Turkish rule, but through the intervention of the Western powers they obtained complete autonomy under a Christian governor appointed by the Sultan (Bey, Greek ékonomos, which was usually translated Fürst, prince), and were placed under the protectorate of France, Great Britain and Russia. They were also allowed a flag of their own. Like the other vassal states of the Sublime Porte, Samos paid an annual tribute, which in 1821 was 400,000 piastras but was later reduced to 300,000. 101,000 of this went to pay the dues to the wâdi endowment of Kîlimdî ‘Ali. The first Bey of Samos, Stefan Vogorides, was appointed in the beginning of Djinmûd, i. 1349 (middle of September 1833), and filled this post till the beginning of September, 1851. After him down till 1873 no less than 18 "princes," who with few exceptions belonged to Farniari families, ruled the island of Polykrates. In 1913 Samos was united with Greece by the Treaty of London, which ended the Balkan war. In modern times Vathy has replaced Chora as the seat of the Government; the number of the settled population was in 1912 about 50,000.

Bibliography: The chief work is Epaminondas J. Stamatiades, Ezaos, 5 vols.,
Samos 1851—1857 (history and description of the island from the earliest to the latest), also the same author's monograph "Επιστημονικα Επιστημονικα Περιοδικα και Ζωνογραφια του Γαρθονικου Εγκυκλοπαιδευτικου, Σεμκο 1666—1797 (ibid. 1842) and Τα Ερασμορ στη γενεα μονη Ευρωπος Σεμκο (ibid. 1894). Of older travellers, not already mentioned, the following are worthy of note: [Des Hayes de Courmeneire, Voyage de Léont, Paris 1832, p. 348 sqq.; Stocchova, Voyage fait en annees 1826 et 1827, Brussels 1843, pp. 234—236; Tournefort, Voyage du Levant, Amsterdam 1718, l. 155—158; Pococke, Description of the East, London 1745, ii. 24 sqq.; Dallaway, Constantinople ancient and modern, London 1797, p. 231—236; Chombi Granger, Histories de voyages dans l'Emp. Ost., Paris 1842, l. 157—161, with the plates 52—54 of the accompanying atlas, vol. 1. On conditions in modern times: A. Ritter zur Helle von Samo, Das Völkert der Inseln des Weissens Meer, Vienna 1878, p. 13 sqq.; Cainat, La Turquie d'Afrique, l. 498—533; Ahmad Tawhîd, Tārîkh Othūmîîâ Memsâhi Muhdmânî, first series, part 13, p. 837 sqq. (J. H. MORDMANN)

SAMAŞ — SAMASAM AL-DALWA, ABU KALîDIR ^AL-MARWÂNî, a Bāyiḍ. After the death of the Bāyiḍ rulers 'Abd al-Dawla in Shawwl, 372 (March, 985), his son Abu Kālidār was recognized as Amir-al-Umār under the name Samaş al-Dawla. The latter then gave his two brothers Abu 'l-Husayn Alīmuhammad and Abu 'l-Tahir Fīrubu the province of Fars as a fief and ordered them to go there at once. But when they arrived in Arrāfān the fourth brother, Sharafr al-Dawla, had anticipated them and already taken possession of Fars so that they had to retire to al-Ahwāz. As Sharafr al-Dawla would not recognize the sovereignty of Samaş al-Dawla, the latter sent an army against him under Abu 'l-Husayn b. Dānnâ, who met the enemy at Kurkommen between Wāsil and al-Bagār, led by Abu 'l-A'azz Dabāiṣ b. 'Abbās al-Ashfi, Abu 'l-Husayn was taken prisoner and his army put to flight (Rābi' I, 373 Aug.—Sept., 983) whereupon Sharafr al-Dawla granted his brother Abu 'l-Husayn rule over al-Ahwāz. At the same time Samaş al-Dawla had to fight with the Kurdish chief Bār, the ancestor of the Marwānids. The latter had invaded Diyar Bakr, where he had seized several towns like Māynsafūr in and Nasibin after the death of 'Abd al-Dawla. Samaş al-Dawla's troops were defeated, and al-Mawālīl also passed into Bābā's hands; but when in Safar, 374 (July, 984), he endeavoured to take Bāghdād also he was defeated and had to give up al-Mawālīl. He was, however, allowed to retain Diyar Bakr and the half of Ṭūr 'Ahbân. In 375 (985/986) the Dallālim general Asfār b. Kurduwwān rebelled against Samaş al-Dawla in Bāghdād and at first declared for Sharafr al-Dawla, but he next decided — by arrangement with the troops who were devoted to him — to make Abu Naqr b. 'Abd al-Dawla, then only fifteen years old and a year later appointed Amir al-Umār with the name Bābā al-Dawla (q.v.), governor of al-'Irāq in place of his brother Sharafr al-Dawla. But Asfār was defeated and Bābā al-Dawla taken prisoner. Sharafr al-Dawla then led Fars to go to al-Ahwāz and there told his brother Abu 'l-Husayn that he wanted to liberate Bābā al-Dawla; but Abu 'l-Husayn did not trust him and began to collect troops. The latter, however, went over to Sharafr al-Dawla and there was no

thing left for Abu 'l-Husayn to do but join his uncle Fakhr al-Dawla (q.v.); but as the latter did not find him absolutely reliable, he was imprisoned and afterwards put to death. To preserve peace, Samaş al-Dawla wrote to Sharafr al-Dawla and, as he was satisfied with the government of Bāghdād and ready to release Bābā al-Dawla and to have Sharafr al-Dawla mentioned first in the Ṭārîkh in the 'Irāq, the latter agreed to his proposal. When in 376 (986/7) Samaş al-Dawla came to Sharafr al-Dawla, he was at first very kindly welcomed, but then seized and imprisoned in a citadel near Shīraḳ. According to the usual statement, Sharafr al-Dawla afterwards had him blinded. In the meanwhile disturbances broke out in Bāghdād between the Dallālim who supported Samaş al-Dawla and the followers of Sharafr al-Dawla, the Turks, and only after quiet was restored did the Caliph al-Ṭāhir recognize the latter as Amir al-Umār. On the latter's death at the beginning of Dhu al-Qa’dāh II, 379 (Sept., 989), Bābā al-Dawla succeeded to this office. Samaş al-Dawla was then liberated but had first to fight with his nephew, Abu 'l-Abī b. Sharafr al-Dawla, and after his assassination with Bābā al-Dawla (q.v.). In 383 (993/994) — or, according to another statement, probably due to a corrupt text, as early as 380 (990/991) — Bābātīyar's (q.v.) sons, who had been interned in a castle in Fars after Sharafr al-Dawla's death, succeeded with the help of the Dallālim garrison in gaining their liberty and gathering a large following. When Samaş al-Dawla heard of this he sent an army under Abu 'l-Abī b. Ustādī Hormuz against them. The latter beseeched them in the fortress in which they had taken refuge; they had to surrender and were brought to Samaş al-Dawla, who had two of them executed and the other four imprisoned. In the same year hostilities again broke out between Samaş al-Dawla and Bābā al-Dawla and after several years' fighting victory was inclining more and more to the side of the former, when he was assassinated in Bābā 'l-Hijjāj, 388 (end of 998), at the age of thirty-five years and seven and a half years. Cf. also the article ABU KALIDAR.


SAMAŞ — SAMAŞ AL-DAWLA, ABU KHALIDAR BUKAIT, an Indus statesman and historian. His early name was 'Abd al-Razzāk Husain and he belonged to a Sajid family which had migrated from Khwaaf in Kirman and attained high honour there. He was born in Lahore on Ramaḍān 28, 1111 (March 20, 1700) and while still young moved to Awarangābād (q.v.) where he was appointed Dāwūn of Berār by the first independent Nizām of the Deccan, Asfār Dīn (q.v.; see also the article NAṢRĀN). In 1155 (1742) he was involved in the rising attempted by his kinsman Dīng, son of Asfār Dīn, against his father and dismissed from office after its failure. The next five years he devoted in retirement to his great historical work, the Mu'ādhir al-Uṣūrār. Shortly before the end of his reign, Asfār Dīn
pardoned him in 1160 (1747) and restored him to his former office, which he continued to hold under the next two rulers, Nâzîr Dîjang and Şehîh Dîjang. After the accession of Bastât Dîjang in 1170 (1756) the French party which had been opposed by Şamsâm al-Dawla succeeded in bringing about his fall; he was killed on Ramadân 3, 1171 (May 12, 1758) by soldiers of the French General Bussy. According to another, unreliable, story, the General shot him with his own hand.

The Mâdhîr al-Umrâh, a biographical dictionary arranged alphabetically, according to the initial letters of the names discussed, of all the more important statesmen under the Indian Moghuls from Akbar to the author's day. It was called it the "Peerage of the Moghul Empire." It exists in two recensions of both of which many copies exist. The original, which was unfinished and even in the completed part not quite ready for publication, disappeared at the murder of the author and the destruction of his house, and was only found, after twelve months' search by the friend and for several years secretary of the author, Ghulâm "Ali Asât Delgrâm (famous as the author of two tasâhid of poets, Khânâ-nâma and Sârvi Asât; cf. H. Ethê, in Grundzüge der iran. Philol., ii. 215), although not complete. He gave it a preface, wrote a biography of Şamsâm al-Dawla (see the Bibli.) and added several articles. This recension contains 261 biographies.

It was much extended and republished by the author's son, 4 Abd al-Hâly Khan (41166 = 1751; for his numerous titles see Merley, op. cit., p. 104; cf. the Bibli.), who in twelve years' labour continued the work of his father to the year 1194 (1799) when he concluded his labours; he took the first recension as foundation, added other parts of the original which had since been found and additions which he compiled from the 30 historical works mentioned in his preface. His own first draft is preserved in the India Office MS. NO. 2424 (Ethê's Catalogue, No. 627). This second edition contains an editor's preface, the preface by Şamsâm al-Dawla and Ghulâm "Ali, the latter's biography of Şamsâm al-Dawla, an index of the articles and the letter themselves, as well as a short biography of the editor. It contains 731 biographies and is one of the most valuable sources for the history of the Moghul rule in India.


(H. H. Schardey)

ŞAMSâm AL-SALTANÂ, NASRÂF KUL KHN, a Baikhtiyâr chief born about 1846. He belonged to the great division of Havî Lang, which he governed in 1903--1905 as Il-beg, and later as KHN. He was the son of the Hulain Kult KHN, killed by order of prince Zill al-Saltanâ, the famous governor-general of Isfâhân, and grandson of Dâ'ir Kult KHN. Samsâm owes his fame to the part he played in the nationalist revolutionary movement in Persia.

Rebellling against the incapable administration of the governor Ilbîl al-Dâlwa, Şamsâm al-Saltanâ at the head of 1,000 Baikhtiyârs occupied Isfâhân on Jan. 5, 1909, and convoked the provincial committee (andefficient). Jointly with his brother Sardâr-i Asâd, who had come back from Europe, Şamsâm telegraphed to the government (May 3) that he intended to advance on the capital. He carried out his plan but allowed the protagonists of the revolution, Sardâr-i Asâd and Sipâdâr-i Aşâm, leader of the forces collected at Rafâh, to have all the credit.

When in the summer of 1911 the news of the return of Muhammad 'Ali Shah reached Tihrân, Şamsâm entered the Sipâdâr's cabinet as minister of war and military governor of the capital (July 5). On July 26 he himself formed a new cabinet; three days later the Moodâs put a price on the head of Muhammad 'Ali Shah. In August the Baikhtiyârs with the active help of the Armenian revolutionary Yefrem Khân inflicted a defeat on Sardâr-i Arâhol, the principal supporter of the fallen Shah. In September they disposed of the rebellion led by the turbulent prince Sihâl al-Dâlwa. Şamsâm at first gave wholehearted assistance to Mr. Morgan Shuster, the American adviser who, entrusted with the reform of the Persian finances, had warmly supported the nationalist movement but very soon a quarrel broke out between them as a result of energetic action taken by Mr. Shuster (the episode of 'Alâ' al-Dâlwa). On October 29 Russia demanded satisfaction for the intervention of Mr. Shuster's gendarmes in the affairs of Prince Shu'i al-Saltanâ who claimed to be a protégé of Russia. As a result on Nov. 11 Wûthîk al-Dâlwa, minister of foreign affairs, expressed to the Russian legation the government's apologies but on Nov. 16 Russia presented an ultimatum demanding the dismissal of Mr. Shuster. The cabinet, which after a quarrel with Yefrem Khân had again made its peace with him, showed conciliatory tendencies. On Dec. 9 Wûthîk al-Dâlwa formed a new cabinet which two days later accepted the ultimatum. Mr. Shuster was replaced by a Belgian (M. Mornard) and left Persia.

In the summer of 1918 Şamsâm was again called upon to take the reins of government. As a repercussion of events in Russia the new cabinet, which had a nationalist character, at its meeting of July 27 abrogated all the treaties with Russia and all concessions granted to Russians. This measure, which affected the interests of foreigners in general, accelerated the fall of the cabinet and its replacement by that of Wûthîk al-Dâlwa, which signed the Anglo-Persian conventions of Aug. 1919.

Şamsâm is noted for his impulsive character but Mr. Morgan Shuster in his book approaches this chieftain with a lack of constancy.

Bibliography: E. G. Browne, The Persian Revolution (1910), p. 266, 268; D. Fraser, Persia and Turkey in Revolt (1910), p. 87; I. A.
SAMSAM AL-SALJANA — SAMSUN


AL-SAMSAM, the sword of the Arab warrior-poet 'Amr b. Ma'dkarib al-Zubaidi (cf. above, i. 336) celebrated for the temper and cutting power of its blade. Like a number of the best Arab swords, its origin was traced back to Southern Arabia and a fabulous antiquity was ascribed to it. 'Amr himself in a verse often quoted (Ibn Duraild, p. 311; Idh. ed. 1293, i. 46, ii. 70; Ibn Badrcha, p. 84; Tidj. al-Qurai, v. 219) says that it had once belonged to Ibn Dhí Kaifan "of the people of 'Ad" (this member of an actual Himyar clan [cf. Hartmann, Die arabische Frage, p. 331, 613], is identified with one of the last Himyar kings of the family of Dhí Qdian; but very probably the poet only means to allude to the great age of his weapon).

The history and fortunes of al-Samsam are rather involved; even in the poet's lifetime it came into the hands of a member of the Umayyad family, Khakhir b. Sa'id b. al-Aswad, the companion of the Prophet. The way in which he got possession of it is recorded with several variants by Ibn al-Kalbi (in al-Baladuri), Abul 'Ubayda (in the Aqgul), al-Zahr (in Ibn Habbash; see Bibl.), Saif b. 'Umar (in al-Tabari). According to the last-named, Khakhir won it in battle after routing 'Amr b. Ma'dkarib who was taking part in the revolt against Iblis raised by the false prophet al-Awwad al-'Amri (cf. above, i. 502); according to the three first, 'Amr himself gave it to Khakhir as a ransom for his sister (or wife) Raibana, who was a prisoner of the Muslims. 'Amr composed a poem on the occasion of which several verses are frequently quoted in the Arab sources (Ibn Duraild, p. 49; Iblib. xv. 240, etc.). The tradition (al-Thabit in Hananda, ed. Freytag, p. 397, 11-13) which says that 'Amr gave it to the Caliph 'Umar in return for better authority is denied by authority.

After the death of Khakhir b. Sa'id at the battle of Maraj al-Suffar during the conquest of Syria (14 A.H.) al-Samsam passed to his nephew Sa'id b. al-Aswad b. al-Aswad, who lost it while defending the Caliph 'Uthman when the latter was besieged in his house at Medina (35 A.H.). It was found by a Beduin of the tribe of Jishahana with whom it was discovered in the reign of Mu'awiya. Restored to its former owner, it passed from one member to another of the family of the Banu 'Atsh until one of them, Aythab b. Abi Aythab, great-grandson of the son of Sa'id, sold it to the Caliph al-Mahdi (158-169 A.H.) for about 80,000 dirhams. Hereafter al-Samsam was kept as a precious relic in the treasury of the 'Abbasids and its fame continued to increase; poets like Abu 'l-Hawli al-Hunayri (Dhahiri, Hayamii, v. 30) and Salm al-Khallair sang its praise.

From different sources we learn of its existence in the caliphs of al-Hadi (169-170 A.H.), Hisham al-Rashid (170-193), al-Walid (227-232), and al-Mu'ta'akkil (232-247), after which there is no longer any mention of it. The anecdotes recorded regarding the excellence of this famous sword during the period when it was in the hands of these Caliphs have little chance of being authentic; a description which has a certain appearance of reality is the one given in al-Tabari, (iii. 1348, 4-6, in connection with the story of al-Walid's using it to execute with his own hand in 231 A.H. 'Abd Allah b. Nasr al-Khunab, who was accused of having conspired against the Caliph and of having maintained that the Khunab was not created, contrary to the view laid down by al-Ma'mun: "It was a blade with a hilt at its end; three nails driven into it attached the blade to the hilt". It is apparent then that the famous al-Samsam had nothing of value about it except its great age.

As to the name al-Samsam, it is simply an epithet referring to the fine quality of the blade (the "cleaver") like muqammim, which has the same significance. Al-Samsam is often used as a common noun, e.g. by al-Farazdaq (Nabakhi, p. 385, 4) and by 'Amr b. Ma'dkarib himself (Hamidah al-Balburi, p. 83, ed. Cheikho, No. 237) Amidi of al-Kili, i. 154, 10, as well as by Muslim b. al-Walid (ed. de Goeje, vi. 18) in a verse which Schwarzlose (see the Bibl.) wrongly thought to refer to 'Amr's sword, while the weapon given by Hisham al-Rashid to his general Yarsh b. Maryad referred to in the verse is the sword of the Prophet, Abu l-Fakir (cf. above, i. 599), as is evident from verse 25 of the same poem and the note Ibn Khudhayr, l. 1109. (ed. 299) = li. 284 (ed. 1319) = No. 830 Wustenfeld.


U. LEVI DELLA VIDA

SAMSUN, a harbour on the north-west coast of Asia Minor, the ancient Amisos, also called Amonos by the Byzantines and later, after the conquest by the Seljukis, Sampson (Akropolites, Bonn ed., i. 14; also Schilberger, ed. Langmantel, p. 14 [transal. Hakluyt Society, p. 12], who says it was founded by the Samson of the Bible), the Sinus of western seafarers and the Samsun of the Arabs, was taken from the Byzantines by Kilidji Arslan II (1156-1192) (Niketas Choniates, Bonn edition, p. 869, 699); three centuries before (860) it had been laid waste by the Arabs on one of their raids into Byzantine territory (Theophanes Contin., Bonn ed., p. 179). Under the Seljukis and their successors, Samsun with Sinope conducted the trade with the Crimea and from the time of Mas'ud II (631-646 A.H.) it was a mint of the Seljukis and later of the Khwarizms (Ahmad Tawhid, Musul-kin-i kaifin-i intishab, Istanbul, iv. No. 704, 705; Mehemmed Mubarak, Hikayat, vol. iii. under the coins of Ghasan Mahmoud, Khudhur, under Mehemmed and Abi Sa'id Bahadar), which suggests a considerable commercial activity. About this time also we find Samsun first mentioned by the eastern geographers as a "famous harbour" (Abu l-'Ilia, Taqsim al-Buldani, ed. Reinhard, l. 32 sq., 215, 392; al-Dimashki, ed. Mehren, p. 146; Hrad Allah
Mustawfi, Nushat al-Kuli, ed. Le Strange, p. 96). Alongside the Muslim Şamsūn there was at the beginning of the 13th century an independent Greek enclave (Fallermayer, Geschichte der Kaiser- thums von Trebizond, p. 56 sqq.), the so-called "Christian Şamsūn" (Ναξάτ Σάμουν), and formed, as in Smyrna (see the art. Σμύρνη, II. 267), with the Muslim settlement a double town. Both parts were enclosed by walls and only a stone's throw (Ibn 'Arabshī, 'Adīd al-maḥāfir bi 'Alī Ṣimīr, Cairo 1255, p. 142) or "half a bowshot" (Schillerberger, p. 16, Hakl, Soc. ed. p. 15) apart. In the early years of the 14th century the Genoese established themselves in Christian Şamsūn and held it for over a century (Heyd, Histoire du Commerce du Levant, i. 553 sqq., ii. 350 sqq., 373); about the year 1425 the last Frankish inhabitants set the town on fire and sailed off in their ships, whereupon the Ottomans entered it (Neshri in Leunclavius, Hist. Musulmon., col. 475; wrongly in Heyd, op. cit., ii. 359).

After the withdrawal of the İkhāns Muslim Şamsūn was in possession of the İsfandıyar-oghlu of Kaştamouni (q.v.) and was taken from them in 795 or 797 A.H. by Būyazīd I (Schillerberger, p. 14 sqq.; Neshri, in the Z. D. M. G., xx. 343 = Leunclavius, op. cit., col. 356; Sa'd ad-Din, i. 133 = of Timurşahı Ahmed Effendi, Giese, p. 34); in 1404 the town still belonged to Mīr Sulaymān Čalebi, the son of Būyazīd I (Chavjio, p. 82); it was then again occupied by the İsfandıyar-oghlu (the date 822 A.H. is given) (Leunclavius, Hist. Musulmon., col. 474; Sa’d ad-Din, i. 287 sqq.; cf. Ibn ‘Arabshī, op. cit.) but shortly afterwards ceded without a fight to Şūṭān Mehmed I (Tabbūrīh-i Atī’i ‘Oṣūrūn, ed. Giese, p. 53 = Leunclavius, op. cit., col. 464; ‘Aṣīk Paša Zāde, p. 89 sqq.; Neshri, Sa’d ad-Din, op. cit.) Şamsūn since then has been under the Turks and became the capital of the sāḥib of Dastār, which formerly belonged to the eyalet of Siwā but in modern times has been incorporated in the vilayet of Trebizond. The harbour still retains some importance for trade with the Crimea, has a shipyard of its own, and in the XVIII century was again fortified as a defence against the attacks of the Don Cossacks. Local trade was limited to the manufacture and export of hemp ropes etc. and of the popular mārī𝒜ν (pomegrante syrup). After the cessation of the Crimea to Russia in the XIX century the town began to decline and in 1806 it suffered considerable damage during the fighting between the rival Dereheys, the Çapın-oghlu and the family of Dastār ‘Alī Paša. It was only with the opening of steam navigation in the Black Sea and the development of tobacco-growing in the adjoining district of Bafr a that the town received an unexpected revival of prosperity. Many Greeks and Armenians came to it from the interior, especially from Karafiray and Karabost, and Europeans also including many Hellenes settled here, to engage in the export of local products (tobacco, corn and hides). The old parts of the town which were avoided on account of endemic malaria were burned in 1286 (1869) and replaced by modern buildings. New quarters and suburbs also arose on a more healthy site, for example the suburb of ‘Aqā-Köy inhabited exclusively by Hellenes. The town which at the beginning of the XIX century had only 400 houses with a purely Turkish population of 2,000 had a century later over 20,000 inhabitants (10,000 Turks, 8,000 Greeks and Hellenes, 2,000 Armenians) and was the most important commercial town next to Trebizond on the north coast of Asia Minor. We have no more recent information. Bibl.: Ewliya, Siyāḥatnāma, ii. 77 sqq.; Constantine 1314—1318 = Travels, ii. 39 sqq.; Hājīdji Khalīfah Dījanīmi, p. 624; Ritter, Kleinsizien, i. 796—806 (collection of the earlier travellers' notices; to be added: Feyssel, Traité sur le Commerce de la Mer Noire, Paris 1787, ii. 92 sqq.; Rottiers, Itinéraire de Thés à Constantinople, Brussels 1829, p. 247—251; Molte, Briefe aus der Türkei 1827—1829; A. D. Mordtmann, Anatolien, Hannover 1872, p. 80 sqq.; van Lennep, Reise in kleine, wenig bekanntes Land von Asien Minor, London 1870, i. 38—60; Shāfākī Shewket, ‘Aṣrāl-‘Azīzī Turānī, Stambul 1394, p. 89 sqq.; Caietn, La Turquie d'Asie, i. 92—105; v. Flotow, Petersmann Mitt., Supplement 114, p. 17, 48; Konstantin N. Papamichalopoulos, Παπαμιχαλοπουλος την Ανατολίαν, Athens 1903, p. 311—329 (views and pictures of costumes); Studia Pontica, Brussels 1906—1910, ii. 111 sqq., iii. 1 sqq., Şükranes of the vilayet Trebizond of 1322 A.H., p. 150—160 (views of Trebizond). Plan of the town in the Planimetría von Kleinasiens of v. Vincze, [F. L.]. Fischer and v. Molte, Berlin 1846—1854, t. II. No. 1. (J. H. MORDTMANN)

AL-SAMT, direction, point of the compass, a term in frequent use in Arab astronomy applied to the length of the arc (angular distance) made by any straight line drawn in the horizon through the position of the observer with respect to the line from east to west. As a circle of altitude of the heavens cuts the horizon along a straight line, such sections in their deviation from the east-west line give the direction by which the altitude is characterised. On vertical walls on which the so-called inclined sundials (māhrarītū) are marked as well as in turning the face towards Mecca (sīdīqī) the direction is important. This is one of the problems of spherical astronomy, which the Arabs were able to solve in quite a number of ways.

The plural of al-samt is al-simā’t. For this we can quote references from the language of one of the greatest Muslim astronomers, namely Ibn Yūnus († 1099 in Cairo). The title of Chap. xxiv. of his famous İkhānī Tables, for example, is: Fi lḥāṣī Khaṭṭ Nasīf al-Nakhr bi l-‘rīfīsī ‘alāthūn Sāmtuha al-ḥāṣrimin min l-‘rīfīsī ‘alīt sīmā’thuţ mlī’in (Oxford, MS. Hunt. 331, fol. 43'). As will be noticed the adjective mlī’in is in the feminine singular, in keeping with the rules of Arabic grammar. An inexperienced translator of Arabic astronomical texts might very well take a plural like this (sīmā’t) for a singular and translate al-simā’t by "direction" instead of "directions". According to Nallino in E.S.O., viii. p. 590 sāmāt is a dialectical form of sīmā’t. By contraction in Spanish and French al-simā’t became asimá’t and in this form and with singular meaning the word has passed into western languages so that we now speak of the azimuth of an altitude of the sun or of a wall etc.

The expression sānt (or sānt) al-ra’s means the direction of the head. Later in Europe the qualification al-ra’s was dropped so that in the French and Spanish spelling only the word sānt remained.
Through errors in copying this became sāri, just as Latin translators of the astronomy of al-Yaghāni (Alfraganus) made Hēmis and then Hēnit out of Himā, Hēnis = Emeus.

Since, as already mentioned, the Arabs measured the azimuth from the east-west line, the meridian (kāfūf wašr al-maḥāf) came with them to be an azimuth of 90°. Its definition is a necessity for finding one's position so that it is never omitted in any Arabic work and even has ra‘ilat specially devoted to it (the writings on this subject by Ibn al-Hāthim, Miṣna on the azimuth and Miṣna on the determination of the meridian were in a derivative extant. Cf. F. Woepcke, L'algèbre d'Omar Alkhayyām, Paris 1854, p. 74 and 75; are probably no longer extant).

The arithmetical relation between altitude of the sun and azimuth (when the geographical latitude of the place and the declination of the sun are known) is given in the azimuth tables (Dié-large al-samit) which were calculated by various Arab astronomers for the latitude of their homes. Cf. e.g. Ibn Yūnūs, Kitāb al-Samit wa-l-Zill ‘il-ma Yūnūs maḥfīl al-jāhibatun al-jāhibatun, MS. Escor., 924. Bibliography: G. W. S. Beeg, Beziehungen zwischen der Gnomon der Araber (Fundgruben des Orientes. 1809, I 429); C. A. Nallino, Riformazione araba e significato di ‘samit’ e di ‘azimuth’ in una postilla su ‘almucantar’ in K. S. O., 1919, viii. 389; C. Schöb, Das 20. Kapitel der grossen Ḥāzimīschen Tafeln des Ibn Yūnūs: Über die Berechnung des Azimuth aus der Höhe und der Höhe aus dem Azimut (Annalen der Hydrographie und maritimen Meteorologie, Hamburg 1920, p. 97–112); c. Über die Erkennung der Mittagslinie, dem Buche über das Analemma entnommen, samt dem Beweis dass von Aḥā’il-Sud al-Durṣ (Ann. d. Hydrogr. u. maritimen Meteorol., 1921, p. 265–272). (C. Schöb)

SAMAUEL. (See SAMAUL.)

SAMÚM, the name of a hot wind in several Arabic speaking countries. The word occurs in three passages of the Kur‘ān, where it is, however, not especially applied to the wind. Sūra 15:9 it is said that the Dāmūs were created from the fire of Samûm. Sūra 52:9 the punishment of the stoners of the day of judgment; and according to Sūra 50:22 the “people of the left” were dwelling in Samûm wa-Samûm. Apparently Muhammad applied the term to infer heat.

The Ḥadith uses the word in the same sense; yet the meaning “hot wind” is here coming to the front. It is said that Hell takes breath twice a times a year: “its taking breath in summer is Samûm”. (Tirmidz̄i, Liqā‘ānumm, bab 9; cf. Ibn Mūjtāja, Zuhd, bab 38). In Bukhārī we find reference to the opinion that the hot-air during the day is called ṣahrūr, whereas it is called samûm at night (Bad al-Khalīfah, bab 4).

In nearly every traveller’s book the samûm (sūmâactive) is mentioned in the sense of the suffocating wind which is also often called strenuo. From the innumerable references a few may be picked out. C. M. Doughty mentions it in the neighborhood of Madīnâ in Sullb as “a drouth and southern wind” against which the Beduins “covered their faces, to the eyes, with a lap of the khechef”. He again mentions it between Madīnâ and Mekkâ and tells us that according to the Beduins weak camels may be suffocated by it (Travels in Arabia Deserta, Cambridge, 1888, i. 100, 188).

In Mekkâ the north, north-east, and east wind are called saumûn, when it blows it makes the impression as if it came from a huge fire through the intermediary of gigantic bellows (Snouck Hurgronje, Mechanische Sprühuürwesen und Reiternarren, No. 76). The reason in which the sun enters the constellation of the Virgin (August) has an extremely bad reputation in Mekkâ, because in this time ṣamûn, wâsâd, samûm and wâsâd blow alternately (loc. cit.).

Concerning Egypl, Lane says (Manners and Customs, Introduction): “Egypt is also subject particularly during spring and summer, to the hot wind called the ‘Saamoon’ which is still more oppressive than the khamâsin winds, but of much shorter duration, seldom lasting longer than a quarter of an hour or twenty minutes. It generally proceeds from the south-east, and carries with it clouds of dust and sand”.

Concerning Kâr-i Shīrīn [q. v.] Hamd Allah Mustawfī (Nushat al-Kalbāṣ, transl. Le Strange, Gibb Memorial Fund, vol. xxxii., p. 50) says: “its climate is unwholesome for in the hot season at most times the (hot) Sunum blows.”

Mas‘ūdī, Mufrīd al-Dhābāh, ed. Paris, iii. 320 sq. has a legendary report concerning the Djāmūn which according to the verse from the Kur‘ān mentioned above, were created from the fire of the saumûn (translated by R. Banet, Mille et un centre, v. 10, p. 863 & 864, arabes, Paris 1924, i. 57). See also A. Munīl, Reisen in Arabien (Vienna 1907–1908), iii. sq.

(A. J. WEISSNER)

ŠÂN, now ŠÂN AL-HADJṣAR, a little village in lower Egyptian in the district of al-Ārio to the south of Lake Manzala on the Bahir al-Mu‘izz (or Maws), the ancient Tanitic arm. The Arabic name corresponds to the Hebrew Šō‘ân, the Greek Τάους and the Coptic Djanī. This town, which was the capital of the dynasty of the Shepherd Kings, had been long in ruins by the time of the Arab conquest. The ancient town, notably the temples, had fallen to pieces and no Arab author mentions them; their remains nevertheless still form the most considerable group of ruins in the Delta. A single text recalls its fame in quoting Šām among the Towns of the Magicians.

A passage in the Chronicle of John of Nikiu (transl. Zotenberg, p. 346) shows that in the seventh century it was a little town, since the same governor administered Kharībat (Farbat = modern Hurbat), Šān, Basta, Bahlā (= Tahrīyā = Copt. Ṭafabiā) and Sanhūr. This district really comprised five contiguous pagarchies, Šafābid, Tāwān, B’estāf, Ṭafabi‘a, and Ḥawīyā and Ḥawīyās.

The Arab šūrā, founded on the pagarchy of Tāwān, was called after two places, Šān and Ibblī, the latter, which is found in Coptic in the form Bâllā, cannot, however, be exactly located. The šūrā of Šān and Ibblī contained 46 villages (49 in al-Dimashq) stretching to the north-east up to the Syrian frontier, and included besides Sanhūr (Hephaistos) the towns of al-Paramā (Felus) and al-‘Arish (Rhincolurca). The southern boundary ran north of a line Hurbat—Fākus, although
the latter formed part of the kūra of Ţūribiya. The kūra of Tumalı (Tumalı al-Amid) bordered it on the west and on the north the kūra of Şan and Illi ended on the banks of the Bağhatı Tınba (Lake Manisa).

We have almost no historical information regarding the town, which had been the see of a Copitic bishop (there is no mention later than the fifth century A.D.). We only know that bodies of the tribes of Khusain, Lakham and Djedhān settled in this region. The geographer Yākūţ gives no details and one is surprised not to find it mentioned in the canons of Ibn Manmūtī, Ibn Dukmāk and Ibn al-Dhā'īn, although in quoting the old lists of kūra’s, al-Kaljaghandī says it is unknown. The notice by ʿAli Pāḥa Mubārak is simply a translation of an article by Quatremer. It is not known at what period Şan received the surname of al-Ḥaḍjar (Şan “of the stones”), which is found in Egypt attached to several places near which there are important ruins, e.g. Bahbīl al-Ḥaḍjar (Tessay), Şaʿ al-Ḥaḍjar (Sialo).


(G. Wiet)

SAN STEFANO, in Turkish Aya Stephanos, a little town on the sea of Marmora, twelve miles west of Constantinople. It probably takes its name from an old church (according to von Hammer) but it is not certain whether San Stefano is the ancient Hagios Stephanos, which was one of the places which Meḥmed the Conqueror occupied before the investment of Constantinople (Ducas, ed. Bekker, Bonn 1834, p. 258, speaks of the παραγων τον σταυρόν συν παλαιούς). The Crusaders landed in its neighbourhood on June 23, 1205, before the Latin conquest of Constantinople. San Stefano lay off the great road from Constantinople to Adrianople, which passed through Kçük Çekmede (Ponte Picolo) 2½ miles to the east of it and has never been of any strategic or economic importance. Ewiyā Čelbi does not mention it. Since the beginning of the nineteenth century wealthy inhabitants of the capital have been building country-houses here so that it has now become a pleasure-resort for the citizens of Constantinople, easily reached by railway. The population itself is entirely Greek and numbers about 2000 souls.

The town acquired a place in history by the preliminary peace of San Stefano which was signed there on March 3, 1878, between Turkey (represented by Şafwat Paşa and Sa’d-ūlāh Paşa) and Russia (represented by Count Ignatieff and Nelidoff), a truce having previously been agreed upon at Adrianople on the previous January 31.

The Russian headquarters were in San Stefano on this occasion; the house where the treaty was signed has been destroyed by an earthquake. The conditions of peace (text in Nouvem Révue Général de Traité, 2nd Series. iii. 240—250) were very harsh for Turkey on account of the great area of territory which was given to the newly formed principality of Bulgaria and the huge indemnity demanded by Russia. The Berlin Congress, summoned on the initiative of England, considerably ameliorated the conditions of the preliminary peace and annulled the latter. Peace with Russia was finally concluded in Constantinople on Feb. 8, 1879.

In 1909 San Stefano was again in the public eye after the Turkish counter-revolution of March, which ultimately led to the deposition of Abdül-Ḥamid. On April 19 of this year the first constitutionalist troops hurriedly appeared here from Salonica. Immediately the deputies of the committee "İttihat ve Terakki" went to San Stefano and constituted the national assembly in the Yacht Club under the presidency of Abu ʿl-Diyâ Tewfîk Bey, who was succeeded as president by Ahmed Râfî on April 21. Next day the whole senate joined the assembly which placed all power in the hands of the army. Mahmûd Shewket Paşa became commander-in-chief and on April 24 Constantinople was entirely in the hands of constitutionalists. During these events the whole Turkish fleet appeared before San Stefano to submit to the army.


(J. H. Kramers)

ŞAN Ā, the capital of Yaman, lies on the eastern Sarťt in a mountain valley which is open to the west as far as the chain which belongs to the Dišāh ʿĀlādūn, while immediately to the east the town is overshadowed by the Dişāb Nūkum which rises 1000 feet above it. Its altitude is 15° 23' N. Lat. and 44° 12' E. Long. As the town is 7200 feet above sea-level the climate is temperate, particularly as in summer regular winds blow through the day. In winter the temperature falls to zero at night which brings ice, which, however, disappears agala with day. In spring and in midsummer, especially July, it rains a great deal. Very dry summers are a rare but disastrous exception. Two streams run under cover through Şan Ā to the Wādi ʿl-Khārīd. They are only fall after rain. A regular supply of good water is provided by an aqueduct from the Nūkum. The soil of the plateau is of volcanic origin but earthquakes are very rare (e.g. one in 657 = 1259) and those insignificant. Lava forms the building material of the better houses while the humble, and even the city wall, are built of mud. The scanty wood supply of the plateau, little tamarsiks (falaḥ), dawn-trees is only of importance as a supply of fuel for the market in Şan Ā. Thin transparent sheets of marble are still used, as they once were on the citadel of Ghamidiin, as windows in the upper-class houses. The industries for which the town was noted in the middle ages, like the smelting of silver and the manufacture of the once famous Yamant clothes have declined considerably. The short curved Yamant swords generally worn, with bone hilts adorned with silver, are still made there. Large well kept gardens are also found within the fort by the thickly populated town. All the fruits of the temperate zone are cultivated: apricots, peaches, apples, quinces, wine-fruit and fragrant herbs. The
Turks have also acclimatised all kinds of vegetables including the potato. The date-palm is only ornamental at this high level. Coffee is grown, notably on the slopes of the Nukum.

The present town, the population of which is estimated at 18,000, has three quarters. The Arab quarter stretches from the citadel at the foot of the Nukum westwards until it joins up with the once separate suburb Bir al-Ajdub with fine gardens and the official buildings and public offices. About 5,000 Jews live away to the west in the crowded Ka‘al-Yahud. Outside the south wall lie the barracks and close to the north wall the tiny town of Shurib. Of the dozen gates only four are usually opened. The chief mosque with two minarets, the so-called “little Ka‘ba”, probably the old “Kalat” (see below), is almost in the centre of the Arab town, which still contains many palaces built by various ruling families that have succeeded one another here. The most important of these is the residence of the Imams, Bosra al-Mutawakkil, in the north-west of the Arab town. Among public buildings San‘a’ has a large hospital, a dispensary, about 12 baths, 3 schools, including a technical school and a printing-press.

The routes for traffic are very difficult through the mountainous country. The descent towards the Red Sea is made towards Hudaideh. With a view to safety the roads generally lead round the tops of the valleys, for example the Wadi Sunfur with its gentle descent. The road, for example, at Karn Wall (Deer-Horn) south of the Hijab al-Hajar Nabi Shurib rises to about 9,000 feet and then descends to about 5,000, climbing through the passes of the coffee-growing range of Harar to Mas'aka to a height of 7,000 feet again and drops down to the Ta‘ihma just outside of Bajil. It takes the regular Turkish pilgrim, carried by riding camels in the San‘a’, 3½ to 4 days to cover the distance from San‘a’ to Hudaideh, which is about 100 miles as the crow flies. This route has also a telegraph line which links up with the Syrian-Arabian system. The road to the site of the ancient Ma‘rib [q.v.], which is 75 miles E.E. in a straight line, and from the region of salt is still brought to San‘a’, begins by going round either north or south the outer spur lying east of the town and then descends to the Hijab through the Wad‘ at Tama with its plentiful water-supply. For the road from north to south via Yirim, the ruins of al-Dur, Ta‘ibah and Turabah to Mecca see above, i. 368 sq. But the pilgrims of commercial traffic to Mecca instead of following this route through the mountain range, begins by striking straight across in the direction of the Wadi Sunfur, and from al-Mahjid, about 25 miles N. of Hudaideh, onwards and then uses the Ta‘ihma road running northwards from ‘Adan via Zabid.

Although San‘a’ is a very ancient town, no mention of it has as yet been found in the Minaean and Sabean inscriptions as far studied, and there is just a possibility that it is mentioned in the Himyarian period if the So‘m mentioned in the inscription Glaser 244, line 13, is our San‘a’; this inscription would date from the middle of the first century A.D. if the king of Saba‘ and al-Ra‘idah in line 3, Ula‘arib Yahud, who wins a victory at or over So‘m, can be identified with the Elisan of the Periplus maris Erythraei, § 26 (see E. Glaser, Die Abessinier in Arabien und Afrika, 1895, p. 117 sqq.; M. Hartmann, Der islamische Orient, 1909, i. 150 sqq.). Legend and poetry have more to tell us, inspired by the vast ruins of the castle of Ghamdan [q.v.], Shem was the builder of the town and castle and Asil their ancient name. As this latter was possibly only taken at a later date by Jews and Muslims from Genesis, x. 27, the suggestion that in San‘a’ we have the Uzal of the Bible is as uncertain as Sprenger’s explanation (Das alte Geographie Arabiens, 1875, § 294) of San‘a’ as the Mesanibi basileum of Ptolemy, Geog., book vi, chap. vii, § 38, or Glaser’s assertion (op. cit., p. 122, and Die Geschichte und Geographie Arabiens, ii. [1890], p. 310, 427) that the old name was Tufsah and that the present name has been brought from the region of Ma‘rib.

It was only when with the Abyssinian invasion Yaman became involved in the struggle for world supremacy between Rome and Persia that San‘a’ is said to have become the most important part which it henceforth played down to the present day in Upper Yaman and with occasional interruptions in the whole of Yaman. Only a few of the events of these fourteen centuries, in which the history of Yaman is reflected in the story of this single town, can be briefly given. About 530 A.D. after the overthrow of the Jewish king Dhi Nuwas, who is said to have persecuted the Christians in San‘a’ also, Abraha arose and after disposing of his Abyssinian rival Aryas made the town the seat of the Abyssinian viceroy. He enriched the town with the Christian cathedral, the Ka‘ba or Kalasa (ukhlera). The materials are said to have been brought from the ruins of Ma‘rib and the workmen and the masons to have been sent by the Byzantine emperor. Summoned by the old Yaman ruling family of Dhi Yzaan, Walraz, Khwasar I and Alhasan I’s general, about 570 drove the sun and the second successor of Abraha, Masriq, from the town and established a system of joint administration with the Dhi Yzaan, then Persian rule alone, which was, it is recorded, in the hands of his son, grandson and great-grandson after him. In the year 10 (631), according to some stories two years earlier, the fifth governor, Badi‘an, adopted Islam. In the same year 10, Mahdiyeh b. Abi Umayya b. al-Mughirah was sent to San‘a’ to collect the taxes for the Yaman. In the following year the town was for three months in the hands of the anti-prophet ‘Abdala b. Ka‘b al-Awar, who entrenched himself in Ghumdan. On the death of Mahammar, his rising became merged in the general struggle for the independence of the Yaman, the principal champion of which was again one of the Dhi Yzaan, ‘Amr b. Ma‘di Karih. The Medina government found most support with the arabised Persian nobles, the Abin (q.v.). In 11 (632), Ferrizah the Dailam, with the help of al-Muhdhir, was able to restore Muslim supremacy in San‘a’ and Upper Yaman. It was probably in this fierce fighting that the fortress of Ghumdan was destroyed, which, according to the legend, must have been rebuilt once before in the Himyar period by ‘Amr b. Abi Sharab b. Yahia, who is known from inscriptions. After the conquest comparative quiet prevailed, particularly as the leaders in Medina dealt gently and tactfully with the notables in and near San‘a’.

Wah b. Munya whom ‘Umar I appointed successor to al-Muhdhir was still in this office on the accession of ‘Ali. The latter dismissed him and appointed
Ubaid Allah b. 'Abbás as., at least so al-Ya'qúbí, ii. 208 a, tells us, 'Ṭalhá refused to be moved to the provincial office to 'San'á', but with al-Zuhair seized all the taxes of the Yaman, which Ya'ús had taken with him from 'San'á to Mekka. But 'Ubaid Allah or his successor was transferred from 'San'á by 'Utb b. Arỹṣ by order of Mu'in b. Idris, according to some versions as early as 60 (660), that is even before the assassination of 'Ali.

There are proverbial sayings such as 'father than 'San'á' or 'everyone, even the shepherd on the hills of 'San'á' (al-Tabarî, i. 2752; iii. 2472). When the centre of 'Islam was removed to Syria and then to the 'Iraq, Upper Yaman appeased even more remote, and its history was in keeping with this. Three forces were resisting the Caliphate, fighting one another, or in certain cases supporting one another: native princes, ambitious governors and leaders of sects, who taught their views far from the capital and endeavoured to put them into practice by founding states; even the arch-heretic 'AbbāS b. 'Abd Allah b. Sa'd (v. i) as described as 'one of the men of 'San'á'. Although such notice is no proof of quiet in this remote town, the Umayyads seem to have had a firm grip of 'San'á'. Even when the Umayyad Caliphate was breaking up, the general Ibn 'Aṭīya was able in 130 (747-748) to send to Marwán II from 'San'á the head of 'AbbāS b. 'AbbāS b. 'Abd Allah b. Hāmīz, who had set himself up there as Khāridji caliph. The situation soon became more difficult under the 'Abbasids. Homage was not paid to al-Hadīth at all. Under Hārūn al-Raḍhī, his fifth governor, Hāmīz al-Barbarī, only succeeded after a nine years' struggle in bringing the rebel Hamdānī al-Hāsīmī b. 'AbbāS al-Mudījī a prisoner from al-Sarḥīn to 'San'á. At this time, about 188 (803), the town was almost in ruins. Things began no better at the beginning of the third century when the 'Alid 'Isām b. Mūsā b. Dījrāf al-Dījrāfī (the 'butcher') ruled from 'San'á to Mekka, half as an adventurer for his own hand and half as an official governor. The attitude of his opponent, the Wālī Hamdawalī b. Māḥtān, was no less ambiguous. In the end the government had to resort to Turkish praetorian generals. Not later than 256 (869) the Ya'furīs of the tribe of the Ḥuwālī became masters of 'San'á by a compromise, it is true, by the terms of which Muḥammad b. Ya'fur gave the caliph al-Mu'tamid mention in the name and paid tribute to the Ziyādīs at Zahāb. Even their rule was often interrupted in the town itself. On the accession of Muḥammad's son, Isḥākīm, in 279 (931) his palace was set on fire by the citizens of the rival tribe of Shahāb and the Abbasids were usually at enmity with the latter. Two bodies of Shī'īs then attacked 'San'á: from the north, from Sa'da, the Zaydīs of 'Yahyā b. al-Husayn who occupied the town for the first time for four or five months in 288 (901); from the south, with the fortress of al-Muḥākhirah (see above, i. 356a) as his base, the Karmātīn 'Abīl b. Faqīl controlled the town at the beginning of 293 (905) at first for two or three months from its castle. In the never-ending struggle between Ya'furīs, Zaydīs, Karmātīn, mutinous clients of the Ya'furīs of the family of Ṭārīḥ, 'Abbasids, governors and generals, 'San'á was taken no less than twenty times in the twelve years from the first entry of 'Yahyá to the end of the century (913 a. d.). it times it was surrendered after negotiations, and was besieged unsuccessfully some five more times. According to al-Mas'ūdī, ii. 55; 'San'á had a quieter and brilliant period after the death of the Karmātīn, under the Ya'furīs of 'Abīl b. Ibrahimī, from 303-332 (915-943). On his death family dissensions brought back the old turmoil. The Zaydīs Mahātīr, grandson of 'Yahyá, took the town in 345 (956) but was murdered in the same year. The streets and quarters of the town became a battlefield for the feuds of the two tribal groups of Khūwān and Hamdān. Behind the chief of the latter, al-Dhūḥūlī, was the now restored power of the Ziyādīs of Zahāb. But in 377 (987) or 379 (989) the last important Ya'furī of 'San'á, 'AbbāS b. Ḥāyūn, was once more able to exact retribution and destroy Zahāb. 'AbbāS b. 'Ahmad had been able to secure the support of the still numerous Karmātīn and officially recognised the caliphate of the Fatimids. The Shī'īs followed the same policy; the first of them, 'Abī b. Muḥammad, as Fatimīd al-Dī made 'San'á his headquarters about 453 (1061) and after half a century put an end to the unrest which had been increased by the fact that the Zaydīs Imāms, who penetrated among the hostile tribes from Sa'da from time to time, were surrendering more and more to their Tunisian masters, When Queen Sā'īya b. Ḥurra moved the seat of government to Dījbal in Lower Yaman, her relations, the Yāmīds, held the town for her for another decade or so, until in 492 (1098) Ḥā'im b. al-Ghašīm made himself independent there. His dynasty, the Hamdānīs, reigned till the invasion of the Yaman by Salādīn's brother Turānshī in 569 (1174), interrupted in the usual way by family quarrels, by another Yāmīd interregnum, and especially by the Zaydīs Imām of Sa'da and Nāḏrān, 'Ābd al-Muhammad b. Salāmīn al-Muṭawakkilī. But even the fifty-five years of Aljūbīl's rule showed that 'San'á could not be held firmly by a distant power. The Hamdānīs 'Abī al-Walīd b. Ḥāfiz, who had established himself in the mountain fortress of Ḍir ash about two hours to the east of 'San'á, in 583 (1187) destroyed the city walls, the castle and the greater part of the town of 'San'á'. In 595 (1199) and again in 611 (1214) we find the Imām 'Abī al-Walīd al-Manṣūr holding the town for a brief period. The suzerainty of the Rashīdlīs [v. i.] of Ta'irīs over 'San'á began in 626 (1229) at first with vigour. The governors, usually princes or Kurd officers, visited the town and the Muslims themselves often came also. It was at first rarely and only for brief periods captured by the Imāms e. g. in 648 (1250) or 671 (1271). It was not till a century later that Zaydī power was again restored. The Imām 'Abbās b. 'Alī was not only able to make himself secure in 'San'á but repeatedly to attack Zahāb, 'Adan and Ta'irīs from it in the years 777-793 (1375-1391). His successors were able to ward off successfully the new Shī'ī kings of lower Yaman; first of these, 'Amīr b. Ṭahīr b. Muḥāwadāwī was only able to enter the town temporarily in 861 (1456). In 913 (1507) the Kurd al-Husayn, admiral of the second-last Mamlūk Suľṭān Kānjābī [v. i.] al-Ghūrī took the town to which the latter sent the Mekkan Shirāf Barakāt II b. Muḥammad b. Barakāt I as Wali in 922 (1510); but in the very next year it was regained by the Imām Yahyā Shirāf al-Dīn. When the Ottoman put an end to the Mamlūk dynasty they had no further fight to gain the Mamlūk possessions. In 933 (1526) Ordemir Fāshū entered 'San'á; in 1038 (1628) Hādīr Fāshū capitulated to the Imām Muḥammad
of the Kāšīmi line which held the town till 1087 (1676). Then followed a period of fighting among rival Išāsā; the native notables, the Bāsūn tribes and the never completely exterminated Karmāṣṭhās thereby gained considerable freedom of action and foreign powers also seized opportunities for intervention. Devastating Bāsūn invasions in 1233 (1818) were repeated in 1251 (1835), which induced the Išāsā al-Māṣūr in 1253 (1836—1837) to negotiate for the sale of the town to the Egyptian Pāshā Mahmed ‘Alī. The Turkish general Kılıçaslan Tāvsh Pāshā was admitted to the town by the Išāsā in 1263 (1849). His troops were massacred within two days and next year the Išāsā was deposed by the Mekkān Sharīf Muḥammad b. ‘Awn who intervened. He appointed a rival Išāsā who was, however, not able to protect the town; in 1267 (1851) and 1269 (1853) the town was again invaded. During the Ottoman re-conquest by Muḥammad Pāshā, Şan‘ā was taken by storm in 1288 (1871) and made the capital of the wilāyād of Yaman and headquarters of the vīla Ottoman Army Corps. But the Balādīs were not disposed of. In the autumn of 1906 the Ottoman had to vacate the town and the country round before the Išāsā Muḥammad Yāḥyā b. Ḥāmid al-Dīn. Although they regained it in the autumn, it took fully five years to secure a rather parlious restoration of the Turkish position. After the Great War Muḥammad Yāḥyā was recognised as Lord of Şan‘ā and Yaman by the Treaty of Sèves on Aug. 10, 1920.

In spite of its remoteness and its turbulent history, Şan‘ā has been able to make its contributions to Muslim learning. It was here that ‘Abd b. Ṣāḥiyā, by his historical tales, laid the foundation for the fame which induced Muḥammad 1 to summon him to his court. His younger colleague Ṭaḥh b. Manahhī, who died in Şan‘ā, was also celebrated by his fellow-citizens as their first authority on the Kūfī. In the second century Şan‘ā was visited by many collectors of traditions, including Ḥaṣ the b. Ḥanbal and Yāḥyā b. Ma‘ṣūn, who studied with Ḥaṣ al-Raṣād b. Ḥamān b. Ma‘ṣūn, who died in Şan‘ā in 811 (817). Şan‘ā is also noted as the place of birth and death of the poet, grammarian and historian, but above all genealogist and geographer, al-Hamādī [q.v.]. Of the Išāsā of Şan‘ā very many of them have done something to increase the bulk at least of literature; this fact provoked the other factions to a similar activity. Christians survived for a long time among the various groups of Muslims and the Jews, or they may have settled again there at the time of the greatest expansion of the Nestorian Church; thus, for example, about 225 (840) Thomas of Margi (The Book of Governors, ed. Budge, i. 238) mentions Mār Petrus as contemporary bishop of Yaman and Şan‘ā.

The first European to reach Şan‘ā was the Italian Barthen as a prisoner in 1508. The first explorer whose goal was either Şan‘ā or to reach the country of Ma‘ṣūb from it, was Castrén Niebuhr in 1755. While the yield of inscriptions from Şan‘ā and vicinity has been slight, valuable collections of manuscripts were obtained there by Gläser, Landberg, Caprotti and Borchardt.

In modern Scripture there is often dealt with by Arab geographers and travellers. In addition to Yāḥyā, we may mention as valuable for economic details also al-Muḥādīn (H. L. A., iii.)


ŞAN‘Ā. [See also SANA‘]

SAN‘Ā, ANG. ‘AL-MU‘ĀDĪ MAḤMŪD b. ‘ĀDAM, of Ghazni, was one of the most famous poets at the court of the later Ghānūmavids, where his contemporaries were Shaikhs. ‘Uṯmān Muḥādī, ‘Āli Fathī and Maḥmūd Warrāṣī. He gained his livelihood as a court poet by writing verses in praise of the king and of the leading men in the state, but one day, overhearing a well-known eccentric of Ghānūmavids drink confusion to “the wretched Şan‘ā”, who spent his time in composing mendacious verses in praise of the great and would be obliged to remain silent when asked, at the Day of Judgement, what he had done for God”, he overcame with remorse and left Ghazni for Marw, where he led the religious life as a disciple of the Shaikhs Abī Yāḥyā Vāsūf. This occurred in the reign of Ibrāhīm (1059—1099), the eleventh king of the Ghānūmavid dynasty.

Besides a Divān, containing 30,000 verses, Şan‘ā wrote the Ḥudhšt al-waṣīla, a didactic poem on morals and religion, of which the editors of the text at Ghazni display only that they sent it to Baghāzā, with a view to its condemnation by the leading jurists and theologians of Islam, but were disappointed by a decision which pronounced the book to be orthodox. After this Şan‘ā returned to Ghazni, but continued to lead the religious life. Besides the Ḥudhšt Şan‘ā has left six more Mathnawi’s, viz. Tarīq al-waṣīla, Şahr-i Ḥanīfa, Sār al-hād ‘idd ‘l-Musaw‘ir, Kāraya, ‘Iṣfāhān, and ‘Abūlqasim. The Ḥudhšt
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was commented upon by 'Abd al-Latif b. 'Abd Allâh al-Abbâs, who wrote in the time of the Mughal Emperor Shâh Dîjâhân.

It is said that Bahrâm (1118-1152) the fifteenth king of the Ghurzawid dynasty, offered his sister in marriage to Sanâ'î, who begged that he might be excused, as he sought neither wealth nor worldly rank. As the year of his death 516 (1134) as well as 576 (1181) is given; the latter is, however, very improbable.


(T. W. HAIO)

ŞANAM (a., plur. aşanîm) is explained in the dictionaries and the commentators of the Kurân as meaning "an object which is worshipped besides God", and it is as a rule distinguished from the word wâthân (plur. wâthânîm) as being a thing having shape and made of stone, wood or metal, while the latter is almost synonymous with "picture or painting". This is also the explanation given by Ibn al-Kalbî in his Kitiât al-ʾAṣârân. The Arabic dictionaries state further that it is a word of foreign origin, derived from the word shânâm, but do not know the language from which it is borrowed. According to the European philologists, it is etymologically identical with Hebrew שמן "image". A deity named ʾI-l-m occurs in the Aramaic inscription of Taimâ, cf. further J. Hehn in Festschrift-Sachau, Berlin 1915, p. 36 sqq. The word occurs five times in the Kurân (vi. 74; vii. 134; xiv. 38; xxi. 58 and xxi. 71) and is frequently mentioned in traditions, though not as often as the word Wathân. From the description of the idols worshipped by the pre-Islamic Arabs, enumerated by Ibn al-Kalbî, the word Şanam appears to apply to objects of very varying character. Some were actual sculptures like Hâhal, Iṣâf and Nâlû; so were the other idols set up round the Kaʿba. Muḥammad when he entered Mekka as victor is stated to have struck them in the eyes with the end of his bow before he had them dragged down and destroyed by fire. Others were trees like al-ʾUzâz and many were mere stones like al-Lât. Stones are well-known as objects of worship by the Semites in general and the traditionist al-Dârîmî states early in the first chapter of his Aṣârîn that in the time of paganism the Arabs, whenever they found a stone remarkable for its shape, colour or size, set it up as an object of worship. These stones called Naṣîb (plur. Anṣâb) had libations poured over them and were circumambulated as a special act of worship. There can be no doubt that the Black Stone in the Kaʿba is but a survival of this stone-worship. Ibn al-Kalbî states that the Arabs were not content with setting up stones for idols, but even took such stones with them on their journeys. The word Şanam, however, does not mean a "god"; it always appears to have a derogatory meaning. For this reason it is found only very rarely in verses ascribed to poets of the time of paganism. The passages as far as few which I have found that I can enumerate them; the verses are by Zâd b. 'Amr b. Nufâl (Ibn al-Kalbî, Kitiât al-ʾAṣârân, p. 22, 24: Ibn Hîthic, Širā, p. 145, 150), Rashîd b. 'Abd Allâh al-Sulâmî (ʾAṣârân, p. 31, 10: Khâdîj, iii. 245, 39), and most instructive of all is the verse of ʿAbî b. al-ʾAbras (Diwan, ed. Lyall, i., verse 6: ʾAṣârân, p. 64, 4): "And they took in exchange for their god Yaḥûb an idol". In the poetry after Islam the word is used by al-Kâtûmî (Diwan, ed. Barth, 23, verse 25) and Ibn Kâis al-Ruṣâîyît (ed. Rhodokanakis, 61, verse 27) in the ordinary meaning of "idol, Güzîte". The numerous names of Arabic idols with all that can be traced about them in ancient Arabic literature are found in the works named in the bibliography. In the Kurân are named as idols of the post Wâd, Suwâ', Vâghûh, Yaʾât and Nasr. The chief idols still worshipped in the Hadjîqat at the time of the Prophet were al-Uzâz, al-Lât, Manît, which were female godheads, and Huhal, who seems to have been the chief male idol; his statue was of red granite.

The enumeration of the names of the idols does not really belong to this article as the proper name for them is probably covered by the word Naṣîb. As deities the various idols had special attendants (Solâd, plur. Sa'dâm), whose office was in most cases hereditary and who accepted sacrifices brought to the worshippers, and who smeared the idol with the blood of the victims. The worship was not continuous, but appears to have been once or twice a year at the beginning of autumn and spring. Then the worshippers in their circumambulation would touch or kiss the idol, the object being to derive from the godhead some of its latent powers. These festivals of worship were the cause of the peculiar Semitic custom of pilgrimages to venerated deities. Though the gods had their special places and were particular to certain tribes, other tribes would come to them from great distances during the so-called Holy Months when warfare was suspended. In this way long before Islam the various Arab tribes maintained continual communications. Growing Islam was from the very beginning intent upon the destruction of all traces of pagan idolatry and was so successful that the antiquarians of the second and third century of the Hijrâ could glean only very scanty details. Some of the idols were made use of for other purposes, as for example, the idol Dhu 'l-Khâlaqa, a white piece of marble on which a kind of crown was carved and which was worshipped at Tabâla, a place on the road from Mekka to Yaman, was in the time of Ibn al-Kalbî (about 200 A. H.) used as a stepping-stone under the door of the mosque at Tabâla. Other stones which had been worshipped as idols were actually used as
SANAM — SANDJAK

corner-stones of the Ka'bah and as such we must consider also the Ma'ṣūm ʿIbrāhīm.

246; Wellhausen, Rote arabischen Heidentumus?, Berlin 1897; Nöldeke-Schwaity, Geschichte der Qurān; Marquardt und de Groot in Festschr.

(F. Keenow)

SANĀR (P., a corruption of ad ʿainā), the name given in the reign of Fāṭḥ ʿAlī Shāh of Persia (1212–1250 = 1797–1834) to a silver coin, the half abādšt or māḥūd; it weighed 36 grains (2.34 grams). With its multiplicity it was abolished at Fāṭḥ ʿAlī's reform of the currency in the thirteenth year of his reign.

(J. Allan)

SANDĀBIL, said to be the capital of China.
The name and description of the town in Yākūt (Muʿājam, ii. 451, 3) and Zakariyā al-Kawthī (ʿAḏābī al-Maḥālibī, ii. 30 sqq.) are taken from the undoubtedly fraudulent story of his travels by Abī Dulaf Muʿāṣar b. Mahdīḥ (see the art. Muṣār), who claims to have accompanied an embassy of the Chinese king Kāhīn b. al-Shakhtī to the Sāmānīd Ṣaʿr b. Ahmad († 331 = 943) from Khūzáān back to China. J. Marquardt (Ostasiatisch und ostasiatische Streifzüge, Leipzig 1903, p. 84 sqq., esp. p. 85) endeavours to show that Samābīl and Kan-tou (cf. the art. Sānūs) are identical and that we have to see in the sender of the embassy "not a prince of one of the short-lived dynasties after the fall of the T'ang dynasty but the Khagan of the Ugurs of Kan-tou". This Khagan is said "to have felt threatened by the steadily increasing power of the Kitan", and to have sought support and an alliance from the powerful Sāmānīd. On the question of the origin of the name Sandābīl for Kan-tou, Marquardt only gives the suggestion made to him by de Goeje that Abī Dulaf confused Kan-tou with Čing-tafo (in Marco Polo Sindufa), well known as the capital of the province of Sz'ewan, where a separate dynasty actually did rule at that time. According to Marquardt, "the latter town must be considered to have been the starting point of the return journey", which is obviously impossible as the return journey is described as being made by sea. So long as Abī Dulaf's story is not confirmed from any other source, the question will remain unsettled as to whether his story of his journey and the alleged reason for it is historical or not.

Nowhere is there the slightest mention of embassies from China to Khūzáān or vice versa nor of the matrimonial alliance said to have been arranged (Yākūt, ii. 45, 3).

(W. Bartold)

ȘANDAL, Sandalwood. According to al-Nawārī, numerous varieties are distinguished. The majority, especially the white, yellow and red kinds, are used for the manufacture of fragrant powders on account of their pleasant smell; they are also used in medicine, while other varieties again are used by turners and furniture-makers or for the manufacture of chessem, etc. At the present day, the pterocarpus imported from Southern Asia, the

islands of the Malay Archipelago and Africa is used for fine furniture and the waxes as dye-woods.

Bibliography: O. Warburg, Die Pterocarpaceen, i. 320; Abuʾn ʿAbd al-Muḥammad, ed. Scheg-
ErL. 1916, p. 38 (al-Nawārī). (J. Roska)

SANDJAK (t., f.) flag, standard, banner (Arabic šāfā), especially of a large size (more important than the muṣār, Ar. ṣāra or ʿāṣām) and suitable for fixing in the ground or hoisted permanently on a mast or a ship; 3) (nautical term) ensign; pennant (tabīrī sandjāf), starboard; 3) formerly a military title or ḥāfī of a certain extent in the Ottoman empire; 4) a Turkish administrative and territorial division; 5) (in the expression sandjāf tīrib-i ʿāṣām-i, p. 88, sq.) a synonym of sandjāf tīrib-i (on this plant see Barbier de Meynard, ii. 101, who gives it as a Persian word also)

As al-Kalawsbantāndi pointed out in the 19th century (Ṣabh al-ʿalā, v. 458), sandjāf comes from the verb sandμaḥ (not sandμaṭ, as in the author already quoted) which means *to sting, prick, plant, stick a weapon or pointed object in the body of an enemy or in the ground (cf. Sāmūṭ, Kamārī, Ṭurkī). The form sandμāḥ found in Cagūt (Boudagov) and even in an old Siberian loanword (Miklosich, Die türkischen Elemente in den südost-
asiatischen Sprachen, Vienna 1884, ii. 50) corresponds to the verb sand of the Orkhon inscriptions (v. Thomsen, p. 42; Radloff, p. 137). Cf. also F. W. K. M ü ller, Uglurc, ii. 78, 80 and 86, sq. InKirghiz the form used is zhandμāḥ (Radloff, Wörter-
buch, iv. 949) and in Uirinkhaj zandμāḥ and sandμaṭ (Katanov, Oeuvres akhmatiques, p. 429 and 779, with the meaning "to prick, stab, erect, fix")

Sandjāf al-Kāhīfī (12th cent.), Dīnārī, al-Turk, ii. 171, 180, 182 and 184 also gives (iii.108) sandμāḥ equivalent to sandμāf (sandμāf) already quoted, which is a Turkish particle used as the name of a prickly plant.

The word sandμāḥ belongs to a family of derivatives which all contain the idea of "point" and mean (the word itself sometimes): harpoon, fork, piercing pin, colic. Such are: sandμāf, sandμāfī, sandμāfī, sandμāfī (Bobolot), sandμāfī (Kirgiz), sandμāfī, sandμāfī (whence sandμaṭ in Ojumanlī). We may add on the authority of Abu 'l-Fidā' and the Turk-Arab glossary published by Houtsma, Leiden 1894, p. 80 and p. 29 of the Arabic text, the proper name Sandjī, glossed waʃ̄an, in preference to the usually accepted ety-

mology from Sandjār, the name of his place of birth (cf. Recueil des Histoires des Croisades, i. 1872; cf. Index under Sandjār).

Sandjī has passed into a certain number of other languages; more recently into the Balkan languages (cf. the work by Miklosich quoted above and Sainanu, Influența Orientală) and earlier into Arabic (cf. Dozy, Suppl.; cf. also W. Marquart, Le dialecte arabe de Timoc, Paris 1902, p. 270, 90, 92) and into Persian where, according to the Burūk-i ʿāṣām, it means or meant a "flag, a large metal pin intended to keep on the head a kind of hood worn by women"; *a kind of girdle*. In Modern Persian sandμāf (sic) simply means "pin" (in opposition to *needles") (cf. Nicolas,
Dictionnaire françois-persan, under the word "pin".
Freyaat took sandiability for a Persian word and the Turks still keep the orthography which it has in Persian (سندیاک) while they write the verb sandiability with a "w." We may note that in Persian direfāh "flag" also means "point" (cf. Vullers), whence the Othmanli word dierfāy (cf. Hind-oghlu s.v. "pointics" and "pointics"). The Turkish word "sandiability" gives us a variant of sandiability in the form sandiability. If it is not a corruption due to the Persians, we have here another example of a Turkish word preserved through its use in Persian. The word sandiability is very well explaining with the help of the Turkish suffix -sīf (ب) which makes a passive participle from transitive verbs. Sandiability then would mean "sharpened, fixed." The suffix sīf, with its tendency to designate place-names (which very well fits a flag "fixed" or able to be fixed) seems to have been more in use very early.

The etymological details which are given above without excluding the explanation of sandiability by "a pin" or "a peg of a person" (it is that of al-Ka'ashibandi who uses the word, which make very probable the explanation as "flag with a tail of the foot". Independently of this peculiarity it is difficult to say what was the exact form of the primitive Turkish sandiability; did they have a horse's tail (or the tail of a yak of which von Hammer speaks in his definition, Hist. de l'Empire Ottoman, xlvii. 257) or were they always flags? Were they line the safik (or, shall be mentioned by Ibn al-Ka'ashibandi for the references see Dovray, Supplement, under the word şalıf; it has become safik by an error in Djewdet Pasha and Ahmed Râsîm, quoted below in the Bibliography). The meaning of these terms may be more indefinite than we think and varied a great deal with time and place. The word sīf (سيف) which it was allowed to take in the meaning "horse's tail", meant, according to al-Ka'ashibandi, not only a flag of silk or orange brocade but also "drum", another symbol of sovereignty (l. 169; iii. 92). Ibn al-Ka'ashibandi confuses the flag with the "pasa" of the prince or dâir, better latr (Persian) pronounced sîf (al-Ka'ashibandi, s. 340) then latr "tent", by the Turks who have preferred these words to their old levîl "silk parasol of the Turkısh Khaghan" (al-Ka'ashibandi, li. 149, 17 and ili. 45, 15; cf. the Othmanli levaş "a place in the sun" and a passage in Rabihuni in Radloff, Winterbuch, iv. 59 under ilave). Whatever its primitive form was, the sandiability appears among the Seljuks as an insignium of royalty. In the Turkish text of Ibn al-Bith (ed. Houtoum, Revue, vol. ii. 152) the word sandiability is always found in connection with the title Sultan (Sultanlı sandiability). This standard is mentioned (p. 135-136, 144, 169, 170, 269 and 357) a propos of different sieges of strong places on the walls of which it was placed after capitulation. Sometimes (p. 135-136) it is the besieged themselves who, ready to surrender and no doubt seeing in this banner a guarantee of protection against pillaging, asked for a sandiability to be sent. It is not, however, necessary that the Sultan himself should be present and the historian (p. 357) shows us the beylerbeyi setting out on an expedition with the standard of the sovereign.

For a long time the neighbouring princes and vassals of the Seljuks respected their privilege but the Alibeg of Mogul, Saf al-Din al-Chah, son of 'Imad al-Din al-Zangi (d. Nov., 1149), was the first of the atšah al-qârî to have a sandiability carried unfurled over his head (Ibn al-Athir, Hist. des Abbeleb de Mesqoul, Revue des hist. or. des Croisades, vol. ii., part 2, p. 167).

The Aybílids followed the example of their predecessors.

In 1198 the Sultan of Egypt, al-Malik al-Ahmar, conferred on his nephew al-Malik al-Mu'âazzam 'Isâ when he became prince of Damascus "the sandiability and the levûl" to display throughout the world" (Kâsâb al-Ka'ashibati, Rev. des Hist. des Croisades, v. 177). In 1250 Alâak the Tarkanman, returned to an Aybirid princess and proclaimed Sultan of Egypt, took part in a procession in which the royal banners were unfurled for him (al-sandiability al-tifânat; cf. Abu l-Fida, Annales, ed. Reiske, iv. 510 of the Arabic text and 515 of the Latin translation). Among the Mamlûks, a distinction was made between the sandiability of "royal witnesses" and the ordinary "alalmûd (Gandufiy-Demouniyens, La Syrie a l'Epoque des Mamelouks, Paris 1923, p. xevii); afterwards, in Turkish Algeria the procession disappeared; cf. Milange, René, Basset, ii. 25 (under the press).

At the end of the Seljuks empire in Asia Minor the sandiability became one of the insignia of investiture of new sovereigns, particularly of the Othmanli Sultan. In 1280 after the capture of the Kâradağ Hisar by 'Othman, Sultan 'Alâ al-Din II to celebrate this conquest sent him by the hands of Ây Timur, 'Othman's nephew, a sandiability "with its accessories" (sandiability yarâgâh), as 'Asîf Pasha Zâde tells us (ed. Constantinople 1332, p. 8 sq.); Negrit prefers another version (cf. Noldeke, Z. D. M. G., 1859, xiii. 207-209). 'Asîf Pasha Zâde mentions in this connection that 'Othman thus became sandiability-beyi and we know that it was from this time that the Kâsâb was read in his name (for the first time at Kâradağ Hisar by Dursun Fakhr). According to the same authority, the sandiability's were made of cloth of Philadelphia or Ala Şehîd (p. 56).

When they became independent in their turn, the Ottoman princes appointed sandiability-bey's in larger and larger numbers and the sandiability, somewhat diminished in splendour, became identified with the territory over which it floated; it appears henceforth as the name of a political division partaking both of the nature of the military fief and of the administrative representative of the central authority. The sandiability generally carried with it a divâtih (for divâtih, "life, livelihood, fief") or, more accurately, a hâtih (a name given to a divâtih of an annual revenue of over 100,000 aspers).

Above were the larger khâjâ's of the beylerbeyi or governors-general of the provinces; below the smaller fiefs, the sîyânet, lewât and hâtih, to give them in their order of importance. Sometimes the Sultanis granted a sandiability to their children (d'Hérelbel, Bibl. Orient., p. 755; this is what was called a sandiability-o Âs-mar, Schilkin, p. 286) or to a beylerbeyi or retired viceroy (for examples see Na'imâ, li. 23, iii. 336 and passim). The sandiability-bey or mir-lewât who had a right to a horse's tail were not in principal the owners of their districts; they had the "possession" or tâparîs of them, and were their muhtarîs. This term used, from the xvith century (Na'imâ, li. 23, 8, 179, 11 and passim) was destined to become a rank in the administrative service (cf. below).

Sometimes the sandiability-bey was only an official
appointed and given an annual salary (ṣulṭān), which meant that his sāngāšt was awarded by ʿahlis. This was the case with all the sāngāṣts of the remote ʿaylāt’s of Asia, like Bagdād, Kāsar, Yemen, Hābesh, Lāhūb, and Egypt, and for three sāngāṣts (maritime) in each of the ʿaylāt’s of the archipelago and of Cyprus (Ḫālīl Ḫalīl, Taḥqīq al-Nīnār, 67). At the beginning of the sixteenth century there were two sāngāṣts divided among 25 ʿaylāt’s. In case of mobilisation, the sāngāṣt-ḵevv became military offices (mīr Ṣulṭān) and presented themselves at the appointed place of assembly (e.g. the plain of Isābān in Rumellia) with the troops collected by their vassals or subjects. The maritime sāngāṣt’s were bound to equip a ship and make war by sea (derya-yu ʿeṭḥem), sometimes at the same time as by land (hāra-yu ʿeṭḥem). The word sāngāšt passed into the sea-faring language of the Turks and Arabs with considerable variations of meaning which can be found in the various dictionaries, notably that of Allā Selyūdī, Recueil Ḳāṭib-ʿĀṭmān, Constantinople 1325, p. 55 (cf. for Arabic Ben ʿEnēb, Mifs ʿeva, p. 48; Brunot, Notes sur le vocab. mar. de Rayat, Paris 1920, p. 80; see also J. Jan–March, 1922, p. 109). By an archaism which has survived in administrative language the word sāngāšt has continued to be used in the sense of “symbol of investiture” for a Ḧeyḥ ʿeṭḥem, for example (Wāṣif, Tāʾrikh, ed. of 1219, i, 81, copy of a firman of 1175 a.H.) without taking account of the general meaning of “flag”.

According to Mouradja d’Ohsson, who does not give his authority, it was Murūd III (1574–1595) who ordered the division of the empire into ʿaylāt’s and Ṣulṭān’s (Tableau général de l’Empire Ottoman, vii. (1824) p. 276–277; cf. von Hammer, Hist. de l’Emp. Ort., vi. 288–289, 40). Neither Fesawi nor Selinchk mention these reforms.

Ṣulṭān Muḥammad II, having just finished the destruction of the Janissaries (1826) suppressed the feudal military organisation, which died a natural death in 1827, the sāngāṣt or Ṣulṭān or muṭṭargarif-šahīd definitely acquired the meaning of an administrative subdivision pure and simple. The muṭṭargarif, governor of the sāngāṣt, was henceforth a civil official, distinct from the mīr Ṣulṭān who now became the modern “general of brigade”.

The division into sāngāṣt’s or Ṣulṭān’s was maintained by the law of the muṭṭagarif’s (the former ʿaylāt’s) of Nov. 8, 1864 (the administration of the sāngāṣts is dealt with in Chapters iv, and v, articles 29–57) and by that of Jan. 21, 1871 (Administration of the sāngāṣts, articles 35–42 and 90).

The government of the Grand National Assembly abolished the sāngāṣt or Ṣulṭān by the fundamental law of Jan. 29, 1921, called tekhbirāt-e Ṣalāt, of which article 10 runs: “The ʿaylāt is divided, in accordance with geographical necessities or economic relations, into muṭṭagarif’s and the muṭṭagarif’s into ʿaylāt’s. The latter are divided into Ṣulṭān’s.” In practice this arrangement was carried out by turning the old sāngāṣt’s into muṭṭagarif’s.


SANDJAK SHARIF (t. "illustrious banner"), the standard of the Prophet preserved in Constantinople. It is 12 feet long, surmounted by a silver case containing a copy of the Qurʾān said to have been written by the Calliph ʿUmān himself. It is covered with another flag attributed to the Caliph ʿUmār and with 40 covers of taffeta, the whole being in a case of green cloth; in the centre of all these covers is a little copy of the Qurʾān attributed to ʿUmār and a silver key of the Kaʾba presented by the Sharif of Mecca to Selim I.

This standard brought from Egypt by Sultan Sültān in 923 (1517) was at first deposited in Damascus to accompany the caravan to Mecca; then, in the reign of Sultan Murūd III, in 1003 (1594) the Grand Vizier ʿOmar ʿAlī Pasha constructed the new monumental edifice in the army that had been brought from Gallipoli assembled by 1,000 Janissaries of the Syrian garrisons to the camp in Hungary where it made a great sensation among the troops. Taken to the capital it left again next year. Finally in 1005 (1597) Sultan Muḥammad III going to war had this banner carried in front of him, under the care of 300 amirs at the head of whom marched the Nāẓir al-ʿĀṣif and the Molá of Galata.

Since then the banner has never left the Serli except when the Sultan or Grand Vizier commanded an army in person. A tent was reserved for it; it was mounted on a staff of ebony wood ornamented with circles and with silver rings in which the standard was attached. At the end of the campaign it was taken from its fastenings and enclosed in a richly decorated box with many ceremonies, prayers and the burning of incense of aloes and ambergris. It was afterwards placed in a kind of chapel containing other relics of the Prophet such as the Kibrāt ʿAlī Sharīf [t. v.]. Since the xvth century 40 officers from the corps of the Haram-ṣafārī have been on guard over it with the title of Ṣandjaḵ-fār.

On Dhu l-ʿ Ḳaḍa 18, 1182 (March 29, 1769), the Sultan Muṣṭafā III having sent the standard to the Grand Vizier Muḥammad Pasha with great pomp, the ceremony provoked massacres in which there were Christian victims and even Europeans of high rank. The Austrian intermédiaire, M. de Brognard, only escaped with difficulty from the fury of the fanatic. On Dhu l-ʿ Ḳaḍa 9, 1241 (June 15, 1826), the Janissaries having mutinied, Sultan Muḥammad II took the Ṣandjaḵ Sharīf in power and gave it to his defenders who planted it on the pulpit of the mosque of Sultan Almān III. This more contributed remarkably to the success of the reformer Sultan’s enterprise.

SANDJAN RAY (or SULTAN RAY; cf. Rieu, i. 230; ill. 908), author of a general history of India up to the early part of the reign of Awarzeg (q. v.), entitled Khuljaqat al-Tawarridh. Nothing is known of his life except the few facts that he mentions himself and the remarks added by the transcribers of his book. In his preface (lith. ed., p. 6, 27) he tells us that from his youth upwards he had followed “the profession of drafting letters i.e. of a Musahib” under administrative and revenue officials; he was born at Batála in the Pandjáb (p. 71, 28); he had visited Kábul (p. 86), possibly Thatta (p. 60, 9), and the Pindjaur Gardens at the foot of the Himalayas (p. 35, 15). He based his Khuljaqat on a number of Persian historical works, which he enumerates, and having revised it two or three times completed it after two years’ labour, in the 40th year of Awarzeg’s reign, 1107 (1695). But the narrative ends with the events of 1068 (1658). His copyists tell us that he was Sháh Khatri (Bhandari or Dúi), and one states that he was a man of substance, Pushtí and Sánskrit (Rieu, i. 239, where the passage cited is obviously corrupt); there is, however, no other evidence of the author’s knowledge of Sánskrit. The work claims to be only an “abridgment of histories”, but is of special interest as being written by a Hindu; it contains a valuable section on geography, the author being particularly well-informed about the Pandjáb.

Much of the Khuljaqat was incorporated in their own works by the authors of the Siyar al-Mutahharshín (Elliot, viii. 194) and the Akballi-i Mahabbat (ib., viii. 376). The Ardish-i Mahbél by Abdás [q. v.] is an adaptation of it in Urdú.

Bibliography: Khuljaqat al-Tawarridh, ed. M. Zafir Haassan (lithographed, Dihli 1918, with an introduction, notes and index); H. Beveridge, The Khalijat-al-Tawarridh, J. R. A. S., 1894, p. 733–768; 1895, p. 211; Elliot-Dowson, History of India, viii. 5–12; Rieu, Catalogue of the Persian MSS. in the British Museum, i. 230; G. Sarker, India of Avarzegh, p. xi, opp. 1–122, Calcutta 1901.

(MUHMMAD SHAHY)

SANDJAR B. MAULI SHAH NASIR AL-DIN (afterwards MUETZ AL-DIN) ABU ‘L-HAJJI, A SALJUG OF SULTÁN. According to the usual statement, he was born on Radjab 25, 479 (Nov. 5, 1086), on Sámsár, and two years earlier, on Radjab 25, 477 (Nov. 27, 1084). His muhammadan name was Aham; on the name Sandjar, see p. 148. After the assassination of his uncle Awarzeg Argilín [q. v.] in 490 (Dec. 30), 1099 the latter was appointed governor of Khurásán by his brother Barkiyáruq [q. v.]. Some time afterwards, however, the third brother, Muhammed, rebelled against Barkiyáruq; in Radjab, 493 (May–June, 1100), the latter was defeated and had to retire to Khorasan. In the meanwhile Sandjar had taken the side of Muhammad, who was his brother on his mother’s side also and when Barkiyáruq made an alliance with the Amir Dádi, who ruled Tabaristan, Djinján and a part of Khorasan, Sandjar took the field against the combination and inflicted a severe defeat on them. In the events that followed, Sandjar stood loyally by his brother Muhammad. During the war between Barkiyáruq and Muhammad, Badr Khán, lord of Sarmascand, tried to take advantage of the absence of Sandjar to extend his rule over Khorásán, having come to an understanding with one of Sandjar’s amirs named Kundoğlu, but was captured and put to death in 495 (1101/1102), whereupon Sandjar appointed his sister’s son Muhammed Arslán Khán b. Subłamát b. Boghrá Khán as prince of Sarmascand and the province of the Djufián. Sandjar also came into conflict with the Ghaznavis Arslán Shih b. Mas’ud [q. v.]. The latter captured Ghazna (510 = 1117) and installed Bahramgir (see the art. GHANA) as Sultan under Sandjájí suzerainty. After the death of Sultan Muhammad on Dhu l-Hijjáda 24, 511 (April 18, 1118), the sultanate was to go to his son Maḥmúd, in accordance with his testamentary instructions; but neither Muhammad’s brother Mas’úd, lord of al-Mawṣíl and Aḏharbajján, nor Sandjar were satisfied with this arrangement. Maḥmúd was able without much difficulty to come to an arrangement with Mas’úd but it was more difficult to satisfy Sandjár. The latter left Khorásán with a large army and on Dżumá 12, 515 (Aug. 11, 1119), a battle was fought near Siwa. Victory was gained on the side of Maḥmúd, but as his troops were thrown into confusion by Sandjar’s elephants, the battle ended in the complete rout of the former. After long negotiations an agreement was reached by which Maḥmúd was recognised as governor of the ‘Iráq with the exception of al-Ráyi, but Sandjár’s name was to be mentioned first in the Khuljaqat. When Muḥammad Arslán Khán of Samascand became crippled he handed over the government to his son Nasir Khán. The latter was soon afterwards murdered, whereupon his father appealed for assistance to Sandjár. Before the Sultan arrived in Samascand a brother of Nasir Khan’s had succeeded in putting down the rebellion, whereupon Arslán Khán sent to Sandjár and endeavoured to persuade him to go back. But this aroused the anger of Sandjár, who at the same time suspected Arslán Khán of having designs on his life so that he laid siege to Arslán Khán in the fortress in which he had taken refuge. When Arslán Khán was forced to surrender in Ráfi’ 1, 524 (Feb./March, 1130), Sandjár gave him his life but appointed the Amir Hassan (or Hasan) Tegín and on his death soon after Maḥmúd b. Muḥammad Khán b. Subłamát prince of Samascand. In Shawaḏl, 525 (Sept., 1131), Sultan Maḥmúd died. According to his last will, his son Dżúd was to succeed him, but his two uncles, Sālūq and Mas’úd, also set up as claimants.

In Džumá 1, 526 (March/April, 1132), the contesting parties agreed that Mas’úd should be recognised as Sultan and Sālūq as heir apparent, while the administration of the ‘Iráq should be left to the Caliph al-Mustarshíd. But Sandjár was not at all satisfied with this arrangement. On the contrary, he proclaimed Tughrál b. Muḥammad, who was with him in Khorasan, as Maḥmúd’s successor and made an alliance with Imam al-Dúa Zāzioni, who appointed governor of Baghúl and Dubai b. Sadáqa [q. v.], who received the principality of al-Hilla. War was now inevitable. On Radjab 3, 526 (May 25, 1132), Mas’úd was defeated by Sandjár at Dinawar, whereupon the latter retreated to Khorasan. In Džumá ‘l-Ka‘da, 529 (Aug./Sept., 1135), he set out against Ghazna but the latter, without bloodshed, Bahramgir submitted and
was pardoned. Sandjar also became involved in a long struggle with Ataś b. Muhammad [q.v.], lord of Khwārizm. The Kara-Khiši also endeavoured to take the town of Samarkand whereupon Sandjar crossed the Dājān at the head of a large army. On Ṣafar 5, 536 (Sept. 9, 1144), however, he was defeated and had to take to flight, thus losing the whole of Transoxania. On Sandjar's struggle with the Ghurid Hussain see the art. Dschūr, p. 254. In 548 (1153) the Ghur [q.v.] also rose. Sandjar took the field against them but was defeated and taken prisoner and only obtained his release in Ramaǧān, 551 (Oct./Nov., 1156). He died on Rabi‘ I 56, 552 (May 8, 1157). After the death of this clear-sighted and vigorous ruler the Saljuq empire began rapidly to approach its dissolution.


**Sandjar**

*Ibn Khaldûn* tells us that the pronunciation of the word approaches Zanûj; both forms are still known. On the other hand we know that the Sandjarzû have given their name to the Senegal which bordered on their territory. The Sandjarzû are one of the branches or one of the great confederations of the Berber people. According to the theories of the western Muḥammadan genealogists, they are descended by Sandjar from Berne b. Berr like the Kutāna of Little Kabylia and the Mustawfī of the extreme Maghrib. No criterion, linguistic or other, has so far been able to justify this grouping. We do not know what was the kind of life led by the Sandjarzû in ancient times and where they lived. In the course of the middle ages their name frequently appears; they were very numerous; their territory extended all over both Maghrib and the Sahara. Among them were great nomads (some still are to this day, notably the Tuareg of Huggar) and settled tribes, of whom it is not possible to assert that they previously led a nomadic life; such are the Telkûta. The Sandjarzû are contrasted with the other great group, that of Zentû [q.v.] who in the latter part of the middle ages succeeded in supplanting them. The Sandjarzû reached their zenith in the first half of the middle ages or, more exactly in the 11th—12th centuries (11th—13th A.H.). This is the period when those whom Ibn Khaldûn considers Sandjarzû of the first and second race appear in the light of history. We must, of course, use the term race with very great reservations. In any case it should be observed that several times the Sandjarzû of one of the groups, wishing to secure the help of the Sandjarzû of another group, appealed to the sense of solidarity due to common origin.

The first race, that of the Telkûta, in the tenth century occupied that part of the Central Maghrib which now corresponds to the department of Constantine without the Kabylia. The settled tribes and especially the descendants of the Banû Zirî founded or ruled over centres of which the chief was Ashsīr [q.v.] in the south of Algeria. Supporting the policy of the Fāṭimids of Kairawān they fought during the whole of the tenth century against their neighbours in the west, the Zanûj, clients of the Umayyads of Cordova. They moved their action to the east as a result of the departure of the Fāṭimids to Egypt. The family of Zirîds ruled in the name of the Fāṭimids at Kairawān. A split led to the foundation of the kingdom of the Ḥammâdids of al-Kār [q.v.]. Much weakened from the second half of the eleventh century onwards these two kingdoms disappeared in the middle of the twelfth, when the Almohad thrust into eastern Barbay was made. A little group of Sandjarzû bearing the name survived into our times in the south-east of Algeria.

The second race of Sandjarzû is represented by the great nomads who occupied in the 12th—13th centuries the desert between the meridian of Tripoli and the ocean. The more important tribes were the "carriers of Ḥādân", Lamūna and Maṣūna, who played a considerable part in the religious and political history of Barbary and Spain under the name of Almoravids [q.v.]. Al-Ḥarîrī speaks of Sandjarzû as "despoilers of the life in the desert, their food and their tactics. The Tuareg form part of this group.

Certain less powerful groups located in the Sûs and the adjoining valleys of the Moroccan Atlas belonged to the same Sandjarzû stock. These are the Lâmja and Gazātû nomads and the settled Haskûra. The latter joined the Almohad movement.

Finally a third stock of Sandjarzû is said to have lived scattered in the extreme Maghrib around El-Ksar, in the plains of the Shāwîya in the region of Tizi and in the Rif. The Sandjarzû Boṭûjûr and Uryâghol have remained in the last named place to the present day. The name Sandjarzû is still borne by one of the two into which the tribes of Northern Morocco are divided.


**Santa Maria de Algarve**, or St. Mary of the West, in Arabic *Ṣaḥṭunmariyat al-Ghār* (to distinguish it from Santa Maria of the East, in Arabic *Ṣaḥṭunmariyat al-Ghār* or *Ṣaḥṭunmariyat ibn Rūṣin*, the modern Albarraque, a town in the province of Terniel in Spain; cf. above, i. 250 sqq., formerly a Muslim town in the south-western part of al-Andalus of which the Portuguese have preserved the Arabic name Algarve—al-Ghar (cf. above, l. 256)). *Ṣaḥṭunmariyat al-Ghār* is usually identified with Faro, a little Portuguese sea-port to the north-west of Cape St. Marie, on the railway from Lisbon to the frontier station of Villarel de São Antão, 35 miles from the latter. The Arabic ethnic from the name of the town is *Ṣaḥṭunmari* (cf. under this name the article on al-Aṣmāu al-Ṣaḥṭunmarī). In the Muslim period, Santa Maria de Algarve belonged to the province of which Silves (Ar. *Ṣibb*) was the capital. It was a little town of slight importance till the Umayyads Sulaiman al-Mustafin Billah entrusted the government to a...
man of obscure birth, Abū Ummān Sa'd b. Ḥārin, a native of Merida, about 407 (1016). The latter in his new residence set up as an independent prince and reigned till his death in 434 or 435 (1042–1043). His son Muhammad succeeded him and together, Ibn 'Abd al-Malik (of the house of the house of Muhammad), but in 444 (1052) he was deposed by the Al-Abd al-Rahman b. Abd ar-Rahman b. Hanif. The latter in his new residence set up as an independent prince and reigned till his death in 444 (1052) by the ʿAbd al-Rahman b. 'Amr al-Mu'Tadid who annexed the little principality of Santa Maria to the kingdom of Seville. But during the brief period of its independence the two princes who reigned there embellished the town and gave it numerous fine buildings, if we may believe the descriptions by al-Idrisi, Yākūt and al-Karawīnī; it had a cathedral-mosque and other places of worship and a church containing very beautiful columns.

Santa Maria as a city of the ninth century shared the lot of Seville and with the conquest of Algarve by Sancho II in 1249–1253 it passed finally to the Portuguese.


(LEE LIYI-PROVENCAL)

**SANTAREM,** in Arabic Shanturrin (ethnic: Shantarrin), a town in Portugal in the region of the Estremadura, 41 miles N.N.E. of Lisbon, 350 feet above sea-level on the slope of a hill on the right bank of the Tagus. This town, the ancient Scalabrius or Prasidium Iulium of the Romans, takes its name from St. Irene (Santa Irene) who was martyred in 653 and thrown into the river at Thamur 30 miles further up the river; her body stopped before Santarem and the name of the saint became that of the place. All the geographers of Muslim Spain give Santarem as the chief place in the district. According to al-Idrisi, its citadel on the heights was impregnable; the rest of the town stretched along the Tagus.

Conquered at the same time as the south-west of the Peninsula, it occasionally rebelled against the authority of the Umayyad Caliphate and it was for this reason that it was taken by the Khalīf Ahmad b. Aḥaṣṣa by order of al-Nasir in 316 (928).

A few years later, in 327 (938), the town was the scene of the rising of Umayya b. Ḥaṣṣa against the Caliph Abū al-Rahmān III who had just dismissed Umayya's brother Ahmad from the office of visier which he held. The rebel made an alliance with the king of Leon, Ramiro II, but Santarem was taken from him by the Caliph's men. The town at the end of the following century the town and its territory became part of the independent kingdom founded by the Alfasidas (cf. above, i. 175 sqq.) of Badajoz at the same time as Évora and Lisbon.

On the fall of this dynasty in 435 (1092/93), Santarem was taken by Alfonso V of Castile, but recaptured by the Almoravid general Sbī b. Aḥbār b. Tāṣḥīfīn in 504 (1111), along with Badajoz and the district of Algarve. Its capture was announced to the Almoravid sovereign Abū b. ʿUṣuf in a letter from the celebrated secretary to the court, Ibn ʿAbd al-Wadī (of the house of the house of Muhammad), of which has been preserved for us by the historian al-Marrākūshī. Santarem remained in the hands of the Muslims till the fall of the Almoravids and was definitely taken by the first king of Portugal, Afonso Henriques in 542 (1147) with other Portuguese cities: Lizbon, Cintra, Alcacer do Sal and Évora.

In 580 (1184) after a raid made by the Christian garrison of Santarem into Ajarafe and the defeat of a Muslim army sent from Seville to retake the lost territory, the Almohad Sultan Abū Yaḥyā ʿUṣuf b. Abū al-Muʾīn decided to lead a force in person against Portugal and made great preparations with this end in view. Leaving Marrākūshī at the beginning of the year, he went over to Gibralta; Algeciras and Seville, thence he marched to Santarem, there very strongly fortified and defended by a numerous garrison. The siege of the town dragged on and as the Almohad Sultan was wounded, probably from a bolt from a crossbow, and died from his wound on Rabī' II 18, 580 (July 28, 1184), the siege was raised. After that date no further Muslim attempts to retake the town are noted by the historians. Among celebrated Muslims born in Santarem may be mentioned the famous historian Abū ʿl-Ḥasan Ḥasan b. Abū Bāṣūrān in 542 (1147/48), author of a work entitled al-Dhāḥīfīna (on him see F. Pons Boigues, Essai bibliographique sur les historiostres et géographes arábigo-españols, Madrid 1898, p. 208 sqq., N.N., and the poet Abū Muhammad ʿAbd Allāh b. Muhammad b. Sāfa b. al-Rakīr b. al-Shanṭarī, d. at Almeria in 517 (1123–24) (cf. Ibn Khaṭḥikān, Waṣafāt al-Rakīrī, Cairo, p. 311–332).


(LEE LIYI-PROVENCAL)
(1902), while the number of sawiyya's rose from 22 in 1859 to 100 (1884).

Sadi, Muhammad b. 'Ali al-Sanusi left, in addition to instructions regarding inlithion into his orders (q. v., Dictionnaire turc, ii. 77). Sar-dar, illuminated frontispiece mounted on a Persian manuscript. Sar-undāta, a little rag of felt which is placed on the willed carpet at one end of the room (Chodzko, Popular Poetry of Persia, London 1862, p. 99 note). (Cl. Huar.)

SARAH. [See in the text.]

SARA. [See in the text.]

SARACENS, The earliest certain mention of this name is found in the work composed by Dioscorides of Anazarbus about the middle of the first century B.C. entitled 1210 P2 λησταρχoς, i. 67 (i. 60 of Wellman's edition, Leipzig 1839—1914) who describes the resin of Bdellium (κολοπατ) as a product of a "Saracen tree" (κολοπατ των Μαρσαυκων) and adds that it is imported through Petra and is of a quality inferior to Indian bdellium (κολοπατ). In the Breviarium Terrae Sanctae, vii. 252 (p. 252). The most recent editor has, against the evidence of all the manuscripts, not only altered the native name ma'dakon given by Dioscorides, but is vouched for by the Hebrew ma'dalak, into ma'dakon but also Μαρσαυκων into Αραβόσων. In the contemporary Hist. Nat. of Pliny the Elder, vi. § 157, ed. Delefsen, the Saracen are mentioned among the Arab tribes of the interior whose lands bordered on the Nabataeans, along with better known names like Taveni (Tayy) and Tamudaei (Thamud); it is natural to find the Saracen in these. Violemy (middle of the second century A.D.), vi. ch. 17, § 3, mentions the district of Saraken in Arabia Petraea and locates it west of the "Black Mountains" ( μακρα μίνα ἀείνα) which, according to him, stretched from the Gulf of Euson to Judea "besides Egypt" (τάραν τοῖς ἀντικριτ). On the other hand in vi. ch. 7, § 21 he mentions the Saracen as a people in the interior of Arabia Felix; according to him, the Skenites and the (others (= 'Ad; var. 'Aid) inhabit the heights towards the north and south of them the Saracens and the Thamudids (Thamūd). According to Stephanus Byzantinus, s. v., Saraka is a district (χώρα) beyond the Nabataeans; its inhabitants are called (τόματοι); under Tausos i.e. Tayy the same author says that they live south of the Saracens, giving as authority the Arabian histories of Uplianus and Uranios. If Uranios, Stephen's authority, to whom the statement regarding Saraka must also go back, belongs to the period of the last Diadochi, as von Domaszewski (A. R. xxvii. 250 sqq.) endeavours to prove, this would be the oldest reference to the Saracens. In any case, relying on the passages quoted we must seek the original home of the Saracens on the Sinai Peninsula towards the Egyptian frontier and in the vicinity of the Nabataeans, and B. Moritz has recognised their descendants in the little Beduin tribe of Sawirā, who live at the present day along the coast between Pelusium and Ghaissu. These Saracens in the narrower sense may still be referred to in the letter preserved in Eböas and Hitt. Ecl. vi. 42, of the contemporary Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, regarding the Christian persecutions in Egypt in the first year of Trajan Decius (249-251); many Christians took refuge in the "Arabian Mountains", where they were sold
by the Saracen barbarians as slaves. In the different versions of the Christian Αναγνώμενα Μεγάλη (p. 10), which is based on the Moslem genealogies and dates from the third century, in the Liber Generationis Mundi and in the Barbarus Scaligeri (Mon. Heri. Hist., vol. ix. 145, ed. Dindorf), the Saraceni and Tauri are mentioned as people of some importance. In the tractate of Baradanos Ḳaʾfha al-Nāmaṯ al-ʿArafawī (ed. Cureton, p. 16 of the Syriac text = p. 24 of the translation), which was placed in the beginning of the third century, the Tayyē and Sarāqīyay, for which the translation of Eusebius gives Tāvāli and Ṣāqāwāli, are the representatives of the independent nomadic Arab tribes; it seems that about the middle of the third century A.D. the tribe of the Saracen, bilharto little known, came to the front among these smaller tribes, incorporated them and disturbed the Roman frontier. In the ecclesiastical historians of the fourth century, Eusebius and Hieronymus, the Saraceni are identified with the Ishaqisalat of the Bible: they live outside of the province of Arabia in the desert, at Kadesh, in the district of Faran or Midian where Mount Ḥoreb lies, to the east of the Red Sea; they were first of all called Ishaqisalat and later Hagarenes and finally Saraceni (Eusebius in the Onomasticon composed before 336 under Περίος, Καὶ καὶ, Μαλκία and Φαρα); Hieronymus in Eus., Chron., ed. Schoene, ii. 13: Ḥismail, a quo Ishaqisulat gentes, qui postes Hagaretini et ad postremum Saraceni dicit = Chron. Pharm. 94, 135 do., on Jes., xiii. 11, ix. 7, Ed., xxvii.; Porphirios, Panarion Haer., iv. 1, § 7: Ḥismail founds Faran in the desert; from him are descended the tribes of the Hagarenes, also called Ishaqisalat, who are now called Saracen). Henceforth the name Saracen is extended to the other Arab tribes also; the profane historians of the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries (Zosimus, Rufus Festus, the Panegyrici, Julianus, Ammianus Marcellinus, the Scriptores Historiae Augustae, who, according to modern research, wrote at the beginning of the fifth century, the Notitia Dignitatum, Priscus, Malchus, Nonnus, Eunapius, Menander Protitkoi, Procopius) and Socrates and Sozomenos among ecclesiastical historians avoid the Biblical names and prefer to use the term Saraceni and only occasionally *Arabae*, Evagrius exclusively Ṣουρία (cf. Ammianus Marcellinus, xxii. 15, 1: Scenitae Arabes quo Saracenorum nunc appellavimus, and xxii. 6, 15; Scenitae Arabes quo Saracenorum posteritas appellavit, word for wood also in Malchu, Progm. Hist. Grac., 1. 112). The names Saraceni Asamnias (i.e. غسانيد) should be noted in Ammianus and Saraceni Thamudeni in the Not. Dign. Or., Ch. 28. Finally, the Arabs in the north, in Mesopotamia and on the Persian frontier became known as Saraceni (Marcianus Herac., Periplus, Ch. i. § 175; Ezekiel torus mundi et gentium, ch. 20; frequent in Julianus, Ammianus, Procopius, Menander Protitkoi etc.).

After the foundation of the Arabian Empire by the successors of the Prophet, the Byzantines call Saraceni all the Muslim peoples subject to the Caliphate, and this name survived into the late Middle Ages even after the decline of the Caliphate of Baghda, as is shown by the anecdote given by Ibn Battūta (ed. Defrémery and Sanguinetti, ii. 441), who was greeted in Constantinople by the Emperor as *Sarākīya*, that is Muslim*. The Seldjuk and Turks, on the other hand, are called Persians or Haguereens. The name Saracen was transmitted by the Byzantines to Western lands through the Crusades and has been used to the present day as the name of the Arab peoples and the products of Eastern lands, as the dictionaries of the Romance languages show.

In striking contrast to the wide distribution of the name Saracen in the west is the fact that the Arabs themselves do not know the name, either for a small tribe or as a collective name for the North-Arabian tribes. The derivation from saragha to rob* (as early as Joseph Scaliger) or *ṣaḥīḥ* east* (Relandus) or even from *ṣahā* (as Sprenger suggested), are all to be rejected; besides, the spelling *tābī* in the Palestinian Talmud and in the Targum Yerushalmi as well as among the Syriac points to *ṣarāh* as the root, provided that this form is not based on *Ṣāqāwāli*, Saracenus. H. Winckler (Arch. für Orientk., iv. 74—76) thought he had discovered the word *ṣawra* in the meaning *desert-dwellers* in two passages in Sargon’s Annals and derived the name Saracen from this. Hieronymus says in his commentary on Ezekiel: Agaren qui nunc Saraceni appellatur falsi sibi assumposerunt nomen Sarac ut de ingenio et dominia videantur generali; Sozomenos (Hist. Ecc., vii. Ch. 38), Synkellus (ed. Donn, i. 187) and others have repeated this interpretation of the name; it is once more dishied up to the credulous reader as late as the xvith century in a modern version in the Travels of Macarius of Antioch (ed. Balfour, i. 169).

The descriptions given in various late classical authors of the manners and customs of the pre-Islamic Saraceni, e.g. in Ammianus, Sozomenos, Hieronymus (Vita Malchi), Procopius Gazaurus, Frasianos and Procopius of Cæsarea ought to be collected and annotated.


SARAGOSA, a town in Spain, capital of the modern province of this name and formerly capital of the kingdom of Aragon, on the right bank of the Ebro 600 feet above sea-level in the centre of a well watered and flourishing region (la Huerta). The modern Spanish name Zaragoza corresponds to the Latin Caesarea Augusta, a name given in 728 a.d. to the military colony founded by Augustus on the site of the ancient Saldua of the Iberians. The name of the town passed into Arabic in the form Sarakstan (nabat Sarakstan) probably through the Gothic form Cesaragosta. From the time it was taken by the Muslims until it was regained by the Christians, Saragossa was one of the great cities of the Muslim empire of al-Andalus; its geographical situation gained it the title of "Upper March" (al-thawr al-ahšāf) of Arab Spain. In the time of al-Idrisi (middle of the twelfth century) it was densely populated; it was known as the "white city" (al-ahšāf) from the colour of its ramparts built of blocks of tufa. The fruits of its gardens were...
recounted among the best in al-Andalus. The capes of bayrak may have been famous throughout the Muslim world.

Saragossa fell into the hands of the conquering Arabs in 944-712/3 soon after Toledo. Mūṣṭ b. Nuṣair, having been rejoined by Tārīk, left this last town and advanced on Saragossa which he took at the same time as the villages and castles which surrounded it. According to Isidore of Beja, it was sacked and its inhabitants treated with the utmost cruelty. It was already a Muslim metropolis when, under the emirate of Yūsuf b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Flīhrī, al-Ṣumail b. Ḥāṭim [q.v.] was appointed governor in 132 (749). He was soon besieged there by Arab rebels and had to abandon the place to one of them. Throughout the second half of the second century A.H., Saragossa saw successive revolts within its walls, which the historians have recorded for us. This is how it came to be in the hands of the local chief al-Husain b. Yāhiyā al-Kharadžī when the army of Charlemagne besieged it in 778. The Emperor was suddenly summoned away to the banks of the Rhone; he raised the siege and soon afterwards in the pass of Roncevaux, where the Basques had prepared an ambush for him, suffered the fearful disaster the memory of which is immortalised in the Chanson de Roland.

Two years later, in 104 (780), the Umayyad 'Abd al-Raḥmān I marched on Saragossa and captured it. But it was not long before it slipped from the power of the Caliph and in 125 (791) Hūṣīn had again to besiege it and take it again through his general Ubaid Allah b. Ṣuhrān. Again in 151 (797) a rebel declared himself independent there and successive Caliphs had regularly to send expeditions to the Upper March of their empire to suppress rebellions — with more or less success.

At the same time (end of the eighth century) a Saragossa family, the Banū Kātī, attained great power in Aragon. They had adopted Islam; one of its members, Mūṣṭ b. Sūr, son-in-law of the first king of Pamplona, Ibnīgo Aristā, declared for the Caliph Hūṣīn and surrendered Saragossa to him. Later, in the middle of the ninth century, the head of the family, Mūṣṭ II, was governor of Tudela and commanded the armies of 'Abd al-Raḥmān II which raided the frontiers of France. He helped this ruler to drive off the Normans who had landed in Portugal and in 852, the year of accession of the Caliph Muhammad, he had in his power all the Upper March, with Saragossa, Tudela and Huesca. He lived like a monarch, exchanging presents with Christian kings, for example Charles the Bald of France. But he was defeated in 860 by the King of Leon, Ordoño I, and killed two years later by his son-in-law, the governor of Guadalajara. On his death the Banū Kātī cast off the authority of the Caliph of Cordova and the latter, Muhammad, to counteract them allied himself with the Tūqīlībīs.

This Arab family, settled in Aragon since the conquest, had its tribal rights recognised and its chief, 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Tūqīlībī, was officially appointed its head. In 888 on the accession of Sulṭān 'Abd Allāh, the latter learning that a plot was being hatched against him in Saragossa commissioned the son of the Tūqīlībī chief, Mūṣṭ b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān, surnamed al-Ankal (the "one-eyed") to put the governor of the town to death. The latter did so in 890 and became a by no means too dutiful vassal of the Caliph. He finally destroyed the last Banū Kātī, whose chief, Mūṣṭ b. Lope, was killed in 898 below Saragossa. Al-Ankal died in 924. His heir Hūṣīn who succeeded him gave his name to all the family and died in 936. His sons, the Banū Hūṣīn, were well treated by the Caliph 'Abd al-Raḥmān III but one of them, Muhammad, rebelled against him in 934, joined the king of Leon, Ramiro II, and after a pretended submission to the Caliph leagued against him the whole of the north of Spain, including the kingdom of Navarre. 'Abd al-Raḥmān set out to overthrow him; he seized Calatayud and then besieged him in Saragossa; Muhammad b. Hūṣīn capitulated, the Caliph pardoned him and kept him in his governorship. His son Yāhiyā was general of 'Abd al-Raḥmān III and of al-Ḥakam II in Spain and in Africa and governor of Saragossa from 975.

Later, in the reign of the Ḥāḍīb al-Manṣūr b. Abi 'Amir, a Tūqīlībī governor of Saragossa, 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Maṣṭarīṣ b. Muhammad b. Hūṣīn, hatched a plot against him which was discovered and the conspirator executed in 989.

On the fall of the Umayyads a grandson of the preceding, Yāhiyā, became governor of the Upper March and had a son al-Muḥammad, who, after fighting with the Slavs against the Berbers of Spain proclaimed himself king and made an alliance with the Counts of Barcelona and Castile. Under his reign peace reigned in Saragossa. The town became flourishing and populous. The glories of his court were celebrated by poets like Ibn Darīḍī al-Ḵastālī. Al-Muḥammad reigned till 1025.

His son Yāhiyā who succeeded with the title of al-Muṣṭafīr died soon after his accession and was succeeded by his son al-Muḥammad II, Muḥammad al-Dawla (420/1029). The latter was killed ten years later by one of his relatives, the general 'Abd Allāh b. al-Ḥakam, because he refused to recognise the Caliph Hūṣīn II. This 'Abd Allâh tried to seize the authority but rebellion broke out among the people of Saragossa; and the independent governor of Alarida, Abī Ayyūb al-Salāmān b. Muhammad b. Hūṣūd arrived quickly to restore order in the city and seize the throne of the principality.

He took the title of al-Muṣtalīs and was the founder of the kingdom of the Banū Hūṣīn (cf. the article 1070) with Saragossa as capital and ruling the districts of Lérida, Tudela and Calatayud. He died in 438 (1046–1047). Son succeeded father as follows: Al-Muḥammad al-Muṭṭadīr Saif al-Dawla till 474 (1081); Yūsuf al-Muṭṭamīn till 478 (1085); Al-Muḥammad al-Muṣtalīs II killed in 503 (1107) at the battle of Valletiua won by the Christians. His son 'Abd al-Malik 'Ismāl al-Dawla reigned in his turn till the final capture of Saragossa by the Christians of Sobrarbe on Ramadān 4, 512 (Dec. 19, 1118); he took refuge in Rueda. Unfortunately we have very little detailed information regarding the reigns of these princes and the dates given for them by the historians are not always in agreement. Nine years before it fell into the hands of the Christians, Saragossa had been taken by the Almoravides for Sultan 'All b. Yūsuf on Dhu l-Ka‘da 1, 503 (May 31, 1110).

At the present day very little survives of the Muslim period in Saragossa, which must undoubtedly have been several times rebuilt in the course of those centuries as a result of the strenuous and heroic sieges it had to endure. The "Seo", or
cathedral is built on the site of the former Great Mosque and there can still be seen on the north-eastern façade an ornamentation of bricks and squares of enamelled faience (azulejos) which probably dates from the Arab epoch. According to a tradition recorded by certain chroniclers and geographers, this mosque-cathedral was founded by the 83rd [q.v.] Hasāṣ b. 'Abd Allāh al-Ṣanʿānī who died in 1000 (718/719); he was buried with one of his companions opposite the mihrāb. The mosque was enlarged in 1243 (856), in the reign of the Umayyad Caliph Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Rahmān b. al-Ḥakam.

At the present day the most important Arab monument in Saragossa is the palace which bears the name of Aljafería (no doubt the Arabic al-Dja'farŷa, from a Dja'far or Ibn Dja'far, whose memory does not seem to have been preserved outside of popular tradition). This palace which has undergone many and far-reaching alterations and was partly destroyed in 1809 is now used as a barracks; it lies as the western end of the town. Of the part dating from the Muslim period there only remains a little oratory 25 yards square with a very pretty dome 45 feet high. It was supported by marble pillars with remarkable capitals, to judge from those that still exist. The mihrāb is adorned with a decoration in carved stucco, on a blue ground. Close to the oratory a little tower 80 feet high (called the "troubador's cell") is most probably of the same date. It is probable that the Muhammadan ruins of Aljafería from the dynasty of the Banū Hilūd whose palaces were numerous in Saragossa (we only know the name of one of them, Dār al-Ṣurūr ["house of joy"]; built by al-Muqtadir b. Hilūd). The Aljafería deserves to be subject of a monograph, for it is a memorial of a period of transition from the beautiful age of the Caliphate of Cordova to the century of the Alumbars.

Among famous Muslims born in Saragossa may be mentioned the great traditionalist 'Abd Allāh Husāin b. Muhammad b. Fierro b. Haiyūn al-Sadafā, known as Ibn Sukkara, born in 452 (1060) and died a "martyr" at the battle of Cutanda in 514 (1120). It was to his pupils that Ibn al-Ḥabār in the following century devoted an encyclopaedia (maqāla) published by F. Codera in vol. iv. of his Bibliotheca Arabico-Hispánica (cf. the references in the J. A., 1923, ccc. 225 and note 1).


SARĀI, capital of the Golden Horde; cf. the articles Kieñak and Mongolls. The name is in Persian Sarāi = palace; nevertheless it is frequently written sarâi in Arabic works. On its foundation by Biał and the name Sarâl Berke see above, i. 685 and 7098. The geographers and historians speak only of one town of this name but on the coins we find a New Sarâl (Sarāl al-Qâlid) mentioned: the earliest coin struck in New-Sarâl is dated 710 A.H. The only historical reference to New-Sarâl so far known is the mention of the death of the Khān ʻOrbeq (the date given is 742 A.H.); in New-Sarâl in Shams al-Din al-Shajā'al-Misqir and quoting him in Ibn Khall Khushba (text in Tienhausen, Sewnik materialow, Sarâl, Sarâl al-Qâlid al-Qurâb, p. 254 and 445). Two ruined sites on the Ablutak, which branches off from the Volga, are regarded as the ruins of Sarâl, now called Tarzew and Sethtennoye or Sethtennury Gorodok. Which of the two was the capital of the Golden Horde and when, whether there were one or two Sarâls (that is whether New-Sarâl was a new part of the town or a town built on another site) are questions often disputed since the xvith century by scholars and not yet decided even now. The sources are obscure and contradictory on many points; thus the distance given by Abu ʻl-Fida (and many others) between the mouth of the Volga and Sarâl (2 days travel) suits Sethtennoye; on the other hand Abu ʻl-Fida says in the same passage (ed. Refaï, p. 217) that the town is built in a plain (fi mustawa’ min al-araf) which is only true of Tarzew (Sethtnennoye is built on hills). The same information is found in Ibn Battītā (ed. Defrémery and Sanguinetti, iv. 477; fi busīt min al-araf); the description by Sethtennoye al-Din al-Umarī, according to which there was a pond in the middle of the town, also fits Tarzew (text by Tiesenhausen, p. 220). The excavations conducted for a series of years (1843-1851) by A. Tereščenko in and around Tarzew show there are certainly the remains of a large town there. It is on the results of these excavations that the view first expressed by Grigorjew as long ago as 1845 is based that the ruins of Sarâl can only be
at Tzaraw; and at most at Seltrennoye we have the town built by Ilia and later supplanted by the Sarai of Berke. Under the influence of Grigor'yev's pamphlet Soloyev in his History of Russia (edition of the Society "Olbch. Pol'tsa"); i. 541 located Sarai at Tzaraw and not at Seltrennoye, as糟糕- wonderful, vol. iv. note 74; German edition, Riga 1823, iv., note 55, p. 263) had done. The ruins at Seltrennoye have so far been only superficially examined; they occupy almost as large an area as the ruins of Tzaraw (both sites are 3 miles long, the ruins of Tzaraw 2½ miles broad and at Seltrennoye 2 miles broad) but the finds made there are much less important. The view expressed by G. Sabulakov in 1844 (Oerk vnutrennego surovnaya Kiplakskyh taurts) repr. by N. Katsanov, Kanaz 1895, p. 28) that Seltrennoye is Old-Sarai and Tzaraw New-Sarai was revived by D. Koboeko (Zap., iv. 267-277) and more recently by T. Balod (Starly Novy Sotai, stolitsa Sotai Ord.), Kanaz 1923). On the other hand A. Spitsyn (Zap., xi. 287-290) locates Old-Sarai at Tzaraw and New-Sarai at Seltrennoye. According to the narrative of a merchant given in Abu l-Faraj, p. 36, there was a village called Eskii Yurt ("Old Settlement") on the Akhtuba below Sarai; this may very well refer to Seltrennoye. The Sarai in the town show that Seltrennoye was perhaps inhabited before Tzaraw and certainly continued to be inhabited much later.

Sarai was destroyed in 1395 by Timur; the skeletons found by Terehchenko without heads, hands or feet etc. must be regarded as dating from this destruction. Perhaps the settlement at Seltrennoye again became of more importance as a result. In 1472, Sarai was ravaged by Russian freebooters from Niatka and is said to have been destroyed in 1480 by a Russian force in combination with a Tatar force from the Crimea. About 1554 at the time of the conquest of Astrakhan by the Russians (cf. above, i. 493b) the towns at Tzaraw and Seltrennoye were both already in ruins.


SARAJEVO. [See SERAJEVO.]

SARAKHS, an old town between Maghasd and Mary, where the frontier between modern Persia and Russia turns from E. to S., on the lower course of the Haridud, which is at this part filled with water for part of the year only and then disappears in the oasis of Tadjik north of Sarakhs. Between the town and Mary lies a part of the desert of Korkum [q. v.] which belongs to the area of the Teke-Turkmans. The Arab-Persian geographers ascribe the foundation of the town to Kau-Kawus, Afrasiyib or Dhu-l-Karmain. The soil is considered good but, as a result of the drought, is devoted to pasture only and there are few settlements in the neighbourhood. Camel-rearing was the principal industry of the inhabitants and the weaving of wools, ribbons etc. was for a long time prosperous. The town consists of houses of mud or brick without any important public buildings. It was the birth-place of al-Farq al-Sahl, the famous vizier of the Caliph al-Ma'mun, who is said not to have adopted Islam until 805/806 A.D. and was one of the most influential representatives of the Persian genius. He was murdered in his bath in Sarakhs in 818/819 A.D.; his brother al-Hasan died there in 830/831. The physician and mathematician Abaq b. al-Tayyib, a pupil of al-Khwarizmi, later the confidant of the Caliph al-Mu'tadid, was also born in Sarakhs.

Bibliography: Ibn Hawqal, Kitab al-Mas'ulik wa-l-Ma'mulik, B. G.A. i. 323; al-Mu'adddas, B. G.A. ii. 312; Yahjui, Ma'mun, ed. Wuestenfeld, ii. 71; B. de Meynard, Dictionnaire de la Perse, p. 307; C. Ritter, Asien, vii. 277; Le Strange, The Lands of Eastern Caliphate, p. 396; A. Burnes, Travels into Bokhara, ii. 50-53; Ibn Khalikhan, transl. de Slane, i. 408, ii. 472. (J. Ruska)

AL-SARAKHSI, Shams al-A'Imma Abi Bakr Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Ali Sahl, the most important 'Ulama' lawyer of the fifth century in Mawar al-Nabir. Little is known of his life. Probably born in Sarakhs, he studied at A'ziz al-Halwasin († 444) in Bukhara. He then came to the court of the Karghans in Uzbdjan. There he was thrown into prison by the Khakhun Husain, probably because he alone of all the 'Ulama' stigmatized as illegal the conduct of the ruler when he married his unmmanulated umma waalad's without observing the 'idda. Here he languished for over ten years and dictated to his pupils, who sat before his prison, his most important works, al-Mas'ulik (14 vols.), the Majal al-fikhl (2 vols.) and the Sharh al-Siyar al-Kabir (in 4 vols., printed at Haidarabad in 1333-1336), entirely from memory without using a book. Parts of the Mas'ulik are dated from the prison in the years 466 (1073) and 477 (1084). When he had reached the fourth part of the Siyar he was released. He completed this work at the court of the Amir Hasan in Marghun in Djamshid I of the year 480 (Aug., 1087) and died in 483 (1090). His pupils were: Barhun al-A'imma 'Abd al-'Aziz b. Umar b. Masa, the father of al-Sadr al-Shahid († 536 = 1141), 'Alamuddin b. 'Abd al-'Azir al-Usjandji, the grandfather of 'Alamuddin († 592 = 1190), 'Ummun b. 'Ali al-Balkandi († 552 = 1157), etc. His Kitab al-Mas'ulik (vols. 1-30, Cairo 1324-1331) is one of the most comprehensive of the earlier 'Ulama' books. It is remarkable for the way in which the author works out general legal principles. Besides the works already mentioned he wrote commentaries on the Mehatulm of al-Tahawi († 521 = 933); the Khilaf al-Hiyal of al-Kasrift (vol. 30), the Kifat al-Kas'af of al-Shahibini (printed in the Mehatulm, vol. 30) and on numerous other works of al-Shahibini. His books are still very common in the east; his Siyar, for example, is in almost every library.

Bibliography: al-Kuraishi, Berlin MS., Pet. i. 619, fol. 190v; Ibn Khulnabuga, ed. Pflegel, NO. 157; al-Kassaw, Berlin MS., Sprenger 301, f. 165v-165v; (synopsis in Muhammad 'Abd al-Halii al-Laknawi, al-Fawaid al-asbhtiya, Kanaz 1903, Ns. 326); Heffening, Das Islam. Fremdenbuch, Hanover 1925, Suppl. i., NO. 20/31; Goeze, W., G. A. L., i. 172 and 373. (Heffening)
SARAT, the mountains which run along the western side of the Arabian plateau. Al-Hamdani, the greatest authority on the Arabian peninsula among the Arab geographers, says that two-thirds of the area, which divides the highlands (Najd) from the plain (Ghawr, Tha’ama) and was therefore also called Hijaz by the Arabs, are the extreme south of the Yaman and Syria; al-Ash’ami makes it stretch to the Armenian mountains. This mountain chain, which al-Hamdani already knew not to be a single range, but a succession of hills immediately adjoining one another, is, according to the old records, four days journey in breadth on an average, varying by a day or part of a day here and there. In his description, al-Hamdani distinguishes the main ridge (Jabal), then the lofty part, not belonging to the main ridge itself (al’is al-Sarat) and the western spurs (ash’al al-Sarat). The average height of this great range, which the Arabs regarded as a great gift of God to be a backbone for the earth, according to a story recorded by Sa’d ib. b. Smarti, is 8,500 feet. In the north-west the greatest elevation is the Daiab al-Dibhi (7,200 feet), in the south-west there is a series of peaks which reach 10,000 feet, and, as in the case of the Daiab Nabi Sjuab, occasionally snow-covered in winter (10,800 feet), the highest peak in the Sarat forming part of the huge Masikna massif, even surpass it. The whole range consists of sedimentary rocks with a substratum of granite and gneiss and numerous volcanic cones between which often stretch wide plains strewn with black lava, which are called barras in the northern part of the Arabian peninsula and fahnd in South Arabia. To the west the range falls sharply down to the Tha’ama, which is a plain sloping from a height of 2,500 feet to sea-level, out of which rise recent volcanic upheavals in the form of peaks. On the east the hills slope gently down to the Persian Gulf. The Sarat as a whole does not show any marked uniformity of direction but is cut up into large and smaller ranges which intersect in all directions. It is in general treeless and uninviting in appearance with black rocky ravines, ridges, peaks and penneaux, round and sharp or jagged, showing all possible forms but always bare. There are mountain villages away high up on almost inaccessible heights which consist of stone houses of two to five stories, sometimes square and sometimes round, and form self-contained often quaint citadels, surrounded by yawning guls on all sides. Breakneck paths and bridle paths often hardly traceable on the sides lead up to the narrow gates which open into the villages; these are well cultivated fields on the slopes and in the valleys, laboriously erected terraces along the slope sink like steps down the valley. The valuable soil is kept in place by a wall built of large stones, rarely bound with mud and always without lime, and protected from being swept away. The rainwater is fully utilised for these plots and runs from the upper terraces to the lower ones. On these fields, which are protected from the great heat of the sun by shade-giving trees, the best coffee in the world is grown, and grapes and sugar-cane also flourish here. The lower chain of the Sarat is interrupted occasionally by broad plains. For example, the plain of San’ah runs 15 miles to the south and about 7 miles to the north; the southern tongue of this plain runs after a short interruption through the Nakit al-Yaslah into the broad plain of Dhahat, the most fertile part of the Yaman and the richest in water.

The Sarat owes its origin to those great volcanic convulsions which caused the young tertiary Erythrean subsidences, and created the great fault on which the Arabian desert sank with its hitherto undisturbed horizontal deposits. Weathering, wind-erosion, and erosion by running water then tried their strength on the steep western slope of the tableland which was transformed into a mountain system of erosion or highlands, which can be divided into an inner and an outer system of valleys which on the western slopes run from east and north-east to west, on the south side run consistently from north to south and south-east and cut the highlands into separate tongue-like peninsulas which are again cut up by smaller valleys, the origin of which probably is also as old as the pluvial period. These side valleys have transformed the Sarat peninsulas into hills of erosion or chains of hills, which has contributed to the varied forms of the hills, which in part owe their existence to volcanic forces also, like the cracks which often occur.

In summer the western slope of the Sarat shows very slight variations of temperature; the heat is tropical and rises from 88° F. in June to 99° F. in August; in the winter it reaches a more endurable maximum of 77° F. At night, however, the temperature sinks to 36°—27° F., and in the high mountains in the winter to 23° F. so that the mountain tops are frequently covered with snow. From the middle of June to the end of September is the rainy period. The spring rains fall in April; thunderstorms are not uncommon in the main rainy season and in the winter months water infiltrates into the higher slopes, especially with a strong east wind; everywhere the thermometer is several degrees above freezing-point. A further peculiarity of the climate of the Sarat are the Tha’ama fog which come in summer down to the bottom of the valleys, which the Arabs call awasa or sahadiit, and only disappear after the temperature has reached its maximum so that they bring their own mitigation with them, which is exceedingly beneficial to vegetation. The climate of the eastern slopes of the Sarat is extremely dry in contrast to the very moist climate of the western Sarat. In San’ah the relative humidity sinks to 20%. Here also the rainy season falls into two parts (March, and July—September). Throughout the whole year it is possible to sow and reap, which is true not only of cereals but also of vegetables and fruit, which are ready at every season in some one of the numerous sorts. The vine, for example, flourishes all over the mountains of Arabia, although only in the river-foothills. The eastern slopes of the Sarat has an almost European character with respect to agriculture although the good soil is limited to the artificial terraces, which are also artificially irrigated. The valleys which have a perennial water-supply show that incredible wealth in fruit and cereals which was described so enthusiastically by al-Hamdani. The occurrence of tamarisks, scacias and mimosa is characteristic of the desert-like eastern slopes of the Sarat, but in addition to the ‘yubbe tree we also find date-palms, numerous varieties of fruit-trees and the cotton plant as well as a great variety of medicinal and garden plants, among which the aromatic are especially important on the classic soil of Arabia Felix. The celebrated frankincense
tree now only yields resin in a few parts of the Yaman; on the other hand cactus-like euphorbias, balsam trees, ‘Aden shrub, Döns palma, tamarinds, râk and a variety of resin- and gum-yielding trees, acanthus and sweet scented plants and shrubs are widely disseminated. Besides the most valuable cultivated shrub in Arabia, the coffee-plant already mentioned, the vine, the date-palm and countless varieties of fruit, there also grow in the Sarat region rye, wheat, oats, barley, maize, sugar-cane, tobacco, ṣâr [q.v.], potatoes, cabbage, beans and figs. But these fruits of the earth do not drop into the countryman’s lap; on the contrary, they are often won from the soil only after a hard fight. The endless year of labour have made this remarkable district, which has landscapes rivalling the Alps in splendour, what it is to-day economically.


(Adolphe GROHMANN)

**AL-SARATÂN (the crab), Cancer, in astronomy for the name of the most northerly constellation in the ecliptic which lies under the summer solstice. The siyâs al-saratân (Greek: Kapiος, Latin: Cancer) with the Arabs (exactly according to the Almagest of Ptolemy) consists of nine stars with an additional four outside the actual outline of the crab. Even the brightest stars in the constellation are only of the fourth magnitude; four of them form a smooth upright curve, the two outer being on the pincers (al-sâhâni al-dajâni) and the al-sâhâni al-ṣâhid), while the two central ones, forming the eye of the crab, are called the little eyes (al-himârin, aswil, assil). Between them is a group of stars, the Beehive (al-mu’dâf, muweṣṣet), looking like a little cloud to the naked eye but showing about 40 stars when seen through a telescope: In the centre of an opposite curve on the hind-legs of the crab is the celebrated and much studied multiple star ε Canceri.

With the entry of the sun into the head of Cancer it reaches its greatest (northern) declination which is equal to the obliquity of the ecliptic E (Arabic: al-ma‘l al-ṣâhid). But this figure (now = 23° 27') is not a constant magnitude; it alters with time within moderate limits. Astronomical calculations have shown that it can be found from the formula

\[
E = 23° 27' 8.26 - 46°.845 T - 0°.0089 T^2 + 0°.00181 T^3
\]

where T is reckoned in units of 100 tropic years and from the initial year 1900.0. Thus, for example, for the year 1000 A.D. E = 23° 34' 8.07 (cf. S. Newcomb, Elements of the Four Inner Planets and the fundamental Constants of Astronomy, Washington 1895, p. 190). This variation in E, which from a present diminution will again pass into an increase, was well known to the Arab astronomers. The Fāṭimid astronomer Ibn Yūnus (+ Cairo 1009) has given us in his book Zijd al-balâb al-Ḥakîm (MS. Leiden 1537, Chap. xi, f. 222) a historical account of the measurements of the obliquity of the ecliptic by the Arabs, from which the following is taken. According to Ptolemy, Eratosthenes and Hiparchus had estimated the obliquity of the ecliptic at 44° of the circumference = 23° 51' 20", and I do not know of any observation for the greatest declination between the authors of the tested tables (ṣâhil al-muntahân) except this one which was made in the year 16. of the Hijra (i.e. after 776 a.n.) and its observer mentions that the greatest declination is 23° 31". Al-Ma‘mûn's astronomers from their observations at al-Šammasiyâ (a quarter and gate in Baghda’d) found that E = 23° 33' and the same figure is given by Muḥ. b. Mūṣâ al-Khwârizmi in his Zijd and Muḥ. b. Kāthîr al-Fârghânî in his book "On the Use of the Astrolobe". The astronomers Khalîl b. ʿAbd al-Mallik al-Marwârî, Abû ʿl-Sanad b. Taiyib ʿAli and ʿAli b. ʿl-Asârî-râbî, etc. of Damascus who took observations after the death of Yahya b. Abî Maśṭir with the instrument that al-Ma‘mûn ordered them to use when he took the field against the Byzantines, mention that they had found E = 23° 33' 32". Their measurement was made in the year 201 of the era of Yazdâjird (832/833 a.n.). The sons of Mūṣâ b. ʿAbî ʿAsîrî say that they had ascertained E at 23° 35' in the year 357 of the same era (868 a.n.) at the gate of the round wall of Baghda’d. In the tables of al-Taṣfîw (restoration) Ahmad b. ʿAbd Allâh Ḥâfizah gives the following two values for the obliquity of the ecliptic: 23° 35' and 23° 33', "but there must only be one". In 243 a.n. (226 Yazdâjird = 857/858 a.n.) al-Mâhî fixed E at 23° 35' 30". "And Abû ʿl-Hasan Ḥâfiz b. Kurra said: I have found old methods of observation before Ptolemy, which show that the greatest declination is 23° 35', and Muḥ. b. ʿAsîrî b. Sinîm al-Battânî says that from his own measurements he has found it to be 23° 35' 5". The Shârî Fâdîl Abû ʿl-Šâfi‘î Abî b. ʿAbî Ḥâfiz Maḥ. b. ʿAbî ʿAsîrî, who is known as Ibn al-ʿAlâm and Abû ʿl-Hasan al-Ṣâfî Abû al-Râfîn b. ʿAbî, under the value of E to be 23° 34' 30" and 23° 34' 45". Ibn Yūnus then gives his own calculation of the obliquity of the ecliptic to which he had devoted great care and found E = 23° 35'. It may be further noted that al-Britâtî also took E = 23° 35' (al-Ṣâfî al-Mu’ṣâfî, Berl. MS. Or. 8° 275, fol. 855), Ibn al-Šâfîr about 765 (1363/64) E = 23° 31' and Uţağ Bég in 1437 a.n. at Samarqand E = 23° 30' 17".

As the extreme daily orbit that the sun can describe in the heavens (in northern latitudes the longest day), the day of entry into Cancer (al-
Sardān al-saraṭān) as well as into the Aries and Capricorn is an auspicious one. Therefore the representation of these three regions and their division into hours (iṣrā' on the face of a sundial) is of special importance. The symbol of Cancer (and of Aries) in a cosmic section, the exact shape of which depends on the latitude of the place and the position of the dial.

The name Cancer (Kapsel) no doubt dates from Greek times. According to L. Ideler (see below), the name Lernass is also found: because he (the crab), according to the fable, crawled out of the swamp of Lerna to injure Hercules in the foot when he was fighting with the Lernan Hydra. The name " Crab" is found on the famous circle of the Zodiac at Dendera (Egypt) which, however, dates from the late Egyptian period and must certainly have been made under Greek influence. In Babylonian the constellation without Σ Cancri was called (Māl AL-LUL = ḫakkāb šittu, which probably is the name of an animal, but hardly crab. In the latter texts of the Seleucid period instead of AL-LUL we always find the ideogram for carpenter (cf. F. Kugler, Sterntafeln und Sterndiagramm in Babylon, Münster 1913, p. 6, 54, 209, 210).

Bibliography: L. Ideler, Über den Ursprung und die Bedeutung der Sternnamen, Berlin 1809, p. 158 996; F. W. V. Lach, Anleitung zur Kenntnis der Sterne, Leipzig 1796, p. 75. There is a Persian, Turkish and Syrian names for "Cancer" also given. The passage in Yûnus on the definition of the obliquity of the ecliptic is translated in C. Schoy, Die Stellung der geographischen Breite eines Ortes durch Beobachtung der Meridianhöhe der Sonne oder mittels der Kenntnis zweier anderer Sonnen- höhen und den zugehörigen Aszenissen nach dem arabischen Text der Hākimimtexten des Ibn Yûnûs (Annalen der Hydrographie und maritimen Meteorologie, Hamburg 1932, p. 1034.)


Cancer is also called al-ṣaraṭān (after the Greek). According to the Αἰμαρ, it is a tumour of black gall, at first no bigger than an almond; as it grows, red and green veins appear on it like crab's feet. The disease is incurable and at best its course can only be prolonged; it attacks both men and animals.


SARAY. [See Saray.]

SARDĀR is a Persian word (see Sar), the etymological meaning of which is "holding," or "possessing the head," i.e. the first place, its current meaning being a chief or leader and hence a military commander. It has been borrowed in this sense by the Turks, who, however, sometimes derive it in error from sīr-dār ("the keeper of a secret"). Through Turkish it has reached Arabic, and in a letter written in 1581 by one of the princes of the Arab (of Yemen) occurs the phrase "wasṣāgha sarādār itilā l-arāfīh." ("and he appointed a commander over the troops") on which Rutgers comments: "Vocabulum sarārār, quod Persicis originis est, ducem exercitii signifficat." The abstract substantive sarārīyyat in the sense of the post or office of commander of an army also occurs; and it was doubtless owing to the familiarity of the Arabic-speaking people of Egypt with the borrowed word that it was selected as the official title of the British commander-in-chief of the Egyptian and Sudanese armies. In Persia the word was and is still much used as a component part of honorific titles, such as Sardār-i Zafar and Sardār-i Djam. In India it is used generally of the Indian commissioned officers of the army as a class. Sardār log means "the (Indian) officers of a corps or regiment." It was formerly applied to the head of a set of palanquins, and it is still applied to the valet or body-servant of a European in India. In the chief of his household servants, Sarār-i Bahārī is a title of honour attached to the first class of the Order of British India, an order confined to Indian commissioned officers of the army.


SARDINIA (in Arabic sources Sarīntiya, Sarīntiya), an island in the Mediterranean Sea, lies 7½ miles South of Corsica and 335 miles South West of the Italian Civita Vecchia, and has an area of 9,187 square miles. It is mountainous, and has a peak as high as 6,016 feet. Throughout the 1,662 miles of its length and the 68 of its breadth it consists chiefly of ranges of granite, marble, and of high plateaux. These ranges of dark hills convey an appearance of wilderness to the island and make it anything but attractive, which probably accounts for its comparatively uneventful history.

The Nuragh or circular towers, of which 6,000 have been traced on the island, bear unmistakable evidence that the island was well inhabited in the Bronze Age, but it is only when we come to the Phoenician period that we have definite information regarding the island. These invaders certainly did
conquer the island at about 500–450 B.C., and they were the first of a succession of overlords, who made the island contribute to their granaries. The Roman occupation bore more heavily on the Sardinians; as they had no free city on the island, they were compelled to supply much of the corn for Rome, and they were obliged to contribute a money tax. Little wonder that there was an insurrection of 80,000 slaves in 181 B.C. The island was useful to the Romans, moreover, as a place of exile. We read that in 355 A.D. Constantius banished 3 bishops to Sardinia, one of whom was Lucifer of Calaris. In 440 the Vandals prepared to attack the place, seeing, as they did, that it gave food supplies to the Empire, and in 476 the island had to be ceded to them. A governor of German nationality was installed to discharge all relevant duties both military and civil. Justinian finally recovered the prize for Byzantium, until the 10th century.

Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam in his Fathih Miq ma 'l-Maghrib wa 'l-Andalus seems to put it beyond question that Sardinia was invaded at the same time as Spain, e. 9th A.H. He says that the Sardinians used their harbour to trick the Arabs out of plundering their ships, and this seems not at all unlikely. That the Arabs reached one of their usual raids on the island is certain, but they did not prolong their stay there. They paid another visit in A.H. 98 and 118 and carried through the same programme, but they never even attempted to maintain themselves in the place, nor is it hard to understand that such a place would little appeal to those who were born to the desert and the heat. In 150 A.H., however, they went a step further, and imposed a tribute on the island, which they succeeded in extracting from the enfeebled people. Meantime in 725 A.D. Ludprimar, fearing these repeated raids, obtained the body of Saint Augustine, and succeeded in removing it out of danger to Pavia. This great treasure of the Church had lain at Cagliari since the 8th century. Once again in the 8th century the island was again plundered and Sardinia suffered another plunder at the hands of the Arabs (143 A.H.). The Saracens never used the island for purposes of grain-producing, as had the previous conquerors, but in 227 A.H., when they made their daring attack on Rome, they used Sardinia as their rendezvous, before making the final onslaught on the capital. Not even in the 10th century did the Sardinia cease to be the quarry of the Arabs, for we read that, when 'Ubayd Allah the Mahdi was plundering Genoa, in 332/3 A.H., he did not forget to take what plunder he could from Sardinia. The last mention of Arab influence in the island is when Moghulid of Denia, in Spain, subjugated it in 393 A.H. Never again were the formidable raiders of the Mediterranean Sea to strike terror into the inhabitants of Sardinia, and it seems strange that in exchange for all their plunder the Arabs gave neither culture nor trade, religion nor art, as a recompense and a memorial of their presence.

Fisian supremacy followed that of the Arabs, and this again was succeeded by that of Aragon. In modern times the island has changed hands several times, having been Spanish and French and Austrian. Its ties, however, are all with the present possessors, and Italy seems to be inaugurating a new regime.

**Sardinia** — **Sarékat Islam**

**Sarékat Islam** (Sarachat, Lower pronunciation of the Arabic dar'ath, a brotherhood or guild), a political combination of Muhammadan Indonesians formed in Surakarta (Java), which has played an important part in the history of the development of the native population of the Dutch East Indies and in Dutch colonial policy in the last fifteen years. Its object was to secure for the native element a more prominent position socially, politically and economically, at the same time retaining Islam, which is the natural bond that links together the very diverse elements of a great part of the native population of the Dutch Indies. The leaders of the Sarékat Islam would not, however, themselves subscribe to this, but rather give the range and estimates of its objects according to local conditions, if indeed they give any reply at all when asked about the objects of their organisation.

**Early History.** While the position of the masses of the Javanese natives as regards their own rulers had from the earliest times been characterised by extreme subservience, during the nineteenth century the independence of both the people and their lords became more and more limited by the gradually increasing influence of the Dutch. The national pride with which they looked back on a past in which the whole Indian Archipelago was under a Javanese hegemony was more and more supplanted by a feeling of dependence and inferiority to foreigners (Dutch, Arab or Chinese), of whom the Dutch in particular and later on the Chinese only rarely concealed the slight estimation in which they held the natives. When about the end of last century a few progressives among the priayays's (aristocracy) of Java for the first time wished to give their sons a European education, they did, it is true, receive support from a few Dutchmen, but a considerable majority of the officials offered marked resistance to this innovation, and the few who made the experiment found it made very difficult for them to find a place in society in keeping with their newly acquired qualifications. Nevertheless, a small body of educated Javanese was gradually formed, and naturally it was they who least appreciated European tutelage. These came the events in the Far East and their reaction on the situation in the Dutch Indies. Even before the Russo-Japanese war (1904–1905) the Japanese had been granted equality with the Europeans in the Dutch East Indies. After the foundation of the Chinese Republic in 1911, Chinese warships visited Java and Chinese officials came to enquire into the position of their compatriots; the Chinese in the Dutch Indies were granted (from 1908) the Dutch-Chinese schools which they had desired for some years, the restrictions on their freedom of movement were abolished (1910) and more satisfactory arrangements were made for the administration of justice (1912). The Arals also
shared the advantage of the new legal position of the Oriental foreigners, but the position of the Javanese remained the same.

In 1908 the League of Young Javanese Budi Utama ("noble endeavour") was founded by students of the Dokter-djawa (native medical) school in Batavia, the first modest attempt to obtain from the authorities the fulfilment of some of their desires by organisation, particularly medical and better education. The father of the movement, which was regarded with suspicion not only by the Dutch but also by many conservative Javanese, was the *Dokter-djawa* Wahidin = Sadra-Usada. Such adherents as this first Javanese organisation found belonged to the higher classes of Javanese society; the masses did not join it, but they also began gradually to desire a reorganisation of social conditions and for a number of reasons.

a. Their social position was thoroughly unsatisfactory. In contrast to the foreign Orientals the Indonesians had to pay marks of homage to their European or native masters (*hornat, Ar. *hurma*). It is true that the central government repeatedly ameliorated these *hornat* but the practice for the most part continued. The administration of the law very much favoured Europeans; detention for examination, applied not only to accused persons but for convenience often to witnesses also, was an evil which had not yet been entirely abolished; trial and punishment by the police were not always just and were imposed only on natives; the security of private property was often very slight; cases occurred in which a man preferred to say nothing about a robbery of his possessions rather than bring down upon his head the unpleasant efforts of the authorities. The few rights were not equal to the hardships of forced labour and the frequent ill-treatment of the native workers in European businesses. Education was very insufficient. In addition, as a result of the progressive development in China, the attitude of many Chinese, especially newcomers, to the Javanese became so presumptuous that the latter felt they were deeply hurt; excesses against the Chinese showed how deeply.

b. Their economic position had gone from bad to worse. The free development of native industry was much restricted when about 1830 the plantation system (Dutch *Cultuursysteem*) especially for coffee, was introduced, which became a misfortune for the native population; when in 1877 the system was abolished, it had brought the Dutch government 832 million gulden — 219% of the State expenses (the so-called Indian Surplus). In the period that followed, the middle classes and the peasants were more and more deprived of their economic independence by the keen competition of European industries and plantations, while the retail trade had long been mainly in the hands of Chinese and Arabs. With however much tenacity they endeavoured to resist foreign competition, the decline was considerable, especially after the mainly native batik industry (turnover about 30 million gulden yearly; a short account of the native industry in *Kolonialer Verslag van 1920*, col. 7) was forced to use imported aniline dyes and textiles in place of the indigenous raw material; full details of this economic decay in *Onderzoek naar de mindere wetenschap der inlandse heerschappij* have been given in *Beriking van Java en Madura*, Report of the Commission, Batavia 1905—1914, 32 vols. folio.

c. In the third place may be mentioned the fear of a conversion to Christianity, although this factor had only been in operation a very short time and the movement among the Muslim population aroused by the activity of the Christian missionaries was quite different both in time and place. But the fact that Christian propaganda was more active, and found open approval with some members of the Dutch parliament, and that a warning had been issued from Meulens against it, was used by the leaders of the Sarékát Islam to arouse the masses in a way which would result in their joining the Sarékát Islam.

A comparatively unimportant incident is said to have brought about the foundation of the Sarékát Islam in 1910 (there are no reliable accounts of the first years). A case of dishonest practice on the part of a Chinese *hongei* (company) in Lawéyan (Nglawéyan), a village near Surakarta, where very well-to-do Javanese merchants lived and where competition between them and the Chinese was unusually keen, is said to have aroused such bitterness among the cheated Javanese that the latter combined to bring about a boycott of Chinese goods. Out of this grew the Sarékát Islam, the organisation of which was perhaps modelled after the Sarékát Dayang Islam of Buitenzorg, which had been founded some years earlier by a Javanese and some Arab merchants.

The name Sarékát Dayang Islam was at any rate also used in Surakarta. The Surakarta S. I., however, developed quite independently.

The S. I. did not long adhere strictly to its original aims. The movement spread with astonishing rapidity after the boycott of Chinese goods had been successful. The huge increase in membership cannot be explained simply from the hatred of the Chinese, natural at the time, but is rather due to the fact that the Javanese who longed for greater freedom and less tutelage thought that, after the successes won over the Chinese, the new union might assist them to a higher position as regards other foreigners also, i.e. this was simply a manifestation under a Muslim banner — in orthodox Lawéyan the union of the Muslims as much as natural — after it had once given proof that a victory over the Javanese was not an absolute impossibility, filled a gap generated in the circumstances described above in a, b, and c, and could also bring within its ranks many people who had nothing to do with the boycott of the Chinese.

Much more important than the details of its earliest history is the fact that this combination was able to rise and spread so rapidly, just as in the years following it was not single incidents and activities but the development of its aims that attracted attention to it. There is now a great difference between the origin and development of the S. I., which is due to the fact that it was born from the higher needs of the Javanese people, but developed under the deciding influence of external circumstances; — viz. the outbreak of the Great War in 1914, the Russian Revolution of 1917, the world economic crisis after the war, and collapse that necessarily followed in Europe. Ideas were brought into the Sarékát Islam from outside which were foreign to the Javanese people, who only demanded the fulfilment of modest requests and the satisfaction of local requirements.
The result was a great internal weakness which ended in the Sarakat Islam losing the great influence it had as quickly as it had gained it.

The history of the Sarakat Islam may be divided into three periods:

a. The first national congress
b. The zenith of the national congresses
c. The decline of the Sarakat Islam before the rise of the radical Sarakat Ra'yat

a. In the first period one can hardly talk of one homogeneous Sarakat Islam. Under the leadership of the vigorous and able Radin Usman Saiyid Tjakra-Aminata, an inspiring orator, who soon, however, became dazzled by his own unbounded ambition, the movement spread beyond its home, especially in Eastern Java; in Surabaya the Sarakat Islam newspaper Utusan Hindia (Indian Messenger) was founded in December, 1912, which was edited by Tjakra and long continued to be the most important organ of the S.I. Branches were later founded in Semberang, Tjiribon, Bandung and Batavia. Admission was made very easy; the curiosity of the masses, the suggestive effect of the ceremonial secret oath, and the rapidly increasing popularity of the Sarakat Islam brought it more and more new members. In the period of first enthusiasm the statutes adopted at the official foundation on Nov. 9, 1911 (the members were to promote a brotherly feeling for one another, to give assistance to Muslims, to work for the social elevation and economic advancement of the people by all legitimate means), were fairly generally observed. Soon, however, each local S.I. began to work only for its own local ends, and according to the views of local leaders. There were some which served the material interests of the people, e.g. by forming co-operative associations to strengthen the Javanese power of competition, others endeavoured by their intervention to dispose of the abuses to which the Javanese were exposed from officials and European employers, others again (e.g. the S.I.-Batavia, which soon had 12,000 members) preached more accurate fulfilment of the duties of Islam. Expression was given to the desire for an improvement in the position of native women; an S.I. for children (Susterma Mulya) was even founded.

The successes of the S.I. in the economic field were but short-lived. The co-operative societies disappeared as soon as the first ardour of the members had cooled off; all economic activities suffered for the lack of financial training among the Javanese; S.I. funds were not seldom selfishly spent by the leaders of the movement. In the field of social progress the S.I. could certainly be credited with a general improvement of the relations between foreigners and Javanese to the benefit of the latter, although many gains were lost afterwards in the general decline of the movement. Interest in their religion was kept active by the leaders probably because of the fear of official apathy. The bond of religion was to be restored to this evil. Before the National Congress the S.I. took very little part in politics.

The first contact of the S.I. with the Dutch government seems to have been the temporary suppression of the Surakarta S.I. as a result of excesses against the Chinese (Aug., 1912). On Sept. 14, 1912, Tjakra presented a petition which asked the central government to recognise the Sarakat Islam. He received its decision on June 30, 1913. The government had long hesitated over its reply. Recognition of the, in themselves quite innocent, statutes involved to some extent a possible change in administration and in the colonial policy hitherto followed, which was based on the principle of the dependence of the native subjects. The leaders of the S.I. had shown themselves too weak to prevent the outrages against the Chinese; practice might very soon be in great contrast to their fine promises. An official recognition of the statutes which would give the S.I. a legal standing would be regarded by the simple populace as complete approval of all the activities of the S.I. or at least would be interpreted to mean that by its leaders. In a discussion between the Governor-General and a deputation of the S.I. on March 29, 1914, the former emphasised his personal sympathy with the S.I. but pointed out dangerous weaknesses which stood in the way of approval of the petition presented, such as, for example, the bad management of financial business (which has always been a weak point). Finally the edit of June 30 refused the S.I. the desired recognition on practical grounds, but called the attention of the petitioner to the fact that requests for recognition and legitimisation by local S.I.'s would perhaps be refused; these local associations would not be able to combine to form a legitimate central committee of representatives of the local sections. The local S.I.'s were to be responsible, to standardise their formulae of oaths and to draw these up in such a way that they would be regarded as harmless by the government. The S.I. was therefore organised in accordance with these instructions.

The attitude of the officials in the provinces proved in general much more hostile to the Sarakat Islam than that of the Government in Batavia. This difference between the Government and some of its officials may have sown the seeds or been one of the most important causes of the native population's distrust of the Government, which was soon to appear. The frequent complaints of countermeasures by local officials, some of whom at first, in spite of the official recognition, even went so far as to suppress local S.I.'s, found a sharper and sharper expression at the later congresses. The European population at this time was almost wholly against the Sarakat Islam. A certain nervousness overcame them at times; especially when hostilities with the Chinese had taken place. The tone of the European press was at first in general contemptuous, later hostile; this brought about an increasingly vigorous reaction in the native press, which was growing very rapidly. The Chinese, of course, were hostile to the S.I.; the Arabs at first were on good terms with it and even had a considerable share in its early development; but when in the beginning of 1913 it was decided that only exceptionally could non-Indonesians be admitted to membership of the S.I., and particularly after the development of the S.I. on progressive lines began to hurt their conservatism, they withdrew. The relations between S.I. and Hadi Utama were good although infrequent; representatives were sent from both to their congresses, etc.

4. In the period that followed, the political element became very prominent in the Sarakat Islam and relations with the other political parties and movements became closer. The influence
of the growing European radicalism made itself more and more felt; European parties like the I. S. D. V. (Dutch Indies Social Democratic Party) endeavoured to gain the S. I. to their side. The official trend of the S. I. became more radical year by year, but within the movement arose strong counter-currents. Tjakra was the representative of the legal, national-democratic movement; Sëma'un became the leader of the growing left minority. This young man, an ardent follower of the I. S. D. V., made his first public appearance at the first national congress where he advocated "pérésit" (Dutch verzet, "resistance") to the government but was hardly able to attract the attention of his audience; yet his speech was notable enough, for he was the only one who had the courage to point to the weak points in the national movement, e.g., the lack of energy. In contrast to the aristocratic Tjakra, he was a simple man of the people, whose work was distinguished by an unselﬁshness and an honesty unusual among Javanese. By the second congress we ﬁnd him acting as president of the S. I.-Sëmarang, where European radicalism had the greatest following, while at the third congress he had become a member of the C. S. I. (Central Sărêkât Islâm). Tjakra had only very reluctantly admitted him to it but he was afraid that this man, who promised more to the people than he did and had more understanding of their needs, would try to gain control of the business and he thought that he would more easily be able to keep him in check as a member of the C. S. I. In order not to lose his popularity, however, he moved more and more from his original attitude with the result that the opposition of the conservative wing increased. The struggle between Tjakra and Sëma'un governed the development of the S. I. for the next few years. With great skil Tjakra was repeatedly able to avert a split within the Sărêkât Islâm but ﬁnally circumstances became too strong for him, and when, at the sixth congress, the S. I. was forced to a choice and in Tjakra's absence drove Sëma'un out of the party, it was too late for the S. I.

A few details regarding the national congresses, where the different opinions and tendencies were able to find clear expression, may now be given.

The first national congress was held in Bandung on June 17–24, 1916. Shortly before (March, 19), the C. S. I. had received offical recognition and it was an attempt to make the west Javanese and Sumatra S. I. branches independent of the C. S. I. had failed. An idea of the extent of the S. I. may be gleaned from the following ﬁgures: There were representatives of 52 Javanese branches (representing 273,377 members), 15 Sumatra (c. 76,000), 7 Borneo (57,574), while Celebes and Bali each had one branch. In an enthralling speech in which he dealt with the most important questions of the day, Tjakra emphasised the value of the name "national congress"; the S. I. was to set itself a new goal: the land was to raise itself to be a nation; the S. I. was to cooperate in obtaining self-government for the Dutch Indies as soon, or the native elements would be granted greater inﬂuence in questions of administration; but he gave praise to the central government which had now really abandoned the old policy and was going to take the ﬁrst step on the path of "politics and association" (cf. Sammiek-Vuringen, Verspr. Geschr., iv/1, 291–306) with the promise that a council composed of European, native and foreign Oriental members would be given to the Governor-General. There was a great deal talked of here and in subsequent congresses which the great majority of the delegates did not understand. Statements such as that the "Kur'an is a work of the greatest importance for socialism", that the Prophet (according to a contributor to the Hindustan Review) is "the father of socialism, the "precursor of democracy", show on what lines propagandists of European parties endeavoured to gain adherents for their teaching. Perhaps the most important work of the congress was the discussion of the 86 proposals made by the local S. I.'s, which usually referred to local complaints and which were discussed with Tjakra's opinion in the Ustumul Hindia of June 15–16, 1916. From these motions we see what expectations the simple country people hoped to realise through the S. I.; the desire for greater personal freedom and independence was continually expressed at this and following congresses; it was not the confused political ideas of a few leaders that attracted the masses to the S. I. but the hope of achieving their desires through this powerful organization; this explains why they later left the S. I. as readily, when Sëma'un's party promised to further native interests more than the S. I. had done.

The second national congress (Batuas, Oct. 20–27, 1917; 281 motions from local branches) dealt with the question what attitude the S. I. should adopt to the coming "Volkraad" (on the organisation etc. of the Volkraad see Koloniaal Studien, Vol. 1, Oct., 1917, Extra Politiek Nummer, p. 169 sqq.); the share that was to be given in it to Indonesians did not satisfy them, still less did the continued postponement of its opening. The congress laid down a declaration of principles which explains the political goal of the C. S. I.: testimony is given to the superiority of Islam but absolute neutrality is demanded from the authorities; in view of the consideration that the majority of the native population lives under a state of weakness, the C. S. I. will always combat any supremacy of "sinful capitalism" (cf. Kol. Studien, p. 35 sqq.; in this volume is also given the programme of work of the S. I. with notes and an elucidation of the political situation at this time, details of the programmes of the political parties of the day given by their own leaders).

The results of the unrest in Europe were clearly seen at the third national congress (Surabaya, Sept. 20–Oct. 6, 1918). The new situation created by the opening of the Volkraad on May 18, 1918 (Tjakra and one other leader were the representatives of the S. I.), and the ameliorations still desired were rigorously discussed. But the unrest which had taken possession of the native society was particularly discussed. Economic difﬁculties and the results of very successful preaching of a coming war against "sinful capitalism" increased the bitterness; disasters results were soon to be seen. The great strike at the end of 1917 and the outbreaks of the mob in Kudus and Demak at the end of 1918 formed the beginning of a social struggle, which went on with intervals to the end of 1924, whose result for the present could hardly be in doubt in view of the weak economic position of the native population and the lack of that energy which alone could remove this fundamental evil.

The organisation of the Javanese into Persirkatan Kudus Tami (agricultural unions) and P. K. Surak (industrial unions) had been in existence for some
years and expanded very much in the next few years. Their activities, which in recent years seem to have been supported by the Bolshevists, cannot be further discussed here, nor all their relations with the S. I. and the later S. Ra'yat (see below). At Christmas 1919 they were centralised by Sarsakardana in the R. S. V. (revolutionary socialist committee of the trade unions), which split at the end of 1920 into a moderate committee in Djokjakarta and a communist under Sēm'ūn in Semarang; these combined again after Sēm'ūn's adventurous journey to Russia to the Trades Union Congress at Medan in Sept., 1923. Their activity has been by no means confined to questions related to the workers' classes but has extended to the whole field of politics.

The period between the third and the fourth congress was a time of great arrest. Soon after the third congress the revolution in Europe caused the formation of the so-called "radical concentration" (Nov. 16, 1918) of different parties in the Völkstraat including the S. I. Here their leaders explained the new development of the S. I. and defended the necessity of going farther than was laid down in the statutes (Nov. 14, Dec. 5; cf. Handelingen van den Volksraad, 1918—1919, p. 175—185, 518—525); the governments, which continued to regard the course of affairs as a healthy development of native society (Kolonial. Verlag van 1919, p. 4—13), nevertheless sharply criticised the attitude of the C. S. I. to extremist movements (Dec. 2; cf. Handelingen etc., p. 432—434) especially the assertion of the C. S. I. that they could not assume responsibility for disturbances by local S. I.'s if the government did not meet their repeatedly expressed wishes more quickly; the C. S. I. was to settle the conduct of the movement, not the branches; the government, however, again declared: once more their readiness to co-operate with the C. S. I. on the lines of their statutes. — An incident which proved fatal for the S. I. was the discovery of a secret revolutionary organisation (the so-called section B of the S. I.) in the Franger (S. W. Java), as a result of investigations into a case of armed resistance to the authorities in the district of Tjimarép near Garut (July 4—7, 1919; cf. the synopsis of the report of the government commissioner G. A. J. Hazen in the Handelingen van den Volksraad, Tweede gewone zitting, 1919, Bijlagen, Onderwerp 10, p. 2—31). The relation of this section B to the C. S. I. and S. I. is by no means clear (cf. Handelingen der Statena-Generaal, 1919—1920, Tweede Kamer, Dec. 22, p. 1153; Blumberger in the Encyclopaedia van Ned.-Indië, Suppl., p. 153; Kolon. Verlag van 1922, p. 6). Tjakra denied that either the C. S. I. or the local S. I.'s had anything to do with the section B (cf. also Handelingen der St.-G. etc., p. 1153; Hand., v. d., Volksraad, 1919—1920, p. 90—92, 94, 96, 106, 110, 114, 211). In any case the government decided to grant no further legal recognitions unless the oaths were taken out of the statutes, etc.; as they thought (probably rightly) that within the S. I. an anti-Dutch movement had become predominant (Kol. Verfl. van 1920, chap. B, p. 5); they withdrew from the S. I. the moral support which they had afforded it in recent years against the local authorities. — In other respects also the Sārēkāt Islam soon met with many great difficulties which crippled its external activities and forced it to work to strengthen itself internally.

The fourth national congress (Surabaya, Oct. 26—Nov. 2, 1919) was mainly devoted to the discussion of the coming R. S. V. (see above) and the relation of the S. I. to it and can be passed over here.

The difficulties increased. The fifth national congress was postponed on account of a sharp criticism of the financial and political management of the C. S. I. (by the communist Darsa in the Sinor Hindia of Oct. 6—9, 1920; cf. Kol. Verlag van 1921, vol. 6; Kol. Verlag van 1922, vol. 9). The branches demanded an account of the money entrusted by them to the C. S. I. The first secretary of the C. S. I. was arrested in Nov., 1920, and sentenced on account of the branch B affair. The situation became more and more confused owing to the increasing activity of the other unions.

The fifth congress which was finally held at Djokjakarta from March 2—6, 1921, was Tjakra's last attempt to keep the control of the whole Javanese popular movement in the hands of the C. S. I. by a compromise between the very diverse movements and the postponement of the most difficult questions for which no solution could be found. The compromise was embodied in a new programme of principles in which (a) the fatal influence of European capital, which had, it was said, made slaves of the native population, was exposed; (b) Islam — which, by the way, demands a popular government, workmen's councils, a division of the soil and the means of production, makes work compulsory and prohibits anyone becoming rich through the work of another — was adopted as a basis and (c) the readiness of the S. I. to international co-operation within the limits placed by Islam and with maintenance of its independence was emphasised. The difficult questions of "party discipline" was postponed (whether a member of the S. I. could be also a member of another political party), which question the C. S. I. wished to answer in the negative and the left wing closely allied with the communist party in the affirmative. Since a and c were wanted by the communists, and they were no doubt willing to take b along with the rest, their claim that communism was now victorious in the S. I. was intelligible. It is also easy to understand that the struggle within the S. I. was so renewed, because the C. S. I. would not allow this interpretation of the compromise (cf. Uraja Hindia of March 26, 1921). The breach followed at the sixth national congress (Surabaya, Oct. 6—10, 1921). Tjakra was not present; he had been arrested. In August, 1921 (because he was thought to have committed perjury in the section B affair; but he was released in April, 1922, and pronounced not guilty in Aug., 1922). The deputychairman was not able to avert the decision: the principle of party discipline was approved by a majority of the congress and Sēm'ūn and his followers left the S. I. (Oct. 8, 1921): soon afterwards (Christmas, 1921) they formed themselves into a Pērsātun S. I. or S. I. Mērāh (Red S. I.) with headquarters at Semarang.

After this decision the S. I. lost ground rapidly. The fidelity of its members disappeared before the attractions of the radical party. After
the release of Tjakra he resumed his propaganda for the S.I. but with scant success. He had lost much of his earlier influence and he no longer represented the S.I. in the new Volkssraad. He now followed a more moderate progressive policy. The seventh national congress was held in the conservative centre of Madiun (Feb. 17-20, 1923). Tjakra again took up cultural and religious questions; in recent years Muslim affairs had been left to special unions, e.g. to the Muḥammadiya. Tjakra now became president of the first pan-Islamic congress (Tjirēkon, Nov. 1, 1922) which had been organized on the model of the "All India Muslim League". A lively interest in questions of international Islam was displayed; a telegram of homage was sent to Mufti Rasāl Pasha; the Javaanese attitude to the caliphate question was discussed. In the Volkssraad the S.I. attached itself to the second radical bloc, which was formed on account of the legislative proposals for the revision of the Dutch Indies Constitution. But its activity remained very limited.

In contrast to the decline of the S.I. was the rise of the radical S.I. Its leader, Sīma'ān, entered into relations with the Russian Soviet government in Moscow. His activity in the trade unions has already been mentioned above. His arrest was the cause of the great railway strike of May 8, 1923. Deported from the Dutch Indies he went to Holland, where he was made a member of the committee of the communist party as "representative of the Indonesian popular movement". At the end of 1924 he was in China, with which country his party maintained active communication, especially after Sun Yat Sen's adoption of Bolshevism. On May 4, 1923, the radical S.I. and the P.K.I. (Indian communist party) held a joint congress in Bandung. The red S.I. was on this occasion given the name of Sarakat Ka'īyat (Union of the People). Propaganda was conducted in close co-operation with the P.K.I. The S.K. was to be a preparatory school for the P.K.I. and only trained pupils were to be admitted to the P.K.I. Courses for S.R. leaders seem to produce brilliant propagandists in spite of the astounding ignorance which the newspapers talk of (I with truth). The S.K. takes no account of religion; it is "neutraal kāpada Allah" (neutral to Allāh). The leaders in the towns are often hostile to religion, but in the country they are Muslims; there seems to be group of religious communists.

The S.R. was continually fought by the authorities. Meetings were forbidden, breaches of the law relating to the free and public speaking were punished, communistic books etc. confiscated, inconvenient members of the party rendered harmless by detention for examination. Since Aug. 31, 1924, the campaign against them has been intensified. The result has been a milder attitude towards the moderate unions (S.I. etc.). Nothing definite can yet be stated about the result of this campaign.

The branches of the S.I. outside Java are far from being as important as the Javanese. The conditions were different, the soil much less suitable for the seed sown by the S.I. Since 1914 branches of the S.I. have been formed in the most important centres which in general have produced less active interest in the religious life. Locally there were occasional excesses. But the enthusiasm soon cooled down. Representatives were sent to the national congresses in Java, who made

known to the congress the local complaints of the district they represented. Later there was sometimes the same conflict between S.I. and S.R. but to a far lesser degree than in Java. — The first S.I. outside Java seems to have been the S.I. Palembang, founded Nov. 14, 1913, by Javanese. The influence of the S.I. varied greatly according to local conditions. In Atjeh the situation was difficult about 1921 because the S.I. (often secretly organised) seems to have pursued anti-Dutch propaganda. In Djamãbi the S.I. played a part in the disturbances of the years 1916 and later; in Minangkabau the pan-Sumatran tendency was stronger than the Javanese influence of the S.I. The action of the S.I. in the islands of Tenate and Ambon was important; radical tendencies were strongly represented on the latter island. Finally we must not omit to mention that the development of the youthful S.I. was watched with the greatest interest from Mekka. In the years 1910 and onwards there was a certain amount of anxiety here because the Dutch governement was credited with the intention of making the paṭďāż impossible for their Indonesian subjects, and, of course, on the pilgrimage of the "Ijâza" the Mekkans depend a great deal for their livelihood (Sannuck Hargronje, Mekke, ii., ch. 4). There seems to have been a correspondence between the Mekkan 'Ulams" and the Muslim authorities in Indonesia regarding the activity of Christian Missions; special prayers are even said to have been offered in the Holy Mosque for the Muslims of Indonesia. There was therefore much interest in the S.I. At the end of 1913 a pamphlet on the S.I. appeared in Mekka in Arabic and was afterwards translated into Malay. A Mekka branch of the S.I. was founded (probably for the Indonesians living there) of the activities of which nothing further is known to the writer. This is probably the only branch of the S.I. outside the Dutch East Indies.

To sum up we may say that the S.I. has played an important part in the development of the relations between Holland and the Dutch Indies, and that its history is important for the history of the revival of Islam and of the awakening of Eastern Asia. The S.I. is the first great independent expression of a want that had been felt among the Indonesians for several decades, their desire for greater freedom and more independence. Their leaders guided it into a radical, perhaps also national, direction, but the masses never understood their theories and gave most support to the movement which best met local requirements. In the fifteen years of the existence of the S.I. there has been externally a tremendous change in Javanese society, the causes of which are also to be sought in events during and after the World War; development internally began especially through the influence of the S.I. but naturally will progress much more slowly. The further development of the popular movement among the Javanese, which is in itself important as a sign of the times, will also depend on many external factors: the degree of capability among the European authorities to adapt their policy to the slowly changing situation may be particularly decisive for the future character of the popular movement.

Bibliography: Koloniaal Verslag, 1913 to 1923, Ch. C (Annual Reports on conditions in the Dutch Indies residences), in the Bijlagen van het Verslag der Handelingen
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van de Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal, Bijlage C; id. 1919 seqq., Ch. B. (Stroomingen onder de inlandse Bevolking); after 1923: Verslag van Beoëtium en Staat van Nederlandsch-Indië van 1922 (because the status of the Dutch Indies had been altered by a change in the Dutch Constitution, the name "Koloniaal" Verslag had also to be altered), Ch. C passim; Bijlage A (official sources).

Shorter articles on the S. L. etc. are found in Schalkx-Muller's Repertorium qv de litteratuur betreffende de Nederlandsche Koloniën etc., Vierde Vervolg (1915—1915), the Hague 1917, p. 89, 203—224, 246, 299, 302, 309; Vredere Vervolg (1916—1920), the Hague 1921, 125, 164—172, 185, 192, 222, 223, 257.


(C. C. B.)

ŞARF is defined by the jurists as a contract of sale (barf) in which the goods to be exchanged are of precious metal (himmam). Sarf is primarily money-changing, but also includes any exchange of gold and silver. As the name shows — sarf in maqdar of a verb denoting the business of money-changing is of Arabian origin (cf. Frauenkell, Die arab. Fremdwörter im Arab., p. 182 seqq.; Lamberti in the R.E. 7, 1906, ii. 29). The expression sarf seems to have been first naturalised in Islam about the end of the first century A. H. It is connected with the first century A. H. It is connected with the fact that, with the Mali̇ks and with him the Mali̇ks make a sharp

distinction between money-changing (parf) and the exchange of gold for gold or silver for silver (maruaf) by weight, mulkada by measure or number), which the other law-schools do not do; only in al-Shâfi'î (Kitâb al-Umm, ii. 30) is a similar term, mulkana, once found. The legal principles relating to parf, which are closely connected with the laws relating to usury, are based on the Hâdîth, while the Korâ'ān has nothing on the subject. They are the following:

1) With the same kind of material (jimm), the exchange can only be made with an equal quantity (maqâl) even if the articles are different in quality and workmanship. With unlike materials (gold for silver) this rule does not hold. Coins debased more than half are treated as merchandise (as in the Talmudic law; cf. Lambert, op. cit., p. 32 seq.) and can be exchanged with a surplus (mulkafaqum). A recompense for the making up of bullion into ornaments etc. is therefore prohibited as usury, while modern authorities recognise the value of the labour and do not consider the sale as parf (Benali Felâr, p. 80).

2) Ownership in the goods must pass on either side before the contracting parties separate (al-taftaft al-taftaft). A cash payment is therefore necessary (maqâl), to the exclusion of all credit (which has passed into Turkish legislation; see below). Among the Hanafs, for example, a silver vessel, only part of the purchase price of which is paid, is common property, while among the Mali̇ks and Shâfi'î such a sale is quite invalid (hâlî).

There are also differences of opinion regarding the settlement of a debt. In general the rule is that the combination of a parf with another legal matter in one agreement is not permitted.

3) The object to be exchanged cannot be disposed of before the ownership is acquired.

4) No option can be reserved (hajjar al-zafr); on the other hand hajjar al-zafr is allowed in case of defeasit and hajjar al-sa'wu' in purchase of bullion (e.g. ornaments).

The jurists have also evolved subterfuges which make a profit possible in money-changing (al-Kuduri and al-Halabi at the end of the Mads Ludmawwana, vii. 126 seqq.; Sachau, Mitt. d. k. preuß. akad. d. wiss., p. 281). The money-changers called by the "Ulama" — usually Jews — have been organized into guilds since the middle ages (Moe, Renaissance des Islams, p. 449; Young, Corps de droit ottoman, title 67, art. 6 seqq.). In modern Muslim states there are special laws relating to money-changing (for Turkey cf. Young, op. cit.; of the year 1821 = 1861). Cf. the art. HAJJ.


SARI (formerly ŞARÍ), a town in Persia, the
SARI — AL-SARI

former capital of Taharistan (Masnadars), 8 miles from the Caspian Sea, 30 from Arbil. Its foundation is attributed to Tīs, son of Nishtar, general of the mythical king Khosrow, because there is a place there called Tīsār. Faribors is said to have taken refuge there; the castle which he built could be seen at a place called Lūmān Dīa. The town itself was built in the time of Farrukhshīn the Great, Ḥarīmshāh of Taharistan (end of the seventh century) by Farīr, one of his nobles, on the site of the village of Awārū. Sārī has several times been the capital of Taharistan, — under the Šahrūrs (828—872) and the Alids Ḥasan b. Ziyād (745/803) and Muḥammad b. Ziyād (739/801). The great mosque begun by the Amīr Yahyā al-Nāṣir in the reign of the Abbasīd Caliph al-Maṣūm was finished by Ṣāḥib b. Kānim (d. 224 = 839). A building is pointed out called Sīyavuḫšānīn "the three cupolas", said to be the tomb of the three sons of Farūk, Imād, Sulaimān, and Tūr.

The district is not fertile and the climate unhealthy. Silk is the principal product. Under the Ṣafawī, the canton of Sārī (which extended as far as Tāmrujun) had a revenue of 1,000,000 dirhams.


(Ch. H. HECKE)

SĀRĪ, the "swift metre", so named because of its swiftness and swiftness of appeal to taste (Freytag, Darstellung der arabischen Verskunst, p. 237), is the ninth in the prosody of the Arabs. It is the first of the six metres of the fourth circle, which is called "the intricated" (al-qarr al-muqābāth) on account of its metrical intricacy (Palmer, Arabic Grammar, London 1874, p. 349 seqq.). The paradigm is: mušafīʿ, mušafīʿa, mušafīʿa (it), which is rarely, if ever, found. According to the native system, the sīr is of four kinds and has seven varieties (De Sacy, Traité de la Prosodie des Arabes, Paris 1831, p. 25).

But the normal form is: mušafīʿa, mušafīʿa, fāʾīna.

Mafīʿ on fāʾīna (−−) is often used in the dārūb; and, more rarely, mafūlā or fūāda (−−) in both arzīf and dārūb, although not so commonly in the latter. A further variety employed by later poets is the introduction of an extra syllable to the dārūb, thus fūʿāda (−−).

Bibliography: Refer to the works under article 'Arba'. (J. WALKER)

AL-SARĪ K. AL-HASAM B. Yūsuf AL-BALASHI, held the office of governor and financial controller of Egypt from Ramaṭa 1, 300 (April 3, 816). On Rabī‘ I, 1, 201 (Sept. 27, 816) the troops openly mutinied against him and al-Maṭṭūn was forced to remove al-Sarī from his post and replace him by Solomon b. Ghallūh; al-Sarī was put in prison and Solomon entered upon his office on Tuesday, Rabī‘ I 4, 203 (Sept. 30, 817), but was removed from office as early as Shabīb I (Feb. 22, 817) as the result of a renewed revolt of the troops, and al-Sarī again appointed by al-Maṭṭūn. The news of his appointment reached Egypt on Shaʿbān 12 (March 4, 817); al-Sarī was released from prison and entered al-Fustān on the same day. He held office till his death on Bagdat 1, 305 (Nov. 11, 820). That al-Sarī played a prominent part in Egypt even before his appointment as governor is evident from his name in the phrases of a law intended for the Kaʿba which is dated in the year 757 (512/13). His name is also found on gold and copper coins of Egypt; see W. Tharhānawi, Memorie der Khilfe Orient, p. 138, Ns. 2700 (Misc. 200 a. H.), p. 193, Ns. 1772 (702 and 202 a. H.), H. N. Kautsky, Katalog d. orient. Münzen in den Kgl. Museen zu Berlin, i. 207, Ns. 2247; ibid. (Ghalla, Meṣḥallād kashkawīi k. lampa Katalog, p. 188, Ns. 505 (Misc. 200 a. H.), p. 387, Ns. 920 (Misc. 200 a. H.), Ns. 924 (Misc. 204 a. H.).


AL-SARĪ B. MATAWAH, better known in Arabic as ABU-SARAYA, a kinsman of al-Sarī, has served as a governor and a military officer, and his name is found on the numerous gold and silver coins of the 8th and 9th centuries. He commanded the army of the Umayyads against the Abu Salama and al-Maṭṭūn. His name is also found on the coins of Egypt. He was a prominent figure in the government of the state and held high positions in the army. His role in the political and military affairs of the time is significant, and his influence extended beyond his own district. His contribution to the history of the Arab world is noteworthy, and his name is often cited in the records of the period. (AUG. GRIINWALD)
al-Hasan b. 'Ali al-Ma'muni's troops, was defeated and wounded, whereupon his force melted away. He tried to reach his home at Ra'a al-'Am but was overtaken at Dja'ilah by Hammad ibn Kunda-
giyy, who made him prisoner and brought him to al-Hasan b. Sahl, al-Ma'muni's vizier, then to Nahrawan, who had him beheaded (Rasif, l. 10 = Oct. 18, 815); his body was hung on a gibbet on the bridge of Baghdad. His rebellion had lasted ten months.

bit 1828, iii. 242 sqq. (CL. HUART)

SARI AL-SAKANTI, Avu 'L-Hasan Sari b. qu-MAHALLA, a Sufi mystic, died at Baghdad on Ramadhan 28, 257 (870) or 253 (867) aged 78 (or 98). He was the uncle of Qunain (q.v.), teacher of Nurri, Kharrar and Khair Nusaydji, and figures at a later period in the classic innov. of the 'Ahl al-Sunna, especially in the works of al-Isfahani (cf. L. Masson), Mission en Irak, Paris 1912, ii. 105). But Ma'ruf can hardly have been the direct teacher of Sari.

Sori is said to be equivalent to 'Yah as synonymous with Raffi or by an accommodating interpretation of Koran vi. 24. Sufi, iuran means a dealer in old iron and old clothes. As regards doctrine, Sari was the pupil of al-Mahdiyya (q.v.) he insists on the reality of a reciprocal love uniting God to man (intimad); he maintains that a true lover ought no longer to suffer any physical pain and says that at the Last Judgement the markabat will have a place of honour above the three communities (of Moslem, Jews and Muhammadan). Sari was attacked by Ibn al-Hashim for having admitted that the letters of the text of the Koran were created and for having neglected asceticism in the matter of food.


SARI 'ABD ALLAH EFENDI, Ottoman poet and man of letters, was the son of Saliyid Mu-
hammad, a prince of the Maghrib who had died to Constantiople in the reign of Sultan Ahmad I, and had married the daughter of Muhammad Pasha, brother of the Grand Vizier Kha bile Pasha. He was brought up by the latter, who had entrusted his education to Shukri al-Mahmud of Scatri, accompanied him as taddabir ("editor") when during his second vision at the command of the troops in the Persian campaign, was appointed reta al-kutub in 1037 (1627/28) in place of Muhammad Efendi who had just died and was dismissed at the same time as his patron. On the latter's death he was appointed reta of the imperial sultah in 1047 (1637/38), accompanied Murad IV to Baghdad and then became reta al-kutub for the second time. He filled other offices till 1065 (1655) when he retired from public life. He died in 1071 (1660/61). He wrote a com-

SARI AL-SULTAN DEDE, a Turkish savant and Bektaşi saint. He was a contemporary of Hafiz Kebir [q.v.] in whose legendary biography (cf. his widely spread Ilyasyet-i Hafiz); he played an important role unit of whom he is said merely to have been a disciple, and came into the most venerable orders of the Bektaşi, his real name is said to have been Meşmed (Meşmed Beg) in Evliya, Celebi. Songs, i. 134--35). Practically nothing is known of his life and career. According to the Oguzmanlilar in the extract in Sevildi Lokeni, in 626 (1263/64) he led a

SARI KURZ, also Sari Kezir, an Ottoman jurist and military judge. His proper name was Nur al-Din and he was born in the district of Karasi, his father's name being Yassu. After studying under famous teachers, including Kadi Ja Sia Tugha, he entered upon a legal career, becoming professor (muqaddim), later "guardian" (hakan) and finally in 917 (1511/12) Rsh of Stambal. Sultan Bayad II employed him on various affairs of state, for example as a delegate to Prince Soyyar's and to the Emperor in Warsaw, Gesch. des sursamischen Reiches, ii. 357. and Die schen Krieger des Kustem Pascha, ed. by I. Forrer, Leipzig 1923, p. 28 sq.; also G.O.R., iv. 371. In 919 (1513/14) in the reign of Selim I he was appointed military judge (hakan-takif) of Anatolia and in 921 (1515/16) of Rumelia. Next year he was dismissed and became again "guardian," about 926 (1619/20) he became kadi of Stambal for a second time (cf. Lamnrizios, Hist. Miscron, p. 613, 30, and F. Giese, An. Chr., v. 159). In 928 (1521/22); according to other sources 929 = 1522/23) he died. He was buried in deceased, where he was buried in a mosque which he had built. He lived not far from the mevlid which bears his name (cf. Hadijar al-Qarni, l. 135 sqq.; G.O.R., iv. 72, No. 280); one quarter of Stambal is still called Sery gunalet after him (a ghubi- mevlid), which has arisen from Sari Kurz which came in time to be misunderstood, on the name see Sirri Pasba, Chaghati-ta-mevlid, Stambuli, second ed., v. Sari gunalet and J. H. Mocett (in Der Islam, xiv. 155). On his son Meşmed cf. Afi, suppl. to the Gazettes, p. 265; on his son-in-law Sia Tugha of Soumous, famous as a commentator, cf. Hadijar Khaditi, Fehiikle, p. 399; Hadijar al-Dawlah, 1. 1344; Sefali 'Oghuzman, in. 108.

Sari Kurz wrote on Fihik and left a number of works, a list of which is given in Hadijar Khaditi, Kaskif al-Garni, ed. Flügel, under No. 7119.

SARI AL-SULTAN DEDE, a Turkish s
large body of people (10,000—12,000), said to have been Anatolian Turkomans, who settled on the western coast of the Black Sea in Dobrudjan Tartary, especially around Baba Daghi. The reason for this migration is unknown; it is perhaps connected with the advance of Hulagu (cf. *Der Islam*, xi. 24). Apart from the Oguzname (cf. J. W. Lagus, *Seit Leomani as Hires Tuncres gus Oguzname inscribrum excerpta*, Helsingfors 1854, smi. G. Fligel, *Die arab.-pers. und turk. Handschr. der Wiener Hofbibl.*, ii. 235) there are no contemporary records and the possible Byzantine sources are also silent (e.g. Pachymeres, Nikephoras Greg., Georg. Acropolita; cf. however, J. W. Lagus, *op. cit., p. 30 xgr*). It seems, however, that older accounts once existed but have now been lost. For example, according to Ewliya Celebi (? v.), Vasi'd-din Ahmed Celebi (d. 824 = 1450) wrote a *riza* on *Safr Saltik* and Kenan Pasha, some time governor of Odzun, composed a *Saltikname* of 40 *kurzan* (cf. Ewliya, *op. cit., iii. 366, and thereon Vas. Dimitri, Obir *istorii tureckoj literatury* in Koryn, *Vestnikglava literaturn*., St. Petersburg 1891, wheres extracts are given from a *Saltikovskoe*). Ewliya, who seems to have had access to one of these sources now lost, says that *Safr Saltik* lived in Arza Çelikovu, in Tekke and Tektaş before he migrated to Reshata. There he is described as a *gazi*, which would be in accordance with Ewliya’s statement elsewhere (I. 659): *purifier (šamār) from the *zir*.* The earliest notice of *Safr Saltik* is given by Ibn Battuta (ii. 416) who visited about a generation after his death his sanctuary at *Baba Saltuk* (the site of which, however, cannot even approximately be defined) and very briefly tells of the saint’s miracles (*manāqib*). The fact that Ibn Battuta is obviously not able to give anything reliable about *Safr Saltik* who died barely 30 years before raises legitimate doubts regarding either the Arab traveller’s statements or the historicness of the saint. The fact is that traits and miracles are ascribed to him which are reported of Byzantine saints, and the *Safr Saltik* is confused with Byzantine saints. The legend given by Ewliya of *Safr Saltik* is remarkable and probably isolated. According to it, the wonder-worker gave his disciples the order to bury his body after his death in 6 or 7 coffins in remote towns of infidel lands, *so that ignorance where the body really is will produce everywhere a pilgrimage of Muslims and from the pilgrimage will result the incorporation of these lands into the kingdom of Islam* (cf. J. von Hammer, *G. O. R.*, vi. 354 sq., following Ewliya Celebi, *op. cit., iii. 153 sq.*). According to Ewliya, coffins were therefore taken to Baba Eski, Baba Daghi, Kalliakra, Buaza (Bulgaria) and even to Damascus. The migration of the Lipta Tatars to Islam is ascribed to *Safr Saltik*. Christian saints are repeatedly identified with the Turkish saint and still more numerous are the places in the Balkans associated with the latter. In Kalliakra (Kiligrasa) *Safr Saltik* appears as a dragon-slayer who liberates an imprisoned Christian princess (cf. Ewliya, *ii. 137 sq.; C. J. Jirecek, *Das Fiirstentum Bulgarien*, Vienna 1890, p. 525; J. von Hammer, *Rumelii und Bosnia*, Vienna 1813, p. 47; *Archiv für griech.-historische Mitteilungen*, 1886, x. 162 sq.; *Z. d. M. G.*, 1922, lxxvi. 155), and Ewliya himself brings *Safr Saltik* into connection with St. Nicolas (Sveti Nikola; cf. *op. cit., ii. 137*). There are other sanctuaries or tombs of *Safr Saltik* in Kroya (cf. *Wissenschaftliche Mitteilungen aus Rumänien*, vii. 60; Ippek, *Storia*, b. 71 sqq.; A. Degrand, *Sommervor der Hau-Hautisme*, Paris 1901, p. 253 sqq., 336 sqq.), in Adrianople (Ewliya, *op. cit., 461 sqq.), Corfu, where he is associated with St. Spyridon (Spyridon) (cf. *Sämt Bey Frafragh [un Arabem]*, *Kamiad el-Othman*, p. 2016), in Illyria at Mostar (cf. Safr Saltik, *Brevis historiae et status novum de*), in the *Töröd*, Budapest 1015, p. 505 sqq.; lacking in Ewliya (d. 974; see *op. cit.* on 436, 5 sqq. a *lavorio di laterai invention*), in Crete, a place between Kroya and Dikovora, where his alleged tomb is shown (cf. P. W. Hasluck, in the *Annual of the British School at Athlone*, 1901, note 3), in the Greek monastery of St. Nazam (Sveti Nazam) on the south shore of Lake Ohriza (cf. *Sämt Bey Frafragh, op. cit.*). *Safr Saltik* once becomes St. George, also Elias, then St. Simeon and finally *Kara Konjolos* (? cf. Ewliya, *Travels*, ed. J. von Hammar, i. 161, not in the Stamibl printed text) and he thus becomes one of the most remarkable features in the mingling of Muslim and Christian beliefs. The principal sanctuary of *Safr Saltik* is, however, at Baba Daghi (cf. Ibn Battata, *op. cit.; Ewliya, *ii. 365 sqq.*). It was built by Sultan Bayezid II, the Welti, as a place of pilgrimage to which Sultan Sulaiman afterwards made a pilgrimage (cf. *Histoire de la turquie* in the *campagne de Mohacs par Samuel Pacia Saltik*, ed. M. Faver de Combraille, Paris 1859, p. 80 sqq., 777; J. von Hammer, *G. O. R.*, iii. 302). *Safr Saltik* Finally appears as *Pir* of the glee of Reppaçiler, the makers of arrows (miller-spirit) (cf. Ewliya, *ii. 659*, where *Safr Saltik* is described as disciple [*miftah*] of Ahmed Yenawi). Whether *Safr Saltik* in Al Jala, *Numaliet el moutte et ristes moutte*, St. Petersburg 1860, p. 94 sqq., is identical with our *Safr Saltik* may not be discussed here. In later Ottoman literature, *Safr Saltik* occasionally plays a part, for example in the *Kâmous* *fiver* of *Newzīde Atay* (d. 1044 = 1634; cf. J. von Hammer, *Gesch. der osmanischen Dichtkunst*, iii. 281). The half historical, half legendary figure of *Safr Saltik* Dede demands a thorough investigation. One thing is certain, that it is closely connected with the Bektashi movement, in the region of expansion of which in the Balkans *Safr Saltik* enjoys the greatest esteem. So long as the history of the *Alb* sectarians (*Alevi*) in south-eastern Europe is as obscure as at present, only vague statements can be made regarding *Safr Saltik* Dede.


**SAR-I PUL**, *the head of the bridge*, called by Arab geographers *Bāb al-An垦tanara, a town of Afgan Turkistan situated in 36° 20' N. Lat. and 65°
40' E. Long. on the Aby-Safid from the bridge over which it takes its name. It is not to be confused with a village near Samarqand or a quarter of Nishapur, both of the same name, such as is historically as important as the Afghan town. Between the northern spur of the Paropamis and the sands to the south of the Oxus, is a fertile tract well watered by streams from the mountains, but proverbially unhealthy, lay four Uzbeg Khansates or petty principalities, Akta, Shirkaghân, Malauz and Sari-pul with Anahú and Anghú, the independence of which has been destroyed by the Durâst and Bârsâkh Amir of Afghanistan. Of these principalities Sari-pul is now subject to the rule of Kâbul. In 1865 the troops stationed there revolted against the Amir Shâr 'Ali, but the mutiny was suppressed by 'Abbâr al-Râmân Khân, who eventually succeeded as Amir; not long afterwards Sari-pul lost the last vestiges of its independence, but the former geographical and political divisions of the principalities are preserved and their Uzbeg inhabitants are exempt from liability to military service.


Sâri-k (a) *theif*, Muslim legal theory distinguishes between al-širâf al-mîqâzâb (theft) and al-širâf al-khâbâ (highway robbery or brigandage).

1) *Theif* (širâf) is punished by cutting off the hand, according to Sâra v. 42. This was an innovation of the Prophet's; but, according to the Amâli literature, this had already been introduced in the days of paganism by Wâlid b. Mughira (Nöldke-Schwartz, Gesch. d. Quaran, I. 230). This method of punishment may be of Persian origin (cf. Lettre de Tâbour, ed. Darmesteter in the J.A., 1894, Series 9, iii. 220 sqq., 225 sqq.; Safar Dar 64, 5 = Sacred books of the East, xxiv. 327).

In pre-Ma'mamadan Arabia theft from a fellow-tribesman or from a guest was alone considered despicable, but no punishment was prescribed for it; the person had himself to see how he could regain his property (Jacob, Bedoonenleben, p. 217 sqq.; Dâvûddârî, Remarques sur la Bedounie). Weimar 1831, p. 127 sqq., 261 sqq.). In the beginning of the first century A.H. the right or left hand was cut off; there was no fixed rule. The Korân leaves the point obscure and one tradition says that 'Abbâr Bâkî ordered the left hand to be cut off (Mawâṣše, Sârî, bâb 4; al-Shâfi'î, Kitâb al-Umm, ed. 117). Cf. the variant of Sâra v. 42: assimûntâhû, transmitted by Ibn Mas'ûd.

According to the teaching of the Fâšâ, the thief's right-hand is cut off (for a second crime the left foot, then the left hand, then the right foot) and on this the wrist is cut off; hot oil or fire to stop the bleeding. The Hâfiz and Zâhid, however, put the culprit into prison at his third crime, which the Shâfi'î and Malikî only do after his fifth. The Shâfi'î inflict imprisonment for the third offence and death for the fourth. The punishment was inflicted in public; the thief was frequently led round the town seated backwards on an ass with the limb cut off hanging round his neck (cf. Ibn Mâdîq, Qutbâdî, bâb 23; Rescher, Studien über den Inhalt von 1002 Nachti, in Jl., i. 1910, ix. 68 sqq.). Punishment could not be inflicted in cases of pregnancy, severe illness or when the weather was very cold or very hot. It is a *hadî* punishment, as a right of God (bîkî Allah) is violated by theft. But at the beginning of the second century A.H. mutilation is still contrasted with the *hadî* punishment (al-Maså'î, Mu'jam, vi. 28), but as the rights of the owner are also injured (bîkî al-dâlî) the thief is bound to make reparation. If the article stolen has disappeared, he is kept under arrest (not so according to Âhî Hâshîa). The Caliph 'Umar is said always to have condoned the thief to return double the value (cf. Roman law: Justinian, Justin. 4, 1, 3).

The jurists define theft for which the *hadî* punishment is prescribed as the clandestine removal of legally recognised property (mâ'âl) in the safe keeping (bîrâ) of another of a definite minimum value (nîzâf; among the Hunaifs and Zâhid ten dirhams, among the Malikîs, Shâfi'îs and Shâfîs' 1/4 dirâm or 3 dirhams) to which the thief has no right of ownership; it is so distinguished from usurpation (ziyâd) and confiscation (zâhîma). By bîrâ is meant guarding by a watchman or by the nature of the place (e.g. a private home). Thus theft from a building is more accessible to the public (e.g.shop-keepers, bath houses) and is not liable to the *hadî* punishment. This is further only applied to one who 1) has attained his majority (bâlîq, q.v.); 2) in compas mentis (bâlkî) and 3) has the intention (nîzâf) of stealing (âmusûn furâsî); i.e. is not acting under compulsion (mu'kîfîcî). No distinction is made between free- man or slave, male or female. The punishment is not applied in case of thefts between husband and wife and near relatives nor in the case of a slave robbing his master or a guest his host. Views are divided on the question of the punishment of the širâf and the alien (muflîd/mem) with the *hadî*; and on the punishment of accomplices and accessories; in any case the total divided among them must reach the nizâf for each of the thieves.

In is not theft to take articles of trifling value (wood, water, wild guns) and things which quickly go to waste (fresh fruit, meat and milk), or articles in which the 'shrâ' does not recognise private ownership or things which are not legitimate articles of commerce (mâal), like freeborn children, wine, pigs, dogs, chess-sets, musical instruments, golden crosses — the theft of a full grown slave is considered 'asbûh — or articles in which the thief already has a share (booty, state deposits, wâbî common good to the value of the share), also copies of the Korân and books (except account books) as it is assumed the thief only desires to obtain the contents. The conception of literary theft is known to the Fâshîa.

The charge can be made by the owner and legitimate possessor (or depository) but not by a second thief. The legal inquiry has to be conducted in the presence of the person robbed. For proof two male witnesses are necessary or a confession (bâbîq, q.v.) which can, however, be withdrawn. It is recommended to plead not guilty if at all possible (cf. the art. ADAM). If the thief, however, has given back the article stolen before the charge is made, he is immune from punishment. (cf. Sâra v. 43).

2) Highway robbery or robbery with violence (mu'kîfîcî, bâb al-arîf) occurs when anyone who can be dangerous to travelling falls upon them and robs them when distant from any possible help.
or when someone enters a house, armed, with the intention of robbing (cf. Roman Law: Justinian, Novellae, 134, Ch. 13). The Shīʿa consider any armed attack even in inhabited places as highway robbery. The same regulations hold regarding the person and the object as above, especially the nisāb. On the authority of Sīra v. 37 sq., the culprit is liable to the following hadd punishments. If a man has committed a robbery which is practically a theft to be punished with hadd his right hand and left foot are cut off (the next time, the left hand and the right foot). If, however, he has robbed and killed, he is put to death in keeping with right of reprisal (ṣalāt) and his body publicly exposed for three days on a cross or in some other way. The punishment of death is here considered a ḥadd Allūh; the payment of blood-money (diya) is therefore out of the question. If the criminal repents, however, before he is taken, the hadd punishment is omitted; but the claim of the person robbed of the article for compensation and the tithes remain. All accomplices are punished in the same way; if one of them cannot be held responsible for his actions, the hadd punishment cannot be inflicted on any.

All these laws hold only for the ḥadd punishments which the judge him only inflict when all conditions are fulfilled. In all other cases the thief is punished with taʾṣīr (q.-v.) and condemned to restore the article or to make reparation. It is the same with the thief who comes secretly but goes away openly (muḥkālah) or the robber who falls upon someone and robs him at a place where help is available (muṣṭalah). Special laws were therefore frequently passed in Muslim states to supplement the ṣalāt, in Turkey, for example, by Meḥmed II (Mitteilungen zur Orient Geschichte, i. 1921, p. 21, 35), Sultān II (v. Hammer, Staatsverfassung, i. 147 sq.), Meḥmed IV and ʿAbd al-Maqīd. These laws endeavour more and more to replace the hadd punishment by fines and corporal punishment. The Turkish criminal code of 1858 still only recognizes fines and imprisonment for theft although the ṣalāt was not officially abolished thereby (cf. the al-Muqlidlī). The code of punishment laid down in the ṣalāt still holds the present day holds only in Persia and Afghanistan and the Yemen.


SARIRA. [See ZARAG.]

SARLIYA, the name of a sect in Northern Mesopotamia to the south of Mosul. This sect is also a kind of tribe called Sarla and lives in six villages, four of which lie on the right bank and two on the left of the Great Zab, not far from its junction with the Tigri. The principal village, where the chief lives, is called Warrak, and lies on the right bank; the largest village on the left bank is Seifye.

The Sarlī, like the other sects found in Mesopotamia (Yazidis, Shuhāk, Bāḏīšu), are very uncommunicative with regard to their beliefs and religious practices, so that the other inhabitants of the country attribute abominable superstitions to them and allege that they have a kind of secret language of their own. In al-Muṣṭīrīq, 1922, v. 577 sqq., Père Anastase gives some notes on the Sarlī and also on the sects of Bāḏīšu and the Shuhāk which he obtained from an individual in Mosul. According to him, their language is a mixture of Kurdish, Persian and Turkish. As to religion, they are monotheists, believing in certain prophets, in paradise and hell. They neither fast nor pray. They believe that their chief has the power to set territory in paradise. For this purpose he visits all the villages at harvest time, and every Sarī is allowed to purchase as much ṣalāt as he can pay for; the price of a ṣalāt is never less than a quarter of a meqdīye. Credit is not granted. The chief gives a receipt which shows how much ṣalāt an individual has acquired. This receipt is put in the pocket of the dead man so that he can present it to Rijwān, the guardian of Paradise. The Sarlī have also a feast-day once in every lunar year which consists in the consumption of a repast at which the chief resides, and to which every one contributes a cock boiled with rice or wheat. After this meal, called aḵt al-muṣṭīrīq, the lights are said to be extinguished and orgies of promiscuity to take place. The head of the community is succeeded at his death by his unmarried son; he is forbidden to shave his beard or his monstache. The Sarlī are polygamous. They are said to have a sacred book written in Persian.

These statements should be taken with considerable reserve. The Sarlī themselves say that they are simply Kurds and belonged originally to the Kāke Kurds who have some villages near Kirkuk. But the Kāke Kurds also have a mysterious reputation. A characteristic feature noticed in one of the Sarlī villages (Seifye) is an ornamental with triangular holes in the walls of the principal buildings of the village.

The Sarlī have the reputation of being good farmers. Their ethnological type is the same as that of the Kurds, as Péres have said. It is only their religious beliefs that have been influenced by ultra-Shīʿa and ancient Persian ideas. Like the Yazidis they have Muslim names; their present chief is called Tāḥa Koa or Mulla Tāḥa.

Bibliography: W. R. Hay, Two Years in Kurdistan, London 1921, p. 95, 94; Père Anastase's article is entitled Taʾṣīr induced al-Muṣṭīrīq fi taʾris ṣalāt Abu adīya; Cunet, Le Théâtre d'Avir, Paris 1894. (J. H. KRAMER)

SŪPUL-I ZOHĀB ("bridgehead of Zohāb"), a place on the way to Zagros on the great Baghda-Kirmānshāh road, taking its name from the stone bridge of two arches over the river Alwand, a tributary of the left bank of the
Diya'a. Sarpul now consists simply of a little fort (Kurban = "arsenal") in which the governor of Zohab lives (the post is regularly filled by the chief of the tribe of Güran), a caravanserai, a garden of cypress and about 40 houses. The old town of Zohab about 4 hours to the north is now in ruins. To the east behind the cliffs of Hassar-Djarzh lies the little canton of Beghiwe (Kurdish = "below") in a corridor running in the foot of Zagros giving access to the famous col of Pa-Tak on the slope of which is the Sástanian edifice called Tak-i Girzá. In the west the heights of Mó-[Y. Qu']bá separate the verdant plain of Sarpul from that of Kásir-Shirin [q.v.]. Sarpul is the natural halting place for thousands of Persian pilgrims going to the resurrection (Karbalá) and other Shi'a sanctuaries. When the pilgrimage season is at its height (in autumn and winter), a hundred tents may be seen near the bridge. They belong to the Kurdish gipsy tribe of Súmání (Fúlú) the women of which are professional dancers and singers noted for their light morals.

Sarpul corresponds to the site of the ancient Khulman of the Assyrians, Hulwan [q.v.] in the Araxes. The earlier name was surveyed as the Kurdish name of the Albánd l.c. Haláwan. Traces of the old town are found mainly on the left bank (Pálp) where the land is level and beautiful.

Sarpul is noted for its antiquities: 1) the bas-relief and Pahlavi inscription on the cliff on the right bank of the Alwád; 2) three steles on the cliffs of Hassar-Djarzh (on the left bank) of which two are Sástanian (Pártián) and the third represents Ana-Bûnini, king of the Lulubi; 3) two miles away to the south of Hassar-Djarzh is the Achaemenid tomb cut out of the rock and venerated at the present day under the name of Dádán-Dádán (Dádán's workshop) by the Ahl-i Hák (see the art. 'Ahl-i Hák, q.v.) who have a cemetery at the foot of the rock.

Bibliography: H. Rawlinson, J. R. G. S., 1839, in. 39; Ritter, Erdkunde, in., Berlin 1840, p. 460; J. F. Jones, Memoirs in Selections from the records of the Bombay Government, xliii, New Series, p. 150; Cirikov, Putevi jedari, St. Petersburg 1875, p. 313 and passim; J. P. Ferrier, Voyage en Perse, Paris 1880, p. 29; de Morgan, Miss. scient. ii., Etudes géog., Paris 1895, p. 106; iv., Recherches archéol., part i., Paris 1896, p. 149-171 (plates vii. and xii. give detailed sketches of the locality); E. Aubin, La Perse d'aujourd'hui, Paris 1908, p. 348; Sarre-Herfeld, Iranische Forschungen, Berlin 1910, p. 61; Herzfeld, Am Tormow Atien, Berlin 1920, p. 221; M. N. Merk, Turko-Tatar, originally old Turkic word for "merchant," is used with this meaning in the Kuágiku-Blik (quotations in Radloff, Verzeichnisse der Tbuche der Türk. Diakete, iv. 353) and by Mahmúd Kasghári (e.g. i. 256). In the Uighur translation (from the Chinese, of the Sádka wentvarthi the Sanskrit word Sártvávatara or Sártvávihāra "caravan-leader" is translated sartap; this word is explained as the "senior merchant" (kursik ul u'lah). Radloff therefore concludes that Turk. sart is an Indian loan-word (Kuan-si-in Pousar, Bibl. Budd., St. Petersburg 1911, xiv. p. 37). When the Iranians of Central Asia had secure control of the trade with the nomad peoples, the word nur became used by the Turks and Mongols as the name of a people with the same meaning as Tádžik (Tádžik). Rashid al-Din (ed. Bresciani, Trudi vantost. Arz. Oikh. vii, 141) says that the prince of the (Muslim) Kárlík, Arslán Khán, when he submitted to the Mongols was called sartákši, i.e. Tádžik, by them. The form of the name of the people here is Sarták: the táz was added by the Mongols to the name to signify a male member of a people (cf. táz, p. 65). As this example shows, the Mongols were not so much people of a definite nationality and language (the Kárlík were of course a Turkish people) as adherents of a definite type of culture, the Perso-Máhámadan. The Sartákši seems to have come to the Mongols not only as a merchant but also as a bearer of civilisation and especially as an expert in irrigation: this seems to be the only explanation of the Mongol legends of the hero Sartákši, and the wonderful canals, bridges and dams which he built (J. N. Fotani, Oécher secoou-ou gond-Mongoli, St. Petersburg 1881/83, iv. 25/56). Alongside of Sartákši we find Sartal used in the same meaning a word derived from the same root (e.g. Rashid al-Din, op. cit., 29). In the Arabic-Mongol glossary published by Michuransky, sartal is explained as al-sartalim (Zap. xvi. 75 in). On the other hand in Turkistan in the Mongol period, we find Sart opposed to 'Turk', apparently only because of the difference of language; cf. especially the description of Ferghána, in Babür, ed. Beveridge, f. 26 on Andíjá, il táz dár, f. 36 on Margáhit il táz dár. A. Samoilovič, Afgánistán, Moscow 1924, p. 103 sq., calls attention to another passage in Babür (f. 131 a-a), where a distinction seems to be made between Sart and Tádžik; it is said that the population of the town of Káhrá reads several villages consists of Sart, while in other villages and wiláyet live other people including the Tádžik. The language of the Sart is often opposed to the language of the Turk by Nur 'Ali Shír Náwái, cf. e.g. the quotation from his Maqá all-Nafz'í in the dictionary of Sháhí Shúlamán in L. Budagov, Svaradiz'í'íyé svarati-tá-farzísh hariri, l. 612 and especially the whole of the Mu'álimat al-injáñuín, where Persian as Fársi or Súr-tí is contrasted with Turkish (Khókon edition, n. d. e.g. p. 19: Sárt táz-tí nil mán miltanfx žàfíh tükürkler). After the conquest of Turkistan by the Özbek the contrast between the Özbek and the subject native population must have at times been felt more strongly than the contrast between Turk and Tádžik (or Sart). The Özbek in Khíwa are very frequently distinguished from the Sart by Abu l-'Ghásí, cf. ed. Desmoulin, p. 231: Urgenchening Özbek wa Sarti; p. 256: Kaxmirazjan Özbeki wa Sartin. The same linguistic usage has survived in Khánzám to the present day. The contrast is less apparent in Buhara and Khókon; it is more usual especially among the nomads themselves, for the Kazák [q.v.] and not the Özbek are contrasted as nomads with the Sart as town dwellers and agriculturists. In Khókon, government edicts are said to have begun with the words Özbek wa Kaxmirazjan Özbeki wa Sartin but (as far as I know) no such documents have yet been published. To the Kazák every member of a settled community was a Sart, whether his language was Turkish or Iranísh; in official language the word Sart seems to have been applied to the turkicised settled population in contrast to the Tádžik
who had retained their Iranian language, cf. in the Türkü Şahkulu, ed. Pauthier (Kazan 1883), p. 193; Sarîyâ wa ad-Dijlîya, p. 209; Kermâşâ Sarîyâ wa al-Dijlîya, p. 279; lâlitâ wa al-kermâsha Sarîyâ wa al-Dijlîya. The same usage has been adopted by European scholars, although it was difficult to define the difference between Sart and Ozbeg. According to Kalfoud (Kalm.-ил. пис.обр. и ст.), Sart now means, "the Turkish-speaking town-dwellers of Central Asia in contrast to the villagers the Ozbeg". In some regions especially around Samarkand, the villagers still pride themselves on being Ozbeg and have retained the division into families, but this distinction between town and country does not apply to the whole of Turkistan. No attempt has yet been made to establish a dialectic difference between Sart and Ozbeg. The settled peoples of Central Asia are in the first place Muslims and think of themselves only secondarily as living in a particular town or district, to them the idea of belonging to a particular stock is of no significance. It is only in modern times under the influence of European culture (through the intermediary of Russie) that a striving for national unity has arisen. The word "Sart", applied by the nomads with unconcealed contempt to the settled population and popularly explained as part of "yellow dog", has been banished from use: now only an Ozbeg nationality is recognised in contrast to the nationalities of the Kazak, Turkmens and Tadjiks.

Bibliography: N. Ostroumoff, Sart?, Taschkent 1908, with a survey of the literature on the Sart and of the several attempts to explain the etymology of the word; R. Jung, Das Problem der Europäisierung orientatischer Wirtschaft etc., Weimar 1915, p. 85-96.

(S. BARKHOLD)

SART, small village in Lydia in Asia Minor, the ancient Sardes (στέρος) of the classical authors, which makes Śāṁ write Sārād, capital of the Lydian Kingdom, situated on the eastern bank of the Sardus, a small river. Sart (Pastoum) a small lake with a lake-bird, filled with the river joining the Golfo Cal (Hermus). Although in the Byzantine period Sardes had lost much of its former importance (as a metropolitan see and been outflanked by Magnesia (Turkish Mahmûd) and Philadelphia (Alş Şerî, q.v.), it still was one of the largest towns, when the Seljuk Turks, in the 11th century, made incursions into the Hermus valley. At the time they were expelled by the Byzantine general Philocharis (1118). At the end of the 12th century Sardes had been for some time under a combined Greek and Turkish domination, until the Greeks were able to drive away the Turks a second time (Pechymeres, ed. Niebuhr, Bonn 1833, ii. 405). In the beginning of the 13th century the citadel was surrendered to one of the Seljuk amirs, and the town probably belonged during the remainder of that century to the territory of the Şarkhan [q.v., dynasty, whose capital was Magnesia. So when in 792/1390 the Ottoman Sultan Bayazid I, after the conquest of the then Greek town Philadelphia, took possession of the Şarkhan country, Sardes was equally incorporated in his empire (Anon. anonym., Gesen. Bruesch 1222, p. 28; Şâhî Bahşâ Zâcâ, Constantinop. 1335, p. 85). After the battle of Angora, when Timur marched against Smyrna (809/1403), Sardes and its citadel were probably destroyed and never recovered again.

At present Sart consists only of a few miserable huts inhabited by Vâlîkas, between the Sart hill and the citadel hill. This hill is a long narrow counterfort, 200 metres in height, belonging to Mount Taures (now Malang Dagh) in the South (a topographical sketch of the site in Courtois, Reise im sächsischen und Türkischen Kaiserland in A. F. P. T. IV, 1785, Plate V). East of the ridge is a small millbrook called Yabah Cal; south of the town it joins the Pastoum, which unites with the Hermus about six km. to the north of the aeropole hill. At the other side of the Hermus is situated the big necropolis of Sardes, a large plain of mounds calledюм Pîr Tepâ. North of this plain is the Mernare Lake, the ancient Lake of Gyges. The railway from Smyrna to Ali-Shek runs along the southern Hermus bank and has a station at Sart. In the Turkish administration Sart belongs to the mîkhél of the Sanişul Şarîkhîn of the wilâyêt Amdin. The necropolis belongs to the Kañar Kaşaba.

The site of Sardes has gained much importance from an archaeological point of view. The most complete information is to be found in the Publications of the American Society for the excavation of Sardis (Laidlaw 1918). See also Peuly-Wiseman's Encyclopädie der historischen Altertumswissenschaft, 2nd Series (Stuttgart 1892), col. 2477 sq.


(J. H. KLAMER)

SARUDE, a town in Dyîz Muqar [q.v.] on the most southerly of the three roads from Bagtab [q.v.] to Urfa [q.v.] in 36° 56' N. Lat. and 38° 27' E. Long. As the name of the town is also that of the district, its relation to the ancient name Anthesmus and Batnae is disputed; cf. Bibliography. On account of the fertility of the district in which the town is situated, and the central position between the Ephesians on the one side and Urfa and Ismir [q.v.] from each of which it is about a day's journey distant, on the other, the traffic through it brought it a certain degree of prosperity, especially as it was also important as a post-station between al-Kassâ and Samsâ; according to Ibn Khordozînî [q.v.], it was 20 farshak from the former town and 13 from the latter. The principal occupation was by the natural suitability of the soil for growing fruit and the vine, as all the geographers tell us. Within the town, itself Ibrî Dzhubatî [q.v.] found orchards and running water.

The town was captured with the rest of Dîzmu in 1639 by Jâng, b. Ghurom. There is a number of references to its later history scattered through the geographers and historians; but the history of the town can only be intelligently handled in connection with the history of the Dîzmu. — By the time of Ibn al-Farîd [q.v.], Saruđ already was in ruins. Modern travellers describe it much as do the medieval geographers, except that it appears smaller to them. Schuch (see Bibli.) actually speaks of the village of Sarudî; it is now the residence of a kâim-nilâm.
SARUKHAN

Sarukhan has attained great fame in literature because he was the son of the Maghann of al-Harrâf, Abu Zaid, whom he belonged to. In this work there are also details regarding the town itself.

**Bibliography:** Fazlul, *Articles Anti-
B. M. K. D. (
him. N. S., ii. 82. *Athey, his *Geschichte.*
S. A. (
5. Some of the events are, however, not completely clear.*

**Andronicus III,** the younger Emperor of Byzantium about 1329 against the Genoese (cf. *G. O. R.,* i. 126 sq. and against the Seljuks, and about 1345 allowed Umar Beg to sail in the east and west of the Seljuks, who was granted to the Seljuks.* *Cf. Ibn Batuta, ii. 316.

Soon afterwards, the Emperor, having obtained the permission to visit Sárâkhan, which, although granted at once, was not available (cf. *Cf. Ibn Batuta, ii. 136), Sarukhan must have died very soon afterwards. The throne was passed to his son Fayadh al-Din Baybars about whose activities almost nothing is known. He died in 1278 (1273/1275) and left the kingdom to his son Mūsâ al-Din Baybars, whom he himself was known. He was an ardent member of the Mamluks and founded a Mamluk monastery in Maghnia as well as the chief mosque (Ulûq al-Maâlûk and the al-Ma'âlûk) which was carved on a wooden chalice.*

**27. 17.**

(M. Plessis)

**SARUKHAN,** the name of a Turkmân dynasty, which made itself independent in Anatolia on the collapse of the kingdom of the Seljuqs of Rûm and had its capital in Maghnia, the ancient Magin of the Sibyllus; for the name was originally that of a tribe (cf. *Sarukhan* in *Homera, Exan.,* 1388 and later survived as that of the dynasty is uncertain. At the beginning of the xiii century the Sarukhan (written Saragh in the Greek) is mentioned as lord of Maghnia which he had occupied in 1215 and had made his capital. He seems to have been engaged in heavy fighting with the Cilician magnates and the Byzantine Emperor (about 1304 cf. *Chronicle des dixen de l'Empire Magnon* of the Seljuks, tr. by C. W. Lang, ii. 416. [Leipzig 1842]; Macraux = Maghnia), but in the end to have succeeded in asserting his independence. Indeed the Genoese settlement of Foca (Thrace) owed him allegiance and had to pay a yearly tribute to him (Ducas, p. 162; Ibn Battuta, ii. 314). While Sarukhan resided in Maghnia (Ducas, p. 157; Pachymeres, ii. 451-452; Nicephor. Gregor. *B. M. D.* ii. 314; Shihâb al-Din al-

Umarini in *E. Quatremere in N. E.,* 97. 339-368; Ibn Battuta, ii. 313), his brother Ali was established as an independent prince in Nis (the ancient Nymphaeum, south of Smyrna) (cf. Shihâb al-Din al-Umarini, p. 307; Defrere in the *Neuville Annuaire des Voyages,* ii. 19 [Bar 1855])

Sarukhan gradually gained a territory which roughly coincided with the ancient Lydia and included the following towns and villages: Genuz Hüsüs, Memeneh, Allah Hüsüs, Mernemeh, Girnûs, Kandik, Ahtâle, Demredji, Nis, Ildje, Türkmenli, Foça, Kara Hüsüs, Kesaina. His rule even seems to have extended, partially at least, to the Aegean Sea, the islands of which he repeatedly ravaged with this fleet (from Pachymeres J. von Hammer, *G. O. R.,* i. 70). In the course of his apparently stirring reign) Sarukhan made an alliance with the lords of Aidin and Mentechis, the
Šārūkhān — Sāsānians

The coinage of the Saʿd and their tricks are discussed by al-Djawhari, in his Kitāb al-Mahdār fī ḫaṣṣ al-ʿAtwar wa-rāḥēl al-ʿAtwar, discussed by de Goeje in the Z.D.M.G., xx. 485, 493, 500; cf. also Jouret, français du Nomum, 1835, p. 291; Dory, Supplément, a.v. SĀRĀN, (J. H. KRAMER)

**SĀSĀNIA S, A Persian dynasty.** The names of the kings in modern Persian form are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ardashir I</th>
<th>226-241</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vahram V</td>
<td>420-438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yadzigird II</td>
<td>438-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Shāpūr I | 241-272 |
| Bahram II | 272-273 |
| Hormizd III | 273-275 |
| Ardashir II | 277-283 |
| Narseh | 283-303 |
| Hormizd IV | 303-310 |
| Adharmnās | 310- |

| Shāpūr II | 277-279 |
| Shāpūr III | 279-283 |
| Shāpūr III | 283-285 |
| Shāpūr II | 387-389 |
| Ardashir II | 389-399 |
| Yadzigird I | 399-420 |

**Bibliography:** The Bani Saʿd and their tricks are discussed by al-Djawhari, in his Kitāb al-Mahdār fī ḫaṣṣ al-ʿAtwar wa-rāḥēl al-ʿAtwar, discussed by de Goeje in the Z.D.M.G., xx. 485, 493, 500; cf. also Jouret, français du Nomum, 1835, p. 291; Dory, Supplément, a.v. SĀRĀN, (J. H. KRAMER)

**SĀSĀNIA N, A Persian dynasty.** The names of the kings in modern Persian form are as follows:

| Ardashir I | 226-241 |
| Vahram V | 420-438 |
| Yadzigird II | 438- |

| Shāpūr I | 241-272 |
| Bahram II | 272-273 |
| Hormizd III | 273-275 |
| Ardashir II | 277-283 |
| Narseh | 283-303 |
| Hormizd IV | 303-310 |
| Adharmnās | 310- |

| Shāpūr II | 277-279 |
| Shāpūr III | 279-283 |
| Shāpūr III | 283-285 |
| Shāpūr II | 387-389 |
| Ardashir II | 389-399 |
| Yadzigird I | 399-420 |

The dates are not absolutely certain; this is especially true of the reigns between Hormizd I and Shāpūr II (see Nöldeke, Gesch. d. Perser und Araber, 400 sqq.). The dynasty is said to be descended from a certain Sāsān, of whom little is really historical is known; the genealogy is then traced farther back through Dārā to the mythical royal family of Iran. In the beginning of the third century A.D., several petty kings were reigning in Persia under the suzerainty of the Arsakids. The epoch of these dynasts is called the period of the Muluk al-Tawāfi by the Arabic and Persian historians, and the term includes the Arsakids (and Seleucids) as well as the minor rulers. Ibn Kūtaliba (Kitāb al-Mawṭūʿf, p. 341), for example, includes Ardashir I himself among the Muluk al-Tawāfi, as ruler of Iṣkāh. Bihāk, Ardashir's father, who, according to al-TahAddresses, was originally king of Khir (east of Shīrāz), in whose father Sāsān is said to have held some priestly office in Iṣkāh, began to extend his territory at the expense of the other petty kings of Persia. After the brief reign of his son Shāpūr came Ardashir, who continued what his father had begun until he defeated the Arshak Artabanus V (Arshān) in battle and killed him (224). It was probably in 226 that the Sāsānian king conquered the capital Ctesiphon, 226 is usually given as the initial year of the dynasty. But Iṣkāh was held in honour throughout the whole period of the dynasty as the ancestral home of the family. The Sāsānians succeeded to the inheritance of the Parthian kings, which included the struggle with Rome and later with the Byzantines. As our most reliable sources for their history are Greek and Roman authors, the relations of the Sāsānians with the empires of the west are best and most fully known to us. Ardashir I conducted an offensive against Rome. Apart from relatively short periods of peace, this
war went on almost to the end of the dynasty. The earlier Sāsānians endeavoured to expand their empire and Rome in this first period was called upon to defend her eastern possessions.

An important bone of contention was Armenia, where a branch of the Arsacid house ruled which had very early adopted Christianity and directed its policy on Roman lines. A treaty of partition regarding Armenia was made about 387. When Christianity became the official religion in the eastern Roman empire also, a new element entered the political relations with Persia. The persecutions of the church by some kings (like Shāhpūr II, Bahram V, Yazdāgird II) contributed to intensify the differences. The history of these wars, the details of which do not belong to this article, has often been written in modern works on Roman and Byzantine history, from Gibbon down to Seeck and Bury (cf. also the biographical articles that have so far appeared in Pauly-Wissowa's Realencyclopadie der klass. Altertumswissenschaft on the kings Artaxerxes [Ardashīr I—III, Sapor I—III, Yazdiğer I and II]. The best known of these wars were fought between Ardashīr I and Severus Alexander, between Shāhpūr II and Julian, in which the Roman offensive was at first successful, by Kawdw I against Anastasius I and by Khusrū I against Justiniān. This last war ended in 628 with a treaty which established a fifty years' truce.

The Christians in the Persian empire then attained religious freedom, but the Persian government soon resumed its repressive measures against the Armenian Christians. When the Emperor Justin II soon afterwards began to be dissatisfied with the boundaries of the respective kingdoms and made demands on Khusrū, hostilities began again. This begins the last stage of this period of war. Khusrū I was unsuccessful in the fighting that followed and under Hormizd IV also the Roman armies were victorious. The Persian general Bahram Cūbir, who had been insulted by the king, seized the occasion to rebel against Hormizd; he even aimed at the throne itself. During these tumults Hormizd was murdered by two of his relatives; but his son Khusrū succeeded in escaping to Byzantine territory, where he appealed for help to the Emperor Mauricius. With Byzantine assistance he disposed of the usurper, but in the reign of Khusrū II there was much prospect of lasting peace with Byzantium, as the Sāsānian, on the deposition and murder of Maurice by Phocas in 602, assumed the role of avenger of the murdered Emperor. In this, the last great war with Byzantium, the Persians at first won considerable successes. Khusrū's armies conquered Jerusalem and even Egypt. The reaction followed in the reign of Herosōlos. Kawdw I, who had deprived his father, Khusrū, of life and throne, was forced to beg peace from the Emperor, with Khusrū II died the last important ruler of the dynasty. Kawdw I begins a series of ephemeral rulers (including a usurper, Shahrwārd, and two queens, Bīrān and Aearmisdēr) who were raised to the throne in succession by the nobles, until they disappeared soon afterwards, until in 632 a grandson of Khusrū II, Yazdāgird III came to the throne. Although it is often stated that at first as if more settled conditions were to return, Yazdāgird III was the last Sāsānian to rule over Irān.

It was not only wars with Rome and Byzantium that endangered the Persian empire. Less civilized peoples, like the Chonites and Gīltāns (against whom Shāhpūr II had to take the field) and the Hephthiales (Haiţāl, defeated by Bahram V), continually threatened its existence. King Fūzbā lost his life in an unsuccessful struggle with the latter. It even seems that for some time after this event Persia was tributary to the Haiţāl. About the middle of the sixth century A.D., the threat from the Haiţāl was replaced by the danger from the Turks. It was not, however, the northern nomads that put an end to the Sāsānian empire, but the Arabs. Even before the beginning of the dynasty, Arab tribes had settled in the Euphrates and Tigris region; in the wars between Byzantium and Persia both parties used Arab assistance. The first king who came into conflict with the Arabs seems to have been Shāhpūr I, of whom a war against Hātra is recorded. It must have been an Araucan king who reigned there, but a story of an expedition by Shāhpūr against the Šūta's has been amalgamated with this story, which was itself already overgrown with legendary matter. How confused all this is shown by the fact that Ibn Khūta'īn (Kitāb al-Ma'ārif, p. 322; cf. Eutychius, ed. Cheliko, l. 105) puts this war with Hātra in the reign of Ardashīr, contrary to the usual Persian-Arabic tradition. It is, however, a historical fact that Ardashīr besieged Hātra (unsuccessfully) (Dio Cassius, 85, 3). Finally Firdawsi gives a different version of the whole episode and puts it in the reign of Shāhpūr II (Macan, p. 1432 et al.). That Hātra was defeated on the Arabs is very doubtful (Noelle, 29, cf. ibid., p. 51, note 2). According to the oriental sources, Shāhpūr II was a bitter enemy of the Arabs; that he penetrated to Yamān, however, and the vicinity of Mērda and received the name Dhu 'l-Akim from the way in which he ill-treated his prisoners of war is an invention of legend. The Arab kings of al-Hira, the Lakhmids, were vassals of the Sāsānians; their antagonism to the Ghassānids, who were in Roman service, was an important factor, for example in the wars of Khusrū I with Byzantium, and earlier they had played a part in the dynastic affairs of Persia. It is probable, indeed, that Bahram V, whose rule was not the first recognition of the nobles, overcame a rival with the help of Nu'mān of al-Hira, amongst others. Khusrū I even interfered in the domestic quarrels of Arabia, when about 570 he assisted the Yamāni pretender Saif b. Dhi Yazan [q. v.] with a Persian army against the Abyssinians. According to Arab tradition, the last king of al-Hira assisted Khusrū II when fleeing before Bahram Cūbir, but when the king was firmly established on his throne, he had the Lakhmids seized and executed. Tradition gives no valid reason for this impolitic act. This king Nu'mān of al-Hira is said to have refused his horse to Khusrū on his flight, or, according to another story, the intrigues of an enemy of his brought about his fall. Governors were appointed to al-Hira by the Persian king. The — not very serious — defeat which the Bāktr tribes inflicted on an army of Khusrū's consisting of Persians and Arabs at Dhi Kar soon showed how impolitic it had been to put an end to the dynasty of al-Hira, the bulwark against the Arabs of the desert. It is, of course, a question whether the Lakhmids would have been of such use against the great Arab tide of conquest which soon afterwards swamped the Sāsānian empire. As early as 633 Abū Bakr sent armies to the 'Ira; this began a
series of attacks on the Persian monarchy (battle of the chains, battles of Walajja and Ulus, massacre of Al-Husayn, etc.) which culminated in the battle of Kátid ša (probably still in 636; cf. the art. KÁTIDŠA) where the imperial Persian forces were completely routed. The complete subjection of Irán, however, only dates from the defeat of the Persians at Nihkawand (642). Vâdîgird III escaped; but in spite of all his evo- deavours he did not succeed in obtaining effective assistance from the neighbouring peoples. One of the nobles had him assassinated near Marw in 651.

The Sâsânian empire was a feudal monarchy. The powerful families which already had very great influence in the Arâkab period, like the Sûrîn, Kâšân, etc., formed an influential nobility. The influence of the higher priesthood was also consider- able. There was a revival of Mazdaciism with the rise of the dynasty; this creed became the state religion in the strictest sense, although the Jews and Nechorians, for example, were unmolested in Persia. The punishment for abandoning Mazdaciism for another religion was death.

The political influence of the higher priesthood was seen at the accession of Bahrâm V. His claim to the throne seems to have been supported by the clergy to an important extent. The works of Chr. Bartholomae (Über ein assanatisches Rechtbuch, in the S. B. A. Heidelberg, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, 1910; Zum assanatischen Recht. i.-iv, ibid. 1918-1922) give us a survey of civil law in the Sâsânian period.

The Persian-Arabic tradition of Sâsânian history goes back to Pahlavi sources now lost, the most important of which must have been a work entitled Fêdâyâmâk (mod. Pers. Khûdâyâmâk). Taking up a rigidly legitimist attitude, it comprised the period of the mythical kings as well as the history of the reigning dynasty. Good historical material was preserved in this work, e.g. on the early deeds of Ardashir; on the other side the "histoire anecdotique" plays a great part in it.

The records of the doings of the kings are often interwoven with the stock motives of romance. Besides the Fêdâyâmâk there were also smaller historical works, among them the Kârâmânâk âr Šâkârâzâ, Pâşâ küdâstill extant (transl. by Noldeke, Gottingen 1878; text several times published, e.g. Bombay 1896, 1899, 1900). A fairly long historical romance about Bahram Câhûn can be partly reconstructed from the echoes of it in modern Persian and Arabic literature (Noldeke, op. cit., p. 474 etc.; A. Christiansen, Romanen om Bahram Tshâhn, 1907). Such Pahlavi works were early translated into Arabic; for example, the Fêdâyâmâk by Ibn al-Muqaffa‘; on the other hand, there were modern Persian versions to which traditions preserved in Fardawis and al-Thâlibî go back, although they are not in complete agreement (Noldeke, op. cit., p. xiv. sqq.); do, Das iranische Nationalpoesie, p. 5 sqq.; al-Thâlibî, ed. Zötingen, p. xxii. sqq.; xlii. I have been unable to consult V. Rosen, K. medern ab arabischer, persischer, und fruhislamischer Chudyafrane = Zur Forsch. betreff der arabischen Übersetzungen der Ch. [quoted in Zötingen, op. cit., p. xliii., note 3]. On the relation of the traditions preserved in al-Thâlibî to those in Fardawis see al-Thâlibî, ed. Zötingen, p. xiv. sqq.)

The old Arabic translation of Ibn al-Muqaffa‘ has also been lost, but it is reflected in those sections of the Arabic historians, like al-Tahâwî, al-Mas‘ûlî, al-Dinawarî, etc., which deal with the Sâsânian period.

It is uncertain how far these authors have used Ibn al-Muqaffa‘’s actual work. The tradition of the history of the dynasty in Ibn Kâshînî (in his Zâbî al-Ma‘ârif) and Eutychius is more closely connected than in the other writers and shows a special character; indeed, these two historians often agree word for word. According to Noldeke, it is probable that these two used the original Ibn al-Muqaffa‘ (Geisch, d. Perser, p. xxii.); the other historians must have used later versions of the original work (cf. al-Thâlibî, ed. Zötingen, p. xlii.). Several of the later historians of the Persians have also a section on the Sâsânians, e.g. Râshîd al-Din (Zâbî al-Fawâidî) and his copyist al-Kârânî (Zâbî al-Fawâidî). These as a rule have no independent value, although it seems to be not impossible that details might still be found in them which are not given elsewhere, as is the case with Ibn Balbûn’s Fârânînâmé (Geech, Memorial Series, New Ser., vol. i.; cf. p. xxiii sqq.).

It is from this semi-traditional history that the anecdotes and the death-poeams which are found in the Adâb-literature relating to these kings and their court for the most part come. They are not uncommon, for example, in the exordium in al-Mas‘ûlî’s Ma‘rûjû. The Marâdûnâmé, which belongs to narrative literature proper, contains several stories of Khusraw I Anushirvân and his vizier Barsemîn. In poetic literature we may mention Nafîn, who, on several occasions, took the material for his romantic works from the Sâsânian period, although he occasionally deviates from the accepted tradition, for example, when he gives, in the Haft Pa‘kar, the story of Bahram Gûr (Bahram V)’s master-shot in an essentially different form from Fardawî and al-Thâlibî, who give a less polished and therefore probably older version. That tradition became much altered in course of time is undoubtedly. It must also have incorporated Arabic elements, which were foreign to the old Book of Kings, alongside of original Iranian matter. It is longer possible to discriminate between these strata, with any approximation to accuracy. The omission of one or other story in Fardawî or al-Thâlibî is, of course, no criterion; besides, these two no longer used Pahlavi originals, but later versions. Among stories that are certainly old and original are the history of the founder of the dynasty, the story of the killing of Yazdîgîd I by a demoniacal horse, most of the stories of Bahram Gûr relating to hunting or women, the death of Fîrûz in the Hephthâlite war, most stories of Anushîrâvân, the cycle containing stories of the fall of Hormizd IV, the rebellion of Bahram Câhûn and his fall and the further history of Khusraw II Farwât to his murder at the instigation of his son Kawâlî (Shîrâyû); on the other hand, originally historical events of the Sâsânian period may also have given rise to similar stories, which were put back into the mythical period, as Noldeke suggests, for example, in the case of the records of the events that followed the death of Firdawî (Geisch Nationalpoesie. p. 9). We also find episodes which are related of Sâsânian kings in some histories attributed to mythical kings by others; for example, the story of Bahram Gûr’s prohibition of wine in Fardawî (Mas‘ûn, p. 1497 sqq.) is placed by al-Thâlibî (p. 149; cf. p. xxi) in the reign of Kâl Kâhûd. The stories based on the very common motif of the king who goes unrecognised into the enemy’s country (Shâbûr II.; Bahram Gûr) belong to the older.
tradition. Other subjects are perhaps later — occasionally, due to an Arab intermediary — like the story of the siege of Heta and the story connecting Safi b. Dth Yaran with Khurasan I; it is possible also that the part of the stories relating to Bahram Gür and Khursaud II, in which the kings of al-Hira play an important part (accession of Bahram Gür, flight of Khurasan II before Bahram Cuhin), is not entirely free from Arabic elements, which are perhaps also found among the apophthegms of the kings. This is certainly the case with a saying of King Narain reported by al-Tha'alibi (p. 510: wa-tha'bii ad-yarhan bi la ban i al-nasir, la'lahi bii lahun fi al-thalabii, bii: had shaghalin khitmuti l'ali' an khitmut al-nasir).

The rulers the accounts of whom are fullest are as a rule the most important historically: Ardashir I, Shahpur I and II, Khurasan I and II; Bahram V, however, is really not one of the great kings. When there was nothing known to record of a monarch, the old Book of Kings seems to have confined itself to giving speeches which the king was said to have delivered at his accession, etc. The speeches and apophthegms of the kings were regarded as models of elegant Persian prose (Nöldeke, Gesch. d. Perser, p. 299, ad Tha'alibi, ed. Zetzenberg, p. xiv. In the latter, p. 481, we find that even Ardashir I possessed oratorical talents). Arabic rhetoric seems to have made its influence felt here; at least Hurmuz IV's speech from the throne in al-Dinawari (Kitab al-Akhbar al-Timwi, p. 77 sqq.) gives the impression of coming from an Arabic rather than a Persian original. (Cf. also Nöldeke, Gesch. d. Perser, p. 326 sqq.)


V. F. Boglicher

SATALIA. [See Adalia.]

SATAN. [See Satan.]

SATHI b. RAHI, a fabulous diviner (khanî), of pre-Islamic Arabia, whom tradition connects with the beginnings of allamî; in reality we have here to deal with a quite mythical personage like the other khanî's in whose company he appears in most stories, Shîkî al-Sî'î, who is simply the humanization of a demoniacal monster in appearance like a man eating in two (shîkî al-allinizî: cf. van Vloten, W.Z. d.M., 1893, vii, 180—181), Sathi, whose name means "flattened the ground and unable to rise on account of the weakness of his limbs" (Lûdîn al-Arab, iii, 312), is described as a monster without bones or muscles; he had no head but a human face in the centre of his chest; he lay on the ground, on a bed of leaves and palm-branches, and when he had to change his position they rolled him up like a carpet"; only when he was irritated or inspired did he inflate himself and stand up. His close resemblance to Shîkî is accentuated by legend which makes them both be born without the intervention of a father in the night before the death of the khalîna Tarafî (the wife of 'Amr Musâ'lî, ancestor of the tribe of that name, who is said to have foretold the catastrophe of the breaking of the dam of Marîb in the Yamun). She is said to be before dying to have made the two newborn monsters come to her and after spitting in their mouths (the classic method of transmitting magic power) declared them her successors in the art of khanîn.

In spite of these characteristically mythical features Arab genealogical tradition has not refused to give Sathi a place in its system, but gives him a name and a paternity (Rabi' b. Rabi' b. Mas'ud b. Mâzûm b. 'Utbi) which connect him with the Qa'asîl branch of the tribe of Azd (just as it connects Shîkî with the Banî 'Sa'b, a branch of the Banî Badîja) and more precisely with the Banî Utbi (i.e., Darâl, Lâyiqîn, p. 286, 29—32; Wustenfeld, Genealog. Fachbl., 11, 16; according to others, the Banî Utbi belonged to the 'Abd al-Khis tribe belonging to the Rabî group); there even seems to have been in historic times an Azd clan claiming descent from Sathi (Abû Hâsim al-Sijdishî, Kirth al-Mawwarînî, p. 3, in Goldscher, Abhandl. zur arab. Philologie, i).
Among the legends associated with the name of Sašā, some are connected with the pre-history of the Arabs and represent Sašā as acting as a diviner and judge. Others, without any regard for history or chronology, even fictitious; sometimes we find him dividing among the sons of Nizar (Muḥāf Rabi'a, Iyād and Atnār) their father's estate (I 3d, 1st and 2nd ed., ii. 46 = 3rd ed., ii. 46 = 4th ed., I. 39); sometimes we find him consulted with Shībī by al-Zarib al-Ashwānī (Wüstenfeld, Gen. Tabellen, D, 13) regarding the real position of Ḥašî, the ancestor of the Hashimī, to whom al-Zarib had been forced to promise his daughter in marriage (Agāhsī, 1st and 2nd ed., ii. 75). In al-Yaḥṣib (ed. Houtsma, I. 285—290) it is he who decides the difference which has arisen between 'Abd al-Mu'tallab, the Prophet's grandfather, and the two Kaši tribes, al-Kāīlāh and al-Rūbāb, regarding the ownership of the well of Dhu 'l-Haẓim discovered by the former in the vicinity of al-Ṭibr; but the parallel versions of the same story either do not mention the name of the arbitrator or give him that of another kālīn, Salām b. Ḥabīb b. al-Mu'allākāt (ed. Maqāli, Amūshāl, ed. 1284, I. 36 = ed. 1310, L. 30, Yākūt, ed. Wüstenfeld, iv. 629; Lādīm, XII. 285).

Two other legends, on the other hand, have a completely Islamic stamp; according to the first, given by Ibn ʿIṣḥāq, who does not give his sources, Sašā consulted — as always with Shībī — by the Lāhūmī chief Rabī'a b. Nāṣr regarding a dream which frightened him, reveals to him that South Arabia will be invaded by the Abyssinians and that after the expulsion of the latter and the brief dominion of the Persians it will be conquered by a Prophet (Muḥammad); as a result of the oracle Rabī'a b. Nāṣr sends his son ʿAmr at the head of the tribe to the king of Persia who settles them at al-Qāhir; this is the "South Arabian" version of the foundation of the Lāhūmī dynasty (cf. G. Rothstein, Die Dynastie der Lāhūmī in al-Qāhir, Berlin 1899, p. 39).

The second and most widely disseminated legend goes back to a certain Hāšī al-Majhrānī, who is said to have lived to 150 and about whom Muslim historiographical tradition knows nothing (cf. Ibn Ḥaḍār, ʿIṣba, Cairo, vii. 270, N 3, 929). It forms part of the cycle of the Muwalla al-Mabresa, that is of the miraculous signs which confirm the truth of the prophetic mission of Muḥammad. In the night when the latter was born remarkable phenomena occurred throughout the kingdom of Persia. The king (Kašī Anūšhārīwān) not being able to get an explanation from his magicians asked the king of al-Qāhir, al-Nūmān b. Masḏīr (an anachronism!), to send him someone who could explain it. Al-Nūmān sent 'Abd al-Muṣṭaf b. Būjazī al-Quṣnānī (on him see the Kītāb al-Muwaṣṣalāt, p. 38; Castani, Annali dell'Islam, ii. 935—936, a. il, § 165; iv. 257, a. il, § 329), who was not being able to explain these marvels himself went to Sašā, his maternal uncle, who lived in the desert. He found him at the point of death and his appeal was unanswered; only after his nephew had addressed him in verse, did the kāhīn predict to him the coming fall of the Persian Empire and its conquest by the Arabs, etc. Having delivered this oracle, his uncle Sašā died.

Sašā claimed to possess his knowledge of the future from a familiar spirit (ra's, cf. above, il. 625) who had overheard the conversation of God with Moses on Mount Sinai and had revealed part of it to him. Here we see the influence of the Kur'ānic passage (Isxxii. 1) about the dijān who overhears God's utterances.

The calculations of the Arab historians on the age reached by Sašā are naturally quite fanciful; those of them who place his birth at the time of the burning of the dam at Ma'rib and his death at Muhammad's birth, give him a life of 650 years. It should be observed that Abū Ḥālid al-Sijdiṣānī (q. v.), whose version is markedly different from the others (he does not speak of his monstrosity, puts his home in al-Baḥra, etc.), makes him die in the reign of the Ḥimyar king Dhu Nuwas and therefore does not know of his prophecy to Khāsa Anūšhārīwān.


G. LEVI TELLA VIVA

SAUL [See TALET].

SĀWA (older SYWĀ), a town and district in Central Persia. It lies on the direct road from Kašwin to Kum (Kašwin-Sāwa: 22 farsakh; Sāwa-Kum: 9 farsakh). This road practically corresponds with the royal road (Shahrāh) described by Mustawār (Sīmūghīn [1]-Saghsūdā-Sāwa-İsfahān) which was of great importance when, under the Mongols Arghūn and Ujūqī, Sulhīnīya became the capital of Persia. The Kašwin-Sīmūghīn road may yet again resume its old importance for traffic between North Persia and the southern provinces. For the present it is eclipsed by a longer combination of paved roads leading through the capital: Kašwin-Teherān (22 farsakhs) and Teherān-Kum (22 farsakh). On the other hand Sāwa has definitely lost its position as a stage on the route from Hamadān to Ra'ī (Teherān) (61 farsakh) on which the Arab geographers place it. Traffic between Hamadān and the capital now goes via Newbarzān-Zarand or, with a detour, by the paved roads Teherān-Kašwin-Hamadān (about 54 farsakhs). Geographical considerations explain the decline of the town. The desert is gradually invading the district of Sāwa as a result of a breakdown in the control of the irrigation system.

Sāwa is situated in the north-west corner of a plain (c. 30 X 25 miles) one towards the east the lower part of which is being gradually eulogized by salt marshes. The district is watered: 1. by the Kār-Şīn (the Gāmūshā or Gāmūshā of Mustawf) which is formed by three streams: the
southern and most important (Do-ših) comes from the north face of the Bakhtiyārī mountains (Dā′pēlīh); the western descends from the Alwand (Orontes) of Ḥamadān and the northern has its source in the mountains of Kharrajān. Having crossed the plain of Sāwā, the Karā-šai pours its brackish waters into the central desert and dissipates itself in several irrigation canals in the north-western part of the plain of Sāwā.

Sāwā is not known before the Muslim period. Tomasek connects its name with the Avestan word sāwā, Pahlavi saevā, “advantage, utility” (?). The Persian dictionaries gives “pieces of gold” for sāwā. According to Tomasek, Sāwā corresponds to the Sevavcina or Sevakina of the Tabulās Pentingeriānaces.

Ibn Hawqal says that Sāwā was noted for its camels and camel-drivers. Al-Muqaddasi mentions its fortifications, its baths and a Friday mosque near the great road at some distance from the town. The people of Sāwā (as of Ulūbudjird) were Sāwāni Sumnā who were at permanent feud with their neighbours in Āwa who were fervent “twelver” Shi’ites. The Mongols sacked the town in 617 (1220) and burned its fine library (Yēkšt) which also contained astronomical instruments (al-Ḳāzwinī). Hamd Allah Mustawfi (ed. Le Strange, p. 62) gives the four nīnjiyas of Sāwā: Sāwā, Āwa, Āmar and Bistn; which are 46, 17, 25 and 42 villages respectively, 130 in all. Khaṣṭa Zāhr al-Dīn Swadjiši about the time of Mustawfi writes that 7,000 yards in circumference and his son Khāṣṭa Shams al-Dīn incorporated into the town the suburban village of Râṭāba.

Mustawfi extols the fruits of Sāwā but quotes the Persian proverb about its cereals: “the straw is better than the grain of Sāwā”. The pomegranates of Sāwā are renowned throughout Persia to this day.

The European travellers Marco Polo mentions Sāwā (“Sabā”) as the town from which the three Magi kings set out for Bēthlehem and where they are buried in a square sepulchre. This Persian-Christian legend must be based on a local popular interpretation of texts like “Reges Arabum ex Sabā duxerunt!” (Psalm lxxii. 10). According to another story given by Marco Polo, the three kings were buried respectively at Sāwā, Āwa and Kaft-ād Atshaparanāt, which Ule locates between Sāwā and Aḥbar, while Tomasek identifies it with Dīz Gābrān (one stage beyond Kūm on the road from Kaft-ād).

Sāwā is mentioned by Giosafat Barbaro (1474), Figueiros (1618) etc. Chardin laments its sterile soil and heat. In 1849 the English consul K.E. Abbot counted 300-400 houses in Sāwā with 10,000 inhabitants; he says that the soil is excellent everywhere that it is not mixed with the kawwir but that the salt desert is met with at only 9 miles from the town.

At a distance of only 4 farsakh to the south of Sāwā is the old Shī’i centre; the little town of Āwa watered by a stream coming from the heights of Tafrish which separate the plain of Sāwā from that of Fārāshān (Persian ‘Irāk’). According to Tomasek, Āwa corresponds to the ʿAgānān of Potlemy, Al-Muqaddasi calls it Awá, Yākūt Aḥa. Rūh-i Namak lies between Āwa and Kūm. It is composed of salt and its friable soil — Hassinknecht calls it Gidīn-Glimas — makes it impossible to climb it. In Mustawfi’s time Āwa was 5000 paces in circumference. Houtum-Schindler says that the ruins of the old town are beside the modern village (100 houses) and that the tomb of Shāh-šan (Siṣen) is shown there. Mustawfi talks of the tomb “attributed” to the Prophet Samuel but puts it 4 farsakh north of Sāwā.

At the present day the population of the district of Sāwā is wholly Shī’a. It consists of Persians and Turks. The latter belong to the local confederation of Shāh-Sewen which includes the remnants of the tribe of Kharrajān. The district of Sāwā is frequently called Kharrajān. There are Shāh-sewens to the north-east and to the south of Sāwā. The Kharrajān live more especially to the north of the Kūm-Sijīnābād road (Kāhigird, Taqī-Khānāt, Dāhshāl, Tafrish). In several of their villages (Kandurūn, Mawdīn, Šīf, Fovūn, Kardūn) the very peculiar Tar Tariki dialect is spoken: wa warawan kāgbe, “I am going to the garden”; kāst-e, “it is warm”; ḥā’-ṣā, “in the home”; yut kawwāt dagh-i aritū, “the road was not good”, etc. The dialect is worth the attention of students of Turkish (cf. the art. Shāh-sewenn).

In the tenth century A.H. (Ibn Fašt) Sāwā formed part of the province of Kūm. In modern times it has formed part of various administrative combinations. Sometimes it was governed along with the districts to the south (Mahalla, Kasar), sometimes with Zarand (N.-E. of Sāwā) and Kharrajān (sewār: Karrajān). This last was an independent district formed by an enclosement between the provinces of Kūm and Ḥamadān. It consists of three bālis: Afšūr-i Baisag, Afšūr-i Kūsūr and Karaj; the chief town of Kharrajān is situated in the latter at the foot of the pass. It is called Āwa and must not be confused with the place of the same name in Sāwā. About 1850 Sāwā was governed by an Austrian officer in the Persian service, von Täufenstein. At the beginning of the twentieth century it formed a kind of fief of the brigade of Persian Cossacks at Teherān. One of the higher officers of this military force acted as governor of Sāwā and controlled the Turkish natives who supplied the principal contingent to the brigade.

The antiquities of Sāwā are: 1. the bārān on the Kūm-Šai (about 12 miles S.-W. of the town) said to owe its origin to Shams al-Dīn al-Ṣawīnī [q.v.], vizier of several rulers of the Ilkhan (13th) century (cf. Nisbat al-Kalīb, ed. Le Strange, p. 221). The bārān is said to have been restored under the Safawīs; it is known as band-i Shāh ‘Abbās. It occupies the passage between two hills and is about 65 feet high, 100 long and 45 thick. Beside it on the left bank, the road rises in a kind of spiral: caravans were thus able to ascend the dam which was used as a bridge and descend on the west side by a gradual slope on the right bank. The attempts to repair this important work by closing the path which the river has made through it have so far failed with resultant ruin for the district. 2. The fortress of Kīz-ḵalān on a rock in the centre of an amphitheatre of hills not far from the dam. 3. Two mosques at Sāwā, one in the town, built, according to Houtum-Schindler, in 1518 A.D.; the other, very beautiful,
sawed, a name of the *Irak (q.v.). While the name *Irak (q.v.) has been proved to be a Pahlavi loanword from *Frag, "low land, south land", occurring in the Turfan fragments, with assimilation to the semantically connected stem *Frag; cf. A. Siddiqi, *Studien über die persischen Formenwörter im klass. Arab., p. 69; H. H. Schachter, *Ist., xvi. 174, 177; J. J. Hess, *Zeitschr. f. Semitistik, ii. *Sawad "black land" is the oldest Arabic name for the alluvial land on the Euphrates and Tigris given on account of the contrast to the eye between it and the Arabian desert (*Yakut, Muʿjam al-adab, iii., 174, 177). The name has undergone a threefold development of application. 1) It is identified with the political division of *Irak and thus corresponds to the Safavid province of *Shirak (Dīl-e Erāq-e Sharq). With this meaning the historians of the Arab conquests use the name Sawad for the *Irak (cf. for example, al-Baladī, *Fihrist, p. 244), and especially the compilers of monumental geographical or political handbooks like Abū ʿUqayl, Yahyā b. Adam, Khudām al-Musawir, also al-Khalīlī. The reason for this is that in the cadastral and revenue regulations of Umar I the name Sawad was used officially. 2) It is used as the name of the cultivated area within a district, e.g. *Sawad al-Irāq, *Sawad al-Kūhūsīn, *Sawal al-Usur. 3) Before the name of a town it means the systematically irrigated and intensively cultivated fields in its vicinity, e.g. *Sawal al-Bayyān, Kūfā, Wādī, Baghdis, Tustar, Bukhārī, etc.


SAWĀKIN (Sawākin or Sawākin) a seaport on the west coast of the Red Sea in 19° 5′ N. lat. The town is built on a picturesque little oval-shaped island about a mile in circumference and 300 yards long, which lies off the mainland in the centre of a deep bay. The harbour is thrown by a narrow channel 4 or 5 miles long hemmed in by coral reefs; Sawākin is connected with the African continent, by a causeway about 60 yards long, commanded by a fort. At the entrance to this road is a pretty gateway which can be closed by a door, through which one reaches the suburb of al-Kif, which lies on the mainland. The Customs House and the Government buildings are the most important buildings on the island town. The best houses are fine white buildings of three stories, recalling in style those of Djidda. Among modern erections Kitchen’s (late, a handsome half Moorish edifice, is worthy of note. The pri
mitive shapeless huts of the natives are in lurid contrast to these buildings. The bazaar consists of drinking-bars kept by Greeks and a little street with coffee-shops and booths. The half-dozed Europeans settled in Sawakin live among the primitive reed-huts of the black and brown houses which are considered particularly habitable. The town possesses a single school which, however, is one of the best in the whole Sudan. The suburb of al-Kail on the mainland is surrounded by a wall which was at one time flanked by half a dozen forts and protected by an outer line of trenches. It has a much larger population than the island town, possesses a large bazaar in which the business life of the town is carried on and irregular streets in which live smiths and leather workers—the former make spears and heads and the latter do a busy trade in amulets—and barbers much visited by the male population. A few silversmiths provide the ornaments required by the women and make bracelets and anklets, ear- and nose-rings. Outside the suburb, which is a long narrow oasis surrounded by salt-lakes and very arid and prairie-like desert, are wells surrounded by gardens and date-palms, providing the town's drinking-water. The climate of Sawakin is not particularly healthy for Europeans. The heat never falls below 86°F even in winter; in June and August changeable winds predominate which often rise to dangerous sandstorms.

Sawakin is an old settlement, although the harbour is not important—it can only be entered by day owing to the narrow channel and the coral-banks. It has been suggested—probably rightly—that Pliny's Oppidum Saccacae was here. In the middle ages the district belonged to the Bedjia (Blemunners) to whom belong the modern Hadendou, Arabis and Bigharun. The gold connections of the Melkans with the West African coast of the Red Sea brought about the settlement of Arab merchants here who intermarried with the Bedjia. The matriarchal institutions of the Bedjia enabled the half-breeds to attain important positions, and Ibn Battuta in 1330 A.D. found in Saawkain a son of the Amir of Mecca ruling the Bedjia. The upper strata of the populace preferred Islam, al-Maqrizi calls them Hadjarib. In those days Sawakin had a serious rival in the harbour of A'dabah farther north, which Th. Bent has identified in the modern Sawakin Khadin, 12 miles north of Hadhab. The harbour, now in ruins, was very important between 450 and 760 A.H. as a landing-place for goods from India and Arabia and was a meeting-place for merchants from the Yemen and a rendezvous for Egyptian and African pilgrims who sailed from here for Djidja. Sawakin, which lay seven days' march to south, was also a landing-place for ships from Djidja, there must have been a good deal of competition between the two towns, from which Sawakin in the end emerged victorious. Al-Hamadani († 945 A.D.) still reckons it in Central Abyssinia (al-Hawash al-Watifi). Under Sultan Selim I, the Turks occupied the harbour. It was under the Pasha of Djidja who governed it through an Aga until in 1865 Egypt acquired it from Turkey by cession or purchase. The Mahdist period (1883-1898) was a heavy blow to Sawakin, as trade died away completely owing to the closing of the important Sawakin-Berber caravan road. By the treaty of July 16, 1899, between England and Egypt, Sawakin was placed under the Anglo-Egyptian condominium along with the Sudan and now belongs to the Red Sea Province, the largest cotton-growing area in the Sudan.

Sawakin now has about 10,000 inhabitants. The town has a rather neglected look and almost half the buildings are in ruins, as the inhabitants in many cases are no longer able to afford the expense necessary to maintain them. The newly founded harbour of Port Sudan is also a serious rival to Sawakin and has attracted a great deal of the trade and traffic in which Sawakin was once supreme. In spite of this competition Sawakin has been able to keep an important position as regards trade and the wholesale migration of business to Port Sudan expected by many has not materialised. Although the numerous wholesale and retail firms are no longer as busy as they were before the foundation of Port Sudan, they are still doing very well and very few native firms are suffering under trade depression. Sawakin will maintain its position if only because the trade of the natives stubbornly sticks to it and regards it as the main centre of the commerce of the Red Sea Province. Sawakin still is, as before, the starting place of pilgrims to Djidja. Fifty years ago the slave trade was still flourishing on the same route and some 3000 slaves annually were shipped from here to the market in Djidja, a trade which the English government was only able to suppress with great difficulty. Sawakin is now connected by a branch line from Athbara Junction with Port Sudan; the railway was made in 1905. If the stretch from Sawakin to Tokar (56 miles) is made, and it is planned for the near future, the two towns are at present connected by a caravan road and the harbour of Sawakin will receive a new stimulus. At the present time the excellent cotton wool from Tokar, 56 miles S.E. of Sawakin, is brought on camel-back to the harbour of Trinibat and then shipped the 11/2 to 2 days voyage to Sawakin. With the building of the railway the Kanols-Sawakin (via Tokar, 297 miles) and Berber-Sawakin (241 miles) caravan routes, on which most of the trade with the interior is done at present, would lose their importance but the amount of the trade would considerably increase. Beside the railway line there is also an important steamer service connecting with Port Sudan. There is also a steamer connection with Djidja with a fortnightly service. The main article of commerce and export is cotton, sesame oil, butter, hides, wax, resin, senna and ivory.
SAWDA BINT ZAM'A, a. Ka'b, Muhammed's second wife, was one of the first women who embraced Islam. She accompanied her first husband al-Sakrân b. 'Amr and her brother Malik to Abyssinia, with the second party of Muslims who repaired thither. The pair returned to Mekka before the Hijra, and al-Sakrân, who had become a Christian in Abyssinia, died there. By this union Sawda had a son, 'Abd al-rahamân, who was killed in the battle of Dījlabî nit.

Sawda's marriage to Muhammed was arranged by Khwâja bint Hamîdî, who wished to console him for the loss of Khaḍîja, and took place about a month after the latter's death, in the tenth year of Muhammed's mission, i.e. Rumaqî, before his journey to al-Tîfî.

In the first year of the Hijra Sawda, together with Muhammed's daughters, joined him in Medina; her dwelling and 'Aqîqa's were the first to be built in the Mosque.

Sawda was no longer young at the time of her second marriage, and, as she grew older, became fat and ungraceful to such a point that Muhammed, during a pilgrimage, allowed her the privilege of reaching Mina for the morning prayer before the crowd's arrival, to avoid being jeered at. As she grew old and Muhammed worried of her and neglected her, while he spent a great deal of his time with the youthful 'Aqîqa; in 3 A.H. he divorced her, but Sawda stopped him in the street and begged him to take her back, offering to yield her day to 'Aqîqa, as "she was old, and cared not for men; her only desire was to rise on the Day of Judgement as his wife". The Prophet consented; on this occasion Sûra iv. 127 was revealed.

Sawda was charitable and good-natured; in one of his prophetic utterances Muhammed seems to have alluded to her as the "longest-handled", i.e. the most charitable of his wives, who would be the first to join him in Heaven, and 'Aqîqa used to say: "There is no woman in whose skin I had rather be than Sawda's, except that she is somewhat cautious." 5

Closely with Zainab bint Dîjlah, Sawda did not take part in the last pilgrimage. Of her life after Muhammed's death there is no record, except that she received a gift of money from 'Umar; this, together with the fact that no mention is made of her dowry, may mean that she was in straitened circumstances, though she had received her share of the spoils of Khaîthâr. She died in Medina, in Shawwâl 54 A.H., during the caliphate of Mu'âwiya, who bought her house in the Mosque, together with that of Safiya, for 180,000 dirhams.


AL-SAWDA' or AL-KHAYRAT AL-SAWDA', a ruined city in al-Djâlîn in South Arabia, in what was once the ancient Micaean kingdom. J. Halévy, who visited the ruins, calls it 'En-Sud and describes it as an extensive system of ruins one hour's journey N. E. of the also important al-Bâjî. Al-Sawda' is built on an eminence. The ancient town was apparently destroyed by a post-Sassanian sack and was presumably an important industrial centre, especially for metal work; even at the present day the vitrified soil is covered with slag-heaps. Insufficient remains of the surrounding wall and a few steles are all that remain of its former splendour. D. H. Müller suggests that these ruins mark the north of the Micaean town of Karnî. F. Hommel identifies it with the Naka of the Micaean inscriptions. Al-Hamdînî describes al-Sawda' as one of the strongholds of the tribe of Naqha. The old Micaean town thus survived into the present epoch as the stronghold of a prominent family. The name "Black Fort" should probably be explained as referring to the building material, black lava or basalt.


SAWDA', Mîrî Muhammed Râfî', Urdu poet and satirist, was born in Delhi in 1173. His father Mîrî Shafî' (from Kâbul) was a merchant and had established himself in India. Sawda was educated in Delhi and his teachers in the art of poetry were Sultanân Kâlim Khân Wâdî and Shâh Zuhûr al-Dîn Hâmîdî. Like his contemporaries, Mîrî Shafî' al-Dîn Shâh, Mîr Tabî' Mir and Khwâja Mir Dârî, he had derived much literary benefit from the eminent Persian scholar and poet Sîrâj al-Dîn 'Ali Khân `Arî; and it was he who persuaded Sawda to write in his own mother tongue in preference in Persian. Sawda's Urdu poetry very soon attained a high standard of excellence and he was recognised as one of the masters of Urdu poetry. At the age of about sixty he left Delhi, and after a short journey he settled at Farînkâshâd, where he died in 1195 (c. 1784). His works were collected by Hâmîdî al-Dîn Khân and were first published at Calcutta early in the nineteenth century followed by numerous lithograph editions.

Sawda is rightly considered to be one of the greatest Urdu poets. He excelled in haftād and ghazal and his satires are witty and sharp. He was well versed in music also. Dr. Falton's advance remarks about his poetry are not justifiable.


SAWJDJ-BULUK, a Persian corruption of the Turkish awjuluk "cold spring"; the form sawdîj (pronunciation sawdîj) is found as early as the
Nuzhat al-Kullub (740 = 1340). There are two places of this name.

The fertile district beginning at Teheran and stretching to the west of the river Karaj along both sides of the great Teheran-Kashan road. To the north a range of hills separates it from Tabas. On the southern slopes of these hills are the pits of Fasland which supply the capital with coal. The district is watered by the Kundan which rises in the same heights. Among its villages Hamd Allah Mattawfi mentions Sunqurabad and Nadjmabad which still exist at the present day. The centre of the district is marked by Yangalmasan (an artificial mound with a tomb). At the south-western extremity of the district is the little town of Ishhīrād whose inhabitants speak the Iranian dialect called tārī; other villages of the same language (towards Karan) are Segīshād, Shīāshād, Iskī Isqūn, Čaī and Shīrāshād. Many of the people of Ishhīrād profess Bahāʾi. See the map in A. F. Stahl, Petren. Mitt., suppl. fasc., No. 118, 1896, sheet 1, and his map Umgegend von Teheran, Gotha 1892.

2. The southern section of the province of Ahvazhūz, the capital of which is Sādjavāl. (in Kurdistān Sāslāb). The governors of Sādjavāl-Bulāk are appointed by Tabrīz, but ethnographically Sādjavāl forms part of Persian Kurdistan, which consists of three parts: a) Kurdistān of Mūri in the north, corresponding to the šāhvar of Sādjavāl; b) to the south of Kurdistān of Sinna (cf. the art. ŞENNE) and c) to the south of it Kurdistān of Kirmānshāh. The province of Sādjavāl-Bulāk is bounded on the north by Lake Urmia in the north-west by the districts of Sulhā and Ushūrwatered by the Gādī-čaī; on the west by the heights of the Tabrīz forming the Turco-Persian frontier; in the south by the Sīr-Kūr range separating Bāna from the district of Shīlēr; and on the east by the watershed between the Tatava and the Diğhatu (only the district of Şalūsh borders on the basin of the latter river); on the north-east by the course of the Tatava on the right bank of which lies the isolated district of Miyān-Kūz (“between the two waters”). The Tatava at the same time forms the boundary between the Turks of this latter district and the Muhārirs of Sādjavāl-Bulāk. Sādjavāl-Bulāk measures some 60 miles and has an area of about 4,800 to 5,000 square miles.

Hydrography. The Muri country lies across two watersheds, that of the Lake Urmia and that of the Little Zab (a tributary of the Tigrel). To the first belong three separate rivers: 1. the Diğhatu, which rises in Mount Čīlūr-Čașma at the eastern extremity of the Turkish enclave of Shīlā which runs far into Persian territory between Bāna in the north and Mārīvar in the south; 2. the Tatava (Mustawfi: Taghhatu) rising in the extreme south-east of Kurdistān; 3. the Sādjavāl-Bulāk rising in the extreme face of the Ma’dān pass (between Puswa and the town of Sādjavāl-Bulāk). The river-system of the Little Zab (al-Zāb al-arzul) belongs to the basin of the Persian Gulf. Its upper course is formed on the high plateau of Lāhūd-i Mūri; the north-western branch (Lāwūm) rises in the eastern face of the Kandil just to the north of the pass of Kabī Shīn; the north branch (Bīrūd-i Māghū) comes from Diğdān via Ushūr; the north-east branch (Awašūr) from the west face of the Ma’dān pass.

Taking in on its right bank the swift waters of Bādjavān, Awašūr, Khīdjavān, Tīlīstān and Kāsān and on the left the large waters that rush down the gorges of the Kastaw, the Little Zab under the name of Zeī or Kāsī rolls southwards, but below Sādjavāt it turns sharply westwards to force a passage through the ravine of Allān to the Tigris. Just at this bend, close to the pretty village of Alīb, the Kāsī receives on the left bank the important tributary which drains the whole basin of Bāna (except the district of Namāshēr, the waters of which enter the Kāsī above Alīb). The river of Bāna (Awa-Kived) forms an almost straight line with the ravine of Allān. The left bank below Dunēs belonged to Turkey (Allān-i Gīaysī). The frontier here follows the course of the Kived and then of the Kāsī, finally ascending the Kandil leaving Bīrūd to Persia and Kandil to Turkey.

There is only one little stream that escapes the gigantic funnel of the Allān; the rivulet of Wama rising on the verdant heights of this name to the south-east of the great cone of the Kandil describes a semi-circle to the west of the Kāsī and enters the Mesopotamian plain (Plōzār) by a deep defile where it finally rejoins the Little Zab on its right bank.

Orography. The lofty chain of the Kandil rises like a wall between the territory of Sādjavāl-Bulāk and the districts of the former Turkish Kurdistān: Rawāndūz and Kū-i Sādjavāt. Among the Arabs the Kandil was called Shāfītna in Persian Tağı-i Shīrvān (Yaḵtā, ed. Wüstenfeld, ii. 298), by the Armenians Zarasp (Hoffmann, Armazg, p. 249, 260). The famous pass of Kūl-i Żīm (about 9,900 feet high) between Ushūr and Shīrāshād (belonging to Rawāndūz) lies to the north and outside the boundaries of Sādjavāl-Bulāk. Communication between Sādjavāl-Bulāk and Mesopotamia is maintained by the less elevated (6,000 feet) and more convenient pass of Garši-Sīnka, between Lāhūd-i Mūri and Bulāk (Rūyāt), as well as by the defiles of Wama and Allān. All traffic is, however, considerably hampered by the presence of turbulent tribes on both sides of the frontier.

The great perpendicular arête which is detached from the southern extremity of the Kandil and forms the northern wall of the ravine of Allān is noteworthy. It is called Shīr-i and its pass the Hawmūl. The heights running between Lāhūd-i Mūri and the valley of the Gādīr are of little importance except a few peaks (Bīrūd and Čoghaqul), they extend to the Tatava, where they cut the town of Sādjavāl-Bulāk off from the northern district of Shīr-i Wōrān; they allow a passage, however, to the Sādjavāl-Bulāk river.

The central longitudinal massif of the Kurūk (up to 7,000 feet) separates the waters of the Kāsī from the basin of Lake Urmia; to the north it joins the summit of Čoghaqul.

The eastern part of Muhārirs of Kurdistān is in the form of a square, the sides of which are in the north the latitudinal heights; in the west the Kurūk; in the south the watershed of the Tatava on one hand and of Namāshēr and Sādjavāt on the other; these heights continue in the extreme south of the Kurūk where their principal summit is Bīrūd-i Sīr (“red stone”); on the east the heights of the watershed between the Tatava and the Diğhatu. The interior of the square formed by the system of the Sādjavāl-Bulāk-čaī and of the Tatava is extremely irregular: it contains mountain peaks (Taraḵā), gentle slopes and fertile valleys.
To the south and outside the square are the districts of Sakka, K. v, and Bana. The first includes from south-west to north-east. It is watered by the southern sources of the Djaned and fills the angle between the square of Sawdi-Bulak and the lands of Bana. The latter district, on the other hand, forms a valley sloping from east to west towards the basin of the Kafir. To the south the Kuf-Kuf ("Red mountain") forms the boundary; to the east the heights of Shi'a-jevan separate it from the southern sources of the Djaned (River Sahl); to the north-east the heights of the Kafir Kafir rise as a barrier between the wooded slopes of Bana and the bare hills of Sakka. To the north, the rocky group of Bati (the "oak") bounds the principal valley of Bana.

To the north of Bati runs the river of Namash, which runs directly into the Kafir on its left bank. Bati thus forms an isolated group corresponding to Bana on the right bank of the Kafir.

The true northern boundary of Bana is therefore formed by the mountain of Bard-I-Sita to the north of the districts of Dasht-I-Tal and Namash.

From the administrative (and ethnographic) point of view the province of Sawdi-Bulak is divided into the following parts:

1. Makri Kurdistân, properly so-called, inhabited by settled Kurds belonging to the Makri and Debokri tribes. The capital is the town of Sawdi-Bulak, founded, according to Rawlinson, at the beginning of the 16th century. A century later it comprised 1200 houses of which 100 belonged to Jews and 30 to Syrians. The town retained this size till the outbreak of the Great War. According to H. Schindler, the town lies in 36° 45' 48" N. Lat. and 45° 47' E. Long. at a height of 4,272 feet above sea-level. The following districts (maphali) form part of Makri Kurdistân:

- 1. The environs of the capital, 36 villages; 2. Shah-i-Warea "the deserted town"; this very rich district is situated to the north of the capital and has 68 villages belonging to the Debokri tribe; 3. Altikhi ("grove"), on the Sawdi-Bulak-Mahmud-Daoud road, in the valley of the Tatavi; 4. Bati on the Tatavi at the crossing of the Sawdi-Bulak-Sakka and Mahmud-Daoud roads; 5. several villages which the principal is Muharram; 6. Tal, on the Tatavi at the crossing of the Sawdi-Bulak-Sakka and Mahmud-Daoud roads; 7. several villages which the principal is Bulak with a fine residence of the hereditary "serdar" of the Makri; 8. Turfan south of Bati, 38 villages; 9. Gwark-i-Makri near the sources of the Tatavi southeast of Kirtuk, 24 villages.

II. The territory of the Kurdi tribe Belnas, related to the Makri and speaking the same dialect. Formerly nomads, the Belnas now spend the winter in their villages and in summer go to the heights (sara) near their dwellings. The following are always the Belnas of Kafir territory:

1. The Manja, a brave and courageous tribe, mostly settled, and the Sawdi-Bulak-tai and in the districts of El-Tamur (below Gowruk) and Nail-i-Mangu (the "horse-shoe", i.e. an amphitheatre formed by the mountains on the western face of Kirtuk). But the headquarters of the Mangar where their villages lie is at Mergun (Tirkash) on the right bank of the Kafir between Lohar and Sardash. The total number of the villages of the Mangar amounts to 148.

II. The Piru to the north of Mergun in old Lohar and on the Luhur, 50 villages, including the little fort of Muharram, just opposite the pass of Gwark-shinaka.

c. The Mamas live in New Lohar, the centre of which is the ancient stronghold of Tawa, now in ruins, but mentioned as early as Yaqut. The Mamas occupy the valley of Bati-Mahd (Djalidin), and all the upper part of Luhur above the point where it enters the plain of Old Lohar. There are Mamas at Sirdar and at Tawu, in all over a hundred villages.

d. The tribe of Dasht (Gwark) which besides the villages already mentioned occupies the wooded spurs of the Kurtag on the left bank of the Kafir and has over a hundred villages.

e. The Sidi live in the villages (68) between Bana, Sardash, the head of the Kafir and the Kandil. Their clans (Baryajid; Milkiti, Daruni, Harj-Ali and Ali) live separately without common chiefs. Belux, the chief of the Ali, has 70 houses surrounded with beautiful gardens.

It ought to become quite important, being situated on the Marjigha-Sawdi-Bulak-Sardash road, and the districts of Sulaiman and Kufi. At Tawu below Belux there are to be seen on the Kafir the ruins of an old bridge having seven pieces of brick.

IV. The two other districts of Makri Kurdistân are Sakka and Bana. They were both at one time under the wills of Sinna, but geographical, ethnical and political conditions (especially since the Turkish occupation in 1905) explain their being attached to Sawdi-Bulak.

Bana is a very important district with 8 subdivisions (Dula, Khurshid, Balaw-Bahkhi, Shew, Namash, Dabati-Tal, Kibrous, Tawu, Pash-Arbera) with 145 villages and about 3400 households. The town of Bana at the foot of Mount Arbera has 800 houses, of which 80 belong to Jews, and is very busy. On Pash-Arbera ("Isenhain A.") the road from Penja, we may mention the village of Balaw-Bahkhi, which though situated to the south of the new Kuf-Kuf range belongs to Bana.

Rawlinson estimated the number of Bana families at 12,000 which would give about 100,000 souls. This figure does not seem to include Baha, Bana, Sakka, etc.

The actual number of inhabitants of the tribunates of Sawdi-Bulak cannot be less than 300,000. The foreigners are few but mostly officials, several hundred Jewish families at Sawdi-Bulak, Bana and Sardash, and even in the villages; a few Armenian families (with a church) at the town of Sawdi-Bulak, whence, on the other hand, Syrians have entirely disappeared.

Language. O. Muns conclaves that the same Kurdi language (Kurna) is spoken on the territory bounded on the east by the valley of the Tatavi and the left bank of the Djaned; to the south, in Sakka and Bana, Kurneidi is spoken, but at Martunf and among the Tifaki tribe (in the district of Hobein) the dialect of Sinna (q.v.) is said to be spoken. Kurneidi extends beyond the bounds of Persia as far as Sulaimaniya and even south of it. The favourite出处 of the people of Sawdi-Bulak are natives of Kirkuk.
Darland, and the villages of Salamata. To the north-west the dialect passes a little beyond the plain of Ughni, but in the Urmia region begins the area of the dialects which are connected with those of Hakkari. Thanks to the labours of O. Manni we have a fine collection of heroic ballads and Muki folk-lore. There is a translation into the Mukt dialect of the Gospel of St. Mark (Avestarian press at Philippoupoli, 1909) and of Protestant hymns (L. O. Fossati) etc. Before the war American missionaries had begun to publish at Urmia a little magazine for the Mukt (Kurdistan, No. 1, April, 1914). By 1921 most of the Mukt Kurds are Shīflī Sunnis. They are very lukewarm in religious matters, but the Shīflī belonging to the religious orders (Najābaṭand and Kādiś) exercise a very great personal influence among them. The disciples of Shīflī Sa'dī of Kewāmbd (killed in 1915 during the Turkish occupation) practised a very violent Shīflī in his time.

Costume. The Mukt costume consists of a shirt with very long sleeves coming down to the feet and tied behind the back when fighting. Above it is put a kind of robe which comes down to the knees and the tails of which cross; a huge girdle of cotton material, sometimes 20 feet long, is then rolled round the body. In summer the tails of the coat fall down over the huge white drawers tightened at the ankles. In winter or when on horseback the tails are thrust into cloth tromers of ample dimensions. Above all a very short sleeveless coat of hard felt is worn. On the head is worn a peaked hoodfress surrounded by a tassel. This is surrounded by a turban of mussul milk, the fringes of which fall over the eyes. The old armon, coat-of-mail, helmet, buckles, lance and sword (cf. de Morgan, ii., Pl. xx. and al.), has completely disappeared. The Mukt is content with a dagger and a rifle, and is specially fond of making a show of the number of his handoliers and belts arranged to hold cartridges. There is not much variety in the equestrian sports; the favourite is the taffe, which consists in throwing a heavy stick to the ground and catching it while going at full speed.

The women wear dark cotton trousers, a long undergarment, and a piece of blue cotton with which they cover their shoulders; a broad or red turban, skillfully arranged forms their headdress. The relations between the sexes have not the strictness usual among the Muslims. The women do not veil themselves. Among the Mukt there are a number of dances (šuyr’, rōnā, ‘üzāh, šagī, gārā, kal-pārin) in which the men and women form circles holding one another's hands.

Occupations. To the north-east, especially in the rich valley of the Tatsa, we have agriculture with a view to export; everywhere else the tribes cultivate the soil for their own requirements only. The vines and tobacco are grown at Afīn, Sardagh and Bāsha. Sheep are reared throughout the mountainous region; cheese is made flavoured with sweet-smelling herbs and felt is manufactured. In the wooded districts the people burn charcoal, gather acorns, guali-nuts and mastic (gaw); these districts and on the right bank of the Klaut the region between Prish in and Sardagh; on the left bank the western slopes of the Tartsa; in Bāna, the eastern parts of the district. In the river at Warma (near Aghrāma) surfice sand is found in small quantities.

History. Down to about 1890 there was at Tatsa on the lower course of the Tatsa a cuneiform inscription in the Khalidic (Vanni) language, which has since been carried off by some vandals. According to Belk (Das Reich der Manndar, in the Verhandl. Best. Ges. f. Anthropologie, 1894, p. 479-487), it was put up by Menna, son of Isayumti, a Vanni (Khalid), (Urartaum) king who reigned between 812 and 776 B.C. (C. F. Lehmann-Haupt, Armeinien etc., 1910, L. 653). This monument, the most eastern known in the cuneiform character, must have marked the site of the town of Mahta in the land of the Mannasens (Minal) conquered by Nebuchadnezzar. Traces of Khalidic influence can also be seen in the waterworks, subterranean corridors and stairways hewn out of the rock, which Rawlinson (J.R.G.S., vol. v.) discovered at Shišān-ābād and at Sawkand on the left bank of the Sawsbātul river. The Assyrian king Sargon, in the account of his famous campaign in 714 B.C., mentions to the south of Lake Urmia — apart from Mannasen territories — the districts of Allahia, Paraunji, Zikkirth, etc. (Thaumaturgus, Une relation de la bataille campagnes de Sargons, Paris 1912). But the identification of Paraunji with the land of the Persians (Persia) and its localization on the lower course of the Gīdir are still only hypotheses.

Another very remarkable monument is the rock tomb of Fakrās near the village of Indirak. North of Sawsbātul; it resembles the Ashkenesin type of tomb (de Morgan). E. Herzfeld connects it with the group of monuments which he regards as Median (Sarso-Herzfeld, Iranische Palaestina, 1910, p. 184; Herzfeld, Chorātān, in Jlam, 1921, xi. 133). Among the towns of Media enumerated by Prokelt (vi. 2) there are two in the same latitude (38° 30'): Ḫwāsā (long. 87° 50') and Sarnū (long. 88°). Rawlinson identifies the latter with Sānū in the district of Ughni and he connected the former (Jarayvanuš) with the Daryā, mentioned in the Kurdish chronicle (ed. Vellina-s-min-nor, i. 268). But he did not know the site of Daryā; it is the name of a village (2 miles N.W. of Indirak) quite unlike to which are the remains of the "deserted town" which has given its name to the whole district of Shār-i Wāzān, which is still recognised as the ancient capital of the district.

De Morgan (iv. 283) has remarked on the great number of artificial tel's (mounds) on the upper Klaut; there are 24 in Līzhīdana. The ruins of the "town" of this district are to the south-east of the pass of Garī-Shīnka. Farther down the tel's disappear but in the centre of the Maku country at Gholgha-tapa there is a large mound 150 ft. in circumference. Quite near, at Khalīsdāla, de Morgan found tombs of the Iron age (Mīz. scient., iv., Richerrr, mochella, b. 9). In the Bāna district Harris mentions "mounds" (tel's) near Sīwāna, the inhabitants of which sold him ancient chalices, cylinders, etc. All this shows that the region of Mukt Kurdistan has been inhabited from a remote period.

The Emperor Heraclius crossed this region in 624 in pursuit of Khusaw Parwīs; in the caves of Khersfūl (Silin-Kalāt, q. v.) Ker Porter found a Greek inscription (Kaibel, Ephes. Graecn, Berlin 1878, p. 312).

The history of Mār Yabalāh, patriarch of the Nestorians (1281-1317 A.D.), shows the im.
portance of the traffic through the territory of Sáwdj-Bulâk in the Mongol period. The present toponymy of the region shows the clash of Turkish influences from the north-east and Kürd influences infiltrating from the west. In the eastern counties (Ağhağ, Bâhi, Târzân, Şekî), there are Kürdish villages with Turkish names. We also find a certain number of Mongol names: Târâq, Tâtaûf (in Mustâwî, Tâghbatî, Dîjaghâtî, which, according to the History of Mîr Yâbûlî, was called in Persian Wâyán?)-îrûmân, according to Rashîd al-Dîn (ed. Quatremère, ad fol. 297v), Zâtûn Kâlî. On the other hand, the Turkish districts between the Tâtaûf and Marâgha formerly subject to the Mûrâkhi have been lost to them. To the west of the Kûrakî, we only find Kürdish names with a few sporadic Semitic ones (Aramûcî: Dîbâ, Kûkâ, Nûbâsû and Simûla).

We have to distinguish several historical layers among the Kurds of Sáwdj-Bulâk. In general the large tribes are divided into two classes: warrior ("aşguîr") and peasant ("ra'îf") and it is very probable that before the formation of a tribe organised in this way the peasants had to be subjugated and sometimes even "Kurdised" by the invaders who are their present masters. According to O. Mann, the peasants are usually proud of belonging to the "(now called?) Debûkî tribe who would represent an older element than the Mûrâkhi. The same hypothesis is probable for the Sûsanî (between the valley of Alûn, Sûradjî and Wâansa) in view of their settled character and their ability as gardeners and vine-growers.

As regards the tribal aristocracy it always claims to have come from the west. For the principal tribe of the Mûrâkhi we have the references in the Mûrafû-sûmanî. The Mûrâkhi chiefs claim to have belonged to the Mûrâkhi tribe which lives in Shahîrûz and to have been of the family of governors of the Bâbûn tribe. During the period of Turkoman dynasties (16th cent. A. H.) a certain Saîf al-Dîn took Dâryân from the Câbûkîn (a Turkish tribe?) and enlarged the territory by the addition of the districts of Dîlî, Bîrîk (Dîlî is a little district to the S.-W. of Lake Yûmîya and Bîrîk is a tribe at present scattered round the mouth of the Tâtaûf), Akhshâ, El-Tâmûrî and Sülâmâ. The tribes united under his sway received the name of Mûrâkhi. His son and successor Şarîm challenged Şâh Ismâ'îl Şafawî and in 912 inflicted a defeat on the Persian troops. Then (in 918) he sought support and investiture from Şâh Selîm. On the death of Şarîm his estates were divided among the three sons of his nephew Rûstâm, who recognised the sovereignty of Şâh Tahmasî. At the revolt of Alûnî, Mîrzâ (1018) Şâhî Şülanî intervened against them, his vassals of the Ahamîrî, Hâkî, and Bîrîkî tribes who fought and killed them. The young son of Şarîm, Amîr-bîg I, succeeded them, having received investiture from Şâhî Şülanî and ruled his tribe and the fey of Dâryân for 30 years. Another Amîrî, grandson of Rûstâm, succeeded him, with the help of the Şafawîs. During the troubles in the reign of Şâh Muhammad Kûdûh-banda, Amîr-bîg II in 991 vested Şâhî Şülanî Murûd III who added to his hereditary fey the williety of Bîrîk (Shâhîrûz) and the sanjak of Mosul; Erûb and certain dependencies of Marâgha were given to his sons. With the help of the Mir-î Mirân of Waste, he defined the Persian governor of Marâgha and plundered the district, of which the Sultan appointed him beyler-beyî with the title of Pâghâ. The hereditary fey of Darûs was, however, awarded to his nephew Hamîn who had given his adherence to the Persians. A war broke out between the Amîrî Pâghâ and Hamîn. The latter was killed and Sultan Muhammad III (1003-1012 A. H.) granted his brother Uleym-beg the district of Dîbûl Khuwarâ (D. Haarmân to the north of Marâgha) in fief. In the meanwhile the Turks had captured Tabûzî and Dîjaghî Pâghâ, appointed Governor-General of the province, wished to have Amîrî-Pâghâ recognise his authority. The latter complied with a bad grace. Dîjaghî Pâghâ lodged complaints against him in Constantinople and the sandjaks of Osâmî, Mosul and Erûb were taken from Amîrî. Marâgha was subordinated to Tabûzî with an obligation on Amîrî to pay an annual contribution of 15 kharîwâr of gold. Finally his lands were reduced to Darûs alone. His son Şahbî Hûdîr, however, was able to hold out in the old fortress of Shahîrûz rebuilt by him. The people of Marâgha complained of him as a troublesome impostor and Khuwarî Pâghâ, governor-general of Tabûzî, issued an edict allotting Shahîrûz to the Mahmûdî tribe. Fighting began around the fortresses and Amîrî-Pâghâ had to intervene to put an end to the hostilities. About 1005 the father and son still had the following districts: Darûs, (Myûnûn), du-àbî, Aqjarî and Lîfânî (the two last named on the right bank of the Dîjaghî), as well as the fortress of Târâq and Shahîrûz and with the districts attached to them.

Information on the later period is still little accessible. I. Kandar Manahî, author of the Tarîkh-i Âdam Arî, was an eyewitness of Shah 'Abbas's expedition against the Mûrâkhi and Brûdîst Kurds; the episode of the siege (in 1017 = 1609) of Dîmûmâli (south of Lake Yûmîya on the river Kûsîmî) is the favourite subject of Mûrâkhi bards, Mirzâ Mahdi-Khân's history of Nûdîr Shah also contains information about the Mûrâkhi (O. Mann, op. cit., i, Preface).

The more recent history of Mûrâkhi territory is as follows: In 1810 the governor of Marâgha, Aliymad-Khân (of the Turkish tribes of Mûrâkhdân and Bâzûk), invited the Mânîsh Agha's to a feast and had 300 of them massacred there, which put an end to this tribe's depredations for a long time. In 1850 the rebel Rûbarî Agha (Hîllîsî) threatened Marâgha. In October, 1880, the Mûrâkhi territory was invaded by Shahîb Ubdîl Allah of Shumûkîn, whose ambition was to found a Kurdish principality of the same character as that of Rumelîa. On this occasion the religious chief of the Sunni sect of Sáwdj-Bulâk proclaimed the holy war against the Şûriya which resulted in wholesale massacres especially around Marâgha. In 1905, the Turks, contesting the Turkish-Persian frontier occupied Lâhîjân, Muhammed Fadîl Pâghâ's headquarters were at first established at Faswa; in the end the occupation gradually opened all over Mûrâkhi territory. In 1914 the delimitation took place with the assistance of British and Russian representatives; they established the old frontier along the Kandîl. The World War began in these regions with a new Turkish-Kurd movement. Colonel Iyka, Russian consul at Sâwdj-Bulâk, was assassinated at Miysân-dûh on Dec. 10, 1914. The region then became the scene of Russian-Turkish fighting which left a trail of devastation behind it.
Five great families constitute the Murti nobility: they are all called Bhab-Amira (Bhab-miri) and trace their descent from Amir Bagbeg. Their more certain ancestor is Budahk-Sultan who is buried in Sawai-Bulak; his connection with Amir II is, however, not at all clear. According to the Kāfī (I. 300), his brother Bhab Saliamān flourished about 1700. There are curious legends about the life of Budahk-Sultan: he is said to have been the son of a certain Fakhr Ahmad who had married a young Frank girl called Kheghā (Rich, i. 291, 293, 359). One of the peaks of the Kandil is called Khān Budahk Kheghā (metronymic names are common among the Murtis). The descendant of Budahk in the eighth generation was Aziz Khān Sardār, governor-general of Adhābastāḏā, who died in 1858. De Morgan (ii. 40–41) extols the ability of his son Salf Al-Din, governor of Sawai-Bulak and owner of the fine estate of Bokka (he died in 1891). His son and successor, Husain-Khan Sardār, several times governor of Sawai-Bulak, was killed in 1914 during the Turkish invasion. Other Bhab-miri families have estates at Akhtābi, Turgān and Yel-zāhid (Vallēl).

Rawlinson (p. 35) describes the fiscal organisation of Sawai-Bulak. The Bhab-miri families receive $\frac{1}{6}$ of the produce of the land; $\frac{1}{12}$ is received by the farmers (gākāt) and $\frac{1}{6}$ goes to the zemstvo who superintend the cultivation. These quotas evidently represented the rent while the rest of the produce defrayed the expenses of tillage and labour. According to O. Mann, this system still flourishes; but feudal customs generally tend to disappear.

The tribe of Debokiri has only played a subordinate part. Their very centre, Daryās, has long been regarded by the Murtis as their hereditary seat. It is only very recently that the Debokiri seem to have again organised themselves with some degree of independence under their present chiefs of whom the great-grandfather, Bahām Khān, is said to have come from Diyar-bakr (?). Near Sawai-Bulak there is a little village of Debok from which Debokiri must be derived. The connection between Debok (Dib Bhok?) and Diyar-bakr is uncertain. In any case the name Debokiri, which does not occur in the Sharaf-nūmā, cannot be old but, as it is applied especially to a family of chiefs, this fact does not prejudice the antiquity of the people owning their rule. The district of Lāriḏān, like its homonym in Glīn, used to be called Lāriḏān. Hoffmann, op. cit., p. 244, 263, identifies it with the Safaq al-Awdi of the Arabs, while denying that the name Safaq may be a reminiscence of the ancient Sīllicere. According to the Sharaf-nūmā (I. 279), Saliamān-Sahrūn (before 994?) pillaged the land of the Zarki. A corrupt passage (I. 280) then seems to show that Lāriḏān formed part of this territory and that it was taken from the Zarki by Sīllicere Bhab. The Zarki now occupy the district of Ughna immediately to the north of Lāriḏān. The date of arrival of the present occupants, the Bibras, in Lāriḏān is unknown. The Bibras with the Kāwātīs are occasionally referred to in the Sharaf-nūmā to the west of the Kandil where some of their branches are still to be found (Mamash-i Bae, Khdhir-mamsen). In Rawlinson’s time the Bibras still paid to the Murtis a tribute of 1000 tomas a year.

As to Bānī, the Sharaf-nūmā says that this district lies between the Ardīlūn, Bābān and Murti, and that it consists of two parts, one of which is the nūriya of Bābān properly so-called with the fort of Bīrān; the other consists of the fort of Shiwa (in Kurdish "slope") which must correspond to the village of Shīvē in the district of this name lying to the south-west of Bānī. The former capital, the official Persian name of which is Bīrīnī, is short distance from the modern town but its name survives in the popular name given by the Kurds to the present town of Bīrān ("exposed to the sun"). The Amir of Bānī (Sharaf-nūmā, i. 320) were called Ilītyūr al-Din because of "their own accord (ba-likīyā-i kānū) they had adopted Islam". The first chief mentioned by the author is Mirzā-Bāgh of Bānī, who married the daughter of Bīga-beg, governor of Ardīlūn, which brought him trouble with a rival and the resultant temporary loss of his life. His son Budāb-beg, driven out by his brothers, sought the support of Shāh Tāmasāb but died at Bāzīw. The Shāh ordered the governor of Maragha to instal in Bānī Budāk’s brother Saliamān-Beg who ruled the district for twenty years and finally handed over his position to his son-in-law and nephew Bādg-Beg. The Ilītyūr are a Murti family, which also claimed descent from the Adhābastāḏās, therefore the patronymics of the khān of Ardīlūn. In the time of Rich (i. 217, 248) Nur Allāh Khān was hereditary governor of Bānī. The last scion of the Ilītyūr Al-Din family, Karim Khān, was killed (about 1850) by his old servant Wenis (= Yunus) Khān, who seized the power in Bānī. His son Hama (Muḥammad) Khān was governor in the district before the Great War. Since 1912 by orders from Teherān Bānī has been detached from Siān and incorporated in the province of Sawai-Bulak.

The only know of him that he fell in battle (Sawml-.newInstance, l. 37).

3) The eldest son of Marad Allah, who, when governor of Rosthania, made terms with a son of John V Palaeologus of Byzantium, named Andronicus, and rebelled against his father. The Ottoman chroniclers give very scanty information about this conspiracy while the Byzantine historians Chalcocene-dykes, Pharramus and Ducas give very full accounts, differing only in detail; cf. Chalcoc, ed. Illus., Bekker, l. 40 sqq. (Sawml-Regis), Pharramus, ed. Bekker, l. 50, where the rebel is wrongly called Maa Rofas; id. M., ed. Bekker, l. 50 (Sawml-Regis) where Sawml is mentioned but the rebel is called Kessas; id. e. Candia, Murad I acted jointly with John V and took the field against the two princes. After an unsuccessful battle at a place which the Byzantine writers call Anadolu Chalco, p. 43) Sawml fled to Irlandistochina, where he was surrounded and forced to surrender to his father. He was blinded and then beheaded.

The execution took place in 1278 (1275-86), and the body was brought to Brusias and buried there. Murad I had apparently made up his mind to get rid of Sawml as he had appointed his son Bayazid to watch his movements, cf. Marad's letter to Bayazid in Feridun, Miniscat. Seljuk, l. 107 (of the beginning of Raho'1, 787 = 1385-1386), with Bayazid's answer,(cf. cit. exp. p. 106 sqq, according to which the Kaiz of Brusis must have passed a death sentence on Sawml. The execution of Sawml was the first of a long series of similar cases, in which princes dangerous to the Ottoman heir-apparent were put out of the way.

Hildiography: J. von Hammer, Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches, l. 190, 399, Zinken in G. 0., R., 837 sqq, Huddiffi Bihis in Al-Tawarikh, under the year 1295, Sa'di al-Diri, Taif al-Tawarikh, l. 100 sqq. (following Idris Bidhisi).

(FAZNE RIAHORS)

SAWML (A.) is in the first place barley flour, then also wheat flour and flour made of dried fruits, such as a soup made from flour with water or paste to which honey, oil or pine-nut syrup, etc. is added. The effects of such flour dishes are discussed by al-Razi in his work on diet. To revenge the battle of Rattab, Ali Sulaymân in Ibn Haldun, c. ii., rode with a body of armsmen towards Medina. Near the town there was some skirmishing and Ali Sulaymân led his men to Muhammad and his followers approached. The Mekkans in their flight threw away their provisions, mainly sawml, which were picked up by the Muslims. The incident has been perpetuated in the Sira under the name Gafran al-Sawml (cf. Cantar, Annalett dell'Italia, year 2, 49).


(J. RIEKA)

SAWML (A.), with Stress, means from the root sawml-m, the two sawml are used indiscriminately. The original meaning of the word in Arabic is "to be at rest" (al-Noideke, Neue Beiträge zc. Syria, Strassburg 1920, p. 36, note 3; cf. previously S. Fraenkel, "Fox s. Sawml ... in Coran pesugravt", Leiden 1896, p. 20: quiescens"). The meaning "fasting" may have been taken from Judaeo-Aramaic usage, where Muslim became better acquainted with the institution of fasting in Medina. The word has this meaning in the Mamlam stans, in the Mekka stans.
it only occurs once, in Surah xx. 27, where the commentators explain it by "pnsn" "silence" (this is therefore given as one of the translations of the word in the dictionaries); but perhaps some has simply to be transferred "fasting" (see below). The verb is followed by the accusative of the time spent in fasting.

Origin of the rite of Fasting. That fasting was an unknown practice in Mecca before Muhammad's time cannot be a priori assumed. Why should not the "pnsn" in whose manner of life there was so much Judeo-Christian features apparent — at least according to tradition — have also used this spiritual discipline? In favour of the occurrence of fasting as a voluntary practice of mortification among the first Muslims in Mecca is the probability that Muhammad on his many and varied journeys had observed the rite among Jews and Christians. But we can say nothing definite on this point; anything told us on this subject in the Surahs and Muslim tradition may be biased. In the Mecca suras, as above mentioned, there is a reference to "pnsn" in xix. 27: a voice commands Mary to say "I have made a vow of fasting to the Merciful, wherefore I speak to no one this day". There is some possibility that the term simply means "fasting", because observing silence as a Christian fasting practice ("Apbāhā", ed. Parisot, in Prose, introd. p. 97) may have been known to Muhammad. Muhammad was in any case not acquainted with the details, because it was only after the Hijra that he ordered the "Aḥārīn"-day to be spent in fasting, when he saw the Jews doing it in Medina. In the year 2 a. h., according to unanimous reliable Muslim tradition (cf. A. J. Wensinck, Mohammed an de Joden te Medina, Utrecht, 1902, pp. 135-137), in contradiction of e.g. A. Sprenger, Das Leben und die Lehre des Mohammed, II. 53-39, the revelation of Surah ii. 179-181 again abolished the "Aḥārīn" as an obligation by the institution of the fast of Ramadan. On the question why Muhammad chose this particular month and when he took the arrangement of the Muslim fast, various opinions have been expressed. Islam teaches that it is a fast imposed by God on Jews and Christians, but corrupted by them and restored by Muhammad to its true form; Sprenger, op. cit., II. 55, ept., thinks that it was an imitation of the Christian quadragesimam; Noldeke-Schawally, Geschichte des Qoran, I., Leipzig 1900, pp. 179-180, note 1, points to the similarity of the module of fasting among the Munchausen. More recently, however, A. J. Wensinck has called attention to the particularly sacred character of the month of Ramadan even in pre-Mohammedan times (on account of the — also old-Arabic — "Lūlūl al-Aḥārīn" [q. v.], which happens in Ramadan) in his essay Arabic New-Year and the Feast of Tabernacles in Vera. Ak. W. Amt. New Series, 1925, vol. XXI. 1-13; cf. also M. Th. Houtsma, Oor de traditie van de Nederlandse vaste dagen, in Verlo. en Med. Ak. Wetensch., Ass. Lett., Series 4, vol. II. 329-332. Amsterdam 1892, has thrown the possibility that the solution of the problem of Ramadan is to be sought in this direction (for further information see the article RAMADAN).

The first regulations concerning the manner of the Muslim fasting are given in Surah ii. 179-181, which probably belong together (Noldeke-Schawally, p. 178; in opposition to Th. W. Juynboll, Hanbook der islamischen Geistes, Leiden-Leipzig 1910, p. 134, who considers 181 a later revelation, al-Bukhārī also assumes that it was revealed in separate parirs): one ought to fast during a definite number of days, to be precise, in the month of Ramadan, "in which the Kur'ān was sent down"; special dispensations were granted to invalids and travellers on condition that they made restitution for it. In obedience to these divine commands the Muslims fasted in Ramadan and the devout among them followed the Jewish custom of fasting from one sunset to the next until a new revelation (II. 183) limited the period of fasting to the day (cf. al-Bukhārī, Sunna, bāb 15, etc.). The fast is also mentioned elsewhere in the Kor'ān: in Surah ii. 192, where it is prescribed as a substitute for the ḍaḥāf in certain circumstances; in iv. 94, where fasting during two successive months is ordered as an atonement when someone has killed a believer of an allied nation by accident (cf. the article GALL); v. 91: one should fast three days (as a substitute) if one has broken an oath; v. 96: one should fast (as a substitute) if one has killed his own animal on the pilgrimage; iv. 5: one should fast (as a substitute) if one has killed a slave; in xxii 25 to describe the devout Muslim, along with other epithets, while in Surah ii. 42 and 148 ḍāfā [q. v.] is explained as pnsn.

The ordinances in Surah ii. 179-181, 183, form the basis of the detailed regulation by the ḍaḥāf of the law regarding fasting; many details and regulations were taken from tradition. What follows here is a resume of the law on fasting according to the Shāfi'i school, as contained in the treatise Aḥīn al-Shāfi'i al-Ifshānī, 4th century A.D., Muhāammad b. Ḥīfīz, annotated by Ibn Khāzin al-Qārī (d. 918 = 1532) and glossed by Ḥāṣim al-Balṣārī (d. 1278 = 1861) (Cairo edition).

How the fast should be observed and who is bound to fast. Fasting in the legal sense is abstinence (imāhā) from things which break the fast (ṣawf), with a special niyyah (intention) for each of the statutory fasts, and for the whole day; the ḍāfā must be a Muslim in full possession of his senses (dāhib) and, if a woman, free from menstruation and the bleeding of childbirth. The fast may be valid (ṣawf) under these conditions; there is an obligation to fast on every one who is in full-grown (bālā) if he is physically fit (kāfi). It is to be noted that the actual profession of Islam at the time is necessary for the ḍāfā, while for the ṣawf the Iṣlām of a mura'id is also valid, who is thus after his conversion obliged to make it for the fast days he has omitted (ṣawf). One who was born a ḍāfā, who has pledged to Islam, and ought, therefore, to obey its laws also, need not, however, make up for his omission; the law calls his obligation ṣawf al-mura'id, whereas that of the mura'id is called ṣawf al-murā'id khāt. The fasting of a non-Iṣlām, who is in mura'id (has power of discrimination), is valid (one ought to compel a child to fast from the tenth year, as is that of a non-ḍāfā). ḤĀJĪ is to be interpreted as meaning that for an ascetic, insane or intoxicated person ḍāfā (fulfilment of the obligation at the right time) is not ṣawf. One may spend the day sleeping if the niyyah has been previously formulated; or in a state of drunkenness or unconsciousness, if one

THE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF ISLAM, (V.)
can pull oneself together even for a moment only during the day.

The asrāt (pillars) of the fast are, besides the ṣawm, the niya and abstinance from the muẓ firāt. One ought to formulate the niya before dawn on each day of fasting (tāẓir); by ṣaghir [q. v.], however, the Ḥājiya can follow the Miʿrikhi muẓ firāt, which allows one to formulate the niya for the whole of the month of Ramadān; in the night before the first of Ramadān; if one fasts voluntarily, the niya may still be formed before noon, if one has actually fasted during the preceding part of the day. The niya should be deliberately formulated; it is desirable but not necessary to utter the words aloud (the law-books give formules); indeed, preparations which are made directly in view of the coming fast day may be regarded as niya.

The Muẓ firāt are:

1. The entering into the body of any material substances as far as it is done conscientiously and is preventable, i.e., the swallowing of food and beverages, the inhaling of tobacco smoke, the swallowing of spittle which can be ejected; if one spits or spits liquids or inserts instruments into the various orifices of the body; if one carries what the body in the course of nature would reject. On account of the limitations in a, b, c (see below) it is not muẓ firāt if insects, dust of the road, fragments of food from the teeth, anything that the skin may absorb, water from rinsing the mouth or rinsing the nose, provided too much is not used, even in the non-compulsory ṣawm [q. v.], and ritually pure scents find a way into the body. If thirst troubles one exceedingly one may hold water for a moment in his mouth, if it can be done without danger.

2. Deliberate vomiting, which is only permitted by doctor's orders and even then only with liability to ṣawm.


4. Deliberate seminal emission, which is a consequence of sexual contact; in other cases abstinance is made as to whether it is caused by passion or not, whether the person causing it is a stranger or a dhul mukhair, a boy, a woman or a ḍāhil. Nocturnal or similar emissions (ḥiftāt) are not muẓ firāt.

5. Menstruation; this even makes the fast ṣawm (this rule is not clear to al-Balḍārī, because the fast does not demand ritual purity otherwise).

6. The bleeding of a woman in child-bed.

7. Unsound mind and

8. Intoxication (7 and 8 make any ṣawm impossible), to which a ninth may be added, child-bed, but only in the view of some ṣafḥāt.

The ṣaww occurs, case per only, in case of deliberate senescence (ṣamāʿat), knowledge (ʿilm) and free will (qayyûra), i.e., not by neglect, in ignorance of the obligations if this is to be excused, or under compulsion. If one eats by an oversight, says the tradition, "he may continue the fast because God himself has caused him to eat" (Bu, Šawwām, b. 26; ʿAynain, b. 15; Muṣli, Ṣādīq, tr. 171).

If to be excused if the ṣawm 1) takes the ṣaww [q. v.], as soon as possible after he has abstained from dawn has set; he ought preferably to use ripe dates for this, or (ramzan-water or otherwise something tasty) the ṣaww is muẓ firāt, because the continuous fasting (ṣawm al-ṣafḥāt) is ṣawm.

2) eats the ṣaww (what is eaten after midnight) as late as possible and uses for it the same as is recommended for the ṣaww; 3) refrains from indecent talk, slander, calumnies, lies and insolence, because, according to the tradition, "the result of fasting is only hunger and thirst; if one does not keep his hands and feet from evil deeds", 4) avoids such actions as, although not actually forbidden, might arouse passion in oneself or in others; 5) refrains from being coarse or bad; 6) tastes no food; 7) chews nothing edible; 8) thanks God after the day of fasting; 9) recites the Qur'ān for oneself or others, and 10) observes the ṣaww in the month of Ramadān [q. v.] (in accordance with Ibn al-Bajrī, 183). Al-Ghazālī adds to these charity in the month of Ramadān.

Arranged according to the five legal categories, the fast may be:

1. Obligatory (maṣūb, ṣawm) (a) in the month of Ramadān; (b) if one has to make up for days omitted in Ramadān (ṣawm); (c) on account of a vow; (d) in definite circumstances to atone for a transgression (ḥaqīqāra), and (e) when the Imam prescribes the ṣawm-ceremonies [q. v.]; particularly in the case of drought. In the case of the indispensable ṣawm is bound, according to al-Ghazālī, to fast during the remainder of the day, mukhāzin hilm al-tayirina.

2. Fasting in the month of Ramadān is the fourth pillar of Islam; whoever denies the obligation to fast is a ṭāfrī, unless he has only recently come in contact with Islam, or has grown up remote from the ʿIlmām. Whoever omits fasting without good cause, without, however, denying the compulsion to fast, is to be locked up and brought to formulate the niya by forced attention. The general obligation to fast (Ṣāliʿ az-zawā'ima) begins on the first of Ramadān, after the 30th Sha'ban, or after the 20th if the ḍāhil (ḥaḍī) has then accepted the evidence of one add that he has seen the new moon, the personal obligation (Ṣāliʿ az-zawā'ima), in the case of an accepted ṣawm of one's own that of another person whom one believes in this respect, even if he should not have, after the 20th Sha'ban, if only one add has seen the new moon on the 20th Sha'ban, fasting etc. only becomes due on the 2nd Ramadān. The beginning of Ramadān has to be announced to the people in a way settled by the local custom (gum-shot, the hanging of lamps on the masāra, in Java by beating the kubang). Special regulations hold regarding niya and ṣawm if it is impossible for one to hear of the announcement or if he is wrongly informed. The observations of an astronomer, the calculations of a mathematician, or the dreams of one who has received in his sleep information regarding the beginning of Ramadān from the Prophet, etc., can only allow Ramadān to begin for the astronomer, mathematician or dreamer themselves and those who firmly believe in them.

3. Days omitted in Ramadān have to be made good (ḥaḍī) if one has as soon as possible, i.e., on the next day if this permits fasting, i.e., if it is not one of the forbidden days (see below) or if it is itself a compulsory fast day. If a man dies without having done his ṣaww, the obligation is thereby removed if there was a valid excuse for his being in arrears; otherwise his will (in this case any relative can be a will) must pay from his estate, or, with the consent of the will, any stranger can
gay, a small kaffāra or jādya (see below), or the makt (or stranger) — and this is the older šamil’s view, which later authorities do not approve of except; however, al-Baghdādi who even calls it zauma — can perform the jādya himself, in which case the merit acquired by the fast is credited to the deceased.

(3) According to the opinion which has predominated in the Shāfi‘ī school, a vow which would impose the obligation to the — the reprehensible — žawāl al-dahr (see below) is regarded as not done (cf. al-Baghdādi, Kithā ‘Akhkām al-Salātun wa ‘l-Salāh). (4) A distinction is made between the major and minor kaﬀāra. The fast is imposed on anyone who (a) breaks the fast in Ramaḍān by sexual intercourse if this is sinful (žayd), under the above mentioned conditions; he is further obliged to perform kaﬀāra and be liable to žawāl [q. v.]; because every fast day is an independent źaid, a kaﬀāra ought to be performed for every fast day broken in this way. Al-Baghdādi gives this subterfuge (žid) to escape the kaﬀāra that one should previously break the fast with another of the sunnah; then the kaﬀāra drops out but the sin remains. The female participants in the transgression is only liable for žawāl and žawāl; (b) is guilty of illegal killing (of the article žtti); (γ) has pronounced the žbār-formula [q. v.] but not the žawāl immediately after it (because he does not observe the vow contained in the žbār); (γ) has broken a valid oath (yaddad); see the article žabūd). This kaﬀāra consists of

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\hline
\text{a}) & \text{žbār (resp.)} & \text{žawāl (resp.)} & \text{žawāl} \\
\hline
\text{b}) & \text{žbār (resp.)} & \text{žawāl} \\
\hline
\text{γ}) & \text{žawāl (resp.)} & \text{žawāl} \\
\end{array}
\]

i.e. in the cases (a) (b) and (γ) fasting (žawāl) will do as a kaﬀāra if one is not able to do the first mentioned; if one receives the means to do so after having begun to fast, (b) should be performed, and the fasting that has been done is counted as a voluntary work of merit; similarly in case (b) fasting takes fourth place with the idea that the first three are interchangeable, but fasting always comes fourth. In (α) (β) and (γ) two months’ successive fasting is prescribed; the omission of one day makes it necessary to begin the fast from the first again, even if the omission was excusable; in case (γ) the fast is limited to three days and need not be successive. — If a man is not able to do any of the things mentioned, the obligation is put off until he has an opportunity to do one of them.

The minor kaﬀāra or jādya has to be paid when one takes advantage of one of the dispensations which are detailed below; the question of fasting does not arise. For the dead man (cf. above) it consists in his will giving a žawāl from the corn that grows on his land to the poor for each day omitted. The same sums have to be given by anyone who has not yet performed his kaﬀāra for days omitted in Ramaḍān by the beginning of the following Ramaḍān, and multiplied according to the number of years in arrears. — Anyone who has omitted, while performing the haddi or the umma,

one of the obligatory rites, which is not one of the first ḍādā (or performs anything forbidden during the period of ḍādā or takes advantage of a dispensation allowed by the law (e.g. žbār or źāmut), should stone it with a jādya consisting in the first place of a definite amount which is prescribed for each case separately; if the person liable to it is not able to perform the sacrifice he should fast, in some cases for to days — 3 during the haddi and 7 after returning home — and in other cases as many days as the quantity of žawāl’s which would otherwise have been given to the poor. These regulations originate in Sûra n. 192 and r. 96; cf. al-Baghdādi, Kithā ‘Akhkām al-Salātun wa ‘l-Salāh, šfat. li. and iii.; Juyalbi, Handbuch etc., p. 143 and esp. p. 157; the art. żawāl.

(4) In the case of great drought, the žlah may, according to the šafi‘īs, prescribe extraordinary conditions which include fasting; the three days before the žnāa al-latīhīqa [q. v.], al-Baghdādi, Kithā ‘Akhkām al-Salātun wa ‘l-Salāh, Žâlif al-Žâlim ‘Akhkām Žālif al-Žālim are spent fasting. One notable feature here is that the formulation of the žnāa by night (žāyib) žawāl for everyone, even when the fast is not obligatory for him, i.e. also for a boy or one who enjoys a dispensation. (This is the only case where žāyib is necessary for a fast which is not obligatory.) — Cf. also C. Smocke Hargroxe, Forseitr Gerecht, l., Bonsi-Leipzig 1923, p. 137, note 2.

The law permits relaxations in the following circumstances:

A. Such as have reached a certain age (mumt; 40; not exactly defined for women) and sick people for whom there is no hope of recovery, if they are imbecile to fast, may omit the fast without being bound to the žawāl, should their strength or health be restored. In compensation they should give alms at the rate of one žawāl for each day omitted; a slave does not have to perform žawāl but his owner may do it for him, or a relative: the latter is also permitted to fast in compensation.

B. If pregnant or nursing women fear it would be dangerous for them if they should fast, žāyib is žawāl for them and žawāl is obligatory. If their fear is for the unborn child or the one they are nursing (not necessarily their own), žāyib is žawāl in this case also: has a žawāl is imposed on them as well as žawāl, which, however, like the žawāl al-latīhīqa [q. v.], need only be paid out of the amount which is left over from the expenses of maintaining oneself and dependent family or from the expenses of housing and service; this žawāl is to be given only to the poor and to žāyibara. — The same regulations hold generally for cases where one breaks the fast for fear of danger to oneself, respectively to another person.

C. Sick persons who are likely to recover and those who are overcome by hunger and thirst may break the fast on condition that the žawāl is performed. If a man is in danger of death or danger of losing a limb, žāyib is žawāl. Chronic invalids need not formulate the žnāa in the night; nor persons sick of a fever if they are actually feverish at the time.

D. Travellers who set out before sunrise may, if necessary, break the fast, but not if they begin their journey during the day. In case of mortal danger, žāyib is žawāl. Two days’ journey is the minimum. žawāl is obligatory on them, even 40. The same relaxation is allowed to
divorced women. — If the persons mentioned under C and D break the fast by sexual intercourse, they are not liable to kaffara because in this case it is not a sin but is permitted to them.

E. Those who have to perform heavy manual labour should formulate the niyā of the night but may break the fast if need be.

When the justification for relaxing the rules disappears during the day of fast, it is suumā to pass the rest of the day fasting.

II. Voluntary fasting is meritorious (qawm al-lataʿawwum); for a married woman only with the consent of her husband; it may be broken without any penalty; the niyā, which can be formulated any time up till noon, need not be definitely specified, although some fūkha considers it desirable for the suumā rasūbit. The suumā rasūbit in the qawm are fasting (a) on the 'Asha'ī day [q.v.]; (b) on the 'Arafa day, the 9th Dhu 'l-Hijjah; (c) on six days of Shāwāl. Fasting on the day of 'Arafa applies specifically to those who do not spend this day in 'Arafa. Whether Muḥammad fasted on this day is disputed in Tradition. Wensinck, Mohammed en de Joden te Medina, p. 126-130, points to the fact that the whole of the first ten days of Dhu 'l-Hijjah had a special character and is recommended in the law for voluntary fasting; the 9th Dhu 'l-Hijjah, however, is regarded as the most auspicious day, just as in the Jewish month of Ab the 9th is a great fast, for which preparations are made from the beginning of the month. Because Ab and Dhu 'l-Hijjah probably coincided in the year 1 a.H, Wensinck thinks that the celebration of the 9th Dhu 'l-Hijjah may have been taken from Judaism. Another view is put forward by Nöldeke-Schwalczy, Gesch. d. Qorāni, i.159, who considers Surā vii. 29 as probably Mekkan and see in it an attack on the ancient custom of making the circuit of the Ka'ba naked and fasting at the time of pilgrimage (cf. p. 179, note 1). According to this view, this fast should be traced back to old Arab customs (cf. al-Bakhtīwī's commentary on Surā vii. 29: "It is said that the Vand Amir in the days of their ḥadīj only ate what was necessary to nourish them but took no fat (= tasty) food and thus observed their ḥadīj; then the Muslims were disturbed; then this (verse 29) was revealed"). It is considered meritorious if one who has to fast (as a substitute) three days during the ḥadīj and seven days afterwards (cf. above) chooses the 3 days the 7th, 8th and 9th Dhu 'l-Hijjah, because the 10th and the tāʿākh days are not possible (cf. below). If the 9th Dhu 'l-Hijjah is a doubtful day (i.e. whether 9th or 10th, on account of uncertainty as to the beginning of the month) fasting is only permitted for ḥadīj, on account of its being a regular custom, al-Bakhtīwī calls fasting from the 1st to the 9th Dhu 'l-Hijjah mandūb.

Six separate days can be taken for the fast on the six days of Shāwāl; but it is best to take six successive days immediately after the festival, i.e. from the 2nd to the 7th Shāwāl. These days can also be taken for a ḥadīj or a nukhr fast. Women who have had their menstruation in Ramādān often use these days for the ḥadīj (Juyonbīl, Handbuch etc., p. 132).

The following days are further recommended for voluntary fasting: the day before and after the 'Asha'ī day; the Yawm al-Mīrāj (27th Ramadān); Monday and Thursday (yumm wuṣūkkūd), according to al-Bakhtīwī, because on these days, says Tradition, the works of men are offered to God. Muḥammad is reported to have said: "I should like my works to be offered while I fast". Wensinck, Mohammed etc., p. 125-126, points out that the Jews also fasted on these two days: Wednesday, "out of gratitude", says al-Bakhtīwī, "that God on this day did not lead this world to destruction, like the other ummān"; the days of the white nights, i.e. the 13th, 14th, 15th and best of all the 12th of each month. As Wensinck, p. 125, says, Muḥammad fasted, according to tradition, three days of every month and the later Muslims, who no longer knew which, chose those days. Perhaps these three days were an obligatory fast in the year 1 a.H. Nothing certain can be said regarding the origin of these fast days; Prof. Wensinck in conversation called my attention to the sacred character of the Jewish 14th and 15th Nissām, and to the sacredness of the middle of the month, e.g. in Shabba in ancient Arabia; as a counterpart, presumably after the example of the white nights; the days of the black nights, i.e. the 28th, 29th and 30th (or 19th) and best of all the 27th of each month, every day on which one has nothing to eat; all other days if they are proper for fasting. On a three days' fasting as an atonement and a preparation to a better life see C. Snouck Hurgronje, Verspreide Geschriften, l., Bonn-Leipzig 1923, p. 137, note 2.

Al-Bakhtīwī only briefly mentions the voluntary fast days and refers his readers for further information to more detailed treatises. To supplement what we have said we give the following from the third ta'ākh of the Ṣu'ūdī of al-Ghazālī (see below).

He gives as additional days recommended for fasting the first, the middle and the last day of every month, speaks of the superiority of fasting in the sacred months (al-ṣaḥār ar-Rahmūm: Māḥrūm, Raddāb, Dhu 'l-Hijjah and Dhu 'l-Ka'ba), but more important is what he says regarding life-long fasting (qawm al-dāhr) which, he tells us, was practised by the mystics (al-ḥikaṭ) of his time in various ways (as had already been done by ascetics in the earliest days of Islam).

In general he considers it blameworthy, as the ṣa'āfī is not only wājib some days of the year, but desired generally; only exceptionally may one have recourse to the example given, according to tradition, by the Sajjā and the Tāḥṣīm (traditions regarding the qawm al-dāhr: al-Bukhārī, Shams, bīb. 59; Muslim, Sajjā, trad. 18 sq.; cf., however, Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, iv. 414; cf. also Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, ii. 263, 435 etc.; ii. 164, 190 etc.). It is highly recommended, however, to fast on alternate days (nisf al-dāhr), which achievement al-Ghazālī considers even more difficult: Muḥammad said: "The most excellent fasting is that of my brother Dādū, who fasteth one day and not the next" (cf. al-Bukhārī, Shams, bīb. 50, 59, 56, 59; Muslim, Sajjā, bīb. 37, 38 etc.; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, bīb. 181, 182, 186, 187, 189-193). To fast every third day is also very meritorious. To fast voluntarily for more than four days in succession is considered wrong by the 'Ulama' and (as a general rule) also by al-Ghazālī.

If one has properly understood the correct significance of fasting, says al-Ghazālī for this see
the fast if it is a result of sensual images, even without preceding sexual contact.

5. In spite of the above-mentioned tradition, Malik teaches that anyone who deliberately eats, drinks, or has sexual intercourse breaks the fast and is liable to hajf; Ahmad b. Hanbal, only in the fast case, hafra then being also necessary. Forced breaking of the fast holds good also in al-Nasawi; in Ahmad b. Hanbal only in the particular case of a woman being forced to have intercourse.

7. Malik says that kissing is always haram; Ahmad b. Hanbal that the cupper and his patient both break the fast; both Imams say that the taking of hajf is to be deprecated and, if the fragrance enters the throat, is actually mafjar. The Shafi view that the cleaning of the teeth after noon is wrong is not shared by the other Imams and not even by the later Shafiis (but is shared by al-Qazwini; even now it is still condemned in the Dutch Indies). There is ijtimii' on the point that for a ajunah a ghahel is recommended before dawn.

8. Malik demands for the settlement of the beginning of Ramadhan the evidence of two adl, Abu Hanifa only the testimony of one, but of a large number when the sky is unclouded. Some other fakhahs recognize only the general obligation (see above) to fast in Ramadhan, not the personal obligation of the one who has seen the new moon, but whose evidence has not been accepted.

9. Like al-Shafi'i, Abu Hanifa also teaches that the weak-minded is not bound to perform hajf in the event of his recovery; Malik teaches the contrary; both views are credited to Ahmad b. Hanbal.

10. The four Imams impose the major hafra for every breach of the regulations in question, even if several are committed on the same day; in the second transgression the obligation is imposed on the guilty woman also. Abu Hanifa, however, is less severe and does not even multiply the hafra's by the number of days broken if the wakafir is in arrears with the payment of the first hafra; Abu Hanifa and Malik say that in case of sexual intercourse between man and woman are liable to the hafra and they impose it also on everyone who breaks the fast of Ramadhan by eating or drinking, if he is not ill or on a journey, without affecting the liability to hajf. Malik leaves the wakafir free choice as to in which of the three ways he will fulfill his obligation, although he himself prefers if-jam.

Abu Hanifa does not impose the minor hafra (the donation of a wakaf) if one has not yet fulfilled his obligation to hajf for the Ramadhan fast by the beginning of next Ramadhan.

11. Ahmad b. Hanbal imposes, in addition, the (minor) hafra on pregnant and nursing women, if they have broken the fast out of fear of injuring themselves; Abu Hanifa, however, only hajf, others only hafra and no hajf.

12. Sick people for whom there is no hope and old people are, according to Abu Hanifa and a section of the Shafiis, liable to hajf only; Malik denies this also.

13. Travellers may, as Ahmad b. Hanbal teaches, break the fast, even if they have set out after the beginning of the fast, but this relaxation does not
include, according to him, permission for sexual intercourse; the ḥaffāra regulations hold, therefore, also with him. Some Ṣaḥabis teach that fasting of a traveller is not valid at all. — Mālik and al-Shāfi‘i teach that one is bound to fast for the remainder of the day if the reason for the dispensation disappears; Abū Ḥanifa and Ahmad b. Ḥanbal hold the contrary. — The ḥifṣa, according to the two last-named, is a half gōdū [q.v.] for every day omitted.

14. Mālik teaches that fasting on six Ṣawmādān-days is not recommended; he and Abū Ḥanifa say that one is bound to complete (iṭmām) a voluntary fast day also.

15. One ought to fast on the doubtful day, according to Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, when the sky is clouded; otherwise it is wrong. — Abū Ḥanifa and Mālik teach that occasional fasting (iṣrā‘d) on Friday is not wrong.

16. Lastly it is to be mentioned that, according to the Ḥanafī and Mālikī view, fasting during the Fitr [q.v.] is obligatory; cf. e.g. Abū Da‘ūd, Ṣahih, bāb 80 (as A. J. Wensinck says, in his treatise Ḥanafī New-Year).

The foregoing regarding fasting differs in the following details from the Sunna (according to A. Query’s edition of the Shāra‘ī al-Islām of Mas‘ūd al-Halālī wa l-Ḥārām of Nadjīm al-Dīn al-Muḥākkak, entitled Recueil de Lois concernant les Murūjmans de Smyrne, Paris 1871–72, i. 182–
209, ii. 75–77, 197–199, 203–205):

1. The niyya is not regarded as a pillar; it need not even be specified for Ramadān, although it does in other cases; it ought to be formulated before noon.

2. Smoking is not one of the munfi‘ā but unconsciousness is and if one deliberately remains in a condition of great ḥadāth after dawn,

3. It is forbidden, say munfi‘ā, to scorn God’s word or that of the Prophet or that of the (Ṣaḥīḥ) Imām; it is forbidden, although not munfi‘ā, to bathe completely in water. It is forbidden to keep deliberate silence during the fast.

4. If a man deliberately breaks the fast of Ramadān, he is to be chastised (50 lashes with a whip for a man or a woman in a case of sexual intercourse) and for the third offence the penalty is death. — The testimony of two ‘add is necessary for the beginning of Ramadān.

5. One is bound to perform ḥaffāra, for example, if one awakes after dawn in a state of great ḥadāth even if the niyya for purification has already been formulated. In the ḥaffāra fast one may eat before noon; if one eats later he has to pay a ḥifṣa (to mudd or three days’ complete fast); indebitterate neglect of purification in great ḥadāth makes the ḥaffāra fast not invalid. If an invalid remains till the following Ramadān, his obligation to ḥaffāra expires but the ḥifṣa (1 mudd) remains.

6. Ḥaffāra is compulsory if one, during the fast day, eats, drinks etc., has sexual intercourse, practises omnism, voluntarily remains in a state of great ḥadāth after dawn or falls asleep in this condition without having previously formed the niyya for purification, and then does not awake till after dawn, viz.: on a day of Ramadān; during ḥaffāra for an unlimited fast in Ramadān if the iftar takes place after noon; in fasting on account of a particular vow and for ḥifṣa. — If a man forces his wife or slave to marital intercourse in Ramadān, his ḥaffāra and ḥaffāra are doubled but the wife is exempt. Other cases of ḥaffāra are: manslaughter, forbidden expressions of grief at a death, hair-cutting when in a state of ṣabr al-amir, intercourse with a slave woman who is in a state of ṣabr al-amir if one has given her permission for the ḥifṣa.

In performing the ḥaffāra, fasting comes second, as with the Sunnis; deliberate murder, however, and, according to some fūkābi‘, also the breaking of the fast of Ramadān with forbidden foods, entails threefold ḥaffāra: ḥifṣa al-sawm al-ṣabr al-amir. The choice is free if one breaks the fast in Ramadān in another way than by sexual intercourse, breaks a vow or ḥifṣa, cuts one’s hair when in a state of ṣabr al-amir, or has intercourse with a slave woman who is in a state of ṣabr al-amir.

In general the ḥaffāra fast should be uninterrupted. In the case of a two months’ fast inexcusable interruption in the first month makes a repetition necessary; in the second it only entails obligation to the ḥifṣa. Interruption by a pregnant or nursing woman is here excusable, but not an unnecessary journey (see below). If the duration of this fast is only one month, as e.g. the ḥaffāra fast of a slave, the hard period lasts 14 days. Interruption on the 10th Dhu l-Hijjah does no harm in the three days’ compensatory fast (see above); if one already fasted two days. — The choice of the days is, however, open in the case of ḥaffāra for breach of an oath, for breaking the prohibition of hunting during the ṣabr al-amir, and in the seven days’ compensatory fast (see above) (as also in case of ḥifṣa). If one is not fit to fast for two successive months, he should fast 28 days and seek God’s mercy with contrite heart. Another kind of ḥaffāra (not fasting) may be voluntarily taken over on behalf of another person.

7. The relaxations. Only if a physician permits an invalid to fast, is it legitimate. Pregnant women are only given a dispensation in their last months and nursing women only when their milk supply is defective. The fasting of travellers is in general not valid; but if a man travels for the best part of a year in the course of his business he does not get the benefit of relaxation. A fast neglected on the account of a journey must always be observed later; in case of death by the next of the deceased.

8. Voluntary fasting may begin before noon. The Shi‘a Fīkh-books recommend fasting on the following days also: on every first and last Thursday of the month; on the first Wednesday of the second ten days of the month (on should even pay compensation, 1 mudd or 1 ḥa‘ám, if this is omitted); on the day of the ’Id al-Ḥaḍir, 18 Dhu l-Ḥijjah, on which Muhammad is said to have appointed Ali his immediate successor at the side of pond (ghadir) (Query, op. cit., p. 37, note 2); on Muhammad’s birthday (17 Rabi‘ I) and on his first day of mission (47 Rabi‘ I); on the day when the Ka‘ba was liberated from chaos, the first place to be created on earth (25 Dhu l-Ka‘da); on the Muhārara-day, because on this day Muhammad and Abū lxgūllisting and fasting during the month of Rajab and Sha‘bān. Fasting on the doubtful day is also meritorious. — The law recommends moderation for the days on which an obstacle to fasting is removed: one should fast a little and then fast.
9. It is wrong to fast: on the 9th Dhu 'l-Hijjah in Arafah, if one fears harm from it; on a pious journey except 3 days in Mединah during the Ḥajj; if a guest fasts without permission from his host, and a child without its father's permission.

10. Fasting is forbidden on the 54th days for those who are ‘Indigent; for travellers.

Al-‘Uqd al-Maṣūm gives at the beginning of his Kitāb Ḥalāl wa-‘Māḥal in the Ḥārlāy meaning some considerations on the value of fasting. He points out, referring to some well-known traditions, the high esteem in which fasting stands with God; he gives as a reason for this that fasting is a passive act and no one sees men fast except God; secondly it is a means of defeating the enemy of God, because human passions, which are the Shī‘a’s means of attaining his ends, are stimulated by eating and drinking. The passions are the places where the Shī‘a live in abundance and where they feed; so long as they are fruitful, they continue to visit them often, and so long as they visit them frequently, the majesty of God is concealed from the slave and he is shut off from meeting with Him. The Prophet of God (ṣallāullāhū wa ἁṣāmīhī) says: If the Shī‘a did not fly around the hearts of men, they would really think of heaven "Fasting is therefore the gateway to divine service."

In the first fas’il Al-Ghaṣālī describes the legal obligations and recommended actions of the fast, according to the Ḥanāfī doctrine, and in the third the recommended fast days, just as a fākh would do. But he says in the second fas’il that the most punctilious observation of the external law of the fast is not the essential of the fast. He distinguishes three steps in the fast. The first step is that of the fākh, the third that of the Prophets, the fidsaṣṣā and those who have been brought into the proximity of God (al-munṣabātān), whose fast consists in refraining from all mean desires and worldly thoughts. The second step suffices for the pious, however; it consists in keeping one’s organs of sense and members free from sin and from all things that detract from God. Everything should be avoided which might affect the result of the fast; for example, at the ifṣār one should not eat more or fare better than usual (this is contrary to the fīkh regulation) and one should not sleep during the day to avoid feeling hunger or thirst, for they are the fākh and zirr of fasting because they fight the power of the passions. Subjection of the passions, whereby the soul is brought nearer to God, is the real object of fasting, not mere abstinence; and he deduces the worthlessness of the fast of those whose conduct at the ifṣār destroys the results of the fast day, of whom the tradition says: "How many fasters there are for whom only hunger and thirst are the results of their fasts."

The ethical conception of the fast which Al-Ghaṣālī gives in this second fas’il supplements, he says, the barren law of the fākhā, but to us it appears often to contradict it. In the Ḥadīth we find already various traditions with ethical tendencies and Al-Ghaṣālī does not fail to quote them in support of his view. Besides we find in the works on Ḥadīth a mass of traditions relating to the fast, which will be found classified under the separate subjects in Prof. Wensinck’s work (now about to appear) A Handbook of Early Muhammedan Tradition, under the word Fasting. Here we can only quote a few traditions which refer to the estimation in which fasting was held in the early Muslim world. As it is to this day a widespread view that fasting, especially the fast of Ramadān, is the most availing atonement for sins committed in the course of the year — which is why the fast is fairly generally observed, although not always so strictly as the fākhā’s desire; cf. the article RAMADĀN —, so it was with the early Muslims (cf. al-Bukhārī, Ḥadīth, bāb 28; Sammā, bāb 6; al-Tirmidhī, Sammā, bāb 1, etc.). Various traditions compare the value of fasting at one time with its value at another as, for example, *fasting on one day in the holy months (see above) is better than 30 days at another time, and fasting on one day in Ramadān is better than 30 days in the holy months*. "If anyone fasts three days in a holy month, Thursday, Friday and Saturday, God considers one day equal to 900 years for him." Similar traditions refer to fasting on the ‘Aḥṣār’—day, the ten days in Dhu ‘l-Hijjah and especially in Ramadān [q.v.]. Other traditions tell how dear to God is the person of the faster or his characteristics; even is the scent of the breath of a fasting man pleasant to God than the scent of musk" (Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, li. 232, etc.).

God compares one, who denies his passions for His sake, with His angels and says to him: "Thou art with Me like one of My angels", and He urges His angels to regard those who fast. The joys of the faster in Paradise are described and how he is honoured there; he will enter by a special gate (al-Ruyānī) and meet God (al-Bukhārī, Sammā, bāb 4; Muslim, Ṣaḥām, tr. 166, etc.). This is his heavenly joy; his joy on earth is the ifṣār (al-Bukhārī, Tawāhid, bāb 35; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, l. 446, etc.). One should, therefore, not deny this joy, because one has a right to it. To continue fasting after twilight is, moreover, not necessary, for the sleep of the faster is (already) ‘shāda.

**Bibliography:** A comprehensive work on fasting among the Muslims has not yet appeared. An outline of the law on the subject according to the Ḥanāfī school is given by Th. W. Juyendb, Handbuch der islamischen Gesetze, Leipzig 1910, p. 113 sqq. (Dutch: Leiden 1903 and 1925; in the edition of 1925 the most recent bibliography is given). The main sources are the pertinent sections in the books of Ḥadīth, Ṣaḥīḥ and Ṣaḥīḥī. For Tradition cf. the work just about to be published, Handbook of Early Muhammedan Tradition, alphabetically arranged by A. J. Wensinck, Al-Ghaṣālī, Ḥārlāy ‘Ulīm al-Din, Cairo, n. d., l. 207—214. For details of the observance and various customs of Ramadān in Muslim lands see the articles OKĀL, ḤUWAṢA, RAMADĀN, IDEE.

(C. C. BERO)

**SAY.** When the pilgrim who is making the ‘umra or the Ḥajj has performed the circumambulation (sawaw) of the Ka‘ba, kissed the Black Stone for the last time and drunk of the well of Zamzam, he goes out, taking care to put his left foot first, of the sacred mosque by the Bāb al-Ṣaḥāf, pronouncing the formula of salutation to the mosque, then a second formula containing his intention (niyāt) to accomplish the ceremony of nīyā. He ascends the steps of al-Ṣaḥāf about 50 yards from the gate and standing there he makes an invocation, looking towards the Ka‘ba, with his hands raised to the level of his shoulders and his palms turned towards the sky. Between al-Ṣaḥāf and another little hill, al-Marwa, lies a broad street with houses
and shops on either side; this is the Mas'ud where the pilgrims have to accomplish the ritual course. Walking at a normal rate he descends towards the former bottom of the valley (Masul), marked by four pillars, two along the mosque on the left and two others opposite it; to cross it, he assumes a more rapid pace, called karawat or khatib, like the ramad of the javan, and runs. Then walking slowly he reaches al-Marwa which is marked by an arch of stone like al-Saff and he again prays there. He has now completed one of the seven elements of the ceremony for, except for one isolated opinion, the authorities agree that the sa'ya consists of seven simple courses. It is usually followed by a desanctification by shaving or cutting the hair, which explains the large number of barbers' shops on the Mas'ud.

The sa'ya has not the value of an independent rite like the circumambulation of the Ka'ba, the accomplishment of which, without the 'umrah and the hajj, is reckoned to the spiritual credit of the believer. The sa'ya is an appendage to the circumambulation (tawaf) of the 'umrah or of the arrival (hudūm) or of the desanctification (ifṣāqa), and the authorities are not agreed as to its importance, whether essential, obligatory or traditional. The law does not impose on the faithful who accomplish it the strict necessity of ritual purity that it demands for the tawaf.

The sa'ya is an embassatory rite with a brief period of running, analogous to the javan, to the ifṣāqa of 'Arafah and Muzdalifah etc.; undoubtedly it was actually a separate ancient rite, which became combined with those of the Ka'ba, as the ifṣāqa did to the ceremonies of 'Arafah and Muzdalifah. Tradition has retained the memory of the cult of two divinities, Isaf and Nāla, but only in the story that they were a man and a woman who were turned into stone for fornicating in the sanctuary and later came to be worshipped. Later Muslim tradition turned them into Adam and Eve, who sat on either of the hills to take a rest. But tradition has made special efforts, not without hesitation, to connect the rite with the story of Abraham: Hādjār, cast off by Abraham and seeing Isaf perishing of thirst, ran in despair seven times from one hill to the other; it is said that Abraham instituted the sa'ya for the worship of Allah and quickened his pace (the karawat) to escape Satan who was lying in wait for him at the bottom of the ravine.

Bibliography: See the art. HAJI and KA'BA, and add: Gaudecker-Demoblyes, Le Pilgrimage de la Mekka, p. 225-234, with references especially to al-Arrāfi, Ḥāfiz al-Din, Ibn Ḥujair, Māsrj Kusayr, Muhammad al-Shādīk, al-Baṣṭamī, Burkhart, etc.

(SAUYABIDJ, مسیبیه, read SAUYABIGA, name of a people. The Arabic form مسیبیه is to be read with ج as a guttural sonant, as the etymology of the name indicates.

De Goeje has devoted a short article to the Sayyabiga in his Histoire et de géographie orientale (No. 3, Leiden 1903, p. 12 and p. 86-91) which has been used here; see also his Contribution (Kön. Ak. z. Wiss., 1875, ed. in English by D. MacRitchie, Accounts of the Gipps of India, London 1886).

According to al-Balādhurī (ed. de Goeje, p. 373, 1 infra), they were already settled before Islam on the coasts of the Persian Gulf (me-kilim μηλέκη εἰς γυαλίτων). In the reign of the Caliph 'Abd al-Malik (632-644), there was a large garrison of Sayyabiga and Zoj—two of these peoples are frequently mentioned together although they have nothing in common (cf. the art. ZOTT—(cf. al-Tabarī, ed. Zonstein, p. 823-925; ed. de Goeje, l. 1961, 4'th Ed. 'Arrāf al-Islāhānī, Kitāb al-Qāhir, xiv. 46). In 17 (658) the Omayyads, horsemen of foreign origin in the service of the king of Persia, concluded a treaty with them. The Caliph 'Umar ratified, by the terms of which they pledged themselves to adopt Islam and to enter the service of the Arabs on condition that they received a scale of pay equal to that of the best paid soldiers, that they should be free to attach themselves to the Arab tribe which they preferred and that they should only have to fight against non-Arabic al-Tabarī, i. 2562 sqq.). Their example was followed by the Sayyabiga and the Zoj and they all attached themselves to the Arab tribe of Tamīm (al-Balādhurī, p. 373-375). In 36 (665), the Sayyabiga were entrusted with the guarding of the Treasury of al-Baṣra; the army of the people of Kifsā which came to the help of 'Ali included a body of Zoj and Sayyabiga (cf. al-Balādhurī, p. 376; al-Masīḥī, Les frontières d'or, ed. and trans. Barbière de Meynard, iv. 307, where the الساسکه is wrongly written as réalisation, al-Tabarī, i. 3125, 3154 and 3151. In a poem by Ya'jid b. al-Muqaffarī al-Jayyūdī edited about 59 (677-678) there is a reference to "savage Sayyāb barbarians who put iron on me in the morning" (Ibn Ūṣayba, Kitāb al-Shahrār, p. 219), which seems to imply that the Sayyabiga acted as gofers. In 160 (775-776) they took part in a naval expedition against the town of al-Nartuk, that is the modern Branc on the west coast of India (cf. al-Tabarī, iii. 460 sqq.).

The Sayyabiga came from Sind. "The Sayyabiga, the Zoj and the Andaghi," says al-Balādhurī, "formed part of the army of the Persians; they were people of Sind whom the Persians had taken prisoners and made to perform this service" (p. 375, 5-7). Al-Dājūlī (al-Muqaffarī, ed. E. Sachau, Leipzig 1867, p. 82) similarly says: "al-Shāfi'ī says:... These are people of Sind who accompanied the táiyyūm (تَاعیِم) of Ya'jūjīm and in the Muqaddīs, ed. de Goeje, ii. 10, 17; the origin of this word is unknown; it means the leader of the marines in the warships"; then, according to another source, "the Sayyabiga are people of Sind who in al-Baṣra were police officers and prison warders". Ibn al-Sikhtī (d. 857) quoted in the Liwan al-Arab (iii. 118-119) gives identical information: "The Sayyabiga are a people of Sind who were hired to fight as mercenaries and they formed the guard". Similar explanations are given in the Taby al-Arab (ii. 56).

From all these sources it is clear that in perfect agreement it is evident that the Sayyabiga were naturally soldiers, disciplined, used to the sea, faithful servants, which made them most suitable to serve in the army by land or sea, to act as guards and to act as soldiers, police officers, guards and warders of the treasury.
All the readings of the manuscripts of the Arab texts quoted above bring us to Sayyabiga which is the correct form (cf. likewise Muhammad, Kamit, ed. W. Wright, Leipzig 1864, p. 41, 3, and 82, 17). It is the form which Sibawaih gives (ed. II. Derenbourg, ii. 209,-8), and he adds *they say Sayyabiga because this word combines the two peculiarity of being a foreign word and plural of an ethnic in ٌ, being practically equal to a plural of...* 

According to al-Djawalih (loc. cit.), the singular is *salhab*. Now de Goeje points out (loc. cit., p. 88) that the people of the *Irak pronounce the vowel ٌ as ِ and this phenomenon is not isolated in Arabic dialects; my friend William Marçais calls my attention to its occurrence in Tunisian. This enables us to state the following equation: 

\[ \text{Sayyabiga} \sim \text{salhab} \]

The original form *Sahab* was pointed out to de Goeje by Henrík Kern. It is now easy to reconstruct its phonetic history from documents which were not available to the latter. The change *Sahab* \( \rightarrow \) *Munawara* is then the third century A.D. in the *Nun nam y n u n i n o* of Wan Cen and the *Funn nam C u n o* of K'ah Tai in the form *Shahu*, old pronunciation *Djouak = Munawara* = Arabic *Sahab*. Much later we find in the *Mahayna* (xxxii. 36-48, and xxviii. 62-75) the original form *Jawaka* (pronounce *Jawaka*; for these texts cf. my memoir *L'Empire sümamtral de Groipy, in the J. A., Series 9, vol. xx. 170-173). In the xiiith century a. D. a Tamil inscription of 1264 has *Jawaka* (ibid., p. 49), which is the Dravidian form of the above readings. The initial is reduced in Tamil by a series of *t* which is transmuted indifferently *w* in *w*, *wu*, and even *w* in *wu* even *wu* in *wu* the sonant and mute palatal and the palatal and dental sibilants: it is the palatal that is generally used to transliterate it: whence *wu* > *wu*. The change of *Indian* *wu* > *wu* is palatal to dental sibilant, in the present case of *Jawaka* to the Arabic *Sahab* is quite regular. We have a parallel example in the Sanskrit *dravida* *tawk* (*Tectonic grandi* which becomes in Arabic *salhab* more frequently inaccurately transcribed *sadd*. 

The Sayyabiga then are the descendants of ancient Sumatran emigrants to India, then to the *Irak and the Persian Gulf where there is evidence of their existence before Islam. This not surprising for we know from other sources also that the sumatrans colonised Madagascar at a very early date (see the art. *Zahro*); the eastern route was familiar to them (GABRIEL FERREDO) 

SKUTARI. [See SKUDHATI.] 

SEBASTIYA. 1) The Arabic name for the ancient Samaria which Herod had changed to *Sebaste* in honour of Augustus. The form *Sebasto* — as in the case of other towns of this name — was presumably also used, as the Arabic name (which is sometimes also written Sebasti) suggests. By the end of the classical period, the town, overshadowed by the neighbouring Nepolis (Sichem; Arab: Nablus), had sunk to be a small town (*Sebasso*) and played only an unimportant part in the Arab period. It was conquered by 'Amr b. al-As while Abu Bakr was still Caliph; the inhabitants were guaranteed their lives and property on condition that they paid poll-tax and land-dues (al-Baladhurt, ed. de Goeje, p. 138; Ibn al-Athir, *al-Kamil*, ii. 388). Ibn al-Battani is the first of the Arab geographers to mention it, but gives already much less accurate figures for its position than Ptolemy had done. In the later Arab geographers Sebastiyya appears on a place in the Qund Filastin. According to a tradition found as early as Jerome, for example, the tomb of John the Baptist was there (Ibn al-Athir, loc. cit.; Vahya b. Zakariya; xi. 333 wrongly only Zakariya); on its site there was in late antiquity a basilica built and in the crusading period (in the second half of the xith century) a church of St. John; remains of the latter still survive. According to western sources, Sebastiyya was again a bishopric at this time (Lequer, *Oriens Christi*, ii. 350 sqq.). Ummah b. Munkidh, about 1148, visited the town and its sanctuary, *Salah* al-Din advanced on Sebastiyya in 1184 but its bishop by handing over So Muslim prisoners saved the town from the terrible fate of Nablus (Ibn al-Athir, *op. cit.*, xi. 333; Abu l-Fida, *Annals*, in the *Recueil des hist. orient. des croisades*, i. 53; ibn Shaddad, *ibid.* iii. 82; Epistola Baldunii, in Röhrich, *Regesta regni Hierosol.*, No. 638). In the year 1187 it was finally taken from the Crusaders by Huṣam al-Din 'Umar b. Lādh; the church of St. John was turned into a mosque and the bishop brought to *Akka* (Ibn al-Athir, *op. cit.*, xi. 357). 


2) A place in the *Daghir al-Samaria, according to Ibn Shaddad (B. G. A., vii., 117), on the Cilician coast, 4 mil from an otherwise unknown Islandari, which again was 12 mil from Kirkisya (*Kerakos*). It is the ancient *Elamites* of *Sebaste*, the modern Ayasb. 


3) A town in Asia Minor, which was taken by al-Abbas b. al-Walid in 93 (711/12) along with al-Marrubain and Tis (should we not read Tarfis) whose situation is unknown. In some manuscripts
of al-Tabari and Abu 'l-Mahasin the name is wrongly written Samastiya (or something like that) which can hardly, as Brooke suggests, stand for the Byzantine Mēshāna in Phrygia. The reference is rather to the Phrygian Sarhess (Pauly-Wissowa, Reussenschr., ii. A. 951, No. 1).


4) A town of this name said to be not far from Samastiya on the Upper Frat is mentioned by Yāqūt, ed. ed., iii. 33. It might be Jblulopolis in Cappadocia (Ptol., v. 6. 25, p. 893, ed. Müller) which was presumably called after Augustus and perhaps may have also been called Sebasteia; but perhaps we should rather assume there has been some confusion with Siwas on the Upper Nahr Alia (Halys).

(HONIHMANN)

SEBKAH, a salt lagoon. The sebka is one of the characteristic features of the hydrography of North Africa and the Sahara, very common in the plain landscapes, without communication with the sea. It is the terminal of a network of streams either above ground or subterranean, which have spread out and disappear in the ground; it is a shallow basin with well marked contours sometimes delimited by steep sides. After rain it is more or less completely filled with water impregnated with mineral substances which accumulate at the bottom of the basin. In periods of drought, the waters evaporate completely or partly and the floor is uncovered. The floor of the sebka is covered with saline crustations, sometimes traversed by crevasses in which the crystals gather. The salt deposit sometimes covers mud, quicksands and dangerous quagmires.

This description and definition of the features of the sebka apply equally to the sahara. An attempt has been made to establish a distinction between the two, the former term being applied to hollows which always remain more or less moist, the second to those whose evaporation is greater than the access of subterranean water or to those the floor of which looks a plain losing itself in the horizon. There is no real foundation for this distinction. The two terms are employed indifferently in the same district. For example we have in Orana the sebka of Oran and the sebkha Ghelalem and Shahrī, in the Sahara the sebkha of Timimun (Gurara), the sebka of Southern Tunisia, the sebka of Wargla, of Siwa, etc.

Bibliography: see the Bibliography of the article SAHARA.

(G. VER)

SEBEZWAR, near Herat, is the present name of the town of Asafzar or Asafzar (Abū al-Dawla Rāz, Haft Šāmī: Sekhā) attached to Sīdijān. It lies to the south of Herat, three days' journey north of Pars. In the itineraries it has the name of Khudān or Khudān. In the 19th century there were in this region four towns besides Asafzar, which was the chief place of this district; a town of medium size, surrounded by orchards and vineyards; its inhabitants were Sadas of the school of al-Shāfi'ī (v. v.). There used to be a stone fortress called Marāsfa Khiq on the summit of a mountain; the soil inside and around the town was so soft that it was sufficient to dig down a few inches to get water. According to al-Farāhī, B. G. A., i. 264, it was the name of the district and not of the town.


(CL. HUART)

SEBEZWAR is a city of Khurāsān, situated sixty-four miles due west of Nişābūr, and should not be confounded with the town of the same name in Western Afghanistan, south of Herat; see the preceding article. Many legends of the heroic age of Persia are associated with Sebzwär, and the square in the centre of the town was long pointed out as the scene of the combat between Rustam and Shohrab and was known as Mālān-ī Div-ī Safdī, "the plain of the White Demon". Sebzwär was a town of some importance in the district of Balsaf, [v.]; and eventually took the place of Bakhsh as the principal town of the district. Sultān Shāh, after having been expelled from Khwārizm by his elder brother Tākāsh, took Khurāsān as his share of his father's kingdom, and in 1186 besieged and captured Sebzwär, and was with difficulty restrained from ordering a massacre of its inhabitants, who had defied him with abusive language to take their town. The town was destroyed by the invading hordes of the Mongols, but recovered its prosperity, and in 1337 'Abd al-Razāk, a native of the village of Bagthūn who had been in the service of the Il Khan Abl Shāh (1316-1335) of Persia, headed a rebellion against the tyranny of the local governor, gained possession of Sebzwär and the neighbouring district and founded the dynasty of the Serbadkins, (q. v.) who reigned there for nearly half a century, until they were overthrown, in 1381, by Timūr. Mahāmān, the heir-apparent of the house, was enabled by the favours of Timūr's grandson, 'Abdūn, to retain some part of the heritage of his ancestors. The town, which fell into decay, was restored by the early Safawī kings and became the capital of a district containing forty townships. It has ever since remained an important town of Khurāsān. The inhabitants have been noted for centuries for their attachment to the Shī'a, and Husain Wā'fī, author of the Amārār-i Sahlī, whose seal for that sect was suspected, narrowly escaped death at the hands of the fanatics of the town.


(SEJDESTĀN. [See Sīlātār].

SEERD, Sīrād or Sīrah, a little town in the frontier region between Armenia and Turkish Kar- diatān, situated in a valley formed by the Bohštān šāh and the river of Bīdis about 30 miles S.W. of Bīdis and about 18 north of the Tigris. The little river Kezer runs near Sīerd; but it is the Bohštān Šah which is sometimes called Sīerd Šah (Sīrād Šah in Persian). This name is also found in al-Masūdī, the earliest Arab geographer to mention Sīerd; he calls the Bohštān Šah .
Se'erd—Segbân

(ed. Paris 1840, i. 227); likewise al-Idrist (transl. Jaubert, ill. 172). The orthography varies much:

(ال اسمكر) (Abu l-Fida', Yâkût);

(ال مصتارف) (Hâdi'dt, Khalifa). The last form is the official Turkish orthography (cf. Kümâr al-'Alâm). The Syriac form is Se'erd (Z. D. M. G., viii. 357, note) and the Kurdish form is Sîrî (al-Khalîfî, al-Hudayya al-Hamîdîya fi 'l-Lughat al-Kurdîyya, Constanti-
noplis 1310, p. 144). The origin of the town is unknown; the suggestion put forward by the trave-
ellers Shiel and Kâneer that it is the ancient Tigranocerta has already been disposed of by Ainsworth and Ritter, who rely particularly on the complete absence of traces of ancient buildings and on the description of Lucullus's campaign against Tigranes given by Plutarch. Moreover, C. F. Lehmann-Haupt in 1869 has identified the site of Tigranocerta with the modern Mainjârtshin.

Se'erd, a town with only slight fortifications (al-Iṣâkhtî; the Şêref-name alone calls it bûlû), has generally shared the political history of Diyar Bakr and Hîsin Kafîa. Thus in the xiii. century it was in the hands of the Marwânîs (Ibn al-Atîr, ii. 56); in the century following it passed to the Urjaşids of Hîsin Kafîa and was taken by 'Imâm al-Dîn al-Zenî in 538 (1143/44; cf. Ibn al-Atîr, xii. 66). The Mongols sacked it after the defeat of Diyar al-Dîn Khozar al-Shtâ (Ibn al-Atîr, xii. 326) but it seems to have quickly recovered, for al-Mustawfî calls it a large town with rich revenues. After experiencing the rule of the Il-Khâns [q.v.] and the Al-Koyunlu [q.v.] Se'erd about 1500 passed to the Safawîs. During the xix. and xix. centuries the town had belonged to the little Kurdish dynasty of the Malîkân of Hîsin Kafîa (descendants of the Aïyûhîs). After the battle of kaldîrân (1513) their prince, Malîk Kâfîtî, who had been thrown into prison by Shâh Ismâ'îl, escaped and again took possession of Se'erd and then of his old residence (Şêref-name, i. 157).

This dynasty continued to exist for some time under the suzerainty of the Ottomans represented by the wali of Diyar Bakr. In the new admini-
strative territorial division established by Dîrid Dîridist, Se'erd became the capital of a sandjak. The town continued to belong to the eyâlet, then to the vilayet of Diyar Bakr down to 1801 (1854). The sandjak of Se'erd was then attached to the vilayet of Bîdîs.

The number of inhabitants is given by Câinet (1892) as 15,000 of whom the majority are Muslims Kurds (5 mosquês). In the Christian element (c. 4,000) the Catholic, Syrians (Chaldaens) are the most numerous (two churches), along with Gregorian Armenians (one church), Protestants and Jacobites (one church). The number of Christian inhabitants, however, must have considerably diminished by the deportations during and after the war of 1914-1918.

Se'erd has been built in the Arab style (Lehmann-Haupt); the houses are of clay and the town is noted for its lack of cleanliness. Water is scarce there and comes from several springs. On the hills around, the principal crop is grapes; the other products of Se'erd are cereals, rice and vegetables. Its trade is with Dyar Bakr. The town has been famous since the xivth century for its manufactures of weapons and copper utensils. Other industries are cabinet-making and the manufacture of cotton stuffs, dyed red. On the only manufacture known at Se'erd see van Berchem in the Abb. G. W. Geot, Ph.-hist. Kl., N.S., ix. 157.

The sandjak of Se'erd has 5 kazas of which that of Erûn (Arwâh) is in Bohûn [q.v.].

Bibliography: Şêref-name par Şêref prince de Bîdîs, ed. Vâlînîmîn-Ezzeîf, St. Po-
ters-hursg 1856, i. 152, 157; Hâdi'dt Kâfîhî, Djîhàn-name, Constantinople 1740, p. 439; Sânî, Kümâr al-'Alâm, v. 2575; C. Ritter, Erdkunde, Berlin 1844, x. 87, xi. 99 sqq.; V. Cuinet, La Turquie d'Asie, ii, Paris 1892, p. 525 sqq.; 600 sqq.; the travellers who have written about Se'erd are Josafa Barbar o (1471), Kâneer (1814), Chiel (1836), von Mulle (1838), Ainsworth (1840), Travels and Researches in Asia Minor, Meziotopolia and Armenia, London 1842, i. 337 sqq.; Müller-Simons, Du Canseau au Golfe Persique, Paris 1892, p. 336 sqq.; C.F. Lehmann-
Haupt, Armånen enst und jetzt, Berlin 1910, p. 332 sqq., 381 sqq., 537. (J. H. KRAMER)

SEFİD KOH (SAFİD KÜH), "the White Mountain", is the name given to the most prominent mountain range of Northern Afghanistan, extending from a point situated in 34° N. Lat and 69° 30' E. Long, near which rises its highest peak, Si-khân, 15,500 feet above the sea-level, to the north-western boundary of Arak on the Indus (33° 15' N. Lat. and 72° 10' E. Long approximately), and separating the valley of the Kâbul river from the Kurram Valley and Afridi Tirâk between these two points; but the range is continued in a mass of uplands running in a south-western direction and known as the Panj Dagh and Toba as far as a point situated, approximately, in 31° 15' N. Lat. and 67° E. Long. This latter range forms the watershed of Southern Afghanistan and a natural barrier between that country and India. In the northern and eastern spurs of the Sefid Koh proper are the Khilat Pass [q.v.] between Peshawâr and Djalâshad, and the formidable passes between Djalâshad and Kâbul in which British and In-
dian troops suffered so severely in the campaign of 1841-1842. Through the passes of these ranges there have stemmed from the dawn of history the numerous hosts by which India has from time to time been invaded, and some of the invaders in historical times have left brief descriptions of those parts of the ranges which they traversed. The northern spurs are barren, but the upper slopes are wooded with pines, deodars, and other trees, and many of the southern spurs with pines and wild olives. Its valleys are a combination of orchard, field and garden, abounding in fruit-
trees, and the banks of their streams are edged with turf and wild flowers and fringed with willow.


(SEFİD RÜD: [See SEFİD ZEHRE]]

SEGeba (p. "dog-keeper, whipper-in"), popularly SHIMES, the third division of the corps of Janissaries forming 34 companies (orţa); the 33rd was in garrison in Constantinople. It was created in the reign of Bayzid I at the same time as the saqâhârî (keepers of blood-hounds), the qanûnishârî (keepers of bullhogs) etc. who later formed the 64th and 71st orţa of the qanûnishârî. Some of
these companies had special names of their own: the 19th was called kithi-seghuln, the 20th hetbawi-seghuln, the 33rd manfi, "hunters" (chasseeurs), the captain of whom was called ter-
ghubari, "chief hunter." Their barracks, like those of the other Janissaries, were destroyed in the
conflagration of Maharram 4, 1105 (Sept. 5, 1693), in the reign of Sultân Ahmed II; rebuilt five
years later, they were again destroyed in the reign of Mahmid I.

Ségbân-Jâghi was at first the title of the general commanding this division; when it was placed
under the authority of the agâ of the Janissaries, his position became a sinecure. In case of mobili-
ization, however, he acted as fîlâm-mahân (lieute-
nant) to the agâ, lived in the capital and com-
manded the Janissaries of the garrison there.

Ségbân-Jâghi, "Cavalry of the Seigneurs," was
the name given to the 65th orca of the 'джемчул.

Bibliography: Ahmed Djeaid, Tarikh
"Ashker-î 'Othmanî, Constantinople 1897, i. 6, 14;
D'Observ, Tableau de l'Empire Ottoman, Paris
1824, v. 314; von Hammer, Hist. de l'Empire

(SESTAN, [See SETÂN].

SEGOVIA, in Arabic Sharâbâya, an important
and present town in Spain, now the capital of
and province of the same name, situated in Old
Castile, 60 miles N.W. of Madrid, 5,300
feet above sea-level, on an isolated rock near one of
the last spurs of the Sierra de Guadarrama. This
town is famous for its Roman (aqueduct) and
Christian (alcasars) remains and was only under
Muslim rule for a short time. It was recaptured
in 149 (757/758) by Alfonso I of Castile or his
son Fruela I at the same time as Zamora, Sal-
amanca and Avila. It was, like those towns, recap-
tured but only for a very brief period by al-Hâjjî
c al-Manṣùr b. Ahî 'Amir in the second half of the
tenth century.

Bibliography: Ibn al-Qâhir, Kamil, ed.
Tomburg, v. 182; trans. Fagan, Annales de
Maghréb et de l'Espagne, p. 104; Ibn Khalidin,
Kithâ el-lbar, ed. Balak, iv. 122; al-Mâkbari,
Annales, i. 213; E. Fagan, Extraits inédits
relatifs au Maghrêb, Algiers 1924, p. 120.

(SEGU, now capital of a district in the French
Soudan. Ségu is a little town with 6,500 in-
habitants lying on the right bank of the Niger
about 150 miles below Bamako and consisting of
four groups of buildings, of which Sikoro is the
principal.

This place was the capital of a Bambara
state founded by a chief of the Koulalî family,
who was at first more or less a vassal of the
Mandingo empire or empire of Mali. Towards 1670
king Biton Koulalû liberated Ségu from Mandingo
suzerainty and made it very powerful with the
help of a kind of standing army of regular soldiers
who had formed of slaves belonging to the
state called in Bambara tuag-dyon. In his reign
the Bambara of Ségou, although pagans, subjected
the Fulba kingdom of Mâina, in which the majority
of the inhabitants were Muslims, and the completely
Mohammedan town of Timbuctu, which was nomi-

nally governed by a pasha who claimed to be
Moroccan. It is even said that Biton having offered
an asylum to a holy man of Ségu, an enemy of the
Haasid Sultân al-Râghid, sent troops against the
ruler of Fès who had come to seek the fugitive
and that al-Râghid having encountered the Bambara
army south of Timbuctu took his way back to
Morocco without daring to risk a battle.

On the death of Biton in 1710, however, the
tuag-dyon took advantage of their power to make
and unmake kings and ended by overthrowing the
Kulukulâ dynast and seizing the power. But the
period of their domination was one of anarchy
which was ended towards 1750 by a popular rising.
A certain Ngolo or Molo belonging to the Bambara
family of Dyâra had himself proclaimed king and
founded a new dynasty, which reigned from 1754
to 1861 and was noted for its wars with the
other Bambara kingdoms, that of Kaara, located
farther to the west.

In 1860 the conquering Tuculors al-Hâjjî al-
Umar, a native of Fittu in Senegal who had been lord
of Nyôro, capital of Kaara, since 1854, marched
toward Ali Dyâra, king of Ségu. The Bambara
were supported in their resistance by their neigh-
bours, the Fulba of Mâina, who had, however, been
freed from Ségu suzerainty in 1810 by the Emer
Sikûn (Sharikhû) Ahmadû; this alliance of a wholly
pagan state with a kingdom which had become
Muslim against a conqueror himself a Muslim, who
justified his expedition against Ségu by calling it
a holy war, is one of the most curious features
in the religious history of the Soudan; Ahmadu-
Aymadu, then Emer of Mâina, explained the
motives of his conduct in a series of letters ad-
dressed to al-Hâjjî Oumar which have been pre-
served. However, after a stubborn resistance by
the defenders, al-Hâjjî al-Umar took Ségu in 1861;
and Hamdallâhi, capital of Mâina, in 1862, cap-
tured the two kings Ali Dyâra and Ahmadu-Aymadu
and put them to death. The Bambara and the defeat-
ced Fulba kept up the resistance for a long time in
a guerrilla war, in the course of which al-Hâjjî
Umar died (1864). He left several sons, nephews,
and favourites who divided the lands he had con-
quered amongst themselves, not without quarrelling.
His eldest son, Ahmadu Tal, whom he had installed
in Ségu as his lieutenant, lived there from 1862
to 1884 exercising a tyrannical sway over the
people without successfully enforcing Islam on
the Bambara or preventing the survivors of the
Dyâra dynasty, aided by their Fulba allies, from
harassing his troops continually, and even threat-
ening him up to the walls of his capital. The naval
Lieutenant Mage, sent with Dr. Quintin on a mis-
tion to Ahmadu Tal by the French authorities
in Senegal, was kept for two years at Ségu by
this despot (1864-1866) and was able to take
exact stock of the situation. In 1884 no longer
feeling his life safe in Ségu where he was detected
even by the Tuculors, Ahmadu Tal handed
the government over to his son Madani and estab-
lished himself in Nyôro.

In 1888, the French government resolved to put
an end to a state of affairs which was paralysing
the development of the country and found
expression in continual massacres and the reduction
to slavery of a great part of the population. An
expedition was organized under the command
of Colonel Archinard who took Ségu on April 6,
1890, and Nyôro on Jan. 1, 1891. Madani fled to
Mopti and Ahmadu Tal to Bandiagara, in Mâina.
General Archinard took Mopti and Bandiagar
in April, 1893. Ahmadu Tal once more escaped;
accompanied by a few followers he fled
along the bend of the Niger and sought refuge with his compatriot, the Sulţân of Sokoto and died in his country in 1898.

After an attempt to restore the ancient Bambara kingdom of Segu, at first under the governorship of M=center Dyar, then of a certain Bodyan Ksalilali, an attempt which was not successful, the French in March, 1893, decided simply to annex the town of Segu and its lands to the new colony of French Sudan.

A few Tucellos who came with al-Hadîjî Umar or in the time of his son Ahmad have remained in Segu; they all profess Islam and follow the Tidjâniyya order, of which al-Hadîjî Umar was Musâbahâm. The bulk of the population which consists of Bambara has remained attached to animism.


SEHÎ ÇELEBI, an Ottoman poet and biographer of poets. He belonged to Adrianoepole. In his youth received his education from Dervish Bey (4 March 1509; q. v.), became Köpektî (secretary) to Prince Mehmed, the youngest son of Sulţân Bâyazîd II, and accompanied the latter to Kaffa where he was governor (zângâbî) (Lenautrennis, Hist. Musulmanen, col. 659–61). When the prince died in 910 (1504/1505) Sehî went to Stamboul and obtained an appointment as secretary in the Dîwan (dîvân köpektî) there. Later he returned to his native town of Adrianoëpole, was for a time administrator (mâlûmatî) of a guvbân of a school of tradition there (Dâr-üt-Hadîth) and died there in 955 (1548/1549).

Selî was the author of a collection of poems (dîvân) and of a collection of biographies of poets with an anthology (heidîbî) which contained notices of 261 metres and poets and was entitled Hâfiz Bîhkî ("Eight Paradises"). The work is expressly planned on Persian models (Dîvân, Dīwân-i shâhî and Mir 'Alt Shir Nâvâ) and classified under eight heads (tehêbîs).

Apart from the Kems-üt-Kûheri of Shehî Ogulî (16th century, very scarce, so far only known in one MS), Sehî's biographical collection is the oldest work of this kind in Turkish. Of particular value are the notices of the Ottoman poets with whom Sehî was personally acquainted from his youth upwards or later, and of contemporary poets in general. The work was published in 1325 (1907) in Stamboul (8°, 144 pp.) by Mehmêd Shikar and has an appendix by Fâtîk Râshdî. Sehî's Dîvân, which specimens are given in the Turkish anthologies, is of little importance.

Bibliography: L'Bâb, Tîbêtîrî, Stamboul 1374, p. 196; Süfîshe 'Othâmî, ill. 115; Brâsîlî, Mehmêd Tâhir, 'Othâmîî Mekcîîlerî, Stamboul 1353, ii. 235; Hûdîdî Khalisî, Köpektî al-Zânîn, ed. G. Flügel, ii. 261; Nô. 2813, and vi. 500, Nô. 14487 (where we have Sehî for Sehî); J. v. Hammer, Gesch. der osmanischen, Dichtkunst, ii. 255 sqq.; v. 'Abîn, Gesch. des osmanischen Reiches, ii. 497, 756, No. 138 (according to 'Ali); E. J. W. Gibb, History of


SELÂNİK, the town of Salonika in Macedonia, situated at the foot of the Gulf of Salonika, to the east of the mouth of the Wardar and at the foot of a hill which commands it on the north-east. It is the ancient Greek town of Thessalonica, founded on the site of Therma by Cassander, who gave the new city the name of his wife, the sister of Alexander the Great (Strabo, VII, vii. 4). Towards the eleventh century, the popular form Thessalonike appears (Chronicle of the Movea) on which is based the form Salonik or Salantik in al-Idrisi, the Bulgarian form Solun, the western form Salonika and finally the Turkish name Selanik. Salonika, situated on the Via Egnatia (from Durazzo to Byzantium) and having a large and safe harbor, was from ancient times an important commercial city. It was still so under the Byzantine empire and in those days included considerable European colonies, especially Venetians. From the tenth century onwards, it received its share of commerce with Muslim lands; once, in 904, it was sacked by a Saracen fleet from Tripoli in Syria led by a Byzantine renegade; twenty-two thousand inhabitants are said to have been carried off into slavery (description by John Comnenus, De Excidio Thessalonicae, Bonn ed., in Script. pont. Thèop., p. 457 sq.). The town is, however, hardly mentioned by the Arab geographers; only al-Idrisi notes it. His patrons, the Norman princes of Sicily, had desirous with the Byzantine empire. In 1185 William II of Sicily undertook an expedition against the empire at the instigation of Latin and Greeks who had sought refuge with him after the troubles provoked by the Norman Andronicus. The Normans took Salonika on August 24, 1185. Under the Latin Empire the town was the capital of the kingdom of Salonika under the Marquises of Montferrat; during this period it had to undergo a siege by the Bulgarians, the allies of the pretender Kalo-Johannes (who was killed there, according to the legend, by the lance of St. Demetrios, the patron of the city). At the end of the thirteenth century, Salonika was finally restored to the empire of the Palaeologoi, then reduced to Macedonia, Thrace and the western coast of Asia Minor. The Serbian conquests still further diminished this territory, so that in the time of Cantacuzenos (1347–1355) Salonika with the western part of the peninsula of Chalcidice was only connected with Constantinople by sea. Soon the Ottoman Turks, under Murad I, began to take the place of the Serbs by their conquests in Europe. It seems that the environs of Salonika were ravaged for the first time by Lala Şahhur in 1787 (1385) after the conquest of Servia and Karaf performances. These lands were thereafter settled by nomads from the sandjak of Saksek (Anonymous, ed. Giese). The town was soon after taken by Kâhir al-Din and again restored to the Emperor Manouz (Hadjî Khsîrî, Ta'âbûnî). Bâyazîd I took it in 790 (1394) after having defeated the ancient Christian fleets (Sa'd al-Din). The states of the Turkish chroniclers and the Byzantine historians on these early conquests are by no means clear and often contradictory (cf. von Hammer, Gesch. d. anat. Reiches).

Sulaimân, son of Bâyazîd, concluded an alliance with
the Emperor by the terms of which Salonika and a number of other towns on the coast were given back to the latter (1453). After the death of Sultan, his brother Murad (1410—1413) laid siege to Salonika, without being able to take it. Muhammad I also, after setting out from Serres to attack the city, had to abandon his plan as a result of the rebellion of Shukri Badr al-Din. Towards the end of his reign the pretender Durme Mustafa, coming from Wallachia, was defeated near Salonika and found refuge within its walls. It was from here that Mustafa began his conquests after the death of Muhammad I (1421). Mustafa being beaten, Murad II turned his attention to the Greek empire and attacked Salonika in 1423, after a fruitless siege of Constantinople. But Andronicus Palaeologos, son of Manuel, governor of the town, thereupon invited the Venetians to take possession of it and sold it to them for fifty thousand ducats (Salonica at this time had forty thousand inhabitants). This act made the Turks withdraw from the town. Murad II then recognized the sale in 1427, when a kind of capitulation was concluded between him and Venice by which the Turks were allowed to have a kadi in the town. Three years later Murad laid siege to Salonika for a second time; the Turkish sources say he did this because of acts of piracy committed by Venetian ships on Muslims. The town fell after a siege of forty-five days in March, 1430 (the 29th according to Anastasios and the 13th according to Venetian sources; the Turks only give the year 833, or,—wrongly—832). The capture was accompanied by looting and a general massacre which Murad had promised his soldiers; it has been chronicled by Johannes Anastasios: De extrema Thessalonicensis assidiae narratio (Bonn 1858). A Turkish fleet from Gallipoli had shared in the attack on the town. Venice was quick to recognize Turkish rule over Salonika and obtained in return freedom of trade for Venetian merchants in the Sultan’s lands.

A great part of the population had been in favour of the Turks in order to escape the terror of the Frank soldiery. The conquerors, moreover, after the looting showed itself conciliatory. For the moment only one church, that of the Virgin, was converted into a mosque (known as the Eski Džum’a). The Monastery of St. John Prodromos seems to have become a mosque during one of the earlier Turkish occupations. In the centuries that followed, the majority of the great churches were destined to be converted for Muslim usage. The conquerors also demolished a number of churches to get materials for other buildings. Murad, for example, in 1450 built a bath in the centre of the town. To give the town a Muslim population, colonists from Venice (wardars) were transplanted thither. Although the number of Turks increased, Salonika has never had a majority of Turks in its population.

The town was not long in again becoming an important commercial centre. The immigration in the reign of Bayazid II of a large number of Sephardim Jews and Maranos, expelled from Spain, Portugal, and Italy, contributed largely to its commercial revival. There had previously been Jews in Salonika (Benedict of Tudela reckoned five hundred in 1170); but after the immigration of the fifteenth century the Jewish element became the feature of the town. The Jews also brought thither their Spanish language, Ladino, which they have kept down to modern times (Lamouché, Quelques mots sur le dialecte espagnol parlé par les Italiotes de Salonique, in Roman, Forschungen, vol. xxiii,) and their religious and scholarly tradition (from 1515 they had their printing press). Under the benevolent rule of the Turks, Salonika became in the sixteenth century "the mother of Judaism". Their number was then put at twenty thousand; the cloth which they manufactured was sold throughout Turkey (Dernbach, Tagöck, ed. Babinie, 1923, p. 167). Towards the end of the seventeenth century, there were 12,000 Jews among the sect of the followers of Shabbatay Zevi. The Crypto-Jews or Dönmes (q. v.), which had such a great cultural influence on the development of modern Turkey since the Young Turk revolution.

For the Ottoman empire, the possession of Salonika was a source of great revenue, especially from trade with the commercial nations of Europe, who by their capitulations obtained the right to have consulates there. The harbour has never been a naval port; it was only exceptionally visited by the Ottoman fleets (e. g. in 1715 in the war with Venice; cf. Rashid, Türkler, ii.41). Administratively Salónica has been since the Turkish conquest capital of an eyalet which has at times included Serres and Drama. In the judicial hierarchy the Salónica Molla was one of the eight mollahs of the sixth rank or mağrūfi muallar (d’Obserson, Tabl. de l’emp. Ott., ii. 271). The Turks, however, never built great mosques there as the Greek churches were in Chalcis. The Jewish quarter, known as Fisaiti, was gradually extended and the town was divided into a Jewish and a Moslem section.

With the decline of the Turkish empire in the nineteenth century, Salonika became more exposed to enemy attacks and foreign influences. For example, in April, 1807, the English fleet attempted a landing there after the failure of the expedition against Constantiopolis (Zinkeisen, vii. 454). In the second half of the century the Macedonian troubles began and Salonika became the theatre of the nationalist intrigues of the Slav elements, while at the same time it was the centre of the Turkish opposition. The administrative reform of 1864 had created the vilayet of Salonika, which, after extending as far as Eshbon and Uskub, had been afterwards considerably reduced and in the end comprised only the sandjaks of Salonika, Drama and Serres with a population in which Bulgarians were in the majority. The assassination in 1876 of the French and German consuls brought about European intervention in favour of the Slavs in Turkey (Conference of Constantinople). In 1902 Salonika became the residence of Hilmi Pasch, who had been appointed inspector of reforms in Macedonia, assisted from 1903 by a Russian civilian agent and an Austrian representative. The town, as the result of European control, became less subject to the direct influence of Constantinople and thus became a hotbed on Turkish soil of Young Turk propaganda, directed from Paris against Abd al-Hamid; from the beginning of the twentieth century the Committee of Union and Progress (Ittihat u Terrakki) held its meetings here in the Italian Masonic Lodge; the constitutional movement among the garrisons of Macedonia had its centre here; besides Turks, the Committee had Jewish members. In the night of 22—23 July,
1908, the constitution was proclaimed in Salonika, followed by the first revolution in Constantinople. The central section of the Committee had evacuated in Salonika, and organised in 1909, the suppression of the counter-revolutionary movement, which broke out in Constantinople on April 12. Mahmut Skew- ket Pasha organised in Constantinople the constitutinal troops, who entered the capital on April 22. 'Abd al-Hamid, deposed on April 27, was sent to Salonika, where he remained till the Balkan War. The beginnings of the constitutional régime bear the stamp of its origin in a milieu where the Turkish element was in a minority, in as much as the Young Turks began by proclaiming the equality of all races being under the Sultan's rule.

Turkey lost Salonika in the Balkan War. The Greek army, commanded by the Crown Prince, crossed the Wardar after the battle of Yanitza and surrounded Salonika on November 8, 1212. On the same day General Hasan Taşkin Pasha surrendered the town to the Greeks through the mediation of the neutral consul. Besides the Greek troops, some Bulgarian battalions also entered it, but the peace of Athens (November 14, 1913) Salonika, with the greater part of the willbet of the same name, was incorporated in Greece. As a result of the Greek occupation not only the Turks but also a great many Jews migrated, especially to Constantinople. The occupation by the allies in November, 1915, with the object of making it a base of operations against Bulgaria, is of importance for Turkish history as much as it contributed indirectly to the defeat of the Turks three years later.

On the eve of the Greek conquest, Salonika had about 130,000 inhabitants, of whom 76,000 were Jews and about 30,000 Muslims, the remainder being mainly Greeks and Bulgarians. The commercial development had been greatly furthered in the nineteenth century by the railways connecting it with the interior, with the Close of the city, and Constantinople. The new harbour was opened in 1901; ships cannot approach the quay there. The export of the products of almost all Macedonia (especially tobacco) took place through Salonika as well as the import of European goods, which made it compete more and more with Constantinople.

As an industrial town, Salonika has very old established manufactures of cloth and carpets (selânik költücs); to which have been added silk-weaving, glass-bowing and the manufacture of soap and salencre.

The town has many old monuments. Of classical buildings there remains practically nothing but the triumphal arch of Galerius. The Byzantine churches are numerous. Besides the Church of St. George, which is already mentioned, the principal one of that of St. George, made a mosque in 1999 (1590/1591), according to an inscription, and then called Orładie Džamî; that of St. Sophia, which became a mosque in 993 (1585) as Ayê Sofia, and notably that of St. Demetrios, the patron of the city, in the central part of the town on the Rue Midhat Pasha (governor of Salonika in 1873); the date of its erection is uncertain. Under Bâyazid II it was converted into a mosque and given the name of Kazimy Džamî (St. Demetrium-Kaizim is a double saint; cf. the art. St.-Kaizim). Of the Byzantine wall which formerly surrounded the town the southern part no longer exists and is replaced by the great quay. The hill to the north-east of the town bears an acropolis called Yedi Kule by the Turks.


J. H. KRAMER

Selinik, Mustafa, Turkish historian.

He was born at Salonika (Turkish Selânik), and lost his father at Salonika in Dhu l-Ka'da 972 (1565/1566), while he accompanied the Beylerbeys of Rumîli, Shamsâ Ahmed Pasha, as a reader of the Qur'an (Târîhî, p. 11, line 6; ab infra). He held a number of offices which are accurately enumerated in his work. When in 1583 he had been for some time secretary and dâwidir of the Nishâbûrî Mehmed Pasha, he became secretary of the sâhîhîr (sâhîhîhîr; cf. Târîhî, p. 235: Dhu l-Hijja 993 = Nov. 23, 1586), then of the zîphâr; then he was appointed sâhîhîhîr (diarist) president of the audience of two of the holy cities (haramain muhâbbedî), and quarter-master of the court (muteferrika). In October 1588 he was wakâmûdar of the Persian prince Haidar who then resided at Constantinople (Târîhî, p. 261).

In Shaban, 1005 (1595/96), he was inspector of the soldiers' pay (cf. J. v. Hammer: G. O. S., 14, fol. 244). Finally he possibly held the function of Annadun muhâbbedî (president of the treasury of Anatolia). The year of his death is not certain. Probably he died soon after 1008 (1599/1600) at Stamoul.

His work on history, part of which was printed at Stamoul in 1281 (Târîhî Selânik Mustafa Efendi), 14 folios, 351 pages octavo, begins with Safer 971 (1565/66), and ends in 1008 (1599/1600); it comprises the last years of Sultan Mahmed the Great, the reign of Selim II, Murâd III and the first five
years of Miḥmūd III. Composed in the manner of a diary it is a mirror of the events at which the author was present as an eye-witness. His office in the treasury supplied him with statistical materials. Selânik's work is consequently a very valuable source for the years 1563-1599. It is to be regretted that the edition published in 1872 (cf. a note at the end, p. 331) is carried on to the year 1001 only (1594/95), because Naʿima [4.4.] begins his work this year. Complete MSS. are preserved (apart from libraries in the East) at Upsala (cf. Tornberg, Codices arabici, pars II t Gerr. bibl. reg. univ. Upsali, Lund 1840, p. 169 sqq., No. 284) and at Vienna (Fraenkel, Die arab. pers. und türk. Hist. der K. K. Hofbibl. ii. 240, sqq., No. 2950 H. O. 57).

Bibliography: J. v. Hammer, G. O. E. ill. 750; iv. 158, 181, 1856, 243, 435; Dëmida Di- minha, Qādaʿan 'Turkî, 2, Muṣawwir, Sambal 1314, p. 50, (not very valuable); Ahmed Refî'eh, Alimdar wa-Sandıkârkar (900-1200), Sambal 1764, p. 365; (Franz Bartholin).

Seîdjuks, a Turkish princely family which ruled over wide territories in Central and Nezher Asia from the 8th to the 12th century. The following families are distinguished: 1. The Great Seîdjuks; 2. the Seîdjuks of the 'Iraq; 3. the Seîdjuks of Kirman; 4. the Seîdjuks of Syria, and 5. the Seîdjuks of Asiam Minor (al-Kümm).

Early History of the family. The ancestor of these rulers was Seîdjuk b. Doğuk (Turk.) called Timur-ra'îsh, i.e. 'with the iron bow'. This Doğuk was a member of the Ghuzz tribe of Kılık which is mentioned in the first place in the list of three tribes in al-Kaṣhghar, Šuwaq Lughât al-Turf, i. 56. The following is told of him by Ibn al-Alhaj, al-Kâmil, ed. Tornberg, ii. 522: 'He was leader of the Ghuzz; they had implicit faith in him and they never contradicted him in a speech or neglected a command of him. Then it happened that one day the king of the Tur's named Bajjâch collected his armies and wanted to march against the lands of Isâm. Doğuk opposed him and after a long discussion the king of the Tur's insulted him with coarse words. Doğuk then gave him a box on the ear and wounded him in the head. When the king's serzouns surrounded and tried to seize him, he defended himself and fought with them; his people gathered round him and they separated from him (i.e. the king). The dispute between them was afterwards settled and Doğuk remained with him. A similar story is then told of his son Seîdjuk but the end is different: Seîdjuk leaves the king with his people, enters the land of Isâm, and takes up his abode in the vicinity of Djaand at the mouth of the Seîdju. According to Marquart, Ottomtische Dilatikutuditen, p. 46, the Turkish title Seîdjuk is concealed in Bajjâch and the reference here is to the supreme chief of the infidel Ghuzz, who in turn recognised the sovereignty of the Kılık or the Uighurs. It seems to me, however, that the whole story is an invention to explain the settlement of the Kılık near Djaand. Whether this tribe, or at least its chieftains, already professed Islam at this time is equally uncertain although the story presupposes it; the conversion perhaps only took place after relations had been formed with the Muslim population of Djaand. Some Russian scholars have expressed the opinion that the Seîdjuks came to Islam through Christianity and in support of his point to the Biblical names of their sons Miḥmûd, Miḥta, Ibrahîm, to a casual remark in al-Kawâni (ed. Wattenfeld, ii. 394) and to the fact of the spread of Christianity among the Turks in Sermây, but tradition makes no mention of it.

Political conditions in Transoxiana, where the Seîdjuks and the Turkish Kârâ Khanîs were fighting for the sovereignty, were favorable to the development of the power of Seîdjuks and his Ghuzz. They became involved in this feud and usually they took the side of the Kârâ Khanîs, but at the same time took the opportunity to further their own interests. In the meantime Seîdjuks died in Djaand, aged, it is said, 107. His sons below mentioned (some records also mention a fourth, Vûnû) we now find not in Djaand, but near Bakhshah in Nûr Bakhshah (now called Nûr Ata, N. E. of Bakhshah; cf. Barthold, Türkistan etc., p. 122, about the year 375/985), as Hamd Allah al-Kawâni, Turçûk Gûrûsî, ed. Brown, p. 434; states. Ibrahîm, whose proper name was Arslân, seems to have assumed the leadership among those sons. Sometimes the name is followed by Bajjâch, which is probably also to be interpreted here as the title yâzîcî; he is mentioned simply by this name in al-Kâmil, ed. Barthold, p. 73, as the prince of the Ghuzz who in 1070 assisted the Kârâ Khanîs generally and in 1079-1080 against the Sulṭân al-Mu'ayyad, thus coming to victory over the Kârâ Khanîs (cf. Barthold, Türkistan etc., p. 283). We must find him mentioned as ally of Aṭ-Ṭegh who had captured the city of Bakhshah. In 416/1025 Mahmûd of Ghuzz undertook a campaign into Transoxiana to overthrow the latter and had a meeting with the Kârâ Khanî Kâdî-Qâb, with whom he came to an agreement regarding a common attitude towards the affaire of the district. On this campaign he sought information regarding the strength of the Seîdjuks. There is a well known anecdote which tells how Arslân, when he was asked about the question, showed him two arrows and said that 100,000 men would turn out if these two arrows were sent round their hands, and if the bow were added, as many as one could wish. This caused Mahmûd some anxiety; he therefore consulted his men about it. Thâbîb, Arslân. Djaand, as it seemed should be done regarding these people. The latter proposed that each man's thumb should be cut off so that he could not draw the bow any longer, or, as ibn al-Alhaj adds, that they should all be drowned in the Djaand. Mahmûd thought this too inhuman and perhaps also impracticable; he thought it better to let them come across the Djaand and scatter over wide tracts in Khurân so that they would be easily kept in control. He took Arslân back with him to Ghazna and kept him prisoner in the fortress of Kûlânjûr in Multân as a hostage for the good behaviour of his people. These measures did not succeed in their aims, however; the Ghuzz proved turbulent in spite of the severe punishment which Thâbîb Farragh awarded to them (i. al-kašâf, Tûrük, ed. Moriart, p. 544). Under the leadership of their chiefs Yâhûd, Kâfî, Bûka, Kâkûtî etc. they withdrew from the jurisdiction of their Ghuzzawid overlords and began raiding the lands of Islam. Damascus, Samânân, al-Râyî, Isfahân, Marâgha, Hamadân and many other towns in the Šanî and Akbarbâjdijân suffered from their incursions. These Ghuzz are always called the Šanî Ghuzz by al-Djâhâji, who says nothing about Arslân in the part of his history that
has survived to us, and distinguished from the Ghzls who had remained in Transoxiana, to whom he refers as the people of Tughrill-Beg (this is the correct form, according to al-Kalbsh, Dārā, etc., p. 400), Daʿud and the Niyālīyān Tughrill-Beg, Mūhammad and Cāghārī-Beg Daʿud are the sons of Mīrāk b. Seldjuk, who, according to some records, was early killed in the war with the Irābīl Turks as to the Niyālīyān, these are the people of Islām or Yūsuf, a maternal uncle of Tughrill-Beg, so that probably the reading should be Yūsuf. It is true that this Yūsuf is mentioned nowhere else but his son Nāthūm b. Yūsuf is well known and at first faithfully supported his two nephews. We hear little of Mīrāk, Seldjuk's third son, but his sons also supported Tughrill-Beg.

These Seldjuk lived in security in Nur Bekhāra as long as 'All Tegin lived; as the pastures there were not sufficient for them, they received from Hārūn b. Altun Bahā, the governor of Khwārizm, through the intermediary of the vizier Ahmad b. Mūhammad b. 'Abd al-Samad Abī Nashr, later vizier to the Ghaznawīs, Māsid, permission to dwell in Khwārizm territory in winter. But when 'All Tegin had died in 425 (1034) they came into conflict with his sons and successors, and, after being harried and molested, some were killed and the others driven out of Khwārizm by command of Māsid and put to flight the sons of Altun Bahā who were in open rebellion and with whom they sided, they found themselves forced to seek other lands to live in. They therefore sent a written petition (cf. Bahā, op. cit., p. 535) to the governor of Kharizm, Aḥmad ibn Shāh al-Fāḍil al-Shīrī (al-Salārī), notorious for his extortion, requesting him to ask Māsid to allot them the districts of Nasr and Farwā; in this remarkable document Tughrill-Daʿud and a third brother, Pahlīgh, already call themselves protégés of the Commander of the Faithful. These negotiations, which did not lead to the desired result, and the events that followed, can be followed almost day by day in al-Balānī's narrative, but here it must be brief and refer the reader to the full account by Kāzinī, and in his portrait of Muʿāwīyā in the edition of Dārā of Minūṭīrī. In brief, the result was an open war between the Seldjucks and the Ghzawīs. Māsid's generals were repeatedly defeated and finally Māsid himself was routed in the battle of Bandānaḵān (Kamītān, 435 = May, 1040). By the end of 429 (Aug., 1038) the Seldjucks had taken Nāthūm, the name of Tughrill-Beg was mentioned in the Ḍūkāne, and an ambassador arrived from the Caliph to complain of the ravages of the Irābīl Ghzls. The rule of the Great Seldjucks was established.

1. The Great Seldjuk, 1038—1157.

Tughrill Beg — 1053, Alv Aryan — 1072, Makīr-Sṣīn — 1092, Makīrīn and Bāṣrīyān — 1104, Makīr-Sṣīn II and Mūhammad — 1117, Sardjar — 1157.

The history of the individual rulers, with the exception of Mūhammad and Makīr-Sṣīn II, whose names were only mentioned for a brief period in the Ḍūkāne, is dealt with in separate articles; here a few general observations will suffice. As regards the expansion of the Seldjuk empire, the majority of the Muslim rulers of the eastern and central provinces of the lands once ruled by the Caliph submitted to Tughrill-Beg, either voluntarily or under compulsion. The rulers of Djurdjān and Taz̄arīz̄a placed the lands by the Caliph submitted to Tughrill-Beg, either voluntarily or under compulsion. The rulers of Djurdjān and Taz̄arīz̄a had done this by 433 (1041/42); in 434 (1042/43) Khwārizm was conquered and was followed by the other lands which form modern Persia. In 440 (1048) Lippert, chief of the Abghāz, was taken prisoner and raids were made into Asia Minor. In Kamītān, 447 (Dec., 1055), Tughrill's name was mentioned in the Ḍūkāne in Baghdad and at a ceremonial audience in 449 he addressed the Caliph, who had in the meanwhile married a daughter of his brother Cāghārī-Beg, as "King of the East and of the West". The sovereignty of the Seldjuk Sultan was recognised throughout the Irābīl in Maywil and in Dīyar-Bakr. Under Alv Aryan the Seldjuk conquests reached to the Jaxartes and after the defeat of the Armenians and Byzantines almost the whole of Asia Minor passed to the Turks. Finally Syria was added in and 435 (1092) even 'Adān and al-Yaman were conquered, although we can hardly talk of an effective rule of the Seldjucks in Arabia. Makīr-Sṣīn II's death in the same year, the quarrels for the throne among his sons which followed, and the Crusades put a limit to their conquests.

As regards the conquered territories, in many cases the conquered rulers continued to rule and paid tribute; in Kirmān, and later also in Syria and Asia Minor, the princes who had conquered these lands set themselves up as independent rulers and did not trouble about the Great Seldjucks with whom they even waged war (see below). The same thing happened in other outlying parts of the empire, which the Sultān, e.g., Alv Aryan in 453 (1066), bestowed on his brothers and other relatives as fiefs, with this difference that the latter did not succeed in founding dynasties. According to the Turkic view, the right to rule belonged to the whole family and the oldest member had a certain right as primus inter pares to the obedience of his male relatives, but in a family with so many ramifications as that of the Seldjucks, harmony could not long be maintained. Even in the reign of Tughrill-Beg his nephew Nāthūm b. Yūsuf rebelled and if his brothers Cāghārī-Beg and Pahlīgh remained faithful to him this was probably because he had no sons. His successor had to fight with Kutanūf, son of Aryan and ancestor of the Seldjucks of Kūn. It was the same in the reign of Makīr-Sṣīn, and after his death the rather brief reign of Bārkiyārī was marked by continual fighting with his uncle Tutanūf, and his brother Mūhammad. The empire of the Great Seldjucks therefore comprised strictly only the eastern provinces of the former territory of the Caliphs, with the exception of Kirmān. They had: their residences in Isfāhān, Baghdad, and under Sandjar, who handed over to his brother Mūhammad's sons the rule over Irābīl, Fars, Kirmān and the western frontier provinces. On the wars with the Ghzawīs, the rulers of Transoxiana, the Chūrida and the Ghzls see the article Sardjar, above. When he died childless in 532 (1157) the line of the Great Seldjucks came to an end.

For Islām the rise of the Seldjucks meant the victory of the Sunnī creed, as far as their power stretched, over the Shiʿa tendencies which had been gaining more and more ground under the
Bûyids and FûtûmilCs. The Bûyids had, it is true, allowed the ‘Abbâsid caliphate to continue a nominal existence in Bagdad, but in 420 (1030) al-Râshîd had the name of the FûtûmilCs mentioned in the ‘Iraq. Also, the ‘Abbâsid al-Kâdim b. Hisâm Allah had to leave Bagdad, and his palace there was plundered for several days. Tughîrl Beg, who at that time already was on intimate relations with the Caliph, was at this time engaged in his struggle with Irâk b. Inâr; as soon as the latter was taken prisoner and put to death, Tughîrl brought the Caliph back to Bagdad. In the following period, notably in the later years of Malik-Shah, there was serious friction between the Caliph and the Sultân, but this did not have its roots in religious questions but was of a personal nature (cf. Houtani, in the *Journal of Indian History*, lii. 147—160). The Seldjûks regarded the Caliph as such as the head of orthodox Islam whom they were called upon to defend with the sword. They took energetic steps against the dangerous activities of the Ismâ‘îlîs and furthered the interests of Sunni theologians, although in this respect it was not they themselves but their viziers, notably the great Nîzâm al-Mulk, that were entitled to most credit. Personally they were nothing but fanatical Muslims, as is evident from the release of Liparites above mentioned and later of the Byzantine emperor Romanus Diogenes and from the treatment accorded their Christian subjects. It is practically the same with the credit given to some of the Sultâns, e.g., Malik-Shah, for their patronage of learning; although untutored, they were able to esteem what they themselves did not possess. They therefore entrusted the administration of their empire to their viziers, who sometimes, like Nîzâm al-Mulk, governed with unlimited powers.

In what spirit they did so, the latter himself has told us in his Sâzây-nâmâ. As regards art, very little of the architecture of the Seldjûks has survived for posterity. Only in Mâs is there still considerable remains from Sandar’s reign. Taken all in all, we must admit that the Seldjûk Sultân was able to guide the rude Ghûz peoples, whose chiefs they were, with great skill and with true insight to turn to their use the advantages of Arabo-Persian civilisation.

II. The Seldjûks of the ‘Iraq, 1118—1104.

After the death of Muhammad in 511 (1118) his eldest son MAHMûD, a thirteen year old boy, succeeded him as Sultân of the whole empire with the exception of Khurasân and the north-eastern frontier provinces, where, as already mentioned, Muhammad’s brother Sandar ruled. After him the title of Sultân was borne by his son KÜRT, 1134—1134 (according to al-Bundari, *Riwa‘i al-tâzir* etc., ii. 172, wrongly, beginning of 1128 = 525), MA‘MûD, 1153, MA-LIK-ŠâH II, 1155, MOHAMMAD II, 1159, SUЛIYÂN-ŠâH I, 1161, ARLŠâH-ŠâH, 1175, and TUGHÎL II, 1194. Almost all these Sultâns ascended the throne while still boys and met with a premature, often violent, death. Out of the majority of them, therefore, it can hardly be said that any actually ruled; they were simply tools in the hands of their Atabegs and Emîrs.

In keeping with the old Turkish custom, the sons of Muhammad, Mahmûd, Tughîl, Malik-Shah and Sulimân, were each brought up by a prominent Turkish Emîr, who acted as their second father and was therefore called Atabeg. The natural result was that each of these Atabegs endeavoured to

gain the title of Sultan for the prince allotted to him in order thereby to increase his own prestige. The result was continual war between these brothers, which were decided for a short time by the intervention of Sandar in favour of one or other of the claimants. For the details of these wars the reader is referred to the separate articles; here, we will only point out that the ‘Abbâsid Caliph also became involved, and that two of them, al-Mustansir (498-514) and al-Râshîd (494), perished in them. This had opened in the reign of the weakling Sultan Mas‘ûd, but his successor Mo- hammed II — Malik-Shah II only bore the title of Sultan for three months — had to abandon the siege of Bagdad in 531 (1137). The power of the Caliphs began to rise again after this and the Seldjûks. Sultan no longer lived in Bagdad but in Hamadan. As a rule these Sultâns, from as early as Ma‘mûd, were only nominal rulers. The great Turkish Emîrs held most of the provinces as military fiefs; the Sultân lacked the money as well as the necessary troops to enforce their authority, if their Atabegs for the time did not assist them. To the latter also they entrusted the war with foreign foes e.g., with the Crusaders in Syria; they themselves had continually to contend with enemies at home. Some of these Emîrs succeeded in founding a hereditary dynasty and making themselves independent with the title Atabeg, Shâh or Malik. Among the latter we may reckon the Uruqids in Marand and Hûn Kafir and the Armanshâhs in Khâtû. They had already succeeded in doing so in the preceding period, and among the former, the Zangids in al-Masq and other places, the Seldjûks in Kars and the Atabegs of Adherence to the first of these Atabegs, Shâhu al-Dîn Ilidjeg (495), married the widow of Tughîl I and when Sultan Ma‘mûd died in 516 (1122) he had his stepson Arslân b. Tughîl proclaimed Sultan, but without affording him any authority. When he later threatened to become dangerous, Pahlâwân, son of Ilidjezdit had him disposed of by poisoning him and raised his minor son Tughîl II to the throne (571 = 1175). When the latter had grown up and Pahlâwân was dead, he endeavoured to enforce his authority but was not a match for Kfîl Arslân, the successor of Pahlâwân, although he had at the time the troops of the latter’s ally, the Caliph, at Dâmar in 584 (1188). He was taken prisoner by Kfîl Arslân after whose death he was restored to liberty, but fell shortly afterwards in a fight with the troops of the Khwarism Shah Takûsh (590 = 1194).

III. The Seldjûks of Kîrmân, 1041—1186.

The ancestor and founder of their line was Kwhâr KâBA ARSLÂN-BÉI, a son of Câghîr-Beg who went to Kîrmân with his Ghûz about 333 (1041) and a few years later (440 = 1048/49) occupied the capital Bâshar. He then waged further wars on his own account with the Shâhidîs, with the Kûs in the Garmir (the hot coast region) and even became lord of Omân without troubling much about Tughîl-Beg. When the latter’s brother Alp Arslân succeeded to the throne Kwharî made no attempt (459 = 1067) to challenge him as an independent chief, but submitted when Alp Arslân hesitated in person to Kîrmân to force him to obedience. On Alp Arslân’s death he thought, presumably as the eldest member of the family, that he had himself a claim to the Seldjûks’ throne, and led his army against Malik- Shâh but suffered a terrible defeat in the vicinity of Hamadân where he was taken prisoner and...
afterwards marched (460 = 1074). The victor then in his turn marched on Baddar, where the king, Shirvan Shah, the son of K fortune, had assumed the title of governor of the territory, to the latter showed himself submissions and left him in possession of his father's dominions. Sulaiman Shah reigned till 477 (1084) and was followed by Tushah Shah (1077-1083).—

1100 (1101), Laban Shah, 1134-1136, Muhammad Shah, 1136-1146, Bahram Shah, and 1137-1138, Shahbuz Khan. The end of the dynasty was brought about by the arrival of a body of Ghuris; the Ghuris after the defeat of Sandjar had fallen like a devastating deluge on the provinces of Persia and went wherever the weakness of authority seemed to offer them a chance of gaining rich booty. In Kirmân, where anarchy was practically complete under the last Seljuk, they had an easy task, routed Tushah Shah who marched against them and went plundering up and down the country. The latter was murdered by his vassal, Shahbuz Khan (477-478), who found himself forced to leave the country to seek help from neighbouring princes, which was, however, not granted. A Ghuris prince, known by the name of Malik Dinkar, then became lord of Kirmân.

IV. The Seljuks of Syria, 1078-1117. After the Marzâreligious war of Halab in 463 (1070-71) had submitted to Alp Arslan, a body of Turks under Atash b. Abak (or Awak) invaded Palestine, captured Ramla and Jerusalem and the rest of Judea, with the exception of Ascalon, where the Fatimids held out. He then turned his attention to Damascus which he was, however, not able to take till 478 (1079). An attempt made by him to conquer Egypt in the following year failed; he was routed by the Fatimids general Bahdr al-Din (478-479), and was next so hard pressed in Syria that he appealed for help to Tushah b. Alp Arslan, who came to Syria in 479 and Damascus was handed over to him (479 = 1078). Tushah then treacherously murdered Atash and became lord of the town himself. An attempt to take Halab failed; the then lord of this city, the Usufid Muslim b. Karshah, even attacked him in Damascus (475 = 1083), and when the latter had fallen in battle with the Seljuk of Asia Minor, Sulaiman (478 = 1085), Malik Shah, himself hastened to Halab and installed As'ousun, the successor of the Zangids there as governor, to the great vexation of Tushah who had in the meanwhile disposed of his rival for the possession of the town, Sulaiman, in an encounter at 'Ain Salma (September), not far from Halab (479 = 1086), where the latter met his death. It was only the death of Malik-Shah (482-492) that enabled him to gratify his ambition, to make great conquests and to set himself up as a claimant to the sultanate against his nephew Bariyaghak (483), till he finally was defeated in 498 (1095) and fell on the battlefield. For details see the article TUSHAH. His son Rikwan (493-544) became lord of Halab and another son, Duwash, the statement in Abu 'l-Ma'sun, ed. Popper, ii. 344, that he was Duwash is wrong, of Damascus. The latter died soon after in 497 (1104) but the real power lay in the hands of his Atabeg, Tughlugh (497-501), who was the standard for a long time in the name of an infant, then for a brother of Duwash, named Arslan (in the al-Adil called Begtah), then made himself independent and founded the Idrisiid dynasty.

The king of Halab died in 507 (1114); he was followed by his son Alp Arslan who was soon afterwards murdered by his servant Liyir. The latter then had his brother Sultan Shah proclaimed Sultan but was himself murdered in 511 (1115). The inhabitants then had had over the town to Ughaz (479-501) and Seljuk rule came to an end.

V. The Seljuks of Asia Minor (al-Rum), 1077-1131. The ancestor and founder of this dynasty was Sulaiman b. Kutulumsha b. Arslan (1050) of the Seljuk. His father Kutulumsha was one of the Seljuk paladins under Tughrul Beg but later rebelled against Alp Arslan, and in the end fell on the battlefield near al-Ray (456-456). Sulaiman himself came to Asia Minor after the great battle of Malikshah (1071) (in which the Byzantines suffered a terrible defeat and their emperor was taken prisoner), like so many other Turkish enmity, with the intention of making new conquests and founding a kingdom. Being a prince of the Seljuk family he was successful, and it was here that he found himself forced to leave the country to seek help from neighbouring princes, which was, however, not granted. A Ghuris prince, known by the name of Malik Dinkar, then became lord of Kirmân.

The kingdom of these Seljuk savedInstanceState many vicissitudes of fortune. More than once its fall seemed imminent, but it revived again until finally it sank into insignificance with the Mongol invasion and collapsed altogether. Seljuk's capital, Nicaea, was lost in the First Crusade in 1097 and never belonged to the Seljuk again, and with this ended Turkish rule in the whole of western Asia Minor, as the Byzantines under the Comneni again took this region under their sway and were able to retain it throughout the period of the Seljuks.

In the south-east the Seljuks were cut off from the rest of the Muslim world by the Christian
the worthless Kaikhusraw II ascended the throne (1237). In the meanwhile the Mongol deluge had reached the frontiers of Asia Minor. Erzerum, the fortress, fell before their onslaught and soon afterwards the Turkish army suffered an ignominious defeat at Kouskâh (1243). The future of the kingdom was thereby decided. It is true that a peace was concluded and the Sultan granted an appearance of independence on payment of a large tribute, but the wealth of the land continually stimulated the covetousness of the Mongols and invited them to new raids, pretexts for which were given by the struggles for the throne among the sons of Kaikhusraw. In the end, in the reign of Hülâgû, a partition of the kingdom was drawn up whereby 'Isâ al-Dîn was to rule on the one and Rükû al-Dîn on the other side of the Küf Irmlâk, but when the former entered into secret negotiations with the arch-enemies of the Mongols, the Egyptian Mamûlaks, an end was soon put to his rule and he had to seek a refuge in Byzantium. Rükû al-Dîn henceforth ruled alone but the power he now exerted by marrying his daughter with the title of Parwânâ, as agent for the Mongols, and when Rükû al-Dîn became inconvenient to him he had him put out of the way in 1266 so that he might rule all the more unchecked in the name of Rükû al-Dîn's infant son Ghiyâth al-Dîn. In the meanwhile the Turks began to rise against the Mongols in Laranda and elsewhere. A number of Turkish Beys therefore appealed to the Manûk Sultan Bahâr [q. v.] and proposed that he should send an expedition into Asia Minor, where he would find the whole population on his side, if only the Mongol troops stationed in the country had once been defeated. Bahâr agreed, defeated the Mongols in the bloody battle of Albitzûn and advanced as far as Kâsîârîa (1277). But the Parwânâ and the Sultan held aloof and the people did not move so that Bahâr was forced by lack of supplies to retire again and leave things as they had been before. Soon afterwards Alaâ appeared in Asia Minor and took fearful vengeance on the Turks, who, as he thought, had conspired with the Egyptians. The Parwânâ also had to pay for his inactivity with his life. The Mongol regime now became stricter. Mongol financial officials settled the taxation which for the most part was used to maintain the troops stationed in the country. The Seljûk Sultanâhs, whose names appeared on the coins down to 704 (1302), had no longer any authority worth mentioning. The turbulent Turkish emirs, among whom the Bâbût Karmatîn and the Bâbût Ahrâf played the most prominent part, were more and more brought to periods of obedience by ruthless punitive expeditions led by the Mongol princes Kungar KâruFIG and Gaûlûdû, who once more came from their retreats and found independent emirates when Mongol sovereignty finally diminished in power. In this way there arose on the ruins of the Seljûk empire a dozen Turkoman dynasties, on which see the separate articles. The last descendants of the Seljûk family of whom we have historical notice are found in Sîrops and perhaps in Arâd. The Kılıçi Arâlû b. Lutfûbeq, who had to yield in 576 (1471-1472) to the Ottoman general Gedik Ahmed Paşa, was deposed with his whole family to Stambol and had Gülmûdjiya allotted to him by the Sultan as 'izzâr [q. v.] but afterwards fled to Egypt, presumably belonging to the old family of rulers.
Bibliography: On the sources for Seljuk history see K. Süssheim, Fidelegen zu einer Ausgabe der im B. M. zu London vorhandenen Chronik der seljukischen Reiche, Leipzig 1914. We may first mention the compendium of general history by Ibn al-Aṣlī; Sīḥ b. al-Dāwīz, Miṣrī al-zamānī, facsimile edition by J. R. Jewett, Chicago 1907, on the years 495–654; Barhebuaus (Syrian and Arabic Chronicles): Abu ʿl-Fidaʾ, Ibn Haldun; Ḥamīd Allāh Mustawīf; al-Kawāṣimī, Tārīḥ Qayrawān (facsimile by E. G. Browne, Leiden and London 1910) from whom was taken the History des Seljukide in die Islamische, etc., by Dufrenoy in J. A., 1849; Mīrāghānī, Kamāl al-Ṣafī, from whom are taken Mīrāghānī's Geschicht der Seljukiden, ed. Vullers; 1838; al-Sūdānī, Hādhāl al-Siyār, Lithographed; ed. Thānī 1771 and Bostān 1773, Manṣūrī, Muḥāfaẓ al-Muhāfaz, in Arabic, is fuller but is only available in MSS.


Coins, Inscriptions, Art. On the Seljuk coins see the well-known catalogues by Lane-Poole, Dorn, Ghulīb Beg, Ahmed Tewfīq, etc. Inscriptions in M. Surve, Role in Kleinasiatische, Berlin 1896; Cl. Huart, Études arabes de l'Asie Mineure, in Revue Semit., vol. ii and iii; J. H. Loewy, Kosovo, Inschriften der seljūk, Bauten, Berlin 1907; v. Borchert, Materialien für ein corpus inscr. arab., vol. iii, Cairo 1910, and many scattered articles by the same author; Khalīl Edhem, Katariyya shelīl Mubānī-i ʿIlāmīyye wa-ʿl-Khāṭībīyya, Stambul 1934, and other articles by him and by Ahmed Tewfīq, etc. in Revue historiqus; Zakowski, Rekonstruktion storage Mēruva, St. Petersburg 1845; Sarrī, Illuminato, Berlin 1841, Cairo 1916, Cl. also the works of H. Saladin and G. Migeon, Woerman, E. Dies, Strzygowski, etc. Since Duguecques, Histoire générale des Huns, des Turcs, des Mogols et des autres Tartare occidentaux, etc., 1754–1758 (Book X–XI), no European scholar has specially investigated the history of the Seljuk, although in the works on history by Weil, Mair, A. Müller, d'Ossen, Howorth, Barthold et al. there is much information on the subject. For the early history of the dynasty Kamārshīī's already mentioned preface to his edition of the Divān of Mumīrī is of particular importance; for the history of the Seljuk of Kirmān see Houtsma's simāl (from Rewell, vol. i) in the Z.D.M.G., xxxix. 392–408; for that of the Seljuk of Rūm, besides the above quoted works of Huart, von Borchert, Khalīl Edhem, etc., see: Negīlī ʿAsīnī, Tarīkh Turbītī, p. 408–445; Huart, Kōnīa, le rôle des échevins tourniers, Paris 1897; do., Les Sultans des turco-tourniers, Paris 1918–1922.

SELEKES. [See Selebes.]

SELEKES, the ancient Emānū, Seleucus Traces or Clacies, a small town, capital of the sandjak of Jūl-Il in the province of Adana. It was built by Seleucus Nicator towards 300 B.C. The river Göz-Şu (Calycanthus) runs past it, about 41 miles from its mouth. In it is a rock-cut temple called Teğha-Antılı, "the Emperor's house", hewn out of the rock and covered by a vaulted roof; it is a great milestone carved out of the rock, 30 cubits broad and deep and 60 long; the aqueduct which brought the water to it has been destroyed. There are numerous ancient ruins and a mosque, dating from the Arab epoch; the town was actually conquered by al-Ma'mūn but soon afterwards evacuated. There is a Byzantine castle on the mountain (7th century). The town is mentioned by Yāqūt, Muḥāfīz, iii. 119, Mariaq al-Itīlī, ll. 44, under the same Selāhūl.

The district, the most part mountainous, contains 3 nūbiyya: Bulāku, Yāghula and Ayābū; in the Salām of 1325, p. 378, Yāghula is given at the capital of Jūl-Ili and its district has now only two nūbiyya, the number of its inhabitants is 24,850 of whom 1923 are Christians. The exports are the abundant agricultural produce: coarse carpets and sacks are manufactured there. The people in the hills rear cattle and those on the plains are farmers. The district at one time belonged to Cyprus and was administered like the islands of the archipelago by the Kapudan-ağa (Grand Admiral) [q.v.].


(Cl. Huart)
SELİM I, ninth sultan of the Ottoman Empire, known in history as Yawar Sultan Selim, reigned 918–926 (1512–1520). He was one of the sons of Bayezid II, born in 872 ( = 1470/68) or 875 ( = 1472/73) (Süleyman I, 1:38). Towards the end of his father’s reign, he was governor of the sandjak of Trebizond. Although his brother Ahmed, older than he but younger than prince Korşud, had been designated his successor by Bayezid, Selim also cherished designs on the throne, knowing that he had the support of the greater part of the army. Civil war finally broke out between the two brothers as a result of the nomination of the Imam’s son Suleiman as governor of Boli. Ahmed protested and the sandjak of Kaffa in the Crimea was then given to Suleiman. Selim soon afterwards (1510) went to join his son in Kaffa and refusing to obey Bayezid, who had ordered him to return to Trebizond, he went to Adrianople in March, 1511, with a body of Tatar troops. He then asked for a sandjak in Rûm III. Only after the Sultan had made up his mind to send troops against his son, did Selim consent to retire, after receiving the sandjak of Semendere as a result of negotiations conducted through the mediation of Mewlânâ Nur al-Din Safrûtu (q.v.). But he soon took the field again, this time as a pretext the rebellion of Shah Kuli or Shahin Kuli (q.v.) in Asia Minor. This time he was defeated on August 3 near Corlu by his father’s troops and again sought refuge in the Crimea with his father-in-law, Khaan Mengli Girsky. But the Janissaries in the capital were in favour of Selim; they forced prince Ahmed, who had advanced against Constantinople, to retreat (August 21). The attempts of Ahmed and Korşud to profit by the absence of their brother only increased the latter’s popularity. Selim therefore left the Crimea in January, 1512, and reached Constantinople in April, where the Janissaries had openly declared for him. Bayezid in vain attempted to open negotiations. He was dethroned on Safar 8, 918 (April 24, 1512), by a great mob of Selim’s partisans and died a month later on the way to Demotika (see the article XXXII in II).

Selim employed the first year of his reign in exterminating his brothers and nephews. By July, 1512, he had set out against Ahmed and his son ‘Ali al-Din, who had taken Brusa; he put them to flight, but did not capture them. Ahmed entrenched himself in Amasia. An attempt by Selim to take him by surprise there failed, probably through the treachery of the Grand Vizier, Muṣṭafa Paşa (q.v.). The latter in any case was executed and replaced by Hersek Ahmed Paşa. On November 5, five nephews of the sultan were executed at Brusa, sons of his deceased brothers Mahmud, ‘Alam-Shah and Shahin-Shah. In the end Korşud, who had fled to the sandjak of Teke, was captured and put to death. The same fate overtook Ahmed, who, after several successes, was finally defeated and captured on the plain of Yehli Şehir (April 24, 1513).

Peaceful relations with Venice, Hungary and Russia were maintained as a result of negotiations conducted by the embassies which these powers had sent to Constantinople and Adrianople. The warring spirit of Selim found an outlet in the east, where Shah Iskander (q.v.), had founded the powerful empire of the Şhi’i Safawids. Iskander had supported the cause of prince Ahmed and had given asylum to the latter’s son Murad. Iskander, moreover, had many partisans in the Şhi’i element in Asia Minor. His own dynasty owed its success to the Kitâb-âbâd of Anatolia, who had rebelled only recently under Şah-Kuli against Sultan Bayezid. Selim, urged either by hatred of Iskander or by his zeal for orthodoxy, began a systematic persecution of the Şhi’is in his empire. The total number killed or imprisoned was forty thousand, according to all the Turkish sources. War was inevitable after this. On March 20, 1514, the Sultan left Adrianople and a month after the whole army met on the plain of Yehli Şehir. During this time Selim had begun with a declaration of war his celebrated correspondence with Shah Iskander in a series of letters written in an elegant style and insulting and provocative in their contents (see the Ayn-i Salṭân of Feridun Bey, l. 374 sqq.), which often resulted in the immediate slaughter of their bearers. At the same time he had turned to ‘Ulla’d Khaan, prince of the Uzbeks, to incite him to war against the Shah. The Turkish army marched by Konya, Kaisarîye, (where ‘Ali al-Dawla of the Dhu ’l-Kadr dynasty showed little enthusiasm to assist the expedition) and Stara, while the fleet went to Trebizond with the commission. After Erzincan the Janissaries began to murmur at the length of the campaign, but Selim restored his authority with a few executions. The Şah’s army was not met till the plain of Châlîrûn (q.v.) between Lake Urmia and Tabriz. Here on Ra’dar 2, 920 (August 23, 1514), the Persian army was utterly routed by the Ottoman, mainly through the latter’s superiority in artillery. Iskander fled, leaving the whole of his harem in the hands of the victor. On September 5, Selim entered Tabriz. He left it by the 33rd carrying off vast treasures and several hundred captives, to spend the winter at Kara-Bâgh, but the opposition of the Janissaries forced him to resume the road to Anatolia. He went via Kara and Biahurst, where Bityûk Muhammad Pây was already been left with a force. Selim himself went into winter quarters at Amasia; the Janissaries, who had begun to mutiny once more owing to the shortage of food, were sent to Constantinople. These disorders resulted in the dismissal of the Grand Vizier and the raising to the office of Khaan Sinan Pasha, Beylerbey of Anatolia (October, 1514). During the same year the sandjak of Semendere had driven back a Hungarian invasion near Belgrade.

The year 1515 was marked by the conquest of eastern Anatolia and Kurdiân. Selim, who had assumed the title of Şah after his victory (according to the coins), went invasion to Kumaq or Kemâk (q.v.) which he took in May and then returned to Stûsâ. From here he sent the new Grand Vizier against the aged ‘Ali al-Dawla, lord of the Dhu ’l-Kadr (q.v.). Selim had previously, in the autumn of 1514, invested ‘Ali Beg, nephew of ‘Ali al-Dawla, with the sandjak of Kaisarîye and ‘Ali had defeated and killed Salâlan, son of ‘Ali al-Dawla. On June 12, 1515, Sinan Pasha defeated the Dhu ’l-Kadr army in the plain of Göksâm. ‘Ali al-Dawla was killed and his four sons captured and executed. The conquest of the land of the Dhu ’l-Kadr, including the fortresses of Alibistan and Marrb, was one of the causes of the war with the Sultan of Egypt, who had been recognised as suzerain of this dynasty. Selim then returned to Constantinople, which he reached on
July 17; there he had executed several high officials accused of having incited the rebellion of the Janissaries, including the Költ "Asker and the poet Dja'far Çelâbi [q.v.]. In August a great fire destroyed a part of the capital and was followed by more executions.

During the battle of Çaldîrân, the Beggars of Kurdiyan [q.v.], the population of which was for the most part Sunni, declared for Selim; the inhabitants of Dîyar Bakr and other towns had opened their gates to the Turks, but the citadel of several towns (e.g. Mârdîn) were still occupied by Persian garrisons. Bîylîk Muhammed, who had been appointed Beylerbeey of Dîyar Bakr, had been given military control of the country and the historian Idris Bitlîs, himself a Kurd, had been appointed to assist him as high commissioner for civil administration. In the beginning of 1513, however, the Persian general Kara Khatîn, brother of the former governor of Dîyar Bakr, Usâdji Ogghi killed at Çaldîrân, went to send to the country. He besieged Dîyar Bakr, but was forced by Bîylîk Muhammed to raise the siege in October, 1514.

At the beginning of 1516, Kara Khatîn was defeated a second time near Koc Hisar between Urfa and Nisîbin by Muhammad and the Kurdish Bega, a battle in which Kara Khatîn himself was killed. In this way the towns of Karpîç, Mâyîyîfârîkîn, Bitlîs, Hûn Kaftî, Dîyar Bakr, Urfa, Mârdîn, Dja'îtsa and the lands farther south as far as Rakka and Mawjîll fell into Ottoman hands, the conquest being completed in the reign of Selimîn 1.

In the capital, Selim had been busy with the construction of a new fleet and arsenal under the direction of Piri Paşa, while he had reorganised the corps of Janissaries so as to secure a more effective control over the higher ranks of this turbulent soldiery. These were the preparations for a new expedition against Persia. The Sultan left Constantinople on June 5, 1516, and went first to Konya, Sinîn Paşa, who had been appointed commander-in-chief was awaiting him at Alîbâistan. In the meanwhile, the Sultan of Egypt, Kânsîn al-Ghûrî [q.v.], disturbed by Selim's annexation of the lands of the Dhu l-Kadr, had left his capital on May 18 with a large army with the object of supporting Shâh Ismaiîl and retaking Marasc. Selim, having learned of the arrival of Kânsîn at Aleppo (August, 1516), was the first to send ambassadors. The latter were not at first well received, but returned with an offer of mediation in the war with Ismaiîl. Selim did not accept the proposal; on the contrary, he sent back with contumely an envoy of the Sultan of Egypt after executing his companions. In the end Selim set off via Al Timâk, capturing towns like Malatîya on his line of march. He met the Egyptian army on the field of Dîbâk [q.v.], north of Aleppo. On August 24 (on the date see Selim, vi, 386, note 4) the Egyptians were completely routed in a short battle; their defeat was due to dissensions among their troops and to the superiority of the Ottoman artillery. Kânsîn himself fell either in or after the battle. Yüms Paşa had been sent by Selim against Kânsîn Beg, governor (malik al-tama'arâ') of Aleppo; the latter surrendered the town to the Ottomans without striking a blow. Selim encamped for eighteen days on the Kôk Mâdîn, near Aleppo, and then resumed his march via Hamsî and Hims to Damascus, which the Manlik-Bega had abandoned on September 22. Damascus was surrendered by negotiation with the traitor Kâhîr Beg and he occupied the town on the 26th. Selim stayed about two months here and ordered among other edifices a mosque to be built over the tomb of Mûhîyî al-Dîn b. al-Ârâfî. On October 22, the Manlikâs in Cairo had chosen the new Sultan, Tûmân Bîly. Selim sent him two envoys to offer him his weight in gold and silver, and to the Sultan of Egypt recognized Ottoman suzerainty. The two ambassadors were put to death, much against the wish of Tûmân Bîly, which rendered inevitable the continuation of the war. The Egyptian army left Cairo towards the end of October, under the command of Djâangerî Ghazîlî. They met the Ottoman vanguard under Sinîn Paşa near Ghazrân and were defeated. Selim had left Damascus in December; before rejoining the army at Ghazrân, he made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. The decisive battle was fought on January 22, 1517, at Rîdânîya near Cairo, after the Ottoman army had crossed the desert in thirteen days. The defeat which the Egyptians suffered there is attributed to the treachery of Djâangerî Ghazîlî, according to an arrangement with Kâhîr Beg, who was in Selim's army; they are said by a ruse to have immobilised the Egyptian artillery, which was served by Europeans. The two Sultanîns took part in the battle in person. Tûmân Bîly slew the Grand Vizier Sinîn, believing he was Selim. Sinîn's office was filled by the appointment of Yûmus Paşa. By the battle of Rîdânîya, the fate of Cairo was decided; although Tûmân Bîly succeeded in regaining the city five days later he was driven from it on January 30, after desperate and bloody fighting in the streets followed by the execution of eight hundred Manlik Bega and a general massacre. After the definite occupation of Cairo, Selim, who had pitched his camp on the island of Bûlîk, confirmed the war with Tûmân Bîli. The latter had retired to the Delta and endeavoured to resist with the help of the Rednîns. But after another defeat at Djâkî, his allies betrayed him and handed him over to the Turks. Selim at first treated him with consideration, but in the end yielded to the pressure of Kâhîr Beg and Ghazîlî and ordered his execution on April 12 or 13 (cf. the article Tûmân Bîly).

Selim, being recognised as undisputed master of Egypt, remained a month in Cairo. Among the numerous embassies which came to pay him homage, one of the most important was that of the Sharif of Mecca, Barakât, who sent a deputation led by his own son, Abû Numâyi Muhammed, then aged twelve, which was received by the Sultan towards the end of May. The Sharif, who had not much reason to speak highly of the Manlik Sultanîn, readily submitted to the Ottoman Sultan, who had already, during his stay in Damascus, showed his solicitude for the holy places. Barakât declared himself ready to insert the name of Selim in the kânsîyah. Abû Numâyi returned with rich gifts and in December following (Dhu l-Ridâ, 923) the pilgrim caravan (turîc-i humâyûn), sent by Selim from Damascus, carried for the first time a covering for the Ka'ba as a gift from the Ottoman Sultan. From this time onwards that Ottoman Sultan bore the title of Kâhîm al-Haramân al-Sharîfatîn which has given them such a great prestige in the Muslim and Christian world. Selim, however, in spite of his solicitude for the sacred places, took care to take with him to Constantinople as hostages several Hâyât notables resident in Cairo.
Another important delegation consisted of the two ambassadors from Venice, who came to negotiate regarding the payment of the tribute for the island of Cyprus hitherto paid to the Sultan of Egypt. They had, besides, to defend their city from the charge of being a nest of pirates against the Ottomans. Their ancient privileges were confirmed by a document of September 8, 1517. There is, however, in existence an Arabic document by which Selim confirmed as early as February 16, 1517, to the Venetian consul in Alexandria the privileges enjoyed by the Venetians (B. Moritz, Ein Firman des Sultans Selim I. für die Venetianer, in the Festschrift Sachau, p. 422 sqq.).

Among the monuments of Cairo, Selim paid most attention to the Nilometer, the mīyāţā on the island of Rawḍa (cf. the article CAIRO, § 4). He had a pavilion built there which was his favourite abode during his stay in Cairo. Towards the end of May, he undertook a journey to Alexandria to visit his fleet which had arrived there under Piri Paşa and returned to Cairo on June 12 to remain another three months there. He left the city on September 10, leaving Khârî Beg, governor of Egypt (but he had sent his harem and children as hostages to Fillîse) and arrived in Damascus on October 8. The main reason for his return was the discontent in the army. He left Egypt without having been able to do much reorganisation there during his stay. Although, according to the Ottoman historians, "true justice" was introduced there (Rustem Paşa), the numerous abuses had not been diminished; İdris Bitlisî, who had dared to call the Sultan's attention to them, was sentenced to death with the fleet. Yûnis Paşa, the new Grand Vizier, was no more pleased with the expedition; the Sultan had already removed him from the government of Egypt; then Khârî Beg aroused the Sultan's suspicions of him, which led to his sudden execution on September 19 in the desert near Ghassû. His successor was Piri Paşa. Selim spent the winter in Damascus and resumed his journey in February, 1518, having appointed Dânebreddī Ghâzî as governor of Syria. He spent a further two months in Aleppo, from where Piri Paşa made an expedition against the Kâtib Bash, and returned to Constantinople on July 25 and went on to Adrianople on August 4. His son Soleimân, who had taken his place in his absence, was sent as governor to Sarukhân.

Among the notable personages whom Selim had sent as Egyptian hostages to the capital was al-Mutawakkil, the last of the "Abbasid" Caliphs at the court of the Manduks in Cairo. He had accompanied Kânsht to Aleppo along with three of the chief Khânts of Egypt and was made prisoner after the battle of Ğâlı. Treated with great consideration by Selim, he accompanied the latter to Egypt, where during his absence his place had been taken by his father and predecessor at the institution of Tâmân Bâ, Selim had endeavoured on an earlier occasion to make use of the authority of the Caliph in his negotiations with Tâmân Bâ, but without success. In June, 1517, al-Mutawakkil had to leave Cairo and seems to have been sent by sea to Constantinople. Here his conduct is said to have decided the Sultan to imprison him in the castle of Yedî Kule, where he remained till the death of Selim, after which he returned to Cairo at some time not now exactly known. These details regarding the Caliph al-Mutawakkil are only given by the Egyptian historian Ibn Iyâs, who probably much exaggerates the part played by him in the Egyptian campaign, while the Ottoman chroniclers do not say a single word about him. It may be concluded from this that the importance of the "Abbasid" caliphate and Caliph had become insignificant by the time of Selim I and existed practically only for theologians. These early and almost contemporary sources show no case guarantee the authenticity of the tradition which appeared two and a half centuries later, according to which al-Mutawakkil formally renounced the caliphate in favour of Selim. It seems that this story was first given in d'Ohsson's Tableau général de l'Empire Ottoman, Paris 1788, i. 272 and 270. It is afterwards found in several Ottoman historians and thus became an article of general belief in Turkey. It is obvious that this story is intended to justify the claim of the Ottoman sultans to the caliphate, but it is unnecessary to assume that d'Ohsson invented it, as Barthold thinks, for the tradition seems in every way worthy of the great conqueror and may have been originated by the Turks themselves. Selim in any case had been called Caliph even before the conquest of Egypt; the historians say on several occasions (kâbsa) of the caliphate without pronouncing his name in different places. Cf. also the article KHALILA.

Selim's successes made a deep impression on the Christian world. The Pope Leo endeavoured to enlist the Emperor and the kings of France and England in common action against the Turks. But Selim's relations with Europe remained peaceful during the next few years; the truce with Hungary was continued and a Spanish envoy obtained the confirmation of the privileges of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. The Sultan also recognised the new Khan of the Crimons, his brother-in-law Muhammad Girî, son of Mengli Girî. The Grand Vizier was sent to the eastern frontier to defend the empire against the Persians. During this time two new Shi'a risings had to be put down; that of Ibn Hanâsh in Syria in 1517, which was suppressed by the governor Ghâzî and the Beys of Tripoli and Hamâ, and that of a certain Shâh Weli (according to Lutf Paşa) at Târkhân near Tâkht. He and his followers are called Djelâlî, a name found in several Shi'a risings, e.g. that of Kârâ Yâsilî (q.v.). Ferhâd Paşa was sent against this Djelâlî, but it was 'Ali Shâhuwâr-Qâhsî, who had been appointed in 1516 governor of the country of Dhu'l-Kadr, who finally defeated and slew him in 1518.

In 1519 Selim left Adrianople for Constantinople, where the equipment of a great fleet was begun, intended for the conquest of the island of Rhodes, but before the preparations were finished he died suddenly on Şawwâl 7, 926 (September 20, 520). He was on the way from the capital to Adrianople when he fell ill, signs of which had shown themselves a few days before (a superstition called abîn cêmsî; according to others it was cancer) forced him to stop near Corfu; the father of the historian Sel'd al-Dûn, Hassan Dînân, was present at his death-bed. His death was kept secret by the viziers until the new Sultan Soleimân reached Constantinople. The body was buried on the hill on the northwest side of Sambuli; Soleimân had the mosque of Selim I built there, to which the türbe was joined; it was completed in Muharram, 939. The türbe also covers the tombs of the mother
of Selim, of several of his daughters and of several princes (Hafiz Husain al-Awamieryk, Hadiyat al-Djedouwet, I., 14 sq.).

The personality of Selim I dominates all the great events of his reign. His unravelling severity and the numerous executions which he ordered earned him the name of Yavuz, expressing at once horror and admiration. It is the latter sentence that has prevailed regarding him. A whole series of histories are devoted specially to him with the title of Selim-name (see Gesch. d. osm. Reiches, vol. ii., p. xii.). Selim I has been made a national hero (one of the two German warships which the Turks acquired in 1914 was baptised Yavuz Sultan Selim). Just as his vast conquests of Muslim lands have given rise to the tradition of the transfer of the caliphate, so there has been attributed to him the deliberate pan-Islamic idea of unifying all the lands of Islam under his sceptre and in this way an attempt has been made to excuse his apparent cruelty (cf., for example, Yavar Vakil Safi al-Din Selim we-It-taşk-ı İslam Sûyeti by Yaûf Kenân, printed at Constantinople n. d., but since the revolution). In reality the conquered lands had at the beginning of the sixteenth century just entered on a period of decline and depopulation as a result of the change by the Portuguese of the trade route with the Indies. The conquests were nevertheless of enormous importance for the religious and political orientation of the Turkish empire, which henceforth became the great Sunni power in opposition to Shi'i Persia (cf. e.g. the kâfiû addressed to him by the poet Khâwîn Isfahânî in Browne, A Literary History of Persia in Modern Times, Cambridge 1924, p. 78). It is also from this time that Persian Shi'i influence in Turkey definitely gives way to Arab Sunni influence (Bâking, Z. D. M. G., lxxvi. 143). The Ottomans, besides, imposed several of their manners and customs on the conquered, such as the practice of shaving the beard (Selim is always represented beardless) and the style of dress and mode of dressing the hair, without, however, exerting a greater influence for the moment on the civilisation of Syria and Egypt.

Selim is equally celebrated as a poet. His Divânî is entirely in Persian and was printed in Constantinople 1506. It was again published in Berlin in 1904 by Paul Horn, by order of the Emperor Wilhelm II. Only a single one of the verses in Turkish attributed to him is regarded as authentic (Tâhirî-i Lutfi, Constantinople 1544, p. 57 sqq.). From his early days in Trebizond, Selim was fond of the society of poets; among the better known of these are Dâfîr Câlebi, whom he married the wife of Shâh Isâmî, taken prisoner in the battle of Câfîrân, and whom he had executed in 1515 (cf. above), Ahtî and Rewânî, whose Muqâmât Zawi‘î was dedicated to Selim; other influential men of this time were Kemâtî Pasha Zâde [q. v.], and the Muhaîr ‘Ali Dîmânî Efendi [q. v.], who legalised by a fatwa the war against the Senî Sultan of Egypt and who was one of the few men powerful enough to oppose on several occasions the execution of the Sultan’s sanguinary orders.

hand over the prince and his four sons to Selim (so as not to break the oath by which he had sworn to Bayazid not to deliver him up to his father). As a result, Bayazid was put to death on September 5, 1561. Selim remained in his sandjak until the day when a messenger from the Grand Vizier, Muhammad Şeyhülislam Paşa, informed him of the death of Suleiman (September 6, 1566) and the taking of Sziget (September 8). Reaching the capital on September 24, where no one had expected him, the death of the Sultan being still kept secret, the new Sultan set out two days later for Belgrade. Here he awaited the return of Şeyhülislam with the army and his father's body. When on October 24 the death of Suleiman was finally made public, Selim refused to receive the solemn hezârı of the troops and had distributed among them accession presents which were thought insufficient. They then returned to the capital. Suleiman's body was sent in advance with a small escort and buried in Constantinople without any ceremony. By the time Selim reached the capital in the early days of December, the Janissaries began to mutiny near the Adrianople gate and would not allow the new Sultan to enter his serail until the increase in the accession presents they demanded had been promised them. The distribution took place on December 10. Besides the Janissaries, the "ülüemî" and notably the Mufti Abu l-Su'ud, Lala Muşafar commanded the expedition; he took Nicosia on September 9, 1570, and forced Famagusta to capitulate on August 1, 1571. After this capitulation took place the horrible execution of the commander Bragadin. (The conquest of Cyprus is described in a Turkish Höyri; see Flügel's Catalogue, l. 236, No. 1015). In the same year an alliance was formed by Venice, Spain and the Pope. Their combined fleets almost completely destroyed the Turkish fleet in the Gulf of Lepanto (October 7, 1571), but this defeat was not enough to weaken Turkey; a new fleet was built during the winter and by the peace of March 7, 1573, Venice had to give up Cyprus and promise to pay a war indemnity. The war with Spain was continued. The Spaniards occupied Tunis in 1574, but were driven out again in September, 1574, by Köçü Sinan Paşa. During the same period (1572—1574) there were troubles with Poland in Moldavia on account of the pretender Iovian; the latter at first supported by the Turks was in the end defeated and killed by them in June, 1574. Peace was renewed with Austria in November, 1574, in spite of the troubles on the frontier and the intrigues of the claimants for the throne of Transylvania.

Selim died in the night of December 12/13, 1574 (Shaban 37/38, 982), as the result of an accident in the palace. He left his Ottoman Sultan to spend his life in the Serail, where the Sultan Nür Bânu was all powerful. His fondness for wine gained him the name of Mest Sultan Selim. During his reign dissipated habits spread even among high "ulema". The system of bribery and corruption, which had begun under Rustem Paşa, penetrated to all ranks of society. But the traditions of the reign of Suleiman were still able to maintain the empire at the height of its glory under the direction of capable men like Şeyhülislam and Abu l-Su'ud. The Sultan must have been put into force, especially in all that concerned the disposition of landed property and the fiefs (cf. Milit Tetcobular Medjmu'â, 1574, vol. i., No. 1 and 2).

Selim II's most famous building is the Selâmîye mosque in Adrianople, built from 1567 to 1574 by the architect Siana (detailed description in vol. iii. of the Siyâsât-nâmâ of Ewliya Çelebi). He also carried out various buildings and repairs in Adrianople, Navarino, Mekka (see C. Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka, l. 16) and Constantinople (Ayâ Sofâ). According to Gibb, he is the best poet among the Ottoman Selâns. He wrote his poems under the nom de Selim and surrounded himself with poets, such as Faqîr [q.v.]; Bâki also enjoyed his favour.
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SELIM III, the twenty-eighth Sultan of the
Ottoman Empire, reigned from 1205 (1789)
to 1222 (1807). He was born on Djanād 12, 1175
(Dec. 24, 1761), a son of Sultan Mustafa III and the Wulīde Sultan Mīhr-Shāh (d. 1805; see Siğilītī Othmānī, i. 83) and succeeded on Radjab 11, 1203 (Apr. 7, 1889), to his uncle 'Abd al-
Hamīd I [q. v.], who had died on that day. Selim's reign is characterised by disastrous wars against the European powers and revolts in the interior, showing the weakness of the Ottoman Empire, and at the same time by the continuous efforts of the Sultan and a party of enlightened men to reorganise the old decayed institutions of the state, which led finally to his deposition.

On his accession to the throne he energetically continued the war against Russia and Austria, but the Turks were beaten in Moldavia by Focani by the Austrians (Aug. 1, 1789) and especially at Martinescu on the river Băza in Wallachia by the Austrians and Russians (Sept. 22) Here the Grand Vizier Dženâzeh Hasan Pasha (who had previously replaced Köstāt Yūsuf Pasha) died and was succeeded by the famous Kapdana Pasha Dženâzeh Hasan [q. v.]. On Nov. 10, the Austrians occupied București, while, on October 8, Belgrad had already fallen into their power. At the same time the Russians under Potemkin continued their conquests in Bessarabia (Khotin and Oznakov had fallen already) and took Bender (Nov. 15). The treaty with Sweden (July 11) to subdivide this country in the war with Russia was of little avail, and Selim, being prevented by tradition from joining the army himself, summoned in a Khāfīr shortly all the Muslims to the holy war. Next year the Austrian danger lessened, especially after a treaty of alliance with Prussia (Jan. 31, 1790) and the death of Joseph II. In June the Turks even gained some success against them. After Prussia had concluded with Austria the Convention of Reichenbach on July 31, in which Austria promised to make peace with Turkey and both nations undertook to guarantee the integrity of that empire, an armistice was concluded at Džen-
dżew (Sept. 17), followed, after very long nego-
tiations, by the peace of Zistowa (to the West of Rusçuk on the Danube) of Aug. 4, 1791.
This treaty, concluded by the mediation of Prussia, England and Holland, restored the Danube principalities to the Porte; only Old-Orsou was had to be ceded to Austria. The war with Russia had been disastrous in 1790. The new Grand Vizier
died in March and was succeeded by Hasan Paşa Sherif [q. v.], who was not able to stop the Russian advance in Bessarabia. The Russians took Kilia in Oct. and, after a desperate struggle, Ismā'īl [q. v.] on Dec. 22. They were also successful in the Black Sea and beyond the Kūbān river, though they did not succeed in taking Anapa. Moreover, Sweden had concluded peace with Russia (Aug. 14). In the Aegean, however, the small Greek fleet commanded by Lambro Cazzani and equipped at Triest with Russian aid, was destroyed by the Turks. In February, 1791, the Grand Vizier was executed, by order of the Sultān, in his camp at Şumila and replaced by Köstāt Yūsuf Pasha who made energetic preparations to continue the war. But the Russians under Repnin crossed the Danube at Galatz and beat the Turks completely at Matchin (April 9). As spirits in Constantinople had sunk very low, and there had been a big fire, the Porte ordered the Grand Vizier to propose an armistice, which was concluded at Galatz on August 11 and followed by the peace treaty of Jassy of January 9, 1792. In its 13 articles the treaty of Kızık Kaimardjī was renewed; in the West the Dniestr became the frontier between the two powers, whereas in the east the Porte undertook to bridle the Tartar tribes on the left bank of the Kūbān; the Crimea was definitely lost to the Turkish Empire.

Immediately after the war the Sultan took up the question of the reforms which he considered inevitable to restore the strength of his Empire. In the beginning of his reign he had already made an attempt in this direction by insisting on the application of the sanmār laws (on them see e. g. Meljmed (Chilib, Selim Şehbūn cîcī̧n ‘otusun imāmīn, in T.O.E.M., N°. 8, p. 500—504). Soon afterwards he invited a number of prominent and enlightened personalities belonging to the army, the administration and the 'ulamā to submit to him schemes of reform. All the projects were sent to the palace, and, as it seems, treated in a way which gave the anti-reform party the opportunity of turning them into ridicule and beginning its never ceasing propaganda against them (Dżewdet, Tērīh, vi., vii., here all the people who present a Lămîr are mentioned). The Sultan, however, proceeded with energy. The Dżenâzeh was enlarged to a body of about 40 members under the chairmanship of the Grand Vizier or the Mufti, according to the matters to be treated. The new regulations which were elaborated successively were called Şībūn—mnāšt or nişmāšt and the total of Sultan Selim's reforms is known as nişmāšt-i şefēd, which, word, however, is also especially employed for the new regular troops. One of the first measures was the foundation of a new treasury (trat-i şefēd) for the cost of the new institutions. It was formed by all available revenues and especially by confiscating a large amount of fiefs, the titularies of which had not fulfilled their military obligations (mahlīl alam ʿalāmāt wa-iṣnāḥārī; a special regulation for the investigating of these fiefs was made. By these and other reforms the financial base of the in-
ventions increased steadily. The first corps of regular army were formed from the Bostandji's new regular troops was formed from the Bostandji's new regular troops were destined for the protection of the Black Sea at the village of Belgrad Köy, where at that time a Russian invasion was feared. Large barrack was built for them at Lewend Cīfīlks,
where they were drilled, though it proved difficult to get volunteers. This first attempt was followed by a still larger establishment at Skutarı, where around the enormous Selimye barracks almost a new town with mosques and baths was created for the new troops. Other regulations concerned the provisioning of the army, the restoring of discipline among the Janissaries, the reorganisation of the Djebedji-corps and the artillery; to the reorganisation of this arm the French contributed considerably. Bonaparte is said to have had in 1794 the intention to put himself at the head of the Turkish artillery, and in 1796 the French ambassador Dubayet even brought with him to Constantinople a mounted artillery brigade. The reforming activity extended also to the improvement of the Bosporus fortifications, the building of new warships under the energetic direction of the Kapudan Paşa Kükçük Hüseîn [q. v.], Selim's foster-brother, the manufacture of gun-powder and the instruction of the officers. The engineering-school at Südülde in the harbour of Constantinople, founded under Abd al-Hamîd I, was also completely reorganised under French and English direction. Although a new navigation school was opened. Although the unfortunate experiences of the last wars made the people comply with all those innovations, there was, of course, a strong party opposed to them, consisting chiefly of the Janissaries and the adînîs, the more enlightened of whom, however, supported the reforms. As a measure of precaution not too many new troops were stationed on the European side of the Bosporus. It is a remarkable fact that, as the reforms proceeded, there was much less opposition to them in Asia than in Europe, where rebellious chiefs took them as a pretext for their taking arms against the government.

The peaceful period from 1792 to 1798 had made possible the taking of all these measures; even the two formidable rebels in Europe, Parzân-Oghlu [q. v.], who in 1792 had entrenched himself in Widdin, and 'Ali Paşa Tepedjenli [q. v.], who had become Paşa of Yanina in 1788 and failed in 1794 in his first expedition against the Suliotes, were comparatively quiet; Servia enjoyed the generous administration of the Paşa's Ebû Bekir and Hâsdijî Mustafa. During this time the Porte paid much attention to her relations with foreign powers; new ambassadors were sent to the European courts and in Constantinople a great diplomatic activity was displayed by the Re's Efendi Rasûl (d. 1798). The international situation became more and more influenced by the French Revolution. Although the execution of Louis XVI made a bad impression, especially on Selim, who had, even before his accession, been in correspondence with him, the emissaries of the revolutionary government (Descosse) succeeded in arousing sympathy, even in the İmâmut, they pointed, for instance, to the fact that, now that France had instituted the "culte de la raison," they were no more in religious opposition to the Muslims. They had influential helpers in Constantinople, e.g. the well-known Mounadze d'Olsnen, then Swedish dragoman, and from 1796 to 1799 Swedish minister, and had nearly induced Turkey to declare war to Russia.

The situation was completely changed by the French expedition against Egypt. In vain the French representative in Constantinople, Ruffin, tried to tranquillise the Porte about the peaceful intentions of his government; on September 4, 1798, war was declared on France and Ruffin was imprisoned, as were also the French consul and merchants. For the operations of the French in Egypt (they landed on July 1, 1798, after having taken Malta) see the article KÜLDİ; the action of Turkey was here much less important and much slower than that of England. On January 5, 1799, the Porte concluded an alliance with England and the first Turkish troops landed on July 25 in Abūkir, but they were compelled by Bonaparte to retreat to their fleet, after the French army had just returned from the siege of 'Akka, where Djazzâr Paşa in defending the town had shown himself for the time a faithful vassal of the Sultan. In the last part of that year a Turkish army of 80,000 men commanded by Dîyâ Yülsen Paşa, Grand Vizier since 1798 (Kodja Vâsi Paşa had been replaced already in June, 1792, by Melik Muhammed Paşa, to whom after 2½ years had succeeded Íşzet Muhammed Paşa), and containing about 4000 men of new regular troops had reached Syria where it was joined by Djazzâr's troops. The Turks took the little port of al-Attish on December 20 and at the same place the Grand Vizier concluded an armistice with General Kleber on January 28, 1800, in which the French promised to evacuate Egypt. But after the treaty had been broken by the English, Kleber attacked the Grand Vizier, who was advancing to Cairo, and defeated the Turkish army near the ruins of Heliopolis (March 20) after which the Turks retreated into the desert. Only a year afterwards, in March, 1801, the Turks participated again in the Egyptian campaign under the Kapudan Paşa Kükçük Hüseîn; this expedition resulted in the definitive evacuation of the country by the French and the occupation by British troops of Egypt. Turkey's other ally in this war was Russia. After a Russian fleet had already appeared in the Bosporus in September, 1798, an alliance treaty was concluded on December 23. The combined Turkish and Russian fleets then went to the west coast of Greece and expelled, in March 1799, the French from the Ionian Isles, which former possession of Venice had been left to France by Austria in the peace of Campo Formio (October 17, 1797). The Ionian Isles then were constituted a republic under protection of Turkey and Russia. In the meantime 'Ali Paşa of Yanina succeeded in occupying temporarily some sea-ports in Albania. Notwithstanding the Russian alliance, the relations with Russia remained strained. By the mediation of Prussia a preliminary peace was concluded with France in Paris on October 9, 1801, in which the complete sovereignty of Egypt over Egypt was recognised, as well as the new republic of the seven Ionian Isles; for the ratification of these preliminaries the famous Sebastiani was sent for the first time to Constantinople on an extraordinary mission. To the peace treaty of Amiens, where the same stipulations were confirmed (March 27, 1802), the Porte was no party; she concluded in June a separate peace with France. In the meantime the Grand Vizier and the Kapudan Paşa tried to restore order in Egypt by exterminating the great Mamlûk Baysa. As the latter were protected by the British, they did not succeed and in December returned to Constantinople leaving Khosrew Paşa as governor in Cairo; the evacuation by the English troops only followed in 1803, after on January 9 of that year an agreement had
been reached at Constantinople between the ambassador Lord Elgin and the Reis Efendi, in which the Porte pledged itself to pardon the Moslems.

The situation in the interior had been equally unsettled in these eventful years. Since the peace of Jassy bandit chiefs (Oṭūmān Paşa) had been terrorising Rumelia; they were patronised by influential people in Constantinople, enemies of the reforms, especially by Yâsun Ağa chief squerry of the Wâlide Seljûq. In 1797 Parşvân-Oğlu had taken possession of a large part of Bulgaria and, when an expedition against him under the Kapudan Paşa Hussein failed, the Porte had to comply with his claims and recognised him as Paşa with three nişâms. But soon afterwards Parşvân-Oğlu, who was protected by Austria, invaded Wallachia. (1801). The Porte then tried to restore order by appointing Ali Paşa of Yanın Beylerbey of Rumelia (1803); but in vain. The latter was suspected of having an understanding with Parşvân-Oğlu and was deposed again. In December, 1803, he then exterminated the little people of the Suliotes. In combating the Rumelian rebels that year the Porte derived great advantage from the use of the new nişâm-troops. Parşvân-Oğlu’s invasion of Wallachia gave Russia the opportunity of intervention in the Danube principalities. Under Russian pressure the Porte consented to a revision of the former settlements, which increased the autonomy of the principalities, and appointed Ypsilanti as heşzdar of Wallachia and Muruzi as heşzdar of Moldavia, both for seven years (1803).

In 1803 difficulties arose in Servia [q.v.] occasioned by invasions of Parşvân-Oğlu and the return of the Janissary chiefs or dâyîs, who had been expelled after the war with Austria. These troubles resulted in the rising of the Knezes under the famous Kara Georg in 1804. Neither Turkish troops nor the diplomacy of the Porte were able to subjugate the Servians in the next years; they had since 1805 their own constitution and were masters of the citadel of Belgrad since Dec. 12, 1806. In the same year 1803 Mecca fell into the power of the Wahhâbes (April 30), after nearly the whole of the Arabian peninsula had already recognised the authority of their chief ‘Abd al-‘Azîz (cf. R. Hartmann in the Z.D.M.G., 1924, p. 195). In the same year also Muḥammad ‘Ali [q.v.] came to the front for the first time who, after having broken the resistance of the Mamlûk Bey Bardîsî, was appointed in 1804 governor of Egypt.

After the May 1803, the war had broken out again between France and England, the Porte had decided to maintain a strictly neutral attitude, but she was put in a difficult position by France’s demand that she should recognise Nâpoleon as Emperor, from which, however, Russia's menaces withheld her. A personal letter of Napoleon to Selim was of no avail. Only in 1806, after in 1805 the alliance with Russia had been renewed, recognition followed. In 1805 General Sebastián had come as Napoleon’s ambassador to Constantinople and finally French influence prevailed. The Porte went so far as to depose the two resolute hospodars of Wallachia and Moldavia; the Cnr then ordered General Michelson to occupy the two principalities. Notwithstanding the resistance of Parşvân-Oğlu and Muṣṭafâ Shairşâd, the Paşa of Rusulâ, this order was completely executed in December, 1806. Under the influence of anti-Russian manifestations in Constantinople and Sebastián’s pressure war was declared on Russia (Dec. 31). Next month England came with exaggerated claims, e.g. the departure of Sebastián, enforced by the presence of the British fleet at Tenedos. When the Porte refused to accept, Admiral Duckworth entered the Dardanelles, scarcely meeting any resistance, and appeared on February 10, 1807, before the capital. After a moment of consternation, in which the Kapudan Paşa was executed, the defence of Constantinople was organised under the direction of Sebastián and French officers (Juchereau de St. Denis). As the British shrank from the responsibility of bombarding the town, they retired again, after fruitless negotiations, on March 4, and reached Tenedos with considerable losses. Immediately afterwards Turkey declared war on England. The English were no more successful in Egypt. Though an English fleet occupied Alexandria on March 17, they were beaten everywhere by Muhammad ‘Ali and had to evacuate the country in September.

In the meantime the interior political situation had passed through a grave crisis. After 1802 the reforms had been taken up again and in March, 1805, a Khaṣîf-Şerîf had ordered a general levy among the population for the nişâm-troops. This occasioned at last an open revolt of the Janissaries, who concentrated themselves in Adrianople and Kırk Kılise. They completely defeated the nişâm-troops which the government sent against them in August, 1806. The result was that the reforms had to be given up for the moment; it was due to the influence of the Muftî Süleyman Efendi [q.v.] that no worse things happened. The Grand Vizier Hâfiz İsmâ‘îl Paşa (succeeded in 1805 to Diyyâ Yâsun Paşa) was replaced by the Agha of the Janissaries, İbrahim Hilmi Paşa. The Porte did not even dare to send nişâm-troops against the Russians in Rumelia.

The successes against England had not restored the Sultan’s authority. On the contrary, the opposition had been still more alarmed by the influence of the French during the fortification of Constantinople. Though the reform party continued its work unstintingly, a plot was devised in order to depose Selim, the leaders of which were Muḥammad Paşa (so the name is given by Djedwedo; Zinkiesen and others have Musta Paşa), the Kâtip-Şehîd of the Grand Vizier Paşa (who himself had marched against the Russians), and the new Muftî Attâ‘üallah Efendi. They incited the rude auxiliary troops (called Yamaşlû), that were encamped on the Bosphorus, to rebellion. The rebellion broke out on May 15, 1807, because they refused to put on nişâm-uniforms; the leader of the rebels, Kâbiḳâli-Oğlu, pitched his headquarters at Büyük Dere. In the following days, while Muḥammad Paşa and the Muftî were calming the alarmed Sultan, the propaganda against him spread rapidly and a fortnight afterwards Kâbiḳâli went with his followers to Constantinople, provided with a list of all the notorious reform partisans. Nearly all these people were driven to the At Medîdin and killed. At this last moment the Sultan hoped to save his throne by a Khaṣîf-Şerîf abolishing the nişâm-şerîf. But his dethronement had already been decided. Next day, Râbi‘î 1 22, 1222 (May 29, 1807), the Muftî declared with regal relaxtance
to a deputation of the Yemenis that the deposition of Selim was lawful; after this, he himself went to inform Selim of the decision of the people. Selim, yielding immediately, retired and as he had no children, the elder of Sultans 'Abd al-Hamid's two sons, Mustafa, was placed on the throne as Mustafa IV [q.v.].

Selim's tragic death happened a year afterwards, when Mustafa Bairakdær [q.v.] marched with Constantinople with his own troops and those of the Grand Vizier Cælabi Musjaïf Pasha to reestablish the reforms and to restore Selim to the throne. On Dümâd 2 4, 1223 (July 28, 1808), Bairakdær entered with his troops the first court of the Seraglio, demanding Sultan Selim. Mustafa IV then ordered the execution of Selim, which had been postposed until that time, and that of his own younger brother Mahmut. Bairakdær came just too late to save the unhappy Sultan, who had been already killed when the Seraglio gates had been broken open. Then Mustafa's brother Mahmut was brought forth from his hiding place and put on the throne.

Selim III is described as a ruler of great gifts (cf. especially his methodology by Djevdet, viii. 263 sqq.). He wrote poems under the taqâbaa'lla ilhâmi and is said to have had musical talents. His seal for reform proves his high intelligence, but was checked by his inclination to occupy himself with the minutest details. He also seems to have been unable to tolerate powerfull characters in his immediate surroundings; during his 18 years' reign he had no less than ten Grand Viziers. Of the pious works he had carried out, are chiefly mentioned the silver gate for the türbe of Abh Ayyub Asref and the complete restoration of the mosque of Fethi. The greater part of his constructions were the barracks and schools for the reform projects.


SEMDKHANE, a Persian formation from the Arabic semid [q.v.] and Persian khane, the dancing hall or dancing room, i.e., the space in the monasteries devoted to the Sufi dances always held in observance by Muslim orthodox, to musâkele (moushekele) and to dâhte. Dancing and music are, as a rule, particularly associated with the Mawlawi. But the Bekkithi monasteries have also their semakhîhâma; the great old Bekkithi monastery of Seyyid-i Ghashi, for example, has three semâkhîhâma in one suite, in front of the türbe of Seyyid Bitârî. Cf. K. Wulsinger, Drei Bekkithi-Kloster-Farygmen, in die Beiträge zur Kümmernde, part 21, Berlin 1913, p. 32 and pass. Cf. also the Arabic, Persian and Turkish dictionaries. (Th. Miedel)

SEM, [see Sink].

SEMENNUD, a town in the Delta of Egypt, in the province of Gharbiya on the west branch of the Nile (Damietta arm), a railway station on the Tanja-Damietta line (11,550 inhabitants in 1884). The Arabic name is based on the Greek Saina (which gave its name to the Sennenau arm), in Coptic Senenmut and in ancient Egyptian Semennu. The ancient town was perhaps built on both sides of the river; in any case there is a little town opposite Semennud on the east bank of the Damietta arm called Mit (Minya). Semennud (4375 inhabitants in 1884), capital of a district (masâba) of the province of Dakhiliana, known from at least the sixth century A.D.

Succeeding the pagarchy of Semennutoy, the k pops of Semennud included an area not easy to define on account of the difficulty of identifying certain adjoining kâba's. It was bounded on the east by the Nile; to the south by the kâba of Banât and Busr (places which exist to this day); on the west by the kâba of al-Mi'âlah, which seems to correspond to the ancient Snawakh, even if we do not admit the phonetic relationship of the two words; and on the north by the kâba of al-Abyâd, which al-Ya'qubi identifies with al-Damia about 15 miles from Semennud. The Fâtimids and the Aybids had an independent province called Semennody, which was not much larger than the old kâba (109 villages against 105).

Semennud, which, according to a tradition preserved by Ibn Dujjat, was founded by an eponymous magician, a descendant of Lab, the son of Sam, had a temple which was destroyed about 550 (961) after having been used for a short time under Arab rule as a storehouse for fodder. It seems from a passage in the Jâchitine Synaxarium that this temple had suffered abuse before the days of Islam. Arab legends credit this temple with possessing a çokum of a dark complexion, with long hair and a short, bearded, and Maspero thinks that the Arabs were describing a statue of Osiris or Ptah, whose face was painted blue or green.

Coptic tradition records the passage of the Holy Family through Semennud during the flight into Egypt and locality a certain number of monasteries here. This town was the seat of the bishop still mentioned as late as the 16th century A.D. The town had a Coptic population which gave Egypt several Jacobite patriarchs, and Makrit, however, tells us that the principal church, dedicated to the Apostles, was in a private house.

Semennud was not on the line of march of the Arab army of invasion, which went from al-Farsa via Billis, and the Arab writers do not mention it in connection with the conquest of Egypt. John of Niki mentions that the local soldiery refused to fight the Muslims. Semennud is again mentioned in 1275 (750) on the occasion of a local revolt directed by a certain John (Yulamis), who was captured and put to death.
Semnun — Senegal

The town has been famous since the time of Yâkût for its manufacture of cotton goods. It is surrounded by a wall of clay and contains the ruins of several castles. There is also a 13th century bath (Jamiâ) and a fine minaret, of which the mosque is now a ruin in the centre of the bazaar. It is probably this mosque which is mentioned by al-Maqrizi (p. 356), although, according to Frasser, it cannot be older than the 13th century (Shar in Islam, xii. 170). At the present day the town has a fine mosque built by Fath 'Ali Shah. The population was estimated by Curzon in 1890 at under 16,000.

The dialect of Semnun, remarked upon even by Násir-i Khwarazm, has the reputation in Persia of being particularly unintelligible. Geiger (Grundriss d. iran. Phil., i. 421) connects it with the group of Caspian dialects. Christensen, who was the last to study the Semnun, reckons it among the numerous dialects of central and north-western Iran, the place of which in the general scheme cannot yet be definitely fixed.

Several traditionists and lawyers have the nisba Semnuni (Yâkût, loc. cit., and Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 373).


(II. H. Khâmêri)
Sénégas, etc.). To this day the Moors descended from the Šanlıdjı give the lower valley of the river the name of Isongan. It is probably from the name of the province that the word "Sennal" comes. Marmol further says that Lancelot du Lac, who visited the region in 1447, gave the river the name of a kingdom within which its mouth lay.

In any case in the form Senegal the name has been applied since the xvith century to the river which flows into the Atlantic about 120 miles north of Cape Verde and to the colony founded by the French in this part of Africa. This colony, the capital of which is St. Louis on the Senegal river and near its mouth, and which includes the town of Dakar, the capital of French West Africa, measures approximately 175,000 square miles and had (in 1921) 1,225,523 inhabitants of whom 5,287 were European and 1,820,216 were natives; of the latter, 1,221,791 belong to the negro race, 19,351 to the hybrid branch of the Fulbe or Ful and 7,094 to the white race (Moors). It is bounded on the north by the course of the river Senegal from the region of St. Louis up to the confluence of the river Falémé; in the east by the latter river from its mouth up to about 12° 40' N. Lat.; in the south by a line running from the upper Falémé to the ocean at Cape Roxo, a little south of the estuary of the Casamance. Inland there is a foreign enclave formed by the British colony of Gambia which consists of the two banks of the river Gambia from Varbutenda to the sea. Geographically the two colonies are sometimes included under the composite name of "Seneegambia".

Senegal was perhaps the first of all the negro countries of Africa to succumb to the attacks of Islam. It was in a hermitage built on an island of the lower Senegal that the religious movement of the Almoravids began about 1040 A.D. and the Almoravids won over to the Muslim faith about 1050 the sovereign and principal notables of the negro kingdom of the Takur or Tokoror, which lay in the present province of Senegal. Futa and the name of which slightly altered to the form Tucolor is still employed by the French to designate the negro inhabitants of this province. It was presumably soon afterwards, towards the end of the xith century, that Islam was introduced among the Sarakole or Soninke of the province of Galam, above Futa. Much later, towards 1770, the Tucolor clan of Torehbe preached the holy war against the pagan Fulbe, then in political control of Futa, a war which ended in 1776 with the defeat of the latter, the forced conversion to Islam of a great number of them, and the establishment at Futa in the hands of the Tucolors of a Muslim theocracy with an elected government which lasted till 1860, the time of the definite annexation of Futa to the French colony of Senegal. It is from this religious centre founded by the Torehbe of the Senegal. Futa that several great campaigns of conquest and Islamisation covering a very wide field, have started, notably about 1800, that led by Uthman Fodéye which ended in the conquest of the Hausa country and the foundation of the Muslim empire of Sokoto, and about 1845 that of 'Umar Tal, called al-Hadjji 'Umar, which ended from 1854-1862 is the conquest by the Tucolors of the dominions of Kaufa and Segu, and the Mandingo kingdom ofMasina. Meanwhile Islam had spread among a considerable part of the Mandingo peoples of the upper Faleme, of the upper Gambia and the upper Casamance. At a more recent period it was over almost all the Wolof of the lower Senegal river and of the lands to the south as far as Cape Verd. The other native populations of the colony (Serer, Non, Banyan, Balant, Dyola, Basi, etc.) are still faithful to their ancestral animism and resist Islam.

The statistics divide the native population of Senegal into 719,000 Muslims, 409,300 animists and 4,700 Christians. (M. Delaporte)

SENNER, a village on the Lower Euphrates, situated 15 miles E.S.E. of Warka [q.v.] on the mound of Tell Sīfū; it is built on the ruins of an ancient Chaldae city, Larsum, the town of the god Shamash; it is in the present Ḫūdī of Samawa.


(L. Masson)

SENN is written Sinna or Sinandji (diqf = dis "castle, fort"). The form Sinha leading to confusion with Senna [q.v.] is wrong.

1. Capital of the Persian province of Kurdistān, the ancient seat of the walls of Arbilān [q.v.]. For the period before the building of the present town see the article SINAK.

Under the year 988 (1550) the Shahr-i-Māne (I.) speaks of a fleet of Timūr Khan, Ardilān, including Ḥasanshāb, Sinna, etc., but the historian of Sennas attributes to Sulaimān Khan the building of the modern town on the site where a town already there. According to Rich, i. 208, the ancient Senna (?) was built on a flat hill to the south of the present town. The Persian ārābā for the building of the latter is Ḫānū ("woes") which gives 1046 (1636).

The town lies between the right bank of the Kīlāhak and Mount Awidar which separates Senna from the old capital Ḥasanshāb. The castle of the walls crowns the hill about 70 feet high which rises in the centre of the town. The principal decorations date from the walls Khusrav Khan I. and Amān Allāh I. Malcolm, Rich and Cirikov have given descriptions of the castle. The hall of honour of Amān Allāh Khan (ātār), covered with transparent marble with numerous figures and inscriptions (dated 1233 = 1815) formerly had a gallery of pictures representing the principal sovereigns of the world (Napoleon, Alexander I.), celebrated battles, etc. Another was still in 1918 decorated with eleven portraits of walls and their visitors. A beautiful panorama is revealed from the now ruined ātār on the mountain separating the valley of the Kīlāhak ("winter grazing") from the plain of Līlāh (yaylak, "summer grazing").

The population of Senna in 1820 (Rich) was 4,500 families of whom 2,000 were Jews and 50 Chaldeans. In 1851 Cirikov counted 10,000 houses. The census of 1895 (1878) gave the figures of 5,484 houses and 24,744 inhabitants. In 1918 the number of inhabitants was about 30,000 with 500 households of Jews and 60 of Christians, Aramaic-Catholic (Chaldeans) and Armenians. There is a Turkish consulate-general at Senna. Senna is a busy centre of trade. The exporters are gall-nuts (māža), tragacanth (battra), skins of the fox, marten and wolf, cattle and carpets of a special design.
The province of Sena (Persian Kordištān in the strict sense) is bounded on the north by southern Ardabīlābād (cf. the art. SAWIDHALA), in the N.E. by Şā‘in-Ka‘a (q.v.), in the E. by Bīdār (Gareh), in the S.E. by Hamadān, in the S. by the province of Kirmānšāh and more especially by its division: Ŝūnkār, Daimawar, Bālū-Durandās, Māhidštād and Zohāb; in the E. Kurdistān of Sena is bounded by the former Turkish districts: Shahr-i Zūr (Halabeh and Karmal = Ga‘mālbar), Fendjīn and Zilbūlāt. Within these boundaries the land of Sena with the exception of Şā‘īkiz (q.v.), and Bāna, now attached to Ardabīlābād, has an area of about 75,000 square miles; except for the principal routes the province is insufficiently explored. In the N.E. and S.E. we have high plateaus devoid of trees; the centre cut up by numerous narrow valleys sloping down to the E., where we find forests (oaks, nut-trees, elms and beeches).

The main group of mountains is formed by the massif of Chīl-Čahma (about 12,000 feet); it begins in Persia at the eastern extremity of the enclave of Šūlāz which runs deeply into Persian territory. Towards the south the Chīl-Čahma sends out a prominent spur which forms the barrier of Kārān on the Senna-Mahmūn road (see below). The continuation of the Chīl-Čahma to the east forms the southern boundary of the basin of the Djaghān which turns northward towards Lake Urmīya. To the N.E. of the Chīl-Čahma is the frontier district of Haftešā with its capital Şā‘īkiz and watered by the main branch of the Djaghātūl. In the S.E. of the Chīl-Čahma are the sources of the Khordahiār, the first important tributary of the Djaghātūl on the right bank. A little below their junction the river of Tīlākū flows into the Djaghātūl; its valley is separated by the mountain Tandūrtū (?) from the next tributary which is called Sārūkhā.

In this valley there are three districts of Sena: i. Khordahiār with 8,000 inhabitants and 50 villages of which the chief are: Basī, with a mosque built in 929 (1527) and Mawlānābād; 2. Tīlākū (with the canton of Kočān), 4,240 inhabitants and 24 villages of which the best known is Bāb-hansh; 3. Karafīt on the left bank of the Sārūkhā; 4,600 inhabitants, 15 villages. The Ashfārā of Şā‘in-Ka‘a encroach upon Karafīt.

To the south of Khordahiār and Tīlākū are the northern sources of the Kīšl-Ūzn (in Kurdish Kīšl-awān) which run into the Caspian Sea. The plateau through which these waters flow is covered with snow for four months of the year but in the summer is covered with rich pasturage. Three cantons administered together and including 82 villages are situated here. 4. Kar-tawāra in the N. (village Bāb-harā); 5. Hābūtān in the S. (villages of Kelekwā and Dwandarā) and 6. Sārūkh to the east of Hūbūl. The southern bank of the Kīšl-Ūzn also has its sources in the territory of Sena but the fork between the two branches, north and south, is occupied by the basin of Kīshlak, the waters of which run eastward.

The basin of the southern sources of the Kīšl-Ūzn is situated to the S.E. of Sena on the Senna-Hamadān road. It is a large plain sloping north-east, watered by numerous streams and having an altitude of 6,200—6,600 feet. The pass of Kar-ghāb-Salawānbād (8,500 feet) separates it from Sena (3,578 feet); to the south, the pass of Mū‘īn-Muhammad separates it from the plain of Hamadān; to the east, it is bounded by the low chain of Panjā-’i ‘Abla behind which lies the district of Ŝūnkār (Songhor). This chain (‘Abla's five fingers’) corresponds to the Kūh-i Panjā Angūt mentioned in the Nuzhat al-Kullā, ed. le Strange, p. 209. To the N.E. the mountain of Talvāntu forms the frontier of Bīdār. The principal source of the south branch of the Kīšl-Ūzn is called Talvānt (Tarwā) or Arzand; its tributary from the south is called Ḥāḍidjāt (Agā-čal, "bitter water"). The Talvānt waters the district of 7. Eīlāk (Kurdl. Lēllīgh), noted for the coolness of its climate and having 80 villages with 12,000 inhabitants. The Ḥāḍidjāt waters the district of 8. Isfandībād (isfandī “lycopodiam”), 94 villages with 14,000 inhabitants; the old capital of Isfandībād is Kūkā; its present centre is Kōrkā. Khanyov visited in these regions the tomb of Bābā-Šīrūk, near which is a sulphurous spring and quarries of translucent marble (halgūn). This saint, Djamal al-Dīn, bears the same sobriquet (Persian gūr-gūr, "coming in torrents") as the well known Bābā Šīrūk of Kūrk, on whom see W. Schweer, Die türkisch-persischen Erdgasvorkommen, Hamburg 1919, p. 10.

The central part of the province is much more undulating and less well known; it is bounded on the west by the mountains forming the Persian frontier (the Avarānān chain). All the streams of this area are carried off by the river Sirwan (see the art. TURALK) which makes its way westwards by the formidable defile separating the mountains of Awarān from those of Şīlāz. Although Hausenmehrt mentions a village of Sirwan near the confluence of the Kīshlak and Gāwārd, the great river of Sirwan only has this name below the defile of Avarānān.

Two main arms form the Sirwan, one coming from the east and the other from the north. The eastern branch is called Gāwārd (Gābārūd) and rises near the pass of Aasādābād. It flows first through the lands of Şīrat (Sonqhor) and then waters the districts of Sena south of the capital. From the right the Gāwārd receives its important tributary the Kīshlak which rises in the fork between the two arms of the Kīšl-Ūzn. On the left it receives waters rising in the Murwāt, the Paflan, Gāwārd (q.v.) etc. The lower course of the Gāwārd is given on the maps as hypothetical.

In this valley there are the following districts: 9. Hausnābād on the Kīshlak above Sena, with 34 villages and 5,000 inhabitants; 10. Hausnābād with 32 villages and 5,500 inhabitants which form the immediate neighbourhood of Sena. The district takes its name from the ancient capital Hausnābād, a stronghold on a considerable height 6 miles S.E. of Sena. 11. Zāwarī with 58 villages must lie near the confluence of the Kīshlak and Gāwārd. The canton of Şīsrū with the village of Fāshlulauin (on the Kirmānshāh road) seems to belong to the same district. The 12th district, Paflan, must be farther down along with 13. A miyrābād and Bīlāvar which are said to have 35 villages with 5,000 inhabitants. Paflan has an ancient ruined stronghold in which had lived an independent chief of the tribe of Şāhīr; the chiefs of whom are given in the Skasar-nāme (l. 317—318).

The new English map places Paflan on the Gāwārd at the mouth of the river that comes from the villages of Şāhīm and Lūhon (Lūn) on the northern slopes of the Šīrīt. 15.

THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM, IV.
The northern branch of the Sirwan is formed by a fan-shaped series of stream; the topography of several of them is still uncertain.

After these rivers join one another, they flow into the Gwarrīd near the village of Abbāsābād in the Awarāmān-i Takht.

Four districts lie in the northern basin of the Sirwan. 14. Kālāt-Atariin with 64 villages and 10,000 inhabitants immediately west of Senna. 15. Kōrrawār, with 20 villages and 2,500 inhabitants, may be located on the south of the Senna-Gāzān road. Lycklama praises the beauty of the landscape in this wooded district. 16. Marīwān (formerly Mihribān), an important district with 200 villages and 26,000 inhabitants which stretches east of the pass of Gūrān up to the western frontier of Persia. The great Senna-Gāzān-Pendjīn-Pallāmānā road crosses it. Its capital is occupied by Lake Zarāh; this depression in the frontier range has always been of great strategic importance. 17. Awarāmān-i Takht (the "A. plain") lies east of the chain of the same name and is immediately south of Marīwān. The northern arm of the Sirwan crosses it from north to south. It is an inaccessible district governed by its hereditary sulṭān's ("captains"). Their capital is Kāsān. The district includes 33 villages with 4,000 inhabitants. The people of A. have preserved their own particular costume from early times (Rich, op. cit., i. 202) and still use their own dialect. They are very brave but not hospitable. 18. Awarāmān-i Luḥān lies S.W. of the preceding. According to the natives, luḥān means "rocky" (cf. Vallers, op. cit., ii. 1108, luḥāna "rock"). The district has 22 little villages buried among the spurs of the mountain to the north of the defile of the Sirwan. It occupies the western face of the chain and its frontier with Turkey is much complicated. A. Luḥān is also governed by its sulṭān's, who are related to those of A. Takht and live in Nafūd. In 1699 (1659) the Turco-Persian treaty confirmed the rights of Persia to Awarāmān and Marīwān, but Persian sovereignty was only nominal. To the south of the Sirwan running N.W. to S.E. as usual with Persian mountains, lies the great massif of Shāhā (cf. Shāhā-Kūh) from which descend the hill tributaries of the Sirwan: Dāryūn, Sarābī Hāwīt watering Pāva, Lēla and the oriental sources of the Zīkānān. The important district to the north and south of the Shāhā (between the Sirwan and the district of Zohāb) is called Djawānārd and has about 100 villages with 15,000 inhabitants. It is governed by a collateral branch of the Ardīlān family. Djawānārd is the principal centre of the great Djāf tribe and its name may be explained as Djāfānārd ("the river of the Djāf"). The little canton of Pāwa dependent on Djawānārd lies opposite Awarāmān-i Luḥān. The Shāfāf-nāme (i. 319) mentions "Bāva" among the possessions of the Kāhūr-i Dariāng. Local tradition attributes the foundation of Pāwa to Bāw, surnumerous ancestor of the Bāwāndīs (cf. above, Bāwānd) and the Arabs, led by ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar, are said to have entered Kurdīstān via Pāwa where there was a sacred fire.

The canton of Shādābād (in Kurd. Shālikwā) on the road from Kirmānšāh is governed from Rawānīsar. Bilāwār is on the direct Senna-Kirmānšāh road, to the south of the Murwān pass. Its waters flow into the Rāzwār river which belongs to Kirmānšāh. Its principal village in Kāmī-ī Yāna.

The population of the province, according to the census of 1298 (1881), was about 150,000 in about a thousand villages. With the exception of the district of Isfandārī, inhabited by Persian and Turkish elements and the tribes of Awarāmān belonging to a particular Iranian stock, the population is Kurdīstān.

The nomads of Senna are following the general course of evolution towards a settled or semi-settled life: in the winter they remain in their villages and in summer after the harvest (April-May) they go up to the neighbourings heights; thus, for example, the Kūrmi tribe seems to have become definitely settled at Kūrrawār.

The tribe of Dāf is the most important among those of Kurdīstān of Senna. There are about 4,000 families of Dāf on the Djawānārd which represents a total of at least 20,000 men (Kūshād, Enakāh, Kallāh, Ulad-begi sections etc.). In the xviijth century a part of the Dāf migrated to the west and gradually occupied the left bank of the Djawār, in the region of Pendjīn. Towards 1914 these Turkish Dāf numbered 10,000 families. Of this number about 2,000 are settled and 8,000 are semi-nomadic and go every year to the pastures of Persia. They go by the enclave of Shīfār by which they reach the Cihīl-Cūmān mountains where they pass the time from May to October. Another migration from Djawānārd took place about 1850 when some 150 families of the Dāf settled on the Zoḥāb under the protection of the Gūrān.

The other important tribes of Senna are the Mandu or Husainābād and their neighbours, the Gūrmānī, at Hāštā, Sarāī and Kān-tawāra. The first-named numbered 2,000 families (in 1286 A.H.) and the latter about 3,000. The two tribes are very turbulent and the central government frequently sends expeditions to punish them. Less important are the Shāhī-Ismaʿīlīs (1600 families) and the Parišk (1000) at Isfandābād. At Lālgāh ("summer pasture") we have the Tāmut-tūza (300), the Kūlā (1500), the Lēla (500), the Malkī Hāwīt (400), the Badwānd (1500) and the Dūrād (1200). A section of the two last-named tribes lends a nomadic life on the Kūshāk and the Gūrān. The tribe of Zawānd and Kālāt-Aramān we have the Kōl (1500) and at Bīlāwār the Gashīkh (1500), a very turbulent tribe. To the north-east, along the Karafteh the Bāsāk lead a nomadic life (450) and a number of tribes lead a scattered existence: the Sakūr (300), the Gīva-kash ("cobblers") and the Kāhār ("turners") and the Līru-i Kūlāghā ("hatters"). These last tribes (1700), whose names give their professions, are rather associations of workers, "travelling guilds", serving the needs of nomads and settled tribes.

In conclusion we may mention quite near Senna the village of Kūshāk occupied by the Sūrmān whose men are musicians and women dancers of rather light morals (Lycklama, iv. 53).

Religion. The great majority of the population of Kurdīstān of Senna belong to the Sunni Shāfi'
The Shakhs of the Naqshbandi religious order have many devoted followers among the Kurds; the real hereditary centre of these Shakhs is in the villages of Tawila and Biyara which form a enclave in Awraman-I Divan. Even in Senna, Lycklama (iv. 51) says he saw a Shakhs holding a seance, cured sores which his dervishes inflicted upon themselves in the course of their esoteric meeting (alhik). Shiks are only found in the non-Kurdish district of Isfandabid. It may, however, be noted that the family of walis of Ardilin professed the Shiks, which perhaps is explained by the sojourn which their ancestors had made among the Gurans who were fervent 'Ali-Ishis. The great sanctuary of the latter sect, Perdwor, is on the right bank of the Swaran at Awraman-i Lahin (above the Prdi-kuran bridge). The people of Haji-k (in the same district) claim to be descended from the seven dervishes whom the Kuska (kusa =‘beardless’), who is buried in this village, had brought with him. This saint is said to be no other than 'Abi Salih Allah, brother of the eighth Shik. According to the people of Awraman, the people of Haji-k were much later in being converted to Islam by a certain Gushahis; they still venerate the tomb of Pir Shifryan, their religious chief before they adopted Islam. A manuscript hook (in the local dialect) of his moral precepts is said to be preserved at Nafsd. The very costume of these peaceable woodcutters suggests to eminent particularities. Lycklama speaks of their bonnet in the shape of a cornet bent back behind, quite like the head-dress... of one of the personages on the bas-reliefs of Bisutin.

The only Christians (60 families) are in the town of Senna. These are for the most part Aramaic Catholics (Khudum) whose head is the patriarch of Masalah. They have a church built about 1840 on the site of an old church. The Jews are more numerous: 500 families in Senna and small groups in the villages. 

Language: The Makti Kurl dialect (Kurmanjij) stops at Banu and Sakkii. To the south of the Diaghlat in the Khorkora and Tilakului districts the Kurdsi dialect begins and continues to the southern frontier of the province. Its linguistic particularities still await systematic study. The language of Mariwan like that of the Diyak closely resembles Kurmanjij.

A non-Kurdish Iranian dialect is spoken in the two Awramans. It is called Awramani or, more popularly Amnu ("I say" in Awraman). To the same group belong the language of certain villages of Pawa, that of the great tribe of Gurant (on the Zohab), that of the village of Kandula (between Dalanaw and Kirmishman) etc. In the heart of Armenia in the district of Davit the "Zaza" dialect is related to the Zazi dialect according to Scharmann (Die Turken im Mittelalter der Provinzen Tan, Berlin 1900, p. 51), all these dialects can be classed with the "central" dialects of Persia (Samaniu, Khorruit, Mahallitian, etc.). We have no original Kurdish texts from Senna, but the Awramani-Guranti dialects have a whole literature of lyric and epic poetry. The walis of Ardilin particularly encouraged at their court the production of this dialect poetry which has certainly passed beyond the limits of the people speaking these dialects. It is curious that "to sing" in Senna Kurdish is Guranti larin "to recite Guranti poetry". The Chaldeans and the Jews of Senna speak their Aramaic dialects in addition to Kurdish. 

History: There are no monuments like those of Kirmanshah or even of Kurdistân-Murk (see the art. SAWL-I-BULSCHAR) in Senna. For the oldest period we may mention the chamber cut out of the rock near Ramshar (Cirks in 1. p. 528); it seems to belong to the same category of monuments as the sepulchres (Median?) of Shana [q.v.]. Its entrance has the typical rectangular form but its ceiling is vaulted. At the other end of the territory of Senna (N. E.) are the caves of Karsift, which seem (Ker Porter, ii. 538—552) to have been used for the Mithraic worship. The Greek inscription there is an invocation of Heracles. The caves lie off the usual route, but at the period when Garsa (al-Sëk of the Arabs, the modern Takht-I Sulaimân) flourished they must have led to its sanctuary (the fire-altar Aschargashap.

As to the ancient toponymy, Streek, Billerbeck and Thuren-Dangin have collected the Assyrian references to Persian Kurdistân. Unfortunately no concordance of modern names has so far corroborated their hypotheses.

The leases in Greek and Pahlavi found about 10 years in cave Mount Qüläin (Awraman-i Takht) and going back to the first century B.C., mention names which may refer to the locality where the find was made (the hyparchies: Baqutu and Balakyan, the stations-stazam: Balakyan and Dastaklan and the village-kom: Khuzi or Kukuj). The ingenious identification of Median places mentioned in Ptolemy (vi. 2) proposed by F. C. Andrews refer to territories outside of the modern Senna. For the Arab period the word ‘sasan. Kurdistän of Senna and Ardilin [q. v.] were for at least four centuries governed by hereditary walis. Their legendary history makes them originate in the Sassanid or early ‘Abbasid period. The Shinar-nama only says that Bahl Ardilin, a descendant of the Marwinds of Diyyar-bakr, had settled among the Gurans and towards the end of the Mongol period became governor of Shahr-I Zor. According to Rich (i. 214), the walis of Senna were of Gurani origin (of the clan Mamal). Their history became better known from the time of Ma’mun b. Monther to whom the historian ‘Ali Akbar gives the date 862—900 A.H. The walis took an active part in the struggle between the Safavids and the Ottoman Saltans, sometimes on the Persian side and sometimes on the Turkish. The Shinar-nama stops at the reign of Halh-Khan (halili "eagle" in Kurd.) oscillating between the two rival empires (994—1014). Local historians continue the tradition to our day.

With only slight interruption the Ardilin family retained authority throughout the Safavid period when the four western frontier districts enjoyed a semi-independence: ‘Arabshah (the ‘Abi Salt’s walis of Husseina), Luristan, Kurdistân and Georgiua. During the Afghan invasions Khâna Pasha Bâbân of Sulaimiya seized Senna in 1132. The coming of ‘Nâder brought back to Senna Sabzân Wardî Khân Ardilin (1143—1160 with interruptions). In 1164 Karim Khan Zand laid waste the district of Senna. After a period of troubles Khusraw Khan Ardilin (surnamed the "Great") settled at Senna (1168—1204). Agha Muhammad ‘Kâdîr as a reward for his exploits assigned Sunkar (Kulyât) to him. His son Amâk Allah "the Great" (1214—1240) much improved the town. Malcolm and Rich were his guests. His son Khusraw Khan Na-kân ("not having enjoyed life" i.e. died young) succeeded him.
(1240–1250); he is celebrated for his literary abilities. Under his son Rida-Khâlîf quatrils broke out in the family. The wall (1250–1260) was imprisoned at Ţeberdân whence he only escaped after the death of Muhammed Shâh. His brother Amân Allâh (1265–1284) was the last hereditary wall of Kurdistan. In 1851 Čirikov was a witness of the intervention by the central government in the affairs of the province under the pretext of discontent among the subjects of the wall. In 1284 (1868) the energetic prince Tarâhî Mirzâ was appointed governor-general from Ţeberdân. He ruled Senna till 1291 and restored order to the ancient lust of the Ardlân. Their descendants still exist in Senna but are now of no importance. On the other hand the old families who held office at the court of the walls continue to play a prominent part in local life.


SENNAR. Modern Sinnar is a village situated on the Blue Nile about 170 miles south of Khartum. It is the seat of a District Commissioner, and the headquarters of an administrative district of the Blue Nile Province. The district has a population of about 50,000, which is composed of a mixture of Sudân tribes and Fellata immigrants from West Africa. The Sinnar dam, which irrigates a large cotton growing area, is situated at Makwar, about six miles to the south of Sinnar village.

The older usage which extended the name of Sinnar to the triangular territory between the Blue and the White Nile with undefined borders in the south is obsolete, and the country in question now forms the Blue Nile Province and the Fung Province of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan.

The discovery of pre-historic remains at Gebel Moya and of Meriotic finds near Sinnar itself shows that the district has been inhabited since a remote period, but historically Sinnar has only been of note as the seat of the Fung [q.v.] Sultanate, which formed the most important political organisation in the Eastern Sudan from the sixteenth to the beginning of the nineteenth century, and the foundation of Sinnar itself is connected by native chroniclers with the establishment of this kingdom in A.D. 1504. The semi-barbaric dynasty, known to natives of the Sudân as the
The Sennar, or Senor, was a province of the Mahdi in Sudan, which was destroyed by the Mahdists in 1885. The palace and mosque erected by the Fung kings was already in ruins at the time of Cail-land's visit.

Modern Sennar is about a mile and a half distant from the ruins of the old town. It is now of comparatively small importance, and its place as a centre of trade and administration has been taken by Wad Medani.

Bibliography: The literature quoted is in the bibliography of the article Fung, to which may be added: H. A. MacMichael, A History of the Arabs in the Sudan, Cambridge, 1922 (contains in vol. ii. a translation of the Sennar Chronicle with explanatory notes, as well as a full bibliography); S. Hillelson, Tahaqat Wad Daaf Alih, studies in the lives of the scholars and saints, in Sudan Notes and Records, vol. vi., 1923.

(SEPOY) is the English corruption of spahi, the adjective formed from the Persian word sipah, "army". Sipahi is used substantively for "member of an army, soldier", and occurs in literary Persian, though it is no longer current in the modern language. The Turks and the French have borrowed the word, the latter in the form spahi, and in these languages as well as in Persian it invariably means a horse-soldier, in which sense it is used by the English traveller Hedges (Diary, ed. Hakluyt Society, l. 55) in 1682. In India both the French and the British adopted the word, which seems to have reached them through the Portuguese, the former writing it sipaio or coppah, and the latter aspi, sepey, sepeh, sepeh, sepey, etc., but there both nations have applied it since the beginning of the eighteenth century to natives of India trained, armed and clad after the European fashion as regular infantry soldiers. Regiments of sepoys were first raised and employed by the French. In 1748 Duplex raised several battalions of Muslim infantry, armed in the European fashion, and in 1759 Lally wrote to the Governor of Pondicherry: "De quinze mille cipayes, dont l'armée est censée composée, j'en compte à peu près huit cent sur la route de Pondichéry". Stringer Lawrence soon imitated Duplex in forming regular battalions of sepoys in Madras, and in 1757 a force of sepoys accompanied Lord Clive when he left Madras in order to recover Calcutta. The military establishment of Bengal had consisted of one company of artillery, four or five companies of European infantry, and a few hundred natives armed in their European fashion, but after the recovery of Calcutta from the Nawabi Sarafidj al-Dawla a force of Madras sepoys was used to form the nucleus of an army for Bengal, and 2,000 sepoys fought at the battle of Plassey in June, 1757. About the same time sepoys were raised and employed in Bombay, and European adventurers in native states raised and drilled battalions of sepoys for their masters.

In 1795 the infantry of the three Presidency armies was organised in regiments of two battalions each, each battalion consisting of eight battalion and two grenadier companies. Of such regiments Bengal possessed twelve, Madras eleven, and Bombay four, with an additional marine battalion. Henceforward the three armies grew on divergent principles and with different organisations. The
Seyop Mutiny of 1857 shattered the old Bengal army and seriously affected that of Bombay, but both were reconstituted and remodelled. Early in the twentieth century Lord Kitchener, then commander-in-chief in India, formed the three Presidency armies into one Indian army.


SER. [See SEK.]

SERAiL. [See SEKYY.]

Seray (P.). This word which is derived from an old Persian form *srda (from the root *arî "to protect") has in Persian the general meaning of dwelling, habitation. The Arabic word sarâbah "tent" has been borrowed from a diminutive in ֕ from *srâda (Horn, Grundzüge der neupersischen Etymologie, Strassburg 1895, p. 199).

We frequently find in Persian the word seräy compounded with another substantive to indicate a particular kind of building, like kârwân-serây (cf. the art. KâRWâN). In Persian mystic poetry serây is an expression for the terrestrial world, the temporary abode of man (cf. SîFîN). It is in Turkish lands that serây has come to mean particularly the seat of government (like the Turkish word bâsâlim) and the residence of a prince, a palace. From this meaning come the names of towns in Tatar countries and in Turkey called simply serây (cf. the articles SâKYY and SERAYVO) or compounded with serây (Aq-Serây etc.). In Turkey the serây par excellence was the serây-i Humâyûn of Top Kâfî in Constantinople (q.v.).

In Arabia the form sarâya is used for palace in the 1001 Night. The Italian loanword seraglio and the French serai are sometimes found with the meaning harem but this limitation of meaning is not Oriental.

SERAYVO, Turk. Bosna. Serai or simply Serai (cf. the art. Bosna SâRAI), capital of Bosna in the Southern Slav states, picturesque situated on the Mijâyâk in a valley open to the west enclosed on other sides by high and rocky hills, 1730—2277 feet above sea-level, with 60,087 inhabitants (1921) (of whom one third are Muslims); they mainly live by local industries (copperware, silver-filigree, carpets and tobacco). In the xvth century we find in place of Serayvo the powerful fortress of Vrhbošna, part of which still survives in the modern citadel of Serayvo. Even in the xvth century Serayvo was still generally known as Varbosnia. The place is first mentioned in the Christian period in 1379 as the residence of Ragusan merchants and again in 1415 as the burial-place of the voivod Paul Radenović. The Turks saw the admirable situation of the place and chose it as the military centre of the conquered district when they captured Bosna under Mehmed II in the spring of 867 (1453); tradition records as the name of the alleged leader, Girîy Kâh (Hâdîddir Girîy Kâh, d. 871 = 1463), who was also buried near Serayvo (cf. Die frühosmanischen Jahrhücher der Uradh, ed. by F. Babinger, Hanover 1925, p. 120, 4-5, and F. Giese, Die altosman. anonymen chroniken, i, Breslau 1924, p. 113, 4-5; ii. [German trnsl], Leipzig 1924, p. 150 [Abb. f. u. K. d. Mevangles, xvii]). We already find here as early as 1438 and 1439 a Turkish governor who had been appointed to control the tributary native dynasts. After the final conquest of Bosnia by the Ottomans the Turkish governor of Bosnia ruled at Vrbosna which name was retained, as the journals of Petrušin and Benedict Karpišić (1530; cf. B. Carpisch, Iterinarii der Botschaftersie, ed. by E. Lamberg, Schwaben, Innsbruck 1910, p. 33 sqq.; Verchbossen) and the Ragusan correspondence (cf. J. Gelisich and L. v. Thallöczy, Ragusa und Magyarszeg, Budapest 1857, p. 670 [1513]; Verbasaria) show. forms like Verchbossen, Vrbosna, Verchbossen etc. are also found. About the middle of the xvth century, however, the name Bosna Sâraî ("Palace on the Bosna"), Slav. Sarajvo, Ital. Seraglio, Seralo (cf. G. di Pietro Lencari, Capitale della nobiltà e degli insediamenti, Venice 1605, p. 17: il castello di Paris-Bosna, da cui correva la città di Sarato), appeared and gradually drove out the older name. Serayvo is found in 869 (1464) in a wakif-nâme as Mekhmed-i Serâyvo. The name Bosna Serai or simply Serai comes from the palace which Mehmed II built after the capture of the town, on the site of the khünkâr hümmât (Imperial mosque, Careva Jamiyya) (cf. Ewliya, v. 428; J. v. Haumer, Russin und Bosna, Vienna 1812, p. 160). Under Ottoman rule Serayvo increased in importance, particularly because it was the residence of the governors of Bosnia (cf. C. v. Peer, Die osman. Statthalter in Bosnien in der Wissenschaft. Mitteilungen aus Bosnien etc., ii. 344 sqq., Vienna 1894), who did much to beautify the town and transformed it into a Maltsian city between 900 and 1000 A.H. Numerous mosques, madrasas and baths were built, some very splendidly equipped, like the foundations of Gâzî Khâs Pasha (1506/1512 and 1520/1542) which are still kept in existence to-day. Gâzî Khâs Pasha (cf. and the document in Cod. Turk. 260 of the Saxon National Library in Dresden) is buried in Serayvo (cf. Ewliya, Sevâhat-nâme, v. 441, and Wissenschaft. Mit- tellungen aus Bosnien, i. 503 sqq.). Although after the definitive conquest of Bosnia the residence of the Turkish governor was moved from Serayvo to Banyaluka, the former retained its importance. Apart from a brief interruption by Prince Eugène's occupation of the town in October, 1697, which lasted a few hours only, Turkish rule lasted 415 years in Serayvo. On Aug. 18, 1789, the town was taken by the Austrian Artillery General, Josef Freiherr von Philippovich (1818—1859) after a sharp fight and incorporated in the Danube monarchy. On Oct. 6, 1908, the annexation with the consent of the Powers was proclaimed. On June 28, 1914, the Austrian heir, the Archduke Franz Ferdinand, was assassinated here. After the collapse of the Danube monarchy in 1918 Serayvo with Bosnia and Herzegovina passed to the newly formed Southern Slav State.

Serayvo which is the residence of a Muslim Baîa al-Ulumd which has a Sherîf school, has a number of buildings from the Muslim period. Among the eight mosques, all of the xvth century, of which Ewliya Celebi (xvith century) mentions the mosque of Ferhâd Pasha (built 966 = 1561), of Khusraw Pasha (built 937 = 1530),
SERBEDÄRS, the name of a line of robber chiefs who made themselves masters of a considerable part of Khurásán; their subjects are also known as Serbedärs. This state, a regular republic of brigands, in which military considerations and the influence of Shī᾽i dervishes predominated, was formed during the troubles that succeeded the death of the Ilkhān Abū Saʿīd; it collapsed before the great Timur. The name Serbedār, which one might translate "gallows-bird" (or perhaps better "desperado"), goes back, according to the historian Khwānd-amīr, to a saying of the first chief, 'Abd al-Razzāk: "Ba mardī 'sur-i hādāh hār dāyān hār hādāh bā tārīk bih hā nāmardī ba hā hāt ra-sūdan" ("courageously venturing to be hanged is a thousand times better than being killed as a coward"). Dawlat-shāh, Taḏkhirat, ed. Browne, p. 278, gives, however, a different explanation of the origin of the name. According to Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, the Serbedārs were called in the Fārāb: Shafiʿī (robbers) and in the Fārāb: Maghīrī: Sahīra (birds of prey, falcons). Their capital was Sābzevar in the district of Bāihāk. The first Amir Serbedār, 'Abd al-Razzāk, was the son of an 'Alīd, Shīhāb (or Tādī) al-Dīn Fadl Allāh Bāštunī, a former official of the Shīh o Dūqwān.

'Abd al-Razzāk was able to gain the favour of the Ilkhān Abū Saʿīd (d. 736/1335) who gave him a public appointment. Appointed to administer the taxes of Khurásan, 'Abd al-Razzāk spent all the tribute he received; but the death of the Mongol prince took place in time to get him out of his difficulty. He went to Bāštunī (a village in the district of Bāihāk), his former abode, where he collected a band of adventurers and malcontents, with the object of becoming independent sovereign of a part of Khurāsān. He had first of all to fight with the vizier 'Alī al-Dīn Mahīyād Fārūymādī, then all-powerful in this country; the latter was defeated and killed in 737 (1335/1337). After the death of 'Alī al-Dīn, 'Abd al-Razzāk seized the town of Sābzevar (738) which became the headquarters for the Serbedār chief's brigandage. According to Dawlat-shāh, he also conquered Dūqwān, Asfarnān, Dījadram, Biyār and Khiṣājān. In 738 (1337/1338) in the month of Safar (accord. to others in Dīn 'l-Ḥijāţa) 'Abd al-Razzāk died, assassinated by his brother Wadīǧī al-Dīn Masʿūd, who succeeded to the throne. The Oriental authors, even those who, like Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, are not prejudiced against the Shīʿī Serbedārs, represent 'Abd al-Razzāk as a tyrannical and unjust ruler, the opposite of his brother Masʿūd. The latter, according to them, only killed him in legitimate self-defence. The romantic details that are given of the death of the first Serbedār prince have a very apocryphal look; probably the historians have only repeated the character of 'Abd al-Razzāk to excuse Masʿūd's fratricide. The latter, the second Serbedār chief, took the title of Sultān (Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, ed. Defrémery and Sanguinetti, iii. 65/66), and had warlike ambitions of further extending Serbedār rule. An ardent Shīʿī — Ibn Baṭṭūṭa tells us that the Serbedārs at that time intended to exterminate the Sunnīs in Khurāsān — he attached the dervish Hasan Dūqwī to his person, who for political reasons had been thrown into prison by the prince of Naḥāṣpī. The dervish was able to escape the wrath of the latter; the authorities are not agreed if Masʿūd aided him to escape or not. Dawlat-shāh says that Masʿūd himself became a mardī of Dūqwī.
The first campaign of the new Serbedër chief was directed against the lord of Nghişpër, Arghun-Shâh Djâni Kurbânî. It is probable that this expedition took place as early as 738. Arghun’s army was routed: Nghişpër and Djâm fell into the hands of Mas’ûd. The defeated ruler sought refuge with Togha Timur, Khan of Djurdjian. It seems that Mas’ûd and Djâni had considered the possibility of extending their power over the whole of Khorasan.

The Serbedër forces seem to have begun by attacking Togha Timur. It would seem then that the defeat of the Khân on the banks of the Atrak, an event mentioned by Dawlat-Shâh as happening before Mas’ûd’s campaign against Hassân Kûrt of Herât, took place during this first war of the Serbedër against Dûrjûn. In any case, to realise their projects of conquest, Mas’ûd and Djâni turned their attention to the king of Herât already mentioned. (743 = 1342–1343). On Şafar 13 of this year the two princes’s armies met near Zhorka. In the battle Hasan Džurî fell, either killed by the enemy or assassinated by order of the Serbedër chief. Indeed, it would not be surprising if Mas’ûd feared the ascendance of the shâhâlî at this time, when, according to the historian Žahhî at-Dîn (ed. Dorn, p. 338): "ethikî-i dawlat-î umiyyât dar akhbar-i qeyîm bi dawli-iân yûnîh bûnî"; in free translation: "In this country most things are performed in accordance with the wishes of the shâhâhs.

The battle of Zawâ was decided in favour of the ruler of Herât, although it at first looked as if the Serbedër army had won. Mas’ûd had to withdraw and returned to Schawar. The historian Khvândamir recounts after these events a campaign against Djurdjian, as well as the defeat and death of a brother of Togha Timur; he says that as a result Mas’ûd was able to become master of Astara and, while the Khân fled from his capital (end of 743). Another authority, however, puts these events in 742 (cf. B. Dorn, Die Geschichtsbuch der Serbeder von der Schiwri und der Serbeder nach Chândînî, p. 165, note 5). This would be before the war with Hassân Kûrt. If this is correct the victory won by Mas’ûd over the brother of Togha Timur would be identical with the battle on the Atrak. Once in possession of Djurdjian the Serbedër began to cast covetous eyes on Mazendarân. This was the end of his career. He was attacked by surprise in the land of Rastâr; he and almost all his army perished (Rahî II, 745 = Aug.-Sept., 1344).

Mas’ûd was the greatest Serbedër prince, according to Dâwlat-Shâh, stretched from Džum to Dânghân and from Khâbârgân to Tarskî. He was the sâbîh kirân of the dynasty. After him the power fell into the hands of those who had been subalterns of the family of ‘Abîd al-Râzâkî: that is to say, the empire having reached its zenith, fell into the control of a coterie of soldiers; (in this case of dervishes also) if the glory of the Serbedër had departed for ever.

This is the normal course of the history of oriental dynasties; Mas’ûd left one son, a minor, named Lajûf Allâh; one of his notables, Muhammad Alîmûr, who during the war with Djurdjian had been aş-dâ of Schawar on behalf of the late prince, seized the actual power. He reigned two years and a few months; in 747 or 748 (1346/1347 or 1347/1348) he perished, the victim of a plot hatched by the dervish clique, murâs-dâ of Dżurî, the prime mover in which was the Khvândija ‘Alî Shams al-Dîn. The latter becoming master of the situation, proposed as ruler a certain Kâbîl (or Kâbûl) Iâfendiyyîr, who reigned for about a year; ‘Ali Shams al-Dîn had him assassinated in 748 or 749. It was then proposed to make Mas’ûd’s minor son successor to Iâfendiyyîr; ‘Ali Shams al-Dîn appointed a brother of Mas’ûd, who also was called Shams al-Dîn, to be regent. He only held the throne for some seven months; in Dhu’l-Hijjah, 749, according to Dâwlat-Shâh, he resigned. ‘Ali Shams al-Dîn himself then assumed the external attributes of royalty also. In general the historians approve his rule, although they admit that he was as bigoted as he was cruel. He is said on one occasion to have had 5000 prostitutes buried alive; his officials and officers when they had to enter his presence used to make their wills first. Shams al-Dîn built or renovated the masjîda ‘uwwal at Schawar. He also built a great storehouse (mukâd) in the same town. With Togha Timur he concluded a treaty which secured the Serbedër chief possession of all the territory formerly ruled by Mas’ûd. In return it is probable that the Serbedër pledged themselves to pay tribute. Dâwlat-Shâh (p. 236) says that they obeyed Togha Timur (mukâd wa muqadð mukâd) which can only be true of the period after the death of Mas’ûd.

‘Ali Shams al-Dîn, already much detested for his avarice and cruelty, insulted in frightful fashion one of his treasury officials, Haidar Kâsâbî, from whom he wanted, in addition, to extort a large sum of money. Kâsâbî conspired with Ya’ûlî Karrâhî, a former officer of Mas’ûd, and killed ‘Ali Shams al-Dîn with his own hand (towards the end of 753 or the beginning of 754; Kârîhî was reigning in 754 because the assassination of Togha Timur by the latter’s order took place on Dhu’l- qa’da 16, 754 = Dec. 14, 1358, as is testified by the poem quoted in Dâwlat-Shâh, p. 237–238). Karrâhî became chief of the Serbedër while Kâsâbî became siphe Shâhîr. The new ruler was a devout man but a bloody tyrant in whom there were thought to be signs of madness. A quarrel soon broke out between the Serbedër and Togha Timur because Karrâhî did not acknowledge the suzerainty of the Khân. On the occasion of a meeting at Sultan Duswin, Karrâhî had Togha Timur assassinated by an officer of his suite. One can hardly imagine that this attempt could have succeeded if the Serbedër had not had allies among the nobles of Timur’s kingdom. With the latter’s death the suzerainty of the descendants of Cîngîs Khân in those regions came to an end. The Serbedër, the Džûnî Kurbânî and the Kûrts of Herât divided the empire of the Khân. Karrâhî took Tûs from the Džûnî Kurbânî. He paid a great deal of attention to the water-supply of this town and to that of Maghadh. Karrâhî, like his predecessors, came to a violent end. ‘Alî al-Dawla, his brother-in-law, assassinated him (759 = 1358). Kâsâbî then placed on the throne the brother of (or cousin) of the dead ruler, the insignificant Žahhî at-Dîn. The siphe Shâhîr were, of course, the actual master of the kingdom and this was not altered when Zahir al-Dîn renounced the throne (Rahî, 760 = May/June, 1359). Kâsâbî himself took the reins of government, but it was not for long. While he was besieging the rebel Nasr Allah Bâshîntî (perhaps brother of Mas’ûd) in Asfârîn he met his end, the victim of an inscrutable instigated by his own siphe Shâhe, Hassan Dânghânî (Rahî II, 761 = Feb.-March, 1360). Hassan concluded a treaty of peace with Nasr Allah;
Later, troubles broke out once more. At the siege of Salzwür by Walt’s forces, Mu’ayyad sought the help of the great Timur (783 or rather 781; cf. Dorn, Gesch. Turkistan’s, p. 186, note 2). This meant that the Serbedær had to abandon all idea of independence and that his kingdom became a part of the great Mongol conqueror’s empire. Mu’ayyad lived on for some time at the court of Timur. He was assassinated in 788 (1386/1387). His body was taken to Salzwür and buried in the town.

Here ends the history of the Serbedær, although in 807 (1404/1405) there was again a rising by a son of Mas’ud, Sultan ‘Ali, against Shah Kuhh, son of Timur, a rebellion which was duly suppressed. As a panegyrist of the Serbedär kings Dowlah-shah mentions the poet Muhammed b. Yamin al-Din Faryamadi.


SERDEBÄ (Pers. serdab, *cold water*); the Kânân has wrongly said àsâd; in Baghâda, a kind of rather large vaulted cellar, more or less decorated sunk four or five feet into the ground where the heat does not rise above 77°–80° F. while that of the room is from 92°–95°. It is supplied with a ventilator, a kind of chimney turned to the north side which ends at the highest part of the house; the air is also kept fresh, morning and evening, with the help of several small windows; in the summer the people of the house spend the time from 11 a.m. till sunset there. This arrangement is also found in the southern parts of Persia where it is called sir-avain *subterranean*; the ventilator is called nūtrāf *wind-catcher*. The name is extended to cover any kind of subterranean room or vault (Ibn Battuta, Paris 1853, i. 264; Dossy, Suppl., i. 647).

Bibliography: Olivier, Voyage dans l’Occident abumehm. Paris 1804, ii. 381; Nieuhof, Voyage en Arabie, Amsterdam 1780, ii. 239; Buckingham, Travels, London 1857, ii. 192; Ker-Porter, Travels, ii. 261.

(C. Huart)

SERDESIR (c), a cold place or a summer habitation in high grounds. The Persian ferâng’s cite verses where the word occurs (e.g. Fara’în’s Shâh‘arî). The opposite is germes [p.v.].

At present both words are used for the northern and southern part of the province of Fârs, corresponding to the division in Sarûd and Djiurmân by the Arabic geographers (Le Strange, The Limits of the Eastern Caliphate, Cambridge 1905, p. 249).
SERES. [See serres].

SERRES (Serres, Turk. Serê), capital of the former sanjak of Seris in the vilayet of Salonika, situated on the edge of a broad well-watered fertile plain, not far from the Struma, on the Salonika—Dede-Ağhaç railway. Serres has a castle, called Dragota in the middle ages, built on a steep hill, numerous mosques and Greek churches. The number of inhabitants is nearly 50,000, the majority Bulgarians. In the country around much rice, fruit, wine, tobacco and vegetables are cultivated, and a big export trade is carried on in tobacco, cotton and cloth. — Serres is the ancient Siris or Serhai, a settlement of the Siropeconi who existed in the time of Xerxes.

The date of the Ottoman conquest, about which the Turkish chroniclers make inaccurate and contradictory statements (Sev'd al-Din, Tâfi al-Tarâriûk [probably following Neşirî]), I, 92, gives 726 = 1324/1325, whom J. v. Hammer, G.O.K., I, 180, apparently follows; Lechaudins, Hist. Monast., p. 243: “787 = 1385/1386 [codex Veraniotianus]. — Giese, Anuw. Chron., p. 26, 121: Azârî Pasha Zade, Tûrîk, Stambl 1332, p. 61: between 783 or, according to codex Mordmian-Cayol, p. 45: 784 and 787; Hâjdîji Kjala, Rumeli and Bosnia, ed. v. Hammer, Vienna 1812, p. 73 sqq.: 784 = 1383/1384), is known from several contemporary Greek sources, which unanimously give September 19, 1383 (cf. Miklosich-Muller, Acta et Diplomata, i., 77—79; Sp. P. Lampros, Nwxt Elwspalamâq, viii., 405, 407, Athens 1812; cf. P. N. Papageorgiou in Byz. Z., 1894, iii. 292). On this day the castle was taken by Deli Balahan and the Lal Shahin Pasha, who had hastened to his assistance. That the town was secured in Turkish hands a few years later is known from the contemporary evidence of two Athos chronicles (cf. L. Petitz-W. Regel, Acta d'Epithigimenon, p. 47, xxii., and L. Petitz-Kornab, Acts de Châloukar, p. 335, No. 158).

Serres and the surrounding territory fell as a fief to the celebrated Erenros Beg [q.v.], and the neighbourhood was settled with Yürükas who were transplanted from Şarukhân (cf. Lechaudins, Hist. Monast., p. 244, sqq.; Giese, Anuw. Chron., p. 26, sqq.). Henceforth Serres was an important Ottoman mint: the first coins were struck there in 816 = 1413/1414. The dangerous rising, half religious and half political, stirred up by Shaikh Bâdî al-Din Mîmphad and his follower, Hâjdîji Mustafâ came to a tragic end in Serres, in the neighbourhood of which the rebels had assembled for their last stand, with the execution of the ringleader in the late autumn (cf. Isâmîn, 1921, xi. 63 sqq.). In the 16th century at the beginning of which the French zoologist Pierre Belon passed through Serres, the inhabitants were mainly Greeks; he found German and Spanish-speaking Jews there but the country people spoke Greek and Bulgarian. Hâjdîji Kjalal (Kâmula, Bâtna, Vienna 1812, p. 73 sqq.) following closely, almost literally, Mehmed 'Azîhî, Mu'âa'isul-Elbânî (Vienna MS., fol. 240 H; Berlin MS., [inaccessible to me], fol. 246 — 247), describes Serres in the xviith century as a town with 10 mosques, 7—8 baths, 2 khâns, a benefica, kitchens for the poor and pleasant gardens. Ewliya Celebi also visited the town; his account is found in the eighth, still unprinted volume of his Sehîret-nâmé. Serres never attained particular importance in the history of the Ottoman Empire; only in the xviith and xixth century it was the seat of a Derebey [q.v.], of whom Isâmîl Bey was the most prominent (cf. E. M. Consenmîre, Voyage dans la Macédoine, Paris 1831, i. 157, [130]—166). Since the treaty of London (1835) Serres has belonged to Greece.— A favourite excursion from the town is to the pleasantly situated Hisârâddi outside the gates of Serres (cf. Rumelî ve Bonâ, p. 74). Here is buried the author of the work, very important for the history of Adrianople, Eski el-Malaqîmîn (cf. G. Flügel, Orr. Hist. Wien, ii. 259, where — wrongly — Malaqîmîn is given), 'Abd al-Kâhîm b. Hasan called Şihri (d. about 1550; cf. Brusali Mehmed Tâhir in Türk Yurdu, third year, vol. 6, part 27, s. 2225).

Bibliography (in addition to works mentioned in the text): — J. von Hammer, G.O.K., i. 180, 246, 600; N. Jorga, G.O.K., i. 241, 249; P. N. Papageorgiou in Byzant. Zeitschr., 1894, iii. (an excellent monograph in modern Greek with which compare the supplementary notes by Papadopoulos-Kerameus in Fanântiasis Vremonis, 1, St. Petersburg 1894, p. 673—685, and by N. A. Bees, ibid., 1913, xiv. 320—325); G. di Pietro Luccari, Giacomo Luccari, Conquestriettore degli annali di Bonâ, Venice 1605, iii. 103—106; C. Jivecek, Geschichte der Serben, Gothas, 1918, p. 107, 118; Th. Spandugino, Cattuzeno, Petit traitâs, ed. Ch. Schefer, p. 17, 18, 124, Paris 1896; ed. Florence, p. 17, 46, 47, 154, Taşköprüzade, Şakâli el-Namâsîn, Stambl 1269, p. 73, continuation (qâbîl) of 'Aja', Stambl 1268, p. 35, 186, 673; Mûnedjudîm-bâšî, Stambl 1285, i. 267: remarkable information regarding the Murâddî (Margarita) monastery near Serres, probably taken from the Tûrîk by Rûshi [q.v.]. (Franz Baringen)

SERT. [See seved].

SERVET. [See Tahir Bey].

SETH. [See Sheth].

SEVILLE, in Spanish Sevilla, Arabic Isbîliyya (ethnically Isbîli), a large city in Spain with over 150,000 inhabitants at the present day and capital of the province of the same name, formerly capital of the kingdom of Seville situated at an average height of about 100 feet above sea level in a vast plain, on the left bank of the Guadalquivir (Arabic el-Wâdi 'l-Kabir = Wâd el-Kabar = the great river), which separates it from the suburb of Triana (Arabic Tawrâna; cf. Yâkût, Mu'âa'is al-Baladûn, q.v.). Although 60 miles from the sea the town has all the advantages of a seaport on account of the very gradual fall of the river; the tide is perceptible up above Seville (cf. the ascensio amnis of the Latin poet Ausonius). The climate is dry and warm.

The province of Seville in the Muslim period comprised all the low valley of the Guadalquivir, and stretched to the east as far as the Sierra d'Arcos and Gadir, to the west as far as the valley of the Guadiana (Wâd Anâ) in a very wealthy region fertilised by the great river. The slopes of Aijarâra (or Alarafar, Arabic Ajbâl el-Sharaf) in the immediate vicinity of the capital are specially favoured, and their groves of fig and olive trees were famous for their fruit throughout Muslim Andalusia. The Arab geographers were never tired of marveling at the natural wealth of the country. It was the only district in the peninsula to produce cotton, the exports of which were important. Other
characteristic products were saffron and sugar-cane. The population of the country was of great density; less than 8,000 villages, according to al-Idrisi, were dependent on the capital.

The name Ibhiliya is derived from the ancient Hipalit; a name of Iberian origin which the Romans retained for the town. It was of great importance under them after its capture in 45 B.C. by Julius Caesar, who made it "Colonia Julia Romula". Under the empire it was alternately with Baetica (Cordova) and Italia (Arabic Tālīka) the capital of the province of Baetica. It then became that of a Vandal kingdom (411) and from 441 the residence of the Visigothic kings, until in 567 Athanagild transferred to Toledo the seat of his government.

It was in the spring of 94 A.H. (712) that Seville after the fall of Medina Sidonia and Carmona fell in turn into the hands of the Muslims after a month's siege, according to some historians, but probably longer if we may believe the more detailed account of the capture of the town given by the anonymous chronicle entitled Alḥārār Maǧdūliya. A section of the Christian population took refuge in Beja (Bājdja) and the conquerors, Mūsā b. Nuṣayr, installed a Jewish colony in the city, left a garrison there under the Medinean Tāh b. 'Abd Allah al-Tawil as governor, and then laid siege to Merida. An attempted rising by the Christians in Seville, aided by their co-religionists of Beja and Niebla (Lahla) in July of the same year was promptly put down and the town definitely re-captured by the son of Mūsā b. Nuṣayr, 'Abd al-‘Aziz, who massacred the rebels. When his father left for the east, 'Abd al-‘Aziz became governor of Muslim Andalusia, and chose Seville as his capital; he there married the widow (and not the daughter, as is often said) of the Visigoth Roderick, Egłona (the Alle of the Arab historians) and installed himself in the old church of St. Rufina, opposite which he built a mosque. It was there that he was killed by his soldiers in Radjab, 97 (March, 716), at the instigation of the Caliph of Damascus, Sulaimān.

After his death, the seat of the Arab administration was moved to Cordova; Seville nevertheless remained one of the richest cities of al-Andalus. Indeed, it escaped more than any other the influence of the conquerors and there is no doubt that its population only abandoned their old religion for Islam slowly, as much from policy as of necessity. It was in great part Roman or Gothic, and the names of notable citizens of Seville for long preserved the memory of this double origin. The spread of Islam in the Peninsula made commerce and agriculture more active and the importance of its harbour augmented.

When residences and fields were allotted in al-Andalus to the qānūn of Syria and Egypt, Seville fell to that of Ḥums (Ennisa) which was established in 125 (742) by the governor Abu 'l-Khaṭṭār al-Husām b. Dīrār al-Kallāt, at the same time as the qānūn of Damascus was given Elvira, that of the Jordan Rayyo (Malaga), that of Kinnairt Jisr, that of Palestine Sidonia and that of Miṣr Tundar (Murcia). The name of Ḥums was even sometimes applied to Seville (cf. Yaḥyā, Muḥammad al-Balḍān, s.v. Ḥums at the end).

When the Umayyad Caliphate of Spain was established in the reign of 'Abd al-Raḥmān I b. Muʾāwiyah al-Dāhilī and his successors, Seville was entrusted to his governors (for example the energetic 'Abd al-Malik b. 'Umar) and, like the other large towns of the country, was often the scene of rebellions. In 149 (766) two risings, those of Saʿd al-Yahṣūbī al-Majārī of Niebla and Abu ʿl-Sabbāḥ b. Yaḥyā al-Yahṣūbī, were quelled in turn. In 150 (773) the Caliph had again to suppress an attempt at independence by the governor 'Abd al-Ghāfir (or 'Abd al-Ghaffār) al-Yamani and Ḥayāt b. Muḥāmmed (or Muḥāṣib).

The town was surrounded by a fortified wall by 'Abd al-Raḥmān II. He also had a great mosque built in it. It was in the reign of this sovereign that Norman pirates captured Seville for the first time in 230 (844). It was stormed after a short siege, and the Caliph had to mobilise his forces to regain it and put the invaders to flight at the decisive battle of Talayita. As a precaution against another attempt at landing by the Majūs (Normans) he built an arsenal at Seville and constructed swift ships, which did not prevent his entering into friendly relations with the king of the Normans and even sending him an ambassador, Yaḥyā b. al-Hakam al-Ghāzūlī. In the reign of his son Muḥammad, in 245 (859), Spain was again attacked by the Normans, but the latter, who landed at the mouth of the Guadalquivir, probably did not go up to Seville but went direct to seize the town of Algeciras. Ibn Khaldūn and al-Nuwmarii nevertheless suggest there was a Norman landing in Seville at this time (cf. particularly R. Dozy, Les Normands en Espagne, in Recherches, p. 256-263 and 279-284).

In the reign of the Caliph 'Abd Allah, Seville was for a long time perturbed by the ambitions and proceedings of the two great families of Yemeni origin, the Banū Khaldūn and the Banū ʿAbd al-Jāfīd. These Arabs had large domains throughout the country and numerous clients, and hated the Jalsa- mided Spaniards of Seville as much as the Umayyad Caliphs of Cordova. The head of the first family, Kurāb b. Khaldūn, soon after the accession of 'Abd Allah, raised the whole country of Aljarafe and rallied to his flag of rebellion the chief of the Banū ʿAbd al-Jāfīd family and other Arab or Berber chiefs of the south of Spain. He ravaged all the territory of Seville with fire and sword and later on, sometimes assisted by the caliph himself, he ruined completely the residences of Seville (275 = 891). In the town the Arabs became all-powerful; and it was not till four years later that the sovereign decided to send an expedition against them.

In 286 (899) the heads of the two families, who had hitherto been at peace, quarrelled, and Ibrāhīm b. ʿAbd al-Jāfīd was victorious and slew Kurāb. After an alliance with the famous rebel ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-Ḥafūn [q.v.] he finally submitted to the Caliph of Cordova while retaining practically unlimited power in Seville. There he set up as a regular sovereign and poet of talent and the famous singer ʿAṣam was ornaments of his court. His return to loyalty to the Umayyad dynasty was the beginning of the return of order in al-Andalus. In the reign of the great caliph 'Abd al-Raḥmān III, Seville, without, however, rivalling Cordova in importance, entered upon an era of peace and prosperity and remained loyal to the central power.

But its most brilliant epoch, and the most important from the political point of view also, was that which followed the fall of the Umayyad Caliphate, when it became the capital of the independent dynasty of the Banū ʿAbbās or ʿAbbāsīd (cf.
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above, l. p. 7] from 414 = 1023. The founder of the kingdom, the Kadi Abu l-Kasim Muhammed l, was the son of an illustrious Andalusian jurist of Lañhuid origin, Issaib b. Abbâb. He seized the power, at first recognizing the suzerainty of the Almohad sovereign Yahyâ b. 'Ali, but was not long in repudiating this suzerainty which was quite nominal. At his death in 434 (1042) his son, Abû 'Amr 'Abbâb, known by his honorific surname of al-Mu'tasîd, succeeded him and during a reign of 27 years his policy was marked by deeds of cruelty and treachery. He increased his kingdom at the expense of the neighbouring principalties of the west and south and only found a serious opponent in Bâdis, the Zirid king of Granada. He died in 461 (1068). His son, Abu l-Kasim Muhammed II al-Mu'tasîd, is renowned for his poetic taste and talents. In his reign Seville became the rendezvous of the best scholars of the period. He took Cordova from the Banu Dâshâwar but soon came in conflict with the ambitious King of Castile, Alfonso VIII, and then had to appeal for help to the newly risen power of the western Maghrib, the Almoravid Yusuf b. Tâfîfin. The latter crossed over to Spain with his troops and on Radjah 12, 479 (October 23, 1086), won the great victory of Zallaâk. When the Almoravids returned to Morocco the Christians resumed the offensive and al-Mu'tasîd had to go in person to the Lamtûn sulphur to ask his assistance once more. Yusuf granted it, but was not long in depriving him of his kingdom to seize its wealth. Seville along with Cordova, Almeria, Murcia and Denia, was taken in 484 (1091) by Yusuf's general, Sir b. Abû Bakr b. Tâfîfin. The Berber troops sacked the town from attic to cellar, and pillaged the palaces of the Abbâdis and the unfortunate al-Mu'tasîd was taken prisoner and exiled to Morocco, where he died at Aghâmîn in 488 (1095) after giving expression to his misfortunes in elegies which came to enjoy a well merited reputation among literary Muslims: he left the reputation of a generous, chivalrous and cultivated prince. - All the texts relating to Seville in the 'Abbâdîd period have been collected by Dozy in his Scriptum Arabum Lœri de Allocabalis, 3 vols., Leiden 1846-1863.

The Almoravid general, Sir, governed Seville for his master and the town, like the rest of Muslim Spain, continued under the yoke of the Maghribi Sulûfis. In Radjah, 526 (May, 1132), a Christian force from Toledo invaded the country round Seville. In the course of an engagement the governor of the city, 'Umar b. Makrî, was killed.

It was with satisfaction that the people of Seville heard of the decline of the Almoravids in Africa and the rise of the Almohads. Barrâz b. Muhammed al-Masâfî, general of Sulûfis Abû al-Mu'tamâr, after conquering the south-west of the peninsula, laid siege to Seville and took it in Shabân 541 (January, 1147), putting to flight the Almoravid garrison. Next year a deputation of notables of Seville went to the Almohad sulûf to give him the hommage (ba'ara) of their fellow-citizens, led by the Kadi Abû Bakr b. 'Arâbi, who died at Fês on the way back (cf. above, i. 362). 'Abû al-Mu'tamâr appointed governor of the town the Almohad Moro b. Sulamîn and in 551 (1165), at the request of the inhabitants, his own son, Abû Ya'qûb Yusuf. The latter kept this post till he succeeded his father in 558 (1162).

Under his reign Seville became the headquarters of the Almohad forces in Spain. Abû Ya'qûb stayed there from 568 (1172) to 571 (1175), and on his departure left as governor his brother, Abû Isâq Isâqînî, with the general Muhammed b. Yusuf b. Wânâdîn and the amir 'Abû Allah b. Dînâmî. It was also in Seville that Abû Ya'qûb made his preparations in 560 (1164) for the Sautaron (Shantarita) expedition in which he met his death. His son, Abû Yusuf Ya'qûb al-Mansûr (580-595 = 1184-1199), who succeeded him, brought back the Almohad army to Seville and returned to Morocco, leaving the Hafsid chief Abû Yusuf as governor of Seville. Summoned by the latter he returned to Seville in 586 (1190) to retake Shilh (Silves) from the Christians, who had taken it by force of arms. After the brilliant victory of Alarcon (Arabic Al-Ark, cf. above, i. 2059) won on Bsh'ân S. 591 (July 19, 1195), over Alfonso VIII of Castile, the Sultan made a long stay in Seville, and it was during this period that he imprisoned the famous Cordovan philosopher, Ibn Rushd (Averroes). He did not return to Morocco till 594 (1198), a year before his death.

In the course of the reigns of these two Sultans Seville rivaled the glories of the most flourishing periods of the 'Abbâdî dynasty. It had at this date more inhabitants than Cordova. The Almohad sovereigns and the great dignitaries of the court built palaces there, and the number of mosques, baths, caravanserais and markets increased considerably. It was in the reign of Abû Ya'qûb that the new great mosque was built on the site which the present cathedral was later to occupy in the 11th century. The Raszf al-Aṣrîn (ed. Thornock, p. 135) gives 567 (1172) as the date of building this dzamâ of the anonymous chronicist entitled al-Halâl al-Ma'mûnî (ed. Tanûs, p. 120) 572 (1176/1177). According to Ibn Abû Zarî', it only took eleven months to build, which seems improbable. The same author mentions the building at Seville in the same year as a bridge over the Guadalquivir, of two ha's, of ramparts and moats, of quays along the river and an aqueduct. Nothing now survives of the great Almohad mosque of Seville but the qâbûn (now Fâteh el-Nâman = court of the orange trees), with the gate known as the Puerta del Perdón, and most notable of all the celebrated minaret, called Giralda (because a statue of Faith which carved mounta *turna* [Spanish girera] at the least wind). This tower, as a whole less successful than its twin sisters, the tower of Hassan in Rîbat al-Fath (Rabat) and that of the Dînâmî al-Kutubiyin at Marrakùsh, built at the same time, has a base 45 feet square. It is built of brick; its walls, about seven feet thick, are pierced by numerous windows with Arab and Visigothic capitals. The lantern-tower which rose from the platform of the tower has been replaced by a campanile; the total present height is over 300 feet.

In 609 (1212) al-Mansûr's successor, the Almohad Muhammed al-Nasîr, collected under the walls of Seville the great army which was to reconquer the part of al-Andalus then in the hands of the Christians. It was defeated on Safar 15 (July 16) of the same year at las Navas de Tolosa and the Sultan and his forces returned to Seville utterly routed.

It was a little later, in the reign of the Almohad, Yusuf II al Mustansîr, in 617 (1220), that the governor, Abû l-Ilîlâ had built on the bank of the Guadalquivir a tower intended to protect the
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royal palace (now the Alcázar, rebuilt in the sixteenth century by Pedro the Cruel) and the river. It has retained its Spanish translation its Arabic name Būrj al-Dhāhāb ("Tower of Gold"); the lower part, which is in twelve superimposed sections and is crowned with battlements, and the smallest tower at its top are still standing.

Some years later Seville again became the headquarters of the Almohad Sultan Idris al-Ma’mūn, and on his departure for Morocco in 636 (1238-1239) the town passed under the domination of the rebel Muhammad b. Yūsuf b. Hūd, who ended by driving the Almohads out of Spain. Strengthened by the alliance he had made with the first Nasrid dynasty of Granada, Muhammad I b. al-Abd, Ferdinand III laid siege to Seville in 1248 and after blocking its fortifications for sixteen months took it on 7th of 1248 (November 19, 1248) (or four days later, according to some sources). The Muslim population was spared and allowed to emigrate to that part of Andalusia which still remained Muslim and to Africa. The attempts of the Marinid Sultans of Morocco to recapture the town from the Christians in the years following met with no success. In 674 (1275) Sultan Abu Yusuf Yaḥyā b. Abd al-Ḥākīm, after his victory over the troops of General Don Nuño de Lara, laid waste the country of Seville and Jerez (Shaṭīḥ); but he had soon to abandon his siege of the capital. On his second campaign in Andalusia in 676 (1278) he again came up to the walls of Seville and pillaged the district of Aljarafe. He continued these raids, which are recorded in detail in the Rawd al-Kīṭārī, down to 684 (1285), and Don Sancho had to seek a truce which lasted till 690 (1290) in the reign of Abu Yusuf’s successor, his son Abu Yaḥyā b. Yusuf. In the end, after the defeat of the Sultans of the same dynasty, Abu l-Ḥasan Ali, under the walls of Tarifa, the Muslims abandoned all hope of retaking Seville.

This would take too long here to give the names of all the famous Muslims who were born or lived in Seville. It is sufficient to mention the poets Ibn Hamdīn, Ibn Ḥāmīn, and Ibn ʿAbdūn, the traditionalist Ibn al-Arabi, the biographer Abu Bakr b. Khair, and to refer the reader to the separate articles on them.


(E. LÉVI-PROVENÇAL)

**SEZAY,** a Tūrkbī rūkhī, Sultan Ḥasan (Dede) Sezay Efendi was a Greek by birth, a native of Kordos (the old name for Corinth), who spent the greater part of his life in Adrianople. He belonged to the order of Gūlāhīn there, first as a disciple of the Sultan Mehmed Le’lī and after his death as his successor. According to some sources, he was also head of a Gūlāhīn monastery in Constantinople. Karaman, 1151 (end of 1738 or beginning of 1739), is given as the date of his death, the only date known of his career. His tomb is in a dervish which bears his name.

We still possess several of Sezay’s works. His Dīwān is of a mystical and allegorical nature and is remarkable for the beauty of its language, so that Ottoman critics sometimes actually describe him as the Ḥāfiẓ of Turkish literature. There is a MS. of the Dīwān in the Vienna Hofbibliothek and in the Gibb collection (see Gibb, *A History of Ottoman Poetry*, ii. xxii.) below), and it has been printed at Constantinople. It begins with a series of ṣaḥīfs, on the works of the different kinds of the mystic path, the Wafi-i ʿAjār-i Awwār-i Tariḥāt. Then come 333 ghazals, a few takhlīsh, tanzīl, emā’āt and other shorter pieces including a chronogram on "Emiḥāthi Sādīq Efendi (d. 1904 = 1685). Among other works by Sezay, his Miḥkāṭ and his commentary on a ghayāt of al-Migri are mentioned. There are commentaries on some of Sezay’s ghazals, including some of quite different dates. Among Sezay’s pupils is a work of great value, his poem called Gūlāhīn-Ehvar, which deals with the stīlīl of Gūlāhīn, and the Turkish poet Mahvi Efendi and Mehmed Fa’shi Kirmi, who translated the *Munāsal al-Sūrīn* of al-Anṣārī into Turkish.

Sezay is also the name of a modern Turkish novelist; cf. Horn, *Geschichte der türkischen Moderne*, Leipzig 1902, p. 45 n. 34.


(WALTHER BÖRKMAN)
SFAK, a religious community of Kurdish origin in the wilayet of Mawil, English statistics estimate the number of Sfakas at 10,000; the Muslims give them the nickname *swoz* (*turboleti*, *turbolent*). The Sfakas live in the villages in the Sindjar district (*Ali-rash, Yangidja, Khazna, Tallira etc.). They are related to their neighbours, the *Vardis*, most of whose assemblies and places of pilgrimage they attend. On the other hand, if we may rely on Father Anastase, they show a particular devotion to the *Ali whom they call Ali-rash (Amir in Kurdish = "black"). Another statement connects them with the extremist Shits, the Ahli-Hashe (cf. the art. *Ali-Iltihal*). The Shaks never cut their moustaches which are proverbial in the country (see Cuinet); in eating they hold them up with the left hand so that the food may not soil them. As is the case with all the secret sects, popular stories credit them with abominable practices; once a year they are said to assemble in a secret cave and spend the night in feasting and debauchery. This night is called among them, as among the *Sarli* (cf. the art. *Sarliya*), *fisalat al-skafta*.

The Sfaks who claim to belong to the Kurdish tribe of Kaka' are also found in the wilayet of Mawil on the lower course of the Great Zab (villages of Tell-Laban, Bashiya, Kabari, Khurs al-Suljana) and in the district of 'Ashar-i Sabs. Their present chief, 'Isha Koshak (Koshak), lives in Wardak. There are Sfaks in Persia in the border districts. The sacred book of the Sfaks is said to be in Persia. The name is explained as *fisalat il-'i-junnatu* "Paradise has been acquired by me" for the Shaks of the Sfaks are said to sell them places in Paradise at 25 majdiliyas the week. The Sfaks permit divorces and polygamy. Their Shaks also never cut their moustaches and grow enormous beards. The *fisalat al-skafta* among the Sfaks is accompanied by agapes (ahest al-arabihi) for which every married man kills a cock. The Shaks bless these offerings which are dressed with wheat or rice and proclaims a blessing on every child conceived that night. The candles are then extinguished and an indescribable orgies ensues.

The Sfaks of Father Anastase evidently correspond to the Khurish-Kishas (*cock-killers*) and Kishas-Kishas (*candle-extinguishers*) of other travellers.

Father Anastase mentions a third secret sect in the same region: the *Bahayen*; they are Kurds and call themselves *Allahli* (Ali-allili). They live in the villages of *Um-ar, Toraq-Hayrat, Tell-Va'is, Radipsa etc. There are also a few in Persia near the Turkish frontier. The Bahayen venerate particularly the prophet (Imam) Immi'il. During the month of *Musarram* (*Ashura*) they lament the death of Husain and collect provisions which on the ninth day (of the month) are distributed under the name of *shahabat*. When the chief visits a community of the faithful each man offers him seven fresh eggs; the Shaks cuts each into seven pieces and places them in a jar. These present drink wine. The Shaks pronounces a prayer, offering the eggs to Imam as an expiatory sacrifice (*fusur)*. No one can eat them without forthwith confessing his sins.

Attention may be called to the links connecting these Kurdish sects with one another and with Persia, their devotion to the Shits Imami (Ali, Husain, Imami), the rites resembling the communion, the syncretist tendencies. The Shaks seem to be a link between the Vardis and the extremist Shits. Finally we may mention that a document coming from Ahli-Hashe circles and found in Khorsan by W. Irvoy mentions Malak-Tau, the great saint of the Vardis.

As to the "night of kafta", Father Anastase explains this word from the Arabic root meaning "seize" (?). Perhaps we have simply to deal with the Persian kafta alluding to a point said to
be played by the shoe in the course of the ceremony. For *shābak* we may recall the name *lašat al-mu'ājdān* which al-Shabānī gives to the alleged nocturnal feast and orgy of the Nestorian monks, cf. Hoffmann, *Ausssage aus syrischen Akten persischen Martyryer*, 1880, p. 127.


(V. MINORSKY)

**SHĀ'BĀN, name of the eight month of the lunar year. In classical *hadith* it has already its place after Radjab Muḥāṣib. In British India it has the name of *Shā-ib buṇāt* (see beneath), the Acheемых call it *Kanduri-bun* and among the Tigre tribes it is called *Maddaγiγi*, i.e. who follows upon Radjab.

In early Arabia the month of Shābān (the name may mean *interval*) seems to have corresponded, as to its significance, to Ramadan. According to the *hadith* Muḥammad practised supererogatory fasting by preference in Shābān (Bukhārī, *Sunan*, b. 52; Muslim, *Sunan*, trad. 176; Tirmidhī, *Sunan*, b. 36). *Aḥa* recovered in Shābān the fastdays which were left from the foregoing Ramadan (Tirmidhī, *Sunan*, b. 65).

In the early-Abrahamic solar year Shābān as well as Ramadan fell in summer. Probably the weeks preceding the summer- solstice and those following it, had a religious significance which gave rise to propitiatory rites such as fasting. This period had its centre in the middle of Shābān, a day which, up to the present time, has preserved features of a New-Year’s day. According to popular belief, in the night preceding the 15th the tree of life on whose leaves are written the names of the living is shaken. The names written on the leaves which fall down, indicate those who are to die in the coming year. In *hadith* it is said that in this night Allah descends to the lower heaven; from there he calls the mortals in order to grant them forgiveness of sins (Tirmidhī, *Sunan*, b. 39).

Among a number of peoples the beginning of the end of the year is devoted to the commemoration of the dead. This connection can also be observed in the Muslim world. For this reason Shābān bears the epithet of *al-mu‘ājdān* "the venerated". In British India in the night of the 15th people say prayers for the dead, distribute food among the poor, eat *ḥabla* (sweetmeats) and indulge in illuminations and fireworks. This night is called *lašat al-baγara* which is explained by "night of quittance", i.e. forgiveness of sins.

In Aṭcheli this month is likewise devoted to the dead; the tombs are cleansed, religious meals (*baγara, i. v.*) are given and it is the dead who benefit from the merits of these good works. The night of the middle of Shābān bears a particularly secret character, as is testified by the *kanduri* and the *pālit*: which are called *alādāt al-mu‘ājdāun* or, on account of certain cultic eulogies, *salāt al-taqlīl*. During the last days of the month, a market is held in the capital.

At Makkah Radjab, not Shābān, is devoted to the dead. Here, in the night of the 14th Shābān, religious exercises are held; in the mosques circles are formed which under the direction of an imām recite the prayer peculiar to this night.

In Morocco on the last day of Shābān a festival is celebrated which resembles a carnival. A description of it is found in L. Brunot, *La mer dans les traditions et les industries indigènes à Rabat & Salé* (Paris 1931), p. 98 sq.


(A. J. WENSINCK)

**SHĀ‘BĀN AL-MALIK AL-ABI’RABI, a Mamlūk Sultan, was chosen Sultan on Shābān 13, 764 (May 30, 1366), through the influence of the all-powerful Arabeg Velbobghā al-Imārī when only ten years old. His father Ḥusayn was passed over because the ambitious Arabeg Velbobghā wished to rule himself and therefore preferred the ten-year-old son, the grandson of Muḥammad al-Najīr. His reign was marked by frequent attacks by Frankish fleets on Mamlūk seaports like Alexandria and Tripolis in Syria. For example at the beginning of 767 (1366) ships of Pierre de Lusignan, king of Cyprus, together with Venetian, Genoese and Rhodian ships appeared before Alexandria which they plundered, but withdrew on the approach of the Egyptian troops, carrying off, according to the sources, 5,000 prisoners. The Christians in Egypt and Syria had to pay the ransom for the captive Muslims, and also pay for the building of a fleet which was to invade Cyprus. The negotiations with Egypt were not successful, as Velbobghā was not really anxious for peace but was planning a landing on Cyprus with his fleet. But troubles at home prevented his plan from developing. The king of Cyprus, however, took the offensive and sent a fleet to Syria to take the harbour of Tripolis and the town of Ayfas in the south of Asia Minor. His fleet was able to land raiding parties but had to withdraw before the superiority of the Mamlūk forces, as had another Frankish fleet which appeared before Alexandria. Peace was only brought in the beginning of 772 (August, 1370). The Egyptian later exacted vengeance for these Frankish raids by falling upon the kingdom of Little Armenia, which was an ally of the king of Cyprus (776 = beginning of 1374), and conquering the towns of Ayfas, Sis and the rest of the kingdom; the king was brought a prisoner to Cairo and his land became permanently a Muslim possession.

A conspiracy broke out in 768 (1367) against Velbobghā, whose Mamlūks could no longer stand his harshness and cruelty. The Mamlūks wanted to take him prisoner, but receiving timely warning he was able to escape to an island on the Nile, and to hold out there, and soon afterwards to return to Cairo and appoint Shā‘bān’s brother Šūkh Saḥfīn. Shā‘bān, however, who was now sixteen, was forced by the Mamlūks to put himself at their head and Velbobghā was forced to retire again to his island on the Nile. Shā‘bān then succeeded in seizing the fleet newly built by Velbobghā; the latter had to leave his place of refuge and fly to Cairo. There he was taken by the Mamlūks who had in the meanwhile returned to the citadel, and soon after-
wards killed by a Mamlik while attempting to escape. Velboghâ's Mamlikis now swarmed the people and did not obey their new leader, the emir Esedâli. Constant fighting was the result, which ended by a great number of Velboghâ's Mamlikis being banished to Syria and interned in Kerak. They later played an important part in the Mamlik Kingdom. After several changes in the person of the reign the emir Acketem el-Saltabî came to power, and held his position till the death of the Sultan. The Sultan had transitory success in the south of the kingdom, in Nubia. The king of Nubia recognised the suzerainty of the Sultan of Egypt. But as a result of Acketem's cruel treatment of prisoners, the Nubians rebelled again and destroyed the frontier town of Aawin.

The Sultan's idea of making a pilgrimage to Mecca in these troubled times was quite a mad one. In order to be secure against conspiracies of his relatives he had his brothers and cousins brought to Kerak and one of them to Cairo. As a protection to Egypt he proposed the frontier against the Beladis; but he had too little authority over his own Mamlik to be able to risk such an expedition. The axuric Mamlikis mutinied at Aakaba and as the Sultan would not yield to their demands they threatened him with death so that he had to flee secretly to Cairo, but the Mamlikis had accomplices there who were hostile to the Sultan. He was able to remain concealed in Cairo for a short time in the home of a singing-girl but was soon recognised and struggled. He was lamented by the people as he had abolished burdensome taxes and in general treated his subjects with kindness. The main reason for the terrible state of the country was the insubordination and cruelty of the Mamlikis who ill-treated and oppressed the people.


(M. SOverheim)

**SHAB'AN**

AL-MALIK AL-KHAMIL, a Mamlik Sultan, son of al-Malik el-Nâhir Muhammed [q.v.], brother of al-Malik al-Saltab I [q.v.], ascended the throne on Rabî′ II 4, 746 (Aug. 4, 1345), after having won over during the illness of his brother the emirs of influence, notably his step-father, the Emir Argân al-Alkâ. He is said to have used threats as to what he would do them if not elected. He forced his brother's widow to marry him and soon after married the daughter of another Emir and, indeed, was always played a great part in his life. His main occupations were all kinds of giolatorial contests, racing and cock-fighting. His court was marked by great extravagance and the very slave-girls wore jewels on their dresses in his and his brother's reigns. Offices were sold quite openly and shamelessly; the Sultan invented a special tax on the appointment to scribes and offices, as his biographer al-Saafi (see below) tells us. An edict issued in his reign has been preserved in the citadel of Tripoli (Syria) and in a fragmentary state in Kalât el-Hafs; by this certain overpayments to the Mamlikis resulting from the differences between the lunar and solar years, which in case of their death before the end of their period of service could be claimed by their heirs, were left to the latter (see Bibliography).

He had two of his brothers and two of his most important emirs murdered. Velboghâ el-Yâfaw, governor of Damascus, ran a similar risk. He therefore arranged with the other Syriac govern-ors to send a letter to the Sultan in which he threatened him with deposition and reproached him vigorously with his wickedness. Sultan Shab'ân then sent an apologetic reply in which he promised to reform but made preparations against the rebels. When he wanted to put to death two more of his brothers he was prevented by their mother and his step-father. Other emirs who had once been friendly to him but who now saw arrest threatening them collected their followers and other malcontents in the neighbourhood of Cairo until the Sultan in the end had only 400 horsemen at his disposal. He took refuge with his mother in the citadel where he was discovered and taken prisoner. He was murdered two days later on Jumāda II 3, 747 (Nov. 20, 1346). In his brief reign he had proved himself one of the most worthless rulers who ever sat on the throne of Egypt.


(M. Soverheim)

**SHABANKARA,** name of a Kurdish tribe and their country. Ibn al-Athir has Shaban-kara; Marco Polo: Soncara. According to Hamd Allah Mustawfi, the realm of Shabankara was established by Fars, Kirmân, and the Persian Gulf. Nowadays it forms part of Farsast; modern maps show a village of the same name of Shabankara 30° N., Lat. and 51° E. Long. Mustawfi says that the capital was the stronghold of Jî; other localities of the province, which was divided into six districts, were: Zarqân (near lq.), Izâhadâm (or Izâhadâm), Bursk, Târes, Khâna, Nâfour, Kur, Khûf, Lîrâ, and Darbâjdîr. As for particulars and identifications it suffice to refer to the notes of G. le Strange on his translation of Mustawfi's *Nuzhat al-Saltab* (B.M.S., XXIII/II, 138/139); for Darbâjdîr cf. also al-Aqâi (above, l. 960) and P. Schwartz, *fot i Mittelalter*, ii. 92 etc. As for the climate, Shabankara is reckoned among the warm countries (*garmār*); but it encloses also regions of a moderate temperature (*huwâr mawtâї*). The products of Shabankara consist chiefly in corn, cotton, dates, (dry) grapes and other fruits; at Darbâjdîr mineral salt is found. Among the most fertile districts is the close of Zarqân and of Bursk. The revenue (*bakâh dâvânti*) during the Shabankara's rule amounted to more than 3,000,000 dirhams, but at this time Mustawfi wrote (± 740 = 1340) they only came to 266,000 drs. The country abounded in strong places, e. g. lq., Izâhadâm (destroyed by the Ayyub Čàwûli, rebuilt later on), Bursk. At the time of Mustawfi, the fortifications of Darbâjdîr were ruined, but the mountain-pass of Tašâ Rûma, to the east of the town, had a strong castle. In the châpter on the Muṣrâfārî dynasty, incised on the manuscript of Mustawfi's *Nuzhat al-Saltab*, facsimilated by Browne G. M. S., XIV/1,
666/666), there is also mention of the fortifications of Shabankara, the fertility of that country ("beautiful and cultivated like the garden of Iran"), its mills, bâhîras, etc.

The Shabankara tribe were Kurds; in Ibn al-Balkhî's time (early sixth [twelfth] century) there were five subdivisions of them, viz., the Isâma'îlis, the Râmânî, the Karzuwi, the Maxûd and the Shâkâni. They were herdsmen, but also intrepid warriors, who more than once, in the course of history, became a power to be reckoned with. Their chiefs boasted descent from Ardashîr, the first Sassanid, or even from the legendary king Mintâhar. Leaving aside the exploits of the Shabankara in Sassanian times (as e.g. the fact that Yazdegerd III is said to have taken refuge among them at the time of the Muslim invasion), the history of the Shabankara begins at the epoch of the decline of the Buyid power.

The Isâma'îlis were regarded as the most noble in their tribe, their chiefs are said to descend from Minûdîr and to have held in Sassanian times the function of Ispahbads. The first time, so far as we know, this tribe came into collision with a greater power was in the days of the Ghurânâd Wasâd (421/1030 – 431/1040), whose general Tâh Farrâh drove them from the environs of Isfahân; so they were compelled to remove southward. But now they came within the sphere of Buyid influence. The Buyids not suffering their presence, they had to migrate once more, until they settled in the Darâsîjird district. Ibn al-Balkhî gives the history of their ruling family at some length. It may be sufficient to state that in the course of the quarrels which arose among the kinsmen of the fallen Buyid dynasty, Sâkî b. Muhammad b. Vahyû called to his aid the mighty Fadlîyya of the Râmânî; at the time Ibn Balkhî wrote, Sâkî's son Ĥasîhây was the ruler of the Isâma'îlis, but his kinsmen contested his supremacy.

The Karzuwâr Shabankâr, taking advantage of the decline of the power of the Buyids, obtained Kâzerûn but were driven out of it by Ĥawwî when he made his expedition in Fârs. The Maxûdîs also came to some power in the days of Fadlîya; the Karzuwi chief Abu Sa'd had also served under that Râmânî ruler. For some time the Maxûdîs possessed Firuzâbâd and part of Shâpûr Khûra, but they were not match for the Karzuwâs, whose chief, Abu Sa'd, defeated and put to death Amârîya, the Maxûdî prince. When, later on, on Fârs, he installed Amârîya's son Vîghstâf as ruler of Fârs, the Kshânîs, rapacious mountaineers of the coastlands, present no historical interest. They also were subdued by Ĥawwî.

Historically the most important tribe is the Râmânî, to whom belonged Fadlîya (Ibn al-Ĥithir, p. 48), calls him Fadlîh), the mightiest Amir of the Shabankâr. This man, the son of a certain 'Alî b. Abu-Isâh b. Aïyûb, was the chief of his tribe, rose to the rank of Isâma'îlî in the service of the Safîh 'Adîr, the wastr of the Buyid ruler of Fârs. Even before this the Buyids had been troubled by the Shabankâr. The Tâm'âhî-Geûdad (ed. Browne, p. 432) mentions an insurrection of a certain Isâma'îl of Shabankâr against the king al-Imâm Il-Din-Allâh Abu Kâbir (446/1055 – 440/1048). This insurrection was suppressed by his eldest son Abu Nasr, who died in 447 (1055) and left the throne to his younger brother Abu Mansûr, the royal master of the Safîh Abu-Allâh Mansûr put to death this wastr, whereupon Fadlîya rose in rebellion. He succeeded in capturing the king himself and his mother, the Sâyîda Khursâdîâ. Abu Mansûr was confined in a stronghold near Shâhâq, where he was murdered in 448 (1056); the Sâyîda was, by order of Fadlîya, suffocated in a bath. The Shabankâr chief, now ruler of Fârs, soon came into collision with the Sâlûkî power. After fighting without success against Kâwûrî, the brother of Alp Ahrâmî, he submitted to the latter, from whom he received the governorship of Fârs. Fadlîya afterwards revolted; the stronghold of Khurshûb, to which he had betaken himself, was besieged and taken by the great Nâqûf b. Malik, and Fadlîya, after various vicissitudes, captured and executed (464/1071). Such is in substance the account of Ibn al-Balkhî, a younger contemporary. Ibn al-Ĥithir represents these events somewhat differently (x. 48/49; the Kurd Fadlîh, who, according to Ibn al-Ĥithir, ix. 289, held part of Âdharbâjûn and raided the Kshânîs in 431/1030, cannot, of course, be identified with the Shabankâr chief). With the Fadlîya-affair is connected without any doubt, the expedition of Alp Ahrâmî to Shabankâr of the year 458/1066, mentioned by al-Râwînî, Râbût al-Ĥittîr (G. M. S., New Ser., vol. ii.), p. 118.

The Shabankâr were to be for many years a nuisance to the countries of Kirmân and Fârs. In 492 (1099), supported by the prince of Kirmân, Isrîshâb b. Kâwûrû, they defeated the Amîr-unûr, who was ruler of Fârs, and took the city of the Saltân Bârîkîrî. About these times the struggles of the Attabeg Ĥawwî with the Shabankâr begin. This prince, Fâkhîr al-Dîn Ĥawwî, who died in the year 510/1116 (the Tâm'âhî-Geûdad wrongly places his death under the rule of Maxûdî b. Muhammâd b. Malik-šâb), governed Fârs on behalf of the Sâlûkî ruler of Irāk, Muhammâd b. Malik-šâb. The Shabankâr Amîr al-Ĥusnî b. al-Muhirâb Khusruf refused to pay homage; thereupon Ĥawwî attacked him suddenly. Khusruf had a narrow escape, being saved by the help of his brother Fadhîlî. Now Ĥawwî subdued Pastî and Djahmân in Fârs, thereupon he besieged for some time the stronghold where Khusruf had taken refuge, but perceiving that the siege would be a long and hard one he came to terms with the Shabankâr chief. Later Khusruf accompanied the Attabeg on his expedition to Kirmân, the king of which had sheltered the prince of Darâsîjird, Ismâ'îl. In this connection Ibn al-Ĥithir mentions the fact that Ĥawwî requested the king of Kirmân to hand over some Shabankâr forces which had taken refuge to him. After these events the Shabankâr seem to have kept quiet during the rule of Muhammâd b. Malik-gîrî, but new troubles arose when under the following king, Muhammîd b. Muhammâd (511/ 1117 – 525/1131), the wastr Nâşîr b. 'Alî al-Dârûzânî began to illtreat these tribes also. This caused an insurrection during which the Shabankâr wrought great damage. For the time up to the Kirmân affair the following data is in the service of the Salûkî Attabeg Sunyûr, the Kurd Muhammâd Abu Tâhir, who afterwards became the first independent sovereign of the Greater Lâr dynasty (he died 555/1160), made himself mighty by a victory on the chiefs (Akkûrûn) of Shabankâr. In 564/1168 the Shabankâr sheltered Zangi b. Dâkîr, who was expelled from Fârs by the ruler of Khusruf.

THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM, IV.
We now enter on the most glorious period of Shabánkārā history, which, however, lasted only a few years. The Shabánkārā chief, Kálūl al-Dīn Mūbāriz and his brother Niẓām al-Dīn Maḥmūd, Amir of Iq, availed themselves of the disturbances which arose in Kirmān after the extinction of the ruling Seldūq dynasty of that country. They corresponded to the call of the waźr Nāsḥ al-Dīn, who solicited their aid against the Ghurz. Contrary to the intention of the waźr, but assisted by the citizens, they occupied before, giving battle to the Ghurz the capital Bardasd and so secured the dominion of Kirmān (597 = 1200/1201). The two Amirs now defeated the Ghurz, but the strained relations between these rulers of Iq and the Atabeg of Fārs compelled them to return to their realm after having appointed as their nāṣir one of the nobles of Kirmān. Thereupon the Ghurz appeared once more to repeat their ravages. One of the Kirmānī Amirs, Mūmūz Tādī al-Dīn Shāhān-shāh, concluded a treaty with them. Niẓām al-Dīn, on the other side, in the battle which ensued Hurmuz fell and the Turkish allies were routed. Shortly after, Niẓām al-Dīn entered Bardasd again. He made himself, however, by his debauchery and his capacity odious to such a degree that a plot was laid against him. In the night the conspirators took him prisoner with his sons (600 = 1203/1204). They intended thereby to compel the commanders of Mūbāriz’s garrisons to surrender. These commanders, however, remained in their strongholds and the latter had to be besieged. In the meanwhile a new actor made his appearance on the political stage viz. ‘Adām Shāh b. Malik Dīnār, a protegé of the Khvārīm-shāh [q.v.]. ‘Adām Shāh had concluded an alliance with the Ghurz who assisted him in his attempts to secure the realm of Kirmān. In short, the course of events was as follows. The prisoner Niẓām al-Dīn was sent to the Atabeg of Fārs, but if ‘Adām Shāh expected to remain in the quiet possession of Kirmān, he was disappointed. On his return the Atabeg, Šāh b. Zang, to the effect that Šād was sending his general ʿIzā al-Dīn Ṭaflūn to accelerate the reduction of the garrisons mentioned above (600). The troops of Fārs duly arrived and delivered Kirmān definitively from the Shabánkārā. An expedition which Mūbāriz undertook in revenge had no results except bringing about once more severe devastations.

In 658 (1260) Hillāgū destroys Iq and killed the Shabánkārā Amir Muḥṣafar Muḥammad; afterwards, in the year 694/1295 we find Shabánkārā among the countries which, according to the treaty between Bābā Kānūn and Ghūzān Kān, fell to the lot of Ghūzān. For the year 712/1312 mention is made of an expedition of the Shabánkārā against the authority of Uluğ Kān. It was repressed by Sharāl al-Dīn Muḥṣafar, who later became the first historically important member of the Muḥṣafarī dynasty. It was the princes of that house who definitely put an end to the power of the Shabánkārā. In the year 755 or 756 (1354 or 1355) the last Shabánkārā ruler, the Malik Ardashīr, refused to obey the orders of the Muḥṣafarī Mūbāriz al-Dīn. The latter sent his son Maḥmūd with an army to chastise the Kānīlī prince. Maḥmūd subdued the country and obliged Ardashīr to fly. From this time onwards Shabánkārā forms a part of the Muḥṣafarī empire; incidentally, in the year 765 (1363/1364), we hear of a hikim of Shabánkārā on behalf of the Muḥṣafarī kings (G. M. S., XIV/v, 698). After the time of this dynasty mention is found of Shabánkārā as one of the seifs (gif) held by Bahānghūr Behbudīr (Dawlat-shāh, Tabrīz, ed. Browne, p. 354).


—SHAB'LĪ, ABD ‘AMIR ‘AMIR b. SHARĀIL b. ‘AMIR al-SHAB'LĪ, traditionalist, was one of the many South-Arabs who gained prominence in the early days of Islam. He was descended from the clan Shāb, which is a branch of the large tribe of Hamīl, and was born in al-Kūfah, where his father Sharāshīl was one of the foremost of the šurē or Kurān readers. There is a great divergence in the dates assigned as the year of his birth, but we may assume that the date which he himself gives is approximately correct. He stated that he was born in the year of the battle of Djālūf, which took place in the year 19/640, but, according to another statement, his mother was one of the captives made after that battle, so that the year 20 given by other authorities may be more accurate. He himself tells us that when al-Hādżfāzī came as governor to al-Kūfah in the year 75, he had him called to enquire there about the conditions of the city and finding him well-informed he made him a disciple (‘arīf) of the tribesmen of Hamīl and settled a salary upon him. He kept in favour with al-Hādżfāzī till the time of the rebellion of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. al-Ash‘āth (in 81/700) when several of the chief šurē of the city came to him telling him that he, as the foremost of their class in the city, ought to take part in the rising and finally persuaded him to join them. He actually went so far as to address the opposing armies and overwhelm al-Hādżfāzī with reproaches. The latter when informed about it said:
"Do not be surprised at this Sha'bî, the villain; if God grant me that I get hold of him, I shall make this world narrower for him than a camel's hide!"

Soon after, the army of Ibn al-Ashârî was defeated (in 83 A.H.) at Dair al-Djama'dun and al-Sha'bi to preserve his life went into hiding. When he learned that al-Hadîdîjâdî had granted an amnesty to all who joined the army of Kutaiba b. Muslim, which was being raised to be sent to Kharnâsîn, he obtained through a friend a donkey and provisions and went to Farghānâ. Here he remained unknown but was able to get into favour with Kutaiba who employed him as secretary. From one of his letters al-Hadîdîjâdî gathered that the new caliph al-Sha'bi who was the composer and commanded Kutaiba to send him back to him without delay. Al-Sha'bi had been for a long time on friendly terms with Ibn Abî Muslim, the chamberlain of al-Hadîdîjâdî, and the latter had probably spoken in his favour before al-Sha'bi arrived before the governor. Ibn Abî Muslim and other friends advised al-Sha'bi what excuses to make, but when he came before al-Hadîdîjâdî, he silently endured the many reproaches of ill-rewarded favours which he made and then admitted his guilt and stupidity. Al-Hadîdîjâdî, who must have valued his learning perhaps more than his position among his tribesmen, readily forgave him.

His reputation must have reached the caliph 'Abd al-Malik for he sent to al-Hadîdîjâdî to send al-Sha'bi to him and he spent the next few years at the court in Damascus. It is difficult to credit the account of the three years till the death of 'Abd al-Malik as, on the authority of al-Sha'bi himself, we are told that he was employed on two very important missions, one to the Greek emperor to Constantinople and the other to the caliph's brother 'Abd al-'Azîz who was governor of Egypt. The first mission related by al-Sha'bi himself was remarkable on account of the fact that the emperor tried to make the caliph suspicious against his ambassador, in which he was not successful on account of the straightforwardness of al-Sha'bi. The mission to Egypt was of the most honourable character, the caliph recommending the ambassador in flattering terms to his brother. The favour of al-Sha'bi did not confine itself to the person of al-Sha'bi, but we are told that thirty other members of his family were with him and all received salaries. After being present at the caliph's death-bed he appears to have gone after the decease of 'Abd al-Malik back to al-Kufa and died there a short time before the death of al-Hasan al-Hasîrî, who died in 110/728. Here again the dates given by various authors differ very much; every year from 103 to 110 is mentioned, the latter being probably the right one.

As regards his personal appearance, al-Sha'bi was a slim, little man and he himself attributed it to having been born a twin. His mental qualities must have been great, and in contrast with other theologians he had a sense of humour. Al-Maqâshî was asked why he did not go to hear traditions from al-Sha'bi; he replied: "Because as soon as he sees me coming he makes fun of me and says: Does this look like a man of learning? He looks just like a weaver!" But Ibrahim al-Nakhârî received him with honour. Al-Sha'bi is said to have stated that he had heard traditions from more than 500 Companions and the general judgment of critics is very favour-
of the 'Amara and the Banū Shabwān, he took his mother who lived on the slope of Mount Sāīdamī near Mawsil and went farther south. Sufyan b. Abī 'Iyāla al-Khāthāmī was defeated at Kāhniḵ and Sawra b. Abūdār (al-Hurr) al-Tamīmī at al-Nahrawān, whereupon al-Hadjājdājī at once collected a new army and put al-Djazl b. Sa'id al-Kindī in command. The latter showed the greatest caution in following up his dangerous enemy, was always on his guard and ready for battle, and entrenched himself at night. An attack made by Shabib failed. Al-Hadjājdājī who wanted a speedy end to the long struggle, then appointed Sawd b. al-Mudjājī al-Hamdānī and ordered him to attack at once, but he was killed. His successor Sawdī b. 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Sawdī could do nothing and suddenly Shabib appeared before Kufa on the same day as al-Hadjājdājī returned from a journey to Basra. In the night Shabib even entered the town and knocked at the gate of the citadel with a mighty blow from his mace, but on the following morning he had disappeared again. Al-Hadjājdājī then sent a body of cavalry under Zahr b. Kais al-Djājī against him; Zahr was however defeated at al-Salālahm and when Zā'ida b. Kudāma, who succeeded him had fallen at Rūḏbār, Shabib threatened the town of al-Madīnā. A new army was at once equipped and the command given to 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Muhammad b. al-Aṣ'āb al-Kindī [q.v.] who pursued the same cautious tactics as al-Djazl. As he did not succeed in gaining a decision, al-Hadjājdājī became impatient and replaced him by 'Othūmā b. Kaṣṣāf al-Jīrīkī, who was defeated and killed in Dhū 'l-Hijājī 176 (March 696) on the river Ḥawāla. While Shabib was spending the next three months in the mountains, al-Hadjājdājī again collected a strong army from the command of which was given to 'Attāb b. Warqā al-Riyāḥī. In the meanwhile al-Madīnā fell to Shabib without a blow being struck. Soon afterwards he attacked the troops sent against him at Sīk Ḥakama near Kufa. 'Attāb was killed and Shabib was once more victorious. He therefore again threatened Kufa; al-Hadjājdājī, however, had already appealed to the caliph for help. 4,000 men under Sufyan b. al-Ahār al-Kalbī soon arrived and there was again a battle at Kufa, in which Shabib had the worst of it and had to take to flight to save himself. After an indecisive fight at al-Anbarī he went to Djasbā, i.e. the region of al-Nahrawān, did not stay long there but went to Kirmān. When the Syrians pursuing him proqued he went to meet them, crossed the Djudjīl into al-ᾭwāz to attack Sufyan but was forced to retreat after a desperate struggle and was drowned while crossing the river (probably in the end of 77 = spring of 697). Shabib's appearance was in keeping with his almost legendary exploits. He was very tall and had possessed extraordinary physical strength.


(K. N. Zetterstern)
besides knows a castle on mount Raina (now the Djebel Rima) in Yemen also called Shabwa.


**SHADD (or RA'AT AL-MUQZAM)**, "signature," "note," "birth which is bound"; this is the most important rite in the initiation ceremony practiced since at least the twelfth century A. H. as well as in certain mystical congregations (cf. *tarikah*). At his initiation the body of the initiate, the candidate (mashkil), if he is a Muslim, takes part if required in the recitation of the *fatihah,* the seven surahs, the *mashkil* in honour of the Prophet, the latter preceded by his taking a preliminary oath. Then comes the *shadd*; the novice bends down and is "bound" by the initiator (*mashkil, shadd*), either on the body, the head, or he shoulder (cf. the Turkish miniature in *Islam, vii. 171,* with a knot of material, a shawl of silk or wool (*mab'un*), a cloth handkerchief (*fûzû, manûl, ghâbha, sumûl,* or a simple piece of string (*wustûl*)). Several successive twirls, knots or turns are made in the cord (sometimes 3 or 8); prayers are recited at each twist invoking some patron saint; when there are four of them, the prayer is in honour of the *mashkil,* Gabriel, Mahbûb, *Al'î and Salâm; in this case, two supplementary knots are added (called *gharz, shabka*) in honour of Hasan and Husain.

The *shadd* is characteristic of the solemn initiation *'asb al-kufr Allâh, jî madid'Al'î, bayn al-ifzâyân,* it binds the initiate, whether he be Muslim, Christian or Jew, to the corporation as a body, as the *'ash al-kihrâs* of the mystics binds one to the whole brotherhood; on the other hand, the *taqâwi,* called "spat without a knot" is a private pact of brotherhood binding to a single individual only by a kind of foster-brotherhood (cf. *shadd* al-qâf wa'l-šâwâl wa't-tâwi, for the novice mystic).

After the *shadd,* the initiate is sometimes partially shaved (forelock, moustache, or beard); then he puts on a special dress (*ihûl,* *sawûtû*) in the old guilds; *mâhira* on the shoulders and *'âdî* (*kabîr* or *kumma,* according to Bakr as early as 570 (1174) or *'âdî* on the head, in the congregations. The initiate's solemn pledge is then taken ("shadd, bay'a, muhârâ'a, mîshîl al-'âlî), certain esoteric instruction on his new duties is given with permission to make use of it (*ifdâta*). He then takes his place with this brethren on the carpet of initiation (*sa'id, saffiyya*), for the traditional meal (*sumdîl, wulûn*).

During the last forty years this rite has began to disappear with the gradual disappearance of the old guilds. Some congregations (*Ra'sût* and *Bakâfiyya*), however, have still preserved the solemn *shadd.*

Thorning was the first to study and classify methodically the esoteric manuscripts relating to the guilds, or *khit al-futumwâna,* which describes this ritual (they are a kind of esoteric mechanism of initiation, like the sodomistic handbooks, compiled in vulgar Arabic with some Persian terms: *dastûr,* "by your leave," *fîr, kâr,* the earliest manuscript dated 844 (1440) but the text is of the xith century; an inscription found by van Berchem in Egypt alludes to them as early as 771 (1369); the Caliph Nasir (d. 622/1225) is remembered for having based his attempt at an order of chivalry (*ihûl al-futumwâna*) on the rite of *shadd,* which is found even earlier in 578 (1182) among the *Nubawiyâ* of Damascus, and in 535 (1140) in a guild of thieves of Bagdad (cf. also Ibn al-Djâwzi, *Tabûs ilûtis*, ed. Cairo 1340, p. 45*).

Its origins are still more remote. If we remember the byname from the fourth century A. H. among the mystics of the words already mentioned *bâlî, fiqâ,-, and especially futumwâna* [q.v.], this "knighthood honour" which no threat or prayer could turn from regarding their oaths (like Sasan damned for his fidelity to the monothestic pact, which he had taken, according to Hallâd, *Tabûs.*, vi. 20-25; Abu Tâlib al-Makki, *Kût al-Kulh,* Cairo 1310, ii. p. 82, i. 8-9; Ahmad Ghazâli quoted in Ibn Dâwjâ, *Kuçib*, Leiden MS., cod. Warn. 998, f. 1177 b 436). The appropriation to the *shadd* of *Kur'ân,* vii. 171 and xvili. 10 seems to be more modern. But certain elements of the ritual itself are ancient, probably of extremist Shi'a origin. It is not by chance that the sect of the *Nabatâ* who practice initiation as reformed by Khâbidî and Tafrîsî in the fourth century A. H. already credits Salmân with the same qualities as initiator who do the guild catechism describing the *shadd:* besides the oath of secrecy and the right to initiate non-Muslim mystics point to the *Kurâ'ân.*


(Louis Massignon)
SHADDÁD, BANU. The Banu Shaddád, of whom there is little record, ruled over Arrán from 340–465/951–1075/1067 when most of the country was conquered and annexed by Malik-Sháh. Members of the family continued, however, to hold governorships in various districts, such as Gandjá and Aní, which they purchased from the Seljúq, at any rate down to the end of the 8th/14th century. They were probably Kurds. The principal towns included in Arrán were Nakhchiván, Gandjá, Tílís, Damárcap and Karabágh. The inhabitants were called A or Leqshána.

In 397/948 the Mamluk ruler of Arrábad, Dállá, Islam Muhammad, was captured before the gates of Raís, whereas on that country was thrown into confusion and any chief who had a following set himself up as independent governor of some town or district. Among these was a certain Muhammad b. Shaddád b. Kárrú, who, having first made himself master of Dállá by 340/951, became practical ruler of Arrábad, which he apparently held intact until 344/955 when his power began to decline, and in 360/970 his authority was limited only to the province of Arrán. There was about this time a ruler of Gandjá named Faḍlún who was possibly a brother of Muhammad b. Shaddád. The son of Muhammad b. Shaddád b. Kárrú was Abu l-Ḥasan 'Ali b. Dállá Qaṣím, who reigned for eight years and was succeeded by his brother Márzúb, who after a reign of seven years was killed by another brother named Faḍl b. Muhammad while out hunting. Faḍl, by his good government, made himself loved of the people, and among his memorable acts was the building of a vast bridge across the river Arránz. He died in 422/1031 after a reign of 47 years and was succeeded by his son Abu l-FAth Músá, who, after a reign of three years, was succeeded by his son Abu l-Ḥasan 'Ali b. Músá Qaṣím, who reigned down to his death in 440/1048. This Abu l-Ḥasan was one of the patrons of the poet Kársí [v.] in Gandjá. He was succeeded by his son Núsharán, who, dying three months later, was succeeded by Abu l-‘Aswár Šáwir b. al-Faḍl, of whom more is known than of the other members of this dynasty, for he is mentioned more than once by Khlás in his Kášá-r-námá, and Ibn al-Athir tells us that he swore allegiance to Tughráh when the latter visited Gandjá in 446/1054 after his conquest of Taláz. Abu l-‘Aswár died in 459/1067 and was succeeded by his son al-Faḍl II Minúčhir. Khlás (op. cit.) writing in 468/1075 refers to Faḍlún b. Abu l-‘Aswár in the past tense, and it would appear that with the death of this Faḍlún and the assumption of Arrán by Malik Sháh the independence of the Banu Shaddád came to an end, and from this point it is very difficult to follow the history of the family. This Faḍlún was presumably the patron of this name so often addressed by Khlás, and is also the subject of several anecdotes in the Kášá-r-námá. He apparently ruled over Gandjá, Aní and Tovín.

According to Khlás (Buld. Acod. Pétr., 1849, vi. 195), al-Faḍl II Minúčhir had two sons, Faḍlún, who was Amir of Gandjá when that city was captured by Malik-Sháh in 481/1088, and Abu l-‘Aswár II Šáwir, who was Amir of Aní when that city was captured by King David the Restorer in 518/1124. This Abu l-‘Aswár II Šáwir had a son Músá, who had a son Kall-Sultán, of whom we know from an inscription found in Aní bearing the date 595 (1198), where he calls himself Kall-Sultán b. Músá b. Šáwir b. Minúčhir al-Shaddád.

RULES OF THE HOUSE OF THE BANU SHADDÁD.

7. Núsharán, A. H. 440;
10. Abu l-Ḥasan, Faḍlún III of Gandjá.


(E. Denison Ross)

AL-SHÁDÍLLI, ABU l-ḤASÁN 'ALÍ b. 'ABD AL-LAH Y b. 'ABD AL-DÁHIR AL-SHÀRÍ b. 'ABD AL-ZAWWILLA, a celebrated mystic, founder of the Muslim religious brotherhood or ṣáfá (q. v.) known as the Shádhílliyá (q. v.), which has itself given rise to some fifteen other brotherhoods like the Wáqiyyá, the 'Arshiyyá, the Qádsíyyá, the Hujjáváyya etc. etc.

He was born, according to some, at Ghemára near Cen-wa about 593 (1190/1197); others say he was born at Shádhíl, a place near the Dábal and Shárdín in Turkménia from which he would take his name of al-Shádíl. In any case the ethnic al-Zawwilla would suggest a Moorish origin. His disciples attributed a noble origin to him and trace his descent back to the Prophet through the line of al-Ḥasan.

From his youth al-Shádill had devoted himself to study with such ardour that he contracted a serious disease of the eyes; perhaps he became blind. Henceforth he devoted himself completely
to the doctrines of the mystic Sufis (cf. the art. TAŠAWWUF). In Fas he had attended the lectures of the adepts of the great eastern mystic Djam, particularly those of Muhammad b. 'Ali b. Hizhām, himself a pupil of Abū Mīdān Shū'aib of Tlemcen. But it was only under the influence of the Moroccan Şūfi 'Abd al-Salām b. Mawṣīlūn that the subject of our article went to Hīrīlāy to the reign of Tunis to spread his doctrines. Persecuted for his teaching and especially for his influence on the people, he took refuge in Alexandria in Egypt where his popularity extended and increased. According to some of his biographers, he could not leave his house without being followed by crowds. He made many pilgrimages to Mecca, on the last of which he died at Hīrīlāy while crossing a desert in Upper Egypt (656 = 1258). His tomb, which was an object of great veneration and pilgrimage, is surmounted by a dome, the gift of a Mamlūk Sultan of Egypt (cf. al-Batashinī, Rūbāl p. 29). Silvestre de Sacy gives another tradition (Christomathie, ii. 233), according to which he is buried in the region of Mokha.

Al-Shāhdīlī led the life of a Şāhiḥ [q. v.] Şūfī or religious man seeking through a wandering life of meditation constant union with the divinity, eternal ecstasy, to teach his disciples the entire devotion of life to the service of God. He recommended them to pray at all hours, in all places and in all circumstances, and to practice the tajwīd, his profession of faith was the ṭawābiḥ. His immediate pupils had no ikhwān (a kind of hermitage), nor monastery, nor noisy practices, nor juggling. Among his many disciples, the most famous were in Egypt Tādī al-Dīn b. 'Aṭā Allāh and Abu 'l-ABBĀS al-Murta; in the North-west of Africa the most of the Muslim religious brotherhoods claim to follow his teaching.

Al-Shāhdīlī left a number of works of which the majority are ḥadīth [q. v.], a kind of formula of prayer for recitation, either regularly or in case of need. They are entitled:


SHĀHĪLĪYA, or SHĀHĪLĪYA, pronounced in Africa Shadulīya, Şūfī sect called after Abu 1-Ḥasan 'Abd b. 'Abd Allāh al-Shāhdīlī, whose title is variously given as Tādī al-Dīn and Ṭādī al-Dīn (593-656 A.H.). For the life of this personage see the art. al-.SHĀHDĪLĪ.

His system. Al-Shāhdīlī does not appear to have composed any large work, but many sayings, spells and amulets are ascribed to him, and since some of the first are recorded in the work of his disciple's disciple, Tādī al-Dīn al-Iṣkandari, composed in 694, they may be to some extent genuine (see the art. al-Shāhdīlī). The best known of his productions is the Ḥāf 'Isāb al-Bahr "Incantation of the Sea", which was reproduced by Ibn Baṭṭūta (I. 41), whence the translation is copied by L. Kim (Maraboute et Khousa, p. 229). Extraordinary powers are attributed to it by Hāḍidī l-Khalīfī (III. 58), and its author thought it might have prevented the fall of Baghdad; several commentaries on it are enumerated. Several other incantations and prayers are given in the Lāzīf (I. 47-66) and the Mafā'īb (p. 135 sqq.). The latter of these works contains fairly lengthy discourses, in some of which the stages through which the murūd should pass are described in detail, though the language is, as usual in such cases, not intelligible to the ordinary reader. It would appear from these that al-Shāhdīlī's aim was in the main the incalculation of the higher morality, such as is found in the works which he approved, viz. the Ḥāf 'Ullum al-Dīn and the Khāl al-Kalībī; and indeed the five principles (mūdīl) of his system are given as: (1) fear of Allāh in secret and open; (2) adherence to the Sunna in words and deeds; (3) contempt of mankind in prosperity and adversity; (4) resignation to the will of Allāh in things great and small; (5) having recourse to Allāh in joy and sorrow.

It would seem unlikely that it was his intention to found an order in the sense which afterwards became attached to the word ẓarīṭa. He desired his adherents to pursue the trades and professions in which they were engaged, combining, if possible, their normal activities with acts of devotion. Anecdotes are recorded of men who offered to abandon employment and follow the saint, who urged them to continue working at the same. Mendicancy was discouraged and even government subsidies for their meeting-houses were, it is asserted, refused. Indeed the erection of ẓarīāt and similar buildings does not seem to have been contemplated by Al-Shāhdīlī or his successors or Abu 'l-ABBĀS, who is praised by his biographer for never placing stone on stone. Even the holding of high offices with ample emoluments and a luxurious mode of living was not discouraged; and this doctrine, as will be seen, survived till recent times among adherents of the system.

Doubtless the ultimate aim of al-Shāhdīlī was, as with other Şūfīs, al-ša'āb, and the method pursued was the usual one of the religious exercises called murūd and ṣāḥibān. Formulas, as usual, were selected and their repetition a stated number of times enjoined. Lists of these with the ritual appertaining to them are given in the Mafā'īb (p. 125, 126). The şāhiḥ, indeed, is said to have adapted his recommendations to the needs of each murūd and to have given each permission to follow some other şāhiḥ, if he found his methods more effective. The use of such formulas, however, is not easily separated from the supposed acquisition of miraculous powers, which are described in the Mafā'īb (loc. cit.): "The least of their (the Shāhdīlīs') messengers are blindness, crippling and desolation", but there was some doubt whether they were justified in sending them on their enemies.

Apart from their mysterious knowledge, the leaders of the system claimed to be strictly orthodox, and, indeed, when a revelation which one
of the adherents received conflict in with a zuma he was told to reject the former in favour of the latter. In spite of some of al-Shadhili's assertions the censure of Ibn Taimiya, whose supporters in this matter in their turn incurred the censure of the historian al-Ya'fi (iv. 142).

The three specialties which the members of the sect claimed were: (1) that they are all chosen from the "well-guarded Tablet" i.e. have been predestined from all eternity to belong to it; (2) that ecstasy with them is followed by sobriety, i.e. does not permanently incapacitate them from active life; (3) that the shīb will throughout the ages be one of them.

Spread of the system. The absence at the first of religious buildings renders it difficult to trace the progress of the community. It seems clear that the first group of adherents was formed in Tunis; al-Shadhili's successor, however, Abu 'l-'Abd al-Murra (d. 686) lived 36 years in Alexandria, "without once seeing the face of the governor or sending to him" (Laf'ī, i. 125), and, as has been seen, did not lay stone on stone; still "Ali Pasha Mubarak (Khidat Biyada, vii. 65) reports the existence there of a mosque bearing his name (restored 1189 = 1775/1776), doublestorey, built by his disciples; also of one called after his disciple Yâkuti al-'Arabī (d. 707) and a third after their joint disciple Tâdid al-Din b. 'Abd al-Iṣkandari (d. 709; author of the Laf'ī). The first of these is called a qubūs and is richly endowed. There are manātīs celebrated in honour of the first two of these persons. The Pasha states that the mosques are chiefly frequented by Maghrebins; he mentions a mosque belonging to the order in Cairo, which, however, is in ruins. It is probable that the adherents of al-Shadhili were at all times to be found chiefly to the West of Egypt; but H. H. Jessup (Fifty-three Years in Syria, ii. 537) asserts that they were in his time numerous in Syria and advocated the reading of the Old and New Testaments and fraternization with Christians. In 1892 a lady adherent, "from Karran, in the Bukara, North of Ms. Hamou," set out on a preaching tour in Syria; she advocated reform and an upright life and insisted that all Muslims, Christians and Jews, are brothers. She preached in the mosques in Damascus, Hasbeia, Sidon, Tyre and other cities, rebuking the sins of the people. It would seem certain that religious toleration of this sort by no means coincided with the views of the founder of the order.

It was reported by C. Niebuhr (Reisebeschreibung, Arabische, i. 439; French transl., i. 350) that in Mokhţī in S. Arabia Shah al-Shadhili was regarded as the possessor of the place and, indeed, the originator of coffee-drinking; and S. ile Sacy afterwards (Christ. Arab., ii. 274) produced from the Ḧijānat-miṣr a passage relating how al-Shadhili came to Arabia in 656, and the series of miracles which led to the production of coffee becoming the staple industry of Mokhţī. It is more probable that the patron of Mokhţī is a later member of the sect; "Ali b. 'Umar al-Kurayshī (whose verses are cited in the Mafā'īd, p. 7), a disciple (and probably cousin) of Nāṣir al-Dīn Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Dā'im b. al-Malikā (d. 797), head of the order in his time (Ritter, Erdkunde, Arabien, ii. 572). It is not clear from Niebuhr's account how far the people of Mokhţī in his time observed the Shadhili ritual or been longed to the community. Since Niebuhr's time the place has seriously diminished in importance, being now "a dead-alive mouldering town whose trade as a port for coffee and hides has been killed" (G. Wyman Bury, Arabic Inflexions, 1915, p. 24).

The main seat of the Shadhili community appears to them to have been Africa west of Egypt, and chiefly Algeria and Tunisia. Materials for the religious history of this region are at present scanty; from a MS. called Taḥāṣṣid Wad Qāfūla, written 1805 A. D., MacMichael produces the following excerpt relating to a shākh who died a. H. 1155 (A History of the Arabs of the Sudan, ii. 250):

"It was characteristic of him (Khogali b. Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Abdhim) that he held to the Book and the Law (zuma) and followed [the precepts and example of] the Shadhilī Sayyids as to word and deed. And he used to wear gorgeous raiments, such as a green robe of Basha, and upon his head a red fez (zarīq), and round it as a turban rich muslin stuffs. For footwear he wore shoes (larahs) and he equipped himself with Inayāshīs (al Kitāb al-ḥikam) and per-ABYSSINIAN cives on his heard and on his clothes. All this he did in imitation of Sheikh Abu el Ḥasan al-Shadhali . . . . And it was remarked to him that the Kādiria only wear cotton shirts and scanty clothes, and he replied 'My clothes proclaim to the world 'We are in no need of you," but their clothes say 'We are in need of you'."

The same notice contains the names of some important members of the order; the shākh's conduct, as will be seen, agrees exactly with the anecdotes recorded in the Laf'ī, and the same is the case with what is told in the next paragraph:

"It was also characteristic of him that he never rose up to salute any of the great ones of the earth, neither the AYLN 'ABB, the rulers of his country, nor the kings of GA'AT, nor any of the nobility, excepting only two men, the successor [Chatifa] of Sheikh Itdis and the successor of Sheikh Šaghin an'an'ils.

In the nineteenth century the order received considerable extension through the efforts of one 'Si Masaum' Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Ahmad, born about 1820 among the Gharib, a tribe located halfway between Bogar and Milians, whose biography is given in detail by A. Joly in the Revue Africaine, 1906, 1907. After studying under certain provincial teachers he went to Masaunna, the centre of Muslim studies in Algeria. Having acquired what was to be learned there, he went back to the Gharib among whom he founded two mosques, in one of which he taught the Qur'ān and Fiqh, in the other Grammar and Logic. Having associated with members of different orders, he converted between the Madanita and the Shadhilī; in 1860 he visited the shrine of Abu al-'Rahmān al-Shadhilī near Algiers, and at this shrine having been a Shadhilī, it is said he became attracted to their doctrine; a member of the order advised him to join it and visit the Shaikh of the order, Adda, at Džahl al-Lah in Wazāl Lakrebn. There he stayed for a time, after which he returned to the Gharib. By special providence he had spared the preliminary trials imposed on other aspirants, and instead of starting his career in the order as a muhaddad, he was elevated shortly
after joining to the dignity of Shah. About 1865 he founded a sawah at Bogari and divided his time between the Qarib and Bogari, to the latter of which he ultimately withdrew. In 1866 owing to the death of Adda he became Shah of the Shadhiliyya in Central Algeria, though at first he had to contest it with Adda's son. He was offered the headship of a government madness at Algiers, but declined. This invitation, however, brought him the acquaintance of European officials, whose respect he enjoyed till his death in 1883. By this time his sphere of influence had extended over the greater part of the Tell Oranais and the whole of Western Algeria. Places where he had khulafa' were Mustaghãnem, Mœnara, Reliha, Nedroma, Oran, Telmenec. After his death some of these khulafa' made themselves independent and the unity of control which he had established came to an end.

Statistics for the end of the last century are given by Depont and Coppolani (p. 454), whence it appears that the number of adherents in Algiers and Constantine did not reach 15,000, with 11 zawiyas. The communities which split off from the Shadhiliyya are there given as 13 in number, and among these the Shadhiliyya, Taibiyya and Derrawiya are said to be the most numerous.

Although when the community started there appears to have been little in the way of organisation contemplated and the connection between adherents was loose, it is evident that in course of time the normal organisation of a Khâtib was introduced.

Literature of the Order. It is noticed that several Shadhili himself or his successor Abu l-Abbas al-Mursi published any treatises, whereas his disciple Yusuf al-Asghi seems to have composed Masâbik, and their joint disciple Tadj al-Din al-Iskandari was the author of several works, of which two, Lâqif al-Minan, dealing with the first two heads of the sect, and Milâs al-Falâs wa-Milâs al-Awnâl, are printed on the margin of the Lâqif al-Minan of al-Sharâf (Cairo 1321). The former of these is the main source of our knowledge of al-Shadhili's career. A biography of al-Shadhili which cannot have been much later was the Durrat al-Asrâr of Mu'mammad b. al-Katim b. al-Himyari b. al-Sabagh, which is excepted in the Mafshîhir. Another biography called Khwastib al-Zahiru, by Abu l-Fâdil 'Abd al-Karim b. Mu'azûl (d. 894), was excepted by Hancheberg (Z. D. M. G., VII. 14 seq.).

The general account of the system called al-Mafshihir al-Ma'siyyâ li-Mafshîhir al-Shadhiliyya (printed Cairo 1314) by Ibn lâyâb is later than al-Sûrî. For doctrine this work refers to two Riâlda called respectively al-Usûl and al-Dimhamih by Siddî Zarrûx (Shadhî al-Dîn Ahmad al-Fadl, d. 896). Hancheberg, loc. cit., mentions the Shadhili poet 'Ali b. Wafâ' (d. 807) and his father Muhammad Wafâ', author of certain mystical works, and a 'diwan, of which the ode breathe for the greater part the spirit of joyous devotion to Allah, without disturbing admiixture'. A poem called Hal al-Salih by the Naṣir al-Dîn Ahmad b. Muhammad b. 'Umar b. Thabit of Alexandria (d. 733), is mentioned by al-Suyûtî in Bugaynt al-Wasâ'il, p. 246.

The chief European literature has been noticed above.

(D. S. Margoliouth)
the two to see which would get rid of the other first. By a great display of affection she managed to dispel Aisak's suspicions and to entice him into her palace in the citadel of Cairo. There he was murdered in his bath (655-1257) by two Mamluks devoted to her. When he was attacked and called to her help, she is said to have struck him with a wooden shoe. Others say that she repented and vainly tried to prevent the murder. But she did not succeed in finding a Mamluk officer who would share the responsibility with her; all turned in disgust from the murderers. She was seized by the other party and beaten to death with wooden shoes by the slave women of Aisak's first wife. Her body was thrown into the castle moat and lay unburied for days. Later it was placed in the little mausoleum which still stands in Cairo. She was the most vigorous woman that the Muslim period in Egypt had seen, but she did nothing good during her reign.

*Biography: Abu 'l-Fida in Revue des questions historiques, Hitt. Orientale, vol. 1, passim; al-Makhtis, KB 1. 235; Sulayk. transl. by Quatremere, i. 72; S infected with cicatrices, iii. 485-487; iv. 4-8. On her tomb see M.L.A.O., x. 111 pp., 728 (with some important notes on the Sulta by European writers in Ann. 3), 730.

(SUBREHNEH)

SHAF'A (A), intercession, mediation. He who makes the intercession is called Shaf'a and Shaf'a. The word is also used in other than theological language, e.g. in laying a petition before a king (Lodi, s. v.), in interceding for a debtor (Bukhari, Intifarah, b. 18). Very little is known of intercession in judicial procedure. In the Hadith it is said: "He who by his intercession puts out of operation one of the hudud Allâh is putting himself in opposition to Allâh." (Ibn Hanbal, Munad. ii. 70, 32; cf. Bukhari, An'ihaa, bab 54; Undad, bab 12).

The word is usually found in the theological sense, particularly in eschatological descriptions; it already occurs in the Qur'an in this use. Muhammad became acquainted through Jewish and more particularly Christian influences with the idea of eschatological intercession. In Job xxiii., 43 sqq. (the text is corrupt) the angels are mentioned who intercede for man to release him from death. In Job v. 1, there is reference to the saints (by whom here also angels are probably meant) to whom man turns in his need. Abraham is a mortal saint whom we find interceding in the Old Testament (in the story of Sodom and Gomorrah).

In the apocryphal and pseudographical literature we again find the same classes of beings with the same function. The angels (Test. Adam, ix. 3), the saints (2. Macab., xv. 14; Assumptio Moise, xii. 6). In the early Christian literature the same idea repeatedly occurs, but here we have two further classes of beings: the apostles and the martyrs (cf. Cyril of Jerusalem in Migne, Patrologia Graeca, vol. xxiii., 1115; patriarcha, presbiter, apostles, martyrs; cf. vol. xvi., 850; vii. 383).

In the Qur'an intercession occurs mainly in a negative context. The day of judgment is described as a day on which no sha'afa will be accepted (Sura, ii. 45, 255). This is directed against Muhammad's enemies as is evident from Sura x. 19: "they serve not Allâh but what brings them neither ill nor good and thereby these are our intercessors with Allâh"; cf. also Sura lixiv. 49: "the intercession of those who make sha'afa will not avail them".

But the possibility of intercession is not absolutely excluded. Sura xxxix. 45 says: Say: the intercession belongs to Allâh, etc. Passages are fairly numerous in which this statement is defined to mean that sha'afa is only possible with Allâh's permission: "Who should intervene with Him, even with His permission" (Sura ii. 256, cf. x. 3). Those who receive Allâh's permission for sha'afa are explained as follows: The sha'afa is only for those who have an 'alidh with the Merciful (Sura xix. 90) and xliii. 86: "They whom they invoke besides Allâh shall not be able to intercede except those who bear witness to the truth". XXI, 28 is remarkable where the power of intercession is evidently credited to the angels: "they say the Merciful has begotten offspring. Nay, they are but His honoured servants. He has given them power on behalf of whom they please Him." It appears that the angels are meant by the honoured servants. Sura xi. 7 (cf. xliii. 3) is more definite: "Those who bear the throne and surround it sing the praises of their Lord and believe in Him and implore forgiveness for those who believe (saying) 'Our Lord! who embraces all things in mercy and knowledge, bestow forgiveness on them that repent and follow Thy path and keep them from the pains of Hall".

Such utterances paved the way for an unrestricted adoption by Islaam of the principle of sha'afa. In the classical Hadith which reflects the development of ideas to about 150 A.H. we already have ample material. Sha'afa is usually mentioned here in eschatological descriptions. But it should be noted that the Prophet even in his lifetime is said to have made intercession. A hadith relates that he often slipped quietly from his side at night to go to the cemetery of Baki al-Chardaj to beseech forgiveness of Allâh for the dead (Muslim, Djanââ', trad. 102; cf. Tirmidhi, Djanââ', b. 59). Similarly this Intihaa is mentioned in the qulth al-djanââ (e.g. Ibn Hanbal, Munad., iv. p. 170) and its efficacy explained (Ibid., p. 388). The prayer for the forgiveness of sins then became or remained an integral part of this qulth (e.g. Abu Tahâl al-Schurârî, Kitâb al-Tâmiâh, ed. J. W. T. Juynboll, p. 48) to which a high degree of importance was attributed. Cf. Muslim, Djanââ', trad. 58: "If a community of Muslims, a hundred strong, perform the qulth over a Muslim and all pray for his sins to be forgiven him, this prayer will surely be granted"; and Ibn Hanbal, iv. 79, 100, where the number a hundred is reduced to three rows (susafy).

Muhammad's intercession at the day of judgment is described in a tradition which frequently occurs (e.g. Bukhari, Tawhid, bab 19; Muslim, Munad., trad. 382-383; Tirmidhi, Tafsir, Sura xviii., trad. 19; Ibn Hanbal, i. 4) the main features of which are as follows: On the day of judgment Allâh will assemble the believers; in their need they turn to Adam for his intercession. He reminds them, however, that through him sin entered the world and refers them to Nûh. But he also mentions his sins and refers them to Ibrahim. In this way they appeal in vain to the great apostles of God until Išâ finally advises them to
appeal to Muhammad for assistance. The latter will gird himself and with Allah's permission throw himself before Him. Then he will be told "arise and say, intercession is granted thee." Allah will thereupon name him a definite number to be released and when he has led these into Paradise, he will again throw himself before his Lord and the same stages will again be repeated several times until finally Muhammad says: "O Lord now there are only left in hell those who, according to the Qur'an, are to remain there eternally."

This tradition is in its different forms the locus classicus for the limitation of the power of intercession to Muhammad to the exclusion of the other apostles. In some traditions it is numbered among the charismata allotted to him (e.g. al-Bukhari, *Musnad*, bâb 56).

Muhammad's *ṣafā* then is recognised by the *sidqin*; it is based on Surâ xvii. 81: "Perhaps the Lord shall call thee to an honourable place;" and on xcvii. 5: "and thy Lord shall give a reward with which thou shalt be pleased" (al-Razi's commentary i. 351; cf. earlier, Muslim, *Musnad*, tr. 320). Muhammad is said to have been offered the privilege of *ṣafā* by a message from his Lord as a choice; the alternative was the assurance that half of his community would enter paradise. Muhammad, however, preferred the right of intercession, doubtless because he thought he would get a considerable result from it (Tirmidhi, *Ṣifat al-Kiyâma*, no. 7; `Abd al-Rahim, *Fawâid*, bâb 13: Ibn Hanbal, iv. 404).

The traditions describe very vividly how the "people of hell" (*ṣafāmaniyin*) are released from their fearful state. Some have had to suffer comparably little from the flames; others on the other hand are already in part turned to cinders. They are sprinkled with water from the well of life and they are restored to a healthy condition (e.g. Muslim, *Musnad*, tr. 320).

In another class of traditions it is said that every prophet has a "supplication" (*adwa*) and that Muhammad keeps his secret in order to intercede with Allah for his community on the day of judgment (cf. e.g. Ibn Hanbal, ii. 313: Muslim, *Musnad*, tr. 334 sqq.).

The view is well-known in the Christian view already mentioned, Islam, however, was not content with Muhammad as the advocate. Along with him we find the angels, the apostles, the prophets, the martyrs and the saints. (Bukhari, *Tawhid*, bâb 24; Ibn Hanbal, iii. 94 sqq., 325 sqq., v. 435; `Abd al-Dha`d, *Diya`, bâb 26; al-Tabari, *Tafsir*, iii. 6 on Surâ ii. 255; xvi. 85 on Surâ xix. 90; xxix. 91 on Surâ lxxiv. 49; Abu Talib al-Mukki, *Kutub al-Kutub*, i. 139). Finally after all these classes have said their word, there is still Allah's *ṣafā* (Bukhari, *Tawhid*, bâb 24; cf. Surâ xxxix. 44). Muhammad's pre-eminence remains inasmuch as he is the first to intercede for his community (Muslim, *Musnad*, tr. 330, 332; `Abd al-Dha`d, *Kitâb al-Sunnah*, bâb 13). Finally the question for whom intercession is effective is discussed. While it is generally said 70,000 will enter paradise through the intercession of one man of Muhammad's community (e.g. Dirmint, *Riyad*, bâb 87; cf. Hanbal, iii. 63, 469 sqq.), the answer is already given as early as classical tradition that *ṣafā* holds good for those who ascribe no associate to Allah (Bukhari, *Tawhid*, bâb 19; Tirmidhi, *Ṣifat al-Kiyâma*, bâb 13). To this group also belong those who have committed great sins (Ahî al-Ka`farî). "The prophet of God said: My intercession is for the great sinners of my community" (Abû Dha`d, *Kitâb al-Sunnah*, bâb 20; Tirmidhi, *Ṣifat al-Kiyâma*, bâb 11). This view, however, is not shared by the Mu`tazila (cf. Zanakhi, *Kashf* on ii. 45: no *ṣafâ* for the "wâli"). Al-Razi deals very fully with the Mu`tazila view in his commentary on the Qur`an (i. 351 sqq., vi. 404) according to which there is no such thing as *ṣafâ*, as no one is released from hell who is once thrown into it. For the denial of *ṣafâ* they appeal to some of the verses of the Qur`an already quoted above.


( A. J. Wessinck)

**AL-SHAFAK** (A.), also al-Samir and al-Fayr, dawn and twilight, which are of special importance in the Muslim world and in Muslim astronomy because they settle two of the principal times for prayer. Al-Birûnî gives an excellent description of the phenomena in the Ma`ṣûd `Kanîn (Ma`n, bâb 13). In the morning a long thin column of light appears first, which is more or less inclined to the horizon according to the latitude of the place. This is called the false dawn al-Sâbîl al-Kaîfî al-Fadîr al-Kaîfî or from its shape *Dhamab al-Sâbîl*, "wolf's tail" also "dog's", or gazzelle's tail". This is followed by the true dawn al-Sâbîl al-Šulûh, first as a faint white light which gradually extends in the form of a crescent along the horizon; it marks the time for the beginning of the fifth or morning prayer. Next comes the red dawn. The same phenomena occur in the evening but in the reverse order. That the *Dhamab al-Sâbîl* is not so frequently noticed in the evening as in the morning is, according to Muslim scholars, due to the fact that in the evening people are going to rest while in the morning they are beginning work; Redhouse has definitely shown that first false dawn corresponds to the zodiacal light; he also shows that it is mentioned as early as `Kur`ân, i. 185, l. c. about 630 A. D. and in al-Djâwârî's dictionary and elsewhere. It was therefore noticed earlier in the east than in the west. Numerous Persian verses deal with the dawn and twilight (cf. Redhouse, *op. cit.*). He also gives the Persian and Turkish names for it. Shâfîî, Malikîs and Hanbalis all agree that the end of the third and beginning of the time of the fourth prayer occurs at the moment when the red shimmer al-Sha`fah al-A`mar disappears, while Abû Hanîfa relies on the white one. His pupil A`in Yasîf and Muhammad al-Shâbîbî follow other schools.

Various Arab astronomers have pointed out how much the depression D of the sun in which
the above phenomena appear depend on the atmospheric conditions (fog, etc.), the presence of moonlight, or the sharpness of the eyesight. Different scholars give therefore varying values for D which lie between 16° and 20°. According to Şübat al-Mürdîni (1423–1494/1495) the general opinion in his time was that for al-Sha'āfî $D = 17°$, for al-Sâbî $D = 19°$. Abî 'Ali al-Ḥasan al-Mârîkukhâ (d. c. 1262) had taken 16° and 20° and said that dawn lasts longer than twilight. The time between sunrise and sunset i.e., between the two times at which the depression of the sun is e.g. 18° depends on the inclination of the sun's path to the horizon. The Muslims took a particular interest in calculating the day on which dawn and twilight coincided. For places in the latitude of 48° for example, this happens when the sun is at the beginning of Cancer. The arguments (İzâd) of Şaftâ and Faḍîr are the choroids of the ecliptic between the western or eastern horizon and Şaftâ or Faḍîr.

Astronomical calculations for the beginning of the dawn from Ibn Yûnus (d. 1009) and Abî 'Ali al-Mârîkukhâ are given by C. Schoy in the Naturwissenschaftliche Wochenchrift.

To explain the varying phenomena in the dawn it is assumed by Kûb al-Dîn al-Şahrî and similarly by others that the earth is surrounded by a ball of vapour which contains earthy and watery parts. These are thicker in the lower strata than in the upper. Around the veil of vapour is a ball of pure air. The sun's rays throw a shadow into these balls from the earth. The parts lying outside the shadow reflect the light and seem to shine; the observations result from this more or less accurately.

On the planes of the astrolabe and on certain forms of quadrant and clepsydras lines are drawn which are used to fix the time of morning and evening prayer; on the other hand such lines are not found on the universal plane nor on the Žariḳî plane.

That we so frequently find among composers of astronomical works the Muwaṣṣîd of mosques, times keepers and summoners to prayer such as Djamâl al-Dîn al-Mürdîni, Şübat al-Mürdîni b. al-Şaftî (1375/1376) etc. is explained by the fact that it was the duty of these officials to calculate the hours of prayer exactly and make the necessary observations.


(E. Wiedemann)
on the tomb was built by the Ayyubid al-Malik al-Kamil in 608 (1211/1212). It was always a favourite place of pilgrimage.

Al-Shāfi`ī may be described as an eclectic who acted as an intermediary between the independent legal investigation and the traditionalism of his time. Not only did he work through the legal material available but in his Risāla he also investigated the principles and methods of jurisprudence. He is regarded as the founder of the Usūl al-Fiqh. Unlike the Hanafis he sought to lay down regular rules for Fiqh (K. al-Risāla, Cairo 1321, p. 65 and 70) while he would have nothing to do with Ḥadīth (q.v.). The principle of Ṣafwah seems to have been first introduced by the later Shāfi`is’ (cf. Goldziher, Žahiriyya, p. 20 4q.; do., in E., vol. ii. 109 and Bergsträsser, Anfänge und Charakter des juristischen Denkens im Islam, in Ist., 1924, xiv. p. 76, 80 sqq.). In al-Shāfi`ī’s two creative periods can be distinguished, an earlier (Itrāj) and a later (Egyptian). Al-Ḥikam (d. 405) for example says this of the Risāla (al-Aṣkaλānī, p. 77), which, however, only survive in the later recension (printed at Cairo 1321 etc.). These two periods are also often marked in the K. al-Umm as well as in the variant teachings of the later Shāfi`is.

His writings in which he makes a masterly use of dialogue, with opponents usually unnamed, we have had transmitted to us by his pupil al-Rabi` b. Sulaimān (d. 270 = 884). A list of these is to be found in the Fikrist, p. 210, another of al-Baihaqi (d. 458) in al-Aṣkaλānī, p. 78, a third in Yāqūt, p. 396–398. The most of the titles mentioned there are parts of the K. al-Umm, a collection of writings of Shafiis’ (printed at Cairo in 7 volumes: 1321–1325, in part from a manuscript of the celebrated Shafii` Sirāj al-Dīn al-Balḵi). The title of this collection can hardly be old. As far as I know, it is mentioned for the first time by al-Baihaqi (in al-Aṣkaλānī, p. 78) and al-Ghazali, Ibrā (Cairo 1327), ii. 131. In the work itself it is mentioned only in such passages as appear to be glosses (e.g. Um, i. 158). Several recensions of this work must have existed. As late as the fifth century another recension different from that of al-Rabi` was known to al-Balshqāi for he gives some of the separate chapters of the Umm in a different order. This may perhaps have been al-Buwaisi’s recension, which al-Rabi` seems to have used along with that of Ibn Abi l-Dārād (cf. Um, i. 96, 157; ii. 52; viii. 389 etc.). In the present printed text of the Umm, a number of larger and smaller glosses seem to have been incorporated; for example al-Ghazali, Ibn al-Sābīdān (d. 477), al-Mawardi, etc., are quoted (cf. Um, i. 114 sqq., 158).

According to al-Ghazali (lev. cit.) this collection was arranged by al-Buwaisi and published by al-Rabi` with his own additions. Final inquiry into the origin of the Risāla al-Umm cannot be based upon the printed edition, as the editor has followed the MS. of al-Balshqāi without recording the variants of the other MSS.

The present components of the Umm are writings quoted by al-Balshqāi as separate works: Qisas al-Balshqāi (Umm, vii. 250 sqq.), K. Aḥād al-Istilāh (Umm, vii. 257 sqq.), K. Ṣafar al-Farq (Umm, vii. 262 sqq.), K. Siyāsa al-ʿAm wa l-Nakb (Umm, vii. 265 sqq.), K. Ḥaṭṭal al-Iṣṭighāla (Umm, vii. 477 sqq.), K. Iḥtiṣāl al-ʿIrāqīyya (Umm, vii. 87 sqq.) i.e. Abi ʿAbd Allah and Abi Abi Laila († 148), K. Irāqīyya ma`a Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan (viii. 277 sqq. = K. al-Radd al-Mahb. b. al-Husayn) and K. Ḥaṭṭal `Alla` Abī Allāh b. Muqaddas († 34); viii. 151 sqq.). The K. Ḥaṭṭal al-Balshqāi is preserved in the translation of Um, vol. 7, the Minhaj on the margin of vol. 6. This contains traditions which have been collected from the different writings, which have those that have not survived but are mentioned in the Fikrist and in Yāqūt, e.g. K. Aḥkām al-Kur`ān, K. Fadil` al-Kur`ān, etc. The K. al-Maḥṣūs b al-Fiqh (Fikrist, p. 210) must have been another large law-book, which was still available to al-Balshqāi, and is also called al-Maqtabar al-Mu`aṣir wa l-Maṣāhir (Fikrist, p. 210). There has also survived a profession of faith by Shafi`is’ entitled: K. Waylay al-Shafi`is (mentioned in Yāqūt, ed. by Kern in M. S. O. S., Am., 1910) while the K. al-Fiqh al-ʿAbbar (Cairo 1324 etc.) is a short treatise on dogmatics of the Ash`arite period. A few poems bear witness to his command of language (al-Muṣʿīdī, Muḥarrarī, viii. 66; Ibn Ḥaddīli, L. 448; al-Aṣkaλānī, p. 73 47).

The main divisions of his activities as a teacher were Baghdad and Cairo. The most notable of his pupils were al-Muṣāfī († 264), al-Buwaisi († 231), Al-Rabi` b. Sulaimān al-Murādī († 270), al-Zarāfī († 260), Abī Thawr († 260), al-Ḥusaynī († 219), Ahmad b. Ḥanbal († 241), al-Kurāshī († 248) etc. In the course of the third and fourth (ix. and x.) century the Shafiis’ won more and more adherents from these two towns as centres, although from the first they had a difficult position in Baghdad, the centre of the Al-Ab. In the fourth (xiv.) century Mecca and Medina were their chief centres next to Egypt. By the end of the third (beg. of the tenth) century they had already successfully disputed Syria with the Awaṣīs so that from Abū Za`ūr’s onwards (302 = 915), they always had the office of ʿādi in Damascus. In the time of Muṣūdī the Shafiis’ exclusively held the jurisdictions in Syria, Kirmān, Bukhārā and the greater part of Khurasan; they were also in considerable strength in Northern Mesopotamia (Akkūr and Dallām (Egypt by this time was Shafa’i). In the fifth and sixth (xi. and xii.) century there was frequently street fighting with the Ḥanbalis in Baghdad, with the Hanafs in Isfahan while on the other hand they won the (ḥarām princes to their side (Snauck Hargraves, Vorprü. Gesch., ii. 306). In Egypt under ʿAlā al-Dīn (564 = 1169) they again became the predominant Madhhab. But in 664 (1265/1266) al-Malik al-Zahir Baibars appointed one Ḥanafi and Malik one judge alongside of the Shafi`i (cf. al-Subkī, v. 134). In the last centuries before the rise of the Ottomans the Shafiis’ had attained absolute preeminence in the central lands of Islam. Even in Ibn Dujair’s time (Riḥā, p. 102) the Shafi’i Imām conducted the prayers in Mecca. It was only under the Ottoman Sultan at the beginning of the x (xvi.) century that they were replaced by Ḥanafis, who were sent from Constantinople to fill the jurisdictions, while in Central Asia with the rise of the Safawīs (1501) they were lost to the Shafa’. Nevertheless in Egypt, Syria and the Ḥijaz, the people followed the Shafiis’ Madhhab (Snauck Hargraves, Vorprü. Gesch., ii. 378/379). The Shafiis’ teaching is still eagerly studied to-day in the Ashar mosque. It is still predominant in South Arabia, Bahrajn, the Malay Archipelago, the former German East Africa,
Daghastān and some parts of Central Asia.

Among famous and important Shāfīīs were:


SHAFHĀWAN (popularly Chechousen, echchaum, in Spanish Xauen); the original of the name is no doubt the Berber plural Shafhawen), a little town in northwest Morocco, 35 miles south of Tetuan. It lies at the foot of the mountain of Sidi Bu-Hajja (a spur of the massif of Ill-Hashem) on a tributary of the Wādī Lāyū; it now lies within the lands of the tribe of al-Khūshān, but it used to belong to the Bani Zaidā, a tribe belonging to the Ghumāra group.

In 1918 the population was about 7,000, who lived in a thousand houses in the six quarters: el-ʿOmrā, Ṣif el-Andalus, el-Kharāzin, es-Sūk, es-Swīḥa, Rif es-Schbānī. There is an important Jewish colony in it of Spanish origin. The ghetto (Melāthi), originally on the edge of the Wādī l-Dmānī, was later brought into the interior of the town. It contains 22 houses with about 200 inhabitants and 2 synagogues, one very luxurious. Almost all the houses have sloping tile roofs, for the winter brings heavy falls of snow. The town is surrounded by walls and has eleven gates; there are twelve mosques, nine zāwiyas (including 3 Deşkaya and 3 Ṣawä) and eight notable sanctuaries, the chief of which is that of Sidi ʿAli b. Rāghid, founder of the town. In the citadel (baʿba) are the government buildings and the madrasa.

The Muslim population consists mainly of Shafīī and Andaluz refugees, possessing the culture and amenities of town life but fanatical and uncompromising in character.

The surroundings, fertile and well watered, produce wheat, barley, fruits, olives and grapes in abundance; the town also has 21 watermills and 13 oil presses. The forests of the surrounding mountains supply wood for carpentry and furniture making (a speciality of the place is artificially painted woodwork); tan-bark is abundant and supplies the wants of 5 tanneries. Woolen cloth for djellānas (cf. jellāna) is made on many looms.

The Jews are mainly occupied in trading in imported cloths and have constant dealings with their co-religionists who are connected by common Spanish origin. They are also jewellers and saddlers, a despised trade which the Muslims leave to them.

Lying at the intersection of the roads from Tetuan, el-ʿAqṣār, Wazân and Fes, in the middle of the land of the Ḫabsā, Shafhāwan is a great centre of supplies for the latter to which they come to get the produce imported from Tetuan (cotton goods, sugar, tea and candles); but the well-nigh permanent state of anarchy in which the surrounding tribe of al-Khūshān lives, makes business difficult.

Shafhāwan was founded about 876 (1471—1472) by a descendant of the great saint ʿAbd al-Salām b. Māskībī (q. v.), the ʿAlawi Sharīf al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad, known as Ibn Dūma, who wished to make it a place of refuge and centre of resistance for the Ḫabsā against the Portuguese. The latter, taking advantage of the weakness of the dynasty of the Banū Wātīti (q. v.), had seized Ceuta (1415), al-ʿAqṣār al-seghīr (1458 q. v.), Tangier (1471) and Arzila (1472); from these ports they raided the country for over 50 miles inland, terrorised the mountainiers and brought the Andjera and various tribes of the Habī, including the Banū Ṭarīq under their sway. It seemed that, oppressed and harassed by the Sharīfīs, these tribes were quite ready to submit to Christian rule; a holy war was therefore an excellent pretext for the Sharīfīs to endeavour to regain their profitable prestige and authority.

Al-Ḥasan founded Shafhāwan on the bank of the river of the same name, in an excellent situation within easy reach of Tetuan and Ceuta in the northwest and el-ʿAqṣār and el-Ḥabsī in the southwest. He died before completing his undertaking; having gone during the holy war to the people of al-Khūshān not far from Arzila, the latter were bribed by the Portuguese and set fire to the mosque in which he was performing his evening prayers; he perished in the flames.

His work was continued by his cousin the Sharīf ʿAli b. Mūsā b. Rāghid who succeeded him as leader of the holy war (ḥaḍr al-Ḥāṣibī). ʿAli lived among the Bani Ḥassānī, a tribe to the north of Shafhāwan; when the latter rebelled against the tyranny of the Sharīfīs, he went over to Andalusia, where fighting sometimes in Christian pay and sometimes for the king of Granada, he became an expert in military matters. Returning to Morocco, he collected a body of horsemen belonging to himself to the Sharīfīs and began to fight the Portuguese. The Wātāythālī, Sultān of Fez, Abd Saʿūd, then sent against him a few horsemen and crossbowmen with whose help he was able to hold his own against the Portuguese. He used his force also to subjugate the mountainiers and restore the supremacy of the Sharīfīs. But rendered vain by his successes he went so far as to refuse to send
his tribute to the Sultan who came to attack him with a large army. Judging resistance impossible, 'Ali b. Râghid submitted; the Sultan pardoned him out of respect for his Sharîfi origin and confirmed him in the government of Shafshâwan which became the center of the marches of the empire of the Banû Watâî. 

'Ali b. Râghid built on the other bank of the Wadî Shafshâwan a citadel which he filled with members of his family and clan; people from the country round also came to settle there. 'Ali b. Râghid is credited with the building of the rampart from the Bâb es-Sûr to the Bâb es-Mûjâf; it is from his time that the es-Swêga and Rif es-Shebbâfi quarters date. After the capture of Granada (1492) and the general expulsion of the Muslims from Andalusia and Castile (1501-1502) numerous Spanish Muslims came and settled here so that by the death of 'Ali in 917 (1511-1512) a regular town had been created; Leo Africanus who was travelling through Morocco at this time, describes it as the people of Shafshâwan.

The prestige of 'Ali b. Râghid was still further increased by the brilliant attacks on Ceuta, Tangier and Arzila in which he fought along with al-Mansîr, whom he had aided to install himself on the ruins of Tetuan with a colony of Spanish refugees. 

'Ali (d. 1511) was succeeded by his sons, Ibrahim (d. 1530), then Muhammad who was destined to be the last prince of the dynasty of the Banû Râghid. In 948 (1511) the Waṭâṣîd Sultan Abî 'Abdâbâs Ahmad married the sister of the Amir, al-Hurra; the marriage was celebrated in Tetuan. Muhammad b. Râghid had quarrels with the following Waṭâṣîd, Abî Hasûn, whose fief of Bâdís in the Rif adjoining his own territory. When with the help of the Turks of Watâsîd, Abî Hasûn had taken Fes in 961 (1554) and, when he had quarrelled with the Turkish chief, Muhammad b. 'Ali arranged with the latter to proclaim Abî Bakkâr b. Ahmad Sultan; when Fes was evacuated by the Turks, Abî Hasûn had the Amir of Shafshâwan arrested but on the death of the Sultan, the latter was released and resumed his government. 

The Saâdâns then replaced the Waṭâṣîd in northern Morocco. In 969 (1561) the Saâdî Sultan 'Abd Allâh al-Qâlibî bilišî, fearing that the warlike activities of the Amirs of Shafshâwan might prevent him from concluding with the Spanish an alliance against the Turks which he was planning, sent against the town his troops commanded by the vizier Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Kâdir, grandson of Sultan Muhammad al-Shâshik. Being strenuously besieged Muhammad b. Râghid fled through the mountains with his family during the night and reached the port of Tarqha along the Ghamàra; from there he sailed for the east and took refuge in al-Medîna where he died; some of his descendants were exiled to Marràkush. The fief of Shafshâwan was then given to the grandson of Mu'âmâm b. al-'Idjî; the latter's grandfather Yâsîyâ (or Muhammad) al-'Idjî was a Genoese merchant who had become a convert to Islam and had married the beautiful daughter of the semi-independent chief of the Tejést region in Siûû. On the death of his father-in-law, the Genoese merchant was chosen chief of the people and gained the favour of the Saâdî Sharîfa by allowing them to cross his territory to reach the Hâba; his eldest son Mu'âmâm had entered the service of the Saâdâns and was one of their most faithful supporters.

In 986 (1578) the Portugese were crushed at the battle of Wâdi 'l-Maghâzi; they had to abandon their hopes of occupying the interior of the country and the struggle against the Christians became localised around the occupied ports and in the sea. Shafshâwan thus lost its strategic importance which passed to Tetuan its rival, which had been raised from its ruins by 'Ali al-Mansîr and had been peopled by Andalusians who soon made it a regular nest of corsairs. On the other hand the religious prestige of the town, based for a large part on the successes of the holy war, also began to decline especially after the installation at Wâzân of the Sharif family of Mawâli' Abî Allâh al-Sharîf (d. 1689 = 1768) whose influence continued to increase. 

After the government of the grandson of Mu'âmâm al-'Idjî, the town seems to have returned under the authority of the Sharîfs. In 1028 (1618-1619), we actually find the Sharîf al-Hasan b. 'Ali b. Rasûl (buried in Shafshâwan) having Muhammad b. al-Shâshik called Zaghâda proclaimed as Sultan as the people of Shafshâwan.

In the beginning of the 'Alawi dynasty and during the struggle between Sultan al-Râghid and his brother Muhammad, the northwest of Morocco was under the domination of an independent chief Abî Khaḍîr Ghalîlî, whose capital was al-Kârî al-Kbîr and whose power extended over the lands lying between Tangier and Ceuta, Tetuan and Shafshâwan. 

In 1667, M. al-Râghid, lord of Fes, subdued the Banû Zarwâl and went to Tetuan after putting Ghalîlî to flight; he appointed the Mu'azzâm al-Tauzi, governor of the town, and the latter's sons succeeded him there.

On the death of Mawâli' Ismâ'il the northwest of Morocco passed under the rule of a leader in the holy war, the Pasha Ahmad b. 'Ali b. 'Abd Allâh al-Kâfi (d. 1156 = 1743) who built at Shafshâwan, inside the citadel built by 'Ali b. Râghid, the government-house and the madrasa.

In 1171 (1757-1758), a murâbi of the tribe of al-Khumá, Mu'âmâm al-Kâfi al-Khumáî, called Abî 'Aqâîr b. al-Kâfi, rebelled against the Sultan Mu'âmâm b. 'Abd Allâh who captured him and sent his head to Fes. He then appointed the Pasha al-Ayyâmî governor of the Ghamûra, al-Khumá and Shafshâwan. He was succeeded by governors appointed by the Sa'dî Sultan down to the rebellion of al-Sâlih Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Salâm called Zaïtân, who raised all the tribes of this region in 1208 (1793-1794). Defeated and pardoned he was restored to the governorship of Shafshâwan and al-Khumá. After him the town was governed by local chiefs, then by the pasha of Tetuan who sent a khalîfa there. 

In 1306 (1899) the Sultan M. al-Hasan visited the town on his way to Tetuan.

Since the establishment of the Spanish protectorate the town has been under the influence of the famous 'Alawi Sharîf 'Abd al-Raçîfî of Târût. On Oct. 4, 1920, it was taken by a Spanish army from Tetuan; on Nov. 15, 1924, the Spaniards evacuated it. It was then occupied by the Rifis under the rebel Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Karîm and since the capture and death of the al-Raçîfi, it became their political and strategic center from which they dominate the Djebel and can raid the districts of Tetuan, al-Kârî and Wâzân; their tyranny has driven away many of the inhabitants of the town, which has been several times bombarded by French and Spanish aeroplanes.
SHĀH (v.), "King." a. Etymological. The old Persian Khāshāyatiya is probably formed with a suffix from an unquotable substantive from the Old Iran. verbal root khāsh (meaning to "rule" etc.); cf. Sanskr., kāyati = "he rules," kāyāyati = "ruler of men (or heroes)," an epithet of the gods in the Rigveda. From the same root comes Old Persian Khāshātiya ("kingdom") = M. P. Gaahr; cf. Kāshāyā ("king, ruler") from an unquotable root kāshāya (cf. Ak. pašā). The word kāshāyatiya is therefore originally, an adjective: it is found as such in the Bactrian inscription while in all other passages it means "king" (Bartholomae, Air. Wor.

terka, col. 553-554). The modern Persian dāštāgh is regarded as a compound of šah; this may be so as regards the modern usage. For a noteworthy attempt to give another explanation of dāštāgh see Bartholomae, Zurn. südostasiatisch. Recht, i. 5, note 5. (S. B. Ab. Heid., Hist. Phil. Kl., 1918, Abb. 5). In Pahlavi the word already means šahān. Whether in the second syllable of the inscriptions form of the name Shāhān: "Ismā'īl" (w. yad) is a remnant of the second syllable of the old Persian word (Grundr. d. Iran. Phil., i. 269) or a sign of an old oblique case, is not easy to decide. The modern form dāštāgh shows with its i Turkish influence in the declension (Grundr. d. Iran. 

Phil., i. b. 24); this combination might perhaps show a remnant of the original second syllable in the form in which it is found on Indo-Sytchic coins (with the ending -yana in the first word; Grundr. d. Iran. Phil., i. 269, but cf. p. 284; there is a good reproduction of one of these coins in Rapson, Ind. Coins, Pl. ii. 12). The Indo-Sytchic word is due to borrowing (but cf. also Konow in Z. D. M. G., lxviii, 93 sq.).

b. Lexicographical. In Vullers' Lexicon, pp. 392/393 the statements of the later lexicographers are gathered. The derivation given in the Burāh-i Kāfi (asl.wākāhāwānd) is, at least as concerns the adj., not supported by the etymology. The meaning given under (5) (via ageris et lusta e qua alias derivantur) is perhaps more closely connected with that under (4) (magnum quodvis et excellens in suo genere, in words like [shāhāz or shāhār]), although the author's view that simple shāh also is found with the meaning of shahār is perhaps more distinctly from the text of the Burāh-i Kāfi (p. 552); so far as I know this use of the word does not occur. The other meanings (a chessman, animal in Hindustān etc.) need not be discussed; an (independent) meaning dāmād, shuwar-ī shahak found not only in more recent lexicons like the Burān and Shuwar, but as early as Shams-ī Pahlī (see Salemmann, p. 114), is perhaps not so certain as it appears in the lexicon. In the two passages from poets which Shuwar gives for it, the word shah is associated with arvā: this would be simply: "lord of the bride" = "bridewoman," which of course, can be expressed by dāmād so that only one meaning derived from the main sense would be present. The verse which is quoted by Vullers, s.v. shahāz out of Shuwar as evidence of a meaning purant dāmād (a peculiar combination in any case) is not absolutely convincing.

c. Historical. The usual title of the Achaemenids is Kāshāyatiya; on their inscriptions they call themselves Kāshāyatiya sarvākā kāshāyatiyā kāshāyatiyā ("great king, king of kings"). Pahlavi and Modern Persian šahān šah (also M. P. šahānšah) corresponds to Kāshāyatiya kāshāyatiyāšah (the worshipper of Manda, the god Ardānšir, king of kings of Iran); it is written with the ideogram یlando mālāk mālākā.

Ardānšir's father Pāpak is given the title šah (škt.) on a coin of his son (E. Thomas, Numismatic and other antiquarian illustrations of the rule of the Sassanians in Persia, p. 16), and in inscriptions and this is also the designation of the rank of some pre-Sassanian dynasties of Persia (Grundr. d. Iran. Phil., i. 487).

The Sassanian crown princes in their father's time were often given the title šah of a certain province, cf. Hamzā, Tāṙešt, ed. Gottwaldt, p. 5051. (cf. Noldeke, Tabari, i. 115; Agathias, 24 and 26 where we have ša'a), Bahram III and IV before their accession were thus called Sagštāhār or Karmštāhār; Hormizd III had also the former title as Crown Prince (Noldeke, Tabari, i. 115). The word sagštāhār wrongly appears as shakštāhār in some Arab writers: not only in Tabari (Noldeke, loc. cit.) but also in Ibn Fawakhir (K. al-mušrif, p. 322), Euthychus (ed. Cheikho, i. 113) and Thāḥibā (Hist. des rois des Perses, ed. Zotenberg, p. 507).

In Muslim lands where Persian is spoken šah remains the usual word for king, a title also given in literature to rulers who have an Arabic title, e.g. the Amir Malešid of Ghazna in Firдавāsi. The regular panegyrics are of course very liberal with the term šakštāhār; when for example Minšūrā VIII, calls the Amir Malešid of Ghazna Kūvarak šakštāhār-i dāmā, this is only one example out of many. The term is further found frequently in kings' names in such a way that we can hardly speak of it as a title, e.g. we have among the Yemeni Ayyúbids a Turānšah and in a Mongol dynasty an 'Arab-Shāh (see Lane-Pool, Mohammadian Dyansties, p. 98 and 239). The word was already not unusual in personal names in Pahlavi; besides the name Šahār (šah + Pahlavi pahr, son) cf. the names of the Sassanian princes in Hamzā, Tāṙešt, ed. Gottwaldt, p. 61. Many rulers of the Seldjuk dynasty used the term in such a way that it may be regarded as a title. From a name of the names (e.g. Lane-Pool, op. cit., p. 153) we see that the combination may have as its first component the name of a people (Turān Shāh, Iran Shāh, i.e. on the Sassanian plan), or a personal name (Arsān Shāh, Bahram Shāh), or we may even have a combination with other words meaning ruler (Mālik Shāh, Ruknuddin Sulṭān Shāh). Analogous formations are found among the Atabegs. On a case of rulers who did not have the title šah having adopted it at a definite time, cf. H. F. Amedroz, The Assumption of the title Shakštāhār by Buwaikhād.
SHAH DHAJAHAN was born in 1592; in 1622 he caused his eldest brother, Khurram, whom his father had placed in his care to be murdered, and afterwards rose in rebellion. Having been defeated in 1623 he became a fugitive, but occupied Bengal and Bidar. In 1625 a peace was patched up between him and his father. When Dhajahgir died, in October, 1627, Khurram was at Djuanur in the Dakun, but his father-in-law, Asaf Khan, caused his younger brother, Shahryar, to be blinded at Lahor and proclaimed as a stop-gap Dcar Bakhsh (Buldaji), the son of Khurram, whom he afterwards permitted to escape to Persia when the other males of the imperial family were put to death by Shah Dhajahgdn's orders. In 1628 Shah Dhajahgdn ascended the throne in Agra, and soon had to deal with the rebellions of the Bundelas and Khan Dhajahgdn Lodhi [q.v.], which he crushed. In 1631 his dearly loved wife, Mumtaz Mahall, died in childbirth at Burhanpur, and he afterwards erected over her remains, at Agra, the beautiful Taj Mahall [q.v.]. In 1632 he captured Daulatabad and swept away the last vestiges of the kingdom of Ahmadnagar, and shortly afterwards compelled the two remaining kingdoms of the Dakun, Golconda and Bidjapur, to acknowledge his suzerainty. In 1632 also Hagi was besieged and taken from the Portuguese, and the Christians were cruelly persecuted for two years. In 1636 Awrangib, the emperor's third son, was appointed vicerey of the Dakun, and in 1638 'Ali Mardan Khan, who held Kandahar for the Shah of Persia, treacherously surrendered it to Shah Dhajahgdn's officers, but the Persians recovered the town in 1640. In 1638 Badalshah and Bulki were occupied, but Awrangib, who, having been recalled from the Dakun, was sent to retain them, failed to hold them and was obliged to retreat. In 1652 the same prince and in the following year his eldest brother, Dara Shikoh, failed to recover Kandahar from the Persians. In 1653 Awrangib was again sent to the Dakun, where his aggressive policy was checked by his father, who ordered him to make peace with 'Abul Allah Kusr Shg Shg of Golconda whom he had attacked, but in a campaign against 'Ali 'Adil Shg II of Bidjapur, who had succeeded Muhammad 'Adil Shg, he captured Bidjapur and Kalyani. In 1657 reports of the fall of Shah Dhajahgdn's health caused Awrangib to rebel and a contest for the throne began between him and his three brothers. Awrangib defeated Dara Shikoh at Samugur and Sultan Shg at Kajwia, treacherously imprisoned and executed Murshik Bakhsh and having imprisoned Shah Dhajahgdn, ascended the throne in Agra on July 21, 1658. Shah Dhajahgdn never regained his liberty and on January 2, 1666, died in the Agra fort at the age of 74.

Shah Dhajahgdn, the wealthiest of the "Great Mughals", displayed his taste and magnificence in his restoration and adornment of Agra, in the construction of his city of New Dhill or Shah-dhajahgdnabad, where he spent the greater part of a luxurious old age, and in the famous peacock throne, which was seven years in the making. He had little military ability and was cruel, treacherous and unscrupulous. A reeling feature of his character was his deep love for his wife, Mumtaz Mahall, of whom her splendid tomb is a lasting memorial, but she died early in his reign and after her death he sank into unbridled
licentiousness. His rule was oppressive and tyrannical and he ill deserves the favourable treatment which he has received at the hands of some modern historians.


(T. W. HAIN)

SHAH MHR, an adventurer who founded the first dynasty of Muhammadan kings of Kāshmir, settled in that country in A.D. 1315–1316 and, having ingratiated himself with the rādhā, Sihānadvā, who was perhaps impressed by the strangeness of the pretensions to descend from Ar- dgha, the Phālāy, entered his service. Kashmīr suffered two invasions during Sihānadvā's reign, that of Dūkō, a Turk from Khāndāhā, and that of the Bhassat of Thīsīt, Kīrnāna, both of whom entered the country by the Zadjīlā. Kīrnāna usurped the throne, made Shāh Mhr his minister and, according to Muhammadan accounts, was converted to Islam by him. He was succeeded on his death by a relation, Adnīnadvā, under whom Shāh Mhr retained his office and extended his power. On the death of Adnīnadvā Shāh Mhr contested the sovereignty with his widow, Kotā, and having defeated and captured her compelled her to marry him. Shortly after the marriage she retired to, or was imprisoned in, the fortress of Dīsyanpur and was there put to death by her husband's orders. In 1341–1342 Shāh Mhr succeeded the throne of Muḥammad under the title of Shāhs al-Dīn and caused the bāwa to be said in his name. The rule of the Hindu rādhā has been oppressive and extortionate and the Kāshmiris were the gainers by the usurpation of the adventurer who limited the demands of his predecessor to one sixth of the gross produce of the land. He was established order with a firm hand, and though he probably encouraged his people to accept his religion, his rule was tolerant and beneficent, and the forcible conversion of the inhabitants to Islam was not effected until the reign of his grandson, Shāh Mhr, Baghshāh. Shāh Mhr is said to have accepted the claim of the Čahk and Mākār tribes to precedence over the other tribes of the country and to have employed them in the principal posts both in the army and the civil administration. It was by the Čahk tribes that the dynasty which he founded was overthrown about two centuries later. He died in 1349 and was peacefully succeeded by his eldest son, Dījumādī.

Bibliography: Muhammad Kāsim Firaūz, Gujarati-Irākī, Bombay 1832; Sir M. A. Stein, Kalpastra's Kājartarangini (translation), Westminster 1900; Shāh Mhr, Būdī, Jīmī Akbār, text and translation by Blochmann and Jarrett, Calcutta 1875, 1877–1894; T. W. HAIN, Chronicle and Genealogy of the Muhammadan Kings of Kāshmir, in the J. R. A. S., 1918.

(T. W. HAIN)

SHAH NAWĀZ KHĀN. [See Ḫaym Khan al-Dawla].

SHAH SHURJĀ, DJUMĀDĪ AL-DĪN B. MUḤAMMAD B. AL-MUṣṭAFFA, A MUṢṭAFFAR. After Mubārīr al-Dīn Muḥammad, lord of Fārīn, Kīrnān and Kūr-hān-dīstān, had been deposed and blinded in Ramadān 759 (Aug. 1358), he was succeeded by his son Shāh Shurjā but within a couple of months Muḥammad, whose sight had not been entirely destroyed, seized the citadel of Kālān's-i Sofād (q.v.) where he had been placed, and fortitude himself in it. Peace was soon afterwards made between him and Shāh Shurjā, the terms being that Muḥammad should go to Shirāz and have his name mentioned in the kharāf; further no business of state was to be decided without his approval. After some time his followers decided to seize Shāh Shurjā and put him to death; but they were betrayed whereupon Shāh Shurjā had the conspirators put to death and his father imprisoned. The latter died at the end of Rabī‘ I 1365 (Jan. 1364). Shāh Shurjā had next to fight with his brother Shāh Muḥammad. In 1364 (1363/1363) his officials had raised a claim to tribute upon the town of Abārākūr, although it was governed along with Isfāhān by Shāh Muḥammad. This excited Shāh Muḥammad's distress and he invaded Yazd and seized this province. On his return to Isfāhān he was besieged by his brother but soon a friendly arrangement was come to, as a result of which he recognised the suzerainty of Shāh Shurjā. In 1365 (1364/1364) however he made an alliance with the Persian ruler, Walī Uwais, lord of Baghādād and Tabrīz, and invaded Fārs. Shāh Shurjā took the field against him; the final encounter was not decisive; Shāh Muḥammad then succeeded in taking Shirāz after eleven months' siege, but lost it again in Dhu l-Ka‘da 767 (Aug. 1366). After the death of Shāh Muḥammad in Shawwal 9, 776 (March 13, 1375), Shāh Shurjā who had recognised the 'Abbasid Caliph of the day in 770 (1368/1369), also became lord of Isfāhān. He also wanted to extend his rule over Alḥarabādīn because the notables there had become discontented with Husain, successor of Uwais, who had died in 776 (1364/1365). With this object Shāh Shurjā set out with a large army, took Karwīn, defeated Husain and advanced successfully up to the neighbourhood of Tabrīz. The former surrendered and Husain had to retire to the south. But when Shāh Shurjā returned home a couple of months later, Tabrīz was again occupied by Husain and as the former had also to fight him, Shāh Shurjā had to make peace with Husain. To seal the treaty Shāh Shurjā's son Zain al-Abīdīn married Husain's sister. Nevertheless hostilities soon afterwards broke out again. When Ṭāhir Aḥrār, one of Husain's vassals, usually called Sāriḵ Adīl, equipped an army in 781 (1379/1380) to invade Muṣṭaffarī territory, Shāh Shurjā went to Sulṭānīyā to anticipate him, but was surprised and only escaped with difficulty. When he himself took the offensive, however, he succeeded in putting to flight Sāriḵ Adīl's troops, who were busy plundering the camp. He then laid siege to al-Sulṭānīyā, whereupon Sāriḵ Adīl had to surrender. In the meanwhile Shāh 'Alī, a brother of Husain, who had been the murder of the governor of Baghādād, who ruled the city in Husain's name, was proclaimed lord of Baghādād, which again provoked hostilities. To strengthen his position he made an alliance with the governor of Busurāt, Pir 'Alī Bādār, who had been supported by Shāh Shurjā; Shāh Shurjā, 'Alī and Pir 'Alī had however to take flight when Husain and Sāriḵ Adīl approached in 782 (1380/1381); but when the latter had departed, they came back and now it was Husain's turn to fly. Soon afterwards — the usual date is Dijumādī II,
is widely celebrated and the place was called Shahârat al-Amir after him. The Saiyid al-Kâsim b. Muhammad, who raised the Yaman rebellion against the Turks about 1630 was born and lived here. When he had succeeded in expelling the Turks he retained Shahâra as his capital. He was the ancestor of the Imâms of Shâhâra. When the Turks began to regain their hold on the Yaman in 1871—1872 Shahâra was taken by Muṣṭafâ Aṣâm Pasha in a bold campaign and the house of the ring-leader in the anti-Turkish movement, Saiyid Muḥāsân al-Shahâra, destroyed: the latter had for years been at war also with the Imām of Shâhâra Muḥāsân Muhamma. Saiyid Muḥāsân had to retire to Wâda and in 1884 the notables of Habūr, Sa'dâ and Shahâra were forced to submit to the then governor of Yaman, Izzâl Pasha. In the wars following Shahâra was again lost to the Turks and became the centre of all the elements hostile to Turkish rule.


(ADOLF GROHMANN)

SHAHH, a small coin of the Shâhâra of Persia. It was the smallest of the silver coins in the xviiith and xviith centuries and weighed 18 grains (1.17 grammes); it was worth 1/10 of anambah or 4 mahmûd or ten copper kâshâbis. In Fâth Allâh's reformed coinage 20 shâhhs were equal to the silver unit, the hâvân. Under the Timurid the shâhâra coin was 5 centimes; the 2 shâhâra piece and 4 shâhhs were also issued in copper.

(THOMAS ALLEN)

SHAHID (A.), witness, martyr (pl. shâhid), is often used in the Kurân (as in shâhid, q.v.), plural shâhid, from which it is not definitely distinguished, in the primary meaning of witness. The following examples are typical of the various contexts in which it occurs: Sûra, i. 127: "Or were ye eye-witnesses when Jacob was at the point of death and he said to his sons"... Sûra, xxiv. 6: "Those who slander their wives and have no witness except themselves"... Sûra, iii. 137: "And thus we have made you a people in the middle that ye may be witnesses in regard to mankind and that the Prophet may be a witness in regard to you"... Sûra, i. 20: "(On the day of judgment) every soul shall come, with an utter and a witness". (On the expression: to give evidence from belief, etc., see the articles SHAHARA and TAHSÂHID). Shahid frequently occurs as referring to God, e.g. Sûra, iii. 95: "God is the witness of your deeds"; Sûra, v. 117: "Thou art the witness of all things". Shahid is therefore also one of "the most beautiful names" (al-asma‘ al-husnâ, cf. the article ALIH). The meaning martyr is not found for shâhid in the Kurân. It is only later commentators that
have tried to find it in Sûra, iv. 71. The Kur'ân always uses circumlocutions to express this conception, e.g. Sûra, iii. 151: "If ye be slain or die on the path of God, then pardon from God and mercy is better than what they have amassed". Sûra, iii. 161: "Consider not those slain on God's path to be dead, nay, alive with God; they are cared for". Sûra, xlvii. 5—7: "And those who fight for the cause of God, their works He will not suffer to miscarry. He will guide them and bring their heart to peace and lead them into Paradise which He has promised them of".

The development of meaning of shahid to martyr (there is not the parallel development in martyr) would be clearer if one were to examine the use of the term as it is used in Islamic literature and legal sources. In Islam, the concept of martyrdom is closely tied to the concept of jihad, which is the struggle against evil. Martyrs are those who die in the cause of Islam, either through a violent death or through an act of self-sacrifice.

The martyr who seals his belief with his death, fighting against the infidels is shahid throughout the Hadith literature and the great privileges which await him in heaven are readily depicted in numerous hadiths. By his sacrifice the martyr escapes the examination in the grave by the "interrogating angels" Munkar and Nekir, nor does he need to pass through the "purging fires of Isrâm", barzakh. Martyrs receive the highest of the various ranks in Paradise, nearest the throne of God; the Prophet sees in a vision the most beautiful abode in Paradise, the Dar al-shahid. The wounds of the shahid received in the Dîjihâd become red like blood on the day of judgment, and shine and smell of musk. None of the dwellers in Paradise could ever come back to earth, except the shahid; for on account of the very special privileges which are granted him in Paradise he still wishes to tarry with his fellow martyrs another ten times. Martyrs are freed by their death from the guilt of all sins so that they do not require the intercession of the Prophet, and indeed in later traditions we even find them interceding for other men. They are already pure, and therefore alone among men are not washed before their burial, a view which has found a place in the Fîkish (cf. A. J. Wensinck, Handbook of early Muhammadan Tradition, s.v. Martyr).

In the Fîkish books the shahid is dealt with in the section on qâdî in connection with the prayer for the dead, and the differences of opinion in the schools (the reasons for them are sometimes very interesting) centre mainly round the question whether the shahid is washed, whether the prayer for the dead is uttered over him, whether he is to be buried in his bloodstained garments, or not, etc. In them we find the distinction made whether the shahâda has been for this world for the next or for both, for as an ethical action it must be judged according to its niyâr, on the other hand we find the different kinds of shahâda as in the wider sense, detailed below. The case of shahid in the legal sense does not occur if the man concerned survived the battle in spite of his wounds and was able to arrange his affairs before his death. We sometimes find sections, fi fasîl al-shahidâ in the books of Dîjihâd, where martyrdom is praised quite in the style of the hadiths.

The praise of shahidâ led to a real longing to meet a martyr's death and according to some traditions, even Muhammad and 'Umar longed for it. This taleb al-shahidâ, however, was by no means encouraged by orthodox theology but rather deprecated, perhaps—according to a suggestion of Wensinck—because this kind of self-sacrifice looked very like suicide, always condemned in Isrâm. Therefore peaceful moral duties are represented as equal to or even better than voluntary death, such as fasting, regularity in prayer, reading the Kur'ân, gratitude to one's parents, honesty as a tax-collector, learning; these are all deeds on the path of God, fi sabîl Allâh (this expression with the gradual cessation of the wars of conquest undergoes the same change from a war like to a peaceful ethical meaning as shahid), cf. the article sabil) and may enable men to share in the rewards otherwise promised for the shahidâ. But the conception of shahid itself underwent an important extension which may be partly already seen in hadith's, so that in the end almost anyone who had died any violent death and aroused pity was considered by the general public to be a martyr and soon was actually regarded as a saint. An important factor in bringing about this development was the very old tendency of the people to worship holy men generally, cf. the article Walî. In this sense, for example, anyone who dies of disease, like the plague and the "diseases of the stomach", is considered a shahid; anyone who dies a violent death, e.g. from starvation, thirst, drowning, being burned alive, being killed by robbers or wild beasts, or a mother who dies in childbirth; also one who dies during the performance of a meritorious action, e.g. on the pilgrimage or in a foreign land, where no friend or relative is with him, or on a journey which is sâmu'a or while visiting a saint's tomb or while in the act of prayer, or as a result of continuous ablations, or fasting, or in the Friday night, or in the search for the knowledge of the faith: fi taleb imâm al-Dîn, or in defending the right against injustice: of the umr bi 'mawrûf wa 'mushk 'an al-munkar against the gâlîn; whoever loves and remains chaste and does not betray his secret and dies, dies a shahid and anyone who meets his death fighting against his own impulses in the giydâd, is shahid.

The tomb of such a shahid is considered masjih, enjoys the reverence of the pious and becomes an object of pilgrimage. In many of these masjid, it can be proved that we have pre-Islamic local cults which have been continued in this form under Isrâm. This side of the survival of the ancient in the near side has been illuminated by van Berchem's study of the inscriptions, but only after further research is available will a final verdict be possible. The phrase found as early as tombs of the third century A.H.: hâdî le jashûdî bikhî wa 'alâshî, with which the term masjid might perhaps be connected (according to a suggestion of M. Hartmann, Z.D.P.V., xxvi. 652; cf. however, Ritter in Jêsî, xii. 148—150), is interesting. When we further find Sultâns called shahid in inscriptions, the word here has lost its
real significance and is no more than a pious term for deceased. In many cases the name mašḥād was transferred to sites of local cults, which have nothing to do with a shaheed and in Turkish şehidlik and mašḥād (also pronounced mašhoft) is a name for cemetery in general (see Moritzmann, in Isd., xii. 223). The inscriptions also show that frequently the Muslim builders of mašḥād built them in their own lifetime, apparently in order to share in the blessings of their good deed while still here on earth (cf. mašḥād).

In Cairo there used to be celebrated a festival in commemoration of martyrs, in which Muslims took part up to the viii/xivth century (Maqrit, Kāf, p. 68 sq.; Men, Die Renaissance des Islam, p. 399 sq.).

In contrast to orthodoxy the various sects often kept rigidly to the original sense of shaheed; for example the Khawārij fanatically sought death fighting against the government, which they considered unrighteous, while the orthodox theologians taught that rebellion against the government was not a shaheed with a prospect of martyrdom.

Martyrdom plays a special role of peculiar importance for the Shi'a. For them Husain is the shaheed par excellence, the king of martyrs, shahīd-i-shuhada (much as the favourite martyr of the Shi'a is the Alī). In keeping with the character of the Shi'a, Husain is sometimes endowed with features which almost recall the passion of Christ or sufferings of St. Francis (deliberate self-sacrifice, transmission and inheritance of the divine light in the family of the Prophet, immortality etc., cf. the articles ʿgsa, Muḥarram, Ḥusain). There is a rich literature of martyrlogies describing very fully the sufferings of Husain and other members of the family of the Prophet, a specialty of the Shi'a; for example there is a famous work entitled Ṭawāf al-Ṣulṭānī or al-Aṣgharī by Husain b. ʿAli al-Waḡ al-Kāshī, which has been translated into Turkish (by Fuṭṭūlī with the title: Ḥadiḥat al-Suʿūdī) and into Eastern Turkish and several times also abbreviated.

The worship of shaheeds has attained noteworthy developments in parts of India where there is a gigantic shahīd gumbad said to be the tomb of no fewer than 150,000 shahīda.


SHAHĪD (A., pl. shahīdān), witness. The statement (shahīda) of a witness, is a declaration on a legal claim in favour of a second person against a third, which is based on an accurate knowledge of the state of affairs and is made before the judge in prescribed form (ashāda bi-kādīh mašḥād). The following main principles have grown up, based on the Qurʾān and Tradition and perhaps also influenced by the legal opinions in the Talmud and are in the main common to all mašḥād; there are of course numerous differences in points of detail which cannot be dealt with here.

The taking and giving of evidence (shahīda) is a fardʿ alaʿī ʿl-kifāya; but if only one person was present on the scene, there is an absolute obligation on him to give evidence (fardʿ al-aʿman). In the case of a Ḥāfiz Allāh it is, however, left to the discretion of the witness whether he cares to bring the culprit before the Ḥāfiz or leaves his Muslim co-religionist and remains silent; the last course is usually recommended as the more meritorious. The witness must: 1. have accurate knowledge (ʿilm) of what he is talking of and have perceivied it with his own eyes and ears (cf. Sūra, v. 11); 2. be mukhlīf (q.v.); 3. be a free man; 4. be a Muslim (if he is giving evidence in a case brought against a Muslim); 5. be in full possession of his mental faculties; 6. be ʿadī (q. v.) (cf. Sūra, v. 105, and lxv. 27; shahād `adī); he must also not have been previously punished with hadīd for slander (cf. Sūra, xxiv. 4); 7. lead a decent and moral life (murruma); thus for example a witness is rejected, if he enters the bath without a shift or is devoted to gambling (cheese, nared) or eats in public; 8. it is absolutely inadmissible to bring about suspicion; he must not for example get any advantage for himself from his evidence or avert any injury to himself; he must not be on bad terms with the accused, if he is giving evidence against him. Nor can those who have a claim for maintenance give evidence against one another, like parents and children, husband and wife, master and slave.

The following regulations concern the number and sex of the witnesses: 1. In ṭūb four male witnesses are required (cf. Sūra, xxiv. 2 sq. and iv. 19). 2. In all other cases, which do not concern māz, like theft, murder, marriage and divorce, release of slaves etc., two male witnesses are required (cf. Sūra, ii. 282 sq. and tv. 105 sqq.); in cases which, as a rule, women alone are competent to deal with (childbirth, chastity in women, etc.), four women are sufficient according to the Fāṭimī teaching (two for the Mālikī and only one for the Ḥanafīs and Zaidīs). 3. In cases which concern māz, like claims arising out of contracts and bonds or accidental homicide, two men or one man and two women are required as witnesses (cf. Sūra, ii. 282 sq.). In these cases one male witness is usually sufficient along with the oath of the adducer.

Except in criminal cases, it is allowed to replace one original witness (ṣāḥib al-aʿf) by two male deputy witnesses (ṣāḥib al-fār), the
so-called shahāda 'ālu shahāda; but only when the original witness is dead or cannot appear before the court on account of severe illness or is three days' journey or more from the place of trial.

The witnesses may withdraw their evidence before the judge; but if sentence has already been passed, they are liable for the injury done. If a statement is withdrawn, which affirmed sin, the witnesses are punished with ṣādī for slander (ṣādī).

False witness (shahāda al-shādūl) is already censured in the Kur′ān (Sūra, xxv. 72; li. 283) and Trad. It is frequent in the east (cf. E. Lane, Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians, 1860, p. 100, 114; Ch. White, Three Years in Constantinople, 1843, l. 103).

The most difficult point in the above rules is undoubtedly the question of ‘ādāla; the witnesses must either be personally known as ‘ad to the ǧādi or their ‘ādāla must first of all be established. From the end of the second (eighth) century an assistant to the ǧādi, the ḥāsh al-muṣādīl or muṣākhi, was appointed to conduct these often tiresome investigations. As Muslim procedure does not recognise documentary evidence as proof but only the oral evidence of eye-witnesses, such people were preferred for the verification of legal matters whose ‘ādāla had already been proved. Thus permanent “witnesses” came into existence: at times their numbers rose to thousands but usually they were only a few. They were officials of the ǧādi, and were appointed and dismissed by him. Thus arose the body of notaries, who were called shuhādā in Cairo and Baghdād, in the east and the Maghrib ‘ādāl. Besides verifying legal matters they also decided smaller disputes independently. They were as a rule young lawyers who later received judicial appointments. Muslim writers frequently complain of the corruption among these people. Their development began in the fifth (viii.) century (the first reference is in Cairo in 174 A.H.): al-Kasāmī, K. Badū' al-Sinā'ī, Cairo 1910, vi. 266—90; Khalīl, Summario del diritto malese, transl. D. Santillana, Milan 1919, ii. 616 sqq.; Querry, Droit musulman, Paris 1872, ii. 451 sqq.; Nic. v. Tornow, Moslem. Recht, 1855, p. 214 sqq.; Ed. Sachau, Mus. Recht, Stuttgart 1897, p. 690 sqq.; 737 sqq.; van den Berg, Principes du droit musulman, Algers 1866, p. 216 sq.; Th. W. Juyntboll, Handbuch des islam. Geistes, Leden, 1910, p. 315 sqq.; W. Heffe ning, Islam. Fremdezeiten, Hanover 1925, § 26. On the development of the shahāda to notaries cf. in addition to the literature quoted in Juyntboll, op. cit., p. 317: Amedroz, The office of hadī in J. R. A. S., 1910, p. 779 sqq.; Bergsträsser in Z. D. M. G., lviii, 1914, p. 409 sqq.; Mez, Renaissance des Islam, Heidelberg 1927, p. 218—220.

(W. Heffening)

SHĀHĪN, shahrī (See shahrī).

SHĀHR (p.) a town. It is etymologically the same word as old Persian xhāhara (cf. tiller, harvest); the old Persian word, however, means only: *dominion, reign* and also: *empire*; this old meaning also: *a district, a large town*. The Armenian—loan word shabakh denotes *a province, a land;* also: *the world* (σαρκαμένος, cf. also the compound shahārkabōl = sarvakāta). It seems to have been borrowed from the older (Aramaic) middle—Iranian. The modern Persian shahar, which signifies *a (large) town*, originally comprised the old meaning (*empire, realm*) besides. It can be seen in phrases like shāhār, shahar-i Kābul, etc., which belong to the poetical style; cf. also the derivates shahārī, shahārīn from xhāhara—, *a ruler, a king*.

It is perhaps no more a certainty, that in old Persian there seems to be a trace of a similar semanticological transition in the case of the word wavartun, — which in that idiom signifies *a town*. In the Babylonian texts of the inscriptions of the Achaemenids, this word is rendered by adu; the old Persian term for *land, district* (da- khun) is translated into Babylonian by wînu; some are found in Bistun 2,6 (= § 25 Weisbach); Babylonian adu corresponds to Persian dākhun and a Babylonian duplicate of a portion of the Bistun inscription (cf. Weisbach, Die Keilschriftener des Achaemeniden, p. xlii.) has 2,12 (= § 31 Weisbach) mānu for Persian wordunam, whereas Bistun 3,13 (= § 49 Weisbach), Persian dāhkun is rendered in the Elamite text by the ideogram for *town*; that the old Persian here may have influenced the Babylonian, is not impossible, as one could suppose, that also the later Babylonian use of the verbal form iddn(w) (lit. *he gave*) for: *he created*, which is found, e.g. in the Elam—inscription of Darius, might have originated by the influence of Persian adu—he created (the Aryan roots ad and dād no more being phonetically different in Iranian); cf. Dellitzsch, Assy. Handworterbuch, p. 451; Weisbach, Keilschriftcr. der Achem., p. 100, note a. The name seems to be, that already in old Persian the meanings *a district* and *a large town* were inclined to fade one into the other. This is not very surprising, taking into consideration the fact, that in later times also several large cities in Persia had their dependent localities, which were reckoned to belong to the town, so that the ideas of *town* and *district* in some cases might cover each other.

The modern Persian, according to the lexicographers, has also the collateral form shahārī.

The word shahr occurs in several names of towns, e.g. shahrābād, and, more often, in the—construction, as shahr-i Biltātsh, shahr-i Kastam, etc; (cf. Le Strange, The Lakes of the Eastern Ciphtpe, Index); in personal names it retains its old meaning: *empire*, as in the (already Pahlavi) names Shahrwāz, or Shahrūn.

The word passed into Osmani under the form of shèhir; town-names, in which it enters, are numerous, e.g. Aškashir, Yenī-shcharg, etc.; see for this word and its derivations Barbir de Meynard, Dictionnaire Turc—Français, s. v.

Shahrang, or Shahrābād, in Turkish and Persian literature, denotes a kind of poetical composition, which satirizes or praises the inhabitants

V. F. Büchner

SHahr-ṣṭān or Shahrīstān (pr.), a derivation from šahr with the suffix -tān. Collateral forms are šahrāšīrān, šahrīstān (and, metri causa, šahrīštān). In Pahlavi the word also occurs, written ideographically .getImage; the meaning is, both in Pahlavi and in modern Persian: a town, especially a fortified one, or a capital (cf. Vullers, s.v. šahrīstān and šahrāšīrān). Le Strange: The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate (p. 203, note 1). The principal part of several Persian towns is therefore named by this term, as was the case with that quarter of Barān (according to al-Muṣḥafāšt, the capital of Dailam), where the governor resided; also with the eastern part of the city of Djurjān, the inner part of the city of Kazvin; the (new) city of Kīf [q.v.], according to al-Muṣḥafāšt, also bore the name of Shahrīstān, and during the Middle ages, the old (eastern) city of Isfahān was known as Shahrāšīrān; otherwise, this latter locality was named Dājī, or simply, Madīma, which term seems to be nothing but the Arabic translation of Shahrāšīrān.

There are some cities and villages, which are designated by this name, either exclusively, or optionally, viz.:

1) Shahrāšīrān-ī Yazdīgīrd, a fortified town, built by the Sassanian king Yazdīgīrd II (439–457 A.D.) against the inroads of the Turks; the king resided here from the fourth to the eighth year of his reign. The town has since been situated in the province of Djurjān.

2) A town in Khurāsān, at a distance of three days from Nāsā (Nisa), on the border of the desert. This locality seems to have been of great importance; it had textile industry, and was the birth-place of the well-known al-Shahrāštānī [q.v.].

3) A village in Siyāvash, situated near the ruins of the medieval capital of the province, Zaranj.

4) Shahrāštān, a village near Hamadān.

5) The city of Shāh-pūr [q.v.] in Fārs also bore the name of Shahrāštān, as was the case with Rūyān, a city in the district of the same name belonging to Tabaristān.

Bibliography: G. Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate (see Index); P. Schrems, Iran im Mittelalter, p. 34, 586; J. Marquart, Erānshāh, p. 56, 73; C. Barber de Meynard, Dictionnaire... de la Perse, p. 358 etc.; C. Ritter, Erdkunde, i. 121. (V. F. Büchner)

Al-Shahrāštānī, Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Karīm, the principal historian of religions in the oriental middle ages, was born in Shahrāštān, a town of Khorāsān, in 469 (1076); the date of his birth is also given as 467 and 479. He studied jurisprudence and theology at Djurjānayāna and Nīshābūr; his teacher in scholastic theology was Abū 'l-Kā'im al-Anṣāri. According to Ibn Ḥaflīkān he belonged to the Ṣafarī school but Samani says that he adopted the dreams of the Ismā'īlis and that in his conversations and discussions he only spoke of the philosophers and took no interest in religious law. He made the pilgrimage however and returning after having spent 3 years in Bagdad, he settled in his native town where he died in 548 (1153). He wrote several books, of which the most famous is the treatise on religions and sects: Kitāb al-Musta‘an wa l-Nisāḥ; among the others we may mention, on speculative theology: Nihayat al-ḥulām fī 'lm al-Kalām, another on metaphysics, the title of which: Muṣlima' al-Falāqīf, the dual of the philosophers, recalls that of the Tahāfut of Ghazālī, and one on "the history of the learned": Ta‘rikh al-Humāznī, which has the same title as the well-known work of Ibn al-Kīfī (d. 1248), written about a century later.

The treatise on religions and sects, one of the most remarkable documents of the philosophical literature of the Arabs, was written in 541 (1127). The author in it passes in review all the philosophic and religious systems that he was able to study and classes them according to their degree of remoteness from Muslim orthodoxy. He therefore begins with the Muslim sects, Mu'tazila, the Shī'a and the ḅūtānīs. He next deals with the "people of the book", those who have a revealed book recognised by Islam, i.e. the Christians and Jews; next those who have revealed books either doubtful or false, e.g. the Magi and the Dualists, after whom come the Sabaeans who worship the stars. Leaving the sects founded on a revelation, he goes back to pagan antiquity and gives articles on the principal philosophers and sages of Greece, after which he gives an exposition of Arab Scholasticism as a derivative from Hellenism; the last part of the book is devoted to the religions of India. The book is preceded by prolegomena, of which one chapter, the fourth, is an account of all the differences which broke out in Islam in the last moments of Muḥammad's life and which, influencing religion on the one hand politics on the other, gave rise successively to the sects of Shī'a and Mu'tazila. This is a very fine section. In another chapter of these prolegomena Shahrastani deals with arithmetic and makes some pretensions to be a mathematician; but these are not justified in the result. Shahrastani's mind is essentially and almost exclusively a philosophic one. He is interested only in ideas, he gives few biographical details, almost no titles of books, little chronology and no dates. As an analyst of the systems he is very subtle and in general very objective. He has not the primarily apologetic character which the last work of al-Ash'ari on the sects for example must have had.

The most important parts of the work of Shahrastani are those which deal with the Shī'a, the Dualists and the Sabaeans. For the Mu'tazila, hair-splitting theologians and subtle thinkers, whose works have not come down to us, he is one of the most important sources with al-Idji; the article on Ash'ari and the Ash'ari school which fixed Muslim orthodoxy, is interesting for the same reason. The articles on the Shī'a, Khāṭībī, Mālikī, divided into numerous sects political in character, which differed in the theory of the imām, are very interesting; but the author is rather brief on the Ismā'īlis and ḅūtānīs. He is equally short on the Jews. As to the Christians he knows three principal sects: the Melkites, the Nestorians and the Jacobites; he contrasts St. Paul with St. Peter (Simon al-Sabūs), saying that Paul came to disturb the arrangements made by Peter and to mingle philosophic ideas in the teaching of Christ. He knows a little about the Christian scriptures but does not criticise them so acutely as Ibn Ḥamm.
The references to the Dualists, Manichaeism, Manes, Mardak, Barzanesan, Marcion, are of course very valuable; the opposition between light and darkness plays, a considerable part in them as in the philosophy of Jāfār. It is the same with the long section on the Sabzavans; Shahrustānī puts it in a dialogue in which an orthodox Muslim argues with a Sabzavān, opposing the idea of prophecy to that of the spirits of the stars, disputing the existence of the latter and criticizing the conception of them.

At the present day, Shahrustānī appears quite ignorant of Greek philosophy; but he has quite a good article on Plato, whose theory of ideas he understands and another interesting one on Pythagoras, in which he gives an exposition of the theory of number and of geometrical ideas conceived as principles of beings. The article on Aristotle is derived from Avicenna and the commentary of Themistius. The very long article on Arab scholasticism is in the main a résumé of the Naqšī of Avicenna. Lastly the section on India contains some curious passages. We know that Arab authors as a whole knew very little about India. Nevertheless we find in Shahrustānī some accurate notes on Buddhist psychology and doctrine, on the Bodhisattvas and the successive Buddhas; and on certain practices of Hinduism — the worship of the goddess Kālī, whose idol (Mahākālī) is described, ablutions in the sacred rivers, religious suicides etc. Shahrustānī seems to regard Pythagoras as the founder of intellectual thought in India.


(CARRA DE VAUX) SHAHRĪR, the name of the sixth Persian month, which has 30 days like every Persian month. The older form of the name found also in al-Biruni’s Shahristanī. As the name is also that of the fourth day of every Persian month, the month and day are distinguished by the addition of nāb or rīz. The 4th Shahīrīr, on which the name of day and month are the same is called Shahrud.


(M. PLESNER) SHAHRUD. 1. Name of two rivers belonging to the system of the Kūzīr Uṣān (Safrūd: this other name, however, which in the Middle-Ages designated the whole Kūzīr Uṣān, at present belongs to its lower course, from Mandji to the Caspian, cf. Andreas in Pauli-Wissowa’s lexicon, s. v., i. col. 1736; Monteil, p. 16). The most important of the two Shahrud is that, which at Mandji (± 36° lat., 49° long.) joins the main river. This Shahrud takes its rise in the mountain-system of the Alburz, and its direction is from the South-East to the North-West. According to Mustawfī al-Kazwini, who gives a concise, but tolerably clear description of this river (Naqshat al-Kalbī, text, p. 217/218; transl. p. 210), the Shahrud rises from the confluence of two streams in the Rūdār-district of Kāzvin, one originating from the Tālšīn hills, the other from the „Nār and Tāghmaus mountains”, as Le Strange construes the text, which is uncertain, as it presents some variants. Ḥakīm Khalīfa, who, in his Līthānummu (p. 304), as often, copies the Naqshat, reads here: Rūd-i Sīr (cf. the variants in Le Strange’s edition, p. 217, 184). The Shahrud, according to Mustawfī, passes Alamūt, while flowing through the Rūdār-district, and unites in the district of Bāra, „which is of the two Tārūms”, with the Safrūd. From its origin to its junction with the last-named river it measures 35 leagues (farāb), its water, but for a small degree, is not used for field-irrigation. With these last words, the statement of the same author, that most of the lands of the district of Rustamār are watered by the Shahrud (text, p. 160, transl. p. 157) should be compared or contrasted.

The Shahrud, not being navigable, has no significance for traffic. Although the Kūzīr Uṣān is well-known in antiquity under the name of Amardus, there seems to be no mention of the Shahrud before the Middle Ages. It is noticed by the Armenian geographer, translated and annotated by J. Marquart, in his Enyaqberd, p. 126; this authority mentions its rising in the mountains of Tabākān. On the infrequent mentions of the Shahrud in Arab geographers, Andrea’s article on the name of Amardus in Pauli-Wissowa, Realen., 7, i. col. 1734 etc. may be consulted. In the nineteenth century, the river became known by the travels of Monteith and Rawlinson. The first, the account of whose journey dates from 1832, explored the valley of the Shahrud, starting from Mandji (or, as he calls it, Menjile), in search of the ruins of Alamūt. He first notices the height of Menjile (800 feet above the sea), and gives the names of some localities, situated on the Shahrud: they are (retaining the orthography of the original): at 3 miles from Mandji: Loushan; at 28: Beremzini; 36 miles from Beremzini: Jurandey, “just where the stream from the mountains of Alamūt and Mazanderan joins the stream from Kherzan, coming from the mountains behind Khashne“. In this region there were found ruins, which were considered to be the remains of the renowned stronghold of Al-Hassan b. al-Sabābī. Returning by the same route, Monteith visited, at 12 miles distance from Mandji, the alum-mines near the village of Surdar.

In the account of Rawlinson’s journey from Tabriz to Gilan (1835) the Shahrud is also mentioned, but the last named traveller does not give a distinct account of it.

The other Shahrud, as appears from Kiepert’s Nouvelle vaste générale des provinces asiatiques et d’Empire ottoman, 1854, joins the Kūzīr Uṣān between Senna and Miyunsary; the locality, mentioned by Monteith (pp. 13 and 20) under the name of „Barendeh”, must be the *Barendā* of Kiepert’s map, to the North of Senna. This „Barendeh” might be compared with the „Barnv“ in the passage of Mustawfī, were it not, that the description of that author cannot but relate to the river of Mandji. One might, however, suppose, that Mustawfī has, in this place, mistaken the one Shahrud for the other. The second, or lesser Shahrud, called formerly the river of Shīl, which
receives some small tributaries (of, as it seems, unknown names) from the East, rises in the Shaf hills, and passes some localities, e.g., Shaf (see below), flowing almost parallel to the Kizil Uzen to the east; then, east of Berinda (which lies on what seems to be the western tributary to the lesser Shahrud), it takes a curve to the South-West, to emerge into the Kizil Uzen, joining it, therefore, from the north-east. To assume, as Ritter does, in his Erdhunde, three Shahruds, is not necessary.

II. A district described by Mustawfi as belonging to the Tallah-districts (شطاه). Among its villages, he mentions Shaf, Kalaf, Hima, Darud and Kilwān. We see, then, that it is a region of the lesser Shahrūd. The climate, according to our authority, is temperate, and the soil produces good corn, but not much fruit. The people are Shāfites, but, as the author observes, only by name, for they do not care much about religion. The revenues, in Mustawfi's time (middle of the viith = xivth century), amounted to 10,000 dinārs.

III. Name of a city in the West of Kūrān, not far from the frontiers of the province of Astarābād. It lies to the South of Bāšām; according to Fraser, its geographical position is lat. 36° 25' 20", long. 35° 5' 29"; its height above the sea is 3500 feet. The town is a trade-centre; from it to the city of Astarābād there are two ways. The geographers of the Middle Ages make no mention of it.


SHĀHRUKH MĪRZA, THE FOURTH SON OF TIMUR AND THE FIRST OF THE TIMURIDS SOVEREIGNS, BORN AT SAMARKAND ON THE 14TH RABI'I, 779 (20th August, 1377) AND THUS NAMED, ACCORDING TO THE LEGEND, BECAUSE HIS FATHER HEARD OF HIS BIRTH IN THE MIDDLE OF A GAME OF CHESS, WHEN THE KNIGHT "Rūdā" WAS ON THE POINT OF CHECKING THE KING "Sāhān." He received also the titles of Bahādur, "valiant," Aḥkām-i Sefīd, "fortunate sovereign." Married at the age of eleven, governor of the Empire during the Khvājā campaign [q.v.]; at the age of thirteen, he was sent back to Samarkand during the great Persian expedition, but was called to the army in 795 (1392). At the age of seventeen he distinguished himself at the siege of Kal-e Sefīd [q.v.], cut off the head of the enemy leader, Shāh Mansūr, and acted as mediator at the siege of Takhrit, became governor of Samarkand and of the country around in 796 (1393/1394); and three years later, he took part in the expeditions to Persia, Syria, and Asia Minor, and held important commands at the siege of Aleppo and at the battle of Anycra. Chalcondylas, who calls him Sayyed, speaks of him with admiration. His presence being necessary at Herāt, he did not go to the ādābār, which decided upon the Chinese expedition, and he contracted then a new marriage.

On the death of Timūr, Shāhrūk was recognized as sovereign of the provinces which he was governing (Rāmān 807 = March-April 1405). The other princes, very much divided, finally adopted the proposal of Pir Muḥammad to rally around Shāhrūk, who would probably be content with a formal recognition and certain marks of respect. Shāhrūk showed himself touched by the deference of his brothers.

One of the latter, Khalil Sūlān, dispossessed by the emir Barāndāq, had taken his revenge by seizing Samarkand. Shāhrūk departed at once with his army for Transoxiana; he was conciliatory and his envoy, Shākh Nūr al-Dīn, concluded a peace leaving Khalil sovereign of the country. Soon after, war broke out between Khalil and Mirāzīr Pir Muḥammad. The latter was assassinated by his viceroy, Pir 'Alī Tāz. Rebellions deprived Khalil of any authority. On the other hand, the Dīlaṅgis and Kāra Yūsuf seized Baghdad and Aḥdarbādijān; Pir 'Omar was dispossessed and killed by his kinsman Iskandar. Shāhrūk then intervened, defeated Iskandar and annexed to his states 'Irāq 'Adžami and contrary to the promise he had given, Khalil's lands were given to Ulūgh Beg. Khalil received as compensation the governorship of 'Irāq and Shāhrūk restored to him his love, Dāwar Shāh, who had been insulted and maltreated by the rebels. In the same year (809 = 1406-1407), Mīnāndārān was finally conquered.

In the following year Mīrāngāhā, the brother of Shāhrūk, was killed in a battle against Kāra Yūsuf. The sons of Kāra Yūsuf's enemy, Aḥū Bakr and Muḥammad 'Omar, survived him only a short time, and Kāra Yūsuf, following up his conquests, founded a vast empire embracing Tābris, Aḥdarbādijān and the 'Irāq. Shāhrūk, desirous of avenging his brother, attacked them in the year 823 (1420). Kāra Yūsuf died suddenly at the moment of giving battle, his troops were disheartened and his corpse treated with indignity.

Several expeditions took place in the year 810 (1407-1408); one against Balkh in which Pir 'Alī Tāz was conquered and put to death; one against Pir Pādāshāh, who had rebelled at Astarābād. War broke out between Pir Muḥammad and Rustam, who was victorious, and made his entry into Iṣfahān where he behaved with moderation. Aḥū Bakr and Iskandar were at war in Kerman; Sūrān was conquered by Shāhrūk. Pir Muḥammad had a reconciliation with Iskandar, but 'Alī al-Dawla revolted; his father, Sūlān 'Alāmd, pursued him and Kāra Yūsuf made him prisoner. At the end of 811 (1409) Samarkand was under the power of Shāhrūk.

In the year 812 (1409-1410) there was an expedition against a rebel emir, Khudādīdān, whose presence at Herāt was sent by a Mongol Khan to Shāhrūk. The revolt of Shāh Bahā' al-Dīn in Badakhshān was put down and Transoxiana, after being conquered, was reorganized. Marw was rebuilt, the ancient course of the Mūrghāb was restored and the dikes repaired. During the two succeeding years Shāhrūk had to return to Transoxiana in order to put down in that country the revolts of the
Emir Shāhrūk Nūr al-Dīn, who was killed in Mogolnia. New troubles broke out in Kermān, where Iskandar supplanted Mirzā Rustam. Under the rule of Khāliqi, the Tatars brought back from Asia Minor by Timūr, had fled to Transoxiana into Ḵᵛārīrım, which they laid waste and they wished to conquer their native land. A first expedition sent against them in 815 (1412/1413) was a failure. Much affected by this lack of success, Shāhrūk sent another against them and, once master of Ḵᵛārīrım, handed it over to an able administrator, the Emir Shāh Mulk. In 817 (1414/1415) the revolt of Mīrza Amrāt Aḥmad took place; Ulīḡ Beg departed to besiege Aḵẖūt. The Emirs of Iskandar revolted and placed themselves under the authority of Shāhrūk, who offered Iskandar an honourable peace. This offer was rejected. After a long siege Isfahān was taken by assault and laid waste. Shāhrūk intervened, undertook the defence of the inhabitants and gave them Rustam as governor. He also ordered Iskandar to be treated with clemency. No attention was paid to his orders and the prince was blinded. The latter resisted in the Emir’s ᴷخلق, the city of the Turkomans, had helped the revolt of Ḵᵛārīrım at Shāzān (818 = 1415/1416). Besieging this town, Shāhrūk pardoned Ḵᵛārīrım and sent him into the district of Kandahār; after another revolt, he was expelled to India with Mīrza Amrāt Aḥmad; another suspect, Mīrza Ilānḡar, was sent into remote exile. Two other rebels, Sulṭan Uwais of Kermān and the Emir Bahāʾī Ilārās of Kandahār made their submission.

In 820 (1417–1418) Bāsānḡor, the son of Shāhrūk, was placed at the head of the government and he abolished the hated exactions of the viziers. Saiyid Fakhr al-Dīn, whom he made dispose of some of his ill-gotten gains. The death of this Emir, which took place soon after, was considered a blessing from heaven.

On 23 Rabīʿ II, 830 (Feb. 21, 1427), Shāhrūk was the victim of a plot in the great mosque of Herāt, where the Darwish Aḥmad Ėrū, who had come under the pretext of presenting a petition, tried to stab him. He was immediately lynched by the crowd. The consequence of this plot was that many arrests and executions of suspected people took place. Iskandar, aided by his brother Dīẖāngẖā, had rebelled again against Shāhrūk in 832 (1429). After being in revolt for six years, Dīẖāngẖā submitted and became governor-general of Aḏhābḵadḵūn. Iskandar, who had fled, was assassinated a short time after at the instigation of his son. In Ramadan 838 (March 1435) the plague laid waste Herāt and its suburbs. Hundreds of thousands are said to have died at this time. Shāhrūk died at Fīḡaward in the province of Ray on the 25th Dhu ’l-Ḣijda 850 (March 12, 1447). Of the five sons that he had — Ulīḡ Beg, Abu Ḵᵛāt, Ḵᵛāṯem Bāsānḡor, Suyūrgẖāḏeh, and Mūḥammad Dīḵṭū — only the eldest survived to succeed him.

Historians are of one accord in eulogizing Shāhrūk as a munificent sovereign, peaceful and void of ambition, loving peace without fearing war, in which he was always successful, and endeavouring to repair the damage done by Timūr. He rebuilt Mawz, fortified and embellished Herāt. A session in Muslim, he was believed even to have the gift of working miracles. Himself a poet and artist, he was the patron of writers, of artists and of scholars, whom he attracted to Herāt, where he founded a magnificent library, Djamīʿ and the mystic poets Sayyid Ṣīmānī, Ḵᵛāḥīrī Kermānī and Kāsim al-Anwārī. In 817 he died here. In the year 1899, the city of Shāhrūk was restored to the Emirs of Kermān, and the Darwīsh is still in possession.

With other states Shāhrūk maintained peaceful relationships. He exchanged embassies with China, the suzerain of the family of Timūr, who paid her tribute. India recognized his authority, at least nominally. In 824 (1421) Khāḏẖ Khān, the sovereign of Delhi, sent him an embassy and we have the story several times published or translated of the embassy of Abū al-Ḥasan Samarkhānī to China and India. Referential to China, Shāhrūk was, on the other hand, arrogant with the Turks. His correspondence with Mūḥammad I is the proof of this. With Egypt his relationships were sometimes difficult. In 824 (1421) Tibet sent to him an embassy.

On the death of Shāhrūk the decline began. The Timurid princes, who all aspired to power and found followers, exhausted themselves in struggles which hastened on the rise of the Safawī and the formation of the ʿUzbek Empire.

Bibliography: The Maṭlaʿ al-Sahāla, of Abū al-Ḥasan al-Samarḵānī, is the most important work to consult; unfortunately it has never been published completely. Galland made a French translation still unpublished (Bibli Nat., fonds français, Nos. 6084–6087) and Quatremère has taken from it his Mémorires historiques sur la vie de sultan Schah-rohkh (J. A., 1836, ii. 193–235 and 338–364), which revised and continued until the year 924 (1421) resulted in the Notice de l'ouvrage persan qui a pour titre Malik- ʿAbed-ʿAllāh, Paris 1843 (V. E., 387). Numerous passages from parts of this work have been preserved by the Maṭlaʿ which contains besides the substance of Shārāf al-Dīn Yāzdi and other historians of Timūr. Mirḵᵛānī, vi. 180–223 and Khāḏẖamānī, i, 178–214 are important. The Tāḏḵīra of Dawlaḵḵā gives but very scattered literary information; see on the same subject Mīr ʿAli Shīr, Maḏḡilī, book vii. (J. A., 1861, xvii. 285–286). The story of the plot is found in Barbier de Meynard’s Extrait de la chronique persan d’Herāt (J. A., 1862, xx. 269–272).

Mundijām Bahlī, Behrīf al-ʿAkẖābār, Constantinople 1825, ill. 57 is important for the relations with the ʿOsmānīs. Consult also: Price, Chronological Retrospect, London 1821, iii. 485 ff.; Sédillot, Sur un sciez de Schah-rohkh, Rev. de Turquie, and une quinzaine des Turqueries de la Transoxiane (J. A., 1840, x. 295–310) and reprinted in our Annales pour servire à l’histoire comparée des sciences mathématiques chez les Grecs et les Orientaux, i. 243–269; Browne, Persian Literature under Tartar Dominion, p. 379–387, and Blochet, Introduction à l’histoire des Mongols, p. 248–265 (on the relations of Shāhrūk with China).

(L. BOUVAT)
SHAH-SEWAN, the name of several groups of Turkish tribes in Persia. The term means in Turkish "those who love the Shah": Persian historians write: shahisewan, thus indicating the Turkish accusative (şahâ) and the Turkish closed a.

History. According to Malcolm, Shâh 'Abbâs I (995—1037 = 1587—1628), in order to reduce the turbulent Turkish tribes known as kîšlî-bâşh (= "red-heads"), who played the part of praetorians, invited the men of all the tribes to enrol themselves in a new body which was called Shâh-sewan. Entirely devoted to the Şafawi family, this tribe enjoyed the particular favour of the sovereign. At one time they must have numbered 100,000 families, but this number diminished in time.

Malcolm quotes the Zuhdât al-tawârîkh and his version has been adopted by later historians. The European travellers, who were contemporaries of the Şafawis (R. du Mans, D. Garcias de Silva Figueroa, Chardin, Olearium), however, do not mention the tribe of Shâh-sewan and the known facts somewhat complicate Malcolm's story.

1. The 'Alam ârûyâ 'Abbâs frequently uses expressions like "shahi-sewan" kardan, yazâyî-şahî-sewanî in the sense of "to make appeal to the faithful." Thus the father of Shâh 'Abbâs, Shâh Sulmân Muhammadd, had already used this procedure in the rebellions of 898 and 992. "Shâh Muhammadd", says Iskandar Munshi, "having launched the (appeal) shahh sewanî, ordered that all those of the Turkoman tribe who were servants and partisans of this hearth (shahî sewan) and attached to his Majesty". These ad hoc appeals were always raised by the feudal family (shahi-sewan, shahisewan). The sovereigns of this dynasty not only traced their origins to the Shâh's imams, but even claimed to be the incarnations of the latter (cf. Khatât). In the time of Shâh 'Abbâs there was in Turkey a sect which regarded the Persian sovereign as its murshid. In our own day, the Ahl-i Haqî (cf. the article 'AL-I-iLAM) give a place in their theophrasies to the Şafawi kings.

The formula called of Shâh-sewan thus recalled to political recalcitrants their obligations to their superiors.

2. In 196, in the first year of the reign of Shâh 'Abbâs, the Kîšlî-bâşh rebelled against the authority of the major domo Murshid Kuli Khan. The Shâh had recourse to the process of "shahi-sewan" and the faithful arrived en masse. A few days later the rebels were captured and put to death. This decisive blow dealt to the truculence of the Kîšlî-bâşh must have made an impression on his contemporaries, for in the firm reign of Shâh 'Abbâs, it was rarely necessary to resort to unusual measures. Iskandar Munshi says nothing about the permanent results of the appeal of 996. He only adds that the Shâh-sewan who came at the king's call "mounted guard till morning".

II. On the other hand, Shâh 'Abbâs continued vigorously and successfully the policy of regrouping the great tribes. His grandfather, Shâh Tahmâsîp [q.v.], about 936 (1529) had already reformed one of the most important Kîšlî-bâşh tribes: the Tâkhâlu (Malcolm, 15000, remnants of which are still to be found in Kirman). The new military corps (kullur, tufangûl) made unnecessary the Kîšlî-bâşh Kûrî (Chardin, 292). Another way of weakening the old praetorians was to dilute them with new elements personally devoted to the sovereign.

These newcomers seem to have been particularly proud of the name of Shâh-sewan as is shown by the history of the Shâh-sewan of Ardabil. To sum up then, it may be doubted if a single regularly constituted tribe was ever founded by Shâh 'Abbâs under the name Shâh-sewan.

The Shâh-sewan of Ardabil. Although the inhabitants of this ālummat all use the "Azari" Turkish dialect and are all Shâh's, the Shâh-sewan, even when settled, form a group apart, distinguished by its tribal organisation. According to their traditions the Shâh-sewan came from Atâ Minser under their chief Yusur (I-)pâshâ who had obtained permission to do this from Shâh 'Abbâs I. Yusur is said to have brought 3,500 families (hectars), a section of whom migrated later to Khûrân.

Among these Shâh-sewan three groups are distinguished: (1) the tribe of Yusur-pâshâ, which later broke up into clans bearing the names of the descendants of the chief: Saru-khan (I-), Kojda-bâgh, Band 'Alî bâgh, Pûlî bâgh, Damir bâgh, Kûrât bâgh, etc., with other later ramifications; (2) the tribe brought at the same time by Kûrî bâgh, of which following clans still exist: Tâlah mîkâlu, Kališefu, Mughânlu, Udulîa, Murdâlu, Zargar, etc.; (3) the tribes which arrived in the time of Yusur-pâshâ, but independently from another clan: Inanlu ("Alam ârû: Inanlu, evidently from the Mongol inan "goat") with the clans: Pir-Ewathlu, Kâbîsh, Kûr (Kûr), 'Abbâsîlu, Aq-îlu, Yuhtû, Darsun Khoji, and Bâtûlu with the clans: Adjîrîlu, Khoji-Khoji, Yeddi Olmâ, 'Arabulî, Kabîslu, Kâblulî. As to the Bâtûlu, the Alâm-ârû (p. 762) mentions the different suffix (i-ynûlû) held in Adharbâd-jîlân by the Kîšlî-bâşh chief Gûndu-gûnsîr Sulmân Bâtûlu, who with his tribe and their tents dwelt at Tâlûk near Kûrîk. Having become Shâh-sewan in the first Baghdad campaign (1073 = 1662), he presented himself to the Shâh and received the rank of Sulmân. Alongside of these two tribes, mention is made of isolated groups, the Rûsh bâghlu, Sarwînî ("camel-drivers") and Gâmmulî ("buffalo-breeders").

Saru-khan succeeded Yusur-pâshâ. Among the descendants of the latter is mentioned Bâdî Khan, who accompanied Nâdir Shâh on his campaigns. His sons, as the result of a quarrel, divided all the Shâh-sewan into two parties. The Ardabil section took the side of the Il-bâgh descended from Napâr 'Alî Khan and the Meshkîn section those descended from Kûlûk Kâân.

The arrival of the Russians in Transcaucasia reacted on the fortunes of the Shâh-sewan. Between 1728 and 1732 several clans leading a nomadic life on the Kura (Kur) recognised Russian supremacy. The peace of Gandja (1873) established the Russians north of Mughân. The frontier fixed on the Turkman-cau (1858) and always rigorously maintained separated the Shâh-sewan from a great part of their winter-quarters. The Russians for a considerable time did not prevent the tribes from continuing to enjoy their emigres, but there were continual incidents. In 1867, the Rûsh bâghlu and Kojda-bâghlu were refused access to Russian Mughân. On their side the Persian authorities burned the village of the Kojda-bâghlu, Barzaud [q.v.], and in 1876 the tribe was deported to Urma, from which it has little by little regained its old home.

From 1869 a mixed commission was created on Russian territory at Bilauswâr (on the river
Bolghār) with the task of settling amicably the mutual claims of Russian and Persian subjects. In 1834, the Russian frontier was definitely closed to the Shāh-sewan and at the same time the Russian nomads (Perembel, Darwishlu) were forbidden to descend into Persia. This measure dealt a blow to the prosperity of the Shāh-sewan, but did not put a stop to their incursions. On the other hand, it encouraged the Shāh-sewan to settle down and they had to cultivate their lands more intensively.

The governor of Ardabil had made very little impression on the Shāh-sewan. Only the expedition of 1910 undertaken against the turbulent tribes by the leaders of Persian revolution attained a notable success. Towards April of 1923, Rīš Khān Sardār Sījah succeeded in disarming the Shāh-sewan.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, there were the following groups in Mughān:

(1) Turākāns (Turkomans) 1,500 families of settlers;
(2) Shānshāki 8,000 families of nomad Kurds (?);
(3) 10,000 families of Shāh-sewan nomads.

The Shānshāki later withdrew into the interior of Persia. Before the Russian frontier was closed, many Shāh-sewan numbering 3,500 families arrived in Russia, while 27 clans with 2,500 families remained in Persia.

Before 1914 the position was as follows: In the canton of Mīshḵūn on the northern slopes of the Sāwālīn [q.v.], N.E. E. of Ardabil, from which it is separated by the river Dugāsh (a tributary of the Kāran-su), there were over 5,000 heaps of the Shāh-sewan divided into 37 clans governed by their hereditary chiefs. The latter in turn were subordinate to an Il-bārīg. The Shāh-sewan of Mīshḵūn are nomads. They spend the summer on the high plateaus of Sāwālīn and winter in Persia and Mughān. The limit of their migration is about 120 miles. On this stretch they have villages inhabited by peasants, who have come from the interior of Ardabīl-Dājūn, where till the soil, receiving a third of the produce.

The number of Shāh-sewan in the canton of Ardībīl was over 6,000 heaps divided into 12 clans, whose chiefs did not have an Il-bārīg in common. Among these clans only two are nomad; they go to Mughān of the eastern road (Barandāl-Bihārvar). Four clans are becoming settled (dagāpa-lūd 3 gates of wood), especially in the S.E. and S.W. of Ardībīl (the strongest clans are the Pālāzī and Yūrūfī). In all there are over 11,000 heaps at Shāh-sewan residing in the šāhīmāt of Ardībīl and they must number at least 75,000 souls.

The Shāh-sewan are Shāhī. The conversion of Yamūr-pālūd, who was at first a Shamānt, is said to have taken place when Shāh Abūhāb crossed through Mughān. Since then the house of Yamūr-pālūd has been regarded as an edāqah ("hearth") by which the tribes swear when taking an oath. The Kočā-bārīg are suspected of Sunni leanings. One clan of Shāh-sewan consists entirely of esfāhānī (Sīyāsdī). Like the majority of nomads, the Shāh-sewan are rather indifferent in matters of religion.

The language of the Shāh-sewan does not differ from the "Kazī" dialect spoken by the rest of the population of Ardībīl, but it is said that the Zargāz also use a "Čagānī dialect.

In the tribes a distinction is made between the clan of biga and that of biqānā, the latter being descended from fraternal lines. The hired peasants who till the earth on behalf of the tribes, are called boqāt ("companions").

The Shāh-sewan of Sāwālīn. This group consists of two tribes: A. Bāgh-dālī, 900 families living between Sāwālīn [q.v.] and Kūn and governed by an Il-bārīg and four Il-bārīgs. The tribe is said to have come from Sīrājū in the time of Shāh 'Abūhāb I. It consists of 14 clans: Kāfīrīn (the most important), Kūshar, 3zā ṭūlūnī, Mīshḵūn, Kūn, Kāshmar, Sījah, Sījah, Kāshmar, Lambānūnī, Yūrūfīnī, Sabīlūnī, Alisānīnī, Alisānīnī, Sījah, Kāshmar, Lambānūnī.

The tribe used to live in Mughān, whence they were transported by Nūrī Shāh (?) to Khamash to form a bulwark against the incursions of the Bīshā Kurda (cf. Sawīy Bulak).

Other groups. In the province of Khamash [q.v.] the Dowestān, who dispute the power with the local Afghāns, call themselves Shāh-sewan and they came from Mughān at the same time they came to Sīrājū. On the other hand, in the province of Māzandārān (Māzandārān, Fāvār-nīmāy Nīzārī, Tihrih 1315, ii. 309: Tih Nūshā, numbering 5,000 families, forms a part of the confederation of the five tribes (Khamash) in the eastern part of Fās. Of at least one of the 25 subdivisions of these Inānī, viz. of the Gōk-pār, it is reported by Hasān Faṣā that, after having proclaimed themselves Shāh-sewan, i.e. "friends of the king (šāhīnāfā)", they had separated from the tribe Gōk-pār in the time of Shāh 'Abūhāb. Zain al-'Abīdīn Shāhīnu mentions the existence of Shāh-sewan even in Kābul and Kāshmār where they had gone in consequence of the policy practised by Nūrī Shāh with regard to the Shāh-sewan (cf. J. Morier).

SHAI (a.), a thing, anything, in Arabic algebra, the name for the unknown quantity in an equation. The expression is first used in the Algebra of Muhammad b. Māhā al-Khwārizmī (about A.D. 820) and probably goes back to the Indian mathematicians. In the medieval Latin translations, it is translated by res, later on by res, Ital. cosa, from which it has been given to algebra. P. de Lagarde’s attempt to trace the word of algebra to Šāhī (which has found some credence among Orientalists) is untenable.


The Ka‘bah (Bani), the name of the keepers of the Ka‘ba (Sāliha, Ḥājirah) whose authority does not extend over the whole of the sanctuary (muzāfi al-ḥarbūm), nor even as far as the wall of Zummam and its annexes. They are the Banū Śa‘ība or Ṣa‘ībiyin and have as their head a wa‘īm or sāliha.

Modern works only give brief references to them. Snouck Hurgronje gives the days on which they open the door of the Ka‘ba: He notes that they only admit the faithful on payment of a fee and quotes the witty Mecca saying: “The B. Śa‘ībia are wreathed in smiles; this must be a day for opening the Ka‘ba.” They find a further source of revenue in the sale of scraps of the covering of the holy house, which is replaced every year by their care. The embalmed parts reserved in theory for the sovereign are given more or less gratuitously to the great personages who represent him at Mecca and on the ḥajj. The remainder in accordance with custom (Chronik d. Stad. Mecca, ii, 72) is the perquisite of the Śa‘ībiyin, who sell it in the little booths at the Bāb al-Salām (Batanūnī, p. 139), the ancient Bāb B. Ṣa‘ība, the principal gate of the mosque. They also sell there the little brooms made of palm leaves, which are all alleged to have been used for cleaning the floor of the Ka‘ba, a solemn ceremony in which the greatest personages of the world are involved in participating (Ibn Dujair, p. 138; Batanūnī, p. 109). They also have the charge and care of the offerings made by the faithful, which adorn the interior of the holy house. This treasure comprises the most diverse objects, articles of gold and of silver, precious stones, lamps richly adorned, foreign idols, the offerings of converts in distant lands. This treasure has regularly been plundered by the Amir of Mecca, by the governors, by its guardians and even by the Śa‘ībiyin themselves (Gautier-Demembry, Le Pèlerinage, p. 57) although according to tradition, the grand-master of the Ka‘ba is said to have defended it against the attacks of the Caliph ‘Umar (Und al-ğāḥa, ii, 8). They have charge of the interior curtilms of the Ka‘ba. They had at one time the care of the Maqâm ‘Ardhīm which was considered a dependence of the holy house; but do I not know what is the present rule.

The possession of these diverse functions by the Ṣa‘ībiyin is now so generally recognised that it attracts no attention. They evoked a more lively interest from earlier authors and especially from the pilgrims. The principal narratives are those of Ibn Dujair in 1183 and of Nāṣir-ı Khusraw in 1276. The visit to the Ka‘ba accompanied by a pilar of two rak‘as made, if possible, at the very spot where the Prophet performed them on the day of the tāking of Mecca, is a pious act, which is not a part of the rites of the pilgrimage, but one from which the pilgrims themselves hope to acquire further merit although the people of Mecca seem to attach but slight importance to it. The dates of the public opening seem to have varied a little (Le Pèlerinage, p. 69 sqq.) but the ceremony has remained unchanged. The wa‘ım alone has the key of the Holy House, the history of which I shall deal with below. When the caravanserai (darajj), which gives access to the door which is above the ground level, has been put into position by the Śa‘ībiyin, their chief advances, and while he is inserting the key, one of his acolytes hides it from the gaze of the faithful. In the twelfth century (Ibn Dujair, p. 93; Pèlerinage, p. 59), he held a black cloth (the Abashid colour) in his extended hands. In the thirteenth century (Nāṣir-ı Khusraw, p. 209), there was a curtain on the door which a Śa‘ībi lifted to allow the wa‘ım to pass and which he let fall again behind him. The Prophet had veiled (intarabīk) the door of opening it (Ya‘qūbī, Tārīkh, ed. Houttmann, ii, 61). In imitation of the Prophet the wa‘ım enters alone or with 2 or 3 acolytes, prays the two ritual rak‘as, then opens the door to the public whose admission he regulates. The Persian pilgrim as well as the Spanish made a visit to the Ka‘ba and they have both noted the miracle, which allows this very small building to hold at one time such a large number of the faithful. Nāṣir-ı Khusraw counted 720 in it at the same time as himself. Ibn Dujair was particularly interested in the Ka‘ba and its Ḥājirah. He was present at the reception of Sulaymān Tughjatkin, the brother of Saladin (p. 146 and 147), on whose right hand the wa‘ım of the Śa‘ībiyin solemnly entered the mosque; the wa‘ım Muhammad b. Ismā‘il b. ‘Abd al-Raḥūm was his chief informant (p. 81). He tells us that during his sojourn the Amir of Mecca, Mukthir, arrested the wa‘ım Muhammad and, accusing him of such baseness of conduct as was "unworthy of the guardian of the holy house," confiscated his goods and set up in his place one of his cousins, whom popular report accused of the same vices. Some time after, he saw the wa‘ım Muhammad, after paying 500 dinars to the Amir, re-established in his office, strutting proudly before the gate of the Ka‘ba (p. 163, 164, 165, 170). This act of violence does not prove that there was any exact custom which regulated the relations of the Amir with the B. Śa‘ība. Under al-Mu‘āwīya III (847–861), they sent deputies to the Caliph at Baghhdād to assert, in opposition to the proposals of the governor of Mecca, their right to decide what works it was necessary to undertake at the Ka‘ba; the master of works sent by the Caliph was to supply only to them. When he came to make his first inquiry the master Ṭāhir was, however, accompanied by the Ḥājirah Ṣa‘ībiyin, and also by the governor, by pious individuals and by the Šāhī al-ţabūr (cf. the art. BAIRD), “the posterior,” in reality the redoubtable intelligence officer of the sovereign (Chron. d. Stad. Mecca, i, 210-211).

The privilege of the B. Śa‘ība is very old; the historians of the ninth century Ibn Ḥibbān, Ibn Sa’d, Ya‘qūbī and the compilers of collections
of bādīhā confirm this; but they pile up proofs of its legitimacy in a way that makes one think it was recent and disputed. We know what obscurity prevails in "spite of the texts" on the history of the "Arab kingdom" at the time when so many things were being organised of themselves.

According to tradition, Koṣaylī, the ancestor of the Koraish, had reserved the guardianship of the Kaʿbah (hājirā) for ‘Abd al-Dār and his descendants. At the time of the conquest of Mecca, it was in the hands of ‘Othmān b. Ṭaḥla b. Abī Ṭaḥla b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Uzza b. ‘Othmān b. ‘Abd al-Dār (Tabari, iii. 2378; Ṣud al-ghābā, iii. 7 and 372 etc.). Ibn Saʿd (Talabbāt, v. 331) has a variant story which casts doubts upon the near relationship of ‘Othmān and Shaibah, while the genealogy given by the saʿdi to Ibn Dzhahār (p. 81) intercalates an ancestor Shaibah unknown to the other authors. ‘Othmān by a happy foresight was converted at al-Hoṣaynīya with other notable personalities of Mecca, although several members of his family had perished at Uhud in the ranks of the Koraish (Tabari, i. 1604; Aḥāmi, xv. 11; Ibn Saʿd, v. 331 etc.). On the day of the taking of Mecca, he accompanied the Prophet to the Kaʿbah and the latter demanded the key from him; in general the authorities say that he gave it up, but according to one tradition (al-ʿAnī,ạnhūd, iv. 609; Chronikien, i. 187), ‘Othmān, a new convert, had to get it from his mother, an infidel, who had charge of it and who refused to give it up. ‘Othmān had to threaten to kill himself before her eyes. According to another authority (Chronikien, i. 185), she heard in the courtyard of the house the threatening voices of Abū Bakr and of ʿOmar before she decided to give it up (cf. Ibn Khalid, ʿBarāʾ, ii. 44). But another tradition which does not assume the conversion of ‘Othmān in the year 8, shows him on the terrace of the Kaʿbah holding the key in his hand and shouting to the Prophet: "If I were sure that he is the messenger of God I would not refuse it in him". ‘Abd climbed up, held in his hand out, took the key and himself opened the door; here ‘Abd ibn Hādī is evident (Rāzī, Mafṣūṭī, ii. 400; Kāshānī, ʿUbāb, iv. 264). The general tradition is that the Prophet, in possession of the key, opened the door and entered with ‘Othmān, Bilāl and Usayma, prayed two rakʿas in a spot which is to-day held sacred and went out holding the key in his hand. At this point the traditions differ once more in detail, but end in the restitutio of the key to ‘Othmān; according to one account, the Prophet either on his own motion or because of the protests of al-ʿAbd (or of ‘Abd al-Azz, ʿAbd, at least on the posts of the door of the Kaʿbah and made a speech which ended: "Everywhere under my feet except the saʿdām and the ṣāhiyya of the pilgrims, which are going to be restored to those to whom they belong". He gave the ṣāhiyya to al-ʿAbd and returned the key to ‘Othmān; according to the other tradition, the Prophet came out of the Kaʿbah uttering verse 61 of Sūrat al-Fātīha, according to an opinion which Tabari (Ṭafsīr, x. 86) accepts as only of secondary value, was revealed at this moment and applies to the saʿdām and the ṣāhiyya (Yahyā, Muṣṭaq, iv. 625; Rāzī, Mafṣūṭī, ii. 400; Chronikien, i. 186).

But ‘Othmān, master of the saʿdām and of the key, did not exercise his rights: he followed the Prophet to Medina and died there in the year 42 (662–665) or he was killed at Adjīdīdā in 13 (634). No one mentions him further and authors take the precaution of making the Prophet say that he returned the sidāmān to ‘Othmān and to Shaibah, and to the Banū Ṭaḥla (Abu ʿl-Maḥāsin, i. 138; Nawawi, p. 407; ʿUṣd, iii. 372; Chronikien, i. 184).

This attempt to make the cousin german of ‘Othmān, Shaibah b. ‘Othmān b. Abī Ṭaḥla, he present at the taking of Mecca is unfortunate. Shaibah was not yet a Muslim, although some late authors have tentatively tried to convert him at the taking of Mecca. They are not able to escape the legend, which has grown up round the conversion of Shaibah at Ḥōnaīn a month later. Shaibah searches out the Prophet in the middle of the combat in order to take vengeance for the death of his father, who had been killed at Uhud by Hāmaz, but from the Prophet a light emanates causing him to lose heart. Muḥammad puts his hand upon his heart and causes the demon to depart from him. Shaibah is converted (Yākūbī, ii. 64; Ibn Ḥīṣām, 845; Ibn Saʿd, v. 331; Tabari, Annaler, i. 1661, 3; ʿUṣd, iii. 7; Chronikien, ii. 46; etc.) and without the writers knowing why, Shaibah becomes the keeper of the Kaʿbah; all his family hasten to come to his assistance; his brother Wahh b. ‘Othmān, the sons of ‘Othmān b. Ṭaḥla, those of Muṣāfī b. Abī Ṭaḥla who was killed at Uhud: "It is then", concludes al-ʿAzraḵī (Chronikien, i. 67), "all the descendants of Abī Ṭaḥla who in general exercise the ṣāhiyya (Chronikien, i. 67)". But according to all the traditionists, it is Shaibah who is their chief. It is he who had the power to demolish the houses dominating the Kaʿbah (Chronikien, i. 15). It is he who came into conflict with Muṣāwīya about the sale of a house and who at the time of the second pilgrimage of the Caliph, not wishing to be disturbed, sends his grandson Shaibah b. Džāhirī to open the doors of the sanctuary (Chronikien, i. 85). In the arbitrating between the two hājiji chiefs, the partisans of ‘Alī and those of Muṣāwīya (Tabari, Annaler, i. 3448 and iii. 2352; Muṣāfī, xvi. 56/57); one of his sons, ‘Abd Allāh or Ṭaḥla was a victim of the "abominable" al-Kasīr (Chronikien, ii. 37; 39; 175). It is he who appears in one of the versions of the hadith where ʿAisha wishes to have the Kaʿbah opened (Chronikien, i. 220, 222, 233). There are discussions with ʿAisha which settle that it is lawful for the Shāhibīy to sell parts of the covering (kiwam) but only for the maintenance of the poor (Chronikien, i. 180, 182 and iii. 70; 72; al-Kalkashandi, iv. 283); in spite of the efforts of the makers of bādīhā, the question is discussed by jurists and in 621 (1224) al-Maḏīl al-Kaṇīl, the nephew of Saʿdīn, purchased from the Shāhibīy for an annual fixed sum, the rooms that they drew from the opening of the Kaʿbah and forced them to open it free of charge (Chronikien, i. 266). Shaibah died in 57 (676–677) or under Yazīd b. Muṣāwīya (Tabari, Annaler, iii. 2378; Ibn Saʿd, v. 331; ʿUṣd, iii. 8).

The tradition which gave to the Shāhibīy the ṣāhiyya of the Holy House is an ancient one. It is still perpetuated in the name of the archway, which, beside Zamzam, marks the ancient boundary of the wall of the masjīd al-ḥarām. When the former had been enlarged, the new gate, called at the present time Bāb al-Salām, which was in a line with the Kaʿbah and the ancient arcade, was
called in its turn Bibi Hani Shabka (Feperringe, p. 132 and 133). But for this institution as for many others the period when it was established and merged in an anti-Islamic institution, remains obscure.

Bibliography: See the works cited in the article.

AL-SHAIBANI, Abu 'Amr Iskand b. Mika, who, according to Abū Mansur al-Ash'ari, had the nickname al-Ahwaj, was descended from Persian country gentry, but being a client (manṣūrah) of some person of the tribe of Shabban was called al-Shaibani. He was the foremost of the Kūfi grammarians. We are told that he was called al-Shaibani because he was instructed to those sons of the caliph Harun ar-Rashid who were under the care of Yazid b. Marwan al-Shaibani. The date of his birth can only be ascertained approximately, but if the age at which he is said to have died is correct, he must have been born shortly after the year 790 (719—720). The date of his death is also uncertain, the years 209, 206 and 213 being given; the latter date is probably correct, as he is said to have died on the same day as the poet Abu 'l-Atthiya and the singer Ibrahim al-Mawjil who died in that year. Abu 'Amr was not only celebrated as a gramarian, but he has also the reputation of a trustworthy transmitter of traditions (judaidh), and is quoted as an authority in the Maṣūṣ of Ahmad b. Hanbal. He studied under the most celebrated masters of the Kufi school, and he spent a long time among the nomad Arabs collecting poetry and linguistic data. In later life he removed to Bagdad. Earlier in life he compiled his large collection of the poetry of the Arabic tribes. This collection, which has not been preserved to us, contained the poems of some eighty tribes and was extensively used by later editors of ancient Arabic poetry. We find his name regularly mentioned, especially when poems are cited which were not known to other grammarians. He surpassed his colleagues, with the exception of Abu 'Urais, in taking an interest also in the historical allusions found in ancient poems, about which many others, like the Basrani al-Aṣma, seem to be particularly ignorant or uninterested. Although a pious man, he was at times addicted to drink. It is not surprising that he gives at times in good faith spurious poems as genuine, as for instance the 66th poem in the Dīwan of al-Abāb (ed. Geyer), where the borrowings from the Kurān are too evident. Only one of his works has come down to us, the Kiṣāb al-Dīwān, which was intended to be a dictionary of the Arabic language but was never completed. No doubt the Kiṣāb al-Dīwān of al-Khalil b. Ahmad had given him the impulse for this undertaking. It is arranged according to the ordinary Arabic alphabet, but only completed to the letter dīm. It is preserved in a unique copy in the library of the Escorial and being one of the earliest books in the Arabic language deserves special study (brief description in Cat. Derobernburg, No. 572).

His biographers tell us that he would not dictate his Kiṣāb al-Dīwān to anyone and that in consequence copies were taken only after his death. The scribe of the Escorial MS. whom I have not identified so far, belonged to a much older period than is indicated by Derobernburg; he used a copy made by the grammarians al-Sukkari (q.v.), but as some leaves were missing in that copy he compared it with one made by Abu Muṣāf al-Ḥamdī. The book is not a lexicon as the biographers would have us believe, though in a rough way the words are arranged in four chapters comprising words commencing with the first four letters of the alphabet. There are frequent errors due to the author himself. The particular value of the book lies in the fact that it is a large body of expressions peculiar to certain tribes; on the last 27 pages no less than thirty different tribes being mentioned, and there is not the least doubt that Abu 'Amr extracted the unusual words from the So old Dīwān of Arab tribes which he had collected. This is evident when he quotes e.g. the poet Kuthayr four times in succession. A diligent search in the Liwān al-ʿArab reveals also that the book had not been used by the lexicographers whose works form the basis of that work. The authorities and poets quoted are in many cases not cited elsewhere and I hope to prepare an edition of the complete work, which is the greatest monument of the Kūfi school of grammarians.

Biographers mention in addition the following works of Abu 'Amr all of which seem to be lost: Gharīb al-Maṣūṣ, Kiṣāb al-Khalil, Gharīb al-Judidi, Kiṣāb al-Khalil, Kiṣāb al-Lamūṣ and especially the Kiṣāb al-Nasīḥ, a miscellany which was frequently extracted, generally without acknowledgment, by later authors. Among his most prominent pupils were the Kūfi grammarians Thālab, Ibn al-Sikkiṭ, Abu 'Urais al-Kāsīn b. Sallūm and his own son 'Amr. The indices of the Maṣūṣ of Būṣīn and the Nāṣīḥ give us only a faint idea of how often he is quoted as an authority for the earlier literature. Kūli mentions him several times, e.g. l. 136, 211 and 238.


AL-SHAIBANI, Abu 'Amr Allah Muḥammad b. al-Hasan b. Farkad, Mawlawi of the Banū Shabiban, a Hanafī jurist, born at Wasīt in 132 (749/750). Brought up in al-Kūfa, he studied in the early age of fourteen under Abū Ḥanīfa, under whose influence he devoted himself to ṣafī. At twenty he is said to have lectured in the mosque of al-Kūfa. He extended his knowledge of hadith under Ṣufyān al-Thawri (d. 161), al-ʿAwārī (d. 157) and others and especially Mālik b. Anas (d. 179), whose lectures he attended for over five years in Medina. His training in Fiqh, however, he owed mainly to Abū ʿUsayf, but he soon began to threaten the latter's prestige by his own lectures, so that Abū ʿUsayf tried to get him a judgeship in Syria or Egypt, which, however, al-Shaibani declined. In 176 (792/793) he was consulted by the Caliph Harūn al-Rashid in the affair of the Zaidi imām Yahyā b. ʿAbd Allāh. On this occasion he lost the Caliph's favour through his own fault and became suspected of being a supporter of the Alids (Tabari IV, 619; Kardari II, 653 sqq.). He was, it is true, like some of his teachers a Murdījī (Ibn Kutaibah, Maṣāfīr, p. 301; Shāhriyārī, ed. Cureton, p. 108), but he seems
to have kept clear of Shī'ah activities (Fīrūz, p. 204). It was not till 180 (796) at the earliest — in this year Hārūn made al-Ra'ūṣ his capital (Tab. iv. 645) — that Hārūn made him kāfīd of al-Ra'ūṣ. After his dismissal (187 = 803) he stayed in Baghdaḍ till the Caliph commanded him to accompany him on his journey to Khurāsān (189 = 805) and appointed him kāfīd of Khurāsān (according to Abū Hāşim (d. 292) in Kāndārī, li. 147). He died there in the same year at Rābah waṭ, near al-Rayy.

He belonged to the moderate school of rāy and sought to be base his teaching wherever possible on hadith. He was also considered an able grammarian. Among his pupils are mentioned the imām al-Shāhīn (q. v.), who nevertheless wrote a polemic against him (Kāthīr al-Ra'īs min Muḥammad b. al-Haṣan in K. al-ʿīmām, Cairo 1325, vii. 277 sqq.). It is to Sha'bānī and Abū ʿUṣuf that the Hanafī Madhābiḥ owes its first spread of popularity. His writings, which have had frequent commentaries made on them, are the oldest that enable us to judge the teachings of Abū Ḥanīfa, although they differ in many points from the ideas of Abū Ḥanīfa. The most important are: Kāthīr al-ʿAṣr fi ʿl-Ḥarīr or al-Maḥd bi, K. al-Dāmīr al-ḥabīr; K. al-Dāmīr al-ṣaghr (pr. Būlīk 1302 on the margin of Abū ʿUṣuf, K. al-Khurāṣī); K. al-Siyar al-ḥabīr (pr. with the commentary of al-Sarākhī in 4 vol., Hāzirāšt in 1335—1336), K. al-ʿAṣhr (lith. in India).

We also owe to him an edition, with many critical additions, of the Maʿwūṣa of his teacher Mālik b. Anas, which differs widely from the nusūr version (cf. Goldzaher, Med. Studien, ii. 222, sq; now published in Kazan, 1909).


SHA'BĀNĪ, Abū Naṣr Fāṭ-ḤALLĀ KĀN of Kāḥān, a Persian poet of the sixth century. His father Muḥammad Kārīm was the son of the Muḥammad Sanī Kāṇ who had been governor of Kāḥān, had fought successfully against the nomad Turkmans and was fond of the society of men of distinction. The poet lived at the court of Muḥammad Shāh and then retired from the world. He wrote a work in prose and verse entitled Mahālāli, "delicious" containing dhīrhymes in honour of his patron Niẓām al-Dīn Shâh, the prime minister Hādīd al-Dīn, Māleh, Perīdīn Mirzâ, governor of Khurāsān, etc. A large selection of his poems was published in Constantinople in 1308, for the Akhtar press, 312 p.


(CL. HUAKT)

SHA'BĀNĪD, descendant of the Mongol prince Shāhīn, a brother of Batu Khan (q. v.). The names of the twelve sons of Shāhīn and their earlier descendants are given by Rashīd al-Dīn (Qānim al-Tawārīk), ed. Blochet, p. 114 sqq., with notes by the editor from the anonymous Muḥīz al-Anwār; on its importance as a source see W. Barthold, Tūrkestan v spahīn mongolščego macestvennoi istorii, i, 50). Later writers give information on Shāhīn and his descendants which is more legendary than historical; the bias of these tales is decided by the political conditions of the countries concerned. For example, Utemish Ḥāḍī, writing in Khārīzim under Shāhīn's rule, tells how Čingis-Khan hoped to see his grandson Shāhīn at the same time as Batu, but paid no attention to their brother, Tughū Timur; in contrast to this Mahnād b. Walt, writing in Bukhārā under the rule of the descendants of Tughū Timur, says that Bahadūr, son and successor of Shāhīn, always regarded the descendants of Tughū Timur as his suzerains. (Zap. xv. 232 and 250).

According to Abū ʿĪṣār (ed. Desmoussins, p. 181), Batu granted his brother Shāhīn the land between his own territory and that of his eldest brother Orda-Ikken; the land between the Ergīn and Ural mountains and along the east bank of the Yāvīk was allotted him as summer residence and the lands on the Sīr-Daryā and the lower course of the Čū and Safī-Su as winter residence.

These statements are in general corroborated by the account of Filo Carpin, a contemporary of the three brothers (Engl. transl. by W. W. Rockhill, Hakl. Soc., Ser. ii, N. iv, p. 15).

According to Abū ʿĪṣār, the sovereignty in the house of Shāhīn regularly passed from father to son; for the names of the princes concerned were Bahadūr, Djiči Baghra, Badaḵš, Ming-Timur and Fūlūd. After the death of the latter his kingdom was divided between his two sons, Ibrāhīm and ʿArābghāl, but the brothers remained together. Their summer-quarters were on the upper Yāvīk, their winter abode on the lower Sīr-Daryā.

On the other hand, according to both the Muṣa al-Anābī and the Tūrkhī Abū ʿĪṣār Shāhīn, the sovereignty immediately before the accession of Abū ʿĪṣār (a grandson of Ibrāhīm) was in another line, the descendants of Fūlūd's brother Tughū, according to the Muṣa al-Anābī, in 829 (Nov. 1425/1426) there was ruling there a prince named Yumadāk (in the Tūrkhī Abū ʿĪṣār Shāhīn; Dijamadāk), a great-grandson of Tughū, although his father Ṣafī was still alive. For the names of the two brothers Ibrāhīm and ʿArābghāl, the ancestors of the later rulers of Mīr war al-Nāḥīr and Kūrūnī, the Özbek used the compound Ḥāwar, (according to Abū ʿĪṣār, p. 182). The people ruled by the descendants of the two brothers called themselves Özbek, presumably after the famous ruler of the Golden Horde under whom the rule of Islam on the Volga was definitely established. The conquest of Mīr war al-Nāḥīr by the Özbek took place under Muḥammad Shāh Bakhš or Shāh Bēgh (also Šahbak Bēgh) known as a poet under the name Shāhīn, which is also frequently given him by historians, a grandson of Abū ʿĪṣār Shāhīn. The capital Sāmarqand was occupied by him.
towards the end of the year 905 (1500) and definitely the next year. After Shabānī had fallen in battle against Shāh Ismā'il, the founder of the modern Persian kingdom, at Merw (Rāmseca 27, 916 = November 29, 1510), Bābur succeeded for a brief period in restoring the rule of the Timurids in Mār waṣr al-Nahr, but he was defeated in 918 (1513) and had to abandon Bukhāra and Samarqand and in 920 (1514) also his last possessions in Mār waṣr al-Nahr (cf. Bāber). Mār waṣr al-Nahr now remained under the rule of the Shaibanids (as descendants of Shabānī and not of Shāhānī, after whose death the succession passed not to his sons, but to other princes of the house of Abu l-Khair) or Abu l-Khairids (Howorth, *History of the Mongols*, ii. 1880, p. 866 sqq.). Cf. the names and dates of the members in Lane-Poole, *Mohammedan Dynasties*, 1884 (21925), No. 98; additions and corrections in the Russian translation by W. Barthold; and a few additional facts in W. Wyckin, *Sprawodl. Królika Samarkąd. Oläkl.,* vi. 242 sqq. from the inscriptions on the tomb of the Shaibanids in Samarqand. On the most important ruler of this house, 'Abd Allāh, cf. the articles 'ABD AL-LĀH R. ENKANDAR; on the latter's father, cf. the article ISKANDAR. Central Asiatic ascensions and inscriptions give as the last ruler of Mār waṣr al-Nahr the son of the previous ruler, 'Abd Allāh, 'Abd al-Mu'min, e. g. Abu l-Ghazāl, p. 183; Muhammad Yūsuf al-Munţi in J. Senkowski, *Supplément à l'histoire générale des Huns*, etc., p. 39; Mahmoud b. Wali in W. Barthold, *Est.,* xxv. 260; Welyamun-zernov in his work on the coins of Bukhāra and Khiwa also calls 'Abd al-Mu'min the last Khan of the house of the Shaibanids (*Trudy Vost. Otd. Arkh.-Obsh.*, vi., 1859, p. 402); also W. Barthold, under 'ABD AL-LLAH R. ISKANDAR. On the other hand, in the *Tārīkh-i-Nām* of Abru-i 'Abdu'llāh (ISKANDAR MUNIKH, a successor to 'Abd al-Mu'min) is given, namely Pir Muhammad, "a relative of 'Abd Allāh and a prince of the house of Dājjān Beg". This statement is quoted by Welyamun-zernov in his later work on the Tatars of Kozimow (*Trudy*, etc., x. 345 sqq.) and this Khán identified with Pir Muhammad b. Sulaimān, a grandson of Dājjān Beg, mentioned in the *Abdallāh-nīma*. Pir Muhammad was soon overthrown by Pir Muhammad, the founder of the new (Ardakhān) dynasty, taken prisoner and killed (end of 1507 = June/July, 1599). Therefore in Howorth (i. 739 sqq.) and Lane-Poole the history of the Shaibanids ends not with 'Abd al-Mu'min, but with Pir Muhammad II.

Western European and Russian scholars restrict the term Shaibanids to the rulers of Mār waṣr al-Nahr, and do not apply it to the rulers of Khwārizm, taking 'Abd Allāh (Rahī' 121, 911 = Aug. 22, 1505).

After the defeat of Shaibanī, it passed not to Bābar, but directly to the Persians. Soon afterwards (according to Abu l-Ghazāl, p. 197, as early as the year of the sheep 911 = the Hijra date 911 given it certainly wrong) the Persians were driven out by another branch of the house of Shaibanī, the descendants of Tārakhān. The last ruler was Hāfezūr Shaibanī and his historical work, see the article ABU l-GHĀZĪ R. BĀBĀQADIR KHAH. The son and successor of Abu l-Ghazāl, Anāṣa Khaţīr (1663–1687) also had considerable power; after the conquest of Māshhad, he took the title "Shāhī"; from this the great emal, which he dug and which still exists, takes the name "Shāhābād". He was followed by his two sons, Shāhshāhābād and Muhammad Kranak; the last year of the latter's death is unusually given as 993 (1687); a still unpublished history of Mu'nis, the historiographer of Khwārizm, 1106–1194/1195 is given. After this for a considerable period there was no longer a dynasty, until the foundation of the house of Kungzhrāt. The Šosk aristocracy installed as rulers only for periods princes of the line of Čingiz Khan, known as the "Kungzhrāt" or "Šosk Khanān".


According to Abu l-Ghazāl, p. 177, the princes of Siberia driven out by the Russians about 1503 (1594/1595), were also descendants of Shabānī.

See: *B. B. Faten.*
previously offered him his services. Peace was concluded with Barandaq, who besiegéd Otrar, which was defended by Muhammad Timur, son of Mahmud Sultan; the treaty was sealed by a marriage.

Entering Transoxiana in 900 (1494/1495), Shabání four years later was master of almost the whole of this region as well as of Khorasan; in 906 (1500), the conquest was completed. Bâsânqor Mirza, the Timurid sovereign of Samarkand, having demanded his assistance against Bâbur in 904/905 (1498/1499), he came, but withdrew on seeing the enemy in force and went to raise a large army of mercenaries with which he took Samarkand, abandoned successively by Bâbur and by Sulân ʿAli, brother of Bâsânqor, in 906. Zuhra Begam, mother of Sulân ʿAli, is said to have offered to hand over the town to Shabání if he would promise to marry her. The town was taken by assault, Khâṣâja Yahiyya, who defended it, was executed with his sons and Sulân ʿAli is said to have met the same fate. According to another story, Sulân ʿAli was killed by Shabání. He is also said to have been accidentally killed.

Aided by the inhabitants, Bâbur regained Samarkand by a bold stroke. All the country rose and the Ùbeks were massacred. Shabání, who only retained Bokhârâ and the neighbourhood, resumed the offensive some months later, seized Kara Kül and Dabistân, inflicted a disastrous defeat on Bâbur at Sar-i Pul (9 v.) and starved Samarkand into surrender. By the terms of the capitulation, Khânûnû Begam, sister of Bâbur, was to marry the victor.

In 908 (1502/1503), Shabání quarrelled with his protector, Mahmud Sultan, laid waste the region of Shahrukhâya and Taşkhent and left it before Bâbur arrived. After a raid against Urūq با, he gave his assistance to Sultan Alâmdâd Tumbal, who had rebelled against Mahmud Sultan, and recognised Shabání as suzerain of Farghânâ. Not strong enough to engage in battle, the enemy army stole away. Shabání surprised it and scattered it near Aâshât. Bâbur was escaped, but Mahmud Sultan and his brother Alâmdâd were made prisoners. They were well treated, but had to agree to the cession of Taşkhent and Shahrukhâya, to the incorporation of a part of their subjects in the army of Shabání and to several marriages with the family of the conqueror.

Returning to his estates, Mahmud Sultan died soon after, poisoned, he said, by Shabání.

In the same year took place several expeditions in the south of Transoxiana, in which Khwâsaw Shâh of the Kipâşâ, had taken several towns. Hâlkh, which was governed by the Timurid Hâdi al-Zamân, was besieged. Alâmdâd Tumbal had entrenched himself in Andijân; obliged to surrender, he was executed with his brothers, but pillaging was forbidden. Khwâsaw Shâh fled without fighting, leaving Shitta Cahâr to succumb in Hâjar after a heroic resistance, and abandoned Kandîzâ, which had supplies to last for twelve years.

In 911 (1505) Shabání set out to conquer Khwârim, with an army of 30,000 former subjects of Mahmud Sultan, undisciplined and dangerous, whom he tried to set at variance by suppressing their chiefs. Besieged for ten months, Urgendj, valiantly defended by Ciu (or Hüsain) Ñûfû, was only taken by treachery. Khwâsaw Shâh, arriving too late to help him, was massacred with his seven hundred men. Khâkh Bi was made governor of Khwârim, and the relatives of Shabání were given important posts.

Next year Shabání repelled the incursions of the Kâzâks. The Kipâšâ at that time had two rulers: one de jure, Barandaq, who died in exile in Samarkand, the other de facto, Kâzîm Beg. The latter was so dreaded that the rumour of his arrival caused a panic in the Ùbeks army. At the end of 912 (spring of 1507), Shabání took the offensive against the kingdom of Herât. Husain Bâkshâ summoned the help of his sons, who hurried up, except Muqaffar Mirza, but he died soon afterwards. Coming to the help of the Timurids, Bâbur, indignant at their apathy and their rivalries, soon left them. Crossing the Oxus, Shabání entered Andîkhyûd, which was surrendered by Shâh Mansûr Baksh, defeated Bâbûl Khâšî and routed Dhu ṭûnûn Arqûhn, who was put to death. The Timurids fled to Herât, but left it in a few hours, leaving their harems and treasures in the palace of Ikhîtyâr al-Din. Shabání entered Herât on Muḥarram 11, 913 (May 24, 1507), and levied a contribution of 100,000 bughâs on it, but reassured the inhabitants by his humanity. Two or three weeks later, he entered the palace. Falling in love with Khâṣâja Khânûm, wife of Muqaffar Mirza, he married her by force, without even observing the legal intervals. Timurids were sent in all directions against the Timurids, who were tracked down and put to death; Bâdî al-Zamân alone escaped, through the protection of Shâh İsmâîl.

Two years were occupied in new expeditions against the Kâzâks, a demonstration against Kâbul and the siege of Kandâhâr, held by Nâṣîr Mirâdîn Shâhâkî, which had to be abandoned. At this time Shabání massacred the Dughûtî princes, Saʿîd Čâgshâhî, Mahmud Khân, and his six sons, Muḥammad Husain Mirza, etc. (914 = 1508/1509). Then posing as the champion of the Sunna, he next year summoned Shâh İsmâîl to return to orthodoxy. The Persian ruler paid no heed to his threats and protested against the aggressions of the Ùbeks; Shabání then sent him a dervish's kajîbî (wooden bowl) and ironically invited him to follow the profession of his ancestors. Shâh İsmâîl promised to go on a pilgrimage to Mecca, where he would meet his adversary, and once took the offensive. Shabání at this time was busy putting down a revolt at Firâszûkh; the Kâzhgâh had just indicted a disastrous defeat on his son Muhammad Timûr, and Shabání took refuge behind the walls of Marw. There he received an ironical letter from Shâh İsmâîl on his way to meet his adversary, who had not kept his promise to come to attack him in his own country. The battle was fought on the banks of the Murghâb, surrounded by 17,000 Persians, who had destroyed the bridges, the Ùbeks, having lost half their fighting men, succumbed after a desperate struggle. Shabání left the field to die of his wounds in an abandoned farmouse. It has been said that his skull, mounted in gold, became Shâh İsmâîl's drinking cup, that the skin of his head, stuffed with straw, was sent to Bâyâzîd II, and his right hand and to Aqâ Rashîm, prince of Mâz�andârân, who had always wanted his support. His tomb in the mosque, which he had formed some months before in Samarkand, became a place of pilgrimage. The most probable date of his death is Shabání 29, 915 (December 2, 1510). Cf. Bâbur Nāma, transl. Beveridge, p. 350 note.
Shabānī Khān has rightly been reproached for his complete lack of scruples and for his cruelties; he only thought of extending his dominions and for him the end justified the means. But he was not the unlettered and boastful barbarian, extravagant and coarse, that Bāhirār shows us, giving lessons to theologians, correcting the works of artists and having his own bad verses recited before him. He was a Persian and Arabic well and has left notable productions in Turki. His official poet, Müllā Bīnūt, had ability. He helped and encouraged men of letters, artists and scholars, sought their society and founded several madrasas. The last of the founders of great empires to arise in Central Asia, Shabānī brought Turkish power to its apogee; his successor, Kūkchūning Khān, was able to restore it again and successfully resist the Persians and Bāhirār; but the death of Shabānī, with the separation of the Shi'as of Persia from the Sunnis of Transoxians, marks a far-reaching change in the situation in Central Asia (cf. Vāṁbērī, Gētch. Bochara's ii. 64).

Shabānī had married Menīr Caghaṭā, daughter of Yūnis Khān, Khūndāda Khānum, whose Shī'ī Ismā'īl's sent back to her brother Bāhirār with great honour and Zuhra Begi, who handed over Šāhruṣa to him. In addition to Muhammad Timur, he had a son Khurram, who died young. Bibliography: [vii. 61; gpp. Khândamār, Ḥāshī al-Siyar, iii. 284; Bâber, Mémoires, years 906 up to 915]. This work, often haggled, has much needed complement in the Ta'rīḫ-i Khwāja of Mīr Muhāmmad Ḥaḍir Dāghū (cf. especially p. 116–123, 158–169, 175–180, 189–211 and 221–237); Mrs. Beveridge also calls attention to the importance of the Rawīʾī Gūstā Nūyāt Nāma (British Museum, Or. 3222), a Turkish work dated 908 (1502/1503) of which the Shāhī Nāma publ. by Bérêzine, Kāzan 1849, is only a synopsis. The epic of Muḥāmmad Ṣāliḥ Mirāz with the same title is a long panegyric of Shabānī; it has been published with a German translation by Vāṁbērī, Vienna 1883, and re-edited by Melioransky and Saffro, St. Petersburg 1908. The genealogical history of the Turks by Abu l-Ḳāhār, often trans. or edited from Beśṭān 176 and Desmoulins 1874, devotes its whole book to him: The Taḏqīḥ-i Muḥīn Khānī of Muḥāmmad Yūṣuf al-Munṣīnī, which contains the main events (Milanges asiatiques, iv. 259), Vēlīanoff-Zerconov, Khān al-Khūna, p. 234–248; Erkme, History of India (cf. esp. 184–192, 203–206, 295–325); Howorth, History of the Mongols, ii. 691–713; Vāṁbērī, Gētch. Bochara's, ii. 35–65, 191–193, 250–268.

(L. BOVATY)

**SHAIKH AL-ISLĀM**

This word means one who bears the marks of old age, who is over fifty (cf. Littám, iii. 509). It is applied to aged relatives; the Shāikh is the patriarch of the tribe or family. In pre-Islamic antiquity the title Sa'yid, the chief of the tribe, was frequently given the epithet Shaikh meaning full maturity in years and therefore of prime powers. The moral influence of the Shaikhs over the Beduins was considerable and the term came to mean chiefs having a long career behind them, the glorious veterans.

In the history of the Muslim period, it has frequently the sense of supreme chief, especially among the royal pretenders seeking to revive Arab traditions. Thus in the fourth (tenth) century the reformer Abū Yaḥyā calls himself Shaikh al-Mu'mīna, i.e. Shāikh of the Believers (Dozy, Bayān, i. 235, transl. Fagnan, i. 315). Ibn Battūta (ii. 288–289) mentions a governor of a town with this title. It is also the title of the governor of Mollān Shahī al-Mardī Khān (Mohammed, ii. 14 and 165 of the transl.) tells us that at the Haṣṣāid court of Tunis the first minister, regent of the empire, who appointed all the officials was called Shāikh of the Almohads. Muḥāmmad, the founder of the Waṭṭāfīd dynasty took the title al-Shāikh as did Muḥāmmad al-Maḥbūl founder of the dynasty of Sa'dī Sheftīs.

The title, at the present day, at once a term of polite address and a sign of importance, respected, venerated, which all who govern, administer or hold a share of public authority are happy to have, whether in the spiritual or political sphere, in the mystic as well as the social life, is borne with unreserved pride. It is given to the head of a family, to the political head of the section of a tribe called shawar (in North Africa) and comprising a group of common origin. It is given to high dignitaries of religion, to teachers, scholars, to men of religion without distinction of age, to all persons respected for their office, their age or their morals. Thus we have the Shāikh al-Islām, the title of the Grand Mufti, the Puntīf of Iṣāfān, the Shāikh al-Dīn, Minister of Religion, Shāikh al-Mardī, Chief of police, Shāikh al-Balad, the mayor of a town. Al-Buḥrān and Muḥāmmad are the two Shāikhs par excellence (Ibn Khāldūn, Muḥaddima, ii. 165): the official leader of the pilgrimage is called in Egypt Shāikh al-Djumāl (Perron, Précis de jurisprudence Musulmane, ii. 641).

But it is particularly in the Muslim religious brotherhood or ṣūfī [q. v.] that the title Shāikh has an importance of its own. (A. COUR)

**SHAIKH AL-ISLĀM** is one of the honorific titles which first appear in the second half of the fourth century A.H. While other honorific titles compounded with ʿIlām (like ʿArī, ʿIlām al-Maṣīḥ) were born by religious and secular power (notably the vissiers of the Fātimids, cf. van Berchem, Z. D. P. F. xvi., p. 101), the title of Shāikh al-Islām has always been reserved for ʿulamāʾ and mystics, like other titles of honour whose first part is Shāikh (e.g. Shāikh al-Dīn; the surname of Shāikh al-Faṭyā is given by Ibn Khāldūn to the jurist Asād b. al-Farīd; cf. Muḥaddima, transl. de Slane, i. p. xxvi.). Of all these titles only that of Shāikh al-Islām has been extensively used. Thus in the fifth century the head of the Shāikh theologians in Kūhūsān, Ismā'īl b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān, was called by the Sunnis the Shāikh al-Islām par excellence (cf. also Djuwaini, Darām-Gūchā, ii. 23, where there is a reference to the Shāikh al-Islām al-Khurāsānī), while at the same period the partisans of the new religious Ismā'īl b. ʿAnṣārī (1006–1088) claimed this title for him (al-Ṣubkt, Ṭabāhīt, Cairo 1324, iii. 117; Djamī, Naṣṣāf-ṣī al-Uṣūl, ed. Lees, Calcutta, 1859, p. 273, 376). In the sixth century Fakhr al-Dīn Rāzī was called Shāikh al-Islām. Other examples in the centuries following are the mystic Shāikh Sāfī al-Dīn of Ardshīl (cf. Browne, Persian Literature in Modern Times, p. 33), and the theo-
logian al-Taftizānī. In Syria and in Egypt, however, Shāikh al-Islām had become a title of honour (but not an official one) which could only be given to jurists and more particularly to those who by their fatwa's had attained a certain fame or the approval of a great number of jurists, especially at the beginning of the Mamlūk period. Thus in the polemics provoked by the teachings of Ibn Taimiyya, his adversaries refused him the title of Shāikh al-Islām, given him by his partisans (cf. the article TADIMIYYA, in the Bibliographie, Muhannad b. Abī Bakr al-Shāikh's treatise, al-Radd al-wā'il ʿala man wālima amma man sālima Ibn Taimiyya Shāikh al-Islām kāfīr, is quoted). The modernists of our day who are under the influence of Ibn Taimiyya and Ibn Kašīyim al-Jāsuwīyya, represent these two jurists and religious leaders who realize the title Shāikh al-Islām (al-Maṇīrī, i. 34, according to Goldscheider, Die Richtungen der islamischen Koranauslegung, p. 339). Toward 700 (1300) Shāikh al-Islām had thus become a title which each muftī of some authority could claim for himself. Muhannad b. Sulaimān al-Kaṣāwī (d. 1382) in his biographies of Ḥanafi jurists, al-ʿIlām al-aḥbār min fathāt al-maṣāḥīb al-Nuʿmān al-Muḥammad (Brockelmann, G.A.I., ii. 83) says that among the muftī's those are called Shāikh al-Islām who settle differences and decide questions of general discipline (according to ʿAlt Emīrī in Ilmiyya Sulṭānīyya, p. 306). We thus find that in Egypt and in Russia down to the present day, and in Turkey till the xvith century (cf. Ewliyā Celebi, Siyāḥatnāma, passim) muftī's (Siṣīs as well as Sunnīs) of any importance daily demand the title Shāikh al-Islām. The development of the title has been different; here the Shāikh al-Islām has become a judicial authority who presides in each important village over the ecclesiastical tribunal, composed of Mollas and Mudjāhidās. In the time of the Safawīs he was appointed by the Ṣadr al-Sudūr (cf. Tavernier, Les six voyages, Paris 1676, i. 598, who calls him Scheli el-Selom and Cutch, Persia, London 1893, i. 453, 454).

But the title gained most glory after it had become applied more particularly to the Muftī of Constántinople, whose office in the Empire of the Ottoman Sulṭān in time acquired a religious and political importance without parallel in other Muslim countries. In the early centuries of the Ottoman Empire the influence of the ʿulamaʾ had been greatly surpased by that of the mystic shāfiʿīs and after the reconstitution of the empire by Muḥammad I, we see a furious struggle between the new Sunni orthodox influences and mystic-Shīʿī influences (e.g. the incident of Badr al-Dīn Muḥammad), a struggle that ended in the victory of orthodox under Sulṭān I. Historical pragmatic tradition seems to have ignored this development and must be accepted with a good deal of reserve, while the older sources give but little information. Thus the collection of biographies al-Shāikhī al-Nuʿmānīyya (written under Sulaimān I) is compiled from quite the orthodox point of view, but it is quite evident from it that the majority of the older jurists in Ottoman countries had studied in Egypt or Persia or had Arab or Persian teachers; some of the first muftīs of Constantinople were themselves foreigners like Fakhr al-Dīn al-ʿAdīman (muftī from 1430-1460) and ʿAlī al-Dīn al-Amalī. Later tradition makes Shāikh Edī Bālī, father-in-law of Oṭḥāmānī, already the first muftī of the Ottoman lands (Ilmiyya Sulṭānīyya, p. 315). They also claim that a Muftī al-Anām was appointed as early as under Mūrūd II, with authority over all the other muftīs (ṣīḥīḥīḥ of Oṭḥāmānī, i. 6), and that Muḥammad II after the taking of Constantinople gave the official title of Shāikh al-Islām to the muftī of the new capital, Khīṭer Bēg Čelebi, who was at the same time given authority over the two ʿaṣīr uṣūr (d'Ossian, von Hammer), but there is nothing to show that the muftī was already so important a person at this time. According to the Shāikhī, this Khīṭer Bēg was only ʿaṣīr of Shāμīr, while Fakhr al-Dīn al-ʿAdīman was the muftī (cf. ibid., p. 111, 81). If we later find that the biographer of the Shāikh al-Islām in the Dānaḥāta al-maṣāḥīb (see Bīhlī), begins his biographies with the muftī Muhammad Shams al-Dīn Fenārī (d. 1430), this seems to be purely conventional. It is only under Sūlmān I that the great influence of the Muftī of Constantinople begins to manifest itself during the 24 years in which the office was held by the famous Šāmīlī ʿAlī Dīmālī Efendi [q.v.]. In the time of the latter (he was Muftī from 1501 to 1525), the two ʿaṣīr uṣūr still had precedence over him because they sat in the Imperial Divūna, while the Muftī did not (Shāōminī, p. 305), but on the other hand we are told that the same Dīmālī Efendi refused to accept from Sulaimān the two ʿaṣīr uṣūrīkīs which were granted to him (Shāōminī, p. 307). It is only in the reign of Sulaimān that the Muftī of Constantinople seems to have exerted a real influence. Their development of the title (ṣīḥīḥīḥ) of the Empire includes all grades of judges. According to d'Ossian and von Hammer, this muftī was Čwī Zāde Muḥī al-Dīn Efendi [q.v.]; it should be noted, however, that the latter was also the first Muftī who was relieved of his office by the Sulṭān (in 1541).

The growth in importance of the Muftī of Constantinople was in any case spontaneous and not caused by the sovereign will of the Sulṭān, expressed by the conferring on his part of the title of Shāikh al-Islām, which at this period was borne by many muftī's (see below). To explain this development, we may investigate in several directions. There is the tempting hypothesis of M. Gaudefroy-Demombynes who sees a striking analogy between the position of Muftī of Constantinople and that of the 'Abbasid caliph at the court of the Mamluks, before the conquest of Egypt by the Turks (La Syrie, Paris 1925, ii, p. xxii). On the other hand, the organization of the 'ulamaʾ of the Ottoman empire under a religious chief may be in some way influenced by that of the Christian hierarchy in the empire under the Oecumenical patriarch. Lastly we may perhaps see in the Shāikh al-Islāmat a survival of the ancient mystical religious tradition in the Ottoman state, a tradition which demanded alongside of the secular power, a religious authority having no judicial powers but representing, so to speak, the religious conscience of the people.

This last hypothesis would explain the tenacity with which the Shāikh al-Islāmat maintained his position through the centuries that followed in spite of the power of the Sulṭān to dismiss the holder of the title, a power of which they make frequent use. Oṭḥāmānī II (1618-1623) went so far as to deprive the muftī of all his
The political function of the Shaikh al-Islām was formerly confided to his power of issuing fetuwa's. In supplying the demand for fetuwa's to private individuals, he was soon replaced by the Fetwā Emini (see below) but enormous importance was attached to fetuwa's relating to questions of policy and public discipline. To the first category belong for example the fetuwa of 'Ali Dhī al-Qarnayn on the war against Egypt (1516) and that of Abū Saʿūd on the war against Venice (1570). Under Oghlān II the mufīt Esʿād Efendi declined to authorise by fetuwa the fraticide of the Ottoman princes. Fetuwa's regarding public discipline were for example, that of Abū l-Ṣaʿūd authorising the drinking of coffee (see Ǧawār), that of 'Abd Allāh Efendi on the establishing of a printing-press (in 1727, cf. Babinger, Stammbücher Buchmesse, Leipzig 1919, p. 9) and that of Esʿād Efendi authorising the Niṣāʾī-d Jāmī-d of Selim III (q.v.). By their fetuwa's the mufīt's also collaborated in imperial legislation by legalising by their fetuwa's the different Kānumāt's (e.g. the Kānum of Sulaimān I all had the approbation of Abū l-Ṣaʿūd, cf. Milli tectebular muktaṣaf, 1331, i, Nos. 1, and 2). Besides, it was the custom to consult the Shaikh al-Islām on all political matters of any importance. In the majority of cases the mufīt's thus exercised a beneficial influence on public affairs, although by their personal interference they had often to suffer from the Sultan's arbitrary measures. The decline of the Ottoman empire has sometimes been attributed to the reactionary spirit of the institution of the Shaikh al-Islām; it should be noted, however, that in many cases the mufīt's have shown themselves less reactionary than the majority of the clergy and that through their intervention they were able to prevent fanatical and arbitrary acts (e.g. Abū l-Ṣaʿūd's opposition to the forced conversion of all the Christians). Although in the Ottoman empire of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the Shaikh al-Islām no longer played this important political role, appeal was occasionally made to the traditional authority of this institution when policy required it, as on the occasion of the deposition of 'Abd al-Hamīd in 1909, the proclamation of the Ǧībli in 1914 and the fetuwa against the nationalists of Angora in 1920. The fetuwa's of 1914 are not only concerned with the policy of the Ottoman empire but are addressed to the whole Muslim world. This fact reveals a new, and more general, pan-Islamic conception of the function of the Ottoman Shaikh al-Islām. It is a conception which seems to have developed in Turkey in the course of the sixteenth century, probably in connection with new theories of the caliphate. And just as is the case with these latter theories, the idea of the central importance of the Shaikh al-Islām for all the Muslim world is first found in Christian European authors. The sixteenth century travellers (e.g. Ricaut) already compare him with the Pope. Volney (Voyage en Syrie, Paris 1760/1790, ii. 371) regards him as the representative of the spiritual power of the Caliphate to the whole Muslim world. Legally speaking, it is true, the fetuwa of a Mufīt is addressed to every Muslim who wishes to follow it, but it was only in 1914 that the attempt was made to take advantage of the universal spiritual authority, which was attributed at the time by Christians as well as by Muslims to the Shaikh al-Islām in Constantinople (cf. Snouck Hurgronje, Verspreide Geschriften, iii. 372).
As head of the hierarchy of the 'ulama', the Muftis had acquired the right of recommending to the sultan persons, who should be nominated to the six higher grades of the judicature. He himself only very rarely acted as a judge.

When towards the end of the xvith century the administration of the Ottoman empire began to be modernised, there was gradually formed an administrative department with the Shaikh al-Islam at its head. By this time there were already several personages who assisted the Mufti in his many duties, such as the bek-khoda or efîye who could represent the mufti, the urukhâfi, who was his agent in the government, the mekâhâtâfi or general secretary and the fetâwi emirî whose duty it was to prepare and give out the fetâwis asked for by the public. All these functionaries had their own offices. In the period of the taqsimât, this departmental organisation was consolidated. The Shaikh al-Islam was given as his official residence the former residence of the Ağha of Janissaries; it was in this office henceforth called Shaikh al-Islam Kapîsî or Babî Fetâwi (cf. the article Constantinople), that the offices of his department were housed till its abolition. The department dealt with the administration and management of all institutions having a religious basis, except the administration of the evlây. The Shaikh al-Islam thus became the colleague of the heads of the other ministerial departments, which were created in the course of the xitiith century. He became a member of the Ministry and as such his tenure of office was limited by the life of the institution of which he was a member. He retained his precedence over the other ministers; this priority was laid down in Art. 27 of the Constitution of Miâhât Pâsha of 1876, in which it is enacted that the Sultan is to choose the Grand Vizier and Shaikh al-Islam directly while the other ministers are appointed by the Grand Vizier. As early as the xvith century the Grand Vizier and the Shaikh al-Islam were the only officials who received their investiture in the presence of the Sultan.

In proportion as the secularisation of the institutions of the Ottoman empire advanced, the influence of the Shaikh al-Islam in the State declined. The institution in 1859 of a Council of State (Şûret-i Devlet) deprived him of much of his influence on domestic politics; then the creation in 1879 of new civil and military tribunals under a new Minister of Justice ('âdilîye Nâzîreî) took away another large share of his influence. A series of legislative measures was passed which defined the competence of jurisdiction according to the şûrûa and nişâlîya tribunals. This development filled a prominent part in the religious reforms of the Young Turks (cf. e.g. the poem Meşhâhât of Zîbâ Gök Alarm, p. 62 of Aus der religiösen Reformbewegung in der Türkei, by Dr. A. Fischer, Leipzig, 1922) and was brought to its logical conclusion, when in 1916 the Young Turkish government removed the administration of all the mekâhât-i şûrûa to the Ministry of Justice and that of the moderna to the Ministry of Education. This step was justified by appeals to modern public law. The declared object was to avoid the mistakes made at the time of the taqsimât and to make the mekâhât-i îslâmîya a department for purely religious matters (cf. e.g. the Ta'lim of Oct. 31 and Nov. 2, 1916). It was in the same spirit that an office was established in 1917 at the Shaikh al-Islâmât, the dav al-khâmíya al-îslâmîya, of a propagandist character. But after the armistice of Mudros (Nov. 2, 1918) the Young Turkish reforms were revoked by the new government. But by this time, however, the life of the Shaikh al-Islâmât was nearing its end, for in November 1922 after the victory of Turkish nationalism all that remained in Constantinople of the old government institutions of the Ottoman empire was abolished. Their functions were taken over by the officers of the new government at Angora. This government no longer included the Shaikh al-Islâmât. At the constitution of the new government, it is true, a şûrûa'nâzîreî had been instituted but the anti-clerical spirit of the Grand National Assembly did not allow this imitation of the Shaikh al-Islâmât to survive; it was replaced by a modest diyyâmât (çehrî reçîâfiyê), by a law passed on March 3, 1924, the day on which the Ottoman caliphate was abolished.

The fullest description of the office of Shaikh al-Islâm towards the end of his existence is found in the 'Imîye Sûlûnumi published in 1334 (1916) by the Shaikh al-Islâmât which was then under the vigorous direction of Muştafa Khârif Efendi. The principal departments which composed it were the fetâwi-khâmî, the mekâhât-i meydânî şûrûa, a kind of court of cassation for the mekâhât-i meydânî şûrûa, an office for the administration of the medreses (der ze'klâtî ve meydânî ve meydânî şûrûa ve meydânî fethâ), an office which superintended the printing of Kûrâns and legal works (mâfâlî ve meydânî ve 'alîf-i şûrûa meydânî) an office dealing with the mystical orders (mashârî) and the administration of the dik al-mulkr ve movâtû, ve movâtû ve movâtû. There were also administrative departments dealing with the archives, correspondence and accounts. As in other government offices, there was an under-secretary of state (mustârzû). The Shaikh al-Islâm Kapîsî also contained the great şûrûa tribunal of the şûrûa, the 'âdilî ve the Ishâmî. Finally a large number of committees (endûfûmân) whose advice was asked on different matters, including a committee for the nomination of judges had their homes there. For further details see the 'Imîye Sûlûnumi.

Bibliography: The biographies of 108 Shaikh al-Islâm are given in Davûbat al-Myakhi'î by Rif'ât Efendi, lithogr. at Stambul n.d.; the last biography is that of Omer Hûsam al-Dîn Efendi (d. 1288/1871). A şûrûa has been written by 'Ali Efendî Efendi. Following these two sources the 'Imîye Sûlûnumi, p. 322—645 gives the biographies of 124 Shaikh al-Islâm dated from Muştafa Khârif Efendi (held office till Nov. 1916), edited by the historians Ahmad Refik and 'Ali Efendi Efendi. The latter contributed to the same Sûlûnumi, p. 304—320, 3 Ma'akhat-î Islmîye 'arâhî. At Vienna there is a manuscript of the Davûbat al-Myakhi'î of Müstakîm Zûle (Flügel, ii., p. 409 sqq.) Many western writers on Turkey have notices in their books of the Shaikh al-Islâmât: Ricaut, The history of the present state of the Ottoman empire, London 1886, p. 200 sqq.; D'Oissens, Tableau Général de l'Empire Othoman, ii., Paris 1790, p. 256 sqq.; J. von Hammer, Der osmanischen Reiches Staatsverfassung, Vienna 1815 i.ii. 373 sqq.; other descriptions: Dr. Stephan Keule, Über Titel,
have always come to sight. Turkey continued to occupy the place and in time made it a well
defended fortress which, although bombarded by the
English in 1914, was strongly supported next
year by the troops of the Indian Viceroy Hamid
al-Din and was even able to bombard Perim and
close the straits for a time. The military collapse
of Turkey in the world-war resulted in the
restoration of the place to the native population.

Like Mokha, Shaihk Sa'id is an important coast-
town in the independent imamate of the Zaidi
lord of Yemen, which is of all the more value
as coal and iron are found there.

Bibliography: al-Hamdun, Shat Djawrat
al-Arab, ed. H. M. Müller, Leiden 1854—1891,
p. 53; H. v. Maltzan, Reise nach Südarabien,
Breussweig 1873, p. 384, 385; A. Sprenger,
Die alte Geography Arabien, Bern 1873, p.
67, 77, 104, 258; E. Glaser, Skizzen der Ge-
schichte und Geography Arabiens, Berlin 1890,
ii., p. 33, 139, 169, 238; M. Hartmann, Der
Islamische Orient, vol. ii, Die arabische Periode,
Leipzig 1909, p. 153, 417, 418, 459; W. Schmidt,
Das südwestliche Arabien, Berlin 1912,
78, 79; F. Stuhlmann, Der Kampf um Aro-
biem zwischen der Türken und England (Han-
seatische Forschungen, Breussweig 1916, i.),
p. 113—120; G. W. Bury, Arabia Infelix or
The Turks in Yemen, London 1915, p. 17,
27; A. Grohmann, Südarabien als Wirtschafts-
gebiet, Vienna 1922, p. 168, 185; do., in Öster-
reich. Monatsschr. f. d. Orient, 1917, xlii.,
p. 340.

(ADOLF GROHMAN)

SHAIKH, followers of Ajjam Ahsai [q.v.],
dissenting Shi'ite theologians of Persia.
Their teachers are the pupils and successors of the
founder: Sajjaj Kajim of Rejat, teacher of
Hadiji Muhammad Karim Khan of Kirmanshah
and Molla Muhammad Mamasfii, a theologian who
was one of the commission which tried and con-
demned the Báb at Tahur towards the end of 1847.
Their doctrines are definitely prepared the way for
those of the Báb. They are opposed to those of
the Akbars, who follow pure tradition; they
contest against the immoderate number of tra-
ditions and the complete absence of criticism
with which they are adopted; from this particular
point of view they approach the Sunni way of
thinking.

They give new explanations of the principles of
religion and of hadith. The twelve Imams are the
effective cause of creation, being the scene
of the manifestation of the divine will, the inter-
preters of God's desire. If they had not existed,
God would not have created anything; they are
therefore the ultimate cause of creation. All the
acts of the divinity are produced by them but
they have no power in us of themselves; they are
only organs of transmission. Hence we have the
charge of taqafful (delegation of God's powers)
wrongly brought against the Shia' by the Shi'a
theologians. God being incomprehensible: and
therefore the thought of every created being, He
can only be understood through the intermediary
of the Imams, who are in reality hypostases of the
supreme being; to sin against them is to sin against
God. The laww maṣbūḥa is the heart of the Imam,
which embraces all the heavens and all the worlds.
The Imams are the first of created beings and
have preceded them all.
In eschatology the Shâikhi have been charged with denying the resurrection of the material body. They reply that man possesses two bodies; one is formed by temporal elements: "like a rube which a man sometimes puts on and sometimes takes off"; it is this which dissolves in the grave; the other which persists when he first has crumbled to dust, is a subtle body which belongs to the invisible world (dâ'în kawârándiyât); it is this which is resurrected on this earth and then goes into paradise or hell.

Their thought became later more definite for they admitted two dâ'în and two dâ'în (these Arabic words both mean "body"); the first dâ'în is composed of the four visible elements, it is it which is perceptible in this world below and does not share in the future life; the second dâ'în persists and reappears in the other life; the first dâ'în is the body which the spirit rechlores in barâqî (purgatory); from the moment of death till the first sound of the trumpet, the second dâ'în subsists pure: it is in it that the spirit becomes incarnate which directs itself towards the second dâ'în and it is the latter which come out of the grave entirely purified.

Knowledge of God. For God there exist two kinds of knowledge; one is essential knowledge and has no connection with contingencies: the other is a new knowledge created (mubâhâl); this knowledge is the actual being of the known and the Imâms are the gates (kâba) which grant access to this knowledge. The world is eternal in time and in essence, for accidents without substance, forms without any substratum cannot come into existence. Accidents are transitory novelties, sometimes they exist, sometimes they disappear; they were nothing and they return to nothing. Substance on the contrary is not a transitory novelty; in consequence matter is a novelty in essence; it is eternal in the future, but not in the past; otherwise the future life would have an end; paradise and hell would disappear. Paradise is the love of the people of the House, the membership of the family of the Prophet, the Imâms, paradise and hell are created by the acts of men.

The material bodies of the Imâms after their death fall into decay in the grave, while it is true that these bodies are subtle they show themselves under the human form, created of the four elements as soon as their human body is no longer useful to men, they return it whence they have taken it and each of its molecules returns to its source while the Shâiks believe that the bodies of the Imâms are not subject to the injuries of time.

It is not possible for known things to be eternal; they must therefore then be new and contingent; they are different to the essence of God but knowledge existed before the objects of knowledge. There are two kinds of knowledge; essential knowledge and newly created knowledge, the latter is of two kinds, that of possibility hâm imkânî and that of being hâm ahkâmî; first is made of beings before their existence, and the second once they exist. This second acquired knowledge is not an attribute of God, it is present before Him.

They attribute particular importance to the order given by God (umr) which is the first class of created things and precedes the creation in the strict sense of the word (shâbî); the first constitutes a fixed world without change: it is through it that time exists and in consequence the latter can exert no influence on it. The knowledge of other creatures is preceded by ignorance, while this is not the case with God; this knowledge is new in the creature, it cannot be so for God. It is by the reflection of phenomena that man gains the apprehension of the world which surrounds him. This reflection does not exist for God who knows beings by their essence. Just as beings are manifold and varied as regards their existence, so there exists in God's knowledge of beings plurality and multiplication.

They condemn Sûfism and its pantheism with such sayings as: "It is impossible for the essence of God to be the being of multiple things". They explain the miracles of the Prophet (ascension by night, the split moon) not in a material sense but figuratively and with rationalistic interpretation.

At the beginning of the reign of Nâsil al-Jân Shâh, troubles broke out in Tabrîz in 1266 (1850) because a Shâikh was forbidden to enter the public baths as a result of a decision of the Mughalshah. The governor succeeded in quieting the disturbance and made peace between the two parties. Later persecutions were several times directed against the members of the sect.


(Çi. Huaty)

SHAIKHI (pronounced: Shâkhi), in two syllables, isma ' from Shâikh, q.v., nâm de plûme (shâkhal- bâ or mehkhâ), of a considerable number of Turkish poets. V. Hammer mentions sixteen of them in his "Geschichte der romanischen Dichtkunst". (See the index s. v. Scheich). The most important by far was Shâikhzade Celbi, alias Meyeşâ (Mawlawi), Yûsusî Sinân Germûni, a Turkish "Romanticist" poet. Born at Kütahia (Konya) in the 15th century, he is sometimes called Shâikh al-châlî 'ord, "The shâikh of the poets".

It is difficult to form an exact idea of his life. Information is not lacking either from the "reciters" (the authors of poetical biographies) or from the historians, but none of them was contemporary with Shâikhzade, and their information is vague and they are sometimes difficult to reconcile with one another. V. Hammer and Gibb; latter without even citing other sources—have combined the different data in order to obtain a continuous narrative, but one that does not give a great guarantee of truth.

Here we give a résumé of the biography of the poet according to Sehi, an author less often cited than Latif but having, nevertheless, the advantage of being of an earlier date (he wrote between 1520 and 1548); Yûsusî Germûni went to Persia where he studied under Saiyid Shârîf Durjânî [q. v.], showing a marked preference for medicine, whence the name of Hekim (doctor) Sinân by which he was equally well known. The Emir Suleiman (the son of Bayazid I, who ruled at Adrianople, then at Brusa from 1402 to 1410 and who was the patron of letters and of art) having noticed his poetical ability, Shâikhzade entered into favour with
the Ottoman sovereigns and later Murad II wished to make him a vizier. Some envious individuals persuaded the Sultan to put Shakhi's talent to the proof by imposing upon him a very difficult task, the translation of the *Five* Poems (Khamas, q.v.) of the Persian Nizami. Shakhi, having chosen the poem called Khusraw u-Shirin began by presenting the first 1,000 verses of it to Murad who rewarded him generously. On his return into his own country, the poet was assailed and robbed by brigands whom his enemies had placed in wait for him. This was the occasion of his writing a well-known poem, *Khamsa u-Shirin*, *laus sainti*. He was buried at Germán (Kutahia).

According to Taşkıpörazıde, Shakhi had been initiated into *Silas* by Hadži Djibrílm, the founder of the Bäirám order, who was born and buried at Angora, in 853 (1429–1430). Shakhi was actually at Angora, to which he was called to the court of Sultan Mehmed I (according to Rieu, wrongly Mehmed II) in 818 (1415–1416), (according to the Tâfi al-tawârîk of Sa’d al-Din) in his capacity as doctor to the prince of the Germân, who had been seized with a lethargy. The poet-doctor is said to have declared that an entertaining romance would suffice to dispel the melancholia. The following verse taken from a nâtî short of Shakhi, which is quoted in the *Pârîš Khâmâsh* (p. 86) seems to confirm this detail:

*nâ et-tâh miñterî dama-râh s-dîr hâyâ.*

The entertaining word is the remedy for the sickness of the soul*.

Shakhi is said to have been rewarded for his medical services by the title of physician in ordinary to the Sultan (ter tahbîh or ahâm-bâgh) which he is said to have been the first to hold officially. The author of the *Sejfûl-‘Othâmîni* in recounting this anecdote calls our poet Sinâti instead of Sinân (iii. 113 and iv. 721) and also gives the date of his death as 829 (1425–1426), which would make him die at a very early age, if it is true that he was born under Bâyazid I (whose reign began in 1389). An anecdote which almost all the authors repeat and which resembles a folk-lore tale, tells how a patient with a solemn countenance one day doubled the sum which he was giving to "doctor", Shakhi in order to enable him to buy something to cure his own eyes, which were affected.

The sojourn and medical practice of Shakhi at the Ottoman court seem very different to reconcile with the continuous stay which he is said to have made at Kutahia according to Taşkıpörazıde. One is at times given the impression that two persons have been confused: From the point of view of the history, which is so little known of the local Turkish dynasties, which the Ottoman dynasty, particularly jealous of its own greatness, had absorbed and effaced, it would have been interesting to have had more precise ideas on the relations of Shakhi with the Germainoğlu. [q.v. In the preface to his incommensurable *Khamsâna*, Firdaws Tawil, who, having lived during the time of Bâyazid II (1471–1452), is anterior to Sehi himself, tells us that Shakhi had begun Khusraw u-Shirin not for the Sultan Murad II, but for a prince of the house of Germân called Murad. The historian Tawil tells (vii. 191) that the buccolic sovereign (Kâbir and râhîl) of the German, unable to appreciate the beauty of the *jâzîa* of Shakhi wearied quickly of his company. One day he greatly upset the poet by showing, by his generous gifts, his preference for the following verses which an *âsâr* (popular hard) had recited to him.

*Bemîn devolêta Sultânma, ‘aškîzâna (nuq) khâyîr olum, ‘Yedîyûn bâllû hâmak, yârûdîyûn hâyîr olum.*

Fortunate Lord that thy end may be happy, may you have only honey and cream for fare and may you tread on your way, only on the meadows.*

The necessities of the metre (*hârîf*) made it necessary to read *‘aškîzâna* instead of the correct *‘aškîzî* and *khâyîr* (metrical value: --) instead of *hârîf* (—). The pronunciation *khâyîr* was in conformity with the vulgar Turkish usage but indescribably shocked men of letters.

The works of Shakhi: The most important is the poem already mentioned, Khusraw u-Shirin. All the authors say that it was left incomplete and that it was Shakhi’s (Shakhi oğlu) Djemal who finished it. In reality the addition consists of 111 verses, in which the subject dealt with in very vague terms is the death of Shakhi and in which we find a new eulogy of Murad II. The first verse of the addition is: *gelîsh‘u bi bu dînma muriq cedmêr; bu hikmet sêlêrînî gûbî cedmêr.*

According to the MS. Anc. f. l. 32 in the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris, Djemalî had as his premiers Bâyazid ben Mustafâ (fol. 272). The MS. 328 follows this hint with the words Ağmed al-tarîqûmîn al-Akbahe. It is known that the poem attributed to Ferhâd, the lover of Shirin, the bas-reliefs of Buufter (cf. Hammer: *Hist. ii.* 109). The work of Shakhi is not the first Turkish translation of the poem. See a translation into Kipêk Türkish of 1383, mentioned in J. Deny’s *Gram. de la langue turque*, Paris 1920, p. xxix.

The satîre called *Khamsâna* was due, according to certain authors, to reasons other than those mentioned by Sehi. The district where Shakhi is said to have been the victim of brigands was called *Dobavušu*.

Shakhi also composed *göster*, as well as *na‘et* and *terêfî* bend, and a certain number of *jâzîa* of which a few were dedicated to the house of Germân, others to the Emir Sulîemân, which were discussed above. It seems difficult to admit that there is here, as in the case of the poet Ağmed Paşâ, a confusion between the prince Sulîemân of the family of Germân the date of death († 990 A.H.) of the latter rendering the same hypothesis improbable.

Like his predecessor and compatriot (q.v.) Ağmed [q.v.] but with greater authority, Shakhi naturalized in Turkey the mehtewî metre (which is that of Khusraw u-Shirin). He was, moreover, greatly influenced by mysticism which pervaded the mehtewî par excellence, that of Mawlawi Djâlî al-Din Rûmî. Shakhi was considered the greatest of the Turkish poets of the epoch before Ağmed Paşâ, who accustomed the Turks to a language more refined. You learned for the taste of the prince of Germân, Shakhi was, however, criticized by Lâtîf for his *oghsuânî* style, this ethnic here meaning “vulgar”. Certain Turkish critics, even modern ones, give vent again to these complaints, reproaching Shakhi with the use of Turkish *archaism*. It is certain that in the eyes of Turks to-day these peculiarities are only an
additional merit, and that the relative simplicity of his poetry in which words truly Turkish are not systematically banned, is appreciated more and more. Of other Turkish personalities of this name, there is to be mentioned the author of the supplement (Dokht, 1780) bibliographies up to the reign of Ahmed III to the Ḥadīth al-Ḥaṣāfī by 'Aṭā', who composed a continuation of Taḥkūkprūnād's work (cf. the Bibliography). Another Shaikhi (Abd al-Kādir, 1002) was Shaikhi al-Iṣlām in the reign of Murād III.

**Bibliography:** Oriental authors: the different Tābāghāt al-ṣāḥibār (takbīr-tashaqā'ār) are easy to consult, being arranged in the alphabetical order of the names of the authors. (See those of Ḥāji Ṣelevi, Hānẓūzādī or Kūnlūzādī, especially). Here are, however, a few more precise references for the printed texts: Selh, Ḥaṭṭ biḥāṭṭ, edited by Mehemmed Şukıffff (Library of Amid) 1255 (1909), p. 52; 36th ed. of İmād, ed. Mehemmed ʻUvrıṣ (Library of the ʻIbadān), Constantinople 1314, p. 215 sqq.; do., in German; Laṭtızī or Biğiogrāfičeskehui Nachrhehui von wurhrihui Türkischem Dicthirn, nebst einer Blumenlektuβ von ihren Wurhen, aus dem türkischen der Mevlu Aḥīb Laṭtızī und der Aḥīb Hasan Tebelızī übersetzt von Thoma Chaher, Zürich 1800, p. 219 sqq. (less complete); Taḥkūkprūnād, al-Shāqāfī al-ṣāḥibīnāwī, transl. into Turkish by Edirmel Mehemmed Mejīdī Efendī, Constantinople 1269 (1853), p. 128–129; 'Ali Efendī, Kūnlūzāfī, Aḥṣār, Constantinople 1277, vii, p. 190; Fālq Ḍuḥādī, İslāf, Comp. 1311, p. 16 sqq.; do, Tūrızī al-ṣāḥibār, Comp. 1311, p. 36 sqq.; do., Taḥkūkprūnād, 1268, Comp. 1312, p. 37 sqq.; Mehemmed Thāhrızī, Sīgihāfī ʻurma, Comp. 1308, i, p. 113 and iv, p. 721.


**Shaikhy**

**NAME.** A sub-division of the Shāhīliyya-order [v.], which deserves the name of a brotherhood rather than that of an order. It was founded by ʻAbd al-Kādir b. Māḥmūd (1055–1102 = 1544–1615), who bore the title of Sīdī Shaikh. He was a linear descendant of the caliph Aḥū Bakr and belonged to a branch that emigrated from Arabia to Egypt in the 1st century a.d., and from there to Tunisia where it resided from 609–802 A.H., from this date onward it had its quarters in the Maghrib, where it was known under the name of Bi Bakr or Bi Bi Bakr.

Selh Shaikhy was awadhān of the Shāhīliyya-order. He retained the title of this order with the addition of a thurice repeated fāṭika, at the end of each of the five daily ṣalāt. His piety and character made him the chief of his people in matters spiritual and temporal. In order to procure accommodation for his many visitors, he built a ʿāshūr at al-Abāyīn which to the present day is one of the five ʿāshūrs of the Shaikhy's. His position became hereditary in his family for some generations. In the second half of the xviiith century, however, a schism took place in consequence of which the Shaikhy became divided into two groups, the Sheraga and the Qherzabba. The further history is dominated by this schism.

In the xixth century a certain Bi ʻAmma (‘Amamā) tried to unite the factions under his authority, which he based upon his being divinely appointed successor of Sīdī Shaikh. His personal attitude resembled that of the popular dervishes and was moreover marked by hatred of Christians. He extended the rite by the addition of a ḍikr and a ṣawād.

The Shaikhy has its centre chiefly in the southern borderland between Algeria and Morocco. Apparently it never spread abroad.

**Bibliography:** L. Rinn, Marabout et Khouman, p. 349 sqq.; O. Depont and X. Coppolani, Les confessions religieuses musulmanes, p. 468 sqq. Cf. also the art. TARKA.

**Shaikhzade,** pronounced Sheikhzade, a compound Persian word signifying "son (or descendant) of the Shaikh" [v.], synonymous with the Turkish expression Şehzade-gahı. The word sheikh, pronounced in vulgar Turkish, ʻSheẖ, means according to Turkish usage "preacher in a large mosque; the head of a religious brotherhood". This expression must not be confused with ʻEshbaked (vulgar secondary form for ʻEshbakedeh) "prince imperial".

"Sheikhzade is a patronym of the same kind as İmâmzadeh or İmâmzadeh, Miṣâhızadeh or Miṣâhızadeh, N.Pașa-ı-bahı, N.Bey-ı-bahı, N.Emirzadeh. The Arabic synonym Ibra al-Šeikh is not used in Turkish; expressions like İhs-i-Kemal for Kemal Pașa-ı-bahı are exceptional.

The patronymic Sheikhzade or Sheikhzadeh has been employed as a proper noun in the names of the following Turkish personages:

1. The author of the Khowṣhāh Name, which was completed about May 20, 1387. It is in the prose and in the epilogue of this work that we find information about the poet Sheikhzade or Sheikhzadeh, and at the same time about his patron, Süleyman Şah, the prince of the German. (The quotations which follow are from the manuscript A.F.T., No. 314 of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris).

Sheikhzade was born about the year 1340. It was in fact about fifty years of age when he finished this book ʻUlamâlê-elles-yi-yağlıgâhı yağlıgâhı, fol. 304, b, l. 9). By birth on both his father's and his mother's side he was of high descent (gûl hadımîn berem ustum ustum); l. 2). His ancestors were powerful (der mêkii, men of learning (icum icim fâthar haʃer), Muslims of note. Süleyman Şah had absolute confidence in him (Hem ʻi-dibum am hem tash-idhum ber, Ne hâlam ulemesemi tağa (shaikhzade) idhum ber; ibid., l. 6) and had granted him the right of acting as secretary as well as High Treasurer (mešâm u defter u milâ u khaʃar); fol. 6, l. 7). This entirely confirms Selh, who says that Sheikhzade was ni-şâhîngi and defterdar of the prince of the German.
It is also to this prince that he intended to dedicate his poem. He says in fact:

"Suleimān-Shāh semāllā-dī kā rūcel, Uraidh šū kūtū taatūne el, Kī šāhī-dī temāmet Girmiyānu el, Hem uth ughī-yidā Caghisdundel (MS. No. 355: Caghisdundel)."

a) It was in the time of Suleimān Shāh when I first stretched out my hand to compose this book;
b) he was the Shāh of all the Girmiyān;
and the elder son of him who makes the weapons clash!"

But this prince died when the author was in the middle of his work (fol. 16, 1 1). Sheiksh oghlu then entered the service of Yldir̄im Baysīid, the son-in-law of Suleimān Shāh, still prince imperial, having already received as an appanage the capital of the Girmiyān (see article Girmiyānu-gel), and it is to Baysīid that the poem is dedicated in recognition of the benefits which he had heaped upon the author in his turn (fol. 18, 1 1). This combination of circumstances explains how the poet could at the same time write a eulogy of his former master. He could not forget indeed that the latter must be eclipsed and over-shadowed by his powerful namesake, who was equally a patron of the Ottoman House (the Emin Suleimān, son of Baysīid). His name has only been preserved on inscriptions and coins (Khalīl Edhem, Ali Girmiyān kušbāelin, Revue de l'Institut d'Histoire Ottoman [in Turkish], I. 118-128; Ahmad Ţawwād, Kūryāhde Girmiyān [Kirmiyanoğlu Beyler], 305, 51). In the eulogy of the Baysīid, "young in age but old in knowledge!" (Vigil-dūr āmābul, ʿārīlī pīr, fol. 18, b. 1 11), this prince is described in different ways in the different manuscripts. That of Berlin, the oldest, styles him: "Yldir̄im Baysīid, son (= descendant) of Orkhan Bey". In the MS. 314 of Paris (fol. 16, b. 1 1 and 2), he is the son of the Sultan Shāh (Sultan oghīdīr Shāh), these words being followed by this qualification: Ns (N'a) Sultan hūm-ī Sultan hūm-ī Sultan, Shēkshūn Baysīid hūm-ī Murād Shāh. The same name is found in the manuscript 355, fol. 4, b. 1, and in place of Shēkshūn, etc. there is: Celēb Baysīid, of Shīr-ī merdān. It will be noted that the imperial princes actually bore the title of Celēb up to the reign of Mehemed II (Siyūrī-ı ʿeşhāmī, p. 59). The surname Ildir̄im (the form in old Osmania for Yldir̄im) appears in the verse: waqīšuğ śūlūm dir kūta bebe-sur, fol. 16, b. 1 5.

In the same said that the work was finished in the time of Baysīid (demellatun, fol. 17, 1 10) and further on, the author expresses the hope of living long enough to finish under the name of the same prince (Shēkshūn adīl) an Ṣūlīm Shāh. The end seems to be a eulogy of a minister (the Grand Vizier ʿAli Pāshā), cf. fol. 19, 1 10. All these differences and variations make one surmise that the preface was entirely remodelled at a later date, perhaps by the author himself. A critical edition would be desirable, but whatever may be the version adopted as definitive, one can adopt as certain the date of the completion of the work (May 20, 1387) given in the epilogue. This date is thus formulated (fol. 304, b. 13)...... yīlī yūn sejen defanda - Ki ilāhī waqīšuğ-ī Ṣūlīm Shāh dākēd - e in 789 when the sun had raised his throne under (the sign of) Taurus". Then a description of spring follows, which concludes thus... ṣaṣ̄īl ilāhīyu (sic) ʿāhir maḥā nīr - Bu Ṣūlīm Shāh Nāme oğīl vel vel ʿāhir (sic). It was evidently at the end of the Rabī' II (spring). That the Ṣūlīm Shāh Nāme was finished (ibidem, l. 2)² now the lunar month of Rabī' II, 789 extended from 21st April to 20th May, and that corresponds exactly with the passage of the sun to the nodical sign of Taurus. Such an exact coincidence, which is in contrast to the usual lack of precision in Ottoman chronology excludes the possibility of error. The poem then is older than is usually believed.

It follows from what has been said that Suleimān Shāh had already been dead for some time in the year 789 (cf. the article GERMİYANOĞLU). We may notice also that according to the eulogy of him by Sheiksh oghlu, Suleimān Shāh was so devout that the derwishes forgot the respect due to a great prince (ulu Shāh) and did not salute him first (iyām ʿāhirīn-e, fol. 15, b. 1 13). As regards the epithet takhabādān which is given in a passage quoted above to the father of Suleimān Shāh (Girmiyanoğlu Mehemed) and which we have translated by "he who makes the shields clash", it is obviously the regular participle of (y)an of a causative verb of onomatopoeic origin takht-i-xur-balluka (takhabādān), synonyms with the metaphysics of takht-i-ballu (takhabādān) (whence no doubt comes the proper name Fach Schaud, wrongly given by v. Hammer, Gesch. d. osman. Dichtkunst, I. p. 110, note 1; we shall correct the other errors in the same quotation). The verb takhabādān is given by Mahmūd Kāshgharī, Divān inghāt al-Turk, III. 211, below in the sense of "to jingle (little pebbles), to tinkle, in speaking of toys or other objects". (Cf. also J. Deny, Gram. turque, § 380, re. 4 and note; add the words takht-balub, from the birkhan-balub in Turkish, p. 626, b. 24; takht-balub, from the Dict. of Redhouse, p. 722, b.; takht-balub, from Kāshgharī, b. 390, b. 12-15; and takht-balub ṣe-balub, Vambéry, Altime., p. 185).

The Ṣūlīm Shāh Nāme describes the loves of Ṣūlīm Shāh, the daughter of the king of Persia Siyūnā and of Ferahshāh, son of the king of Magrib, (see the analysis in Hammer, loc. cit.). It is a poem of 7,460 verses (with two rhyming hemistichs of 11 syllables), that is to say it is a muhabbat like the Ṣūlīm Shāh and in the same metre, the benefic (-----). This poem is called Ṣūlīm Shāh Ferahshāh by Sehi and Ferāsh Nāme by Ḥādījī Khalīfa (iv. 412), v. Hammer, Gibb, and, following them, other authors pronounce it Ferahshāh, and Gibb corrects the editor of Ḥādījī Khalīfa by reading Ferāsh Nāme. In the Paris manuscripts quoted, this name is always written Ferahshāh and this reading ought always to be retained as the only one compatible with the metre (-----). The word is found indeed either at the beginning or at the end of the hemistich (fol. 70, 72 b., 73, 78, 78 b., 76 etc.) where Ferahshāh and (-----) would be inadmissible.

This last word besides does not occur either in the Suleimān or in Jasti, Ṣūlīm Shāh Nāme, Marburg 1895, and seems due to a confusion with Ferahshāh and Ferugkūt (cf. a analogous confusion in the original story of Ferahshāh, Ferukhīzād, translated into French by the Jean de Langues Maltor in 1742, Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris, Suppl. turco., No. 945).
Seth identifies Sheihkghulu with the "nephew", on his sister's side, and companion of Sheihkbu. The historian Alī who makes the same confusion, calls him Djamal ith Sheihkghulu (Hammer: Djamalī zakład). The dates contradict this identification (Shalihi, who wrote under Murād II, was still alive in 1421), and it is difficult to believe that he could have his companion a nephew born in 1430. Two different individuals must therefore be distinguished.

Köprülü Zade Mehmed Fu'ād notes in No. 124 of the bibliography to his Türk edebiyâtında ifık müteşwäfifler, Stambul 1918, an autograph and unique manuscript belonging to him of a work entitled Qunus ullahâr by Sheihkghulu "extremely important from the point of view of the history of language and literature", but without more detailed information, it is impossible to say if it is here a question of our author.

Bibliography: See especially Gibb, History of Ottoman Poetry, London 1900, p. 422 sqq. The manuscripts of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris are: A.F.T., No. 314 (a fine vocalised ma'āli MS. of 852), 315 and 355 (the last two incomplete). The Berlin copy (Pertsch, No. 365) is of Rabī' I, 807 (Sept. 7-Oct. 6, 1404).

II. The author, or rather the translator, of the Kirb Westir (Wastr) hikâyâsî, "the history of the forty viziers". Only the little which is given in the preface of this work is known about this writer. The text also varies according to different manuscripts. In some one finds only Shaikhzade, in others only Ahmed-i Müşir. Gibb thinks it is one and the same person, the translator of the Kirb Westir from Arabic into Turkish, from a work which has been lost, entitled Arbâ’in ma‘âl close, "The Forty Days and Forty Nights". This translation is dedicated in the great majority of manuscripts to Sultan Murad II (1421-1451), and indicates approximately the epoch in which our author lived (according to Pertsch he is said to have written the Kirb Westir in 850=1445). It is to be noted, however, that according to the text of Belletté (which is in agreement with one of the manuscripts of Vienna) Shaikhzade is the name of an author who wrote in Arabic for the Sultan of Egypt (Müşir and Müşir in place of the "sar" of other manuscripts), and it is an anonymous writer speaking of himself in the first person who wrote the Turkish translation, commenting it with diverse flowers of diction and quotations. According to other manuscripts, we might suppose that Shaikhzade (or Aḥmad Muṣir) made the first translation and that an anonymous writer improved upon it. Fleischer, Behrnauer and Gibb reject the reading Muṣir as wrong, but the change of person (which passes from the third to the first) in the text of the preface remains none the less a puzzle. It is important then to set up a critical text from the different manuscripts of the Kirb Westir in order to establish even the name of the author.

Like the Bağhiyâ-nâme [q.v.] or the "History of the Ten Viziers", "The Forty Viziers" is a compilation of the "Sindâd Nâme" [q.v.] or the "History of the Seven Wise Men" (seven viziers in the Arab version). The framework of "The Forty Viziers" may be summarized as follows: There was in Persia a sovereign called Shaikh-i Khâshâyân (of the east and of the west), whose young wife fell in love with his stepson, a prince of marvellous beauty and of great virtue. Solicited by the Queen (Khatun), the prince (Sheikhzade) follows the advice which his tutor (khâshā, aïûd) had given him, who after consulting his horoscope, recommends him to maintain, whatever happens, the silence of a mute, during a dangerous period which will last forty days. Irritated by the indifference of the prince, the queen slanders him to the king, who orders his son to be put to death. It is at this moment that the forty viziers intervene and the first of them in the presence of the executioner tells a story (that of Shaikh Sihiâbah al-Din Maktûl, who died the victim of a woman's ruse), at the end of which the king consents to post-pone the execution of the prince until he has obtained further information. In the evening the queen on her part tells a story calculated to revive the anger of her husband, who again summons the executioner on the following morning. But the second vizier intervenes in his turn and so on until the forty stories of the viziers alternate with the forty stories of the queen. Finally, on the forty-first day, when the king was just going to give credence to the queen by putting his son to death and throwing the viziers into prison, the tutor, who had disappeared during this time, comes back and relieves the prince of the silence imposed by the omens. Then the prince reveals the intrigues of the queen. The latter, confounded by the testimony of her servants, is attached to the tail of a horse, which shatters her to pieces dragging her over stones and rough roads.

The stories of the forty viziers are most frequently localized in Egypt, which is in accordance with the indications in the preface as to the place where the collection is said to have been written (Aṣḥād [Aṣḥād], the Sultan of Egypt, of one of the tales — cf. Chauvin, p. 125 — is probably Ikhâshîd).


Bibliography: Hâddîjâ Khâlîfa, Khâṣîf al-Zânîn, vii., Index, No. 6437; Brockelmann, G.A.L., i. 205-417; Dozy, Catalogue ..., bibl. Ac. Lusden-Batavien, 1851, lii. 82.

4. Abû al-Râmayn b. al-Shâkh Muhammâd b. Sülîmân, called Shaikhzâde (in Hâddîjâ Khâlîfa: Shaikhî zâde); died, in 1078 (June 23, 1667—June 11, 1668), finished in 1077, Mâjudîf al-âhkâm, commentary (Arabic) on the Multûfah al-ahbâr, a treatise on Ḥanâfi law by İübûhim al-Ḫalâbî; see al-Ḫulâfî. The Turkish translation
of this work by Mawgūfī is at the root of d’Ohsson’s Tableau général de l’empire Othoman. This commentary was first published in Constantinople in 1240 (1824/1825) and again in 1305, a tome in one large volume in 4.

Bibliography: Hadji Şahi, vi. 195; Zekeriya, Bibliotheca orientalis, No. 1450; Halm, Manaṭṣa, ii. 433; Blochet, Catalogue des manuscrits arabes..., etc., by Diderokens, 1909, ar. No. 6411 (misprints in the dates).

On other individuals who have had the surname Shaikže (or) see: Rien, Cat. of Turh. MSS. in the British Museum, 82, b. and 122b; Dorn, Das asiatische A Museum, St. Petersburg 1846, p. 219. (J. Deny)

ŞAI'T (A.), poet. The word is probably derived from the word َشَأْيَرَ poetry" or "poem," which may be of ancient Semitic origin, for we have in Hebrew שָאָר for a solemn hymn, and it is most unlikely that the derivation is from the Arabic verb َشَأَرَ to "know," as Arabic philologists explain it. The fact that the term is not used in the meaning of composing verses seems to speak against such a derivation. (Goldziher in his Abhāndl s, x. arab. Phil., i., 17, has explained َشَأْيَرَ as the one with inspired knowledge. The origin is lost in the remotest antiquity and though to my knowledge no ancient Arabic inscription contains any metrical verse, we cannot argue from this that poetry did not exist at those times. The remarkable fact remains that the oldest specimens of Arabic poetry which we can consider genuine have already fully developed rules as to metre and rhyme. That a poem must rhyme is imperative, but the َشَأْيَرَ in some of the earliest specimens of his art which are preserved employs metres which the critics of the second century of the Hijrī did not acknowledge and did not know (e.g. poems by َأَهْبَت, َأَمَرَ َأَمُرُ َأَمَرُ َأَمُرُ). Also in early times it was probably more frequent than we can now ascertain that the metre was not always correct, even if it corresponded with one of the 16 metres evolved by َأَهْبَت and َأَحْبَت for one verse of َأَهْبَت has several syllables too many which the grammarians have not been able to amend.

It is also important that the earliest specimens of Arabic poetry are by men who held an honourable position in their tribe; the time had not come when poor men, like al-حَسَّلَة, practised the art. Some authorities wish to emphasize that the َشَأْيَرَ and the َأَحْبَت were probably identical, a view which I cannot endorse, as Arabic poetry as a rule in early times holds aloof from all that is religious. It is a strong point that it is as a rule strictly concerned with worldly affairs. The short َشَأْيَرَ metre may have been the first which was practised in the َشَأْيَرَ or "leading the moving string of camels," but we have no ancient specimens of the َشَأْيَرَ, the earliest being preserved in the َأَحْبَت of َأَحْبَت of the َأَحْبَت who lived during the time of the rise of Islam.

The earliest poets of whom we have any knowledge lived in Eastern Arabia, and in their poetry they employed only very few of the 16 metres, and it is significant that even such late poets as َأَحْبَت and َأَحْبَت never use the shorter metres, which seem to have originated later in the Hijrīa. َأَحْبَت only uses the metres َشَأْيَرَ, َشَأْيَرَ, َشَأْيَرَ and َشَأْيَرَ and َشَأْيَرَ, the poet َأَحْبَت adds to this number only the metre َشَأْيَرَ. As later poets in various parts of Arabia employ all other metres, the fact mentioned might point to the existence of some unknown cause for this peculiarity. The َشَأْيَرَ was considered to be possessed of some special knowledge communicated to him by a kind of familiar spirit which inspired him, and he had in his company one or more real persons whose business it was to remember his verses and to recite them in other camps. While the familiar spirit may only have been fictitious, the reciter of the poet, named َشَأْيَرَ, was very real and we have many names of such َشَأْيَرَs mentioned in the َأَحْبَت al-أَحْبَت and by the poets themselves in their poems. More important, however, is it that in many cases the َشَأْيَرَ himself became a poet of note in the next generation. Among the َشَأْيَرَs of the following the most notable was َأَحْبَت al-Dhulām, who had for his َشَأْيَرَ Aws b. َأَحْبَت, whose َشَأْيَرَ was the poet َأَحْبَت. The َشَأْيَرَ of َأَحْبَت were his son َأَحْبَت, َأَحْبَت and َأَحْبَت. Such chains of poets who recited each other's poems could be mentioned in greater numbers than is generally realised. This points to a kind of school for poets and the َشَأْيَرَ at the same time made attempts at own composition, which he submitted to his master; this also accounts for finding in certain parts of Arabia a prevalence not only of specific metres, but also of special themes. It is not an accident that َأَحْبَت Dhu’l- َأَحْبَت, Sūda b. Dhu’l- َأَحْبَت and َأَحْبَت al-Mutamāshghad, the Hudhali poets, specialize in the description of bees; they were one the َشَأْيَرَ of another and not only used similar metres but also the same subjects which they had learned from their masters. This also explains why we find a line word for word in a poem of َأَحْبَت, Aws b. َأَحْبَت and َأَحْبَت, "The unfettered horses of passion" was an idea which the َشَأْيَرَs of َأَحْبَت could not omit from their verses.

The poet of the early times loved to fill his poems with fine words and it is specially in the earlier times that a large quantity of foreign words were used to adorn the poems, a practice which ceased after the first century of the Hijrī. At this time the calling of the َشَأْيَرَ had altered entirely. In the earlier times the poet stood for the honour of his tribe; he had to mourn his relations or the valiant men of his clan or sing the defiant َشَأْيَرَ against the enemies of his tribe. Now the poet had sunk to be a beggar for favours from the mighty and rich; to this he added lampoons against rivals, who made his work of extorting presents more difficult, and new themes for the edification of drunken gatherings, poems on banquets and obscene ditties. We have no Persian poetry as old, but Ibn Dānīl tells us (َأَحْبَت, 1952) that in Persia also poetry flourished and that they were very diligent in avoiding the use of any Arabic word in their poetry which was by critics considered a serious fault. We do not know the contents of this class of poetry, but we may assume that the lighter poetry in the Arabic language as represented by the poems of Khawfik and Abū Nawās reflects the themes of Persian verse. The earliest authentic Persian poetry dates from the fourth century of the Hijrī and the specimens preserved agree remarkably well with the kind of verse composed in Arabic by their contemporaries like Abū َأَحْبَت al-Busti, who wrote in both
languages. Since then the šā'ir has never died out, but the art which seems so fresh in the earliest specimens has seldom been able to leave the old path and like sheep and cows the poets, whether Arabic, Persian, Turkish or Urdu, have been chewing the cud to this day.

The Prophet took a special stand against the poets. He seems to have been a šā'ir himself, which brought about the answer at the end of Sūrat xxvi, which has been entitled "the Poets" from these verses. "The poets are liars and those who follow them have gone astray." The poets, however, were too well established in Arab civilisation and the traditions know that the Prophet's immediate successors were well versed in ancient poetry; especially 'Ali is credited with many verses, all of which are probably spurious. Though the Prophet would not be called a poet himself, he made full use of several poets, especially Hassan b. Thabit, who composed biting verses against the Mekkan adversaries. The method the šā'ir had to use for such verses to reach the hostile camp was to teach the verses to a rāwi who recited them in another place before a neutral audience, which had, however, sufficient interest to repeat the verses to the enemy attack. As regards the art of the poet I am inclined to doubt that all ancient poems were originally complete poems; often the šā'ir could only get from his familiar spirit the inspiration for part, and, like Zahir, had to work for a whole year on a single poem or recite it before it was completed, according to the rules which Aḥwārī d. g. has laid down for every poem. We have ample evidence that many poems were at all times only fragments, for an Arabic (or Persian) šāfī with the same rhyme going through a great number of verses is a very rare thing. (F. K. KENNICK)

SHAIṬĀN, Satan. (See also ḤAQQ, ILĪS). "Every proud and rebellious one among ḍīnun, men and animals" is the meaning given in the dictionaries. As applied to spirits shaiṭān has two distinct meanings with separate histories. The sense of devil goes back to Jewish sources and that of superhuman being has its roots in Arab paganism, though the two meanings interact. In the stories about Solomon a shaiṭān is nothing more than a ḍīnun superior in knowledge and power to other ḍīnun. But even their powers are limited. Closely connected with this is the use of the word in the sense of genius. He made up his mind, when they died, to hunger and disappointment, but his Demon said to him — Thou hast the charge of a household to meet" (Mishqat al-Tarā'il, xvii, 65). Belonging to the same order of ideas is the belief that a poet was possessed by a shaiṭān who inspired his works. Later writers knew the names of these familiar spirits. There is some evidence that the pagan gods of Arabia were afterwards reduced to the rank of demons. Tāhār says (Taṣfīr) that the shaiṭān are those whom the insidels obeyed while disobeying God. The bow of Qūṣ ṣah was afterwards called the bow of Shaiṭān and the horns of Shaiṭān is a name for a phenomenon accompanying sunrise. Similarly old superstitions are preserved in the belief that a shaiṭān eats excrement and all manner of filth and frequents the borderline between shade and sunlight.

The word is common in the Qurʾān but in the Sūra of the first Mekkan period the indefinite singular alone is found and that only once. It is not till the second period that the definite form occurs, suggesting that the prophet had found or remembered another idea. Shaiṭān is tactfully identified with Iblīs who is obviously borrowed from Judaism. Thus al-shaiṭān is the chief of the evil spirits and shaiṭān is a spirit, though not necessarily evil. There is no fixed tradition as to the relation of al-shaiṭān with the shaiṭāns and other ḍīnun. One account says that he is their father; another makes him produce eggs from which they were hatched and another says that God first created the devil then his wife and from the union came three eggs from which the various sorts of ḍīnun were hatched. The Qurʾān says that Shaiṭān is made of fire; the commentators refine on this and say that the angels are made of light, Shaiṭān of fire or of the smoke of fire. It is not settled whether the shaiṭāns have no bodies at all or have bodies of some very subtle substance. The punishment of Shaiṭān for resisting God is postponed to the end of the world when he will receive his reward in hell-fire. He is not Lord of Hell; according to the Qurʾān Malik is Lord of Hell. His standing epithet raqīḥ is derived from the Abyssinian word meaning a drumstick or cudgel; other names for Shaiṭān are ẓāhir and ḍīnun which is said to mean the father of the ḍīnun. The serpent which helped shaiṭān to tempt Adam was punished by being deprived of its legs but the peacock, the intermediary, seems to have escaped scot-free. Perhaps there is some connection with the Malik Tāb of the Yazidis.

In religious thought Shaiṭān is the power that opposes God in the hearts of men. He whispers his insidious suggestions in their ears and makes his proposals seductive to them. The Qurʾān describes this activity now to one shaiṭān now to several. Later it is said that one shaiṭān is attached to each man so that it is possible for everyone to speak of "my shaiṭān." There are no exceptions to this rule for even Yahyā b. Zakāriyyā (the Baptist) had his shaiṭān though he was too good to listen to its insinuations. The union between a man and his shaiṭān is as close as that between a man and his blood. But there is no hint of dualism for a shaiṭān has no real power over man, he owes his success to craft alone. He cannot exploit that success for he is afraid of God and leaves men in the lurch as soon as he has persuaded them to sin. The activities of Shaiṭān are summarized in the following tale. He complained to God of the privileges granted to men and was thereupon given similar ones. Diviners were his prophets; tattoo marks his sacred books; lies his traditions; poetry his religious reading; musical instruments his maezzas; the market his mosque; the baths his home; his food was everything on which the name of God was not invoked; his drink all intoxicating liquors and the object of his hunting women. The popular view is that every man is attended by an angel and a shaiṭān who guide him to evil and good deeds respectively. Hisan al-Baqri is reported to have said: — They are two thoughts that rush into the minds of men. He thus reduced these spirit forces to mental states.

Shaiṭāns were of both sexes and ugly. They could appear in human form without anything
SHAIYAD—SHAYYAD HAMZA

unnatural, betraying their identity. Many had names. Those of the familial of some poets were known. Farazdak's demons was "Amr. The sha'istas of India and Syria were among the most powerful and the names of their chiefs are given. Diseases, particularly the plague, were their weapons. Some said that the sha'istas were bound during the month of Ramadān and a cock was supposed to be a protection against them.

Attempts were made to reduce these ideas to some system. An unbelieving fitan was a sha'ist; one strong enough to move buildings and over hear the divine plans was a mardī (rebel) and one capable of more than that was an isfit. Spirits who attacked boys were called armāqī. Some men had power over the various kinds of spirits, but this power was not for all. The body of the māqūl had to be a fit temple (kabūl) for spirits if a man was to control them.

The Arab philologists accepted sha'istān as a native word and derived it from the root sh-h-n though some preferred the root sh-g-f. The word was rare in early poetry. Umayya b. Ahi 'l-Sā'it uses it in connection with the throwing of the stars at the devils. 'Adī b. Zaid tells of Ibīs being punished in fire. It might be urged that he was familiar with the idea but not with the word sha'istān. Umayya also has the participle shāstit in the sense of rebellious spirit. It almost looks as if he were experimenting to find a suitable word. The form shāstit used by Belādhīrī seems to be an attempt to represent the Greek form of the word. As the idea is obviously borrowed, it is probable that the word — a regular Arabic form — is also borrowed from the Ethiopic which is in turn derived from Hebrew.

Sha'istān is also the name of a snake and has some metaphorical meanings.

Bibliography: The passages of the Kurʾān and the commentaries thereto; Goldziher, Abhandlungen zur arabischen Philologie, i. 106 sqq.; Nobelken, Neu-Belürg, p. 34; al-Dījākī, Kitāb al-Tanwīr; Thālibī, Kitāb al-Anbāyāt; Taḥbāzdī, l. 78; al-Ghazālī, al-STāfī, iii. 20 sqq.; al-Kawāzīmī, Ṣadda al-Makhuqāt; al-Mas'ūdī, Murūj al-Dhahāb, Paris ed., iii. 321.

(A. S. Tritton)

SHAIYAD, a term used as a synonym of the word kalender and meaning a certain kind of dervish. The word has been derived from the root sh-g-f, which means "to perish", according to the translation of the 'arūf by 'Aśim. The same author defines ʿayrī as follows: "to cry something with a loud voice; to raise (a building) to a great height; to mention someone loudly, i.e. to praise him openly and make him famous; to cry a war article". Thus etymologically we might translate sha'īyād by "some one who loses himself in the despair that he is not the man of true virtue". This comes near Zenker's translation (p. 554). Tāhir Efendi in his Rekber-i Ghulāsîn (Maṭbūʻ-i 'Amīr, 1308, p. 156) gives the meaning impostor (khalīfub), but this is due to the fact that the word sha'īyād is used as a synonym of ṣayūr — which is also an old šūr term — and is not a translation (the niyār formed a special body which played a part in politics in Baghdad towards the end of the second century A.H. and whose influence long survived; they contributed a great deal to the spread of Sūfism in other lands of Islam and laid the foundations for the development of the šūfis, cf. Ṣāḥib al-Maḥṣūr, transl. Nicholson, p. 100, 1835; Taḥāhriṣ al-Awliyā', ed. Nicholson, l. 332; R. Hartmann, Av-Sulaimān's Risālat al-Malāmātayya, Der Islam, vii. 190—91. In the third century, we find in Khorāsān and in Transoxania similar groups which in Khorāsān are called ḥārīyān or ḥārīyān and in Transoxania īmāḥāl (cf. Köprüü Zade Fu'ad, Türkiye Türkiye, i. 81—82).

We find this term — which is synonymous with kalender, hādari, abādī — in general use from the seventh century A.H. onwards and especially in Asia Minor. We know that there was a Suffi named Sha'īyād 'Abd al-Rahmān Sha'īyād, a contemporary of Djalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, in Konya (Les Saints des Derwischs Tourneurs, transl. Haurz, i. 115); Sādī, in the Gulistān, speaks of a Sha'īyād with dishevelled hair who claimed to be 'alawī and referred a ṣayūr or Ewerti to himself. In the seventh century and later, we find Turkish poets like Sha'īyād Hamza [q. v.] and Sha'īyād ʿIsa, author of a romantic poem called Şalāt-i nūm (in the Biḥl. Nat. there is a Turkish MS. No. 1207, entitled Şalāt-i nūm by a Turkish poet called Ibn ʿYasuf). The references in Faḵrī, a poet of the tenth century, in his Risāle-i tawīfūl (on this book cf. the bibliographical index to my Ilk Mutanawwif) show that these sha'īyāds still existed in his time and that, both in their manner of living and in their mystic life, they did not differ from the groups of heterodox dervishes who had much in common and were closely connected with one another, like the abādīs, hādari kalenders, ʿdāmīs, ṣawāmīs, ṣabīs and bektāshīs (for historical information regarding them, cf. my Anadoluca İslámiyet-i). In the Alam-çrāy-i ʿAbdī, a one of the events of 1029 A.H., there is mention of a Sha'īyād (cf. Dorn, Anzüge aus Mohammedischen Schriftstellern, 1858, p. 370: the note which Dorn gives in his introduction on the word sha'īyād is of no importance, cf. p. 18.)

SHAIYAD HAMZA, a Turkish poet who lived in Asia Minor in the seventh century A.H. He was one of the ʿAbūl [q. v.], Dīlah, who spread throughout Asia Minor in this century under different names like kalender, abādī, ṣawāmī, yeṣevī and hādari, and taking the opportunity of the material and moral crisis caused by the invasion of the Mongols, went from village to village, trying to spread their teaching among the people (on the religious situation and movements in Asia Minor at this time see my Anadoluca İslámiyet-i, p. 36—90). This explains the surname of Sha'īyād [q. v.] which he took. The only information regarding his life is found in certain legendary biographies written in the tenth century. It is certain that he was the author of mystical-religious poems written in the language of the people in syllabary metre (hāf-i nermu) in preference to the ʿarūf but these poems are lost like many of the literary products of this period. The only remnant that survives is a matnawī of 159 hāf-i preserved in the Dīlah al-arf, composed in 918 by Egenderi Ḥ饭ji Kemal (the only known MS. of this work is in the Kitābkhāne-i ʿUmūṣī; for further information cf. the bibliographical index to my Ilk Mutanawwif); this matnawī has been published by me. Sha'īyād Hamza the memory of whom and his works sur-
vived till the tenth century, did not, like Yûnis Emir, have a powerful poetic personality but, like his predecessors and contemporaries whose names are now forgotten, he had an influence on the development of Yûnis (on the character of and formative elements in Turkish literature at this time cf. my İlah Metanetçiler, Ch. viii., p. 205-286). Nevertheless after gaining some fame at the period when this style of poetry was adopted by Yûnis Emir and his successors to the popular taste, the works of Sâidy Ğamza gradually lost their popularity and became completely forgotten from the tenth century onwards.

Bibliography: Besides the sources mentioned above: Köprüli Zade Fuâd, Selçûklu dövründe Anadolu şairleri, I, Sâidy Ğamza, in Kâzîl Caema Cümhter, I, No. 3, 1922, p. 18-19. (KÖPRÜLI ZADE FUÂD)

Sâiza, a town in Northern Syria, the ancient Ḫayyâ, Byzantine _CTXographer. It is mentioned as early as the inscriptions of Thutmose III and Thutmose IV. The table below lists the settled colonists here from Larsein in Thutmose III and up to the time of the name of this town; but the new name could not drive out the old, which soon came into general use again in the Muslim period in the form Shisra. It is mentioned as Shisra along with Hamzû by Imru ʾı-Kais and ʿUbaydallâh b. Kašâyûd b. Kašâyûd b. Idârûd b. ʿUbaydallâh b. ʿUbaydallâh b. Imru ʾı-Kais, Diwan, xx. 40, ed. Ahwardt, The Divans of the six amir. Arab. Poets, ......, p. 130; Kašâyûd b. Shisra, Diwan, liv. 9, ed. Rhodokinias, S. B. Ak. Wien, phil.-hist. Kl., csiv., (Abh. xi.), p. 240).

In the year 11 (638), the people of the town received ʿAbbû ʿUbayda with open arms. They went out to meet him with music, and were satisfied with the same general terms of peace as had been offered to the people of Hamzû, namely payment of the poll and ground-tax (qâza and ᵃʳẖḏâ). Shisra later became a district (ẖim) of the military province (genden) of Hamzû. Towards the end of the 10th century, the people were Kindî (al-Vâʾkhtâ), and Houtama, ii. 324). When Nichephorus Phocas advanced on Halab, Saff al-Dawla retired to his Shisra, but fell very ill there and was brought back dying to his capital (336 = 967). In the following year Nichephorus took Shisra and burned down its chief mosque. In the treaty between him and Kârghîyûa of Halab (Safr 359) the town was included in the latter's territory. (Kamûli al-Dîn, Zabûr, transl. Freytag, Z. D. M. G., xi. 227 = Migne, Patrolo Græcæ, csiv., Col. 1023). On the 16th Rajab 383 (Sept. 6, 993), Shisra, which then belonged to the Hâmidî and Saff al-Dawla, was taken by the Egyptian general Muḥtari who guaranteed the commandant Shisra, who was the office of Saff al-Dawla, security of life and property. When Saff al-Dawla appealed to the Emperor Basîr for help against the Egyptians, the latter came up and besieged Shisra; the commandant appointed by the Caliph, Mansûr b. Kaṭûdû, was bribed by him and handed over the fortress, which received a strong Greek garrison (383 = 994/995). But it again passed — apparently as a result of the defeat of Damascus Dalassenos at Affûnûs (998) — who installed Ḫâmilû (or Halîmû) b. Kaṭûdû as governor there (who can hardly be identified with the above mentioned Mansûr b. Rosâm, Zaptûk İm. Ak. Nauk., xiv., p. 311, note 266 and Schlumberger Épitre byzantine, ii. 151, note 3, supposé; rather his brother). Basîlios however attacked Shisra the very next year (999), began hostilities on October 28 and destroyed the aqueduct which supplied the fortress with water. An attempt to revive the commander failed, but want water finally forced him to offer to surrender, if he and his troops were allowed to march out freely, without the usual proskynèse before the Emperor, and the citizens were guaranteed security of life and property; the Emperor accepted these conditions; in spite of this, many citizens left the town with the garrison, and Basîlios repopulated it with Armenian colonists.

The town remained for the next eighty years in the hands of the Byzantines. In the year 395 (1004/1005) a certain ʿArîmû b. ʿArîmû ʿAṣîr of the tribe of Tabûlîb appeared as a žeʾir and advanced against Shisra with a prominent Arab named al-Ḥamûlî, to drive the Greeks out of it. They defeated a Byzantine detachment and were only driven away by an Egyptian army sent in reply to an official complaint by Basîr to the Caliph al-Nâṣir (Yâḥiyyû al-Anjâjû, in Rosen, op. cit. p. 41 [transl. p. 43]; an Amîrûnûnî, in Ibn Khûlid, I, 347; an Alûgûlûnî, in Mersîdûrûnî, p. 2, Shisra should be read for Cazacûrûnî, cf. his note p. 95). About 1025 Ṣâlih b. Mîrûdû [q.v.] granted the Munkûds the title of the tribe of the Banû Kûfûn the land:round Shisra, which however itself still remained in the hands of the Byzantines. The Munkûdî Muḥkâll was ruling over Kûsâfîyû in 1041; he was the ancestor of ʿUmmî Abu ʾl-Mûtawwâdd Muḥkâll b. ʿAbî b. Munkûdî, who extended his territory down to the Orontes, and probably built the fortress Dîjûr on the bridgehead below Shisra. When he died in January 1059, he was succeeded by his son Irs al-Dawla ʿAbî ʾl-Mulûk Abu ʾl-Hassan ʿAllî, who in 1078, by arrangement with the last Munkûds of Halab, Shûkî, rebuilt the fortress above mentioned and the suburbs of Shisra, Ḫâbil al-Dijûr, in order to cut off the fortress from supplies and support from the Greeks, and thus force it to surrender. In the same year he gave shelter in this fortress to the Greek Arman ʿAbî Mûnîr, who were fleeing before ʾAbîd al-Dawla Tabûtûn (Kamûli al-Dîn, transl. Mûnîr, p. 85, 90; Deringer, Oksâm, p. 30), but was able to win the favour of Tabûtûn again, and later of ʿArîf al-Dawla, who took Halab on June 18, 1080. On December 19, 1081 he succeeded in getting possession of the citadel of Shisra which had hitherto belonged to the Emperor, [Alexius Comnenus, by a treaty with the Bishop of al-Bârû, who resided in it. The Greek garrison were allowed to depart. ʿArîf al-Dawla who envied him the possession of the fortress, and vainly endeavoured to take it from him, was appeased by rich presents from the Munkûdî. He latter died next year (towards the end of 1082); he was succeeded by his pious son Irs al-Dawla Abu ʾl-Mûhrîf Nâṣîr, a peaceful, art-loving prince, under whom the territory of Shisra for a time included Affûnûs, Kûsâfîyû and al-Adhîka, till he had to cede these towns in 1086 to Mâhîb Shûk al-Shîb of ʿIsmâil. Shisra was several times besieged during his rule, but always successfully. He died childless in 1098, shortly after the conquest of Anjâjû by the Crusaders (Oct. 1097). He had destined as his successor his younger brother ʿArîf al-Dawla Abu ʾl-ʿAṣâhir ʿUstâmî.
before them, and razed his fortresses to the ground as he went; Shizar was among these. Baibars had it rebuilt when he ascended the throne, after the expulsion of the Mongols in 1261. He visited the town in 1268 on a tour through the country. Under Sulṭān Káltān, Shizar belonged for a year (1280–1281) to the rebel emir Sungkūr al-Asḥābar of Dimashq. Henceforth it was a miyāba under the miṣāḥ of Ḥalab (cf. the inscriptions of Shizar of the time of Barbarsī, published by Littmann). After the troubles stirred up by Mīnṭāḥ and al-Nāṣirī (1389), nomad tribes occupied this miyāba (Kālqāshandī, jučūš al-ʿĀdī, iv. 277, 17). A. F. 1450 Khalīl al-Zāhirī uses the modern form of the name, for the first time. No deduction can be made from the fact that al-ʿIṣṭāḥānī Abū l-Bakrā in his description of Kāšbātī’s journey (1477) through Northern Syria, does not mention Shizar (cf. Devonshire’s edition in E.I.F.A.O., xx., Cairo 1921), as the Sulṭān’s route did not take him near the town. With Turkish rule or even before it began the gradual decay of the stronghold, which is still going on.

SHAKAK (SHAKAK), a Kurdish tribe on the Turco-Persian frontier. In Persia to the west of Lake Urmia before the war they occupied the cantons of Bûrank, Sonnâ [q.v.], Cêrihî (cf. Salâmâs) and Kottûr; in Turkey, the eastern districts of the vilayet of Van: Surâî (Mahmûdî) and Alâbî (Baghâsh)4, i.e. the territory which in the xviith century belonged to the Dumbull tribe (Sharaf-nâmâ, l. 313–314).

The name of the tribe is written by Yusuf Dîyâ al-Dîn: Shîkak and by Shirwanî: Shâkak; Kûrâsh Efendi writes "Shîkak or Shîkakî". To the south of Lake Urmia in the canton of Bûrûr we have a village Kûnî-Shâkak ("the source of the Shâkak"), which not being far from Bulak-Shîkak (cf. Shâkakî) may be evidence of contact between the two tribes, if it is not a phonetic variant of the same name.

Among the Persian clans, the principal are: Kandîr and Delân (Sonnâ and Bûrank) and 'Awdûl (Cêrihî and Kottûr). There were in all about 2,000 families of Shâkak in Persia who formed the warrior caste (vaqsh-i): their subjects (vaqsh-i) were the villagers who have appeared.

The 'Awdûl have played a prominent part in local politics. Their ancestor is said to have arrived in Dîyâr Bakr at Urmia about 1700. The first known chief was Ismaiîl-Ághâ (l. 1231/1816) whose stronghold and tomb are on the river Nâzû-sâî (N.W. of Urmia). The 'Awdûl harassed by the Afghân then entrenched themselves in Dîyûn (Sonnâ) from which they went northwards to Cêrihî. Dîyûn-Ághâ, sometimes frontier-commissioner and sometimes rebel and brigand, was killed at Tabûz in 1905 by order of the governor-general. His brother Ismaiîl, better known by the Kurdish diminutive of Simkî (Sinmûkî) succeeded him and operated between Cêrihî and Kottûr. He trimmed carefully between Persians, Turks and Russians, holding a practically independent position. As a result of his numerous crimes (e.g. the assassination of the Nestorian patriarch, Mîr-Shimûnî, and the massacres of Muslims at Urmia), the Persian government undertook several expeditions against Simkî who in 1922 was driven towards Turkey and Mesopotamia.

On the Turkish side, the principal clans are: Maqûrî, Millûn, Sâmûltakî and Taqût (Mahmûdî) and Mersakî (at Bash-kulâ). The Turkish government used to recruit 5 "Hamdiyyâ" regiments from among these clans. About 1900 these clans numbered 2,000 families, but the war must have severely reduced their numbers.


SHAKAK (SHAKAK), a tribe of Kurdish origin. According to Yusuf Dîyâ al-Dîn, the word shalak means in Kurdish a beast which has a particular or disease of the foot. According to the Sharaf-nâmâ (1463), the Shalak were one of the four warrior tribes (vehârî) in the shîniya of Fînik of the principality of Dînjar. According to the Ottoman sîl-nâmâ, there were Kurdish Shalakî in the shîniya of Shîkhdar in the haja of Kilis in the vilayet of Aleppo (cf. Spiegel, Erza, Allertânia-

4iime, l. 744). The shîniya Shalak of the Dînjar-nâmâ (between Mînûsî and Dînjar-dîr) is certainly only a mis-reading for Shalakî. As a result of certain circumstances, probably in the time of the Aq-Koyunlu, we find the Shalakî leading a nomadic life on the Mughûn on the frontier of Transcaucasia (cf. Shâh-sewân). At the beginning of the xixth century there were 8,000 families on Russian territory. Dupré speaks of 25,000 heartths of Shalakî among the tribes speaking Kurdish. About 1814 J. Morier numbered them at 50,000 grouped along the Tabûz-Zandîn road and in the districts of Haçtûrê, Garmûtû and Mîyânâ as well as at Ardabîl. 'Abîdâ Mrîzî drew from this tribe the main cadres of his infantry drilled in European fashion. According to Morier, the Shalakî spoke Turkish. Shîrwanî puts the summer and winter quarters of the 60,000 families of Shalakî in the region of Tabûz-Sanû (on the road from Ardabîl) and adds that it is a Kurdish tribe whose language is Turkish, which forms part of the Kûrlî branch (minen tawîsh-i čal-lêg), which evidently means that the tribe is Shû as is also suggested by its association with the Shâh-sewân. The importance of the tribe may be judged from the fact that at the beginning of the xixth century the Persian government recruited four regiments from the Shalakî: we do not know the connections that may exist between the Shalakî and the Kur-

dish Shalakî, but all indications point to their being a Turkishled Kurdish tribe (like the Kûrd of Gandja). In the toponymy of the region south of Lake Urmia (cf. the article SHAWK-BULAK), we find traces of the passage of the Shalakî (the village of Khâlaq-Shalakî at Sûltûn).


(V. Minorsky)

SHAKAK-GANDJA. An Indian saint, whose real name was FARID AL-DIN MAS'UD, was born in 569 A.H. (1173 A.D.). He was a disciple of Khwâ
djâ Khûtî al-Dîn Bâkhîsh Kûki and settled in Adwâdadhan, better known as Pâkpatan, in Mûltan and died there on Saturday, Muharram 5, 664 (October 17, 1265), at the age of 95 years. It is said that by continued fasting his body had become so pure that whatever he used to put into his mouth to allay the cravings of hunger, even earth and stones, used to turn immediately into sugar; hence he derived his title of Shâkak-gandja, "sugar-store".

At the tomb of this saint there is an annual fair on the fifth day of Muharram and Muslims in considerable numbers come there to pass through a narrow gate-way known as the Bihâlî Darvâzâ or "Gate of Paradise", which leads to the mausoleum and is opened only once a year.

His teachings were collected by his famous de

Bibliography: 'Abd al-Hâkî al-Dîhlâwî, Aštâh al-Atâwîlî, p. 54; Dîrî Shîkhâ, Safînât al-Atâwîlî, p. 69; Imîm al-Dîn, Tâlîsh al-

Atâwîlî, p. 166; Rieu, Cat. Pers. MSS. Bâl-

ûz, p. 47; J. C. Oman, The Brahmans, The Hethites and Muslims of India, p. 312; Forbog...
SHAKUR, a Spanish Arabic place-name corresponding to the Spanish Segura. This last name is now only applied to the river which waters Murcia and Orihuela and flows into the Mediterranean near Guardamar. In the Muslim geographers this river is usually called the "white river" (al-muhr al-khayaf). It rises like the Guadalquivir in the range called Djabal Shaikur, but on the eastern slope. The mountains to which this name was given are of considerable extent. They were, according to the Arab geographers, covered with forests and had no fewer than 300 towns and villages and 33 strongholds. They corresponded apparently not only to the Sierra de Segura still called on the maps Sierra de Segura, but also to those called del Velmo, de las Cuatro Villas, de Castielfabib and de Cazorla. The highest points are the Velmo de Segura (6,000 feet) and the Blanquilla (6,100 feet). Shaikur was also the name in the Arab writers of a fairly important town in the district, clustered around a castle reputed to be almost inaccessible.

It was here that Ibn 'Ammar, the vizier of the 'Abbasid al-Ma'tamid, came to seek refuge with Ibn Mubarak, lord of the town, whom he handed over to his master. At the end of the Almoravid dynasty, Segura was the usual residence of Abū Ishaq Ibn Abī Hāmid ibn Hesâbko, lieutenant and vassal of the famous king of Murcia, Abū 'Abd Allâh Muhammad b. Mardanish.

SHALTSISH (sometimes Saltsis), Spanish Saltes, is the name which the Arabic geographers give to the little island situated in the estuary of the river Odre over the modern Huelva (Alt. Walias). A fairly minute description of it is given by al-Idrisi: it almost touches the land on the west coast, for the arm of the sea which separates it is only about a stone's throw in width. This island has no spring of drinking water; there was a little town on it in the period of Muslim rule. It is a fishing centre of some importance; according to Ibn Sād, the fish caught here were salted and sent to Seville. Saltes formed part of the province of Si d'ana (Arab.: Shaljsana) and in the middle ages shared the destinies of Huelva. This island was the last possession of the Almohads, Abū Mus'ab 'Abd al-'Azīz after he surrendered in 1051; he surrender his capital to the 'Abbasid sovereign al-Ma'tamid.


(E. LEVI-PROVENÇAL)
AL-SHALYAK, the usual Arabic name for the constellation of the Lyre (Lyra), is the Arabicized form of the Greek word κύλευ (Lyre), as the Arabs usually reproduce the Greek θ by th (cf. Arshamides, Euthyphro) and are fond of adding a k to such foreign words (R. K. Knobel, see below). The Arabic meaning of shalayak is unknown. The word Sulshath is a second name for the Lyre occurring in Ulugh Beg; it again corresponds to the Greek κύλευ in its original meaning of 'tuttle'. Al-Liura, the form taken from the Greek κύλευ, is also found quite early in the Arab astronomers, e.g., in al-Biruni, in the form γύλωτα ἐν κύλευ φωνής al-qanadi (al-šāliḥ al-maʿṣūrā, Berlin: MSS. Or. 8, 275, fol. 196b) and not for the first time in Ulugh Beg (as L. Ideler thinks). The word al-qanadi (= cymbal, harp) comes from the Persian sang, song or dān (= Persian harp).

The constellation of the Lyre is a northern one, but is not circumpolar in the latitudes of the Muslim world. It thus contains stars, one of which is particularly striking for its brightness and its distance. This is a Lyra or Vega. The full name of the star is: al-mâr al-walâfat ("the falling eagle"). The last component of this expression was changed in course of time into Vega through the influence of the Spanish. The star Vega was classed by the Greeks and Arabs as of the first magnitude; as a matter of fact its magnitude is o.1.


AL-SHAM, Syria. From time immemorial the Beduïns, troublesome neighbours of Syria and Palestine have been attracted by the fertility of this land, "a land of wine and leavened bread". They succeeded sometimes by whole tribes, sometimes by driblets in slipping into the districts bordering on the desert. They founded there from the beginning of the 2nd century before Christ principalities at Hims, at Palmyra and at Petra. They did not take long to adopt the Syrian language and civilisation. In the fifth century A.D. the Ghassanid phylarchs (cf. Ghassan) were entrusted with the defence of the Syrian tribes. They soon embraced Christianity. So also did the tribes, which in the sixth century roved up and down the steppes which separated Syria from Arabia: the Banū Kalb, the Banū Lakhm, the Banū Ḥidschān (q.v.). As is attested of the Banū Kalb (al-Lakhm, xx. 127), these Syro-Arabs spoke a sort of tabir, a mixture of Arabic and Aramaic, related without doubt to the Safaitic dialect. Thus any of these groups before the Hijāra might have given a name to the Arab Pannars. They all believed themselves to be Syrians and had only commercial relations with the Arabs of Najd and the Hijāz. At Māta (q.v.) they fought with the Byzantines against the invaders from Medina.

The Arab conquest: The death of Muḥammad (June 8, 632) and the election of Abū Bakr, was the signal in Arabia for the ridda, the defection of the tribes. A year after that date bands were formed around Medina amongst the Beduïns who had taken part in the bloody sup

pression of this revolt. They undertook the government of Syria, in conformity with an order of the Prophet or simply with the object of ravaging this land now without defenders. Thinking he had only to deal with an ordinary raid of pillaging Beduïns, Sargius, commander in Cæsarea, hurried to meet them with several hundred hastily equipped soldiers. He came upon the Arabs assembled in the valley of al-ʿArab, to the west of the Dead Sea. Overcome by numbers, the Byzantines retired in disorder, and suffered a second defeat at Dāμaṭi, Sargius fell in the battle (Feb. 634). The imperial troops collected reinforcements from Medina. Under the command of Ḥādīl b. al-Walīd (q.v.) who had hurried from the Ḫurraḳ, they inflicted on the enemy the disastrous defeat of Adnānāin (July 30, 634) between Jerusalem and Bāditjūm. The defeated forces tried to reform behind the marshes of Bāsin. Dislodged, they crossed the Jordan, to be again defeated at Fīḥi (Pella). Palestine was definitely lost to the Empire. In March 634 the Arabs took up their position under the walls of Damascus. Abandoned by the Greek garrison, the citizens capitulated in the following September. The army collected by Heraclius to raise the siege arrived too late. The Arabs established themselves in Dāḥbiyya, then retired to entrench themselves behind the Yarmūk, the eastern tributary of the Jordan. A mutiny of Armenian troops broke out in the Byzantine camp. Abandoned by the Syrian Arabs in the middle of the battle, the imperial forces were completely routed. This battle (Aug. 20, 636) settled the fate of Syria. The conquest of the north and of the Phoenician coast was simply a routine-march. Everywhere the towns, abandoned by their garrisons, paid contributions. Nowhere was a serious resistance encountered. This was literally the fatḥ yasir, easy conquest, as Bākhūṭyta tactfully calls it. Jerusalem did not surrender till 738. Cæsarea after a more or less continuous siege of seven years, in 640, thanks to the treachery of a Jew. After the surrender of the last coast towns of Palestine, the conquest could be regarded as complete.

Shortly before the capitulation of Jerusalem, the Caliph Ōmar arrived in Syria, to preside over the congress or "Day of Dāḥbiyya" (q.v.). The question of the organization of Syria was debated. The year 18 was marked by the plaque of Amwā (q.v.), Yazid b. Abī Sufyān, governor of Damascus, perished in the epidemic and was replaced by his brother, Muḥāṣwiyya. Ōmar rigorously maintained the political inequality of the conquerors and conquered. The latter formed the daḥīmīs. The privileged race of Arabs was to furnish the framework of a military and imperial aristocracy. Syria was divided into daḥīm al-muhālibīs, military districts: Damascus, Hims, Palestine, al-Urdān or the Province of Jordan. Yazid I later added the daḥīm of Kinnisīn for the north of Syria. From their military cantonments — the chief of which was Dāḥbiyya — the conquerors controlled the country and collected the taxes. Besides the land tax, the daḥīmīs paid a personal or poll-tax. In Syria, as in the other conquered provinces, organization was confined to a military occupation for the exploitation of the natives. The Arab government was confined to finance; their chancellery was an "audit office" (Wolffhausen, Das arabisches Reich u. sein Sturm, p. 20).
At the beginning of his administration, which under 'Othman extended over all Syria, Mu'awiya realised the necessity of getting the support of the Beduin tribes, politically more developed than the Beduins of the peninsula. For his military operations see the article Mu'awiya.

'Ali, 'Othman's successor, wanted to dismiss him, but the Syrians took the side of their governor. The encounter between Syrians and 'Iraqis on the battlefield of Siffin [q.v.] being undecided, arbitrators were appointed to decide between the two parties. The conference at 'Adhrab [q.v.] proclaimed the overthrow of 'Ali (Jan. 658). Profiting by this diplomatic success, Mu'awiya sent 'Abd al-'Aziz, his lieutenant, to conquer Egypt. On January 24, 651, 'Ali fell a victim to a Khairidji dagger, and the field was left clear for his rival.

Omayyad Syria: Mu'awiya had only been awaiting this day to found a dynasty, that of the Omayyads. The elder branch is called Sufyanid, from Abil Sufyan [q.v.], father of Mu'awiya. The younger line begun by Marwan b. al-Hakam took from him the name Marwanid.

Mu'awiya was acclaimed Caliph at Jerusalem by the troops and emirs of Syria. By taking up his residence in Damascus, he made it the capital instead of Medina, or Kufa. Whether deliberate or not, this step displaced the centre of gravity of the caliphate to the advantage of Syria. It dealt the unjustified supremacy of the Beduins a blow from which it never recovered. Mu'awiya made the Syrian Arabs supreme, and under the Omayyads they held all the principal offices. He twice tried to besiege Constantinople. For a verdict on the policy and character of the sovereign, who was with 'Omar I the real founder and organiser of the Caliphate, see the article Mu'awiya. He died at Damascus in April 680 (aged 75).

His son and successor, Yazid I, had to face a rebellion, which the ability of his father had been able to prevent breaking out. Husain b. 'Ali and 'Abdallah b. al-Zubair [q.v.], nephew of 'Ali, the prophet's widow, refused to recognise Yazid and took refuge on the inviolable territory of Mecca. Husain left the sanctuary to fall in the massacre of Karbala' (cf. Mashhad Husaini), on October 10, 680 Medina quarrelled with Syria, and its inhabitants proclaimed Yazid despised. After futile negotiations recourse was had to arms. Victorious on the day of al-Harra [q.v.], the Syrians marched on Mecca, where Ibn al-Zubair had declared himself independent. His headquarters were in the great mosque. A scaffolding of wood covered with mattresses protected the Ka'ba from the Syrian catapults. The carelessness of a Meccan set it on fire (Nov. 683). The news of the death of Yazid (Nov. 11, 683) decided the Syrian army to retreat. Yazid was not a worthless sovereign, still less the tyrant depicted by anti-Omaya' annalists. He continued his father's policy. The patron of artists and poets, and himself a poet, he completed the administrative organisation of Syria by creating the guirn of Khirmanin (cf. above). He perfected the irrigation of the Ghuta [q.v.] by digging a canal which was called after him. The Caliphate of the Caliphate Arabi calls him

\[\text{Supplication et cunctis nationibus regni sive grattissime habitis... cum omnibus civitatis visut}.\]

Beloved of his subjects, he lived civiliser like a private citizen. "No Caliph", says Wellhausen, "ever had such praise: it comes from the heart".

His younger son, the valetudinarian Mu'awiya II had but a transitory reign. He was apparently carried off by the plague which was raging in 684. His brothers were all very young. The fact that they were minors compelled the Syrian chiefs to give their support to Marwan b. al-Hakam [q.v.], first Caliph of the Marwanid branch (June 22, 684). The Syrian Kaisis having refused to recognise him, were defeated at Mardj Rabil [q.v.]. His reign was a continual series of battles. A rapid campaign secured him Egypt. Excluded with his sympathisers, the septimanejan Caliph returned to Damascus to die on May 7, 685. His eldest son 'Abd al-Malik [q.v.] succeeded him. He had to retake the eastern provinces and Arabia from the anti-Caliph Ibn al-Zubair, and at the same time repel an invasion of the Mardis or Djurdjums [q.v.]. In Jerusalem he owes him the building of the mosque of al-Aqsa. His reign marks the beginning of the nationalisation or arabisation of the administration, which had remained in the hands of the individuals of the conquered races. He succeeded, if not in substituting Arabic for Greek, in getting it used alongside of Greek in the keeping of the official accounts and registers. He was the creator of Arab coinage. 'Abd al-Malik died in Oct. 705, after a reign of 20 years.

His successor, Walid I, brought to the throne an autocratic temperament and a display of ruthless fervour unknown in his predecessors. He was the great builder of the dynasty. According to the earliest evidence it seems that the Christians of Damascus had been allowed to retain the splendid Basilica of St. John. Walid took it from them and turned it into a mosque. In his reign the Arab empire attained its greatest extent. Walid was singularly successful in his enterprises. His autocratic mood revealed itself in a diminution in tolerance to the conquered peoples. The great administrative offices were definitely taken from the Christians. By his fondness for magnificence, Walid secured undisputed popularity with the Arabs of Syria. He died on February 23, 715.

His brother, Sulaiman b. 'Abd al-Malik [q.v.], founder of al-Ramlah [q.v.] in Palestine, succeeded him. He perished at the disastrous siege of Constantinople. He was succeeded (Aug. 717) by his cousin 'Omar II b. 'Abd al-'Aziz [q.v.] who died on February 9, 720, and was replaced by the incapable Yazid II. From the time of Walid I the Omayyads had begun to forsake Damascus; the official capital, it ceased to be the Caliph's residence. The decline of the dynasty set in after the death of 'Omar II. Highkun, who succeeded Yazid II, vainly endeavoured to revive the prestige of the Syrian caliphate. The conquests ceased. In France the Arabs suffered the disastrous defeat of Poitiers, Oct. 732. Highkun allowed the Melkite patriarchs of Antioch to reside in Syria. His greed, the failure of his military plans, and finally the way in which he himself was turned up in his desert palace of Ruafa, made this ruler unpopular, though he was the most hard-working of the Omaya' caliphs. He was succeeded in February 743 by his nephew, Walid II, son of Yazid II. This prince, an artist and poet, lived contentedly in the desert, where he began the building of the splendid palace of Mahatta [q.v.]. He died at the hands of an assassin before finishing it (April 744). His successor, Yazid III, was the
first caliph born of a slave. He died five months later, having designated as his successor his insignificant brother, Ibasim, who did not succeed in getting himself acknowledged.

In the midst of the general anarchy, there came on the scene the energetic governor of Mesopotamia, Marwan b. Muhammed [q.v.], grandson of the caliph Marwan I. The victory of ‘Aindjar in the Hijaz broke the resistance of his adversaries, the Syrian Yemenis. Becoming caliph in December 744; Marwan II made the mistake of moving the capital to Harran (Mesopotamia) which alienated the Syrians from him. He exhausted himself in putting down their rebellions and those of the Kharijites. The ‘Abbasids, now secretly conspiring against the Omayyad dynasty, taking advantage of the disaffection in Syria, Abu l-‘Abbas al-Saffah [q.v.] had himself proclaimed caliph at Kufa (Nov. 749). After his defeat on the great Zab (Jan. 750) Marwan had to evacuate Mesopotamia, and then Syria. Abandoned by the Syrians, he took refuge in Egypt where he died at Abişir in August 750. The Omayyads were everywhere pursued and exterminated, their tombs desecrated, and their ashes scattered to the winds. The Syrians tried in vain to regain their lost ground. They raised the “white flag” of the Omayyads in opposition to the “black flag” of the ‘Abbasids. They found too late that by indifference to the fall of the Omayyads they had thrown away the future and supremacy of Syria. They hoped henceforth for speedy coming of al-Sufyān [q.v.], a national hero and champion of Syrian liberty. As his name shows, al-Sufyān, was to be a descendant of Abī Sufyān. He was to bring back the golden age and the happy days of the dynasty, the memory of which his name perpetuates.

Immediately after the conquest, the tribes of Syria had to learn the dialect of the Kuraish, now promoted to be the classical language. Among the Syrian Arabs, distracted by foreign conquests and the suppression of revolts in the provinces, intellectual activity under the Omayyads had been confined to poetry. The chief representatives of this literary renaissance were, next to the Taghibi Christian Abjāl [q.v.], the Caliphs Yazid I and Walid II. Arts and liberal professions remained the monopoly of the subject races, like banking and commerce. The Kadrāt movement [q.v.] which seems to have started in Syria, shows that the Arabs of Syria were beginning to take an interest in the philosophical problems to which they had been introduced by their Christian compatriots.

Agriculture remained flourishing in spite of the greed of the exchequer. As a result of the war with Byzantium, maritime trade had considerably diminished. On the other hand the fall of the Persian empire had opened up Central Asia to the Syrians, but they were soon to meet the competition of the commercial cities of the ‘Irāq, notably Baghdad. Syrian commerce, so active in the time of Justinian, became dormant under the Arabs. When maritime relations were resumed, it was the western peoples who secured the advantage from it, at the time of the Crusades. From the time of the Marwānids, the great towns of eastern Syria — Damascus, Homs, etc. — began to be Islamised as a result of the abolition of the military cantonments. The subject races learned Arabic, without, however, abandoning Aramaic or Greek. Decimated by epidemics, famine, civil strife and foreign wars, the Arab population of Syria grew slowly. If we neglect local outbreaks of fanaticism, there is no evidence of systematic persecution or proselytising encouraged by the authorities. The latter only exercised pressure on the Christians of Arab race, the Tabib and Taghibī. The Banū Kalb and other Syrian tribes had adopted Islam soon after the conquest.

In spite of their position as political helots, this was a period of marked tranquillity and toleration for non-Muslims, if we compare it with the troubles that awaited them under the ‘Abbasids. For the Arabs, paid and fed by the State, it was a golden age, a continual feast. Their chiefs, growing rich in exploiting the provinces, acquired enormous fortunes. What favoured the success of the ‘Abbasid conspiracy was the incapacity of the latter Marwānī caliphs, excluding of course ‘Abd al-Malik and Marwan II.

Then came the grave and continuous dissensions, after Marjāl Kālib, between Kais and Yemen, and lastly the refusal of the conquerors to grant political rights to the non-Arabs, who were their intellectual superiors.

‘Abbasid and Fāṭimid Syria. With the fall of the Omayyads, Syria lost its privileged position, and ceased to form the centre of a vast empire. It found itself reduced to the rank of a simple province, and jealously watched on account of its attachment to the old regime. The capital of the caliphate was moved across the Euphrates. Straining under a power, the hostility of which they never ceased to nourish, the Christians found themselves systematically excluded from all share in government affairs, as they were henceforth to be under the Fāṭimids and succeeding dynasties. The caliphs of Baghdad only intervened in Syria to make it feel its position of inferiority by inflicting increased taxation on it. Driven to extremes by the exactions of the caliph’s agents, the Christians of Lebanon attempted without success to gain their freedom in 759–760. On the occasion of the pilgrimage or of the war against the Byzantines, the Caliphs al-Ma’mūn, al-Mahdi, Hārūn and al-Ma’mūn passed through Syria. In the midst of the troubles that preceded the accession of al-Ma’mūn (813–833), the position of the Christians became intolerable and many of them migrated to Cyprus.

The misfortunes of their country, the loss of its autonomy, could not decide Kaisis and Yemenis to forget their regrettable differences, which ended by weakening the Syrians and driving them to failure in their efforts to shake off the ‘Abbasid yoke. A descendant of Mu’āwiya, ‘Abī b. ‘Abdallāh al-Sufyān, raised the “white standard” which had become the symbol of Syrian independence. But to get the support of the Kalb, he alienated the Kaisis (809–813). Another rising was no more successful. An Arab of obscure antecedents, named Abī Ḥarīr of Yemen origin, proclaimed himself the Sufyān (cf. above). The indifference of the Kaisis once again brought about his defeat in the reign of the Caliph al-Mu’tasim (833–847). Yielding to caprice, the moody caliph al-Muta-wakkil (847–861) thought of shifting his capital and living in Damascus. A mutiny in his garrison forced him to return to Mesopotamia. His reign was a period of severe trial for the Syrians. From his reign dates for the most part the intolerant legislation, which it has been proposed to attribute
to 'Omar I: the wearing of a special dress, the prohibition of riding on horseback etc. Numerous churches were turned into mosques. At this date there were no longer any Christians of Arab stock in Syria. Under the Umayyads, the Banū Tanikh had resisted all advances of the government. The Caliph al-Mahdi (775–785), however, forced them to apostatize.

It is to the early 'Abbāsid era that the Syrian military marches owe their origin, the 'aṣifia and al-nūkha'īna [q.v.], lines of fortifications built to check the progress of the Byzantine invaders. In 906 an aggrieved Syrian claiming to be the salṭānīn was arrested. This was the last attempt at an Omayyad restoration; it failed before the apathy of the demoralized Syrians. A Turkish Mamlik, Alūs b. Tūlān [q.v.], already master of Egypt, invaded Syria and undertook the task of defending it against the Byzantines. He declared himself independent there. The dynasty which he founded had only an ephemeral existence (875–905), as had that of the Ḳasbātíya (875–905) which replaced the Fatimids in the interval. Syria had been devastated by the 'Amranīya [q.v.] who left behind them the germ of al-maṣūrīn doctrines. From the time of the Ṛūfānids, the country may politically speaking be considered lost to the 'Abbāsid dynasty. Their power was maintained only there during a few brief periods of restoration.

In turn the Bedouin tribes wished to take their share in plundering an empire in decay. A Taghlibī clan, the Banū Hāmadān [q.v.] found themselves entrusted with the reconquest of Syria for the Ḳasbātíya and checking the Byzantine advance. They installed themselves as masters of the south of the country, without however breaking with the 'Abbāsid caliphate. The most famous of these Hāmadānī emirs was Saif al-Dawla [q.v.], who in his court at Aleppo, showed himself an enlightened patron of arts and letters (949–967). After the fall of the Ḳasbātíya (1003/1004) in spite of a brief 'Abbāsid reaction at Damascus (975–977), Syria fell into and remained for over a century (977–1098) in the hands of an 'Atid dynasty, or more accurately Isma'īlī, that of the Fātimids [q.v.].

Having conquered Egypt, the Fātimid armies invaded Syria (969), and conquered Palestine and then Damascus, without encountering any particular resistance. In the centre and north it is difficult to say what form the Egyptian conquest took. The direct authority of the Fātimids was enforced so long as their troops occupied the region. After their departure, the local Emirs did as they pleased without openly breaking with the uṣūrī in Cairo. Fātimid rule was only kept up in Syria by continually dismissing the agents to whom it was forced to delegate its authority, thus perpetuating administrative instability. In Palestine it had to reckon with the Banū 'āl-Djarāk. These Emirs of the tribe of Taiyy arrogated to themselves for over a century a regular hegemony over the nomad Syrians. In the reign of al-Hākim (996–1020), the Banū 'āl-Djarāk amused themselves by appointing an anti-caliph, and then sending him back to Mecca, whence they had brought him. In Tyre a humble boatman succeeded for a time in declaring himself independent (997).

Taking advantage of the anarchy the Emperor Nicephorus Phocas (963–969) had conquered Northern Syria. His successors, Triconocles (969–976) and Basil II (976–1025), easily conquered the valley of the Orontes and the Phoenician coast. Of all these conquests all that the Byzantines were able to keep for over a century was the "duchy" of Antioc, which included most of Lower Syria, except the emirates of Aleppo and Damasc. We have already mentioned the Caliph al-Hākim [q.v.] with whom the Hākimīn was connected the origin of the Druzes [q.v.]. This moody prince quarrelled with the Christians and ordered the Basilisk of the Resurrection in Jerusalem to be destroyed, Syria gradually detached itself from Egypt. In the midst of the political disorders, the pernicious influence of the Beduins increased. About 1023, the Banū Mirḍa of the Kašī tribe of Banū Keith established themselves in Aleppo, and held it with interruptions till 1079.

By this time the Saldākh [q.v.] had already gained a footing in Syria. The provinces of Syria fell into their power, Damascus in 1075. At Jerusalem a Saldākh Emīr, Ortoš [q.v.], founded a local dynasty (1086–1087). In 1084, the Greeks lost Antioc, their last possession in Syria. Syria was now divided into two Saldākh Subhānī, that of Aleppo and that of Damascus. Saldākh Emirs more or less independent commanded at Aleppo and Damascus. The Saracens, all at war with one another. At Tripoli, a humble kābest founded the dynasty of Banū A'mār. To the south of this town the towns on the coast remained in the hands of the Egyptians. Into the midst of this confusion, this piece-meal distribution of territory, came the armies of the Crusaders.

The persistent hostility shown by the 'Abbāsid to the intellectuals of Syria, the political anarchy, the rule of Turkish and Berber adventurers, unlettered and greedy masters, were all circumstances unfavourable to the progress of ideas. A few poets had gathered at the court of the Ḳasbātíya and Mirdāsid of Aleppo. The patronage of Saif al-Dawla encouraged the progress of the celebrated Kītaīb al-Aghāmī. The reader may be referred to the articles on Abu Tammān, Abu 'l-Āla al-Ma'arrī, al-Mutanabbi, a native of Kūfa, but a Syrian by education and upbringing, al-Maḳdisī, one of the most justly esteemed of Arab geographers. Less tolerant, more irritating than the Omayyads, the authorities began to encourage conversion to Islam. Arabic slowly began to take the place of Syriac as the spoken language of the subject races, who began to write in it. Profane sciences, especially medicine, began to be cultivated, mainly by Jews and Christians. The end of this period coincides with the institution of the Madrasas [q.v.] which grew up under the stimulus of the Saldākh, especially in Aleppo and Damascus. The lack of respect into which the 'Abbāsid caliphate had fallen restated on orthodox Ḳalām; it favoured the rapid growth of sects practising initiation and following the Shī'ā: the Druses, Ismā'īli, Naqṣānis and Muṭawallīs [q.v.].

The exactions of the 'Abbāsid and Fātimid agents diminished without however destroying the great vitality of the country. In 311, a governor of Damascus was sentenced to pay 300,000 dinars to the treasury. The country began to become depopulated and agriculture languished. Its complete decline was only checked by the introduction of new crops: sugar-cane and the orange. Cotton-growing was developed and cotton was used for manufacture of paper. In the tenth century there was a paper factory in Damascus. One should
read the sketch of the commerce of Syria in al-Makdisi’s geography, Akīyân al-lāṭālik (p. 180, 184), to get an idea of the various regions of a country which centuries of oppression and the most deplorable administration had not been able to impoverish.

Syria under the Franks. On October 21, 1097, the army of the Crusaders appeared before the walls of Antioch. After a very laborious siege, they entered on June 3, 1098. Then following the valley of the Orontes through the mountains of the Nusairis and along the coast, the Franks, now reduced to 40,000 men, debouched before Jerusalem. The city, which the Fatimids had just retaken from the Ortogols, was taken by assault on July 15, 1099, and Deinrey of Bouillon elected head of the new Latin state (1099-1100). But the first Frank king of Jerusalem was really his brother and successor, Baldwin I. He conquered the towns on the coast, Arsur, Caesarea, Acre, Saida, Birit, and Tripoli (1109-1110). This brave leader, the most remarkable of the crusading sovereigns, died during an expedition against Egypt (1118). His successor, Baldwin II du Bourg, captured Tyre in 1124; he failed before Damascus, but the town had to promise to pay tribute.

It was towards 1130 that the Latin kingdom attained its greatest extent stretching from Deyr al-Bakr to the borders of Egypt. In Syria its frontier never crossed the valleys of the Upper Orontes, nor the crest of the Anti-Lebanon. The great cities of the interior, Aleppo, Hama, Hims, Baalbek, Damascus while agreeing to pay tribute, remained independent. The kingdom consisted of a confederacy of four feudal states: 1. The east, the county of Edessa lay along the two banks of the Euphrates. 2. In the north the principality of Antioch included in its protectorate Armenian Cilicia. 3. In the centre the county of Tripoli stretched from the fort of Margat (Marqab) to the Nahr al-Kalb. 4. Lastly came the royal domains, or kingdom of Jerusalem, strictly speaking. It included all cis-Jordan Palestine and in Transjordan, the ancient districts of Moab and Edom, which became the seigneurie of Cric (Kerak, q. v.) and of Mount Sion (cf. Shawbak) “in the land of Oultre-Jourdain”. For a time it had a dependency, the port of Allâh-Abâ. To defend these possessions the Crusaders built strong castles: the Cric des Chevaliers (Hsîn al-Akzîd, q. v.), Castel-Blanc (Safîkî), Murselas (Marjatya), Marqab (Marqab) and in southern Lebanon, Beaufort (Shakfî Arrîîn). Lastly in Transjordania the two massive fortresses of Cric and Montéflag.

After the death of Baldwin II (1131) the decline of the Latin state began; it was hastened by the isolation of the Crusaders and their lack of unity. The Byzantines claimed the rights of a successor over the north of the kingdom. The Armenians sought to form a national state for themselves in the region of the Taurus. Instead of coming to an agreement with Franks, Byzantines and Armenians only succeeded in embroiling one another to the advantage of the Muslims, who were gathered round remarkable leaders like Zangi, Nûr al-Dîn and Salâh al-Dîn (q. v.). Baldwin III (1144-1162) resumed the siege of Damascus (July 23-25, 1148) without any more success than his predecessors. Already lord of Aleppo, Nûr al-Dîn installed himself in Damascus, Amsuya, king of Jerusalem from 1162, formed the bold project of seizing the heritage of the dying dynasty of the Fatimids. He was anticipated by Nûr al-Dîn. The latter sent his lieutenant, the Kûrd Salâh al-Dîn, to Egypt. On the death of the last Fatimid Caliph, Salâh al-Dîn proclaimed himself independent in Egypt, and founded the Ayyûbid dynasty there, then seized Damascus from the sons of Nûr al-Dîn. On July 4, 1187, at Hattin between Tiberias and Nazareth, the whole Christian army under Guy de Lusignan fell into the hands of Salâh al-Dîn. Jerusalem capitulated on October 2 following. Deprived of their defenders, the other cities, except Antioch, Tripoli and Tyre, had to surrender.

The preaching of the third crusade brought to the camp before Acre, which the Franks had been besieging two years, Philip Augustus of France and Richard Coeur-de-Lion of England. The town surrendered on July 20, 1191. A truce between the belligerents ceded the coast from Jaffa to Tyre to the Crusaders. In default of Jerusalem, which they had been unable to reconquer, Acre was henceforth the capital of the kingdom. The death of Salâh al-Dîn produced dissension among his numerous heirs. The Emperor Frederick II took advantage of the discord to negotiate with al-Malik al-Kâmil, Ayyûbid Sulṭân of Egypt, for the cession of Jerusalem and other places of no strategic importance. Threatened by the sons of Salâh al-Dîn, who had made an alliance with the Franks, their uncle al-Malik al-Kâmil called in the help of the Kâfirim who crushed the combined Syrian and Frankish forces near Ghaza (1244) and enabled the Egyptians to occupy Jerusalem, Damascus and Hims.

The seventh crusade brought St. Louis to Syria after the check to his expedition to Egypt. For four years (1250-1254) he was engaged in fortifying the towns of the coast. It was the Mamlûk Sulṭân, Baibars, Kalaân and al-Malik al-Ashraf, son of the latter, who dealt the last blow to the Latin kingdom. Acre fell (May 31, 1291) after a heroic defence. In the course of the next months, Tyre, Haïfa, Saida, Birit and Tarsus were taken or evacuated. Ḥilîl [q. v.] the imposing fortress between Ḥilîl and Caesarea was the last to surrender (Aug. 14, 1291). The Frankish colonies in Syria were at an end.

The Crusades introduced into Syria the feudal organisation of contemporary Europe. The elective character of the kingship soon gave place to dynastic succession. The king alone ruled directly the Palestinian kingdom of Jerusalem. His authority was limited by the privileges of the three orders: the clergy, the nobility and bourgeoisie. "He cannot", notes Usama b. Munkîjî, "remove by the decisions of the Court of Seigneurs". The authority of the great feudatories within their principalities was circumscribed in the same way. Agricultural servitude was retained, as had been the custom in Syria. The name "poulains" (poolane) was given to the issue of marriages between Franks and natives; the etymology of this word is still obscure. The army was recruited not only from Franks but also from Armenians and Maronites. The Turcopoles were the Muslim auxiliaries. The position of Muslims and Jews recalled that of the dhimmis [q. v.] in Muslim lands, with this difference that they were not so heavily taxed. According to Ibn Dujairî, his co-religionists did not conceal their satisfaction with Frankish rule.

Every principality had its own silver coin.
There were also gold ducats, "besants sarracenats", or "sarrassins" with Arabic inscriptions. Commerce, more or less dormant since the Arab conquest, again became active as a result of maritime relations with the west, which were never greater. The principal ports were Acre, Tyre and Tripoli. In the principalities of the north, the terminus for continental trade was La Ligue (Ladiukiya) or Soudia (Suwaydiya) now called Fort St. Simon. We have to go back to the time of the Phoenicians to find a period of so great economic activity.

The state of war hampers trade but did not put an end to intellectual activity among the Muslims of Syria. In Damascus, al-Kalâmis was busy with his history, and Ibn Asâkir finished his monumental encyclopedia, Ta'rikh Dimyâh, devoted to individuals who had a more or less remote connection with Syria. At the end of his troubled career, the Emir Usâma b. Munkîdî, produced an autobiography which is very valuable for the study of the relations which existed between Franks and Muslims. Barhebîns, Syrian and Mesopotamian, wrote Arabic and Syriac with equal elegance. It was in this last language that the Jacobite patriarch wrote a voluminous Chronicle. Muslims, Christians and Jews studied medicine with success. Never except in the Roman period had there been so much building. The fortresses built by the Crusaders are wonderful specimens of medieval military architecture. Among the churches which they built, we mention that of Djnabl, the monastic basilica at Tarsus, the graceful cathedral of John the Baptist, now the great mosque of Bairût, with its walls once covered with pictures. Many crusading lords had adopted Syrian customs (tabladdh, [Darjma]). In the collaboration of Franks and natives was hailed, as by Pope Honorius III, a "Nova Francia", the dawn of a new civilisation. The destruction of the Latin kingdom destroyed any hopes based on it. The coming of the slave dynasty (Mamlûk) opened a period of anarchy, such as Syria had not yet seen.

Mamlûk Syria. We have already given a résumé of the exploits of the early Mamlûk Sultan against the Frank principalities. Fearing a return of the Franks and the warships of the European navv, which ruled the Mediterranean, the Mamlûks began to lay waste the towns of the coast, not even excepting the most prosperous, Acre, Tyre and Tripoli; they demolished the citadels at Sâdî and Bairût. Tripoli was rebuilt two miles from the coast. From the administrative point of view, they retained the old Ayyûbid appanages and divided Syria into six main districts called mamlaka, or nîshâ : Damascus, Aleppo, Hama, Tripoli, Sa'daf and Kerak (Transjordania).

The past history of Damascus assured its ma'dîb, or viceroy, not only authority over his Syrian colleagues, but a special prestige of his own. This high official had little difficulty in persuading himself that he had the same rights to the throne as his ancestor in Egypt. To guard against the ambition of the Syrian ma'dïb's, Cairo took care to change them continually (Sa'dîb b. Yahya). Never did instability of government and greed of rulers, uncertain of their bow, attain such proportions. Lebanon continued to enjoy a kind of autonomy. The dissenting Muslims of the highlands — Druses and Mutawallas — took advantage of the troubles of the Mamlûks, occupied with the Franks and Mamlûks, to proclaim their independence. All the forces of Syria had to be mobilised, and a long and bitter war endured (1293—1305) which ended in the complete destruction of the rebels and the devastation of Central Lebanon.

The Mongol Khâns of Persia were burning to avenge the military defeats which the Mamlûks had inflicted upon them. The most energetic of these sovereigns, Ghâzîn (1296—1304), in 1299 secured the support of the Armenians and Georgians as well as of the Franks of Cyprus, and routed the Mamlûks near Hîmîs. The troops occupied Damascus, and advanced up to Ghâzza. The Egyptians having again invaded Syria, Ghâzîn reconquered the Euphrates to meet them, but he was defeated in 1303 at Mardj al-Saffar near Damascus. Syria had nothing to gain by the coming of the Burdît, who in 1382 replaced the Bahri dynasty. They "preserved" Ibn Ayûb tells us, "the old laws", that is to say the anarchical rule of their predecessors. Sultan Farâj (1392—1405) had to begin the reconquest of Syria no less than seven times. The year 1401 coincided with the invasion of Tûmûtî [q.v.]. After the capture of Aleppo which they sacked, his hordes appeared before Damascus. The town having agreed to surrender, the Tatars plundered it methodically. The majority of the able-bodied inhabitants were carried off into slavery, especially artists, architects, workers in steel and glass. They were almost all taken to Samarkand. Farâj was then set to the city, to the mosque of the Omayyads and other monuments. Tûmûtî led back his army and left Syria a prey to epidemics and bands of brigands. Meanwhile on the plateaus of Anatolia, the power of the Ottomans was gathering. The capture of Constantinople (1453) had increased their ambition. Death alone prevented Muhammad II from invading Syria. His successors did not cease preparations. Sâlih (1468—1496) and Baysid [q.v.] signed a treaty of peace, but it was only to be a truce.

The destruction of Baghdad by Hûlîgân and the fall of the 'Abûbût caliphate had shifted the centre of the Muslim world to the west of the Euphrates, Arabic literature found in the land of the Mamlûks the only asylum, at best precarious. No encouragement was to be expected from ignorant and brutal sovereigns, many of whom could not even sign their own names. The intellectuals lived in the past, their activity lacks originality. It was the golden age of epitomizers, compilers, authors of handbooks and encyclopaedias. They were interested in collecting knowledge and learning it by heart. Among the encyclopaedists a special place must be given to the worthy Shihâb al-Dîn b. Fu'âd al-A'îmî, author of the Mamlûk al-Ma'ârek, a voluminous compilation of a historical, geographical and literary character for the use of officials of the Mamlûk chancellery. We may next mention Abu l-Fadlî [q.v.], historian and geographer, the geographer Shams al-Dîn al-Dîn al-Dirîshî (d. 1327), markedly inferior to his predecessor al-Mîkurî [q.v.]. The versatile al-Dhababi [q.v.] was born in 1336. He studied in the Mezopotamia but lived and died in Damascus (1353). Ibn 'Arâbîhî (d. 1450) was the author of a history of Tûmûtî. Al-Sâfâdî [q.v.] compiled a great bibliographical dictionary (1296 — 1385), Shihâb b. Yahya (d. 1436), the author of the Tarikh Bartûbî, has left us in this work on the Emirs of the Ghur the best contribution to the history of the Lebanon and a valuable supplement to the annals of the Frankish states. Ibn Talûyî [q.v.]
and his pupil Ibn Kaiyim al-Djawziya are among the most original figures of this period. Their activities covered the whole field of Muslim studies. Indefatigable polemists with a keen scent for heresies, they had had the peculiar good fortune to be exalted both by the Wahhabis and the modernist Muslims of to-day.

The departure of the Crusaders marks the end of a period of astonishing economic prosperity. Syrian commerce fell back into stagnation. Little by little, however, necessity forced the resumption of relations with Europe. The decline of Acre, Tyre and Tripoli, ruined by the Mamluks and the fall (1347) of the Armenian kingdom of Cilicia, to which western merchants had first gone, were to the advantage of Beirut. For over a century this town became the principal port of Syria. Near Damascus and opposite Cyprus, — the kingdom of the Lusignans and rendezvous of the European shipping — Bârît was every year visited by ships of the Venetians, Genoese, Catalans, Provençals and Rhodians. These various communities had henceforth consuls as their representatives, officially recognised by the Mamluks and receiving a grant or şâmâbiya. On the other hand the Cairo government regarded them as “hostages” (rahiya) (Khâli al-Zâhirî); it held them responsible not only for those under their jurisdiction, but also for acts of hostility by Corsairs. The consuls protected pilgrims and intervened if required on behalf of native Christians. Thus we already have the system of capitulations which was to be developed in succeeding centuries.

Syria under the Ottomans. With the opening of the XVIth century the rule of the Mamluks had begun to break up. Their excitations had exasperated the populace. The Ottoman Sultan Selim I. [q.v.] resolved to take advantage of the occasion to invade Syria. Taking the initiative, the Mamluk Sultan, Kânsâm al-Ghûrî [q.v.] mobilised his forces, and marched via Damascus and Aleppo towards Antioch. The two armies met at Dâbîk, a day’s journey north of Aleppo. The Turkish artillery and the Janissary infantry scattered disorder through the Egyptian ranks. Ghûrî disappeared in the disaster of Dâbîk (Aug. 24, 1516). Aleppo, Damascus and the towns of Syria opened their gates to the conqueror who went on to Egypt and put an end to Mamluk rule. The Turks retained at first the territorial divisions or nîyâža. The Mamluk Ghasanî, nîbî of Damascus, had gone over to the Ottoman camp after Dâbîk. The renegade was in return given the administration of the country except the nîyâža of Aleppo, which was reserved for a Turkish Pasha.

On the death of Selim I (1520), Ghasanî had himself proclaimed Sultan under the name of Al-Malik al-Ashtaf. He was defeated and killed at Kâshân at the gates of Damascus (Jan. 1521). Before the end of the 16th century, Syria had become divided into three great pashâlisks: 1. Damascus, comprising ten sandjsaks or protectorates, the chief of which were Jerusalem, Ghaza, Naplus, Saids and Bârît; 2. Tripoli, including the sandjsaks of Hama, Hamâ, Salamiya and Djabal; 3. Aleppo, including all North Syria, except ‘Aintâb, which was included in the pashâlik of Marash. In the century following, the pashâlik of Saids was created to include Lebanon. In its main outlines, this administrative division lasted till the middle of the xviith

century, when the centre of government of Saids was moved to Acre.

The Diwan of Stamboul was only interested in Syria in so far as it enabled it to watch Egypt and Syria, and to levy upon its resources contributions to the expenses of the palace and for foreign wars. The taxes, which were put up to auction went to the highest bidder. According to a Venetian Consular report, the pashâlik was worth 50,000 to 100,000 ducats (probably the silver ducat, the Venetian guadice whence frîgî plus fr. 400, or piastre = 5 francs). The Pasha only administered directly the important towns and their immediate neighbourhood. The interior of the pashâlik was left to the old feudal tenants whose number and influence increased since the Mamluks: — Bedouin emirs, Turkomans, Mutawwâls, Druses, Naṣârîa. The Porte only asked them to pay the tribute or mabri, without worrying if it saw them fighting with its own representatives. Every year the Turkish Pasha at the head of his artillery and janissaries set out to collect the taxes. The force lived on the country and laid it waste if resisted. Is it remarkable that agriculture, the principal resource of Syria declined, the population diminished, the country districts emptied in favour of the Lebanon and mountainous districts where the harassed people sought an asylum?

The instability of their position increased the rapacity of the Turkish functionaries. Damascus saw 133 Pashas in 180 years. This period saw the rise of Ḥakîr al-Din [q.v.], the champion of Syrian independence (1583—1635), the Mutawwâls emirs, the lords of Farîsh, lords of Alâbek and al-Bagî, the Banî Mansûr b. Fâmûkî, Beduin Shâhîks, who carved out for themselves an appanage in Palestine and in the region of Naplos. These feudal lords were fairly well organised in spite of their cupidity, and they were able to defend their gains from the arbitrary Turk. By sending round the Cape the traffic of the middle East, the Portuguese occupation of India proved fatal to Syria. The harbour of Bârît remained empty. Tripoli at first, then — thanks to the initiative of Ḥakîr al-Din — Saids attracted European ships which came for cargoes of silk and cotton, Aleppo, thanks to its situation between Mesopotamia, the sea, and the Anatolian provinces whose market it was, the principal depot on the direct route to the Persian Gulf, remained for three centuries the chief commercial centre of Northern Syria.

In the second half of the xviiiith century, the doings of three individuals suddenly attracted attention to the town and region of Acre. These were Ėhrî (Syrian pronunciation of Zâhirî) al-Omar, Djâzzâr and Bonsaparte. Dâhîr, a Beduin Shâbîk, lord of the land of Saids, extended his authority over Galilee, and settled at Acre which he fortified and raised from its ruins. He resisted the Porte (1750—75) with assistance lent by the Egyptian Mamluks ‘Ali Bey and Abu Djaabab and a Russian squadron cruising in Syrian waters. Besieged in Acre by the Turks, he died there in 1775. His successor Djâzzâr [q.v.] held out for three months (March—May 1779) against the military genius of the youthful Bonsaparte. Pasha of Damascus and of Acre, he remained the arbiter of Syria for nearly 40 years (1775—1814), in spite of his exactions and his cruelty.

The four million inhabitants of Syria and Palestine at the time of the Arab conquest were reduced
to one and a half after three centuries of Turkish rule. The cultivation of cotton, which with that of silk, formed one of the main sources of Syria's wealth had completely declined, when Muhammad 'Ali [q.v.] of Egypt, decided to attract to Egypt the disheartened Syrian planters. It was this state of anarchy that enabled the Lebanese emir Bâghr [q.v.] to intervene in Syrian politics. Down to about 1840 we continually find him mixed up with the history of Syria. Even the great Turkish officials sought his intervention. Yûsuf, Pasha of Damascus (1807-18) obtained his help against a threatened invasion of the Wahhâbi. Bâghr presided in Damascus at the installation of Sulaimân, Pasha of Acre and successor-designate of Yûsuf Pasha. In the middle of the general confusion however Muhammad 'Ali of Egypt was watching for an opportunity of adding Syria to his government of Egypt. 'Abdallâh Pasha who succeeded Sulaimân at Acre (1818) undertook to give it him. He refused to allow the extradition of Egyptian sellûhin and the repayment of a million piastres. Summoned to contribute towards this sum by the Pasha of Acre, under whom the Lebanon was, the Christians of the Lebanon refused to pay. The rising of the Christians was a new feature in Syrian politics, but it was not to be the only one. Through contact with the Europeans the Christians were becoming enlightened and they were learning their own strength. Taking as a pretext the refusal of 'Abdallâh Pasha, Muhammad 'Ali sent his son Ibrahim Pasha [q.v.] into Syria at the head of an army trained on European lines. Acre surrendered on May 27, 1832, after a siege of seven months. On July 8 at Hims, Ibrahim routed the Turks. A little later he forced the pass of Ballûn and entered Anatolia. (A treaty (May 1833) assured Egypt temporary possession of Syria.

The new rule proved tolerant. It admitted Christians to the communal councils; it favoured the abolition of measures humiliating to non-Muslims. It endeavoured to reform the police and the tribunals. On the other hand it provoked discontent by introducing forced labour and conscription even in the semi-independent regions of the Lebanon. Rebellions broke out among the Druses of the Lebanon and of the Hâwrân, among the Nahrân, and in the never properly subjected province of Naplusk. Ibrahim exhausted himself in suppressing three risings. The Turks thought the moment had come for the re-conquest of Syria. They were completely defeated (June 27, 1839) at Nîzîr, north of Aleppo. European diplomacy then intervened at the instigation of England, which was disturbed by the ambition of Muhammad 'Ali. Until the expedition of Bonaparte, England had taken no interest in Egypt. Thenceforth she was continuously occupied with Egypt and the Red Sea. Her agents stirred up the whole of Lebanon. An allied fleet bombarded Bairût (Sept. 1839). On Nov. 2, Acre surrendered and Ibrahim Pasha had to agree to evacuate Syria. Shortly before, the Emir Bâghr had gone into exile.

From the reign of Mahmûd II. [q.v.] the Porte had inaugurated a policy of administrative centralisation and decreed the abolition of local autonomies and feudalities. After the departure of the Egyptians, it moved to Bairût, whose importance was steadily increasing, the administrative centres of the ancient paghaliya of Acre and Suidû, in order to prepare for the annexation of Lebanon. With the same object it declared the old line of princes of the Lebanon, the Shihâb Emirs, deposed. The only result was to perpetuate anarchy there. The Christians who had fought against the Egyptians claimed to be treated on terms of equality to the Druses. In the southern Lebanon several had acquired the confiscated lands of the Druse chieftains banished by Ibrahim Pasha. The latter, coming back from exile, demanded a return to the statuts quo and the restoration of their ancient privileges. In taking their side, Turkey paved the way for new conflicts and sanguinary fighting. The Syrian Muslims showed no less animosity to the Christians, whom Egyptian rule had partly enfranchised. They took no account of the intellectual and material progress made by the Christians, nor of the political equality promised by the khâfûf of the Sultan. The khâfûf-i hâmâyûn [q.v.] of Sultan 'Abd al-Majid [q.v.] communicated to the congress of Paris (1856), and tacitly placed under the guarantee of the Powers, scandalised Muslim opinion, but inspired confidence among the Christians. At Damascus and in the large towns they took advantage of the occasion to enrich themselves. A secret agitation began to stir up the Druses and Muslims, and waited for the events of 1860 to burst forth.

The Druses of the Lebanon combining with their co-religionists of the Wâdî Tâ'îm and of the Hâwrân, scattered fire and death through the villages of the Maronites, who were at sixes and sevens, as the result of an agrarian dispute. The anti-Christian movement reached Damascus, which the Muslims pillaged and then set fire to the prosperous Christian quarter, after massacring its inhabitants. In this city, in the Lebanon, and in Bairût, the Turkish authorities intervened only to disarm the Christians, and watched the butchery inactively, powerless or abetting it. Under a mandate from Europe, France disembarked at Bairût (Sept. 1860) a body of troops to help the Sultan to restore peace;" Taking the initiative, the Porte had sent Fu'âd Pasha [q.v.] with discretionary powers to Syria. He began to inflict summary judgment. Sentences of exile pronounced against the Turkish leaders and the most compromised Druses, faced Europe with the following facts: French intervention, though paralysed by the cunning of the Turks and the distrust of England, nevertheless restored confidence to the Christians, and preserved their native land for the people of Lebanon. The latter, given an autonomous organisation under the direct supervision of Europe (cfr. LEBANON), thus gained half a century of peace and prosperity.

After 1864 Syria was divided into two wilayets: Aleppo and Damascus. In 1888 Bairût, the chief port, the centre of the commercial life of Syria, was made a separate wilayet. Falling into stagnation after the shocks of 1856, the country saw with indifference the fall of Sultân 'Abd al-Azîz and Murât, the coming of 'Abd al-Hamîd [q.v.] and the granting of a constitution in 1876 (then withdrawn). Between 1881 and 1883 we have the foundation of the first Jewish agricultural colonies in Palestine, which paved the way for Zionism. The latter received official recognition by the Balfour Declaration (Nov. 1917). It has since then been incorporated in the text of the British mandate over Palestine (1922).

Under 'Abd al-Hamîd also, emigration began to assume disquieting proportions. Having no room for development at home, exploited by a greedy
and untrustworthy power, the Syrians began to emigrate. Among the just complaints of the Syrians, was the indifference of the Turkish government to public works. France, with its capital, came to the relief of Syria, now left to herself, and having suffered a further economic blow by the opening of the Suez Canal. With the exception of the Syrian section of the Baghdād railway and the Damascu-Medina railway—the work of 'Abd al-Ḥamīd, the Syrian railway system is in the main a French creation. These enterprises have considerably increased the wealth and productivity of Syria, by linking it up with an extensive series of connections, the Taurus, Anatolia and Constantiopole on the north, and Arabia and Egypt on the south.

The Turks took even less interest than the Mamluks in furthering intellectual progress. 'Abd al-Ḥamīd showed himself frankly hostile to Arabic literature, and instituted a system of turkicising. In spite of all obstacles the Christians of Aleppo in the xvith century succeeded in resuming contact with Arabic studies, which had been practically closed to them for centuries. We owe to them the establishment of the first printing press in the Lebanon (1610) and in Aleppo. It is to their beginnings that we owe the literary revival of the xith century when Syria became the centre of Arabic studies. Under the stimulus of foreign missions, French, Americans, etc., Syria became covered with schools and printing-presses which published newspapers, reviews and standard editions. Bairūt took the lead in the intellectual life of Syria, less by its own energy than under the stimulus of Europe. Still more efficaciously than the American mission, the Society of Jesus, with its very well organised printing-press, contributed to the renaissance of Arabic letters and no less to the diffusion of European culture. Bairūt and Syria in general thus produced a large number of young literary men. Their native land soon becoming too small for them (Brockelmann, G. A. L., ii. 492), some migrated to Egypt. Among them we may note the two Yāqūṭī, Nashīf [q.v.] and his son Behārh (d. 1906) and Butras al-Bustānī [d. 1883] [q.v.]. Turkey took no part in the movement for the education of Syria. Here it was again foreigners, particularly French and Americans, who made up for official indifference. They developed education in all three grades. In 1878 the Jesuits founded the University of St. Joseph at Bairūt. The older Syrian Protestant College of the Americans in Bairūt has recently been made a university (1923).

Syria of today. A revolution prepared secretly by the young Turkish party overthrew 'Abd al-Ḥamīd and set up in his place his brother Reṣāḥ (April 1907). The Constitution of 1876 was re-established, and the Parliament which had been closed by the Sultan was reopened. Syria hailed with enthusiasm the revolution as the dawn of a new era. This illusion was of short duration. The young Turks, whom the Syrians had trusted, were not long in resuming once more the process of turkicising begun by 'Abd al-Ḥamīd. With more method and continuity they declared war against all who were Arab by race or language. They insisted everywhere in Parliament and in the government offices on the employment of Turks only, and removed the Syrians from high offices and important military commands. This provocative policy brought together for the first time Muslims and Christians in Syria. It awakened amongst all the desire to come to an understanding in regard to a common policy and to take joint action. Their demands were limited to reforms of a decentralizing nature. They asked that in the allotment of public offices, regard should be had to the progress which had been made by Syria, the most civilised province of the Empire, and that in the imposition and spending of taxes regard should be paid to the needs of their country. They thought the time had come to grant it a certain administrative autonomy. It was the obstinacy of the young Turks in rejecting these moderate demands which opened the door to separatist ideas, and finally convinced the Syrian nationalists that there was nothing for it but to rely upon their own efforts and upon the sympathies of Europe.

On the 29th of October 1914, Turkey entered the Great War. It began by suppressing the administrative autonomy of Lebanon, and imposing on it a Turkish governor. 'Ummāl-Ṭāha took into his own hands the government of all Syria with discretionary powers. He at once proceeded to hang the principal patriots whether Syrian, Muslim or Christian. Hundreds of others were sent into exile. Soon afterwards famine and disease decimated the population, principally of the Lebanon. Energetic but presumptuous, dreaming of the conquest of Egypt, 'Ummāl proceeded very unsuccessfully to attack the Canal of Suez (Feb. 1915). After the repulse of the second attack (August 1916), the English, commanded by Allenby, advanced as far as Jīlābah. By November 1917, they had come to the gates of Damascus and the provinces of Latakia and Hama. On the 11th of December, they entered Jerusalem, which the Turks had evacuated. The latter defended themselves for a further nine months on a line extending to the north of Jaffa as far as the Jordan. The decisive action took place on the 11th of September, 1918, on the plain of Samor near Tulkarm. The forces of Allenby broke the Turkish front. It was a rout. At the end of the month the English, without meeting with any resistance, arrived in the neighbourhood of Damascus. The advance was delayed for a few days, in order to allow the Emir Faisal, the son of the Grand Sheik of Mecca, time to hasten from the remote end of Transjordania and to make on the 19th of October his entry into Damascus at the head of a body of Beduins. On the 31st of October, the Turks signed an armistice. A week later, the last of their soldiers had crossed the Taurus.

The English occupied the country with a military force. The French continued, which had brilliantly contributed to the victories in Palestine, established itself on the Syrian side. During the course of the war the allies, in order to secure the help of Husain b. 'Alī, Grand Sheik of Mecca, had promised to support the establishment of a federation of Arab states "with reservation of the rights acquired by France". The Emir Faisal took advantage of these equivocal formulae to claim the whole of Syria, and organised a form of government at Damascus. This town became a hot-bed of intrigues, from which hordes of bandits and assassins went out to perpetuate the insecurity in Syria. On March 7th, 1920, an alleged "Syrian Congress" at Damascus proclaimed "Faisal I, King of Syria". General Gouraud, appointed High Commissioner of the Republic of Syria, called upon
Faisal to produce his credentials. When the ultimatum received no response, the French, after a few air raids, fighting, scattered at Khūṣ Maisalūn in the Amelouchan, the bands who opposed their advance (24th of July 1920). On the following day they entered Damascus; Faisal had taken to flight. On August 10th following, the Treaty of Sèvres separated Syria from Turkey, in order to form provisionally an independent state, on condition that the councils of a mandatory should guide its administration until such time as it should be capable of independent government. Previous to this, the Congress of San Remo decided that the mandate should be conferred to the French government. On the 1st of September 1920 at Balût, Gouraud solemnly proclaimed the constitution of "Grand Liban" (v. LEBANON). Thereafter the "Federation of Syrian States" comprising the three independent states of Damascus, of Aleppo and of the "territory of the Alawis" (the name officially adopted for the Nusairis) was formed. The administrative centre of this last state is Lādhikīya. A fourth state was formed for the Druses of the Hawrān. Like the people of Lebanon they had been allowed to remain outside the Syrian Federation. The latter had as its chief a Syrian president. Native officials, with the help of French advisers, assumed the government of these states. Representative councils were entrusted with the discussion of affairs of general interest and settling the budget.

Syria, placed under French mandate, adjoins Turkish Anatolia. The Northern frontier is defined by a line running from Alexandretta, crossing the Euphrates to the south of Djarbash, and ending at Dzjarat b. Omar on the Tigris. On the west Syria is bounded by the kingdom of Irāq, on the south by Transjordania and English Palestine. This part of the frontier runs on irregularly from Rās al-Nakhrān between Tyre and Acre. On the east it goes round the Lake of Tiberias, traverses the valley of Yarmūk, leaves the town of Darā (Ahrān) on the north and after crossing the desert reaches the district of Dzjarat b. Omar by way of Abū Kamal on the Euphrates.

The following are the approximate results in round figures of the census of 1921—1922, the first taken in Syria since the Arab conquest. The nomads in the district of Aleppo and of Damascus are not included in it. The state of Aleppo, comprising the independent sandjak of Alexandretta had 604,000 inhabitants. This number was made up as follows: 502,000 Sunnīs, 30,000 "Alawis, 52,000 Christians of diverse denominations, 7,000 Jews, 3,000 foreigners. The state of Damascus contained 595,000 inhabitants of which 447,000 were Sunnīs, 8,000 Isma'ilīs, 5,000 "Alawis, 4,000 Druses, 9,000 Mutawallīs, 67,000 Christians of different denominations, 6,000 Jews, 49,000 foreigners. In the state of the "Alawis, there were 60,000 Sunnīs, 153,000 "Alawis, 3,000 Isma'ilīs and 42,000 Christians of different denominations, in all 261,000 inhabitants. The state of Hawrān was remarkable for the homogeneity of its population. There were 43,000 Druses against 700 Sunnīs, and about 7,000 Greek, Catholic, or orthodox Christians. For the population of Grand-Liban, see the article LIBAN.

Bibliography: This is given in detail in H. Lammens, Le Syrie, précis historique, 2 vol., Balārut 1921.


**SHAMAN (pl. SHAMANs), an idolater.** The word belongs to the poetical language, and is at present obsolete. In Asadu's *Laghaf al-Farq* (ed. Horn, p. 104), it is explained: *'shamana*, while quoting the following verse of RUDAKI:

*shamana gurisa in kuma, no dafa kim but ast a in mā shamana in*

("We have all adopted idolatry; this world is like the idol, and we are idolaters", or, "because this world is the idol, etc.").

The same explanation is given in the *Farhang-i Shahrwī* (*cc.* fol. 132 verso) whereas the verse just mentioned (here reproduced in a somewhat altered, seemingly corrupt form), quotations are given from Sameh, Shams-al-Fahri, and Amir Musa'z by Shams-al-Fahri (*Lexicon Persicum, ed. Seemann*, p. 105); by Abd al-Kadir of Baghdad (*Lexicon Shāhānshāhī*, ed. Seemann, p. 133). The last named author cites Shāhānshāhī, 1074; 155 (Vullers), with which verse may be compared Minūbīhī, *Divān* (ed. Kazimīrski), ii. 2 sq.; and Kazimīrski's note, p. 320, where two passages from Shāhī's poetry are cited, one of which is also given in Shabhī.

In all these passages, shaman signifies nothing but 'idolater', and a term, expressing the idea *shahrwī* (common, but *wrong*) always occurs in the verse also. Shāhrwī, *e. c.*, besides the signification 'idolater', given that of 'idol' (*but* too). It is, however, not probable, that these two ideas would be expressed by the word; moreover, an instance for this signification 'idol' seems to be wanting. This second explanation, then, may be due to a mistake.

Respecting the etymology of the word, the derivation from Sanskrit *gāmasta* a Buddhistic term, seems to be very probable. Words, denoting a religious person of some foreign sect, after passing into Persian, more than once acquired a less definite sense, for instance the word *mīrān* which, while originally denoting the "auditor" of the Manichees, in Persian poetry signifies simply: "an infidel". As to the medium, through which the term *shaman* has been derived, we must look to the East-Iranian countries, where Buddhism once flourished. In Sakian as well as in Sogdian we find resp. the forms *samun* (*a*) and *ghum* (to be pronounced *gham*?), reflecting the Indian *gāmasta*. Most likely, then, the word entered the Persian from the Sogdian. The question, whether the East-Iranian word come directly from the Sanskrit or from some popular dialect, is of minor importance. The Pali form *saṁmāṇa* does not come into consideration, as the East-Iranian Buddhism belonged to the Northern form of that religion; besides, the initial *s* of the Pali word would scarcely have been retained by Sogdian or Sakian. A derivation direct from the Sogdian seems probable for the Sogdian word (comp. R. Gauthier, *Essai de grammaire sogdienne*, 1914—1923, 1, § 177), and for the Sakian one also, for in all Frārista, except Magadhi and one minor dialect, *s* becomes *t*. Moreover, a word like *gāmasta* would rather be taken from the scriptural language of the religion, in this case Sanskrit.

A second question refers to the relation between the Persian word and the modern European term Eng. *shaman*, German *Schaman*, Russian *Shaman*, etc., which designates the sorcerer-priest of the North-American and some North-American peoples. First, we must state, that the Persian *shaman* has no connection with any priestly function, but simply signifies an idolater. Kazimirski, who, in his edition of Minūbīhī's poems, translated the word by "bonze" seems to be led to this interpretation by his supposition that the Persian *shaman* and the Siberian *shamow* were originally the same, cf. his note p. 120. Now, the European word occurs, so far I can see, for the first time in Brand's relation of Eberhard Island's embassy to China, by order of the Russian government, in the years 1693—1695. The passage runs in the original (A. Brand, *Beschreibung der Chinesischen Reise, welche . . . in 1693, 94 und 95 . . . verrichtet worden*, Hamburg 1698, p. 80): "zum fünf oder sechs Tungusen bey einander wohnen . . . halten sie einen Shamah, welche auf ihre Art einen Pfaffen oder Zauberr' bedeutet". The European term, therefore, originally designates the sorcerer of the Tunguses. And, indeed, only the Tungusian dialects (as well those of Siberia as of Mandja) call the sorcerer *samar* (cf. M. A. Castries, *Grundzüge einer Tungusischen Sprachlehre*, St. Petersburg 1856, p. 9; P. R. Schott, *Voyage dans les pays du Nord*, St. Petersburg 1912, p. 3). It is not quite certain, if this word *samar* is originally Tungus; W. Schott (*Abh. Pr. Ak. W.,* 1842, p. 462) is inclined, though hesitatingly, to derive it from a Tungus root; a different etymology, but also from the same language, is proposed by C. de Harles (*La religion nationale des Tartares Orientaux*,
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Brussels 1887, p. 28 sq.) On the other hand, however, it is difficult to assume an Indian (or Iranian) origin for the Tungus word, as the other North-Asiatic idioms designate the sorcerer in a different manner. If Buddhist influence had been at work here, the term might have spread over a wider area. The derivation of the Tungus word from a Chinese one, which itself might be taken from the Indian (though representing rather Close then 3' ranks) seems also to be excluded (cf. Schott, p. 403). The form Shimān in the German work of 1898 presents an irregular aw in stead of ə; we may, however, be sure, that the traveller acquired the word through a Russian medium, and therefore the difficulty lies in the Russian shamān, having aw instead of the Tung. ə. de Harlez (op. cit., p. 28, n. 1), thinks that this fact may be due to Chinese influence.

"The European shaman" therefore, seems to be independent of the Persian shaman, which latter has nothing to do with any definite branch of religion.

(V. F. Büchner)

SHAMĪNĀN), known also under the Kurdish name of Nxiw Cia (between mountains), kāb of the sandžak of Hakkârî, in the vilayêt of Wân, is one of the least explored regions of Central Kurdistan. Its boundaries are: on the north, the kāb of Giuwar; on the south, Baradost and Barzan (mahall of Rawwândî); on the west, Orumîn (nâhiya of the sandžak of Giuwar); on the east, the Persian districts, dependencies of Urmîa: Deyrî, Merguiwar and Uğûn. Situated between 37° and 38° N. and 44° and 45° E. (Greenwich), Shimānān is divided into three nāhiyâ: (a) Zêrân with Nehrî, the administrative centre and seat of a ʧə'ummaštûm; (b) Hamûrî, with the seat of a mudir at Benbûd or Surûnî; (c) Giurdî Herkî (Herkî), mudir at Bitkîr. Giurdî is divided into three parts: (a) Giurdîye Barotâ (against the sun); (b) Giurdîye Nûwarî (middle); (c) Giurdîye Iñ Cia (under the mountain).

The greater part of the population is Kurd with a small Christian (Nestorian) minority. In 1914 there were about 13,000 Kurds and 2,000 Christians. The Kurd tribes of Shimānān are the Herkî, Giurdî and Shimānān. This last tribe is divided into Zêrân and Hamûrî. Every tribe recognizes the authority of its chief and all obey the power of the powerful family of Shîlz of Nehrî (Sadde Nehrî) [see below]. There are in all 126 villages in Shimānān. In view of the importance of Kurdistan, loponymy, it may be useful to give here the names of the principal groups: viz. Nâhiya Hamûrî: Nehrî, Benbûd, Surûnî, Bar, Dezmân Surât, Malânîn Hamûrî, Giurdî, Awlân; Nâhiya Zêrân: Gîrî, Masîrîn, Hofîn, Nowzâlûr (Bendûrîn), Hâmîn, Serûrîn, Ribûnî; Nâhiya Giurdî: Gîrî, Barotâ, Isâtan, Isâtan, Barûbî, G. Nûwarî: Bitkîr, Orê, Maûtân; G. Cia: Stûnî, Sheptanî Coreumînî, Benûnîn, Zewî Rezî, Beûrzûnî, Kevûrî, Keûrûnî; Nâhiya Herkî: Bitkîr, Nefîl Herki (which includes three villages under the common name of Şîha Herki: Gûnû, Zheri, Kerespâni, Zilâni), Bedêwî, Stûnî, Dîrî, Beûrzût, Sate.

A few observations are suggested by the above names. On the subject of the name of Nehrî a suggestion has been made (Minorsky, Zap. Vost. 7, 1917, p. 157) connecting it with that of Naïrî. This name, according to him, may have been brought here at a later date by the Christians. Delattre (Enquête de géographie assyrienne, in La Revue des Questions Scientifiques, July, 1883) expounds at length the controversy on the subject of the site of Naïrî, "which matters is of capital importance in the study of Assyrian geography."

He is against the application of the names of Upper Sea of Naïrî and Lower Sea of Naïrî to the Lakes of Wân and of Urmiya respectively. Note, however, his remark that the name in question is rendered Naïrî, Naïhîr or Naïhîrî, according to the different ways of writing it. He also says: "presumably that must above all be noted is that Samurîmân locates the country of Naïrî to the east of the Great Zab, on the frontiers of Media. On the other hand, according to Thureau-Dangin (Une relation de la 2ème campagne de Sargos, Paris, 1912), there is every sign that Naïrî or Hubûlgîk is the valley of the Bohût-Sa. It is that part of the ancient region of Naïrî which remained independent of the kings of Urartu (op. cit., p. x-, xii.). According to the same authority, "the Guâwar probably forms the centre of the country of Mu'asîr. This localisation is confirmed by the itinerary of the thirty-first campaign of Samanâsir. . . . Up to this time the site of the country of Mu'asîr was placed further south, in the district of the villages of Kälich's and of Tûpwarwa. . . ." If this is so, Shimânîn must have formerly formed part of the country of Mu'asîr. Mention should also be made of the opinion of Th. Reinaud (Un gênele rendu to: Les Mattiènes, in Revue des Études Grecques, vol. 1, 1894): "the territory of the Mattiènes of Herodotus corresponded in the main to the greater part of the present Turkish vilayets of Hakkârî and of Mouyl. . . . it is, in a word, the Turkish Kurdistan of to-day." Besides Nehrî, other names seem to suggest certain links with this ancient epoch. We refer particularly to Bitkîr (cf. Bit - Ka - ri, page 222, M. Streek, Glossen an O. A. Tofthen's Geographical List to R. F. Harper's Assyrian and Babylonian Letters, vol. I-VIII in Amer. J. of Sem. Lang. and Liter., vol. xxii., No. 3, 1900) and some names in -î (Surûnî, Ribûnî) or -ûy (village of nāhiya Hamûrî; the mountain Baski Gâmar, between Helîn and Kätûnî Vâkhtûr). Dr. W. Beleck (Beitrag zur alten Geographie und Geschichte Perserreiches, Leipzig 1901, i. 46-47) points to the importance of such names, saying: "I have discovered a whole series of ancient Chaldaean names among those ending in -î or -îš." It is well to point out, however, in regard to the name Sheptanî, that it might perhaps be connected with Sciba as mentioned by Assenmânh (Salamâs . . . sub Abîmen Patriarcha Anno 853: subjuncta ecclesiâs hexabat . . . Scibaémom . . .). May there be some connection between Gulínâ (Assenmânh, Bibl. Or., iii, l. 3.) and Gulâm, mentioned above?

As regards Kurdish oigraphy of Shimânān the following names are worthy of mention: Shehtân (Kur Shehtân), on the frontier of Debat; Serî Giwêkân, above Nehrî; Kûr Mizgewîn, above Aûlîwîn (Kur means a separate summit); Øyê Keleshîne, above Geleshîm; Øyê Helîn, Øyê Helîn; Serî Salârân at Salârân; Øyê Rûyân (or Rûyîn), at Bemûwî; Øyê Celî, nāhiya Herki; Tastê, at Bedêwî; Gerûr, at Arê, Øyê Hûsûl, between the nāhiya of Giurdî and Herki; Mengûre, nāhiya Giurdî Barotâ; Serî Sûlû,
nearly Reṣāṭ and Begār; Dola Mēhendī, Gēwērtik, Gihēntik and Čāyē Ș ipt Rezi — on the frontier of Guaiwar.

The principal passes, leading into Merguiwar are: (1) the pass of Kāleşhēm, very difficult, which must not be confused with the pass of the same name to the south of Uṣbūn, famous on account of the celebrated stele which was found there; (2) the much easier pass, rendered passable even by vehicular traffic during the war, which is known by three names: Ziniya Sori, Ziniya Pirgounle, Bēd Ḥāštir. Mention must be made also of the pass of Gūrīv Taldīnt between Kāštīn Yūkharī (nāhīya Zeran) and Djerma (Dēšt). Finally, the road from Nehri to Mosul (telegraph line) passes by Begārī (ancient bridge) Ruwān (pass Ziniya Bēti) and Shehīntik. The principal water-course is given by the Turks the name Shamudnān Su, but amongst the Kurds it is known by the name Rubārī Begārī, in its higher regions, and Rubārī Shīn in its lower regions. It is a tributary of the Great Žab into which it flows at the spot called Tengul Bīlna, in the neighbourhood of the village of Sūniya, in the district of Aḵkālīyā. Its source is near the pass of Ziniya Sōrik. Its principal tributaries are on the right: Hūndir (upper course called Dūra); Nāgulān, Herki, Rubārī Shīn (or Ōrārūn Su); Awi Mariḳ; on the left: Sher-weenān (Hūndel), Māwān, Beghīntik.

Holy places. Amongst the places which are venerated by the Kurds mention must be made of the numerous places of sepulture. There is the cemetery of Čel Shehīntik on the mountain of the same name, where it is popularly believed that the remains of the companions of the Prophet are buried. At Madīna Humārāt there is the tomb of Mollā Ḥāštir, the founder of the family of the Shehīks of Nehri. At Nehri itself, there are the tombs of the saiyd ʻAbdallah, the disciple of Mawānī Kḥābd, the propagator of the Naṣīḥībānīya doctrine of the saiyd Ṭa and of the sheikh Sīlīb. These three tombs are found in a family vault called Marbārd Shīna tīta in the northern part of the village. Other tombs venerated are those of Pir Ṭabāhān at Ṭabāhān; Pir Ābū Bhrāt at Gāwīkān; Pir Weṣān at Bāsīyān. The gift of telepathy is attributed to the latter two saints. Harānır, a widow, married one another’s sisters, they were able to communicate with one another at a great distance. The tomb of Sheikh Farāḥ or Farākh at Nehiwa possesses a special virtue in gaining the acceptance of prayers that are offered there. There is also an ancient tomb which is not attributed to any one person, but bears the name of ēm kāk (green lance). He who is buried here, the Kurds say, is continuing in the other world with this lance the fight against the infidel. In the village of Bēltīntik there is a tomb called marbānd Sheik Ḫābd. This sheikh, at the invitation of the angels who appeared to him, is said to have been transported from Guaiwar, where he lived, to Bēltīntik, on a praying carpet, in order to build a mosque there. There is still shown on a stone of the gate of this mosque the imprint of the sheikh’s foot. In order to correct the work of the masons he pushed with his foot and set in line the layer of stones, although other voices had already been placed above it. Under a cupola, at the side of his master, is interred the sheikh’s favourite cat. He always sent him with his little caravan to superintend the muleteers.

Besides the tombs there are other ziyārāt gàd, in the veneration of which we see signs of the ancient cult of the spirits of the mountains. Thus, on the mountain of Serī Sātes, the place called Marnōn is venerated without distinction by Muslims and Christians. This sanctuary is always guarded by a Christian of the village of Sātes, who is exempt from taxes and treated with esteem by the Kurds. We must remember in this connection, with B. Dickson, that on this mountain there are "the remains of Urartian construction." On the other hand, the summits of Kūrī Mīrgēwān at Ašwīya and of Čāyō Rēsh at Hewsāk (a place called Mālī Shīrām) are also considered holy places.

The ruins which have associations of a more or less historical nature, ought next to be mentioned. Near the road between Benkwrī and Nehri, on the hill of Kērī Tāwān, is the Kēl of ʻArūrd Ahmed. Its site is very spacious and the remains of a fountain, to which the water was fed from Dērā Rēsh are found. Gūrīl Ahmed is said to have risen in revolt against the Persians, the masters of Shamīnān at this period, to have been besieged in this fortress and to have perished with all the garrison after having thrown the women from the walls; feminine ornaments have frequently been discovered at the foot of the hill.

It is difficult to pronounce with certainty regarding the exact period of Persian domination in these districts. Did Shamīnān share the destiny of the district of Mosul or on the other hand did it go rather with the district of Hakkārti in regard to this question, no direct evidence is given in history, but it is just this vague frontier zone whose possession was in dispute between Turkey and Persia. Under the Safawī Shamīnān belonged to Persia. It passed to the Turks after the victory of Šāltān Selīm, but returned to Persia under Nādir, etc. All these frontier districts, Shamīnān as well as Merguiwar, Ferguiwar, Barādd-Šomāt, Uṣbūn and Laḥiḏān, were known at first among the Turks by the name of ʼAllamatun ʼāh, then by that of Nawāshīya Shārtīya. The final delimitation, with Anglo-Russian assistance, took place exactly on the eve of the outbreak of the war. It must be added that in all this district on this side of the Grand Žāh, Persia is the language employed by the Kurds.

At Shehī Kēlkī on an isolated rock, the ruin called Khlīk-Kelāti should be noted (khlīk = little mountain in the Herki dialect). This fortress attributed to a certain Mīr Dīwān and it is believed that it was razed to the ground at the Arab conquest. We read in the Sharīf Nāṣīr (q. 177), "A great river passes under the bridge of stone in front of the Chaqmat of the Emir Dīwān." The reference here is to a castle in the neighbourhood of Guaiwar, while the one which concerns us, is in the middle of Shamīnān. Moreover, the name Dīwān is very frequently applied to the remains of the past in this part of Asia. (Cf. for example the groto Dukkāt Dīwān near Sārt Pūl [q. v.; cf. G. Hüssing, Der Zugang and seine Volker in Der Alte Orient, iii, 4, Leipzig 1908].)

In the district round the village of Begūtta on the peak of Begūtta (Kēl Begūtta) are the ruins called Kelāta Timīr Leng, very difficult to access. It is known that the Mongol warriors overran Central Kūhīstān in many directions (Cf. Hammer,
Genealogy. The Kürd tradition traces the origin of the name of Shāmīnān to that of Shaikh Shams al-Dīn, the founder of the very noble and ancient local line of Bekāde 'Abbāsī. It is said to have belonged to an Arab tribe (the Kurds usually show a marked preference for Arab pedigrees) between Mosul and Baghādād. Defeated by Shamsar [q.v.], he is said to have taken shelter in the mountains of Shāmīnān, where his first residence was at Sumāt, in the nāhiya of Herkī. His son, 'Īzāl-Dīn, extended his power over the districts of Mergiwan, Tergiwan, Garīṣ, Harūdust, Dushkūn, Omarūn and Rekūn. Six or seven generations of this family resided at Sumāt and at last abandoned for Birkār in the time of Mīr Za‘īn al-Dīn whose name a mosque at Nehrī bears. After three or four generations the capital, in the reign of Mīr Za‘īn al-Dīn, was transferred from Birkār to Harūnān in the nāhiya of Humartū. The remains of the fortress which he erected at that spot are visible to the present time. One of his sons, Imād al-Dīn, left his father after a quarrel and migrated to the district of Urmīya, where the beligerent Afschār gave him Berde Sūr and Tergiwan as a fief. From him sprang the family of the Bekāde of Deği. The second son, who succeeded his father, was the first to take the name of Mīr of Shamsīnān. For two or three generations the Mūs remained at Harūnān and thereafter they established themselves at Nehrī, where they exercised their power until the time of the Shāh 'Ubāīd Allāh (1870–1883), who imposed his rule not only on Shamsīnān, but on many other Kürd districts, even in Persia.

The Kürd oral tradition, which has only recently been written down, offers only rather uncertain chronological data. Only one reference to Berde Sūr is said to be known. It is given in Minorsky. (Materiāl pe islamini Vostoka, publ. sull. de Minist. des Aff. Étr., St. Petersburg 1915, p. 473), who in speaking of the Bekāde of Deği points out that at first this region was governed by a branch of the Mūsānawī. The line of the latter having for a long time been extinct at Tergiwan, their place was taken by the Bekāde of Deği, who trace their origin to the three 'Abbāsid brothers of Bohtan: Rashīd Beg, who died at Tādžikān, Mūs, Beg, who died at Shamsīnān, and Kalamār Beg at Berde Sūr. The fortress which was erected there in 970 (1562) is still visible. These indications allow us perhaps to assign to the reign of the Shāh 'Abbās the period at which the separation into two lines of the 'Abbāsi Begāsīde took place, for it was not till then that the Afschārs who accepted 'Imād al-Dīn, established themselves firmly at Urmīya and began to exercise authority over the neighbouring Kürds.

On the other hand, v. Hammer (op. cit., l. 55) speaks of the presence at the Kurūnī of Gurguk (August 1745) of "the two rulers of Kürdistan, Shemshedīn and Schikhsbedīn", while according to one story (Shāfīr Nāmeh, ii, 47), "the Hasker princes, who are descended from Shemshedīn, are called Chemushi" (a regular Kürd, etymologically cf. 'Īz al-Dīn = Chos). A confirmation of this is given by G. B. Margarelli. (Dizionario Geografico storico dell'Impero Ottomano, Milan, 1829), who is relying probably on the authority of Père Garson, "the father of Kurdology". (He refers to his name in the second volume under the name Kurgestan, "secondo Garsoni", etc.). Margarelli says
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on the subject of the Djuilmerk (ii. 3). Its inhabitants call themselves Sciambo, according to others they have the name of Hakkiari, which is a corruption of the principal family reigning in that place. Djuilmerk on the Grand Zab is not far from Shamdinam. These condescences—Shams al-Din, Shamdinam, Sheno, Sciambo, Hakkiari—seem to establish a certain connection between Shams al-Din and the powerful tribe of Hakkiari, which is well-known in Kurd annals. It should be recalled that, if on the one hand a Kurd (Hakkiari) prince Shams al-Din, was present at the Kuratal of Guguk along with other Mongol vassals; on the other hand at a later date in 1326, under Arghun (cf. Hummer, op. cit., i. 314), a revolt of Hakkiari took place, "after which 16,000 horsemen, commanded by the At wa Masku Kuschabschi and the Djalair Nurinaga, were sent against the Hakari Kurds and their rising put down".

This rather scanty documentary evidence does not permit any definite conclusion to be made, and we are content to note the references.

The Power of the 'Abbasid Begsede, which we have seen to have been very great, had to bow before the family of Nehri Dadate. The genealogy of this family traces its origin to the person of the Shahk 'Abd al-Kadir Giliin (or Djilin; cf. R. A. Nicholson, Studies in Islamic Mysticism, Cambridge, 1921, p. 81, No. 11; contrary to the belief of Nicholson, we are here concerned with the locality called Giliin in southern Kurdistan and not with the province (to the south of the Caspian). One of the sons of this promotor of the Khdritiyya doctrine, Shahk 'Abd al-Aziz, is said to have established himself at Akrir (to the north of Mosul), where his tomb is still venerated. His son, Shahk 'Abd Bakr, proceeded to establish himself in the district of Herkti at the village of Sutin, which had been the capital of Shams al-Din. Of the descendants of the Shahk 'Abd Bakr, Shahk Haidar and three or four generations resided at Sutin, then afterwards in the time of Molla Hddji they moved, some to Melaun, some to Demane Sulta in the Humari, until the time of Molla Sahih. Of the two sons of this latter, Saiyid 'Abd Allah and Saiyid Ahmad, the first was the disciple and successor of Mawlawi Khaidi. After having studied myasbaniyya doctrine under him, he chose Nehri as his domicile which became from that time the residence of this family. At first it was content with purely spiritual influence, but in time it seized upon temporal authority also, which reached its apogee under Shahk 'Ubaid Allah. The ambitions of this great Kurd chief, who invaded the 'Aghehbadjan about the year 1383 and who was overthrown only by the joint efforts of Persia and of Turkey, are well-known (cf. S. E. Wilson, Persian Life and Customs, 1895. See also in the English Blue-Book, Correspondence respecting the Kurdish Invasion of Persia, Turkey, 1881, No. 5). Saiyid Tii and Shahk 'Abd Allah II, grandsons of the Shahk 'Ubaid Allah, are the present representatives of this family.

Besides these two principal families which disputed for primacy in the Shamdinam, we may mention amongst the lords of less importance the 'Aghehbadjan Zerain. This tribe is divided into two branches, one at Ushin in Persia and the other in the district called by its name in Shamdinam. Both of them trace their common origin to Khatid Ibn al-Walid (v.b. another Arab descent). In regard to Guird, the family of the Mira divided in time into two branches, Zeyd Begsede and Sin Cia Begsede. For about a century, power belonged to the former. At Guird as at Zerain besides the Mira, there were paghmiit. The Taiti paghmiit family of Zerain is extinct; that of Guird, known as Kte Begsan, has pretensions to a more ancient nobility than that of the Mira. In the Guird Bador, the Mir Lgekzeri family is well known. Lastly amongst the Herki, the most ancient family is that of Mala Shabe Aga at Shawa Herki. It no longer possessed influence nor wealth, but the prestige which it had formerly won, still remains; in all the assemblies of the Herki Kurds the first place is reserved for it. The Herki tribe has many branches. The settled part, Herki Bashadi (1,000 hearths) constituted the population of the district of this name in Shamdinam; the nomad part (6,000 tents) passes the winter between Rawandiz and Erbil (Hawler in Kurid), the Sidan and Serhatat and at Akrir, the Minand at the summer at Tergulawar and Merginia in Persia. The common ancestor of the Aghlas of Herki was a certain Abul Bakr, a dangerous rival of Zain al-Din, Mir of Shamdinam, who ended by getting rid of him. Abul Bakr had four sons: Mendo, Sidom, Serhatat and Mam Shalikh, from which are derived the names of the nomad Herki clans. Jaba in his Rechits wrongly places a part of the tribe of Herki in Kirkinnah [q.v.].

Amongst clerical families the following enjoy a certain renown: in the Zerain, Shahk Djamal at Sirit; in the Guirdi, the family of Shahk Isk, that of Molha Nabi of Kelit and that of Shahk Parakh at Nehawa. It should be mentioned that the evil spirits, qimam, recognize the authority of the families of Shahk Djamal of Molha Nabi and of Shahk Balik Pirani (in the aghiret of Shirwan), which adjoins Shamdinam.

Bibliography. As has been indicated at the beginning of this article, Shamdinam is a Kurd country very little studied. Apart from certain vague references in the books of the American missionaries of the Presbyterian mission of Urmia, e.g. Dr. A. Grant, Ten Lost Tribes, New York, 1841, there is a comparatively full description only in the works of B. Dickson, Journeys in Kurdistan in the Journal of the Royal Geographical Society, 1910. One can consult also W. A. Wigram and Edgar T. A. Wigram, The Cradle of Mankind (Life in E. Kurdistan), London, 1914, ch. viii; V. Cuinet, La Turquie d'Asie, Paris 1919, t. 177-199.

The author of the present article is believed to be the first to publish details of the geography and history of Shamdinam, which he has been able to bring together during his sojourn at Urmia and his expeditions to Kurdistan. Cf. also his publications, B. Nikitine and E. B. Soane, The Tale of Suto and Tate: Kurdish text with translation and notes in Bull. of the School of Oriental Studies, ill. 1 and Le Kurd et le Christianisme in R.H., 1927; Les Kords racontes par eux-mémes in Ad., Fr. B., No. 231, May 1925; Vue d'ensemble sur le théâtre de la grande guerre dans le N.O. de la Perse, ibid., No. 224. (B. Nikitine)

SHAMIL, a popular leader in Dagestan, head of the dervish order of Nizamshandiya, the last and most successful leader of the rising against
Russian rule (cf. above, i, p. 890). Like his predecessors he belonged to the people of the Avars. Born in the last years of the xvith century in the village of Gimri where the family estate was, he distinguished himself for the first time in 1850 in the unsuccessful attack on the fortress of Khistan. After the murder of his predecessor Hama Beg (1834), he was chosen by the rebels as their leader. In 1857 he was defeated and forced to surrender; he was able to return to power next year and extend his rule over a great part of Dagesthan and over the land of the Chechenen west of it. His institutions (mijmum) were based on the religious law (qur'â''). So that his rule was later known in Dagesthan as the "period of the Sharif''s". His territory was divided into 32 districts, with a nû'âb at the head of each and a muftî for judicial matters under whom were four qâjîs appointed by him. Shahim's armed force amounted to 60,000 men. The mountains of Dagesthan and the still less accessible forests of the Chechenen formed the bulwark of his rule; it was the fortress of Wedeno. Shahim's residence from 1835 till the Russian conquest (April 11/13, 1859).

After several unsuccessful attempts to put down the rising by the superiority of military force, Shahim began in 1845 a slow penetration of the mountains and clearings of the forests. Shahim's attempts, especially during the Crimean War, to get help from the Turks were unavailing. After the fall of Wedeno the struggle was decided. Shahim was forced to surrender in his last mountain fastness Gunib on Aug. 25 (Sept. 6) 1859. After being received by the Tsar Alexander II in St. Petersburg, the town of Kaluga was allotted to him and his immediate relations as a residence. There by his own request he and his sons in 1866, took the oath of allegiance to the Tsar. In Feb. 1869 he was allowed to go to Mecca; he died in Medina in March 1871. Before his death his oldest son Ghâzî Muhammad (local pronunciation in Russian transliteration = Kaz Dzhoma) received permission to visit his sick father; later, he entered the Turkish service and took part in the war of 1877 and in the efforts to stir up the people of Dagesthan. He died in Mecca in 1903. Shahim's second son, Muhammad Shahî, entered Russian service and ultimately settled in Kazan with the rank of Major-General.


(W. Hartshold)

AL-SHAMMÂKHI, Abû 'l-'Abînî 'Abd al-'Ummâran Sâîdî b. Abî al-Wâkidî, 46 learned jurist consultant and Abâdî biographer, died in Dammâdî 928 (= March 29—April 28—May 26, 1522) in one of the villages of the oasis of the Iren of the Djâbal Nafûsa, in Tripolitania. Among his pupils was Abî Yahyâ Zakariyâ' b. Ibrahim al-Hawwârî.

He was the author of the following works: 1. A commentary on the 'Ahdâ, a short treatise on theology by Abî Haṣîn Omar b. Djamî al-Nafûsî; 2. A commentary on his synopsis of the K. al-âdîn wa 'l-bînâ'îf on the sources of law by Abî Yahyâ 'Abdîn Yûbûf b. Ibrahim al-Sadîrî; 3. A. al-şyârî, a biographical collection, spiced with anecdotes and a few historical events, of the principal Abâdî personnages. A few extracts transl. into French have been published by Masqueray in his Chronique d'Alba Zabaria, Algiers 1879, p. 325 sqq.; the Arabic text was lithographed at Cairo in 1301.


(MOH. BEN CHERI)

AL-SHAMMÂKHI, Abû Sâîdî 'Abî 'l-Hâdî b. 'Ali b. Abî. 'Abî b. Isfâwâb, Abâdî jurist consultant, died at a great age in 792 (December 20—1396—December 8, 1509) in one of the villages of the Iren of the Djâbal Nafûsa, in Tripolitania.

After studying with Abî Mûsâ Taštî b. Taštî al-Shâmâkkî, he attached himself to Abî 'Azîz b. Ibrahim b. Abî Yahyâ. On the conclusion of his studies, he settled at Metiwen where he devoted himself to teaching for thirteen years. He then settled in the oasis of Iren in 756 (January 16 1355—January 4, 1356).

His pupils were: his son Abî 'Imâr Mûsâ, his grandson Sulâmîn, Abî 'l-Khâidî b. Ibrahim al-Bârâkî, Abî Yûsuf Yûbûf b. Mişâbîh, etc.

He composed the following works: 1. Al-Dawân, which remained unfinished in four great volumes which has become the fundamental lawbook of the people of the Djâbal Nafûsa; 2. 'Ahdâ, a theological treatise dedicated to Nûbî b. Hâjîm; 3. 'Ahdâ wa 'l-fu'a'mâ.

Bibliography: al-Shâmâkkî, K. al-şyârî, Cairo 1304, p. 559; Motylnski, Bibliographie du Maroc in Bull. de Correspond. afric., 1885, i, ii, p. 44.

SHAMMAR, (a) the plateau containing the parallel ranges of Djâbal Adja'and Djâbal Salmâ, "the two mountains of Tayî". In extent it stretches southward from the Nafûf to the Wâdi l-Rumma and includes Iram, Misma, Hûrân and Rumusîn which shelter Shammar tribesmen. Politically the term is constant. Thus, when the Amir of Hâ'l [q.v.] was at the height of his power Djâfî and Rıyâd were included to Shammar. Inasmuch as the tribe gave its name in the district, like its predecessors, the Tayî, it is best to confine the name to the Djâbal where the tribe is paramount. The capital is cut off from the outside world by its mountain barriers, fair access only being possible from the direction of Taima by the Rif al-Sâf which pierces the mountain to the S.W. of Hâ'l and by a pass through the Djâbal Salmâ. Between the ranges water is plentiful; but outside, the fertile fringe wells are few. The climate is bracing and healthy and epidemics like those recorded by Doughty (l. 296) are doubtless of external origin. In the
oases water is near the surface and cultivation correspondingly easy.

(2) The confederation of tribes in this region and in al-Dhajira. Local traditions as to the origin vary. It is claimed that the Shammar are of Northern stock in the lines of Rebā' and Muqār. Wallin (J.R.G.S., xx. 351) reported that they differ considerably from Syrian Arabs in racial characteristics and resemble in features the Yemenis, and that their tradition is that they were the last to migrate from southern Arabia. The ruling clan, the Diq'far, is a sub-tribe of the 'Abda of Abība, descent from Kahtān, so that they may be Yemenis. They certainly hold that they displaced and in part absorbed the Ta'yī. Ibn Duraid, Kitāb al-līmālāt, ed. Wittenfeld, p. 233, merely says that the Banū Shammar are min Ta'yī. Doughty, ii. 41, reports that Najidian opinion favours a mixed ancestry. There is no good clue as to the date of the Shammar irruption. At the beginning of Islam the Ta'yī were in the Shammar lands and probably their expiation was gradual. Al-Kalqāshandi mentions the Shammar merely as Arabs inhabiting the Ta'yī mountains. He does not connect them with any known tribe.

Their mountains are the 'Anaza; Bedouin war has gone on for at least a century and a half. About a hundred years ago, the 'Anaza succeeded in dividing the Shammar. They forced a large section of them to cross the Euphrates and occupied the intervening dira. By this time the two groups of Shammar are politically distinct, the Mesopotamian section following Ibn Jebra. Nevertheless the blood tie is still honoured in that the pasture land of the Dābāl is open to any of the Jebra Shammar. The Shammar dira extends almost to Najafāt, though the assault of the 'Anaza, the Dhafrī and recently the Amir of Riyāṣ tend to confine them to the Najafāt.

The Dhajira Shammar are practically all nomads, their range being between Tigris and Euphrates. They range far south as Baghālād and Zuhār. A rendez-vous is Dair al-Zor and they move up the Khālār [q.v.] towards Niṣiṣmān. In the absence of an official estimate their numbers may be said to be 10,000.

The Amir, who takes the name of his house and is known as Ibn Rashīd, is not only the paramount shaikh of the Shammar tribes; he is also the ruler of the settled population in the line of cases between the ranges of Adja and Salūn, and outlying settlements like Mustajjīdā. Hai'l [q.v.] and Fa‘id (population about 1,000), Kafr, Aqī⪞, Muqāṣ and Samirah deserve mention.

The renowned Tamīm still form a considerable proportion of the settled population, though they incline to Ibn Sa‘d of Riyāṣ. The townspeople are regarded as superior to the Beduin brethren in courage and military skill. They form the backbone of the army; each man is compelled to furnish his own camel or horse, weapons, ammunition and equipment, and afterwards a summons is sent to the nomads, who, though they turn out in great numbers, are merely regarded as auxiliaries. The great strength of the Shammar in the past has lain in their discipline and they may yet again assert their strength under a capable Amir.

Wallin noted that apart from the Khālit and Kaffīm, man with any knowledge of Arabic literature were extremely rare; and the former knew little but the Korān, the Ḥanbal traditions and the specific tenets of the Wahhābi faith. The Shammar have been some of the most devoted champions of Wahhābi doctrines and they have done much to propagate it throughout western Arabia. Latterly they have revolted against the excessive austerity of the sect, and tobacco and silk are not taboo in Najd. Doubtless up-to-date information of the effect of Ibn Sa‘d’s regime in Hai’ll would lead to a modification of some statements made above.

I refrain deliberately from noticing the work of William Gifford Palgrave, as Philby (i. 117-156) has shown that he was a liar.


(2) AL-SHAMS (α.), the sun. As in Greek astronomy, whose conception of the cosmos the Arabs had taken over, they made the sun go round the earth from east to west in a true (tropic) year. The centre of the sun’s orbit (epicycle = ṣaḥāl al-tawwur) did not coincide with the earth’s centre but was eccentric to it (al-khāṣṣir al-makhtūr) to account for the inequality of the seasons which had already been established by Hipparchus. The sun itself was a ball-shaped solid body sunk into the so-called eccentric sphere of the sun (ṣaḥāl al-shams) in such a way that the ball of the sun now protruded beyond the surface of the sphere. (A pictorial illustration of this idea is given in Rudolf and Hochbein, Die Astronomie der Gegenzeit, Leipzig 1893, p. 13). If we put the radius of the sun’s orbit at 60°, then according to Hipparchus the distance of its centre from the centre of the earth = approximately 2° 30' = 1/8 of this radius, according to al-Battani = 2° 45', while the calculations of Muhammad b. Mūsā al-Khwārizmī result in an eccentricity, the magnitude of which has been variously estimated from 2° 10' to 2° 20' (cf. H. Suter, Die astronomischen Tafeln des Muḥ. b. Mūsā al-Khwārizmī, Copenhagen 1914, p. 45). The two directions at which one looks at the sun from the two centres mentioned thus form an angle calculated by Hipparchus as = 2° 13' as a maximum (by al-Ma‘ṣūn’s astronomers at 1° 59'), by Battani at 1° 58'. This magnitude is called the inclination (ta‘dīl al-ṣaḥāl al-makhtūr). In consequence of the eccentric sun’s orbit which (in modern language) is simply the elliptic path of the earth round the sun projected on the sphere of the heavens, there were two outstanding points for the motion of the sun; that at which it is nearest the earth (ṣarq, ṣurarum, ṣurūf, ha‘ad al-ra’ūf) and that of its greatest distance from
the earth (apogee, apogamum, ʷaḍā, ʷu’d-‘aḍā‘). It is one of al-Battānī’s most important contributions to knowledge, that he discovered the turning movement of the apogee which we can now prove to be a necessary result of the disturbance of the earth’s path by the attraction of the moon (three body problem). Al-Battānī found it amounted to 21° in a year, according to the results of modern astronomy it is about 11° 50’ (cf. e.g. Israel-Holzwart, Die Elemente der theoretischen Astronomie, I., Wiesbaden 1885, p. 17). This movement of the apogee has nothing to do with that which is produced by the precession of the equinoxes and is added in the same direction to the former. While Hipparchus and Pтолemy estimated its annual amount at 56°, al-Battānī came nearer with 54° — 55°, while Nasr al-Dīn al-Ṭārī about 1260 calculated it at 51° which is practically correct. Whether now the introduction of trepidation into this movement of precession in the zodiacal circle, i.e. the assumption of an inequality in it in the form of a see-saw movement (qasat al-ḥāfiz wa l-liddār) is due to lack of agreement in calculations or, as S. Günther thinks, was learned by the Arabs from the Hindus (cf. his Studien zur Geschichte der mathemat. und physisch. Geographie, ii., Halle 1877, p. 75), need not be discussed here. It will be sufficient to refer to the work of Thabit b. Kūra (826—901) which was translated into Latin by Gerard of Cremona with the title Liber Thebit de motu accessorio et revolutionibus (cf. H. Suter, Die Mathematiker u. Astronomen der Araber und ihre Werke, Leipzig 1900, p. 37). Both texts, Arabic and Latin, are in MSS. in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. Delambre has investigated the Latin MSS. He quotes it as Thabit ben Khorrath: de motu aequinoctiali sphere and finds that Thabit introduces a second movable eclipse, which rises and falls alternately above and below the fixed eclipse. The equinoxial points at the same time advance or retire as much as 10° 45’ (cf. J. B. Delambre, Histoire de l’astronomie du moyen âge, Paris 1819, p. 74). The divisions of time are caused by two kinds of solar motion. The first is that which is completed within a tropic year along the eccentric solar sphere, during which time the sun traverses the twelve constellations of the zodiac (eclipse = falak al-burūjāf) to return again to its starting point (beginning of spring = naqat al-tildal). The duration of the tropic year was calculated by al-Battānī at 356° 5’ 40’ 24’ (actually it is 365° 5’ 48’ 47’), i.e. much more accurately than by Pтолemy who put it as 365° 5’ 55’ 12’. Secondly, the sun as a result of the revolution of the globe of heaven around the earth performs its daily round in the heavens from east to west. The Arabs understood by natural day (wan) the day of sunlight and night combined. Muslim religious ceremonies are closely connected with the different stages of daylight: Dawn and twilight (fāqr, ẓaḥafer q.v.) are periods for prayer and it was necessary to define them astronomically. In the meridian or at midday (naṣf al-māḥir), the sun attains its greatest height (ghayyat al-ristīfā) and then begins to sink (ṣawad). The sunr is the period of prayer immediately after noon. The distance of the sun from the meridian is called faṭl al-ḍarīf. The position of the sun in the heavens was usually obtained from the length and direction of the shadow of the ẓaḥāf. The Hakim astronomer Ibn Yūnus (1009) called attention to the half-shadow which is a result of the flatness of the sun’s disc. The shadow instruments of the Arabs i.e. their sundials were of varied kinds. At the moment when the afternoon shadow on the hasita (horizontal sundial) exceeded the midday shadow by the length of the mīqās (shāhās), the time of ṣyah began (afternoon prayer). The hours (al-būṣr, see ẓā’ar) were either equal (al-‘ind al-māwita dilla) or unequal i.e. temporal (al-‘ind al-samāniya). Later the equal hours were also marked on the sundial.

The procedure for ascertaining the beginning and magnitude of the eclipse of the sun (ḥaw奖励 al-shams) among the Arabs is based on the Almagest of Pтолemy. As regards accuracy in calculating the beginning of and observing an eclipse of the sun, the same holds as for the moon (cf. Al-ḥamīr). In such questions as solar parallaxes, apparent size of the sun, its distance from the earth etc., the Arabs also closely followed the Greeks. Ibn al-Haitham notes that in solar eclipses a similar reddish black is seen on the sun’s disc as on the moon, at the time of its total eclipse. He recommends the observation of a solar eclipse in its reflection in a vessel filled with water, in view of the too fierce light, especially in partial eclipses.

Bibliography: In addition to the references in the text: C. A. Nallino, al-Battānī sive Al-Ḥātami Opus astronomiæ, Milan 1899—1907, i. 41, 43, 77, 104, 135; and the corresponding Adnotationes, Vol. ii. with the plates of the sun; R. Wolf, Geschichte der Astronomie, Munich 1877, p. 47, 160, 173. On Ibn Yūnus’s proof that the shadow (al-qāf) of a mīqās gives the height of the upper rim of the sun and not that of its centre, cf. S. Choc, Über eine arabische Methode, die geographische Breite aus der Höhe des Sonnen im ersten Versitit (Höhe ohne Azimut) zu bestimmen (Annalen d. Hydrographie u. maritimen Meteorologie, 1921, p. 131). On sundials, the division of the days and hours: S. Choc, Gnomonic der Araber, Berlin 1923 and do., Sommernahmen der spätarabischen Astronomie, Isis, vi., No. 18, 1924, p. 332—361. On the greatest declination of the sun or sphere of the ecliptic (ghayyat al-ma‘lī, al-ma‘lī al-dī‘am), cf. the article Al-Sa‘ātan. Ibn al-Haitham’s note on the observation of the eclipse of the sun is in his: Fī Mū‘ayyat al-Aṣr ala‘dāf fi Wālid al-Kamār (Madīlis baldayi in Alexandria). (S. Choc).

SHAMS AL-DAWLA, Abū Ta‘īhir b. Farah AL-DAWLA, a Būyīd. After the death of Fakhr al-Dawla [q.v.] the amirs proclaimed as his successor his four-year-old son Ma‘djid al-Dawla under the guardianship of his mother Saiyida and gave the governorship of Hamadhān and Kirmānshāhān to Shams al-Dawla who was also a minor. When Ma‘djid al-Dawla grew up, he sought to overthrow his mother and with this object made an arrangement with the vizier al-Khalīf Abī ‘Abd Allāh Abī al-Kāsim in 397 (1006/1007). But when they sought assistance from the Kurd chief Badr b. Ḥusayn al-Dawla, the latter set out for al-Ra‘i with Shams al-Dawla and took Ma‘djid al-Dawla prisoner. The government was then given to Shams al-Dawla but as he was not so planta as Ma‘djid al-Dawla, the latter was again proclaimed ruler, while Shams al-Dawla returned to Hamadhān. After Badr had been murdered by the soldiers in 405 (1014/1015), Shams al-Dawla
seized a portion of his territory and when the grandson of the dead man, Thāhir b. Ḥillī b. Badr, wished to dispute the possession of it, he was defeated and thrown into prison. His father Ḥillī b. Badr had already been imprisoned by Sulṭān al-Dawla (q.v.); but the latter released him and sent him with an army to regain the lands occupied by Shams al-Dawla. In Dhu l-‘Qa‘da 405 (April/May 1015), he came upon the enemy but the battle resulted in Ḥillī’s defeat and death. After this victory Shams al-Dawla seized the town of al-Kayy; Madjīd al-Dawla and his mother took to flight, but when Shams al-Dawla wished to pursue them, his troops mutinied and forced him to return to Hamadān, whereupon Madjīd al-Dawla and his mother returned to al-Kayy. In 411 (1020/1021) the Turks rose in Hamadān; Shams al-Dawla appealed to Abū Djafar b. Kākawīb, governor of Ishāfān, and with his help succeeded in driving the mutinous element out of the town. About 412 (1021/1022), Shams al-Dawla was succeeded by his son Sāmih al-Dawla but within two years (414 = 1023/1024), Hamadān fell into the hands of the Kākawībids (q.v.; Kākawīwāls).


SHAMS AL-DIN. [See JUWAINI, ii. 1076, IL- DĪGI, ILTUTMISH, FEHLWĀN, TIRAH)]

SHAMS AL-DIN, IBN ‘ÂD AL-ÂLĪ AL-SAMA‘TĀN (the nisba is variously given, as the pronunciation of the name of the country varies), = belonging to Samastrā < Samuqād, a district in North Sumatrā which in those days formed a part of the kingdom of Pasē; cf. the art. SUMATRA, a Malay mystic author, who was born probably before 1075 and died in 1030 (Kusdjid 12, 1039 A. H.), as we know from Nūr al-Dīn al- Rānī’s Bušṭān al-Silāḥī; his part in question has been edited by G. K. Niemann, under the title Ḥikayat Nagari Atjeh, in Bloemen uit Maletische Geschichten, the Hague 1907, ii. 127.

On his personality al-Ra‘īnī says: *This Shaikh was learned in all branches of learning; especially his knowledge in the field of the ‘ilm tapawwur was well known; a number of books have been written by him*. He is often mentioned along with his contemporary Ḥamza al-Faṃṣūrī (= belonging to Barūs, on the West coast of Sumatrā; cf. the art. ḤAMZA AL-FUQHĪ in the Supplement), whose importance is, however, much greater. Whether Shams al-Dīn was Ḥamza’s pupil, as H. Kraemer suggests (Een Javanse Prachim uit de Zettinge Eeuw, diss. Leiden 1921, p. 28), seems to be not quite certain.

After the conquest of Malacca by the Portuguese (1511), the importance of Acheh as a centre of Muslim economic and religious life had increased. Especially during the reign of Iskandar Muda, al-Rānī left Acheh for some time, but later on, during the reign of Iskandar II, he succeeded in securing the assistance of the public authorities and, by a fauzī, caused the books of his opponents to be burnt publicly (H. Kraemer, op. cit., p. 30; do., Noord-Samarraanse invloed op de Javanesse mystiek, in Djawas, 1924, iv. 30; cf. also H. N. v. d. Tuuk, Kort Verslag der Mat. Handelb. etc., in 3. J. f. F., 1856, vol. 3, p. 457, where Mawlī Naḥj al-Majātī Qādī (another name for Iskandar II).

Kraemer, op. cit., p. 30 nqf, mentions the following works of Shams al-Dīn:

1) Mīrāt al-Ma‘wīn, "Mirror of the Believer," deals with dogmatics in an orthodox manner, written in 1009 (1601). Cod. Or. Leiden No. 1750 (H. H. Juybobil, Cat. Mat., Handelb. Litt., Univers. Bibl., Leiden 1899, p. 31–137) and No. 1952 (Kraemer, p. 30) contain parts of it; the former is provided with a Dutch MS. translation by P. v. d. Vorm (d. 1731), and is therefore the same MS. as has already been described by G. H. Wernald; the complete work contained 211 questions and answers on religious subjects (G. H. Wernald, Maletische Boekentafel, Amsterdam 1738, p. 320–335; the author also says that 'this work was very popular in his days and cites [Introduction, p. I–III] the beginning sentences, according to which Shams al-Dīn wrote this book for those who were not acquainted with the Arab and Persian languages).

2) Mīrāt al-Muḥāʃībīn, "Mirror of those who have acquired a deep mystic knowledge," mentioned by al-Ra‘īnī, seems to be lost. V. d. Tuuk’s identification of this work with Cod. Or. Leiden No. 1332 is, according to Kraemer, p. 31, wrong. 3) Shāhī Rūk<kā’ s Ḥawwāt al-Faṃṣūrī (written in 1611), perhaps a commentary on Ḥamza’s Ruk<ka al-Maḥṣūṣī (Kraemer, p. 20 and note 3), which has not survived to us. Juybobil, op. cit., p. 259, supposes that Cod. Or. Leiden, No. 1953 (2) contains this commentary.

Excerpts of works by Shams al-Dīn are mentioned by Kraemer on p. 31; on p. 32 we find a list of works which are only known by name (cf. also p. 30 above). As it is not always certain that Shams al-Dīn is the real author, and our knowledge of their contents is still very limited, it seems not to be necessary to enumerate them all here. Only scanty notice of Shams al-Dīn’s teachings can be gathered from the fragments preserved to us; even Codex Leiden, Ic. coll. St. H. No. 30, described by Prof. P. H., S. Rinke (Suppl. Cat. Mat., Handelb., Leiden 1921, p. 145, No. 34) as a résumé of Shams al-Dīn’s teachings, has only the character of a collection of annotations which presuppose a fuller account or oral explanation.

Al-Ra‘īnī mentions Shams al-Dīn (Kraemer, p. 28) as a representative of the Wujūdīs (q.v.), and from the information on his teachings given by Kraemer (p. 46–48) we may conclude that there is no essential deviation from the general Muslim mystic conceptions of his day. On the other hand he has exercised a considerable influence on the peculiar Javanese mystic literature which is, however, not yet fully investigated (cf. the art. SULAK). Continued researches will perhaps solve the question whether Indonesian elements, which are so well represented in Je-
SHAMS AL-DIN — AL-SHANFARA

volumes of mystic treatises, are already to be found in the literary inheritance of Shams al-Din and his contemporaries.

According to v. d. Tunk (op. cit., p. 463–464), al-Ra‘i’s [q.v.] Nuhbas fi Da‘wa al-Zill and his Tabyins fi Mur‘ifat al-Adyan are especially intended as polemics against Shams al-Din (cf. also Kramer, p. 32–33).


(C. C. Berek)

SHAMS AL-MAL‘ALI. [See later.]

SHAMSIYA, order of derwish is called after Shams al-Din Abu l-Chanâ’ Ahmad b. Abi l-Barakât Muḥammad Swâş or Swâsh-ráž, also called Kara Shams al-Din and Shams (d. 1099 = 1600–1601). He is mentioned by the historians Nâmâ (Constantinople 1281, i. 372) and Pecčevi (Constantinople 1283, ii. 290) among the saints of the reign of Muḥammad III, and they state (probably on the authority of this sovereign, whose letter is cited by von Hammer, Geschichte der osmanischen Dichtkunst, iii. 286) that he was the author of numerous works in Turkish, enumerated by Hâddîl Khalîfa, who, however, confesses him with other persons; of one called Manâsil al-Arifin there is a copy in the British Museum, and another called Gutakanâhîd is preserved in the Vienna Library. Notices of this order in European works are mainly derived from d’Ohsson, who mentions it in his list (Tabbica, iv. 625), whence von Hammer obtains his information in the Geschichte der osmanischen Reiche, i. 250, adding that the founder lived and died at Medina in the odour of sanctity. In his later work on Ottoman Poetry, loc. cit., he states that this person was head of the Khalwati order in Swâs; and in the Kamûs al-A‘lam he is called the restorer of the Khalwati order. In a pedigree of orders made by a Nâshîhanid and cited by Le Châtelier, Confiriit, p. 50, the Shamshîya is represented as a branch of the Khalwâya and appears to be confined to Swâs. It does not figure in the list of tekâw at Swâs drawn up by Coënet (La Turquie d’Asie, i. 666), whence it was probably a local name for the Khalwâti order which speedily became obsolete. Le Châtelier, loc. cit., p. 179, mentions an order of this name as a branch of the Bedawiyah in Egypt.

(D. S. Marocolo)

AL-SHANFARA was a poet of the time before Islam and is reckoned by the Arabs as one of the great racers, along with others like Ta‘abba’ thumbân. And also one of the ravens (agribba) on account of his black skin. The genealogists know his complete genealogy, but as the various sources consulted are not even unanimous as to his name and that of his immediate ancestors, it is hazardous to attach great credence to the chain of his forebears named. There is, however, perfect agreement that he belonged to the South Arabian clan of the Banu T‘awâ b. al-Hâjir b. al-Hanw b. al-Azd and consequently he is one of the very few South Arabian pre-Islamic poets of whom poems are preserved. As a boy he was captured by the tribe Shabhâ b. Fahm, a clan of Kays ‘Alâhû, and he remained a prisoner among them till he was exchanged for a man of the Banu Shabhâ, the. Banu Salamûn b. Mufarrîdî, a clan of al-Azd, had captured. He remained among the latter as one of their tribe till he began to make love with a girl of the Banu Salamûn whom he seduced, and was wounded and, when he was insulted by the girl of the desert, he ran away to his first captors. When he learned from them his real descent he swore that he would take vengeance upon the clan of Shâbâm by killing a hundred of their men. He succeeded in this in so far that he killed actually 90 of them. The small tribe of Fahm were noted robbers; associated with Ta‘abba’ Sharrân he was for a long time a terror to tribes which often lived very long distances from the home of the clan of Fahr, it is reported that he, like his companion, made all his raids on foot, crossing large stretches of desert, through which he made his retreat sure by burying ostrich eggs filled with water in the sand. As soon as he had made his murderous attack he would, upon being pursued, race back into the wilderness, where his pursuers were compelled to give up their chase for fear of dying of thirst.

When his murderous career against the Banu Salamûn had assumed the dimensions indicated, three men of the clan Ghanâm waylaid him in the night when he was going to a lonely well al-Nasîf near Abîdah and though they wounded two of them by shooting at them as he expired their form in the dark, they overpowered him and after cutting one of his hands off brought him to their camp, where they killed him. It is stated that on this occasion he uttered the defiant verses telling them not to bury his body but to leave it to the hyenas, which are found in the Haumâs of Abî Tammâm and have several times been translated into European languages. Al-A‘in in his commentary on the verses of the Alisiya (iv. 596, sq.) mentions his Divân among the books which he has consulted, but this book is now probably lost.

We have, however, two celebrated poems of some length attributed to him, one found in the collection of ancient odes entitled al-Mu‘athâ‘iyya (ed. Lyall, No. 20; ed. Thorbecke, No. 18) in which he celebrates his murder of Hârâm b. Dâ‘îrî, a man of the Banu Salamûn, but the chief beauty of this poem lies perhaps in the mabk of introductory introduction. This poem is accessible to European readers in the excellent rendering of Lyall. Greater celebrity, however, is enjoyed by his other poem which is generally known under the title of the Lâmiyat al-Arâb, a poem full of defiance and manliness, which since it was made accessible to Western readers by Sylvestre de Sacy has been acknowledged as one of the finest products of Arabic poetry. It has been translated into several Western languages, even Polish. It was also appreciated by Arabic scholars and we possess an early commentary which is attributed in the printed editions (Constantinople 1580 etc.) to al-Mu‘arrab; this is, however, an error as the commentator himself mentions that he derived his text from Abu l-Ablâs in more than one place and once
(p. 26) from Ahmad b. Yahya i.e. the Kufi grammarian Thalib who died in 291 (903). Printed with the same commentary is another commentary, more extensive, by al-Zamakhshari who died in 538 (1143/1144).

While the poem in the Musafiriyat is considered the undisputed work of al-Shanfarar, this is not the case with the Lamiat al-Arab. The earliest scholars appear to have no knowledge of the poem at all; it is not mentioned by Ibn Kutasah in his book on poets, nor is there any reference to this poem in the fairly long account of the poet in the Kitab al-Maghribi (vol. I, 134-143). Though al-Kasdi died 358 = 969 quotes the poem at length in the appendix of his Amali (iii, 208-212) he informs us in an earlier part of his work (i, 137) that the poem, though generally attributed to al-Shanfarar, is in reality the work of Abul Muqir i.e. the Basirian philosopher Khalaf al-Ahorn, he who, who deserves about two thirds of his book from Ibn Duraid, has received this information also from him and probably from this source. It is repeated in later literature. Ibn Duraid was well informed about the activities of the scholars of the Basirian school and only two generations separated him from Khalaf al-Ahorn, his information being as a rule derived from pupils of al-Ahorn from Khalaf. We are consequently compelled to attach some weight to his statement, which is largely corroborated by the internal evidence of the poem itself. The entire lack of names of places and personal names, except such as cannot easily be identified, is so unusual in early poems that it must give rise to suspicion, for we have not a fragment, but a harmonious complete poem. To this must be added that in its diction occurs words and phrases which cannot easily be confirmed from poems which are acknowledged as originating from poets who lived contemporary or near the time of al-Shanfarar and we must come to the conclusion that Khalaf inspired by the fragment found in the Hamasa composed his masterpiece, which truly represented the defunct 'nature of the wild robber and murderer.

Added to this comes the remarkable fact that another poem of equally wild nature and attributed in the Hamasa to Thaliba Sharran, the companion of al-Shanfarar, is also attributed to al-Shanfarar, but by critics vindicated as a forgery of the same Khalaf al-Ahorn. The author of the poem is the same Khalaf al-Ahorn who, according to the author of the Kitab al-Maghribi, cited a fragment of a longer poem, and in several early works are quoted fragments of other poems, which probably are not remnants of longer basha's.

Bibliography: The whole subject is most exhaustively dealt with by G. Jacob in his Shanfarar Studies, Munich 1914-1915, from which it is evident that the poems of al-Shanfarar have attracted greater attention in European literature than any other Arabic poet, and to the works cited there I can only add an edition de-luxe of the Lamiat in German translation, Hanover 1923. Scattered verses by al-Shanfarar are found in several other works besides those used by Jacob, but they add nothing to our knowledge.

SHANT YAHUK (Yahuk, in Abu 'I-Fida'), Arab transcription of the Spanish Santiago, in French St. Jacques de Compostelle, is the most celebrated place of pilgrimage in Christian Spain, the former capital of the kingdom of Galicia, situated 760 feet above sea-level, between Vigo and La Coruna, to the east of Cape Finisterre. It is there that according to the legend are the relics of the apostle St. James the Greater, the patron-saint of Spain, who landed on the coast near Santiago to convert the peninsula. There was, before the eleventh century, a celebrated church dedicated to St. James Compostelle, with which the Arab authors deal with full details. It was for the Christians, says the author of al-Bayan al-Maghribi, what the Ka'bah is for the Muslims.

In 387 (997), the Shatib al-Mansur Ibn Abi Amir directed an important expedition from Cordova against Santiago, of which Dozy has given a detailed account from the chronicle Ibn al-Ijarli. On Sha'ban 2 (10th August), the town, which had been deserted by the inhabitants, was taken by the Arab army and burned to the ground; only the tomb of the saint was respected. The king of Galicia, Bermudo II, recaptured Santiago from the Muslims at the end of the eleventh century and restored all its traditional splendour to the place of pilgrimage. The building of the present cathedral on the foundations of the sanctuary destroyed by al-Mansur, was undertaken in the reign of Alphonso VI in the last quarter of the eleventh century.


SHAPUR (r.), Arabic Sabur (the form Shabur in a verse of Ahsa' quoted in Thalaib, Hist. des rois des Perses, ed. Zonberg, p. 493 is nearer the Pahlavi Shapuhr), the name of severa members of the Sassanid dynasty. The three Persian kings of this name have associations with Muslim tradition.

Shapur I B. Ardashir called Sabor al-Dinamid by the Arabs, the Sapor I of the classical historians (241-379 a.d.) who waged war with the Romans for the greater part of his reign, he continued the offensive which had been begun by his father Artaxerxes. He succeeded in capturing important towns like Nisibis (which were however lost again after his defeat at Resaina in 243). Later (256) he took Antioch and in 260 he even took the Emperor Valerian as prisoner. The Roman wars, waged with varying fortunes, thus seemed to have ended in the definite victory of Sapor, when he discovered an enemy in the king of Palmyra, Odenathus, who forced him to evacuate the conquered territory. Odenathus remained the enemy of the Persians till his death; it was only his successor Zenobia that concluded a treaty with Sapor. On this and other historical facts which cannot be gone into here, see Pauly-Wissowa, ii., Realens, ii., col. 2325 sqq.; here we are only concerned with the Muslim tradition based on an older Persian tradition, which can on the whole claim little real
historical value, although it will not be disputed that it has preserved many historical, important and valuable details, otherwise unknown. The facts of the legendary biography of Šāpūr I as contained in Muslim sources are in the main as follows:

Youth. Ardashīr, Šāpūr’s father, had married a daughter of the Arsacid Ardawān, whom he had divorced and slain. The princess attempted to poison Ardashīr, but the plot was discovered and the king ordered a trusted court official to put her to death. When the latter saw that she was pregnant, he spared her life and when she gave birth to a boy, he called him Šāpūr, i.e. “king’s son”. Šāpūr grew up in concealment. Ardashīr was lamenting that he would have no heir to succeed him at his death; the courtier thereupon revealed the secret and brought the son to his delighted father.

This story is already found in the Pahlavi Kārnameh. Muslim tradition agrees with it in the main, although all the sources do not have the same details. Firdawṣ gives two details, which are lacking in the Kārnameh but can be shown from the rest of the story to be old; in order not to run any danger should the fact of Šāpūr’s birth become known, the official entrusted with the execution of the Arsacid princess acts exactly like the Lycean Combabos; the second is that Šāpūr is recognised as a real prince by the fact that he dares, while playing, to pick up the ball near Ardashīr who is looking on, without showing any awe at the king. Al-Ṭabarī knows this story also, but says nothing of a poison-plot. In his story Ardashīr is bound by an oath to destroy all Arsakids but does not know that his wife belongs to this family; so also al-Dinawarī, only he makes the princess a niece of the Arsacid Farrakhhān.

The legend next deals with the story of Šāpūr’s weaning and the birth of his son Harūnids; it is practically a repetition of the preceding. An Indian sage has predicted to Ardashīr that the throne will be inherited by the family of the Mihrak dynasty overthrown by Ardashīr, therefore the king has all the descendants of Mihrak put to death; only a daughter escapes; Šāpūr meets her while out hunting and brings her home without Ardashīr’s knowledge. When her son, later Harūnids I, is grown up, Ardashīr recognises royal blood in the boy, who is without fear in the presence of the king (the same motif as in the story of Šāpūr); everything then ends happily. This is the story of the Kārnameh and Firdawṣ and al-Ṭabarī agrees. The other sources do not give this story, but Hisma al-Ifshānī says (ed. Gottwaldt, p. 49) that there was a well-known story about the mother of Harūnids I, whom he calls Gusrādī.

The legend preserved by Ṭabarī tells that Šāpūr, before his accession, took an active part in a fight between Ardashīr and Ardawān; Šāpūr killed the dābīr of the Parthian king. Šāpūr succeeded Ardashīr on the latter’s death; the statement in Mas‘ūdī (Mafīrih, ii. 160) that Ardashīr resigned the throne in favour of his son and henceforth devoted his life to religion, does not seem to belong to the old tradition.

Hatra. The conquest of Hatra is ascribed by al-Ṭabarī and Tha‘alibī to Šāpūr I, by Ibn Ḫaṭīb and Eutychius to Ardashīr, and by Firdawṣ and al-Dinawarī to Šāpūr II. The story is as follows:

The Persian king was unsuccessful in taking the stronghold of Hatra, the residence of the prince Sāṭrūn (according to others: Da‘īzan) until the latter’s daughter Naḍīra fell in love with him and put the town in his hands by making her father and his soldiers intoxicated, or by betraying to the enemy the talisman on which the ownership of the fortress depended. The Persian king married Naḍīra as he had promised, but afterwards had her executed, in disgust at her ingratitude to her father.

Our authorities quote Arabic poems in this connection, which are, of course, of much later date and are of as little value as sources as the stories of the historians. They are evidence, however, that the Arabs also had the tradition that the like Sābūr once besieged Hatra. Whether the king who took Hatra was Ardashīr or Šāpūr I, cannot be certainly ascertained. We know from a really reliable source (Dio Cassius) of only one siege of Hatra by a Sāsānīd, namely Ardashīr, and this siege was unsuccessful. It is assumed by many, what is not in itself improbable, that either Ardashīr himself after an unsuccessful attempt, or Šāpūr I soon after his accession took Hatra. But we have no reliable historical information; what we have is a version of the widespread Scylla (Romaihī) story. There may be an echo of history in the name of the king Sāṭrūn; he must have been a Syrian with an original Parthian name (Sūrāk). The name Da‘īzan is an intrusion from another context (cf. Nöldeke, Gesch. d. Perser und Araber, p. 35). The version which places the taking of Hatra in the reign of Šāpūr II (cf. Firdawṣ: Tafsīr, makes the Arab prince Da‘īzan (in Firdawṣ: Tafsīr: Tafsīr) carry off a Persian princess; his daughter by her is the traitress (so in Firdawṣ). Here we find the better known Šāpūr II in this story in place of his earlier namesake and the treachery of the king’s daughter at Hatra excused to some extent because she is of Sāsānīd descent on her mother’s side. Firdawṣ further knows nothing of her execution, which al-Dinawarī inserts from another, apparently older, version of the story (cf. the article HATRA in Pauly-Wissowa, Realen. 4, vii, col. 2516 sqq.).
with native tradition or a non-Persian version. Tha'alilli calls the Roman emperor in question Constantine. His source, therefore, does not seem to have contained the correct name. Eustychius, whose synchronism between the Roman emperor and the Sassanids are wrong, puts the capture and death of Valerian (who appears here as an unnamed son of Gallienus, while in reality their relationships were the reverse) in the reign of Bahram II (Eutychius, ed. Cheikho, p. 113). That, according to al-Tabari, Valerian was besieged in Antioch by Šāh-pūr is a reminiscence of the taking of this city by the Persians under Sapor I (the year is not certain); indeed Antioch seems to have been taken twice: Pauly-Wissowa, op. cit., cols. 2327 and 2329). The name Cappadocia, which occurs several times in the Persian tradition (cf. Nödeke, op. cit., p. 32, note 2) is likewise an echo of the events of 258 A.D. and the following years, namely the capture of the Cappadocian capital Caesarea by Sapor I (c. 260). There is a wonderful story associated with the fall of Niissib. Šāh-pūr is said to have invested the town in the eleventh year of his reign, then to have raised the siege because his presence was required in Khorsān. Later he laid siege to the city a second time and succeeded in taking it because the walls split open by a miracle. The story is found in Tabari and more fully in Eutychius; the interruption of the siege and the splitting of the walls reflect events of the reign of Šāh-pūr II. According to Tha'alilli Šāh-pūr I also took Turus; there is also a historical basis for this in the taking of this city by one of Sapor's generals (c. 260 A.D., cf. Pauly-Wissowa, op. cit., col. 2331 supra).

City-Foundations: Miscellaneous. The oriental writers ascribe to Šāh-pūr I the foundation of the following cities: Shāh-baş-pūr (in Kūshkar), Djamāl-Šāh-pūr (in Ahwāz) near Shattar (with an absurd story that the king settled the Romans taken in Antioch here). Firdawsi's Šāh-pūrgrd is probably the same town; Hamza further mentions the towns of Bahš-pūr (in Fārs), Šāh-pūr Kūshāšt and Ballāgh Šāh-pūr which cannot be exactly located, and wrongly (they are foundations of Šāh-pūr II) Nešāhpūr (also attributed to Šāh-pūr I by Firdawsi) and Firdowsā-Šāh-pūr (an-Abār). Ibn Khallikan says that Šāh-pūr settled his prisoners of war in three cities: Djamāl-Šāh-pūr, Sābūr in Fārs (probably Hamza's Bahš-pūr) and Turas in Ahwāz (cf. also Tha'alilli, p. 494).

Some historians like Tabari and Dinawari, place the first appearance of Māni in the reign of Šāh-pūr I; but the catastrophe did not occur till the reign of a later king (Hormizd I or Bahram II). Firdawsi, who wrongly places the event in the reign of Šāh-pūr II, alone makes a continuous story of it: the painter Māni from Cīn appeared before Šāh-pūr as a prophet and the founder of a sect, but he was arrested by the Mōsēs and executed by the king's orders. Tha'alilli (p. 501) has a similar story: in the reign of Bahram I, Māni had a dispute with the chief mōbād, was worsted and flogged. According to Mas'ūdī (Margūji, ii. 164), Šāh-pūr I was a Manichean for a time; this can hardly be historically, perhaps we have had a reminiscence of the later king Kavāš and his inclination to Mazākān. Šāh-pūr I died, according to the Muslim tradition, after a reign of thirty years, after giving the usual exhortations to his son and successor Hormizd.

Šāh-pūr II, Hormizd, called Dhu'l-Akīf (because he had the shoulders of Arab prisoners dislocated or pierced), is the Sapor II of history (310–379 A.D.), throughout whose long reign wars were waged with Rome. Persian arms were not successful against Constantine and under Julian the Roman offensive threatened to be dangerous to the Sassanid empire. The death of the gifted emperor (363) was the reason that the treaty of peace which his successor Jovian made with Sapor was as advantageous for Persia as it was shaming for Rome. In the reign of the Emperor Valens, also the war with Persia continued; within this period falls the capture of Araxes of Armenia by Sapor and following this the intervention of Rome in favour of Pap, son and successor of Araxes. These wars, which were interrupted from time to time by negotiations, dragged on and had not yet brought about any important decisions when Sapor died in 379. For all details and references to original sources see the Pauly-Wissowa, op. cit., col. 2334 sqq. Here we are only concerned with the oriental traditions. It must be remembered that in Persian tradition, although on the whole it has kept distinct the figures of Šāh-pūr I and II, details originally referring to one have been transferred to the other. Incidents from the Julian story, which has of course nothing to do with Persian tradition, have penetrated some of the sources.

Youth and Arab wars: All sources agree that Šāh-pūr was not yet born when his father Hormizd II died; but in case his mother should give birth to a son, the throne was set aside for the latter, so that Šāh-pūr was born a king. All this must be legend; the older western sources suggest that Sapor II only ascended the throne as a young man (cf. Pauly-Wissowa, op. cit., col. 2334; Nödeke, Gesch. d. Perser, p. 51, note 3). Aškharâzân must also have reigned between Hormizd II and Sapor II.

During the time that Šāh-pūr's youth rendered him incapable of ruling in person, the kingdom was attacked on all sides (say the oriental sources) by enemies, particularly by the Arabs. Among the tribes mentioned are the 'Abd al-Kain, the inhabitants of Bahram and Kāşma (Tabari, Ibn Khallikan, the Ghassânids (al-Dinawari, who also mentions Bahram and Kāşma), and the Banū Iyâd (Mus'ūdī, Tha'alilli). The young king early gave an indication of his foresight by ordering a second bridge to be built beside the bridge over the Tigris at Ctesiphon, so that traffic between the two banks of the river could develop unhindered. When sixteen years of age (according to some fifteen), Šāh-pūr led an army against the Arabs. Here Firdawsi and al-Dinawari place the Hātra episode which belongs to the reign of Šāh-pūr I. The fairly full details of these Arab wars, probably in part at least, became incorporated in the old Persian tradition in the post-Achaemenid period. That the king dislocated or pierced the shoulders of the prisoners (in Eutychius, the captured kings) seems to be based on quite an early tradition: Hamza (ed. Gottwaldt, p. 51) gives the Persian equivalent of the epithet Dhu'l-Akīf as ḍhū yuḥ furnish (I) mūdā. On the whole the account of these wars is unhistorical. Šāh-pūr certainly never advanced so far as some writers say. He is said to have not only conquered Bahram and Yūsufa, but even to have reached Medina. The story of Šāh-pūr's encounter with ʿAmr b.
Tamim b. Murra in Bahrain (Masūdī, Murūǧī, ii. 176 sq.; a connected story in Thā'ālibī, ed. Zotenberg, p. 520 sq.) is an invention of Arab fancy. How far these stories reflect historical happenings, it is difficult to decide; nor can we say whether tradition has here kept Shāpūr II and I quite distinct [of the latter a war of destruction against the Kūda and the Banū Ḥalwān is reported, cf. Nöldeke, Gesch. d. Perser, p. 38. (The Kūda's here appear as allies of Ḥasan of Hatra)]. The Arabic verses quoted in Masūdī (Murūǧī, ii. 176 sq.) which are referred to Shāpūr II's campaign against the Banū Ḥalwān, are of course, of a much later date and seem to have had nothing at all to do with Shāpūr's history. If the other verses quoted here (ii. 178) really date from the time of 'Ali b. Abi Ṭālib, this would be the oldest Arab reference to these events. But all these stories must have some historical background; it is known that Shāpūr II had dealings with the Arabs; the Emperor Constantine negotiated in 338 with Arab tribes and urged them to conduct raids into Persian territory. Julian also had Saracen chiefs as allies in the war against Sapor II. That the Persian king took steps to protect his frontier against the Arabs is very probable (Nöldeke, op. cit., p. 57, note 1).

Shāpūr and the Romans. In the tradition the account of the Roman war is introduced by the well known motif of the king who visits an enemy country in disguise. This is found, for example, in the Greek Alexander romance (Psēdō-Callisthenes, ed. Müller, ii. 14 sq., iii. 19—22; cf. Malalas, ed. Bonn, p. 194, sq.); in Sasanian legend a similar story is told of Bahram Gūr. Firdawsi reports the story as follows: The astronomers prophesied a misfortune to Shāpūr; nevertheless he decided to risk entering the enemy land of Rūm in disguise. He appeared before the emperor as a Persian merchant, but was recognised by a Persian staying at the court, sewn up by the Emperor's orders in an ass's skin and put in prison. A young woman whose duty it was to keep the keys of his prison was herself of Persian descent and aided him to liberty by softening the ass's skin with hot milk. When a great feast was being celebrated and the imperial palace was empty, the two fled to Iran. On their way they stopped at the house of a gardener, who told the king, whom he did not know, that the Emperor of Rūm had invaded Persia and laid it waste in dreadful fashion in the absence of the legitimate king. Shāpūr then ordered the man to take his (Shāpūr's) signet-impression to the chief mobed. The latter saw that the king had returned. An army was soon collected with which the king attacked the Romans in the night, wrought great slaughter and took the emperor himself prisoner. The Romans found the Persian emperor were massacred everywhere. Shāpūr levied a heavy indemnity on the Emperor, but did not release him; on the contrary he had him mutilated and put into prison. The Persian king then carried fire and sword into Rūm, defeated the Emperor's brother and slew many Christians. The Romans then chose a certain Bazānūsh as Emperor; the latter sought for peace which Shāpūr granted on condition that the Roman Emperor rebuilt the destroyed Persian towns, paid a yearly tribute of 600,000 dinārs and surrendered Nisibis. This was done, but the people of Nisibis resisted Shāpūr as they would not serve a fire-worshipper. The king subdued them by force of arms. He then rewarded the young woman who had liberate him and the gardener; he sent to Ṣūm the body of the previous emperor who had died in prison. He settled the Roman prisoners-of-war in towns specially built for the purpose (Khurramābād, Pirūshāpūr, Kūnām-i Aṣrār).

This story is for the most part fictitious. The beginning (the prophecy of the astrologer) also forms the introduction to another story which develops differently, but is no doubt connected, and which is related in medieaval oriental sources of Shāpūr II b. Ardāšīr; the latter king is foretold that he is doomed to be unfortunate for some years. He therefore goes voluntarily into banishment (cf. P. Schwarz, Iran im Mittelalter, p. 544, note 6). We have already called attention to the occurrence of the motif of the unknown king, afterwards discovered. Shāpūr's flight with the young woman recalls the story of Ardāšīr's flight before Ardawān, which is already in the Ahrānāmā. It is quite in the style of Iranian story-telling that the Emperor of Rūm in his request for peace mentions incidents like Mīnūthīr's revenge for the Chaldean. It should further be observed that the representation of military events agrees in some respects better with the deeds of Shāpūr I; the capture of the emperor (which here appears as a kind of revenge for Shāpūr's imprisonment in Rūm) and his death without regaining his liberty, recall the historical facts of Sapor's war with Valerian. Even the name Bazānūsh occurs again although in somewhat different connection. The imposition of indemnities was also found in the story of Shāpūr I. On the other hand, as we saw above, the account of the (historically true) capture of Nisibis by Shāpūr I, has features which belong to the vain siege of this town by the historical Sapor II in 350 (fall of a part of the wall, withdrawal of the king as a result of an invasion of Persia by nomads). The following elements in Firdawsi's narrative may be considered historical: Shāpūr's hostility to the Christians (Sapor II began a great persecution of Christians in 339 A.D.), the ravaging by the Romans of the Persian kingdom (Julian plundered and burned a great part of it) (cf. Pauly-Wissowa, op. cit., col. 2347), thecession of Nisibis (by the peace of 363 ceded by Jovian to the Persians) and the dismantling of the Nisibenes for Persian rule (Pauly-Wissowa, op. cit., col. 2351).

The other sources (apart from the fact that Tābarī and Dinawardī also contain elements of the Julian romance with which we are not concerned here) differ mainly in the fact that they make the Emperor take Shāpūr with him sewn up in a skin on his campaign. At the siege of Dūndān-Shāpūr the king is released by Persian prisoners of war and taken into the town by the garrison. This causes the defeat and capture of the emperor who has to make good the damage done and is sent back mutilated to his kingdom. This version of the story is also found in the poem quoted by Mašūdī, Murūǧī, i. 185, echoes of the phraseology of which seem to be found in Thā'ālibī (cf. Thā'ālibī, p. 525; farātāmanakun Sahūr with Masūdī, op. cit.; farātāma 'l-Parāz, Thā'ālibī, p. 527; vakhrī maṭbāna kull nhāčun xapnāhā satiānān with Masūdī, op. cit.; xaj yughrīnīa min afādirsīn mā 'bāhārī min adīmkhānī).
p. 52, he lived in this city till his thirteenth year and then moved to Ctesiphon, a statement which does not agree with the story of his building the bridge while still young. The new foundations are: Busrurg-Shapur ("Ubarra"), Firdawsi-Shapur ("Ambar"), Iran-Khurra-Shapur, with which Suse is mentioned; he probably restored the latter town under the name Iran-Khurra-Shapur (cf. Noldke, Gesch. d. Pers., p. 58, note 1). Roman prisoners were settled there. Nishapur also was one of this king's foundations; Tabari also mentions a town which cannot be accurately identified with a fire-temple Sarab-Adharan. The rebuilding of Djundai-Shapur formed part of the reparations the Emperor had to make; besides in the stories of these facts, there are confusions between Shapur I and Shapur II (Noldke, cf. cit., p. 66, note 2). The king is said to have sent for an Indian physician and given him a dwelling in Susa; from him the people of Susa learned the art of healing, in which they afterwards excelled all other Persians. Haruni says finally that Achatbar (quite well known from Pahlavi literature) lived under Shapur II. There are no legends associated with Shapur's death.

Shapur III, the historical Sapor III (probably 383-387 A.D.). On the historical events of his reign, his relations with Armenia and Rome, see Paulus-Winsow, cf. cit., col. 3355. Oriental tradition deals chiefly with his accession and his death. Shapur III was a son of Shapur II. According to Firdawsi, the latter at the end of his reign handed on the government to his brother Ardashir, who had to bind himself to give it to the young Shapur when he came of age. This he did as promised. More in keeping with historical truth, Tabari says that Shapur III followed his predecessor Ardashir when the latter was overthrown by the nobles. Al-Dinawar quite wrongly makes Shapur III succeed Shapur II directly. Maxud knows of a war of Shapur III against the Banu Iyad and other Arab tribes. The death of this king is ascribed to the collapse of his tent, caused by a storm, (Firdawsi, The Khuthe) or by a plot of the nobles (Tabari); the latter is probably nearer the truth. That Eutychius makes this ending war on Julian is due to the fact that his synchronism between the Sassanids and the Roman Emperors are wrong.

Bibliography: See the article ASAIUS.

SHAPUR (1) Name of the river of the district of Shapur Khuras in Fars; also called Bigashwar (in Thovenot: Suite du Voyage de Lewant, Paris 1674, p. 295: Bouschaviir; p. 296: Bouchavir), and river of Tawwadji. It must be identical with the ancient Gransis, mentioned by Arrian, India, 39; Pliny. Nat. Hist., vi. 99. The lower course, the proper river of Tawwadji, is formed by the junction of two streams, the Shapur and the Dalak-Rud, rising both on the S.W. border-mountains of the Iran-plateau, which extend along the Persian Gulf. The upper course is called by the Arab geographers Nahr Ratin; this name is, very likely, found in Pliny, Nat. Hist., vii. 133, where Draconis (w/h. d. Ratine) must, however, mean the river down to its mouth. This statement must be due to another source than Tuba, on whose authority the Gransis was mentioned in vi. 99. In his Nasbat al-Kuhut, Mustawfi al-Kaswin seems to indicate, that the Ratin, whose source is, according to him as well as to al-Istakhri, in the Upper Humayyidjan (I斯塔khri: Khumayydidjan) district, is a tributary to the Shapur Rudi (Gibb Mem. Ser. xxix., ii. 217: "It is a great stream, and it flows into the Shapur river, its length, till it joins the Shapur river being 10 leagues"). By this way of putting things, he can but mean, that the river of Tawwadji originates from two different streams, one of which is the Ratin. This, then, must be the older name for either the Shapur or the Dalak-Rud. Al-Istakhri (ed. de Goeje, p. 120) represents these facts in the same manner; there is said, that the Ratin flows through the district of al-Ziriyun (with v. l.) before joining the Shapur.

The other rivers of the system are the Djirra (or Djirshik), which joins the Shapur on the left, below Khakht, and the Ikhshin. The name of the latter (it signifies "blue"); can have originated from the colouring property of its waters, mentioned by the medieval geographers. Djirshik is the older name of the Djurra river, although in the Nasbat Djirshik and Djirra are erroneously described as two different streams. The account which the latter work gives of the Djurra is for the most part copied from Ibn al-Balkhi's Framasa. This states (Gibb Mem. Ser., New Series, i. 151) that the Nahr Djirra, rising in the Masran-district, waters the lands of Musjin and Djirra, and part of Ghandidayn, after which it joins the Shapur. In addition, al-Istakhri mentions the bridge of Sabak, under which the river Djirshik flows before entering the rawad of Khura (Ibn al-Balkhi's Djirra; on the reading Khura in the text of al-Istakhri, cf. P. Schwarz: Iran im Mittelalter, p. 35, ann. 4); after Khura the stream passes into Irud, where it unites with the Ikshin. The Nasbat makes the Djirra join the Shapur and the Djirshik the Ikshin: as its author erroneously splits up the one river Djirshik-Djirra into two, his account is here worthless.

The Ikshin, according to al-Istakhri and Musafir, rises in the Dadeh-hills, and unites with the Shapur at al-Djunkan. The Nasbat calls it a great stream; now at day, it is identified with a little water course to the SW. of the lake of Kazerun. There appears, then, to be a difference as to the question, whether the Djirshik and the Ikshin first join each other, and then unite with the river of Tawwadji, or flow into that stream each apart. Concerning the Shapur itself, the Framasa (p. 152) says, that it rises in the mountain region (Kuhistan) of the Bighapur district, which it waters, as also Khait and Dih Malik. It flows in the sea (Persian Gulf) between Djanik and Mammadshah. This account is repeated in the Nasbat, which only adds: "its length is 9 leagues". In Framasa, p. 142, the Bighapur district is said to have its water from a great river, called Rudi Bighapur. Owing to rice-plantation being there, its water is unwholesome (wakalam a nasawar). A short description of the river in modern times is given in J. Morier's Second Journey through Persia... between the years 1810 and 1816, London 1818, p. 49: "a river which... having pierced into the plain of the Dakhistan, at length falls into the sea at Rohilla. It takes its source near the site of Shapur, and when it begins to flow is fresh. But when it reaches the mountains it passes through a salt soil, and then its waters... become brackish. A lesser stream of the same river branches off before it reaches the salt soil, and flows pure to the sea".
The mouth of the river is at a short distance to the North of Bishur, near the frontier of the district Armadjan. Opposite to it lies the island Khārīk, in the shipping-route from Basīm to India. The name Mündistan in the Persian geographers is connected by Tomasek ("Topographische Er-"luterung der Küstenfahrer Nearch" in S.B. Ak. Wien, cxxxi. 65) with the Dicxomontani in Pliny, Nat. Hist., vi. 99. (The edition of Jan-Mayhoff reads Dēxī montani, in two words). According to Pliny, the river (Græn) is navigable for small vessels. Now at day, the principal mouth presents difficulties to navigation because of its shallows: two minor mouths can be navigated up to some distance. On the present conditions, the delta, and the bitumen wells on the left bank of the river, S. of Dalaki, Tomasek, op. cit., may be compared.

In Shāpurī, there was on the Græn a royal residence, Taaska, 200 stadia from the sea. This must be the same as the medieval Tawwad (or Tawwar), from which place the Shāpur is named river of Tawwad. In early Muslim times it was an important trade-city, which also had a considerable textile industry: the stuffs named tawwadda were well-known. This town belonged to the district of Adashir Khāra (Ibn al-Balkhi, Fārsnāma, p. 114). During the viith/viith century, the place had already declined; in Mustawfi al- karwīnī’s time (viith/viith century) it was totally ruined. Its site can not exactly be determined; nowadays the coast-district of the Shāpur river is called Tawwadd. Le Strange (Gibb Mem. Ser. xxiii., ii. 115, an. 2) thinks, that the site of the town may be identified with the present Dih Kuhna, “the chief town of the (modern) Shābnākāra sub-district of the Dhashhtān District”.

On the other Shāpur (Shāwūr), a tributary of the Dīrīl-Rūd, comp. the article KĀXÜN (li. 833).

(2) Name of the ancient capital of the district Shāpur Khāra of Fars; according to Maγaddašī, it was also called Shahrastan; its older name is Bishūr (from Pahlawi With-Bishūwar). A naive etymology is found in the Nāmrāt, whose author, Mustawfi, says, that the word Bishūr is a contraction of bīna-i Shīpur, building of Shīpur Ibn al-Balkhi on the other hand states, that the first syllable of the original Bishūr (with a long i) may disappear by way of tawanīf.

Shāpur-Khāra, the area, watered by the system of the Shāpur-Rūd, the smallest of the five provinces of Fars, contained besides the town of Shāpur some other important localities, e. g. Kazerūn (q.v.), which was regarded as its chief town after Shīpur had fallen into ruins, moreover Nibandishān and Dīrūr.

The old town of Shāpur was situated on the Shāpur-Rūd, at the road from Shirzān to the sea, to the north of Kazerūn. Mustawfi gives its situation as long: 36° 15′, lat. 20°. Its climate belongs to the garmkīr, but its atmosphere was considered not to be healthy, because the territory of the city was shut up by the mountains from the northern side. The environs were fruitful: they produced, besides many kinds of fruits and flowers also silk; the mulberry-tree being frequent in that region. Honey and wax also came from its territory. The town was founded by the Sasanian king Shāpur I. It was one of the three cities, where he colonized his captives of war. It has been supposed, with much reason, that the king made use of the skill of these Roman captives in the construction of his buildings, and also in the execution of his famous reliefs, that have been found in the ruins. These reliefs relate to the campaigns of Shāpur against the Romans. Tree later kings, Bahram 2, Narsai and Khusraw II have also added each a relief of themselves.

These works of art, who are already described in detail by Morier, have also been noticed by the Oriental geographers of the Middle-ages: at least, they mention a great statue, standing in a cavern, which European travellers could identify. The Orientals have exaggerated a mythical history of the city from before the times of its Sasanian founder. It was, according to these traditions, originally built by Tahrirūs, at a time, when there existed in Fars no other town besides Išṭakhr. Later on, it was laid waste by Alexander, to be only renovated by Shāpur I. The name of Tahrirūs’s foundation had been ʿAlī (Ibn al-Balkhi, Fārsnāma, p. 63, 142).

The Muslims subdued Shāpur Khāra in 637, after the conquest of Tawwad and the battle of Rishahr. Bishūr is mentioned on the occasion of the disturbances which ensued at the beginning of the kalifate of ‘Uthmān b. ‘Affān; the inscription in Fars (25 = 645/646) against the Arabs seems to have been directed for some time from Bishūr by a brother of Shahrūk, the governor of Fars, who had fallen in the battle of Rishahr. After the submission of the rebels, the inhabitants of Bishūr once more broke the treaty; in consequence thereof it was reduced by Abu ʿAbdallāh al-Asbagh and ‘Uthmān b. Abī l-ʿĀs.

In the time of the geographer Muγaddasī (end of the ivith/vith century), the town of Shahrastān or Shāpur was already decaying, its outskirts being ruined; the environs however were well cultivated. He notices the four city-gates and the ditch, also the musījid al-qanī, outside of the city. Perhaps this may be the musījid-i gāmī mentioned by Ibn al-Balkhi, whose words seem to imply, that it still existed when he wrote (beginning of the viith/viith century). In the end of the Bayḍr rule, the Shābnākāra chieftain Abdul Saʿd b. Muhammad b. Mamāl destroyed Shāpur, but, as Ibn al-Balkhi remarks, in his time the (Sabūk) government tried to restore the damage. These endeavours may have had effect as regards the district as a whole, but the city of Shāpur never has been raised from its ruins. As Morier visited the site (1809), he found only a poor village, Darsī, in the neighbourhood of the remains. The opinion of this traveller, that the town may have existed till the vīith century of the Christian era, because its name occurs in a table of latitudes and longitudes in the Fīn- Akhbarī carries no weight, for such a table may have been composed from older sources.

On the other foundations of Shāpur I, which were called after his name, comp. the article on that king, in addition to which it may be remarked, that the town of Shāpur Khāra, according to the Fārsnāma (p. 63), was situated in Khūstān, near al-Asbagh.

Bibliography: (Besides the authorities quoted in the article): The articles Draṭīnūs and Graṇīs in von-Wissowa, Realis, 2 (v. 1668; v. 1813); Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 259—263, 267; Barber de Meynard, Dictionnaire de la Perse, p. 142 sq.;
him to Samarqand. Sultan Muhammad, who became lord of Khurāsān after the death of Shāh Rukh, allowed him to return to Yazd (853 = 1449–1450), where he died in 858 (1454). He was buried in the Shāhārafa' madrasa, which he had built in the village of Taft.

In 828 (1424/1425) he wrote the history of Timur under the title Zafar-Nāmah, in a vigorous style, on materials apparently taken from an unpublished work with the same title written by Nūsām al-Dīn Shamsī under Timur’s orders in 804–806 (1401–1403), of which there is a unique M.S. in the British Museum. This history was translated into French by Félix de la Croix (1722) and from French into English by J. Darby (1725). The text has been published without the preface in the Bibliotheca Indica (Calcutta, 1887–1888). He also composed under the taqāṣṣāūl of Shāhār a treatise on enigma, another on magic squares, a commentary on the fables of Bāhīr and various poems.


AL-SHĀ'RĀNĪ, a nisba by which several individuals are known; it is usually derived from shār’s hair and is applied to any one with a strong growth of hair or with long hair (cf. al-Samānī, Kitāb al-Anwār, G. M. S., fol. 334b, Wright, Arabic Grammar, i. 164); in the case of the best known bearer of the name, it is a nisba from a place like the form also found, indeed more frequently, AL-SHĀRĪ (which has however a different origin: Vollers, Z.D.M.G., 1890, p. 390) but came to be interpreted as above.

al-Mawāni (ideal Kurna, also ABū 'ABD-AL-RAHMAN from his son; his family still existed in modern times) ABūDALLAH 'ABD-AL-AZHAR (d. 907) B. 'Ali b. M. at-Tirmidh, MUSAYYIBI (d. 970) B. M. MAWLAYI B. 'ABD-ALLAH al- 'ADM (d. 1073) B. ZANGALDI B. TIMĪNĪ (d. 1132) B. AL-'ANJARĪ B. 'ABD-ALLAH AL-MIJĀMIRĀNĪ, a famous Sufī, born 807, lived in Cairo from his early youth and died there in 973 (other dates given are wrong). Since 1188 his favourite mosque beside which he is buried, has borne his name. He earned his living as a weaver. He belonged to the tarīqa founded by al-'Abbās al-Shāhī (d. 656: Brockelmann, G. A. L., ii. 449, no. 29, and the article al-Shahābī) and himself founded al-Tarīqa al-Shāhābiyya (cf. Lane, Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians, 1899, p. 353) but not mentioned in Kahle, Islam, vi., p. 154. Among his Sufī teachers the most important was al-Khwāsawī (d. 941), whose maqāṣīs he attended for ten years. A number of other teachers are mentioned by him in various works, e.g. in al-Fahār al-mawrūd, al-Dhawāhīr al-muṣārith wa l-Ṭir al-markhūm and in the Lajūf al- Mu'amun; a full list of the shāhīs whom he knew and whose lectures he had attended is given at the end of his Taḥfīṣ. Like many Sufīs he had to endure persecution but was successfully in overcoming all hostility.

His literary activity was mainly concerned with mysticism, but he also dealt with learning, generally Kuranic sciences, dogmatics, šīb, grammar, and medicine; further we may mention his Taḥfīṣ al-
Besides his intellectual importance, which must not however be over-estimated, he owes his far-reaching influence on the Muslim world to his extremely prolific pen, writing in an easily intelligible form, which has contributed to the popularity of his works. His books were already popular in his life-time and are still very highly esteemed as may be seen from their numerous reprints. In spite of his insistence to the contrary there is hardly any originality in them; in mysticism especially he simply repeats the ideas of Ibn al-'Arabi [p. v.]. No. 8, for example, is a synopsis of his al-Futuhat al-makkiya, printed in 1166. In passing with reference to passages from the Futuhat itself, No. 9 an explanation of the verses of the Futuhat, No. 10 a defence of Ibn al-'Arabi; he tells us for example in No. 2, that he has used the terms used by Ibn al-'Arabi and not those of other Sufis. Al-Sha'arani endeavoured to bring about a synthesis of Sufism and Fikih in his person and was therefore in no wise hostile to the Sharif. Several of his writings show this strikingly, notably, No. 7, 21, 28, 43–51, 55–58.


2) Abu Muhammad al-Fadl b. Muhammad b. al-Mu'ayyib b. Zuhair b. Yazīd b. Kārān b. Badrān (the Persian governor in Yaman in the time of Muhammad): a traditionist who travelled widely to collect traditions; he also studied with the Kūfa grammarians Ibn al-A'tā'ī (d. 231); Brockelmann, i. 116, No. 6); learned Kūfī reading with Khalaf (d. 229): Nöddke, Geschichte des Qorān 1), p. 291, No. 9; Ibn Sa'd, Tahābāt, vii.iii. 87; al-Sam'ānī, fol. 771, 30) and heard the lectures of 'Abram b. Hantul (d. 241; q. v.); he did not however obtain general recognition and died in 282. His epithet which he received from his habit of wearing his hair long, was transferred to his descendants, his son Abu Bake Muhammad al-Baihaqī and his sons Abu 'l-Hasan Ismail (d. 347) and Abu 'l-Hasan Muhammad al-Tūsī. Al-Sam'ānī, fol. 334b, 16–16 and 101b, 13–13.


4) Thirteen further individuals with the same nickname will be found with the following initials: Kābūl-al-Fīhirī, ed. Flügel, p. 71sq.; al-Sam'ānī, fol. 314b, 16–16; Pihrī, fol. 314 sq.; al-Sam'ānī, fol. 334b, 16–17. (cf. Ibn Sa'd, vii.iii. 51, 78); ibid. 26 sqq.; Massingham, Al-Hallaj, p. 835; ibid. p. 333; al-Sam'ānī, fol. 334b, 16–16; ibid. 43–43; (read 371 for 372); ibid. 46 sqq. (cf. Brockelmann, i. 334); al-Dājūn (cf. i. p. 1055), Na'farāt al-Unī, No. 298 (Calcutta 1859, p. 205; turkish
Constantinople 1720, p. 181); Ahkwart, Verzeichnis der arabischen Handschriften Berlin, s. v. al-Shara\'a.

(J. Schacht)

AL-SHARA\'A, from the Latin serra through the Spanish sierra, is the term applied by certain geographers of Muslim Spain to the mountains which stretch from the east to west in the centre of the Iberian Peninsula. The most definitive is given by Ibn Fadl Allah al-Umari. According to this author, the mountain range called al-Shar\'a stretches from the country behind Madrid Saltim (Medinaceli) to Córdoba. This term therefore describes the mountains now known under the names of Sierra de Guadarrama (Ar. Wâdî 'l-râmâ), Sierra de Gredos and Sierra de Gata in Spain and Sierra de Estrella in Portugal. In the time of al-Idrisi, however, it was applied only to the Sierra de Guadarrama, to the north of Madrid. The geographer Abu 'l-Falak, quoting Ibn Sa\'d, described the mountain system of the centre of al-Andalus under the name of Qasab al-Shara. According to him, it divided the peninsula into two well marked divisions, the north and the south.

Al-Idrisi, in his description of al-Andalus, gives the name of al-Shara to one of the twenty-six chains of this country, the twenty-second in his classification; this region, which embraced all the Sierra de Guadarrama, included the towns of Talavera de la Reina, Toledo, Madrid, al-Fahrum, Gualajara, Ucles and Huete.


SHARJA, name of three places in Arabia: 1. Sharja al-Kari, a port on the coast of the Yamun, where there were storehouses for the jarrah which was shipped to Aden; the native town of Sirad al-Din 'Abd al-Latif al-Zabidi, the famous grammarian who taught in Cairo and died in 802 A.H. (1399-1400).

2. A place near Mecca.

3. A port on the Pirate Coast, on the Persian Gulf between Omani and Bahrain.


(G. S. Colin)

SHARA\'A (a), opening, commentary; shar\'a means to enlarge, expand, open, thus to explain, comment upon; tahr\'a, dissection of bodies, anatomy.

1. The word shar\'a was taken as the title of the Shar\'a xciv. of the Kur\'an, as the first verse is: "Here we not opened, expanded your heart!." A legend has grown up round this verse. Mahommed, while still in the arms of his nurse, had his chest opened by two angels, who took out his heart and replaced it after washing it. This is why it is called the *opening of the heart*.

2. Shar\'a, commentary on a work which is being studied in different branches of knowledge; next come the glosses, tafsir. The greater part of the famous treatises or poems in Arabic and Persian literature have had commentaries written upon them; e.g. commentary on the Madhhab (Arabic polymath); on the Masnavi (Persian poetry); on the Mo\'a\'tir (law); on the Alfayy (grammar); on the Bibliography, phil\'a; on astronomical treatises; the great, middle, and little commentaries on Aristote by Avicenna. For the commentaries on the Kur\'an, a special word is used, tafsir [q.v.]. (CARRA\' DE VACA)

SHARA\'A (b), also SHAR\'A (originally, infinitely), the road to the watering place, the clear path to be followed, the path which the believer has to tread, the religion of Islam, as a technical term, the canon law of Islam, the totality of All\'ah\'s commandments (also used as the term for a single commandment = hukm, the plural shar\'ah = hukum, which is also used as identical with shar\'al); shar\'a, which was also used for custom and later became obsolete, is synonymous. Shar\'a is also used as a technical term for the Prophet as the preacher of the shar\'a, but it is frequently it is applied to All\'ah as the law-giver, shar\'a, what is laid down in the shar\'a. Anything connected with the canon law, or anything in keeping with it, or legal is called shar\'a. Shar\'a is also used in opposition to hadith ("purely sensible"); the former means the outward perceptible actions, which come under the cognizance of the law; the latter, all those in which this is not the case and so they have no significance in the shar\'a (offence and acceptances are, for example, in concluding a bargain, shar\'a, in other circumstances hadith). Similarly shar\'a and hukum are in contrast to hadith, the actual relations, from which those created by the law may be divergent.

The technical use goes back to some passages in the Kur\'an, xlv. 17 (of the last Meccan period) on the dialogue of Nuh\'le-Schwell, Geschichten der Qura\'ams, i. 58, n., and Grävner, Mohammed, i. 24 sqv., where we gave the name of shar\'a (a path to be followed) in religion; follow it and not the wishes of those who have no knowledge; ali\' (the same period, perhaps somewhat later): "To you be hath prescribed the religion (shar\'a), which," etc.; ibid. 20: s. gods, who have prescribed a religion for them (shar\'a\'), which All\'ah hath not approved"; v. 52 (Medina, perhaps of the first Medina period): "To every one (people) of you, we have given a hukum (a path to be followed) and a min\'a\'\'ah (a clear path)." Here shar\'a and hukum are not yet technical terms.

An old definition of shar\'a is given by Tabari on Kur\'an, xlv. 17: the shar\'a comprises the law of inheritance (f\'ar\'\'d), the hud\'d-punishments, commandments and prohibitions. In the later system shar\'a and hukum are considered All\'ah\'s commandments relating to the activities of man, of which those that relate to ethics are taken out and classified together as hadith (cf. ADAM, ALEKHEH). Fik\'h (along with the sciences of tafsir and hadith and the ancillary sciences) is the science of the shar\'a or the shar\'a\' (cf. FIKH) and can sometimes be used as synonymous with it, and the wa\'i\' al-fik\'h are also called wa\'i\' al-shar\'a. According to the orthodox view, the shar\'a is the basis (wasara\') for the judgment of actions as good or bad, which accordingly can only come from All\'ah, while according to the Mu\'a\'tia\' [q.v.], it only confirms the verdict of the intelligence which has preceded it.
for him than edifying literature. But it is not everyone who is able himself to ascertain from the șfih books with sufficient technical knowledge how the law affects particular cases; the laity rather require instruction from experts. This is done through fâzâda’s (legal opinions) and a scholar who gives fatwa’s is therefore called mufti.

Allâh’s law is not to be completely grasped by the intelligence, it is șa’bubî, i.e. man has to accept it without criticism, with its contradictions and its incomprehensible decrees, as wisdom into which it is impossible to enquire. We must not look in it for causes in our sense, nor for principles; it is based on the will of Allâh which is bound by no principles, therefore evasions are considered as admissible use of means put at our disposal by Allâh himself. Muslim law which has come into being in the course of time through the interworking of many factors, which can hardly be exactly appreciated (cf. Bergström, Islam, xiv. 70, nqq.), has always been presented to its followers as something elevated, high above human wisdom, and with justice, in so far as human logic or systematic has little share in it. A modest enquiry into the meaning of the divine laws so far as Allâh himself has indicated the path of enquiry is also not prohibited. There is therefore frequent reference to the deeper meaning and suitability (bi‘ma) of a law. But one must always guard against placing too much stress on such theoretical considerations.

For this very reason the šar’âa is not “law” in the modern sense of the word any more than it is on account of its subject matter. It comprises as an infallible doctrine of ethics the whole religious, political, social, domestic and private life of those who profess Islam, to the fullest extent without limitation and that of the tolerated members of other faiths as far as their activities are not inimical to Islam. Only one who has attained years of discretion (î’tifâd) and is in full possession of his mental powers (âshir) is bound to obey the ritual law (mutallâf). The prescriptions of the šar’âa may be classified under two main groups according to their subject: (1) Regulations relating to worship and ritual duties; (2) Regulations of a juridical and political nature. The first of these, similar, from the Muslim point of view (although it of course felt that the former, the so-called șhîâ‘, are more closely connected with Allâh), and this is also true of the numerous regulations scattered everywhere through the șfih books regarding the most varied matters, which have hardly been brought under the heads of the two main groups, e.g. permitted and forbidden musical instruments, the use of gold and silver vessels, the relations of the sexes, racing and shooting for wagers, the copying of living things, clothing and ornaments for men and women, etc. The fundamental tendency in the growth of the šar’âa was the religious evaluation of all affairs of life and legal considerations were only secondary (cf. Bergström, i.e.). A systematic division of the šar’âa was never reached. The Sunna sometimes classified it quite formally into șhâbūt (obligations regarding worship), mâ‘âmulât (civil and legal matters) and șu‘âbî (punishments), without any special stress being laid on this. We shall more systematically worked out among the Shî‘a Twelve Imâms an equally formal division and one not logically carried through to its con-

THE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF ISLAM, IV.
A collection into ḥadīth, 'ubūd (legal matters affecting two parties), ḥaḍār (legal matters affecting one party), ḥādhim (the remaining laws).

Among the early generations of Muslims, no unanimity prevailed as to what were the main duties of Muslims. Muhammad himself had laid special weight on the ṣalāt (ritual worship), suḥūk (charity), and ṣawm (fasting). Many further regarded participation in the ḥijāb (war for the faith) as one of the first duties of a Muslim, a view still held among the Khādijis. The Mahdi Muhammad Ahmad also adopted the ḥijāb as one of the main duties as revised by him (cf. Islam, xiv. 285). [The Shi'a regard recognition of the imāmat as one of the main duties. But according to the view that has come to prevail among the Sunnis, Islam is based on five pillars (asrūn, sg. ruh): ḥaḍār (the profession of faith), ṣalāt, suḥūk, ṣawm (fasting in the month of Kūmādān). The profession of faith is not dealt with in the Fīsh books. Questions connected with the creed were so numerous that the teaching of the first pillar soon became a special branch of study, the science of kalām. The other four arūn are sometimes classed together with ṣaddā (ritual purification) as the five 'sūrah. In the traditional arrangement of the Fīsh books, which is already the basis of the oldest books that have survived to us, but regarding whose origin, which must be earlier than the formation of the modern madhhis and probably belong to the second century, nothing is definitely known, the first five chapters are always devoted to these five 'sūrah, usually followed by the following subjects in succession: contracts, inheritance, marriage and family law, criminal law, war against unbelievers and attitude to unbelievers generally, laws regarding food, sacrifices and killing of animals, oaths and vows, judicial procedure and evidences, liberation of slaves.

All the prescriptions of the Fīsh are not to be taken as absolute commands or prohibitions. In many cases it is regarded, from the religious point of view, only as desirable or undesirable to do or permit something. Finally the law also regulates actions which it neither recommends nor condemns, but regards with indifference. In keeping with this, the following five legal categories (ahkām al-khamsa) are distinguished: (1) "duty" (fard), or "necessary" (wajib; cf. below), i.e. prescribed actions, the performance of which is obligatory, whose performance is rewarded and omission punished; of the further divisions of fard (wajib), the most important is that into fard 'ain and fard kifay (cf. Fard kifay), a similar division being made in the following category; (2) meritorious (maṣūba) (an action recommended, wajib ' ordained custom); (3) sunna in this meaning is not to be confused with the sunna of the Prophet, one of the maṣūba, although these two senses are connected; sometimes, however, the meaning of sunna as quality of an action did not remain un influenced by the other one; maṣūba "desirable", naft or maṣūba "voluntary" meritorious action; the performance of such is called ( ṣawlīma); i.e. actions the neglect of which is not punished, but the performance of which is rewarded; (3) permitted or indifferent (mūhā, rarely ṣawlī; cf. below), i.e. actions the performance or neglect of which the law leaves quite open and for which either reward or punishment is to be expected; (4) reprehensible (makrūh), i.e. actions which although not punish-
regard to persons; but they also showed a rabbinical turn for dialectic in continual new deductions and in stating cases. Thus a more learned body developed the school out of the council of the first Caliphs. It was only after many fruitless attempts to regain power that the pious became resigned and concluded a kind of truce with the temporal powers, a truce which is not laid down in any document, the terms of which are nowhere expressly formulated, but which was observed by both sides under the pressure of circumstances; they obeyed in practice, retaining full liberty to use theoretically, and thus we find everywhere learned men about the "present age" and warnings against "the princes of this world". The latter in their turn recognised the law in theory and did not claim for themselves the right of legislation in the field of Shāfī'ī, but when they thought fit, put the latter practically out of action by regulation in a contrary sense (fālihāt; cf. below). This did not prevent them when they wished to be considered particularly pious, from sometimes—usually at some one else's expense—enforcing one or another regulation of the Shāfī'ī, especially penal laws, but without themselves fulfilling the demands of the Shāfī'ī or being able to do so. One must not imagine too sharp a line drawn between the influence of the schools and the power of the state. This is particularly evident in the office of jāhār, the religious judge who is at the same time a state official (cf. e.g. Amedros, J. A. S., 1909, p. 1138; 1910, p. 761; 1914, p. 635; 1913, p. 821; Bister, "I. D. M.C. G., 1916, p. 395; Margoliouth, J. A. E. S., 1910, p. 307). Finally there was only left to him public worship, the law of marriage, family and inheritance, vows, in part also pious foundations (huqūq), all fields which in the popular mind are more or less closely connected with religion, and in which the Shāfī'ī always prevailed. So far as circumstances permitted, sins in the proper sense did not so much come under his consideration; as for example, invalidity of contracts, yet the religious character of the separate sections of the Shāfī'ī was already emphasised from the first (cf. Bergsträsser, Islam, etc., cit.). In the field of commercial law, practice therefore went its course unencumbered; only the Shāfī'ī never really prevailed. Constitutional and criminal law, law relating to war and taxation and all the more important suits regarding property, were more or more appropriated by the temporal power and cases were settled by a mixture of arbitrariness, local custom (dālā; cf. below) and a feeling of equity, and latterly also according to laws on the European model. Thus everywhere in Islam, quite independent of western influence, a twofold legal practice has grown up, which may be called the religious and the temporal. It is true that with the coming of the Ottomans a new wave of appreciation of the Shāfī'ī even in practice sets in, which found expression, for example, in the office of Shāhīd al-ālim [q.v.] and ultimately in the codification of the madhhab [q.v.]; but even here we do not have an actual enforcement of the Shāfī'ī according to the Shāfī'ī even the madhhab is illegal and the temporal jurisdiction continued to exist in this case also. This period is not only long past (cf. the words quoted above on Turkish modernism), but an attempt is being made to drive the Shāfī'ī entirely out of public life even out of the spheres reserved to it hitherto. European codes have been bodily adopted (cf. the articles in the Oriente Moderno and in the Revue du Monde Musulman).

Of the impossibility of enforcing the Shāfī'ī under prevailing conditions the Shāfī'ī themselves were quite aware under the pressure of the facts. Even their truce with the temporal power was based on a recognition of this. To brand almost all Muslims as sinners or heretics, because they had continually to break the law, if they were not prepared to withdraw from the world entirely, was not feasible; on the contrary, these things had rather to be taken as arranged and even wished by Allāh. Thus the Shāfī'ī was rendered virtually powerless in so far as it could not be enforced in practice; the way was even pointed out to evade its rules; appeal was made to the principle that necessity breaks the laws; it was emphasised that one does not become an infidel by breaking the law, but only by doubting its eternal validity. The conviction that the Muslim community would steadily become corrupted till the coming of the Mahdi and that the breach of Allāh's commands, which had been deduced in the course of development, would still increase, were expressed in traditions which were invented and even put in the mouth of the Prophet as prophecies; these conditions were thus sanctioned as a fulfilment of his prophecy. To sum up, the law in the convinced opinion of the Shāfī'ī themselves is intended only for the ideal community of the early decades of Islam and for the time of the Mahdi; this was a confession of the impotence of the pious in face of the circumstances of the age. The Shāfī'ī, essentially academic in character, hes at the same time always been a considerable educational force and is still ardently studied; in spite of al-Ghazālī's advice to the contrary, it is still regarded in wide circles of Islam as the only subject of true learning. But as it was held up as an unattainable ideal and became the doctrine of the infallibility of the ʿulamā' together with the conviction of cessation of the ʿighāthā forbade any divergence from what had been formally customary, it has become quite rigid: the jurists are opponents of all progress; even yet many prescriptions are still considered which only referred to the early Arabis and can have no longer any practical significance even for the most orthodox Muslim of to-day.

The heads of the law which are of practical importance for the Muslim (not regarding the later developments in Turkey) have already been mentioned; the following notes are now added and it should always be remembered that there may be considerable differences in detail in different periods and countries and that strictness and slackness in following the prescriptions of the Shāfī'ī has nothing to do with the degree of intolerance. Even in ritual and the religious duties in the narrower sense, which mean most to Muslims, ignorance and gross neglect is never general, but nevertheless throughout the whole Muslim world there is perceptible a striving to perform some at least of the main obligations as closely as possible. The usages especially, by which Muslims are externally distinguished from members of other creeds, are in general very closely observed and considered very important even if they are not quite in accordance with the letter of the law, while, on the other hand, many religious obligations imperative
in theory are generally quite neglected. In the law relating to marriage, families and inheritance, which usually can be quite closely followed in practice, we have already the limitations enforced by 'aḍa [q. v.] or 'urf, the local customary law that has existed from time immemorial in the different Muslim lands. The other parts of the law have no practical significance although everywhere and in every period we find concessions, pious men who endeavour to take account as far as possible of the teaching of the shari'a even in commercial affairs; but here the 'aḍa everywhere outweighs the rules of the shari'a, although according to the fiqh books the former only has binding force in cases where the law definitely refers to it. But this low estimation is not quite in keeping with the position which the 'aḍa had in the history of the shari'a. Muhammad himself allowed the Arab 'aḍa's to remain, so long as no uniform regulation was necessary or if the 'aḍa didn't conflict with his principles. He only laid down a few rules, and the 'aḍa was to be in no wise despised, although of course he did not lay down this as a principle. Islam then married the Arab 'aḍa's into foreign lands and even foreign 'aḍa's were at first partially recognised to a far-reaching extent; later this doctrine was given up in theory, although the 'aḍa always retained great influence, as the fiqh's have continually lamented; even the recognition of the 'aḍa as the fifth of the equal al-fikr was rejected. But public opinion knows only the 'aḍa; even the obligations of the law, which are actually observed, are observed simply because they belong to use and wont, and in the Dutch East Indies, for example (apart from the theologians proper), the 'aḍa is recognised among authoritarian Muslim circles as being even in theory equal in every way to the shari'a.

The position of the ḍiynūd [q. v.] with regard to the shari'a is similar to that of the 'aḍa's. The word is sometimes used in the sense of 'aḍa; generally, however, it is applied to the (in part based on the 'aḍa) regulations laid down by temporal princes of Islam; in this way ḍiynūd is the opposite of shari'a. The best known are the Kohnānī's of the Ottoman Sultan (cf. Kohnānī, Murād al-Ṣalāṭīn al-Ṣāliḥ, ed., Beirut, 1906, 163, 165, 1126), the Diyarbakır's, the Kohnānī's of the Sultan (cf. Kohnānī, Murād al-Ṣalāṭīn al-Ṣāliḥ, ed., Beirut, 1906, 163, 165, 1126).

The collection of ḍiynūd's from the Fikhi literature along with other sources for 'aḍa and ḍiynūd are important for ascertaining the actual practice; from the questions of those who seek ḍiynūd's we see in what parts of the law the people of a country are most interested, what heresies and abuses are most prevalent and what conditions arouse misgivings regarding their legality among pious laymen. At the same time the ḍiynūd (stratagem) literature has to be considered, which describes evasions of the law (cf. above) and deals fully with the actual practice; finally the documents, original documents as well as collections of forms and precedents (Sharī'a books, cf. Sharī'a) because in them more notice is taken than elsewhere of actual practice.


(Joseph Schacht)

SHARĪ'A (SHARĪ'A) (plur. aṣhāf, aṣhāra' [aṣhāf], "nobles, exalted", the root of which expresses the idea of elevation and prominence, means primarily a free- man, who can claim a distinguished position because of his descent from illustrious ancestors (cf. Lit. Ar., xi. 70 sqq.). It is of course assumed here that the meritorious qualities of the fathers are transmitted to their descendants. The possession of several illustrious ancestors is the requisite condition for a aṣhāf (also ḍarāb) ḍakīma, a "solid" nobility (Goldschmidt, M. Stutt. Stand., Halle a. S., 1808—1809, i. 41 sqq.; Lamennis, Le Droit de l'Islam, Rome 1914, p. 289 sqq.). Although in Islam the doctrine - based on Kurān xlix, 13, Verily the noblest among you in the eyes of God is he that fears God most - of the equality of all Arabs and ultimately of all believers grew up (Goldschmidt, op. cit., i. 50 sqq., 69 sqq.), it never quite displaced the old reverence for a distinguished genealogy.

The aṣhāf were the heads of the prominent families, to whom were entrusted the administration of the affairs of the tribe or alliance, cf. Ibn Hibāni, Sūr, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 237 f.; 295, 17; al-Ṭabarî, Aḥkār al-Nawār wa l-Mudāf, ed. Leiden, i. 1110; the Aṣhāf of al-Yūn, ibid., i. 2017; the Aṣhāf of Aḥkār, ibid., ii. 541, 17; the Aṣhāf in Kūf, ibid., ii. 631 sqq. passim; the Aṣhāf of Kūrāzān, ibid., iii. 714; Aṣhāf al-ʿAlām, al-Yaḥṣūb, ed. Houtsmas, ii. 176. The aṣhāf regarded themselves as the aristocrats (aṣhāf al-ʿAṣfīf) with whom were contrasted the rude and unlettered masses (ʿarāfī, ruṣafī, ḍakhītsī) (al-Ṭabarî, ii. 631, 23). Aṣhāf also means a person of prominence in contrast to one of low social status (aṣhāf, muʿāṣir, Rukhāni, Bad al-Wahy, b. 6, al-Madīn, b. 11, 12). In this sense the word is frequently found in the older literature of Islam, e.g. in the very title of al-Baludjari's history, Ansār al-Aṣhāf and in chapter-headings, for example in Ibn Kūtayba, Aṣf al-Ṣalāḥ wa al-Aṣhāf (Uṣūl al-ʿAṣf), Cairo 1343, p. 332, in Ibn Aḥb Rabbī (al-ʿAlā, al-Ṣalāḥ, Hilāl, 1293, i. 29; Marājī, al-ʿAṣf, Aṣhāf al-Kutab al-Nāṣir, ii. 311; Novi, b. 406; muḥammad musa wa al-ʿAṣf) and in the Thulūt (Sīnā bi al-Aṣhāf, Lūfīt al-Mudāf, ed. de Jong, Leiden 1867, p. 77); cf. also L. Massing, La Faison d'al-Ḥallāf, Paris 1922, i. 830, note 6.

In Islam under the influence of ḍaḥāna's view and the increasing veneration for the Prophet, membership of the house of Muḥammad became a mark of special distinction. The expression Abī
This special position of the Banū Ḥāshim, among whom the Ṭālibīs are already celebrated by al-
Kūnaytir as ṣafarāwī and ṣāḥib (cf. al-Ṭāhir, text, p. 19, L. 29, p. 56, L. 80), led in the later 'Abbadid period (about the eighteenth century) to a limitation of the title of honor al-ṣafarāwī, which is also said to have been a ḍābah of 'Abbās ibn Ḥādī al-
Ṭābirī, al-Riḍāfī al-ḥāṣibī (Cairo, 1327, ii. 155, 18) to the descendants of 'Abbās and Abū Ṭalib.
Al-Tābirī (ii. 155, a) also mentions the ṣafarāwī as a special group alongside of the Banū Ḥāshim.

In al-Muwāridi (al-Ṭāhir al-nuṣrāfī, ed. Enger, Bonn 1853, p. 157, y) the ṣafarāwī are divided into Ṣafarāwīyūn and 'Abbāṣānūn. From the literary history of the second half of the eleventh century we know of the two brothers al-Sharif al-Riḍā and al-Sharif al-Murtada (cf. Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 85). According to al-Suyūṭī, Rīs. al-Sulṭān al-Zainabīya, f. 90 eq. (= al-Sabbāh, p. 112 eq.), the name al-
Ṣafarāwī was used in the earlier period (al-qadīr al-
ʿawāfī) of all who belonged to the Abī Ṭalib, whether a Ḥāṣim, Ḥāṣib or Ṣafarāwī, i.e. a descendant of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanāfīya or of another of 'Abbās’s sons, or a Djiḍī, Ayīl or Ab-
bāṣī. He points out that in the chronicle of al-
Dhahabī (cf. x), we often meet with titles like al-
Ṣafarāwī, Abī Ḥaṣib al-Sharīf, Abī Ayīl, al-
Ṣafarāwī, Djiḍī, al-Ṣafarāwī, al-Ṣafarāwī, which however proves very little for the older period. The Fāṭimids however, as he observes, restricted the name al-
Ṣafarāwī to the descendants of al-Ḥasan and al-
Ḥusayn and this had remained the custom in Egypt down to his time. Although this does not seem quite to agree with the very brief note that he quotes from the Kākūl al-Ṣafarāwī of Ibn Ḥadīr (al-Ṣafarāwī), according to which abṣafarāwī was used in Baghda and is a ḍābah of every Ḥāṣib and in Egypt of every Alawī, we may assume that the word al-
Ṣafarāwī in the strict sense was at that time applied only to a Ḥāṣim or Ḥāṣib. For, as al-Suyūṭī notes in another connection (p. 65b, al-Sabbāh, p. 150 eq., similarly Ibn Ḥadīr al-Haitamī, al-
Fāṭiḥi, al-ḥāṣibīyya, p. 142 eq.), a waṣf or a testamentary deposition in favour of the ṣafarāwī is only awarded to the descendants of al-Ḥasan and al-
Ḥusayn for such depositions are decided by local usage (ʿurf) and according to the usage in Egypt, dating from the Fāṭimid period, this term was applied only to the Ḥāsims and Ḥusaynids. In conclusion al-Suyūṭī observes that according to the linguistic usage of Egypt the noble blood (ṣafarāwī) was divided into different classes, namely al-
Ṣafarāwīs which included the whole of the Abī Ṭalib, another which contained only the Ḥāṣib, i.e. the descendants of 'Abbās which included the Zainabids, the descendants of Zainab bint 'Abbās and also all sons of 'Abbās’s daughters, and finally a still smaller class the ṣafarāwī al-misbaḥ which only admitted the descendants of al-Ḥasan and al-
Ḥusayn. Among the historians the title ṣafarāwī is first used for the 'Alids in the period of the domination of the 'Abbadid empire, when the 'Alids were re-
belling everywhere and attaining power in Tabaristan and Arabia (Snouck Hurgronje-Mekka, i. 56 eq.).

The case of al-sawādī "lord" is similar to that of ṣafarāwī. Al-sawādī means the master in contrast to the slave (cf. e.g. al-Bukhārī, al-Ṭāhir, b. 1, etc.; i. al-
Mirmidhī, al-Bīrū, b. 53), and the husband as opposed to the wife (e.g. Kūrān, xii. 25). Al-sawādī was also the usual name for the head of a tribe or clan (cf. Kūrān xxxii. 67; Ibn Ḥāshim, p.
295. 157, whose authority was based mainly on personal qualities like discretion (ilm), liberality and command of languages. Ibn Kutanab, in his Kitab al-Abhur, I. 223 ascribed G. Jacob's, Altnachral, 2. ed., Berlin 1857, p. 223 sqq.; Lammens, Le Bureau de l'Islam, p. 206 sqq. Certain physical qualities are also said to mark a man as a sayyid (Ibn Kutanab, loc. cit.; Mez, Die Renaissance des Islam, p. 144). The Khurān praises the prophet Yahyā as a sayyid (ill. 34). Sayyid may have become particularly used as a title for "Alī and Tālibids at about the same time as sharīf. This development was probably not unaffected by traditions which describe al-Husayn and al-Husayn's parent as sayyids. The Prophet is recorded to have said of al-Husayn, "this my son is a sayyid and perhaps Allāh will bring about reconciliation between the two parties of Muslims through him" (al-Bukhārī, al-Ṭabarī, b. 20, No. 2, Fadl al-Sabāha, b. 23; al-Tirmidhī, Manaqib al-Hanāfī, b. 30). Al-Husayn appears in the Hadīth as Sayyid Sabāha al-Ūlama, "lord of young men among the inhabitants of Paradise" (al-Nabābī, p. 64, sqq.) and along with his brother he is celebrated as Sayyid Sabāha etc. "the two lords of the young men" etc. (al-Tirmidhī, op. cit.; al-Nasāī, Khidrī's Amīr al-Muwāminin, 'Ali b. Abī Talib, Cairo 1908, p. 24, 26), while their mother Fātimah is lauded by the Prophet as "mistress of the women of my (this) community" or "mistress of the women of the world", "mistress of the women of the dwellers in Paradise" (Sayyidat Nāīr al-Insāniyya, and Muhākima 'l-Umama, S. A. al-Isfahānī, al-Sayyidat, S. A. al-Ūlama, cf. Ibn Sa'd, Tabaqāt, III. 7, 7 sqq.; al-Bukhārī, Fadl al-Sabāha, b. 29; al-Nasāī, op. cit., II. 3 sq.; al-Nabābī, p. 54, sqq.). The Prophet is said to have called "Ali Sayyid al-Ārāb and Sayyid al-ムシフィン and to have once said to him: "Thou art a sayyid in this world and a sayyid in the next" (Maḥbūb al-Dīn al-Tabarī, op. cit., II. 277). In a verse in al-Bukhārī, op. cit., p. 96, 97, "Ali is described as sayyid al-nabī, but as a rule such expressions are only applied to the Prophet (Sayyidat Wulad Adam, Ibn Sa'd, op. cit., II. 1, and 3; Sayyid al-Ḍiyār, Ibn 'Abd al-Rabbī, op. cit., II. 246, 17). In the beginning the term sayyid may have been first applied to those who possessed some authority in their own sphere. In the genealogical work of the Hanāfī Ibn Maḥmūd, 'Umdat al-Ṭalibat fī Anbāb Al-Ārāb, individual 'Alīs are often described as sayyids (Boukhoury edition 1318, 56: p. 51, 56, 57, 58, 59, 64, 70, 76, 81, 96, 97, 98, 103, 104, 112, 117, 118, 127, 137, 142, 149 sqq.). Al-Qabābālī, Ẓāhir al-Islām, MS. Leyden, 1721, II. 65a gives this title to the Twelve Imāms 'Ali b. Maḥmūd. We also find this combination as al-Sayyid al-Sharf or vice versa (al-Numayr, Nāṣir al-ʿArāb, Cairo 1342, II. p. 777, 78); al-Khaṭṭār, al-ʿUṣūl al-Istiqāf, l. Gibb Mem. Ser., iii. 4, Leyden—London 1913, p. 324, 327). The word sayyid also came to be applied to Sufi authorities, saints and notable theologians, e. g. al-Sādi al-Šīfī, al-Sādi al-Ārāb (al-Sharfī, Tabaqāt al-Khayrāt, Cairo 1321, II. p. 2, 3, 195, 31; al-Sādi al-ʿArāb (Ibn Ḥadījr al-Haṭṭāmī, al-Sādi al-ʿArāb, l. p. 124, sqq. u. s.). The term sayyid or šīfī (especially in al-Shafi, Ẓabākh al-Anwar fī Tabaqāt al-ʿArāb, Cairo 1315), became very popular for persons regarded as holy, and is the expression used by the slave in addressing his master.
The green turban which became usual as a mark of the aṣḥāf, especially in Egypt, owes its origin to an edict of Sulṭān al-Aṣhāf Shāh-bān (1647–78 = 1063–1076) who ordered in 1773 (1371/1372) that the aṣḥāf should wear a green badge (ṣulṭān) fastened to their turbans to distinguish them from other people and as a honour for their rank (Ibn ʿUyayn, Ṣalāṭīn al-Ṣubḥ, Cairo 1311, l. 237). “Ali Dede, Muḥammad al-Aṣhāf al-Muḥāsin ar-Riṣāqa, Bülkic 1300, p. 85; Docy, Dict. des noms des sultans chez les Arabes, Amsterdam 1845, p. 308; Men, op. cit., p. 59). This edict which is commemorated by the poet of the time recalls that of al-Maʿmūn which replaced in Rāmnān 1001 (507) the black colour of his house by green, when he designated the Ḥusainī “Ali b. Mūsā al-Riḍā as his successor (al-Tahārī, II. 1012 sq.). The Ḥasanī Muhammad b. Ujjār al-Kattānī in his treatise on the turbans (al-ʿĀṣaṣa wa-miṣrīf at-shāqīm nasiḥat al-sulṭān, Damascus 1542, p. 97 sq.) supposes that the descendants of the ʿĀṣaṣa and Fītmān bequeathed retained green as their colour, but confined themselves in practice to wearing a piece of green material on the turban. This, he thinks, fell into disuse in time, until Sulṭān Shāh-bān revived it by his edict. According to the work Durr al-sulṭān which is quoted by al-Kattānī, the wearing of an entirely green turban dates from an edict of the Fatih of Egypt al-Sayyid Muḥammad al-Shārī (cf. in al-Ḥāfiz, Abūl-ʿUwwāl, Ṣulṭān al-ʿUqūs, fī muṣn wa ar-ṣūd al-sulṭān, Cairo 1311, p. 164 infra) of the year 1004 (1596). When he had the khamsa for the Khan el-Atrash exhibited, he ordered the aṣḥāf to come before him, every wearing a green turban. Al-Sayyid al-Muṣṭafī observes that the wearing of this badge is a permissible innovation (khudn, nushkha) which no one, whether a šarīf or not a šarīf can be prevented from following, if he wishes to do so, and cannot be forced upon any one who wishes to omit it, as it cannot be deduced from the law. At most it can be said that the badge was introduced as a distinction for the aṣḥāf, it is therefore equally permissible to limit it to the Ḥasanīs and Ḥusainīs or to allow it to the Zainibāys also and to the wider circle of the remaining Aṣla and Ṭilībās. An endeavour is made to connect this custom with Korān xxvii. 59 in which some scholars see a suggestion that learned men should be distinguished by their dress, for example, by wearing long sleeves or by the winding of the μuḥāshā, so that they may be really recognised and honoured for the sake of learning (al-Sayyīf, p. 56-58, complete in al-Sulṭān, p. 183 sq., abbreviated in Ibn Ḥadīr al-Ḥalīmī, at-Ṭarāfī, al-ṣulṭānīya, p. 124 and al-Nabātī, p. 41 sq.). With regard to the Korānic verse above mentioned, it should, according to al-Sulṭān (p. 101), be held that the wearing of the green badge or green turban is recommended for the aṣḥāf, and blameworthy for others than they, because the latter by wearing it would put themselves into another than their real genealogical category, which is not permitted. (On this account according to al-Kattānī, even the Ṣulṭānī authors considered the wearing of a green turban forbidden to a non-šarīf. With regard to tradition transmitted by ʿAbd al-Rahmān ibn Ḥanbal, according to which the Prophet on the day of resurrection is clothed by his Lord with a green turban, Shāfīʿī teachers are said to incline to the view that this headgear is desirable for the aṣḥāf (al-Kattānī, p. 98 below, cf. 95). Other authorities like to insist that green is the colour of the garments of the dwellers in Paradise (cf. Kurān, xxviii. 30, lxxvi. 21), and that it was the Prophet’s favourite colour (al-Kattānī p. 95 sq., with references to Ḥadīth). The green turban did not become the general headgear of the aṣḥāf throughout the Muslim world. In Arabia they rarely wear other than white turbans (Šamūk Hurgovitse, Vorles. Gesch., T. 65). The green colour was preferred in Persia (Charīn, Vorles. Gesch., loc. cit.), according to P. M. Sykes, Ten Thousand Miles in Persia, London 1903, p. 24; note 1, the aṣḥāf is distinguished by a blue turban and a green linen-cloth. In India aṣḥāf’s wear green; they are therefore occasionally called: aṣḥāfī: “green-robed” (jafar Shāhīz Horkelts, op. cit., p. 303). According to al-Nabātī (p. 42 sq.) the green turban is not a mark of noble blood in Constantinople. It is worn there not only by learned men and students but also by artisans and street merchants, especially in winter as it does not show dirt so quickly. On this account many aṣḥāf are said to avoid the colour green.

The colour of the Prophet’s blood are also distinguished in other ways according to orthodox views. For example the sharing in the ḍāba (ṣekh, q.v.) is forbidden them. The Prophet is recorded to have frequently said of the ḍāba: “It is the blood of men (cf. Kurān, ix. 104) and permitted neither to Muḥammad or the family (ṣe) of Muḥammad”. The legal authorities differ on the question whether this rule applies not only to the Bān Ḥāshim but also to the Banū Ḥiṣaib and the clients of these families, and whether also free-will offerings (ḍāba al-ṣafī, ṣalāfījum) are included under it (al-Nabātī, p. 33-34).

The sons of Fītmān have the privilege of being called “sons of the Prophet of God” and thus having their descent traced directly to the Prophet. They are therefore frequently addressed as Ibn Rasūl Allāh. From the work of al-Ṭabarānī sayings of the Prophet are quoted in justification such as: “All the sons of one mother trace themselves back to an agnate, except the sons of Fītmān, for I am their nearest relative and their agnate” (Wâlid ibn am Ṣalāḥ ibn Abū Tālib, from Ibn Ḥadīr al-Ḥalīmī, al-Farāw, al-ṣulṭānīya, p. 123, sq.).

The sons of Bāzin are the noisetest in descent it results that the female members of the family have no one of equal birth to them (luf). According to al-Sayyīf (p. 56 sq., al-Sulṭān, p. 188; cf. Ibn Ḥadīr al-Ḥalīmī, op. cit., p. 123, sq.) it is a very old opinion that the son of the marriage of a šarīf woman with a man who is not a šarīf, is not a šarīf. As al-Sulṭān, p. 192, points out there are many people who consider him a šarīf. In practice however marriages of a šāyid’s daughter with men not of their equals are extremely rare (Šamūk Hurgovitse, The Arakheen, Leyden 1906, p. 158; D., Vorles. Gesch., l/v. 297 sq.; Mrs. Meer Ḥasan Ali, Observations on the Muriżmān of India), with notes by W. Crooke, London 1917, p. 4 sq.).

al-Shafrānī (in al-Nabātī, p. 89 sq.) notes that it is not considered seriously to marry the divorced wife or widow of a šarīf; one may only enter into matrimony with a šarīf woman, if he knows
he is in a position to afford her all that is due to her, will obey her pleasure and consider himself her slave.

The following saying of the Prophet refers particularly to the Aḥl al-Baʿīt: "Every bond of relationship and consanguinity (nabūba wu-maṣūmū) will be severed on the day of resurrection except mine". They are therefore the only ones whose relationship can avail them (al-Nabhaṇī, p. 22, 30, 39 sq., 47).

A weak tradition makes the Prophet say: "The stars are a security (āmūn) for the dwellers in the heavens and my aḥl al-Baʿīt are a security for the dwellers on earth" (or 'For my community'). According to the commentators by the aḥl al-Baʿīt are here meant the descendants of Fāṭima. Their existence on the earth is a security for its inhabitants in general and for the community of the Prophet in particular against punishment or against overwhelming by 'temptations' (fīṣṭām). It is not the pious among them that are specially meant here; this distinction is solely based on their descent from the Prophet (al-ṣaḥāba al-nabhaṇī) apart from any qualities, meritorious or otherwise, which they happen to possess as individuals. An allusion to this opinion is also sought in Kūrān viii. 33 (al-Nabhaṇī, p. 28, sq., 30 and 47; cf. al-Sabbān, p. 119 sq.; Ibn Ḥadījar al-Haṭaimī, al-Saʿūdī, p. 144; al-Ṭabarī, al-ḥadīthiyā, p. 122, 1199).

None of the Aḥl al-Baʿīt will suffer the punishment of Hell (al-Maṣṣūrī, f. 109b; al-Nabhaṇī, p. 24, 12 sqq., 33, 37, sq. 45), and Aḥl al-Hasan, and Aḥl al-Hussain with their families will be the first to enter Paradise along with the Prophet (al-Nabhaṇī, p. 48, 11 9sq.).

The "sons of the Prophet of God" may be certain of divine forgiveness and any wrong inflicted by them must be accepted like a dispensation of Allah, if possible with gratitude. Ibn al-ʿArabi, who takes the verse of purification in connection with Kūrān xlvii. 2, in which the Prophet is promised pardon for his sin, observes, inter alia: "It behoves every Muslim, who believes in Allah and in which he has revealed to recognise the truth of the word of Allah: 'Allah will remove the stain from you. O people of the house and purify you completely', so that he may be convinced with respect to everything done by the Aḥl al-Baʿīt that Allah has given them pardon for it. It is therefore not fitting for a Muslim to criticise them, neither for what is not in keeping with the honour of those of whom God has testified that he has purified them and removed the stain from them nor for pious works performed by them, nor for good deeds which they have performed, but always to remember God's watching care over them (al-Faḍlul al-Maʿkūli, Cairo 1349, Chap. 29, f. 196, 17-195, v. 33, esp. 196, 31 sqq.; cf. 197, 14 sqq.; in al-Maṣṣūrī, f. 108b, 13 sqq.; in al-Nabhaṇī, p. 11-13, 76-79).

A sharīʿah who has received good punishment for incontinence, taking intoxicating liquor or theft may be compared with an amūn or sulṭān whose feet have become soiled but are wiped clean by one of his servants. He is likewise likened to a refractory son, who is however not deprived of his inheritance (Ibn Ḥadījar al-Haṭaimī, op. cit., p. 122, 11 sqq.; al-Nabhaṇī, p. 46).

The duty of love for the Aḥl al-Baʿīt is based on Kūrān xiii. 22, where barāk is referred to relationship with the Prophet (Ibn Bīrī, Kāfīr al-Maṣāḥ, p. 51 sqq., 20, 21, v. 22; al-Maṣṣūrī, f. 112b, 16 sqq.; Ibn Ḥadījar al-Haṭaimī, al-Saʿūdī, p. 104, 14 sqq.; al-Shabrāwī, p. 4 sqq.; al-Sabbaḥ, p. 96 and sqq.; al-Nabhaṇī, p. 72 sqq.). It is further pointed out that the conclusion of the ṭaḥābād (q. v.) contains a prayer for the Al-Muḥāmmad (Ibn Ḥadījar al-Haṭaimī, al-Saʿūdī, p. 143; al-Nabhaṇī, p. 75 below). A saying attributed to al-Shāfiʿī (q. v.) is as follows: "O ye members of the house of the Prophet, love for you is a duty to God, which he has revealed in the Kūrān". It is a great honour for you that any one who does not say the ḥaṭīya (q. v.) over you has not performed the gāfūl (op. cit., p. 85). There are further a large number of traditions, which urge this affection, represent it as a proof of belief, and promise in return for it the sharīʿa of the Prophet on the day of the resurrection and a heavenly reward, forbid signs of hatred and even describe the latter as infidelity (Ibn Ḥadījar al-Haṭaimī, al-Saʿūdī, p. 141 sq.; al-Shabrāwī, p. 3 sqq.; al-Nabhaṇī, p. 81 sqq.).

Reverence and respect ought therefore always to be shown to the sharīʿah, especially to the pious and learned among them; this is a natural result of reverence for the Prophet. One should be humble in their presence: the man who injures them should be an object of hatred. Unjust treatment from them should be patiently borne, their evil returned with good; they should be assisted when necessary; one should refrain from mentioning their faults, on the other hand their virtues should be lauded abroad; one should try to come nearer to God and his Prophet through the prayers of the devout among them (al-Shabrāwī, 7, 117 sqq.). According to al-Shāfiʿī, one should treat a sharīʿah with the same distinction as a governor or a šayṣ al-ṣābīr. One should not take a seat if a sharīʿah is without one. Special reverence should be paid to the sharīʿa; one hardly dare look at them. Any one who really loves the sons of the Prophet will present them with anything they wish to buy. Whoever has a daughter or sister to give in marriage with a rich dowry, should not refuse her hand to a sharīʿ even if he has no more than the bridals gift for her and can only live from hand to mouth. If one meets a sharīʿah or sharīʿa on the street, who asks for a gift, one should give him what one can (al-Nabhaṇī, p. 89 sqq.).

One should not refuse marks of respect even to a sharīʿah whose conduct is contrary to the law (fāṣīb), because one knows his sin will be forgiven him. This high esteem is due only in account of his pure origin (al-ṣaḥāba al-ṣalihā) and faith does not affect his genealogy (al-Nabhaṇī, p. 45). If it is doubtful whether a man is a sharīʿ or not there is nothing to object to in his genealogy from the legal point of view he should be treated with the proper respect. Even if his pedigree is not legally established, one should not assume he is lying without being absolutely certain on the point (Ibn Ḥadījar al-Haṭaimī, al-Faḍlul al-ḥadīthiyā, p. 122, 17 sqq.; al-Nabhaṇī, p. 46). There are a number of anecdotes in which an individual who has been neglectful of respect to a sharīʿ or who has irritated one has been corrected in a dream by the Prophet or by Fāṭima (al-Maṣṣūrī, f. 144b, 11 sqq.; Ibn Ḥadījar al-Haṭaimī, al-Saʿūdī, p. 148; al-Nabhaṇī, p. 45; 95 sqq.).
The numerous sáveis and sharifs are represented throughout the whole Muslim world. Several families have attained ruling power for longer or shorter periods, e.g., in Tabaristan and Dauin, in western Arabia, Yemen and Morocco. Other families have exercised local influence but by far the great majority lived and live in poor circumstances. The genuineness of an ‘Alid pedigree has for long not been unassailable. The genealogical tradition has survived in its greatest purity in western Arabia and Ḥadramawt. The family of ‘Alawi’s in Ḥadramawt, which has produced many notable jurists, theologians and mystics, regard only the west Arabian sharifs as their equals in birth.

The saiyid, who distinguishes himself by a pious life, readily comes reverenced as a saint. His blessing is expected to bring good fortune, while his wrath brings misfortune. By vows and gifts it is hoped to secure his auspicious intercession and his tomb becomes a place of pilgrimage. On the tomb visited by saiyids and sáveis in Cairo al-Shalshaliy’s work cited below.

In the Yemen as in Ḥadramawt, the saiyid who is to be distinguished there from the armed shirf carrying a staff (uškār) and rosary, acts as intermediary between two disputing parties. He also drives away the locusts and his prayer puts an end to infertility while his curse makes it continue. Many saiyids are also visited for their healing powers. Reverence for the saiyid frequently finds expression in presenting him with lands (H. Jacob, Parfumier of Araby, London 1915, p. 45, 173, sqq.).

For a fuller description of the sharifs and saiyids and the reverence paid to them see Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka, I, 32 sqq., 70 sqq.; on the saiyids of Ḥadramawt, who are also strongly represented in the Malay Archipelago and to whom belong the founders of the sullāmakē of Siak and Poutanakan, cf. do., Vesper. Geschr. iii. 166 sqq., and The Alchemists, L. 153 sqq.

For the history of the Sharifs who ruled in Mekka and the Hijāz from the 4th (4th) century till 1244, see Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka, I, and the article Mekka (history); cf. also the sketch in al-Barāṭinī, al-Nikāḥ al-Hijāzīyūa, Cairo 1329, p. 73 sqq. — Information on the families of ushrif in Arabia is given in A Handbook of Arabia, I, comp. by the Geogr. Sect. of the Naval Intelligence Division, London n.d., Ind. and Aṣhrif.

On the Sharifs of Morocco cf. the art. Aṣhrif, BANAN, HUSAYN; SHARIF; on the Sāiyids of India cf. art. IVIRA (Brit.) II.

The genealogy of the Tālibīds is discussed in Aljumā’a b. Ḭan... Ibn Muḥammad al-Di‘ūdī al-Hasani, ‘Umdat al-Tālib fī an-Nābi Al-ʿAṭī Talīb, Bombay 1918.


Ahl al-Balīq. Al-Sarafṣ al-ʿAṭībī, Abu ʿl-Ḥasan al-Murqab b. Abī Tahār al-Muḥāammad b. Abī Talīb al-Ḥasan b. Musa descended from al-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī through Biṣāb al-Ka‘im and on account of which he and his brother Abī al-Muṣābīdān [q. v.] were given the family name al-Muṣābīr. His father who was born in the year 307 (919/920) was under Bayād rule in Baghdaḍ, Naṣīḥ of the Tālibīn, an office resembling that of a herald’s-college for the descendants of the Prophet through ‘Alī’s wife Fāṭima, al-ʿAṭībī was born in Baghdaḍ in the year 359 (970) and appears to have been very precocious; we are told by Tha‘alibī, his contemporary, that he composed his first verses when he had hardly passed the age of ten years. The earliest dated poem in his Diwān was composed in the year 374, when he was 15 years old. Tha‘alibī, and the authors who copy him, assert that al-ʿAṭībī was undoubtedly the greatest poet of the Tālibīn, perhaps even the greatest poet the tribe of Kurājah had produced. If we take the measure of so much inferior poetry composed at that time, for the times were prolific in poets, the Ta‘alibī may be right, and we cannot but admit that some of his elegies upon friends have a touch of genuine feeling. The quantity of poetry composed by him in his short life is also remarkable, as his Diwān filled originally four volumes. Al-ʿAṭībī must have been of feeble constitution and he tells us himself in one of his poems that he began to show grey hair at the early age of 21 years. Several other poems tell us of his recovery from serious illness. Perhaps the anxiety for his father who for a long time was imprisoned in Shīrāz for some offence which I have been unable to elucidate, and the agitation in Baghdaḍ due to the marked preference given by the Bayād amirs to the Shi‘a and the consequent rancour of the Sunnis, may have contributed to undermine his health. His father had retired from the office of Naṣīḥa and al-ʿAṭībī was honoured with the appointment to this important office. Tha‘alibī, and other biographers who copy him, state that he received this post in the year 388, but the introduction to the poem which he sent to Bahāʾ al-Dawla thanking him; for his favour tells us that the diploma was sent to him from al-Bayrūt, together with the command to serve as leader of the pilgrim-caravan, and arrived in Baghdaḍ on the 1st of Jumādā II in the year 397. The following year, Bahāʾ al-Dawla honoured him further by conferring upon him the title of al-ʿAṭībī by which he is generally known. Three years later in the month Dhu ’l-Qa‘da 401, he received from the same amir the further title of al-Sarafṣ. Bahāʾ al-Dawla continued to confer other honours upon him and on Friday the 16th of Muḥarram 403, he was appointed Naṣīḥ over the
descendants of the Prophet in the whole dominions of the amir, but in Djiunmâd I. of the same year he felt so seriously ill, that his life was despaired of.

However two months later in the month Radja' there had so far recovered that he was able to send another poem to Sultan al-Dawla who was then in Arradji, where Bahê al-Dawla died in Dju-
mâd II. His last poem composed in praise of any prince was a poem he addressed to Sultan al-Dawla in the month Safar 404 and the last dated poem in his Dîwan is an elegy upon the poet Ahamd b. 'Ali al-Ratti who died in the month Sha'ban 405. He himself died on Sunday morning the 6th of Muhamarr 406 (26th of June 1016). His brother 'Ali al-Murtaja was so overcome with grief that he could not stay in Baghâd to attend his funeral and the wazir Fâkhr al-Mulk said the prayers over his grave. He was buried in his house in the quarter of the Anâbât in the suburb al-Keâkh of Baghâd. In the time of Ibn Khallîkân the house as well as the grave had been demolished. From occasional references to al-Ra'ji found scattered we can form the opinion that he was of an amiable character and broad-minded as is proved by his friendship with al-Sâbî, whom he honoured with two elegies though he was not a Muslim, and even the reproaches of his brother on account of the first of these did not deter him from composing a second one in which he pronounces his grief even more. His poems as already stated are very numerous and were collected by several friends; manuscripts are not rare and we actually have two printed editions (Bombay 1889 in one volume and Baqir 1892/1893 in two volumes). Both these editions are in alphabetical order; this is also the case in the two MSS, in the British museum (Add. 19410 and Add. 35350) consulted, except that in one manuscript the Elegies are separated from the other poems. It is of value that both in the MSS. and the printed editions many of the poems are precisely dated and these dates have furnished some of the details of the biography, but as many poems are elegies upon eminent persons who died in Baghâd, these dates have additional historical value. There are poems for every year from 374 to 405 and a full analysis would require too much space. In addition to his poems al-Ra'ji is credited with two works dealing with the exegesis of the Kurân entitled Ma'dni al-Kurân (obscurities of the Kurân) and Ma'dnî al-Kurân (Metaphors in the Kurân), these works have not come down to us. In his Catalogue of the manuscripts in the library of the Escorial, Dérénbourg describes under No. 348 a manuscript of a work entitled Ta'if al-
Khayâtal as being by al-Ra'ji. Whether the error is due to Dérénbourg or to the scribe who wrote the codex, there can be no doubt that this is a mistake. The brother of al-Ra'ji, 'Ali al-Murtaja, certainly wrote a book of this title and another 'Aliid author, Hibat Allah b. al-Shâjâ'î quotes in his Idrâsî (Paris, MS. Arabe, No. 9257, fol. 96 verso) from the Ta'if al-Khâyâtât of al-Murtaja; further in the introduction of the Escorial MS. the author mentions that he had previously written a book on *grey hair* (I'dé Shâ'î). This latter book we possess in a printed edition (Constant-
inople 1302) and it certainly is by al-Murtaja, who tells us at the end that he finished it in the year 421, or fifteen years after the death of his brother al-Ra'ji. We cannot possibly admit that the two brothers wrote two books with exactly the same titles and the same, or similar contents, and we consequently have to attribute the work in the Escorial MS. to al-Murtaja.

**Bibliography:** Tha'âlib, Yâzîma, Damascus, ii. 297—315, with many extracts of his poems; Ibn Khallîkân, ed. Wîsântenfeld, p. 659, Cairo ed., ii. 2; Yâsîn, Mir'ât al-Djâimân, ii. 18—20; Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 82. — Poems by al-
Ra'ji are found in nearly every anthology.

(F. KREKHO)

**SHARIF PASHA**, an Egyptian statesman in the reigns of the Khedives Ismâ'il and Tawfîk. He was of Turkish origin and was born in 1853 in Cairo where his father was then acting as kâfi 'l-îmâma sent by the Sultan. When some ten years later the family was again temporarily in Cairo, Muhammad 'Ali had the boy sent to the military school recently founded by him. Henceforth his whole career was to be spent in the Egyptian service. Sharif was a member of the "Egyptian mission" sent to Paris for higher education (cf. the article EGYPT) which included the future Khedives Sa'id Pasha, Tawfik Pasha and 'Ali Mustârik Pasha. He then took a military course at St. Cyr (1843—1845) and served in some time in the French army until the mission was recalled by 'Abbas I in 1849. For the next four years he acted as secretary to Prince Halim, then took up military duties again in 1853 and attained the rank of general under Sa'id Pasha. During this period he was much associated with the commander-in-chief of the Egyptian army, Sulaimân Pasha (de Sèves), whose daughter he married.

In 1857 Sharif Pasha began his political career as Minister of Foreign Affairs and he acted as deputy for the Khedive Ismâ'il when the latter went to Constantinople in 1855. He later filled in succession all the high offices of state. It was he who in 1866 drew up the plans for the new Ma'dîla Niyyâ'.

After the inauguration of constitutional government in Egypt in 1878, three cabinets were formed by Sharif Pasha. When in February 1879 Naftul Pasha's cabinet (which included two Europeans) had been overthrown by the nationalist parliament, a constitutionalist movement was begun under Sharif Pasha, the leader of which in Parliament was 'Abd al-Salâm al-Muwaïlî. This party drew up a plan of financial reforms, which was laid before the Khedive who in April 1879 entrusted Sharif Pasha with the formation of a cabinet composed of purely Egyptian elements. This new cabinet (see the list of members in Sabry, p. 153, note) instituted a Conseil d'Etat and had a new organic law passed by the Chamber (promulgated on June 14, 1879). After the accession of the Khedive Tawfik Pasha, Sharif Pasha's cabinet was remodelled, but the new government was not so national as the preceding. In August of the same year the new Khedive refused to approve the constitution drawn up by the Prime Minister and on the 18th of the same month Sharif Pasha resigned and was succeeded by Riyâd Pasha. Sharif then took part in the formation of the "National Party" at Hulwa, which published a manifesto against Riyâd Pasha on November 4. Two years later after the nationalist military revolution of Sept. 9, 1881, Sharif Pasha was the only statesman in whom the military party had sufficient confidence to entrust with the formation of a new cabinet.
SHARIF PASHA — SHARKAWA

(Sept. 15). Sharif then called together an assembly of notables intended to counterbalance the influence of the military. This assembly met on Dec. 26, but the nationalists in it soon combined with the military against the Khydive and his cabinet, who were thought to be too much under the influence of the political and financial control by the Great Powers. Sharif Pasha was unwilling to co-operate with the Mafjils in the modification of the rules on the budget vote and he resigned in January 1882. His successor was Mahmud Pasha Sämt. On Aug. 10 of the same year, after the Khydive had taken up a definitely anti-'Arabi attitude, Sharif Pasha again became Prime Minister (Aug. 18, 1882). He held this office after the defeat of 'Arabi and the English occupation but in the end came into conflict with the English cabinet and its representative, when they demanded the evacuation of the Süddan. Sharif Pasha thought the evacuation a political and economic danger to Egypt but he had to yield to English pressure (Jan. 1884). He then retired from politics and died three years later at Graz, to which he had gone on account of a malady of the liver. He was buried in Cairo in April 1887.

By birth Sharif Pasha belonged to the Egyptian-Turkish class and was of course a khedivialist rather than nationalist. The nationalists, however, never doubted his sincerity. He sincerely endeavoured to make Egypt a constitutional state under the Khydive's dynasty; as a political figure he occupies a position intermediate between the tendencies represented by 'Arabi, Nûbah and Riyâd.


(J. H. KRAMERS)

SHARISH (adjective: Sharishi) was the Arabic name for the modern Jeres de la Frontiera, an important town in Spain, in the province of Cadiz, a little north of this town. It has been distinguished from Jeres de los Caballeros, the Sharisa, of the Muslim period (cf. al-Idriîsî, Deser de l’Esp, p. 175, 186, 211, 226), a little town in the province of Badajos, south of this capital and west of Zafra. Jeres de la Frontiera, from its position in a country blessed with remarkable fertility, was while under Muslim rule as at the present day a rich and prosperous city. According to some geographers it formed part of the province of al-Bahaira (Lago de la Janda), according to others of Shadhûnîn (Sidonia). Its vineyards were already renowned in the middle ages, like its olive-groves. A speciality of the town was the making of尊严 (a kind of cheese-pastry).

Muslim Jeres never rose to a capital. It was too near its great neighbour Seville, whose political fate it usually shared. It used to be thought that it was in the district of Sharish, on the banks of the Guadalete, that the first encounter between Christians and Muslims took place at the time of the conquest of Spain but we now know that this battlefield should be located in the valley of the Rio Salade farther east. The town plays little part in subsequent history and not even the names of its governors have been preserved. After the fall of the Umayyad Caliphate, it formed part of the kingdom of 'Abdallad [q.v.] and in 650 (1253) it submitted to the Nasrid rulers of Grenada after having successively rejected Almoravîd and Almohad suzerainty. Jeres was taken by the Christians for the first time in 1251 three years after Seville, but in the years that followed, it was never retaken by the Muslims in spite of the efforts of the Castilian leaders Gari Gomez Carrillo and Fortun de Torre. In the end it was definitely retaken by Alfonso the Wise on Oct. 9, 1264. The Marinid Sultan then tried in vain to recapture it, notably Abû Yûsuf Ya'qub b. 'Abd al-Ĥakkî, who made it and Seville his main objectives on his various campaigns in Andalusia and several times laid waste the whole district.

Among celebrated Muslims born in Sharish, we may mention, besides the commentator on the Ma^hadîmat of al-Harîri (see the next article) the jurist Djamal al-Din Abû Bakr Muhammed b. 'Abd al-Bakr al-Sharishi born in 601 (1204/1205) and died in Syria in 685 (1286) after declining the post of Malikî Kishlûn al-Sâmil of Damascus.


(E. LEVI-PROVENÇAL)

AL-SHARISHI, Abû 'I-Abrès Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Mu^min (or 'Abd al-Mu'imm), according to al-Suyûtî, followed by Brockelmann s. Mîshr li Kîli b. 'Abd al-Mu^min al-Kâmil, Kalam al-Din, Arab author of Spain, a native of Sharish [q.v.], where he died in 619 (1222). He wrote a commentary on the al-Ishâq of al-Fârisî and another on the al-Djamal of al-Zâdîjâdî and wrote also a treatise on prosody. He also compiled an anthology of ancient Arabic poems and made a synopsis of the Nawa^dir of al-Kalî but he is best known as a commentator on the Ma^hadîmat of al-Harîri. He wrote three commentaries on the Assembly, a large one, literary, a medium, philosophical and a small one, a résumé. The first was published at Bûlak in 1284, 1300 and in Cairo in 1306; the second is in the Library at Leiden, N°. 415.


(E. LEVI-PROVENÇAL)

SHARKAWA, or Serekawa, the common ethnic of a Marabout body in Central Morocco, belonging to the Shadîlit-Djanîlît brotherhood through the intermediary of the mystic Abî Farih 'Abd al-'Arîs al-Tabbâ [q.v.]. The singular is Serekâtî, synonym of Serekî (sharkî, pl. shérâqû), a geographical ethnic (cf. on the other hand râdîl, ethnic from Tâdil confined to the sharbî of this name, while the geographical ethnic is Tâdîlîn). The principal Zawiyah of the Sharkawà is in the town of Abu 'I-Djâ'd (modern spelling:
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Boujdour, in the Tafilalt, between the Middle Atlas and the Atlantic coast. It attained importance at the end of the xviiith century and henceforth became one of the most frequented sanctuaries in Morocco.

Among the more notable of this Marnoh family may be mentioned: 1. the founder of the Zawiya of Abu l-Dja'd, Mahammad (with initial is vocalised in a) b. Abu 'l-Kasim al-Sharki al-Sumaski al-Za'ki al-Dirahi, d. 1010/1011 (July 601); a monograph was devoted to him by one of his descendants, Abu Mahammad 'Abd al-Khaliq b. Muhammad al-Ar'asi al-Tadili al-Sharkawi, entitled al-Muraja fi ilah al-qiyam manasik al-ghahir sayyidi M. al-Sharki; 2. the latter's son, Muhammad al-Mut'ak, d. Rabä' II 102/ April—May 1611; 3. his son Muhammad al-Sukki, who was the patron of the historian al-Ifrini (or al-Wafsi), q.v.; a monograph entitled al-Rauq al-aswan al-fadhi fi manasik al-shahid 'Abd 'Abd Allah M. al-S., was devoted to him by a scholar of Fas who was kadi of Meknes (Miknas al-zaiyun) in the reign of the 'Alawid Sultan Mawlây Isâm, 'Abd Allâh al-Hassan b. Ra'hal al-Madani al-Tadili, d. 1140/1728; 4. the son of the preceding, Muhammad al-Mut'ak, who restored the Zawiya and wrote a collection of prayers in no fewer than 40 volumes entitled Dha'farat al-ghani wa l-manasik fi ilah al-mowl wa l-rijal (there is one volume in the Bibliothèque Générale de Rabat, No. 100, cf. E. Lévi-Provençal, Les Mémòries Arabo de Rabat, 1, p. 36); he died in Muharram 1150/June 1766. A monograph has been devoted to him by his secretary Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Karim al-Asadi, d. 1189/1775-76, entitled Yattamal al-ahdud al-umru fi manasik al-shahid al-Mut'ak.


(E. Lévi-Provençal)

SHARKI, the name of a dynasty which reigned at Djawwar, so called from the title of Malik al-Sharki (Lord of the East) conferred upon its founder, the enunsh Malik Sarzar, Khdâja Djâhân [q.v.], who, having in March, 1393, placed Nasir al-Din Mahmud of the Tughlak dynasty on the throne of Dhih, suppressed the Hindu rebellion in the Gangetic Doab and Awadh, and assumed independence in Djawwar. He died in 1399, leaving no direct dominions to his adopted son, Malik Karsanf, who assumed the title of Mubarak Shah. Mahmud Shah of Dhih made two abortive attempts to recover Awadh, and Mubarak Shah died in 1402, and was succeeded by his younger brother, who assumed the title of Shah al-Din Ibrahim Shah. Ibrahim was a patron of learning and art, and it was during his reign that Djawwar was adorned with most of those buildings the remains of which excite our admiration to-day. He annexed some districts in Katchr which had belonged to Dhih, invaded Bengal, where he protected the Muslim from persecution, and an unsuccessful attempt to annex Kali, and was succeeded, on his death, in 1436, by his son Mahamud. Mahamud Sharki quarrelled with Mahamud Khaled I of Maha over Kali, and an indecisive campaign was closed in 1445 by a peace not altogether honourable to Djawwar. In 1452 he unsuccessfully attacked Dhih, then held by Baholi Lodh, and in 1457 he died just as he was about to meet Baholi Lodh in the field, and was succeeded by his son Bikan, who styled himself Muhammad Shad. His tyranny was so galling that his nobles, even while confided in the field by Baholi Lodh, dehronized him and proclaimed Husain, his younger brother. Husain concluded peace with Baholi and then led a successful expedition against the Hindus of Urja. In 1466 he failed to take Gwalior but compelled the Kali to pay tribute and do homage. In 1473 he invaded the dominions of Dhih and during the next three years strove to subdue it. He was on the threshold of success, but as often failed owing to carelessness or want of confidence, and in 1476 Baholi Lodh occupied Djawwar, and with Husain's flight to Bengal the Sharki dynasty came to an end. Husain lived for twenty-four years after his fall, and although he made no serious attempt to recover his kingdom, lost no opporunity of fomenting dissension and rebellion in the south-eastern provinces of the kingdom of Dhih. He died in 1500.

Bibliography: Muhammad Kâsîm Firan, Gulshan-i Ibrâhîmî, lith., Bombay 1832; Khâdiya Nâîm al-Din Ahmad, Tuhfâ-i Akhari, Bibliotheca Indica, series of the Asiatic Society of Bengal; Cambridge History of India, vol. iii, chap. x.

(T. W. HAM)

SHARKI. As opposed to the Turkish popular ballad which has arisen among the people and is composed by the national system, syllabic (isnavi äsnavi) not metric and is found in various forms notably the turkî and also the zuwarî, zuwarî, hânîâ, bâzi bâzi, maâd and tanûg (on the latter cf. Samoilowicz in Musulmânîî Mûsî, Petrograd 1917, i, No. 1, p. 899), the shârî is a poem regularly composed by a poet on an literary lines in more or less accurate agreement with the laws of Persian and Arabic prosody, following the quantitative system of metre: the shârî is the turkî adapted to literature.

While the popular song as regards matter, imagery and phraseology is quite feet from restrictions, the shârî is usually a gay love-song and follows the model of the traditional love-lyric in metre, language and contents.

It is distinguished from the ghâsî, which is intended only for recreation and reading, by the fact that it is intended to be sung. In contrast to the double verse system of the ghâsî with the monorhyme running through it, the shârî stanza form, taken from the folk-song, is peculiar to the shârî. The separate stanzas, of which the third (mâyûkhâne) is traditionally meant to be the most impressive, are linked together by a refrain of one — sometimes two — line (called mawâîrah, chorus) which recalls the rhyme of the ghâsî. The rhyme scheme is usually as follows a a b (and more frequently a a b; c c e e; d d d b or a a a, b b b, c c c, in the case of a two line refrain, a a a, b b b, c c c).
The language is elevated in the šahrık, free from dialectic forms; the rhyme is more strictly observed than in the türkî. But although it is free from extravagant language, it is nevertheless much too literary to be at once intelligible to the common people.

The link between the türkî and šahrık was probably formed by the popular poets and mystics, notably the tařeq, the successors of the Arab and Persian poets, who very early recognised this intermediate form, the ballad with a literary flavour suitable for single facts, as a form of literature admirably suited for dissemination, which could also be to some extent used as a chant to accompany the exercises of the šahrık. But it was long before the šahrık won itself an official position in the traditional “regular” Divâns of the classical poets. The fact that the Divâns of poets of the people so rarely contain šahrık is simply explained from the literary intolerance with which non-classical forms of verse were rejected.

The first poet in whose Divân we find šahrık’s seems to be Naşîm (d. 1107 = 1695). The šahrık is the characteristic poem of the period of transition which begins with Sultan Âmîd III (1703–1730) and marks a concession to popular taste and a reaction from Persian influence, Nâmî (d. 1143 = 1730) and Enderûn Oğlû Nasîr (d. 1240 = 1824/1825) are the most famous of šahrık writers.

The many printed and lithographed collections of šahrık are evidence that they are still very popular.

Bibliography: Smirnov, Omer ištoria türkçesi literaturu in Kóra, Vest-okhâbiyâ ištoria ištoria literary, St. Petersburg 1891, iv. 445; Kânos in Radloff, Proben der Volksliteratur der türkschen Stämme, vili., St. Petersburg 1899, ii; Gibb, A History of Ottoman Poetry, i. 96, iii. 319, iv. 8, 44, 280. (Th. Menzel)

AL-SHARKIYÂ, name of a küra and of a province (formerly ‘ummal, now mu’diriya) in Egypt.

1. The küra of al-Sharkiya, which replaced the Byzantine pagarchy of Aphroditopolis, was one of the few districts which received an Arabic name; the latter is explained by its situation on the eastern bank of the Nile. It is difficult to estimate the extent of its territory, which lay immediately south of the capital of the country, Fustat. The first capital of the küra, situated on the right bank of the river, was Anajîk (Antinòe), but the small number (17) of villages in the küra of al-Sharkiya allows us to suppose that the next küra, Dallâs (Nilepolis) or at least at-Kais (Kynopolis) lay on both sides of the Nile. The capital of the küra was very probably Atfîh since one of the censuses quoted by Makrizî gives it in addition the name of Aţfîhia. It should, however, be noted that Dimashq, very late for information of this kind, distinguishes a küra of al-Sharkiya and a küra which, lying beyond the district of Atfîh, included also that of Wasiium the north-west of Fustat, which is exceedingly improbable.

In the Fustât division into provinces, there was a province of al-Atfîh, larger than the old küra (50 villages at the time of İlî al-Dîjîn) and now forms a district (mu’diriya) of the mu’diriya of al-Dijà. The capital is now al-Saff, a few miles to the north of Atfîh.

In the time of the governors of the Caliphs, the küra of al-Sharkiya enjoyed at times a certain prosperity. On account of an epidemic of plague, ‘Abd al-Azîz b. Marwân transferred the government offices to Húlûwâ; a little later and for the same reason another governor transferred his seat to Akûr (or Sukur) towards the south. To the north of the küra lie the quarries of Tûrê.


2. The Eastern province of the Delta of Egypt, situated to the east of the province of al-Dâkkaîlîa and bordered towards its south-west by that of Kâlûbîâ. Now it has 749,170 inhabitants (in 1897), 393 towns, villages and hamlets, and is divided into 6 districts (mu’diriyât) which are as follows: (1) Bîbûs, (2) Fâlûs, (3) Hîthîs, (4) Kafîr-Sükh, (5) Mînâl-Kâm, (6) Zâkhîzî, The capital is Zâkhîzî (41,741 inhabitants in 1917, against 135,700 in 1897).

The present area of the mu’diriya of al-Sharkiya corresponds roughly to the following pagarchies of the Byzantine epoch, divisions retained by the Araqi under the name of kûra; Bubast (Baṣṣa), Arabic (Tarîbû), and PharÂbîthos (Farbâ). The Delta was at this time divided into three large divisions not administrative in character, which are mentioned by the historians: the Hâwî Shârî, situated to the west of the Rosetta arm, the Baṣṣa al-Rîf applied to the territory lying between this arm and that of Damietta. All the land which extended to the east of the latter district was called the Hâwî Shârî and it is probably this name which gave rise to that of al-Sharkiya. The Hâwî Shârî followed the two Augustanmics. It included 11 or 12 kûras and 529 villages.

At the time of the division into provinces under the Fâtimids the Hâwî Shârî included those of al-Sharkiya, of al-Mûrûthîyût, of al-Dâkkaîlîa and of al-Abwaûamîa. Thus delimited, the province of al-Sharkiya, which extended farther than at the present time in the direction of Cairo, still included 452 towns and villages (the three other provinces together accounted for 165). It brought annually to the Treasury 694,121 dinars. The southern part of al-Sharkiya was separated from it in 715 (1315) at the time of the survey of Malik Nâşir Muhammad, and received the name of al-Kâlûbîâ. From this time the province of Sharkiya must have shown little variation. Thus reduced it contained, according to Ibn al-Dijîn, 380 towns and villages and the taxes were valued at 1,417,675 dinars. The capital was Bûbûs in the Middle Ages and it was also in this town that the Turkish Kûshîrî resides. It was only during the nineteenth century that Zâkhîzî supplanted Bûbûs.

This eastern region of lower Egypt plays a considerable role in the history of Muslim Egypt, for if we except the Fâtimid conquest, which came from the north of Africa, the Crusaders’ attack on Damietta and in modern times the French occupation by Bonaparte, all the invaders of Egypt entered the country by this route. The anonymous military memoir called the *Dessert de chemins de Babûlîn*”, which is simply an exposition of the different plans of attack upon
Cairo, shows in the first place the itinerary of an army setting out from Ghazza with the object of menacing the capital through the province of al-Sharkiya (Susiargue).

This region offered the difficulty to the owners of Egypt for the time being that it had no natural defences. The Byzantines had made up for this by stationing several garrisons in the Augustanuic, the sites of which we know from references in the accounts of the Arab conquest. The Arabs, avoiding the fortresses in the neighbourhood of Rhinocorua (al-'Arish), advanced on Pelusa (al-Farama), near which they were held up for two months. The defences of the region of Farhat (Farhat) and Bubaste (Baṣja) did not inconvenience the conquerors, who, turning their route southwards and following the valley of the Wadi Tanaiq, attacked Philbes (Billbais), which only held out for a month.

If we review the military events of which the province of al-Sharkiya was the scene, it will be seen that the main resistance was offered by the successive defenders of Egypt round the town of Billbais. As early as the end of the period of conquest, we find — in obedience to some instinct for security — the Djūdhum in the army of 'Amr b. al-'As, given some towns in this district, notably Farhat and Baṣja, as fiefs (tīgh). A century later portions of the tribe of Kais were settled in Billbais, then sparsely populated, who had also the task of organizing the caravans for Kūzman intended to provision the Ḥiṣān. We further know that Billbais was in time provided with another chain of fortresses (Makriat, Kāfīt, publ. in *M. I.F.A.O.*, iii. p. 188; Sulīk, tracial, Blochet, p. 358).

It was by this route that Marwān I came from Aila to Fustāţ to regain Egypt, which had been stirred into rebellion by the partisans of Ibn al-Zubair. At a later date the Dā'ir Sharkī was the scene of the Coptic rebellions which shook the Delta in blood in the second century A.H., especially towards its end: in 107 (725) at Nati, Tumair, Farhat and Taṣilikiya: in 178 (794) in 186 (802) and on this occasion the tribe of Kais joined the Copts, who were overcome at Djjub ʿUmair, halfway between Fustāţ and Billbais. In 191—192 (807—808) a new rising was put down; in 214 (829) a series of rebellions began which lasted with varying success till the arrival of the Caliph Maʾmun in 217 (832). In 469 (1076) the Salīḥi Emīt Attās, who had reached the outskirts of Cairo, suffered a disastrous defeat at the hands of Bādir al-Qasamāt; the chronicles do not give the exact site of the battle. In 558 (1163) the Franks under Amasty 1 occupied Billbais; next year near this town Shawar, coming from Syria, defeated Dūrgham and later Shīrkh was besieged in Billbais by Shīrkh, helped by the Franks. In the course of the Saladin's wars with the Crusaders, the latter, on at least one occasion, attempted a diversion on Fūṣās. The Suliṭan of Egypt, who did not fear an attack by the north of al-Sharkiya, but was more anxious about the Franks of the principality of Montferrat placed advanced lines of defence at Kūzman and at al-Sawās (Sues) and even farther to the east at Saydā, where his fortress had just been identified (Bartus and Wiet, *Découverte d'une forteresse de Saladin à Surya*, ill. 44—65, 145—152). We also know from official documents that Kāfīr Sadr was administered by the governor of al-Sharkiya. When in 593 (1195) Malik 'Aḍil and Malik Aḥfāʿ resolved to dethrone Malik 'Aḍil, the plot was begun with a siege of Billbais. It was in the same region that the last serious rising of the Arabs in Egypt ended (631 = 1253). Their leader, Ḥiṣna al-Dīn ʿAbd ʿAbd al-Malik, was taken at Billbais where gallows were erected from here to Cairo. Lastly it was by this, the natural route of invasion from the east, that the Ottoman army reached Cairo in 923 (1517).

This province was of course traversed by the post route which connected the capital with Ghazza. The following are the stages in Egypt as given by Ibn Khordādhbeh:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fustāţ-Bilbais</td>
<td>24 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billbais-Maṣjid ʿAbd ʿAbd al-Malik</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maṣjid ʿAbd ʿAbd al-Malik-Kāfīr ʿAbd ʿAbd al-Malik</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāfīr ʿAbd ʿAbd al-Malik-Djīr ʿAbd ʿAbd al-Malik</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djīr ʿAbd ʿAbd al-Malik-Ṭabāna</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Mamluk period, the post stages for the same stretch were: Sīrāṣ (which took the place of al-Uṣūb, which was too far from Cairo), Bīr al-Baṣja, Bilbais, al-Salāhiya, al-Kharīrat, al-Kharīrat, al-Ṭabāna, al-Qādiriya, al-Salāhiya, Bīr al-ʿAbad (or al-Baṣja), ʿAbd al-Malik, al-Qaṣr and Kāfīr ʿAbd ʿAbd al-Malik (cf. also *Devise des chemins de Besançon et des analyses in Schefer*, in *Arch. Or. lat.*, ii. 94—95).

It may be also mentioned that there were dovecotes for carrier-pigeons at Bilbais, al-Salāhiya and Kāfīr ʿAbd ʿAbd al-Malik (Gaudefroy-Debomybne, *La Syrie*, p. 255).

The pilgrim route also passed through this province, in the south of it; it was only abandoned for about two centuries between 450 and 660 A.H. Some stages are difficult to determine, for the names have become much corrupted by the copies of manuscripts; the known points are Birat al-Djīb (Birat ʿAbdar mentioned above), ʿAbd ʿAbd al-Malik and Kūzman (cf. the article in *Syria*, iii. 128—149).

In conclusion we may mention that Trajan's canal passed through the province of Sharkiya; it was renovated by order of the Caliph ʿOmar, whence its name of Canal of the Commander of the Faithful; the Caliph Ṭurban had it partly filled in.


(G. Wiet)

**AL-SHARRĀT** (the manufacturer of string from palm-leaf, dhīrīf), Aḥḥ ʿAbd ʿAllah Mūsām a Mūsām a Ṭāhir, son of a mawālik, slain in battle which the Spaniards at al-Muriq (al-Mahāzin — San Miguel de Ulzamar) was born at Fās in 1035 (1625/1626) and died there in 1190 (1697) after having adopted Shiism. He is credited with the authorship of a hagiographical collection, but this has sometimes been disputed by his contemporaries; it is entitled: *al-Rawd al-ʿAbrīr Anfās bi-ʿAbbār al-Shīrāzī min Aḥkām Fās*. According to al-Kattāni it was really the work of Mūsām a Ṭāhir al-Kādiri. In it among the biographies are a synopsis of the *masālik* of 99
SHASH. [See TASHKENT.]

SHATH, a place celebrated in the Middle Ages, situated a few miles from Damietta, on the Western shore of the Lake of Tinns, now called Lake Manzala.

This town existed before the Arab period, since it is mentioned as the see of the bishop (Zera). There is no reason for giving credence to the romantic story of the pseudo-Wajih, which gives as the founder of this town a certain Shaht b. al-Hammik (var. al-Hamirak), a relative of the famous Mukawwās. This Shaht is presented to us as a deserter from the garrison of Damietta who helped to secure the possession of Burullus, Damira and Ashmūn Tāmār for the Muslim army and who was killed at the capture of Tinns, on Shahtān 15, 21. Every year at this date, it is the custom to celebrate the anniversary of his death. To this origin the writers attribute the pilgrimage which still took place at Shaht in the time of Ibn Batūta.

To guard against the maritime attacks of the Greeks the Arabs stationed regiments of troops on certain parts on the coast, and Shaht was amongst the number. This port became in the Middle Ages a very active industrial centre, in this region sharing with Damietta, Dubāj and Tinns, the manufacture of valuable materials. Each of these towns probably manufactured a special article since the materials which they exported bore a name indicative of their place of origin. Travellers and geographers never tire of praising the goods of Shaht called shāshūq. Very probably there was at this place in addition to the private industry a government workshop, a Dār al-fitrūs, analogous to those of Alexandria and Tinns. The historian of Mecca, Fikihī, has preserved the text of an inscription embroidered on a cover intended for the Ka′ba. It was the Caliph Ḥarūn al-Rašīd who ordered it to be made in the year 191 at the tisrāt of Shahtā.

We do not know the port which Shaht played in the two occupations of Damietta by the Franks. Certain writers have tried to place at the spot the site of the encampment of Jean de Brienne, but this view has been disputed. Between the two crusades, Tinns had been razed to the ground by order of Malik Kāmil in the year 624, and as military reasons had probably induced this destruction, Shaht perhaps suffered the same fate.

But while the ruins of the former have survived under the name of Tell Tinns, a miserable hamlet of shepherds now bears the name of Shaikh Shaht. Their huts surround the mosque in which the relics of the hero of the Arab conquest, who became the Shaikh Shaht, are venerated. But the town is no longer a port on Lake Manzala; the waters have receded to a distance of 5 or 6 hundred yards. The depth of the lake in this district is insignificant, and the inhabitants use flat-bottomed boats for navigation.

Biblilography: Bakri, Muḍjīm, ii, 811; Liūnas al-ʾArab, xix, 162; the bibliography, given in J. Maspero and G. Wiet, Matīrīana, M. J. F. A. O., xxvi, 112—113; Makrīnī, Khībat, in M. I. F. A. O., iv, 80—82. (G. W.)

SHATH (pl. sharāf) or (al-Mahāf) (shāshūq) is a technical term in mysticism, signifying an "ecstatic phrase" or more exactly a "divinely inspired utterance".

Etymology: This term, which was probably a Syrian loan-word (shāshūq = expands) is derived
from the root ṣḥ-ṯ in Arabic: "disturb, agitate" (misḏḏaḥ = place where flour is ground). Adopted in the tenth century A.D. by the Shi'a it is applied to the sudden perturbation of the consciousness, into which divine grace suddenly penetrates them to the "divinely inspired utterances" which this supernatural commotion extracts from the subject.

The Muslim mystics are unanimous in seeing in the ṣḥḥāfī, following preparatory anagogic graces (ḫafṣurāt, faṣūli, muḥāf), the sign of a perfect purification reaching the soul of the mystic. But the majority of theorists — at first from scroful of orthodoxy, later from monistic conviction — consider that this state is transitory and is only a stage before the definitive annihilation of personality in the divine silence. Some, notably Muḥāfīz and Ḥalāfī [q.v.], on the other hand consider that these divine touches transfigure the faltering voice of the lover, give him an interminable divine investiture, which will make him constant for ever to the dialogue of love (muḥāf-dāthā) "between These and me the lovers".

The first "ecstatic sayings" were incorporated by tradition in the classical collections of Ḥadīṣ, not as utterances of the mystics but as "words of God" (ḥadīth kauṭ, q.v.).

From the third century A.D. Muslim orthodoxy excluded this source of traditions and the ṣḥḥāfī circulate under the names of those responsible for uttering them. Here we give the most famous, arranged according to two tendencies, the one class referring rather to an immediate psychological commotion, the other which betrays a scholarly reconstruction, or at least a retrospection influenced by the prejudices of the school, sometimes showing an insolent and cynical familiarity.

Abū Yūsuf Abū-Ṭayyib Abī-Bīṭāmī (d. 261 = 875): "Praise be to Me! (Sūḥālassa). My intercession is greater than that of Muhammad! Thou obeyest me no longer than I obey Thee. Adam sold his God for a mouthful. Thy Paradise is only a child's game". — Ḥalāfī (d. 309 = 923): "I am the Truth (ṣināʾal-ḥākīm). It is Thou, or is it I? That would make two gods. Ah! for mercy sake take away this amor ("it is 1") from between us! I do not desire thee for my joy but for my hurt. Pardon them and do not pardon me. Pray for the perfect lover becomes impotent". — Abū Bākī Naṣṣādī Tātī (d. 487 = 1094): "Guide of those who have gone astray, lead me still farther astray". — Abū Ḥanīfī (d. 517 = 1125): "God alone understands God. There is no one more persuasive than Desire. The call for the union is the essence of the beloved; the call for separation is the essence of the lover whether We torture him in desire, whether We kill him by severing him from contemplation".

Ibn Saḥāl Tūsī (d. 283 = 896): "I am the Proof of God, in face of the saints of my time. Divine omnipotence has a secret; if it is revealed there is an end of the prophetic mission". — Al-Waṣṣī (d. 320 = 932): "Religious acts are only impurities," Al-Shahī (d. 334 = 945): "I am the diacritical point under the letter ʾāl! In Paradise there is no person except God. Mysticism is only polytheism, since it is engaged in purifying the heart of that which is not God, when God alone is". — Khorāsānī (d. 426 = 1034): "I am only two years younger than God. God is my constant (my unity of psychological time)". — Ibn Abī ʾl-ʿLāh (d. 440 = 1048): "Under my robe there is only God". — Ghazzālī, the elder (d. 505 = 1111): "There is nothing more in the possible than in the created".

— Ibn Ṭārīq (d. 638 = 1240): "The slave is the lord and the Lord is the slave; who can tell which of the two is the debtor?" — Al-Ḥāfīz (d. 645 = 1247): "The perfect poor man is not he who has a heart, nor a lord". — Ibn Sīrāj (d. 1268 = 1659): "There is nothing but God (laṣa ʾllāhā, the dīn of his order). — Abī al-Tūsī (d. 690 = 1291): "The whole Korān is simply polytheism".

Whole monographs have been devoted to elucidating, criticising or justifying one or other of these ecstatic utterances. Dūrī and Sarrāfī were the first to perceive their theological importance, and we possess in three books by Rābhān Abī Bālī (d. 606 = 1209) a full treatise on the question.


SHAṬĪBA (adjective ʿṣḥḥāfī), the Arab name of Jātīva, the Sarabī of the Romans, a town in the East of Spain, in the province of Valencia, 35 miles to the South-West of the last town, at an altitude of 500 feet. Jātīva, which has at the present time about 12,000 inhabitants is built on a splendid site above Mount Bernosa on whose steep slopes the Muslim city was built. The latter was celebrated in the middle ages for its manufacture of paper which was sent not only throughout the whole of Spain but also as far as Egypt. This paper can still be recognised in old Arab manuscripts, on account of the watermarks bearing the name of its place of origin and in Morocco the name ʿṢḥṣḥā ʿJātīva paper is still given to a kind of coarse grained paper. There still remained at Jātīva at the time of the Muslim occupation remains of the Roman occupation. Al-Maḳṣūṭ quotes the verses of a poet called Abī ʿUmar al-Buryāmi about an ancient statue which was to be seen in his day in the town, no longer in the Muslim town. On account of its strategic position of the first order, Jātīva was one of the most important fortresses of the whole of Andalusia from the height of its rock it dominated and guarded the whole of the very rich and fertile plain which stretched below it. There still exists at the present time remains of the wall and of the dīn of the Muslim Jātīva of very great archaeological interest, in spite of alternations and unfortunate restorations to which it has been subjected since the reconquest. Abī ʿl-Fihīrī has preserved the names of three pleasure resorts near Jātīva: al-Baṭḥūr, al-Ghadrī and al-ʿĀhin al-Kalīra.
Játiva is too near to Valencia not to have shared the latter's political history. In the Muslim period it was the second town in the district of Valencia, and its population was without doubt larger in those days than at the present time. Mention is hardly made of it during the Umayyad caliphate of Spain, and its history commences, when with Valencia, it formed a part of the independent principality founded at the end of the 12th century a.d. by the grandson of the celebrated alfí al-Ma'adur Ibn Abi Amir, 'Abd al-Azzar, after the reign of the two 'Slaves' (see above), by Muhammad and Muqaffar. When the kingdom of Toledo and al-Andalus was divided among the Christian sovereigns of Castile, took possession of the kingdom of Valencia, Ibn Ma'adhur, who was at that time governor of Játiva, refused to come in person to Valencia to pay homage to his new master. An expedition was therefore decided upon against the town. But it miscarried; the Heddi prince al-Ma'adhur b. al-Muqaffar who reigned over Leida, Denia and Tortosa, came to the rescue of Ibn Ma'adhur and took possession of Játiva for some time. The town was also taken by the troops of the Almoravid Sultan Yusuf b. Tashfin at the time of the expedition, which was crowned by the victory of Zalaka; Játiva was finally conquered in 1329-1330 by the king of Aragon Jaime I and the last Moslems were driven out of the town at the end of the year 1328.
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part which the Kādi 'l-Fādi had given; and Ibn Khallīkhā tells us that he had visited the grave of al-Šāthṭī several times. He was a man of very humble and devout character and during his last illness, when he was suffering very much, he always replied in an answer to enquires that he was recovering. He was renowned for his extensive learning in the sciences concerned with the reading and interpretation of the Qur'an and his reputation as an author rested upon his two didactic poems, or better rhymed prose, dealing with these matters: 1) A poem rhyming upon the letter l consisting of 1173 verses, which the author entitled Hīr al-Ma'adhur al-Tahštī, but which is generally known by the name of al-Shāthṭīya after its author. It is a verisimilitude of the work on the same subject by 'Uthmān b. Sa'd Abī 'Amr al-Dānī (born 371, died 441 A.H.) entitled al-Tuṣīr. As Yākuti in the *Irušād* says that the verses of al-Shāthṭī are awkward and difficult to understand, it is no wonder that they are not easy for us and that the poem has been the subject of numerous commentaries. The author after the introduction begins with the explanation of the correct way of reading the letters when unvocalised, when to read a word *mālik* or *māmuṭād*, how to pronounce the Hamza especially if two should occur in one word; then follow chapters on *Tawāni*, *Imā'ī*, etc., till at last he comes to the chapters of the *Kur'an* indicating the various readings of the seven *Readers*. To understand the seemingly endless rhyming is only possible with a commentary, or by comparison with books in prose dealing with the same subject. The great popularity of the book is undoubtedly due to two reasons, first a student according to the old method could more easily learn the whole thing by heart, whether he understood it or not; but here the second reason for its popularity came in, as this gave the teacher ample scope for displaying his own learning in commenting on the obscure verses. The poem is found in many manuscripts in most libraries of Arabic literature and there exists a printed edition (Cairo 1928 a.h.) which contains also the second poem of al-Shāthṭī. As regards the commentaries, these are very numerous, the best is said to be that by 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Dānī Ibrahim b. 'Umar al-Dīnārī who died in 732 (1332) and who finished his work in 691 a.h.; this commentary was amplified by Shams al-Dīn Ahmad b. Ismā'īl al-Kawrānī who died 803 a.h. Another commentary is by a pupil of al-Shāthṭī, Abu l-'Hasan 'Ali b. Muhammad al-Sakhwā, who died in 643 a.h. This was the first commentary written upon the poem and has the title al-Sāli al-Wastā'ī fi Sharḥ al-Qadīf; a third commentary is by Abu Shams 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Ismā'īl who died 665 and called his commentary Dhū al-Ma'adhur al-Tahštī, of which manuscripts are in several libraries. To enumerate more commentaries would take quite a page, but the existence of such an abundant literature shows that the poem was after the taste of the following generations. 2) A poem rhyming upon the letter J in about 300 verses which has the title Abu 'Ali Aṭā'ī al-Qadīf fi Amr al-Maḥājīd, also on the reading of the Kur'an, but this poem is far more concerned with reading the holy writ elegantly than with the variants as was the case with the poem rhyming upon l. It is, like the other poem, not an original work, but a verisimilitude of a book on the same subject by al-Dānī (see above) which
has the title al-Makhtūb. This poem is composed in the same obscure language as the Hīra al-Awāni and has found numerous commentators for the same reasons and the earliest commentators are the same as for the other poem, namely al-Dī'a b. al-Salāḥ and al-Saḥhāwī; the first called his commentary Qisas al-Arba'ah al-Masā'ik, while the second named his work: al-Waṣīl bi l-Riyāḍ al-Aṣālī. Both these poems have in the eyes of the pious another merit i.e. that they are cherished against all kinds of evil influences. 3) A poem of about 500 verses rhyming upon the letter b, which is a veritableisation of the work al-Tamā'īd by Ibn 'Abd al-Barr. Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Abd Allah al-Kurtī on the last (Fīb) as found in the Traditions. This poem I have not seen, but according to Vāqīt it is also very obscure. Fragments of other religious poems of al-Shāhī has occasionally cited in anthologies, but all are of little literary value. — The name of al-Shāhī's father is explained as meaning in Spanish "iron" and we must read Ferro, because at that time the word was pronounced so and not ferro as in modern Spanish. There are rather many errors in all biographies of the author consulted as regards the proper names, but I hope I have been able to correct them.


### SHĀTRANDJ, the game of chess.
The game of chess was known in Greek antiquity when Ptolemy was said to have invented it. From there it spread through various countries. The Musalm are said to have invented it from Persia, but the stories are not sure; it is seen from these are seen from these that it was later to them from ancient Persia. In the middle ages there were several games in the East played with a board, notably, the game (strictly speaking) is to be found in the Indian (Sanskrit) origin; as to the word itself, it has been derived from the Persian yā sīl, "O King," so when the king is threatened; but this etymology is not very satisfactory.

The legends relating to the origin of chess have a Pythagorean character. According to Mas'dūd, the king of India invented the arts and discovered the principles of the sciences. The first was Brahmas, the second Bāhūdī under whom word was invented; the third Dāhilīn who is connected with the book of Kīla von Dīnāmār, the fourth Bāhūdī and it is in his sign that chess was invented; even at this time there was a treatise on the game entitled Tarsikh Senāsī which has remained popular among the Hindus. The pieces were figures of men and animals and were thought to be representations of the signs of the zodiac. The game was not yet fixed in the time of Mas'dūd (fifteenth century). He knew six mass forms of the game, two squares with 64 or 100 squares, one, one or two, one attributed to the Byzantines and the other called sodalik; the latter invented in the time of the author had twelve pieces played with six on each side and representing the different organs of the human body. Even then there were treatises on chess and celebrated players.

Al-Balštān became acquainted with the several forms of this game in India. That which he describes as the custom was a regular game of chance and played with dice. It is the dice that settle the movements of the pieces and not the skill of the player. Thus 1 and 2 move the king or the pawn, 3 moves the rook; 4 the knight whose move is already what it is now, the 6 and 8 move the elephant which goes in straight lines and which is king among the Arakhs which replace the castle. The pieces had values which were counted up and the total decided the victory.

Firdawsī has written charming pages on chess and describes a game in poetic language. He puts the king in the centre with the vizier who plays the part of our queen; on either side of them are two elephants, next dromedaries, then knights and lastly two rooks. This rōk is an animal; it is the same as the fabulous bird mentioned in the Archimedes' Night and it is from it we get the term "rook." Another variety, mentioned by the same poet, is still nearer our modern game; this board has 64 squares; in the middle is the king with his minister, on either side are elephants, horses and rooks, in front are the foot-soldiers, or pawns.

The game of chess has an interest in arithmetic, in which it has given rise to a question of some importance: that of the summation of the successive powers of 2. The story is well known in which an inventor asked his king his reward, a grain of wheat on the first square, 2 on the second, 4 on the third and so on, doubling each time. The result is a number in 20 figures beyond possibility of fulfilment. This legend is given by al-Sadat; al-Balštān in trying to shorten the calculation led to interesting observations.

Chess was a noble game in the middle ages both in east and west. During the Crusades it was played in both camps. Hārūn al-Rashīd sent a chessboard as a present to Charlemagne. The Old Man of the Mountains presented a very handsome one to St. Louis. Qamar al-Rūhaydān has taken a beautiful image of Smalis from the game:

> "Fis all a Chequers-board of Nights and Days,
Where Desiny with Men for Pieces plays,
Hither and thither moves and makes and slays,
And one by one back in the Closet lay."
SHATT al-ARAB. The word shatt, properly the bank of a stream, is used in Mesopotamia for a large river, as tigris is in Egypt and such in Merv, Shatt al-Arab is the name given to the tidal estuary formed by the united streams of the Euphrates and the Tigries (Dr. Grenfell and Arthur), known in the middle ages as the Blind Tigyes (Du Tillet al-Aswad), the Fadil of B 같은, and, in Persian, Mahanaghir. A modern name is the Bageh River. It is generally reckoned as extending from Kusa to Alshush (q.v.) to Fao. The confluence of the two streams took place at Kusa during five or six centuries; and quite recently, but now past, sixty miles further down, at Garmut Al, called above Bageh (so W. Wintleguard in Journal of the Royal Geographical Society, 1910, p. 11). In addition to the two great rivers, the Shatt al-Aswad receives also the water of the Karthen (q.v.) River (Dr. Saffuri of Al-Ashada) and its tributaries. The Shatt al-Aswad is some 100 miles long and about 1,200 yards wide. It is navigable by vessels of 15 feet draught. The obstacle to navigation is the bar at the mouth (whereupon the epithet "blind"). Vessels which can pass it (drawing 17 to 20 feet) can reach Bageh, 70 miles up. The lights and buoys on the coast are kept up by the British Government. The country on both sides of the estuary is practically level, Bageh, where the tide rises and falls nine feet, being only five feet above and below. The land along the banks is higher than that at a distance, owing to the silts brought down by the current. In the middle ages the streams met the sea at Alshush, but now some 20 miles further south at Fao, where there is a fine light. The land is therefore encroaching on the sea at the rate of 20 miles in every 1,000 years. Plantations of date-palms line the banks of the estuary for its whole length.


SHATTARIYA, SHATT order included in the list of 161 orders furnished to S. Anderson by the Imperial Board of Derwishes at Constantinople (Moslem World, 1922, p. 56). It is called sattārīsh, a neighbouring order, in the Persian work cited above; since a person named Shattari is not mentioned in the chief biographical dictionaries of authors, the former vocalisation may be correct, as the plural of shattari, according to Redhouse "a wayfaring man who has broken with the world," though this name is not recognised by Sadi Pashe. The order is mentioned by Abu T-Abbad (Abu T-Abbad, trans. Jevons, iii. 472) as one which provided his father with Khutbah (that is, he does not deal with it in his lists of orders, ibid. 349—356), and he suggests that its headquarters in India were at Jamnagar (ibid. 373). Allusions to it in Shiite literature are rare.

Some notice of its doctrines is to be found in the Ishbaish al-Arsheen of Shihab Muhammad Balkhi Gharuni (13th cent.) as a contemporary of Jangani (trans. Khazm El Shihabi, translated by Prof. Nicholson). The following are the chief passages: The sect of Shattariya despise with negation and adherence to affirmation, it is waste of time in Murrah, (meditation) to attend to negation, for it is nothing, to be prudent in the religion of Shattariya there is no self-effacement. There is nothing in it, except its name."

Tawhid is understanding one, saying one, seeing one, and being one. "I am one and no partner with me." With the Shattariyah there is neither opposition to fana, nor nafsah; neither is there Fana, nor Fana (and), for Fana requires two components; the one above to be annihilated, and the other the one is the name in which this one is to be annihilated, which is opposed to Tawhid. The Shattariyah affirm Tawhid and observe the Dhu’a with its isla in all stages and ti’ajilat. The Shattariyah do not complain, they set what they get, keeping the real Gif-wiser in view.

Consider your that, isla and ala as the Dhu’a, isla and ala of God and become one. This is one of the stages of the Shattariyah and not of the other colleges (shurah and ala’,). who adopt the practices and manjishahat, and say consider your nafs in the way of fana, and God’s is the way of isla’a; your nafs in the way of Unshriyatt (serentship) and His in the way of Rayshriyatt (ruleship)."


SHAWAR. SHAWAR from Murgi, AL-BIN F. Murgi, AL-Sain, a Pashai merchant, writer of the last caliph al-Aswad and in this capacity bore the honorary surname of Malik Murgi.

At first in the private service of the vizier Malik Shalib Fadil, Shwar obtained from his master the government of Upper Egypt with Kaq as his residence. This office was then the highest in the administrative service and the fact that Shwar is said to have asked for it shows his ambition. On his deathbed Fadil is said to have express regretted that he had thus contributed to the rise of Shwar as he feared he would cause trouble to his son Ruzaf, who was going to succeed him. But, knowing the man, he had advised his son to exercise great caution and to deal carefully with this possible rival. The two adversaries, who were never to meet, must not to make a mistake. The first slip was made by the minister who recalled Shwar from his government, shortly before Shawar (1162) Oct. 1162). Shwar had been expecting this and in anticipation had collected numerous troops and put into a state of defence a territory which he had practically owned as if it were a fief. Without awaiting the arrival of his successor, he resolved to attack the offensive fort was defeated at Talhja in Middle Egypt and took the road of the scenes, thinking Egypt and took the road of the scenes, thinking that it was becoming forgotten until suddenly in Muhammad 538 (Dec. 1162) he appeared in the Delta and by promises of booty rapidly recruited an army of ten thousand men. Ruzaf was unable to resist and fled from his capital. Shwar installed in the vizinate in Safar (Jan. 1163) had or allowed his rival to be put to death. His first period of power was to be of short duration on account of the unpopularity of his three sons, Talal, Shu’afa and Sulaiman, whose savior and excesses alienated even the officers of his immediate entourage from their father, Dorgani, an emir whom Shwar himself had just raised to the office of grand chamberlain, put himself at the head of the rebellions, who were secretly supported by the Caliph. Shwar did not attempt
to fight but fled to Syria in the course of the month of Ramdân (August).

He went to Damascus to the court of Nûr al-Dîn and was given an army by him to help him to return to power: Shâwar in his turn promised to hand over one third of the revenues of Egypt, to pay the expenses of maintaining the army. The troops sent by Nûr al-Dîn, who had entrusted the command to Assîd al-Dîn Shîrîkh marched on Cairo and inflicted a serious defeat near Tell Baţţa on the unreliable soldiers that Dirghâm had been able to collect. On entering the capital in Liwwât al-Adâb, 1559 (May, 1164), Shâwar resumed the viceroyalty. Difficulties immediately broke out between Shîrîkh and Shâwar: some accused the former of treachery while others accuse Shâwar of not fulfilling his engagements to Nûr al-Dîn. In any case after some skirmishes which jeopardised his authority, Shâwar appealed for help to Amaury, pointing out to the Franks the danger of allowing their enemy Nûr al-Dîn to establish himself in Egypt. The Franks, whom Shâwar had promised to indemnify, accepted the terms offered with pleasure in the hope of conquering Egypt for themselves. Shîrîkh, besieged in Bilhais, when his provisions were almost exhausted, accepted the terms offered and returned to Syria. The Franks on their side, impressed by Nûr al-Dîn's capture of Hûtim were not long in leaving the country.

In 562 (1167) Egypt was again invaded by Shîrîkh, who defeated Shâwar, again allied with the Franks at Bâbîn in Middle Egypt near Asûtûn in Liwwât al-Adâb, 1562 (April 18, 1167). This defeat did not lead to a definitive decision and Shâwar was able to rally his troops and besiege Shîrîkh in Alexandria. On capturing this town he succeeded in getting Shîrîkh to leave the country once more. But the treaty with the Franks was onerous for the Fâtimids, who besides paying an annual tribute, had to allow certain points in Cairo to be occupied by troops and to have a kind of High Commissioner (shikha) quartered there.

In 564 (1168) Shîrîkh was sent into Egypt for the third time by Nûr al-Dîn with the avowed object of driving out the Franks, whose demands had provoked a rupture with Shâwar. Besieged by them in the two towns of Cairo and Fustât, Shâwar was forced to leave the area which he could no longer defend. He got out of his difficulty once more by negotiation and purchased the departure of the Franks. But his own position was becoming precarious, the policy of balancing between the Franks and Shîrîkh being no longer possible; besides, the Caliph al-Axîd had in the meanwhile made a personal appeal to Nûr al-Dîn. Shîrîkh began by calling upon Shâwar to fulfill the terms of the treaty concluded between them and, in view of his shuffling, his death was decided upon by Shîrîkh's entourage notably by his nephew Salâsîn.

Shâwar was brought into an ambush near the tomb of the Imam al-Shîfâ and assassinated by Salâsîn and the officers of his suite on Rabîʿ II, 1564 (Jan. 18, 1169).

He was, strictly speaking, the last statesman of the Fâtimid dynasty, the decline of which was signalled by the rise of Shîrîkh. Shâwar, although praised by the poet Ŷûhût al-Muwafîq of Yemen, has left the reputation of being crafty and cruel; a Christian writer sums him up as very able, experienced in wars, tricks, plots and stratagems.
and al-Shawbak are known from inscriptions of Umar at Mura of the years 717 (1323) and 722 (1328) (de Laynes, Voyage, p. 205, N° 23 sqq.; Brünnow and Domanszki, Provinciae Arabiae, l. 105). About 1549 Umar says of al-Shawbak: “its circuit is now emptied of men, its gate is closed” (R. Hertzenmann, in Is., ii. 138). In the country round at this time the Luit ‘Utha, who now dwells around al-Karak, lived in tents (op. cit. p. 137).

The present al-Shibuk (Musil also writes al-Shibuk) adorns greyish walls still surround gardens and terraces which were formerly covered with vines, is a miserable village. In the castle are ruins of baths and other buildings, also (according to Socin-Baecker) an underground passage, which leads by 375 steps down to a well. The thousand line of defenses of the Crusaders’ castle mentioned by William of Tyre and Thietmuart no longer exist; the existing remains rather date exclusively from the time of Hattus and Jadlu, to whom belong the foundation inscription running along the outside of the enclosing wall.


Inscriptions: Safwain in De Laynes, Voyage d’explorer, ii. 209-213; Brünnow and Domanszki, op. cit., l. 118-119.

(E. Horschmann)

AL-SHAWI (n. via from Shawiya; q.v.) Abu ’l-‘A’rak Ahmad Muhammad, one of the most popular saints (na’ibs) of Fés, died there on Ma’rib 26, 1014 = June 13, 1605 and was buried in the Shawiya which still bears his name, the Al-Mubtak (el-Sakh) quarter. Many notices of him are given by the Moroccan hagiography, and a collection of his manahí is written by the famous Abu Mahammad ‘Abd al-Sallam al-Kâdiri (1058-1661), entitled al-Manahí al-’Arabi fi manahí wa’l-Athk ranceh Ahmad al-Shawi.


SHAWIYA (plur. of shawak, “sheep-breeder”) a name, originally applied in contempt in several groups in the Maghrib, of which the most important are in Morocco, the Shawiya of Tmamna
and in Algeria, the Shāwiya of the Awrâs. E. Douâté (Menzâd, p. 4–5) mentions several other groups of less importance. An endeavour has also been made to connect Choa, the name of a district in Abyssinia, with Shāwiya.

Wherever it is found, the term is applied to Berbers of the Zanâta and Hâwârâ, more or less arabised, mixed with purely Arab elements; almost always, moreover, these ethnic groups seem to have schematic tendencies.

The massif of the Awràs occupied by the Shāwiya of the department of Constantine, was in the viii. century the centre of resistance of the Abâdâ (q.v.) Khâridjîa as the Mâs still is at the present day. Now among the Shāwiya of Morooco, the successors to the heretical Baraghâwatâ (q.v.), we find the province of Mâqâï and the adjacent part of the territory of Bârak; conquered and oppressed by the Arabs, they had scattered through the whole of the Maghrib where, crushed by taxation and having lost that pride and independence which once characterised them, they devoted themselves to sheep-breeding, whence the name ultimately given them. As to the Zanâta, they were nomadic Berbers, like the Auras, living in tents on the produce of their flocks and spending the summer in the Tell and the winter in the desert (Ibn Khaldûn, Hist. des Berbères, i. 1; transl., ill. 179–180).

The name of Shāwiya seems to be first found in Ibn Khaldûn (Problèmes, i. 226, 256; Hist. des Berbères, i. 179, 21); transl. i. 278; ii. 254; transl. i. 31); the Shāwiya mentioned in this last passage do not seem to correspond to those of Tamaânt but to some people of Eastern Morocco, neighbours of the tribes of Hâwârâ and Zakkâra.

Next, Leo Africanus (i. 83–84) who calls them Shurûw tells us that they are African (i.e. Berber) tribes who have adopted the Arab way of living. The majority live in the Atlas or in the mountain range itself, living by cattle- and sheep-breeding. Wherever they dwell they are always subject to the local dynast or to Arabs. This author already knew two main groups: one in Morocco, in Tamaânt, the other on the borders of the kingdom of Tunis and the "land of Dâten" (Hilâd al-Madâr).

It will be easily understood that in the Arab world, the term "sheep-breeders" would have a contemptuous significance. As M. W. Marquis observes "in ancient Arabia a certain disgrace seems to have been attached to the breeding of the smaller domestic stock. North African opinion has retained a prejudice against the eaters of sheep. The great camel-rearing nomads have nothing but contempt for them. In the middle ages the feeling may have been strengthened by racial antagonism, real or imaginary. But in general at this period, to abandon the camel and adopt the sheep was an avowal of a terrible downfall for a tribe. It

meant renouncing the long free travels, the secure refuge of the desert, and independence, to submit to local rulers, endure their blows and tolerate their fiscal exactions."

2. Shāwiya of Tamaânt. They occupy the N. E. the lower course of the Oum al-Khîr; vast fertile plains which extend to the latitude of the little harbour of Fesâla. They are descended, according to Leo Africanus (iii. 9) from the Zanâta, and Hâwârâ whom the Marâid sovereigns settled there and who mixed with the remnants of the Baraghâwât (q.v.), the ancient heretical inhabitants of the region, as well as with the Arabs brought from Ittâ'sya by the Almolâh Sultân Yâbûb al-Mansûr. These Shāwiya now speak Arabic; the modern tribes which seem to be of Berber origin are the Zanâta, Medîyât, Mâaï, Mellila, Zirzâta, and the Ulid Bû-Zirû.

3. Shāwiya of the Awrâs. They occupy this mountain mass, in the south of the department of Constantine, between Bata and Biska. Ibn Khaldûn (Hist. des Berbères, ii. 1; transl. ill. 179–180) already mentions sections of the Zanâta settled in the Awrâs alongside of the Hiilîf Arabs who had conquered them. It is no doubt to their living in a mountainous country that these Shāwiya have preserved a Berber dialect to the present day.


SHAWWAL, name of the tenth month of the lunar year. In the Kūrān (Sūra ii. 2) four months are mentioned during which, in the year 9 A.H., the Arabs could move in their country without exposing themselves to attacks (cf. "the sacred months" in verse 5). These four months were, according to the commentators, Shawwâl, Dhū l-‘Ikâda, Dhū l-‘Hijja and Muhârîram. In Ḥadîth Shawwâl is therefore mentioned among the "months of pilgrimage" mentioned in Alîth's Book" (al-Bukhâri, Ḥadîth, bāt 33, 37).

In pre-Islamic times Shawwâl was considered illomened for the conclusion of marriages (Liṣān
al-'Arabî, c. v.). In order to prove this opinion
baseless, Kâfîa emphasised the fact that Mu-
hammad had married her in this month (Tirumûrū,
Nîlân, hâl 10). In the modern Muslim world there
is difference of opinion concerning this point.
Among the Muslim Tigré tribes Shawwâl is one
of the months suitable for celebrating marriages,
and in 'Unmân, on the other hand, it is considered
illomened in this respect.

The law recommends fasting during six days
following the 'ad al-fitr (q.v.); cf. Tirimûrû, Simûs,
hâl 52. Whosoever fasts the month of Ramadan
as also six days of Shawwâl, has reached the
law al-dhâha; cf. also Muslim, 'Umar, trad. 203).
Nevertheless these days usually partial, and
solemn character of the "lessers festival".

For the same reason: Shawwâl bears not only the epithet
of al-nukarram ("the venerated"), but also such
names as al-fitr & al-tîmî (Tigré), hâlân (Turkey),
Ifîr-i-tâlî (Unmân), urâs râyân (Acheh).

Bibliography: Littmann, Die Ehrungen und
Noorannamern der islamischen Monate
in IsA, viii. 228 sqq.; Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca, 97; do., The Achehese, l. 237, 299.

(A. J. WESSEYNICK)

SHA'AYA, Isâhâ, son of Amûs, a prophet sent
by the islaams in the reign of Sadûq (Seddacis,
by confusion with hezekiah), took part in the
siege of Jerusalem under Sassanpûsiri, summoned
by the king that his death had been postponed
for fifteen years; the besiegers all perished except
their king and five of his secretaries who took
refuge in a cave. For 66 days the king made the
people walk round Jerusalem, giving them two loaves of barley each day as their food.
According to Muhammad b. Isâhâ, Isâhâ fleeing
from the islaams who had turned against him
on account of his prophecies, came in the course
of his flight to a tree which bent down and he
took refuge in it. Satan having caught the hem
of his garment which remained visible, betrayed
him by this means and the islaams saved the
tree through the middle. Tabari gives as his
authority Wâli b. Munabbih, an echo of the
Talmud (Jerem. 4009, v. 636) which places
the event in the reign of Naamseh. The book
of Isahâ is quoted by Mutahhar b. Tâhir al-Mâshî, Livre de la Creation, ed. and transl. Huart, l. 188;
d. l. 172.

Bibliography: Tabari, Annals, l. 638-645;
Jun al-Athir, ed. Hâmmâr, l. 788-800;
Mirkhoud, Nouvel âl-Safâ, Tâmour, l. 121;
îsâhâ; cit. ii. Kolt. xix.-xx.; ii. Chronique,
xvii.; Kmoln, xvii. 4; al-Bajâqî, Tafchrist,
ed. Fleischet, l. 533. (Ed. HUAR)

SHEBIB BILÂT. [See SHA'BâN.]

SHEBEK. [See SHABA.]

SHEBISTARI. Sâ'd al-Âlam MAHMÔD b. 'ABD
al-Qâhir b. Yâqûb, author of the Persian
mystic work entitled Gûshân-i Rûs, was
born circa 650 at Shahistâr (Cahabûr), a village
near Tabrîz, and died in 720. He composed the
Gûshân-i Rûs in 717 in answer to fifteen questions
which had been sent to him by an eminent Sufi of
Khurânân, whom Dâmarî (Nafisi, p. 705) identifies
with the celebrated Mr Fâhîr al-Sâhîb. Hânnân
of Gîrîr. These questions, written in rhymed verse,
form part of the mawzûhû, each one standing at
the head of a separate section. The popularity
of the poem is attested by the large number of
commentaries upon it (Ethb, India Office Lib. Cat., 996
N. 41816). Within the compass of little more than
a thousand verses Shahistâr explains concisely
and in simple language the doctrine of wâjdat al-
waqîfât, the descent and ascension of the "perfect
man" (see Ind. al-Kâmîl and H. H. Schaedler,
Die islamische Lehre vom vollkommenen Mannehen,
Z. D. M. G., 1925, p. 233, sqq.), and other leading
ideas of the later Persian mystical poetry, which
was deeply influenced by him al-'Arûsî — as well
as as the terms used in the erotic symbolism "where-
by the 'Sâfîs express their conceptions of God and
the universe and their ecstatic experiences". The
author refers to his want of practice in vernifi-
cation, but though some traces of this are appa-
rent, he shows himself to be a true poet. Besides the
Gûshân-i Rûs he has left three prose treatises on
Shâûn, namely: (1) Hotâk al-yâzân fi Masâ'îf-râb
al-Âlamûn; (2) Sab'âdat-nâmâ; (3) Rûsîl-i
Shâûn.

Bibliography: E. G. Browne, Persian
Literature under Tâhur Dominions, pp. 146-150;
J. von Hammer-Purgstall, Mahmûd Shâhristâr's
Rosenflor des Gelehrtenmenschen, Persisch und Deutsch.
Pesth 1838; E. II. Whinfield, Gûshân-i Rûs:
The Mystic Rose Garden of Sâ'd al-Dîn Mahmûd
Shâhristâr. Persian text with English translation
and notes, chiefly from the commentary of Mahmoud bin Yâbûl Lâhlî, London 1880.

(R. A. NICHOLSON)

SHEFIK MEHMED EFEENDI, called Ma帅气
shâde, Ottoman an imperial historian
and stylist. Not much is known of his life. He
was born in Stamboul, received an appointment as clerk
in the Dwan (dwan khâtîb), later became one of the
khânçes, i.e. head of one of the 28 chancel-
leries (cf. J. von Hammer, G. O. R., viii. 431),
was next appointed chief of the smaller
audit office (muâshâhîsî-khâtîb) of the pious
foundations (waṣâfî), and ultimately was appointed
imperial historian (waṣâfî-nâmâ). He seems to have
died not long after his appointment to the office,
the date of his death is given as 1127 (1717/1718).
Mehmed Shefik Efendi is not prominent on the
roll of official imperial historians as the author
of the waṣâfî-nâmâ Muṣâfa Na'ma (4 vols) who
died in the Morea in 1125 (1716) was immediately
continued by Mehmed Rakhîd, the former dealing
with the years 1090-1707 and the latter with
1071-1134. Mehmed Shefik Efendi only described
— by command of Sultan Ahmud III — the
important events of the year 1115 (1703), that is
practically the fall of Muṣâfa II and accession
of Ahmud III, under the title Ta'âvîkî-Abâlîh (by
which he meant himself). There is a good
manuscript of this short work (c. 75 folios) in the
Vienna National Library; cf. G. Flügel's Katalog,
ii. 278 sqq. Mehmed Shefik also describes the
same revolution in a work entitled Shefîk-nâmâ, which
has become famous on account of its involved
allegorical style; the difference between the two
works is that, as it was not advisable in the former
work to discuss quite openly the secret workings
of the rising and its course, in the latter he used
a secret, allegorical style and at the same time
gave his political and historical creed (cf. Flügel,
Stam., ii. 471; according to J. von Hammer, G. O. R., ix. 207, N. 92). The Shefîk-nâmâ has
been several times printed (Stamboul 1282 (1865),
small 8°, p. 112; Stamboul 1289 (1874); p. 154,
SHEFİK MEHMET — SHEHRIZUR

small 8°, with a commentary (Şefik'hâne sherifî) by ession ed-Din Mehmed Paşa Kurnat-ı-kâmilî under this title also published separately 1269, p. 312, 8°, Stambul) and several times annotated; besides the above commentary, mention may be made of that by Abdallah Mehmed b. Ahmad (of Khalis in the Yedi Bâmi'L Library in Stambul cf. Brusel Mehmed Tâhir, "O'zemanî Mü'ellifleri, ii, 426, Hâddîji Khalîfî, Kâ'}îf al-Zâmî, vi, 600, No. 14822). A French translation planned by Arthur Alric does not seem to have been printed.

Bibliography: Si'djîli‘-i ‘osmâni, illi, 152, (brief); Djamal ed-Din, ‘Ozemanî ‘Tevâhî me-Müherşerbânî, Stambul 1314, p. 50 sq.; Sâlim, Tadrîsî, Stambul 1315, 385 sq. (where he is wrongly called: Ahmed); Brusel Mehmed Tâhir, "O'zemanî Mü'ellifleri, illi, 75.

(Franz Babinger)

SHEHR. [See ŞAHÊR.]

SHEHRI SER.B. [See KAŞI.]

SHEHRÎZUR (Şehrârîzur, in the Şehêr-i-nâmé: Şehrârîzûr), a district in Kûstânê. Şehrîzur, strictly speaking, is a beautiful and fertile plain (36 X 25 miles) situated to the west of the plain of Ahrâmên (cf. Sannû). To the south-east it adjoins the Persian district of Ahrâmên; to the north it adjoins the plain of the Irânian (Kenza-Üzûr). On the south the river Siriân is the boundary of the district; on the south-west Şehrîzur extends as far as the pass of Darâmîn-i Khân, by which the Siriân (Diyâla) makes its way to the south. On the west Şehrîzur is bounded by Arbet which belongs to Salâmâniya. To the north a buttress of the Ahrâmên (Kurra-Kâşû) separates it from the district of Kosta-Ewânî (Şehrî-erbûrê).

The plain is watered by the tributaries of the Têdjerî (Têdjerî), which coming from Salâmâniya flows into the Siriân; the chief of these tributaries is the river Zalâm, which in turn receives the Çewînî from the north.

The mountains Nalîrî and Bâlbâmî rising on the right bank of the Siriân separate the plain from the right bank of this river (the district of Şât-malîita). The district of Şamirîn situated on the left bank in the bend of the Siriân is also considered a dependency of Şehrîzur.

The old centre situated where the river Zalâm enters the plain, is Gûl-anar, whose real name seems to be Gihâmî (Khîlîmî-bar), to which the Kurd name Kherrîmî corresponds phonetically. The present chief town is Ala-bâ (Alâheh Halaîba), a township of 500 houses, 25 being Jewish and there are a few Christian families.

The plain belongs to the Dîr Kurds. In the time of Rich (p. 107) there were Afghan colonies in the province of Şehrîzur; these were the remains of the troops of Ahrâmîn, who during his struggle against Kermî Khan Zand (q. v.) besieged Semî (in 1168).

To the south-east of Şehrîzur, in the two parallel gorges formed by the spur of the Ahrâmên amongst vineyards and woods are situated the villages of Bâyêr and Tawîlîs belonging to Nakhî-banî; Sişîkîs. Numbers of pilgrims come thither from all parts, even from Russia and India. At Tawîlîs there is a beautiful mosque built by Shahîq ‘Omar, who is himself buried at Bâyêr. The two villages form enclaves in Ahrâmên-i-ubahîn and the Ahrâmên dialect is spoken in the north. It is said to extend even as far as Fandînî.

The district of Şehrîzur is closely associated with the beliefs of the Ahâf-i ‘Çakî (q. v., ‘Çakî-kal‘î), the initiates of the sect await the last judgment which is to take place in the plain of Şehrîzur, "in the threshold of Şehrîzur (Şehrîzûr-i Muhammadâ) all the faithful will receive their due." In the wide sense of the word, Şehrîzur served to denote the eyelet of the world whence, as one can see, there resulted a considerable amount of confusion in geographical terms.

History. For the epoch of the Assyrians, Billerbeck places at Şehrîzur the centre of the Zama country, inhabited at the time of Assur-nâsîpat by the Luîla people. Streek seems to agree with this localisation of Zama (Z. A., xv. 1900 p. 284). The Arâb (Ibn Mulshîhîl) associated with Şehrîzur (more precisely Duzdîn) the biblical legends concerning Saul (Tâlût) and David, which suggests the presence in these districts of strong Jewish colonies.

The numerous tumults in the plain of Şehrîzur confirm the testimony — of Theoephanes as well as of Mu‘îr b. Muhaîlît — regarding the number of settlements in this region. The most important town bore the name of Nîm-âs-tî (Nîmêtî) i.e. "half-way" between Ctesiphon and the great fire-altar of Shîr (q. v.) (Tâlût-i Salâmîn in Ardaşîrîn). Cirikov and Hertfeld (on his map) identify Nîm with Gûl-anar, and this corresponds with the situation of Mîsam (in Ya‘kût) regarding the proximity of the town to the mountains of Şehrîzur and Zalâm. The most persistent tradition (Ibn al-Fâkhî, p. 199, Mustawîf, p. 107) attributes its construction to the Sâsâmî Kawaiâ, the son of Pîrîc (488—531). The ruins of a Sâsâmî bridge on the Siriân protected by the fort of Şamirîn (Cirikov, 438) indicate the line of communications of Nimrâh with Kaşr-i Şîrîn. At this latter point the route coming from Ctesiphon forked: to run towards Hamadân and towards Şehrîzur (Ibn Rusta, p. 164, Edrisî, ed. Jaubert, p. 136). On the other hand, according to Rawlinson (J. R. Â. S., 1868, p. 296—300), the monument of Pî-kullî on the right bank of the Siriân not far from the foot of Bûkîl-baî Àrak marked a station on the road from Nimrâh, which the great explorer thought was to be found at Vâsîn-tapâ to the North-West of the plain of Şehrîzur. As the monument dates back to the epoch of the first Sâsâmîs, the road, before the construction of Nimrâh, might well have followed another direction in the plain. According to Ibn Khurîdahî (p. 120) the Sâsâmîs, after their accession to the throne, made a pilgrimage on foot to Shîr. The monument of Pî-kullî may mark the road. Hertfeld promises to publish separately the geographical part of his new explorations in this district. Finally, the Kurds told Rich (i. 269) that the ancient town of Şehrîzur? was at Kêlakà to the south-east of Arbet (cf. Hausknecht's map).

Şehrîzur, forming part of the diocese of Bîth Garîmî (Bâ-Dîrmaî) is often mentioned in the history of the Nestorian Church. The Syriac Orientale (ed. Chatot, 1902, p. 266) gives the names of its bishops between 554 and 605.

During his third Persian campaign the Emperor Hormizd spent the month of February in 628 in Şehrîzur "laying waste the district and towns by fire" (Theophanes Chronographes, ed. de Boor, p. 325; q. v. Zadour; Chronicon Paschale, ed. Dindorf, i. 730; les an Ephraïmos — the two graphics indicate the pronunciation -eir and not -em).
The Arabs had reached Shehriyar soon in Saharan times (Ibn al-Fakhr, p. 150). The remote situation of Shehriyar frequently attracted rebels and rebels and its location (Khartoum, Khartoum). The district is often mentioned along with Dimaqahan and Dinar (Kuräa, p. 233) the exact sites of which are unknown. In the time of Ibn Malahid (330944) there were in Shehriyar 60,000 (7) tents of Islam. Djidji (Rich, l. 250, Gebel-like), Bulsäm, Habob, and Shit (Shiite).

The same author (in Yaqut) counts Shi'a (perhaps a misleading of Hofmann, p. 254) among the town names of Shehriyar and mentions a little town Darân (7) between Nimrâd and Shu'a. The other names of places in the region of Shehriyar were Tanjâm (Ibn al-Atîr, Kamsi (7) and Dilmamast (Yâku), Between 400 and 434, seons of the Kurdi dynasty of the Hanawithiules ruled at Shehriyar.

In the eight (seventh) century the Turcomans and the Zangid Atâbeg held the district. In the time of Yâku, Maqsâf al-Din Kuîbî, Atâbeg of Arbil had settled himself there. In 693 (1296) an earthquake raised the road. According to al-Umari (7. 249 = 1348) Shehriyar "before its depopulation" was inhabited by Khul Kurda (Ritch, l. 254), a few remnants of them in this region; cf. also place-names like Kons-maalina, Manum-Kons). After the capture of Baghdad by Huluj, all these Kurds migrated to Egypt and Syria and their place was taken by the Hanawithiules (7) who are not true Kurds.

Shehriyar was inhabited by the modern name Avrâmîn, who still occupy the western slope of the mountains. On the other hand, a Khul whom A. von Le Coq met in 1901 at Damascus spoke the same dialect (7-7) which is not a proper Kurd one.

Timur crossed Shehriyar in 503 (1401) on his way from Baghdad to Tabr (Zafar-un-nâm, ii. 370; as Shehriyar von Kalâgîh).

Shehriyar played an important part in the Turco-Persian wars. According to the Shârâf-al-nâm, the Ardûl family (cf. Shârâf-un-nâm) had been at first settled in Shehriyar. The local history of Sinai even claims that the fort of Zalm was built by Bâba Ardûl in 504 (1158). Sulhân Sulamâân about 944 (1537) sent the governor of Amâdu to conquer Shehriyar but although a fortress was built at Gûl-anbar, the Ardûl re-established their authority in the district (Shârâf-al-nâm, 84). Shah Âhmad dismantled this fortress but it was restored during the Persian campaign of Khusrâw-pažâh (7-7) in 1630. The treaty of 1049 (1639) allotted to Turkey the western slope of the Avrâmîn with the fort of Zalm. Changes, however, must have taken place slowly, for Tavernier on his journey in 1644, seems to place this Turco-Persian frontier much further west. The representatives of Sulamâân-Khân, Wall of Ardûl, maintained a garrison in a "large town", the situation of which corresponds to that of Gûl-anbar. We may note here that Tavernier seems to mention the town of Alum-serek (7) under the name "Shehriyar".

The Ardûl being finally removed from Shehriyar, the district was governed by local hereditary chiefs who received their investiture from Constantinople. At the beginning of the eighteenth century the governor of the 'Irâq, Hasan-Fâhâ, was allowed by the Porte to have southern Kurdistan placed under his control. The eyalit of Shehriyar was then formed containing the sandîks of Kerân, Arbil, Kôn-sanâêt, Kora-colis (Shârâf-un-nâm).

Rawanduz and Harî, the mutessilims of which were appointed from Bâghdâd (Khurâf-al-END, p. 199-263). But soon the Bâhân chiefs (cf. Sulamâân-Yâku) attained to power and Shehriyar was placed under them. After the administrative reforms of 1857 and the creation of the wilayet of Mawsil the name of Shehriyar was given to the sandîk of Kerân (the kurân were: Kerân, Arbil, Kônî, Rawanduz, Kôrî and Sanâût). In order to complete the confusion the plain of Shehriyar proper was included in the sandîk of Sulamâân-Yâku (v. Cuvet, La Turquie en Asie, ii. 764).

From the sixteenth century a branch of the tribe ofelay (cf. Sena) had been established in Turkish territory. The plain of Shehriyar, as well as many villages in Khur, Pandjavân, etc., belonged before the world to the powerful Dîlî chiefs, Othmân Pâshâ and Mâmûd Pâshâ. This family exercised administrative functions of which the Porte gradually tried to deprive them. For a considerable time the effective administration of Shehriyar was in the hands of the widow of Othmân Pâshâ, the energetic Adîla-Khânum, a native of Senne. Senne has given an interesting description of her little court at Alâbe.

Archaeology. Among the half score of tombs on the plain of Shehriyar (Hassdnacht's map) the most important are: Bakrêwa (Ciricov: 120 feet high), diameter 450 feet, remains of walls, ditch 60 feet broad) and Yûstapâ (F. Jones; square in shape 90 feet high, surface sloping from N. to S. 320 feet). Important ruins exist at Gul-anbar (Ciricov: walls of trimmed stone, towers and an ancient aqueduct). In the ravine of the river Zalm above Gul-anbar lies the fort of Zalm. Karwint (Aâhîr-e-Râbî, ii. 266) explains that these are called a kind (kashâ) possessing aphrodisiological qualities and not found elsewhere. Tavernier mentions lilies between Shehriyar and Senne having similar properties. The Dzâhânunâm (p. 442) gives the gorge at Zalm the epithets, "habitation of the blue sorcerers" (așâq-rotâz) and "care of the confusion of speech" (Aîlî-7-khân). He mentions the local sights: the fort of 'Ali Zalm (apparently for Zalm), another ruined fort of Yezdegerd and a cave (natural) with a staircase and windows carved out of the rock. We may recall in this connection the Christian tradition of the monk Sabishî who had built a cell in the mountains of Shârān (Labeur, Le christianisme dans l'Empire Persan, Paris 1904, p. 310). The number of fortifications on the river Zalm show the importance of the place. Their object was to protect Shehriyar from invasion from the east. The usual routes of communication with Akbarbûldûn were however by the more convenient passes more to the north (Câlahn Giri, Nawkhausan, the passes of Bûnû).

Cartography: Map by F. Jones; Hanshnecht, Kipert, Reis in Orient, i1; Kuristan and Jarr. H. Hertfeld, Pavlial, Monument and Inscription of the early history of the Sassanian Empire, Berlin 1924, map 1: 200,000.

(See 'al-Fitr.)

SHEKHK BAI BAKRI. Shekhk is a district in Eastern Transcaucasia. In Armenia, it is called Shekht, in Georgian Skhakha (and Shekha); the Arabs write Shakhkal (Busu Bakhladzhi, p. 123, 124, 125; Balchard, p. 205), Shakhk (Yakub, iii. 311), Shakhkha (Ibn al-Fakih, p. 293, Balchard, p. 194). Shakhk (Muhammad, Musli, i. 68).

The usual boundaries of Shekht were: on the east, the Gokji which separates it from Abw zam (cf. v.); on the west, the Aklan (Turk. Kazkh) and its left tributary the Kazhly, which separates Shekht from Georgia (Kakhkhtia) and the Georgian counties later occupied by the Djaghatsuks (Elbasan, now Zekeri Aish); in the north the southern slopes of the Caucasus (Salawat-Dagh), the passes of which, however, are within the confines of Djaghats (Djaghats), to the south the Kura (Kur). Shekht is named by the tributary of the Alakan, Agi-kai (river running diagonally) i.e. from east to west and the river Alqij (Gilan) and Turlyan which run towards the Kur. Shekht consists of three regions, one of high valleys covered with forests and orchards; a central one, a treed and desert plateau; lastly a fertile plain declining to the Kur.

The variety of the factors which have influenced this remote region is responsible for the remarkable character of its local history in which we see how, before us in succession, the Albanians (Aghjowats), Armenians, Georgians, the people of Daghats, Russians, Turks and Russians.

In ancient times it formed part of Caucasian Albania (cf. Arman) which was a confederation of 26 tribes speaking different languages (Strabo, xi. 4). The remnants of one of these tribes are believed to survive in the Ulus, who are still to be found at Shekht (Balchard, p. 203, Ulus). From their name they must have originally come from the region of Oti (Strabo, xi. 7; Ov low); Fliny, xi. 138; Crito) lying on the right bank of the Kura (the modern Gandja, Shameki, Talat). It is first believed to have belonged to Armenia Major but was later occupied by the Albanians (cf. 11th Armenian geography of the 8th century translated into Russian by Palanov, 1877, p. 54). The present language of the Ulus is related to the S.E. group of languages of Djaghats (Khinchakh, Baniakh, etc.) and has been subjected to very heterogeneous influences, especially Turkish (Marqam, Ostertag'sche Stud, p. 49). The Albanians were very early converted by the Armenians and according to the Armenian legend the church of Gal (now Kish) was built by Rish, a disciple of the Apostle Thaddaeus.

Among the places mentioned in Albania by Polonya Kaskha and al-Kuba (vokh) occupying the same position, long. 50°, lat. 47°, must correspond to Kabala and to the passes which allow a free access to the valley of Samur (Khoin and Kakeh roads). The ruins of Kabala lie near the confluence of the two branches of the Tirtiyan-kai. "Arnav (long. 77° 30', lat. 44° 45') may correspond to the town of Shekht which has now disappeared (Yanovski places it S.W. of Nukh, the present village of Shikh). The other villages of Skiht (Sirn = Nukh) still has its name connected with the ancient town. The present capital Nukh or Nukh (on the river Kish) is said to have taken its name from a village more to the east (Sultan-Nukh, now Nukh); its name is only found from the xvth century onwards, unless it is connected with Tekin (name of an Albanian canton according to the Armenian geographers).

When the Arabs talk of towns of Arnav built by the Sasanians they probably only refer to the rebuilding of ancient sites; thus Kabi b. Faruk (488-531) is credited with the building of Kabala (Ibn al-Fakih, p. 286; Yakub, iv. 32) and his son Kherarsh Ashshawru (551-579), with al-Bakht, Kambtihan (Raghaberfe, Kambtihan in Kakhkhtia) and Al-Bakht, al-Dhulani (Balchard, p. 194).

Under the Caliph Uthman, Salman b. Rabab having crossed the Kur conquered Kabala, but continued himself in concluding an advantageous peace with the chiefs of Shikhy and Cambtihan. Later Djarzah b. 'Abd Allah al-Hakam halted at Shikh on his return from the Djaghats campaign.

The Christians of Shekht remained for a long time in the majority. According to Ma'addi (ii. 85) the principality of Skhik, adjoining that of Samal (Polonya, v. 91, Simak, Damir in the valley of the river Samur), was inhabited by Christians and the Musulins who worked as merchants and artisans. The king was called Adamaros b. Humam. The next district on the east was Kabala, "a haunt of robbers and bandits", a town of which had a Muslim population while the environ were inhabited by Christians. The king (M'adid) of Kabala was called 'Abaasatu al-Awar (the "one-eyed"). The identity of these is still uncertain. Towards the end of the 6th century, Georgians and Armenian sources mention a mysterious Adsmart, the Blind (Broset, i/4, 249); in the 8th century the name of Armenia was falsely transferred to the family of Mikhail (Albanian princes of Samur origin, Broset, i/2, 480). According to Mokaddese, p. 51, Kabala and Shekht were little towns.

Shekht later belonged to the Shirwanis, with whom, however, the Georgians disputed its possession. In 1117 King David conquered Gish (Kish above Nukh) on one of the tributaries of the Agrjali. This little town was the residence of the governor (czarxan) of Tankh (district of N.E. of Alasan) and of the bishop whose diocese comprised.
Elfen (Ellen), Tarkhan and Shakhli. Bossest, t. 17, 550, thought the latter name identical with Shakhli. In 1622 (1625) we again have the Shvrszhkhsh Shekki called on to complain to the Khv-Srimshkh Djalil al-Din of the loss of Shakhli and Kabala which had been taken by the Georgians. Towards 626 (1229) Djalil al-Din established his authority over both towns simultaneously. (Nasawi, ed. Housius, i. 146, 176).

It is the time of Timur we find Sidi 'Ali of the Arlit tribe acting as wali of the wilyet of Shakhli. (Aril is the name of one of the four chief tribes of the Uilz of Caghatti, q.v.) A punitive expedition sent by Timur (1790-1393) drove him from his office. Although a "good Muslim" he joined the Georgians and perished in a skirmish under the walls of the fortress of Alingjik (near Nakhalzawan). About 801 (1398) through the intervention of Amir Shakh Hisham of Shirvan (who had originally been a humble landowner in Shekki) Sidi 'Ali, son of Sidi 'Ali, was restored as chief of that tribe and governor of Shakhli. Ibranum and 'Aliy afterwarwards acted in concert (Zafar-nama, Calcutta, i. 731; ii. 204, 218, 222).

To judge from the dates upon tombstones found by Yanovsky in the cemetery of Kabala (890-901 = 1447-1485), this town must have no longer existed towards the period of the Kara-Koyants and Ak-Koyants dynasties.

At the beginning of the Safawi period Shakhli was ruled by the hereditary chief Husain Beg, a son (according to the Gultamir-nama) of the Shirvanshsh dynasty. Hard pressured by the Georgians, he appealed for help to Shah Tahmasp, but was killed in a battle against Lewan I, king of Kakheta (1520-1574). When Shirwan was conquered by Shah Tahmasp (in 943 = 1538), Darwish Muhammad, son of Husain, sided the last Shirvanshsh against the Persians. In 958 (1551) Shah Tahmasp with the help of King Lewan besieged Kakh and the fortress of Gulsanpur ("see and set it") near the modern North. Shakhli was annexed by Persia.

When in 898 (1578) the Ottoman troops under Lala Mustafa Pasha fought a battle at Kakh against the Khans of Gudia, Erivan and Nakhalzawan, King Alexander II of Kakheta, an ally of the Turks, occupied Shakhli without striking a blow, and it became an Ottoman sandjak. The Turks re-established at Shakhli the son of the former governor, Ahmid Khan (Hammer, G.O.R. ii, 484), but an Ottoman governor (Kariy Pazha) was placed in Arslan.

When the Safawi again became masters of Transcaucasia, Shah 'Abdul appointed the Georgian prince Constantin-Mirza (son of Alexander II of Kakheta) vizier (in 1014 = 1606). Shahmiy Khan of Shakhli became his faithful vassal. Later the Safawis removed their protection from the kings of Kakheta who were turning towards Moscow, tried to reduce their possessions and towards 1643, Shakhli fell into the power of local madirs and razgas. Under 'Abdul Ewliya Celebi visited Shakhli (li. 286-293). At this time (about 1657 = 1697) the Sultans of Shakhli were under the Khans of Arslan. The town had 500 houses, although he puts the stronghold of Shakhli in the city of Shirwan Ewliya and states it is considered to belong to Georgia, "because the Georgians had founded it". Ewliya's works on the tribe of Kaliash whom he met near Mahamulabol (Khalka) are very curious; these people talked pure Mongol (li. 291) which has now completely disappeared from these regions.

Nadir and his troops several times traversed the territory of Shakhli and Kabala (in 1147, 1154). To be able the latter to resist him the local petty chiefs chose as their leader 'Abdul-Allah (Abdul-Kadir) the former tax-collector Hajiidy Celebi, son of Kurban. In 1157 (1744) Nadir Shah besieged the fortress of Gulsanpur without success. After the death of Nadir (1160 = 1747) local dynasties arose again throughout the Eastern Caucasus. Hajiidy Celebi consolidated his position and only allowed authority to the sultans of Arslan and Kabala. On two occasions he inflicted defeats on King Frakel of Georgia. This energetic man, whose character is not without chivalrous features, played a considerable part in Transcaucasia (Bossest, ii. 2, 88).

Hajiidy Celebi, a grandson, we are assured, of the priest (Karabakhsh) of the former church of Kakh, was a zealous Muslim and converted to Islam forcibly a large number of his Christian subjects. He died in 1172 (1759). His descendants (Agha-Keshi, Husain, Abd al-Kadir) relying alternately on their neighbours in Darband (Fath Ali Khan) or Karabakh (Ibranum Khan) expended their energies in intrigues and internal struggles. Finally in December 21, 1755, Muhammad Hasan, son of Husain Khan, established himself at Nakhla after having massacred the whole family of 'Abd al-Kadir (who had murdered Muhammad Hasan's father). He proved an able administrator. He annexed to Shakhli the cantons of Arslan and Kabala, colonised the open lands and drew up a written canon of laws (dastur al-walas) by which the population were divided into five classes: the beg (3 categories; in all 1560 of whom 51 were Armenians), the monks, the waqf (masqar) — 700 mm at arms excepted from taxation, the amir (peasant-proprietors) and the sandjar (peasants).

About 1209 (1795) Salim Khan, brother of Muhammad Hasan, seized Shakhli and invaded the seat of government to Gulsan-Gudia. Muhammad Hasan, taking refuge with Agha Muhammad Kadir was blinded by his orders and sent into exile in Russia. In May 1805 Salim Khan submitted to the Russians and promised to pay tribute but soon rebelled against his new sovereigns. On Dec. 10, 1806 the Russians invested l'ignu Kuli Khan Dumbait, the former governor of Khor Nhật Khan, son of Djanar Kuli, General Yermolov, and Shakhli as a separate province in the Russian empire. At this date (1814) the khanate covered 7,600 square miles, contained 200 villages and had a population of 93,500 of whom 80,000 were Adhadrakhsh Turks, 15,300 Armenians, 1,500 Ulli and 1,000 Jews.

Since 1846 Shakhli, divided into two districts (viceroy: Nakhil and Arslan (capital: Ak-dash) has been under the governor of Elivanetpol (Gandja). According to the census of 1896, the district of Nakhil (1600 square miles) had a population of 49,797 of whom 66,600 were Turks, 14,500 Armenians, 7,400 Ulli, 4,400 Greeks and 1,500 Jews. The town of Nakhil had 25,000 inhabitants (81/4
Turks and 18% Armenians). Among the villages of Nakhchivan may be mentioned the two last refuges of the Udi: Wattaghin (majority Jewish; the Udi half Armenian-Gregorians and Orthodox) and Nif or Nis (5000 Udi, Armenian-Gregorians). The village of Nakhchivan, Yolm (Vakhsh, iii. 314) still exists west of Wattaghin. The district of Nakhchivan produces raw silk, fruits and wine. The district of Aresh covers 1000 square miles, has 125 villages and 52,372 inhabitants, of whom 37,577 are Turks, 12,278 Armenians and a few Gregorians, Kurds and gypsies. The district consists of steppes and flat lands where rice is grown. Many of the inhabitants are semi-nomads.

Since the Russian revolution the old khanate has formed part of the Acharbaddjan republic (at first affiliated to the Transcaucasian federation, later independent and finally, since 1920, Soviet).


ELIZA, in the texts of the middle ages, Shafo, title of the Marathi Shahis of Mogov, S. E. of the Acharbadda fortress of Ribat al-Fath (Bush), 70 yards below the gate now called Bub Jax. It occupies the site of an ancient Persian settlement, later the Roman Sala Colonia (cf. Rabat), some distance above the mouth of the Wadi Bit-ragragh. With Salai (Sale) on the other side of the river and the Almohad Ribat al-Fath, it formed from quite early times a centre of mobilization for the holy war.

At the end of the xinith century, the Maralid princes decided to use this site for their dynastic necropolis. The first member of the family to be buried there was the prince Umm al-Izz (d. 693 =1258); she was the wife of Suljan Abu Yaqub Ya'la b. Abi al-Hajjaj and the mother of Suljan Abu Ya'la Yaqub. On his death which took place at Algecras in 682 (1286), Suljan Abu Ya'la Yaqub was taken to Shella to be buried; 706 (1239) his son Abu Ya'la Yaqub after his assassination at Tlemsen and in 708 (1308) Suljan Tshuli 'Amir who was poisoned at Tangier were likewise buried there.

Down to this time the necropolis seems to have been a simple sanctuary of modest size. It was the Suljan Abu l-Hassan 'Ali who gave it the appearance which it has retained to the present day. He enclosed the original sanctuary within a vast enclosure of cement, with three gates, one of them monumental. The work was finished, as the inscription testifies, at the end of 739 (1339). Within the necropolis, various restorations, extensions and decorations were undertaken at the same time. A new mosque was built with a splendid funeral chamber. In the lifetime of the Sultan, his son Abu Malik (d. 740 =1340) and his wife Shamsa al-Dinah (d. 750 =1350) were buried at Shella. On his death in 752 (1351), on the mountain of the Hinat in the Great Atlas, the Sultan's body was brought here for burial by order of his son Abu Tashin.

No Maralid Suljan was buried here after Abu l-Hassan; the enclosure however continued to receive the remains of members of the royal family. It was for some time a splendid sanctuary, some idea of which may be gathered, not only from what remains of the present day, but also from the enthusiastic descriptions written in the xivith century by the celebrated Andalusian writer Lisan al-din Ibn al-Khatib. With the fall of the Maralid dynasty, the necropolis of Shella began to fall into ruins as it was no longer cared for. Since the French occupation, the remains that still exist are preserved against any further injury.

An architectural, epigraphical, monumental and folklore study, with numerous illustrations has been devoted to Shella by Henry Benoit and E. Lévi-Provencal, entitled Shella: Une necropole Meridio, collection Besire, vol. i. Paris 1915. The bibliography — rather limited — of the subject is collected there.

(F. LÉVI-PROVENCAL)

SHEMAKHA. [See SHEWARWAN.]

SHENDI, SHUNDI, 18° 41' N, 33° 59' E., a town on the right bank of the Nile, about 125 miles north of Khartum, on the old caravan-route between Egypt and Sennar, it also gives its name to a district in the Berber Province. Nowadays it is an important station on the Wadi-Halfa-Khartum Railway, with many locomotives and leather and iron works. Although still a thriving city, in the olden times it was one of the outstanding marts in the whole of the Eastern Sudan with over 50,000 inhabitants. In the course of history it has suffered at the hands of ruthless invaders and merciless marauders. The
result has been that it has shrunk from its former greatness. It is the centre of a district that has been noted for its tall, beautiful women, and it is significant that this region in past ages was ruled by a succession of queens. A vague relic of that period lingers in an eighteenth century traveller's tale of his meeting a "Queen of Shenid" in 1772 (Bruce, Travels, vi. 448). Until modern times the town was a busy market for slave-traders and other traffickers. The neighbourhood, north and south, contains many remnants of ancient splendour, ruins of Mecca and its crumbling pyramids. In 1882 a dreadful catastrophe befell the town. The native Governor, who is called the Meh, and given the sobriquet of Man or Panther, invited landladies, the sons of Muhammad Ali, who had been sent by his father to quell the rebellious tribes and punish the fugitive Mamlitk Beys, to a splendid banquet. When the Egyptians were in a drunken stupor the building was set on fire and burnt, and his suite perished in the flames. In retaliation the place was bombarded by Muhammad Bey of the Defterdar, and thousands of the inhabitants massacred in the most revolting fashion. In 1884 the Gordon Relief Expedition passed by Shenid. Ever since the Anglo-Egyptian occupation in 1898 the town has developed to a great extent.

Bibliography: Prince Ibrahim Hilmy, Bibliography of Egypt and the Sudan, ii. 233; James Bruce, Travels, Edinburgh 1813; Backer, Travels, p. 277-301; Wallis Budge, The Egyptian Sudan, ii. 402 seq.

SHERCHEL (French Cherchel), a town in Algiers, 60 miles W. of Algiers; long. L. 10° E., 36° 37' N. lat. — Population: 5500 of whom 1400 are Europeans. — The town is built on a plateau 1000 yards broad lying between the sea on the north and wooded hills, the outer Butresses of the massif of the Saul Menasser, in the south. The calcareous rocks of the plateau provide excellent building materials, the fertility of the soil and humidity of the climate are conducive to the growth of all kinds of produce. The country round is covered with gardens and vineyards. The harbour, sheltered from the west winds by the little island of Joinville and from the east by Cape Tifnine is small but safe. Its annual trade is about 30,000 tons and it exports the agricultural produce of the region.

History. The advantages of the site of Cherchel were remarked in very early times. The Phoenicians had a trading station here called Iol, which later passed to the Carthaginians. After the Second Punic War, Iol became the capital of the King of Mauretania, Bocchos, and his successors. Placei. the throne of Mauretania in 25 B.C., by Augustus, king Juba II gave the town the name of Caesarea and adorned it with monuments and works of art. When, after the death of Ptolemy, successor of Juba, Mauretania had been annexed to the empire the town was raised to the rank of a Roman colony (Colonie Claudia Caesarea) and was the capital of the province of Mauretania. It was considerably extended and in the second century A.D. had about 150,000 inhabitants. Its walls were about 5 miles round. The ruins of baths, theatres, the amphitheatre, statues and mosaics discovered since the French occupation attest its wealth. Having previously lost its importance by the partition of the two Mauretania in the time of Diocletian, it was burned during the rebellion of Firmus (371) and at the beginning of the next century was sacked by the Vandals. The Byzantines reoccupied it in 515, but never restored to it its past prosperity; at a date which is not accurately known, but probably in the early years of the viiith century A.D., Caesarea fell into the hands of the Arabs who completed its ruin. It was perhaps not completely abandoned. The harbour in any case still existed in the time of Ibn Hawkal (Description de l'Afrique, transl. de Slane, f. A., 1842, p. 184). In the time of al-Bakri (Masala, transl. de Slane, Algiers 1913, p. 165) it was in ruins. According to this author there was nothing left at Sherchel but an *anchorag q commanded by an enormous town of ancient buildings and still inhabited*. Bakri, however, mentions the existence of several *ribāt* where a large crowd of people assembled every year. Idrisi describes Sherchel as a town of small extent but well populated (transl. de Goeje, p. 103). The country round was occupied by Beduin families who devoted themselves to cattle-rearing, to growing vines and figs and they harvested more plentiful and barley than they could consume. This circumstance explains the descent made on the town by the Normans of Sicily in 1144. According to Leo Africanus, Description de l'Afrique, bk. iv., ed. Schefer, iii. 52 the town was continuously inhabited during the five centuries that followed the Arab conquest. During this period Sherchel was held in turn by the various dynasties which disputed the possession of Central Maghrib. After the disruption of the Almohad empire, it fell to the Abi al-Walid of Tlemcen, who was taken from them by the Marinids in 1300 A.D. It became a part of the ephemeral kingdom founded about 1350 by the Ulad Maita until it was ultimately recognised the authority of the Ziyânids in the reign of Abi Tabet. In the xvth century fugitive Moors from Spain settled here in large numbers and built 2000 houses (according to Leo Africanus, op. cit.). The newcomers devoted themselves to agriculture and industry, especially to silk growing, and commerce but also to piracy. In the first years of the xviith century A.D. a Turkish corsair named Kara Hassan settled at Sherchel, but was put to death by Atibij [q.v.] who made himself master of the town and placed a garrison in it. Temporarily liberated from the authority of the Turks as a result of the defeat of Khoir al-Din [q.v.] by the Kabyls, the people of Sherchel had again to recognise the Turkish government and this time finally in 1528. An attempt made by the Spanish to seize the town and make it a base of operations against Algiers failed in 1531. Andrez Doria had to reembark after losing 600 men.

During the Turkish period, Sherchel simply stagnated. The population never exceeded 2500-3000 men occupying a limited part of the old town. The depredations wrought by the corsairs who settled out from it, led to its bombardment by Deuxness 1882. Turkish authority was represented by a kaid, aided in the administration of local affairs by a council of six notables and supported by a garrison established some distance south on the al-Hashim. The mainstay of Turkish power, however, was the Marabout family of Chebri, whose ancestors had come from Masegor the end of the xvth century and who had acquired considerable influence throughout this region. At
the beginning of the sixteenth century, the Turks quarrelled with them. Al-Hajjali b. Awda al-Ghobrini was put to death by order of the Dey and his relatives had to take refuge in al-Dhara.

The disappearance of Turkish government in 1830 enabled the Ghobrini to return to Shershel and become masters of the province. But they found their influence assailed by that of another Marabout family, that of the Brakou who lived among the Bani Menaser. Firstly Abd al-Kadir who had established a sheikh at Meknasa forced the people of Shershel to submit to him. He tried to use the harbour of Shershel for an attempt to revive piracy. An attack by a Shershel corsair on a French warship decided the governor-general Valèe to occupy the town in 1840 and to establish there a colony of a 100 European families. The new settlement prospered rapidly and by 1850 had over a thousand inhabitants. They began the development of the country round and this has been steadily continued. An attack on it in July 1871 by the Bani Menaser who besieged it for a fortnight is the only incident that has occurred since the occupation.


Shī'ah, the general name for a large group of very different Muslim sects, the starting point of all of which is the recognition of 'Ali as the legitimate caliph after the death of the Prophet.

THE MOTIVES OF THE SHI'AH AND THE EARLIER PERIOD

Islam is a religious and a political phenomenon as its founder was a prophet and statesman. The development of the community of Islam into separate sectional groups was therefore a natural result of the different possible relations which the political constitution and religious belief might bear to one another. Three main schools may be distinguished. The middle line was taken by the Sunnis. Their leading principle that the imamate belongs to the Karahīs is a simple expression of the historical fact that the world of Islam in the early centuries was ruled by Meccan families. The intelligible demand that the ruler who represented the state which was founded upon religion should be really religious personalities very early led among the Sunnis also to the unhistorical glorification of the first four pious caliphs and further faced them with the problem of finding formulas to explain that it was also a religious duty to owe obedience to caliphs of little worth and even to foreign Sulṭāns, so long as the exercise of religion and the maintenance of order was afforded by them. How little, however, such principles grew out of a pleased approval is best shown by the constant warnings, not only from pious circles, to be careful in dealing with secular, though Sunni rulers. If we have here on the Sunni side less a clear theory than rather the attempt to reconcile a religious ideal with political reality, on the other hand on the two flanks of Islam we find two fundamental theories. The one demands an elegant separation of the constitutional question from the religious one, the other has interwoven the two. The former question, although already in existence, only obtained greater publicity in the first civil war among the Khāridjīs (q.v.) for whose salvation the question of the person of the caliph was a matter of such indifference that he might "even be an Abysinnian slave." The Shi'is on the other hand lay religious value on the question of the imāmate and their dogmatic books contain a special section, the leading idea of which is the traditional principle "whoever dies without knowing the true imām of his time dies the death of an unbeliever".

There was a political Shi'ah, more accurately a Shi'ah Alī i.e. a party of Shi'ah (q.v.) at the very latest immediately after the death of the Prophet. If we may believe the Shi'ah stories the original Shi'ah consisted of three men: Sulṭān al-Fārisī, Abū Uṣūl and al-Mīqāīdī b. al-Awān al-Khāndī. They were the only ones — some stories give a few more names — who championed 'Ali's succession on the death of the Prophet and therefore did not falter from their faith. For the other companions of the Prophet are credited by the majority of the Shi'ah with 'idda (q.v.) for paying homage to Abū Bakr. But the stories, especially about Sulṭān al-Fārisī — if he ever really existed (cf. Horovitz in Islam, xii. 178, 194) — are quite legendary. A large number of the later Shi'ah traditions and prophecies regarding the future of 'Alids are associated with his name.

The desire that the imāmate in Islam should be kept for the 'Alids (q.v.) as the family of the house (of the Prophet) (Abū al-Ḥair) has not been fulfilled. The brief reign of 'Ali from 35-40 (656-661) was only a strongly contested partial caliphate while his son Ḥasan (q.v.) can hardly be seriously considered to have been caliph. The first 'Alid independent principality was founded in 726 (780) in Morocco by the Ḥasanīd Idrīs I b. 'Abd Allīh (q.v.). But his territory was entirely Sunni, that is to say we have not here a Shi'ah state but simply an 'Alid kingdom. At the present day there still exist a few small states with 'Alid chiefs, all more or less under European Christian powers, of whom however the Imām of San'ā in Yemen alone is Shi'ī and indeed a Zaidī (see below).

As the energies of the Shi'ah forces met with too much resistance in the political field they devoted themselves to the religious. The political experiences of the Shi'ah had been particularly suitable for this development. The martyr's death of one 'Alid succeeded that of another. Much more than the blood of 'Ali who was murdered by a casual Khāridjī, it was the blood of Ḥasan (q.v.) who perished under the swords of the government troops that was the end of the Shi'ah's creed. The passion motive was thus restored to the religion among the Shi'ah; it had been lost to official Islam since the turn of fortune which after the Ḥijīrā set the Prophet's career on the path of worldly prosperity and excluded all possibility of it by a peaceful death, devoid of any tragedy that might have borne fruit in this direction. The insistence on the idea of a passion has so thoroughly penetrated the Shi'ah that it has formed legends full of difficult historical problems, which make even the lives of 'Alids, who never attained any prominence, end in martyrdom, usually through poison at the instigation of the caliphs, as in the case of Ḥasan I, Dja'far al-Sahlī, 'Alī al-Rijālī, etc.

That this feeling of passion, which can remain
mordidly and among the Zaidis who are closest to the Sunnis, has remained very worldly, was transformed to something completely religious in the majority of Shi'a, i.e., to that of the Shi'a the death of Husain paved the way to Paradise, is a result of the fact that another religious idea came into play, which is, as the history of religions shows, often associated with the passion motive, namely the idea of the manifestation of the divine in man (epiphany). It was not strange to Muhammad, led to him for example, Jesus was "a word of God" (Kor'an iii. 40). But he had not placed the intermediation between God and man in a person and certainly not in his own (Kor'an, xviii. 110; xi. 5; xvii. 95) but in a revelation, the Kor'an. From this point of view the characteristic of the Shi'a can be thus defined:— to the First Article: "I believe in God the One" and the Second Article "I believe in the revelation of the Kor'an which is uncreated from all eternity"—is added a Third Article:— "I believe that the Imam especially chosen by God as the bearer of a part of the divine being is the leader to salvation". But if such an Imam possesses in the eyes of his believers any quality or more frequently a substance of divine origin, then when faced with his decease, they do not consider themselves with the "right hand of his living" in paradise, in which he only share although in a higher degree, with all believers, but to them the death of an Imam is rendered void by the idea of "Bay'a" [q.v.], belief in "concealment" and "parousia." The Imam becomes Mahdi [q.v.]. Many indeed abandon the earthly part of the Imam but make his divine element pass into the next Imam, after the manner of the doctrine of transmigration. The mutual interaction of the idea of passion and epiphany again shows that the expectation of parousia arising from the latter, which, as the example of the hidden Mahdi, Muhammad b. al-Hajjaj, shows, can also arise independently of a martyrdom, was increased by martyrdom.

The state of our sources does not enable us to have a reliable insight into the confines of the various Shi'a motives. It must for example remain an open question how far the Shi'a ideas of epiphany and the intermediation of the Imam are the direct continuation of the similar ideas which, according to Ibn Ishak, certain singers of primitive Islam, already associated with the person of Muhammad: i.e., the question arises how far these religious ideas of the Shi'a were within Islam before the year 11 (632). Under 'Ali, however, they appear as important dogmas of religion. If the tradition through "Abd Allah b. Said [q.v.] is still obscure, we find it somewhat clearer in the many poems of Shi'a mentality. One Abu b-Awwad al-Di'ali [q.v.] who fought by the side of 'Ali at Siffin praised him with more than ordinary infatuation: "When I looked into the face of Abu 'I-Husain, I saw the full moon, which filled the spectators with reverence and wonder. The Koran now know, wherever they may be, that they are their noblest in merit and religion." His attitude to 'Ali is therefore ascetic-religious. In accordance with traditions referring to him, therefore already current (see below), he calls him "our scourge and warf." Phrases like "I seek God and my friend and warf." Phrases like "I seek God and my friend and warf." Phrases like "I seek God and my friend and warf." Phrases like "I seek God and my friend and warf." Phrases like "I seek God and my friend and warf." Phrases like "I seek God and my friend and warf." Phrases like "I seek God and my friend and warf." Phrases like "I seek God and my friend and warf." Phrases like "I seek God and my friend and warf." Phrases like "I seek God and my friend and warf." Phrases like "I seek God and my friend and warf." Phrases like "I seek God and my friend and warf." Phrases like "I seek God and my friend and warf." Phrases like "I seek God and my friend and warf." Phrases like "I seek God and my friend and warf." Phrases like "I seek God and my friend and warf." Phrases like "I seek God and my friend and warf." Phrases like "I seek God and my friend and warf." Phrases like "I seek God and my friend and warf." Phrases like "I seek God and my friend and warf." Phrases like "I seek God and my friend and warf." Phrases like "I seek God and my friend and warf." Phrases like "I seek God and my friend and warf."
forms may be distinguished within the Shi’a: The Zaidis [q.v.], who are nearest akin to the Sunnis, limit the manifestation of God in the Imam quite rationalistically to mere divine “right guidance” and deny the miraculous influx of the divine portion of light into a definite Alid individual. The martyrdom of the Imam finds expression almost exclusively in the political field in constant endeavours to attain with the sword of man and help of God the goal of Alid supremacy. They have successfully resisted various chiliasmic expecta-
tions of the Mahdi that have appeared among them. On the other wing, the epiphany becomes completely inherent, absolute zulfiqar [q.v.]; the mortal in the Imam is entirely swallowed up; in the end God himself has no place beside him. The representatives of this school are ardently fought by the Zaidis and Imamis, the representatives of the middle school, as people who have brought the Shi’a into discredit and have fallen away from Islam— they call them Ghulat (sg. ghail, q.v.). To the Imamis the Imam remains mortal but a divine light-substance is inherent in him by partial zulfiqar. The death of the Imam, which among the Ghulat e.g. the Druses, is simply the withdrawal of the deficient, becomes with them the religious experience which makes it a joy to die. Its voluntariness is emphasised with dogmatic intention. In the battle of Kerbelä God sent the angel of victory to Hussain; but he preferred “to approach to God”.

In the course of history each of the three divisions had possession to divide into many subdivisions, simply on account of the specifically Shi’a ideas of each. Thus, as a result of the Zaidi agitations, small principalities arose in Tabaristan and Dailam from 250 (864) and in Yemen from 288 (901) which from the distance between them could not form a unity nor even possess uniformity. The Zaidis of the Irak, who never attained independence in a kingdom of their own, but were often able to make up for this by exerting considerable influence in the Caliph’s empire, had to adapt themselves to conditions there by a greater use of the ta’ziya [q.v.] or of the hajj. The school of the Ghulat, who went furthest beyond Muhammad’s inheritance and gave the greatest play to individual initiative, found a very varied expression in the Karb Mean groups, the Ismaiilis and the Druses and ultimately in the Nusairis and the Al Baki [q. v.]. These groups also to a great degree cut themselves away from the members of the holy family. This is already seen in the Kalyanis [q. v.], whose Imam, Muhammad b. al-Hanafiya, is not a descendent of the Prophet; this is also expressed in a tradition: “Salmân al-Farsi belongs to the family of the house”. It led for example in the 5th (9th) century among the Harität [q. v.] to the exclusion of the Alid Imam in favour of the deity incarnate in Fádi Allâh al-Ashtarabadi. But the very principle of the Ismaiya had the seeds of diaspores within it. For the contact between God and man is not at a point of intersection but in a continuous line, nor is a single individual but in an uninterrupted series of Imams, among whom the divinely inspired father appoints the son on each occasion or— according to others—the divine element is transmitted directly to the eldest son, whose mother also comes from the holy family. But religious adherence to an Imam might become so fervent that one could not abandon him even after his death; or the successor might be a person of very doubtful character, or he might be quite defective. Thus arose the subordinate group of the Waqifsya and Kifsya or Kifia. The former “hesitates” regarding the death of the Imam, therefore “stands” by him and see in them the Mahdi; the latter regard the death of the Imam as “destined” and therefore continue the line. There are a whole series of such. Waqifsya, like the Dja’farîya with Dja’far al-Ṣadiq, Mâsaâyiya, the Râjîâyiya etc.; in the narrower sense only the term applies only to the Dja’farîya. For the reasons mentioned, however, the line could not be continued endlessly among the Kifia. It is very doubtful whether these even elenent of Islam—al-Ḥasan al-Ḵâlid left a child at all at his death in 260 (873), but the belief has prevailed among the Imamis in the existence, the mysterious disappearance and the Mahdi character of a son Muhammad Ḥudjîj Allâh. Thus the Imamis become “Twelvers”, Isma’ili ‘Abârîya [q. v.], although it was for a period still disputed whether there was not a thirteenth Imam.

If we thus see among the Shi’a denominations, simply in so far as they are Shi’a, a range which corresponds to that in the Christian church history which separates the Theopaschites from the Socinians, we must remember we are only considering one of the principles that have gone to form it. For the Shi’a belongs to Islam and is therefore faced with all the problems that agitate Islam generally. But Islam does not look at the world from the point of view of religion only, but has its cultural, economic, and social and through the question of the šu‘ab its political problems also, and for the Shi’a can only be briebrly indicated here. In dogmatics we find besides the Mi‘arûs [q. v.] predestinarians like the Zaid Sulaîma’n b. Djarî and anthropomorphists like the already mentioned Isma’il Hîshâm b. Salîm al-Djassali’dî, and how much the dispute common to all Islam regarding the nature of the Kûrân was also a disintegrating danger for the Shi’a is shown by the tradition attributed to Dja’far al-Ṣadiq, said to have been uttered to the above mentioned Yûnus b. Abd al-Râhîm, a saying which suggests a provisional formula: “The Kûrân is neither creator nor created; it is the word of a creator”. In relation to philosophy both attraction and repulsion are considerably stronger than among the Sunnis. For on one hand their richer theological speculation required to a greater extent the categories of philosophy and its dialectic for dogmatic stabilisation, on the other hand the Shi’a was here particularly sensitive, indeed vulnerable, like every religious community, which sets out from pure metaphysical postulates, as it does with the belief in the Imamate. Apart from epistemological antagonistic principles which philosophy, called in to its aid, introduced into the Shi’a, the latter had also to settle well known disputed points within Islam on the fundamentals, the Uṣûl al-Din and the Uṣûl al-Fikr, for example on the binding force of a single tradition or on ûkâya [q. v.]. In the same way there were in Shi’i law disputed points from the Zahiris to the Ḥanafis. In worship there was at all groups a strong impulse to satisfy the tendency towards adoration by the reverencing of Imams and places of pilgrimage at the graves of their martyrs, which was in conflict with the conservative tendency to remain Muslims.
The dividing line between the Sh'ites and domestic policies i.e. nationalism is very intricate and much broken. It is not simply that the conquered people like the Persians from the first had sided with the Sh'ite opposition. The oldest of the principal leaders were genuine Arabs, of the south, it is true. Among those around Riḍá for example, Yáns and Hítham al-Djwáilí were clients, but Débíl a race-pride proud South Arabian and an opponent of the North Arabs. Two hundred years later we still find Mufíd (see below) priding himself on his South Arabian descent from Yaṭṭán, the first man to speak Arabic". Social disputes were brought into the Sh'ite as early as al-Mughír when he mobilized his clients and slaves. Among some Ghulíti, like the Karmátíjí, socialist demands increased to communism, which however here in view of the authoritative attachment to an imám or his representative was only a mask for a despotic oligarchy.

A more obvious aristocracy was formed by the circles of higher administrative officials at the 'Abbasid court, who, for the most part, imhäuser, and bound together by ardent devotion to the imámate, among whom the local was a part of the family of the Najúbhí. As regards women also the Sh'ite had to deal with all aspects of the problem. Some of the Karmátíjí are accused — at least — of having community of women; the Imámí allow temporary marriages (see MÁTA') the Zaidí construe themselves to polygamy as defined by the Sunnís; the 'Alí Sh'ites decided on monogamy.

As the numbers of possibilities in the fields of dogma, epistemology, law, worship, politics and social sciences are not additional to but multipliers of the figures of possibilities in the question of the Imámí, the result is that, although we do not have in practice all the possible combinations, we have a number of Sh'ite subdivisions, which far exceeds the well-known 72 sects. At the same time this possibility of variation explains the many discrepancies in the usual Muslim books on the various sects, as the latter, as can easily be understood, divide one and the same community into several groups according to the special feature they emphasize.

In view of the elemental force with which the Sh'ite creed, in itself full of problems, made its appearance in the world of Islam which was already full of its own problems, we can understand that the personalities who are considered heads of schools in the present Sh'ite communities were less creators than connoisseurs, but we can also see that the consensus each time became limited to a smaller circle. In the language of the Sh'ite, the 'aš'íja' affects only the individual ecclesiastics, which alone will be blessed. In dogmatics this limitation has never attained very great success; Zaidís, as well Imámís, finally joined the Mu'tázíli.

This is not mere accident, as the example of the Qur'án already shows: of the above mentioned six sects of belief, the third was bound to drive out the second. The hasmíta of an uncertain Qur'án had in the long run no place beside an imám as a guarantor of the true faith. It is also logical that the Imámí for the purpose of its classification among the beliefs of the imamate undertook an allegorical explanation and that on the extreme wings the Ghulíti fought it, made interpolations or even rejected parts and because themselves Bátíns (cf. BÁTHÍNA). The Mu'tázíli was not simply the first step; but through these borrowings from philosophy, primarily only seeking the formal, it penetrated into the space left vacant by the supernatural belief in revelation; theology thus became theosophy and gnosticism.

The origin of the Sh'ite motives is not explained if we again emphasize the fact in itself illuminating after what has been said above that Gnostic Neo-Platonism, Manicheism and old Iranian ideas have intermingled. But in the present state of our knowledge, we cannot go far beyond this statement, as the literary modes of approach have not yet been indicated. With the echoes of Christianity also, one must for the time being content with the general remark that Islam spread over countries formerly Christian and made many converts whose forefathers had been Christians. Still more general but not less important is the observation that motives so fertile from the religious point of view like passion and divine epiphany need not be lost, at the foundation of a new religion like Islam.

THE LATER PERIOD

The consolidation of the separate groups begins in the second half of the third (10th) century. Signs of this process were earliest noticeable among the Zaidís. Al-Kásím b. Ibráhím b. Ťábát Charity. Al-Rasúl (d. 246 = 860) selected the dogmatic and legal foundations for an ecclesiastical state, which his grandson Yahyá b. al-Husain carried into effect in Yemen in 288 (901). His teaching also found recognition in the territory of the older Zaidi state which had been founded in 250 (864) on the Caspian Sea. In 297 (909) the kingdom of Isámi Yáfítídís arose in Africa and at the same time bodies of the Karmátíjí held small tracts in N. E. and S. Arabia. Here we may refer to the reference to the special articles for the lateral branches but we shall consider the main branch somewhat more fully, the Imámí or "Twelvers". It is of them one usually thinks when using the term Sh'ites generally. They form also numerically by far the majority of Sh'ites, with their 4–5 million Persian followers and in addition to sporadic groups also considerable bodies in India and in the 'Irák. Their literature, which is still the most easily accessible of all Sh'ites, also forms the best approach to Sh'ite problems, on account of intermediate position of the Imámíyá.

Even the old 'Alíids, like Dí'far al-Sádíf, Ali al-Ríhá had not themselves been the real leaders. Envoyos and plenipotentiaries (su'far and wakti, plur. su'far and wakfát) acted on their behalf — or alleged behalf. The office of shákh became still more important when the Imámí had disappeared. He claimed to be the only one who knew the concealed Imám. Four men have one succeeded since 260 (873) in establishing this claim for themselves. When the fourth, Ali b. Muhammad al-Samárí died in 334 (939) the so-called "Little Ghaibá" was at an end and has been succeeded to the present day by the "Great Ghaibá", in which for example the Friday service dependent on the cooperation of the Imám is in abeyance. A clerical aristocracy took over the leadership, many representatives of which claimed to base their teachings on miraculous occurrences with the hidden "Lord of the Age". It is true that the modern Persian theologian can still be a Mu'tázíli or a Sh'ite; but in all essentials he still remains like the Sunní, bound by what that aristocracy has made canonical. The literary deposit of the process of forming a
He was Shaikh of the Shī'ā in Kumm, which already was strongly 'Alid in sentiment in the second century but down to late in the fourth century was still exceptional in Persia which was mainly Sunnite. Of his works the Ruhūš fi l-'Irshād to his son was used by the latter in his Man la yaḥšubun fī l-Faṣīḥ. In Baghdād the son became associated with the Bāyiḍ Rukn al-Dawla, who was able to make good use of his teaching of the imāmīte for political purposes. Among the many pupils of the younger Ibn Bābyṣa was the father of Naḍjīzāh (see Bihār). Rāyi is mentioned as the place of his death, but the tomb now honoured in Teherān was only discovered in 1328 (1812) by the members of the court of Fath 'Alī Shāh following an alleged miracle. There was a necessity for graves of saints in Persia proper, besides those in Meḥmud Tūs and 'Kūm especially as Naḍjāf, Kerbela, and the great Shī'ite cemeteries of al-Kā'imān of Baghdād lay in foreign lands under Turkish rule. The tomb of the father and sister of the eighth Imām al-Riḍā, was, we know, very much visited even in ancient times. Of the some 300 writings of the son a considerable number has been printed, e.g. the Hījaq on good and bad qualities (Teherān 1502), the 'Ittā' al-Sharāʾī and the book on the concealment of the Mahdī Kamāl al-Din wa-Tamām al-Nawā (ibid. 1501) (on the latter cf. E. Möller, Beitrag zur Mohedehre des Islam, Heidelberg 1901). His Naḍjīzāh is very popular, notably his 'Cyām Aghār al-Riḍā (Berlin MS. 9665 etc.). While these already contain besides theological, legendary, exilic and polemical matter, many questions of a special comprehensive Fī ḥl al-Riḍā (2 vols., Teherān 1911) was first compiled by Mufīd Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-No'mān b. 'Abd al-Salām al-Ukhrāt al-'Arabī. His conscious pride in his Arab descent did not prevent his close association with the Bāyiḍ 'Aṣāl al-Dawla. His funeral service was conducted by the Shafi'ī Murtuza 'Alī al-Husain. In him the Shī'ā in Baghdād reached its zenith. A direct descendant of the seventh Imām Mūsā al-Kā'im, he was, as official naṣīḥ, the recognised representative of the 'Alids and also held the offices of chief-secretary and leader of the pilgrim-caravan. His authority gave his lectures and his participation in the business of the court great theological and political importance. He conducted a vigorous correspondence with the faithful in Mūsā, Dālam, Djarīḍ, and as far away as Syria in Ḥabab and Tripolis, the latter of which was wholly Shī'ite according to the testimony of the contemporary Naṣīr al-Khosrow (Nafsū, ed. Scheber, 12 ult.). The discourses held at the halting-places with his pupils on a journey to Mecca, Charbūr al-Fardāw wa-Durar al-Fardāw were printed at Teherān in 1312; the Iṣābāt dedicated to the vizier 'Amīr al-Din, ibid. 1315; the Amūsā also at Cairo in 1325. On the fundamental question of the Shī'ā he published his attack on the three first caliphs in al-Sharāʾī (Teherān 1301). A-Naḍjīzāh had died before Murtuza and was laid to rest in the burial-place of his ancestors in al-Kā'imān. For another 28 years the pupil of Murtuza and of Mufīd, al-'Uṣūl, Abū Ja'far Muh. b. Ḥasan, called the 'Shāḥk' or the 'Shaikh of the (Shī'ā) people (Shaikh al-Talâfa'), worked in Baghdād alongside of Murtuza, who lived to be over 80. When the Sāliḥū Toghril...
Beg entered Baghdād (447 = 1055), the position of the Sha'i became more difficult. This and the desire of being buried in the holy Mshshid "All induced Ťis to migrate to Naqšābān, where he died between 458 and 460 (1065–1068).

The enormous Shi'a literature of the fourth and fifth centuries, of which only a few authors and books can be mentioned here, seems at the first glance to be very one-sided. The same traditional themes crop up again and again: the imāmate; the estimation from the theological and legal point of view of the earliest caliphs and of the opponents in the battles of the "camel" and of Šīfī; the "muhājir" and all that is connected with the concealed Imām; then along with Fīlṣ in general, special imāmite subjects like the *mur'ā marriage or the *muhājir marriage and the *tawātir on the pilgrimage; besides complete exegeses of the Korān, special interpretations of favourite Shi'a passages like Sūra 37, 12 and 13, 13, 33 and notably the "light-verse" xxiv, 34; finally, continuously recurring polemics against opponents within the Shi'a. But a development cannot be denied, as a reference to the main problem may show. Ibn Bīṣāya, the younger had still greater the possibility in Prophets and Imāms of sahī ("pilgrimage") in secondary matters and even described the opponent view in the last step to *pilgrimage (heretical exaggerations). Against him for example, Muḥāf had urged in a special pamphlet their absolute infallibility (*tiwār), although later the position is still often discussed. But that on the other hand the gates were not at once closed against extremes is shown by the estimation in which the principal book of the *ismā'īl, the *Daw'ā' al-jirām long continued to be held. The author, Muṣ'lmān b. Muhammād h. Muṣ'lmān b. Ṭalā'ī (d. 437 = 947), the "Abū Shabān al-Maṣārālānī (d. 588 = 1192) (see Bihār) says simply: "he is not an Imām" and is followed by later writers like Tārīkh al-Duḥāy." In the centuries following arose for example the great commentary on the Korān (printed in then as the Imām of the Sevener was also left. But Iṣhārāt al-Mazārānā (d. 588 = 1192) (see Bihār) simply: "he is not an Imām" and is followed by later writers like Tafrīkh al-Duḥāy.

In the centuries following arose for example the great commentary on the Korān (printed in then as the Imām of the Sevener was also left. But Iṣhārāt al-Mazārānā (d. 588 = 1192) (see Bihār) simply: "he is not an Imām" and is followed by later writers like Tafrīkh al-Duḥāy.

In the centuries following arose for example the great commentary on the Korān (printed in then as the Imām of the Sevener was also left. But Iṣhārāt al-Mazārānā (d. 588 = 1192) (see Bihār) simply: "he is not an Imām" and is followed by later writers like Tafrīkh al-Duḥāy.

In the centuries following arose for example the great commentary on the Korān (printed in then as the Imām of the Sevener was also left. But Iṣhārāt al-Mazārānā (d. 588 = 1192) (see Bihār) simply: "he is not an Imām" and is followed by later writers like Tafrīkh al-Duḥāy.
Ahmad ibn Idris al-Dhahī al-‘Ujlī, who appeared to him to destroy the ‘Idjīthād arbitrarily, in the xth (xviii) century a reaction came from the opposite side through the Mullā Muḥammad Amin al-Aṣṭariḥā, (d. 1033 = 1623), whose views are still much disputed. As he only allows the ‘Uṣūr Sunnī as a source of law beside the Kāfān, although he also worked on commentaries to the “Four Books”, he and his followers are called Akhbarī in opposition to the Uṣūrī who favour the ‘Idjīthā. In his polemics which he conducted from Mecca he was very severe. He refused to rate the ‘Uṣūr higher than the consensus of the Jews, Christians or philosophers. His activities however enlivened the discussion on ‘Idjīthād, ‘Uṣūrī, ‘Uṣūrī and on the legal force of a unique tradition in the same way as the attacks of Ibn Ḥanbal or Dā’ūd al-Zahiri had done among the Sunnis. The matter of the disputed principles among the Shī’īs is of course put by the background in keeping with the system: A is the rejection of the authority of the dead, tā’īdd al-ma‘ājī, the subjection to the principles of the holy Imāms laid down in the Sunna.

The conception of the passion has also remained alive in the Shī’ī. Out of the multitude of Shī’ī learned men special honour is therefore given to one who combines the fame of an author with the glory of martyr. Four martyrs are particularly famous. The first shahid is Muhammed b. Makkī al-‘Amili al-Dīzmī, the author of the Fīqh book al-Luma‘ al-Din-maṣīhīya. Betrayed by seducers, he was imprisoned in Damascus and executed with the sword on the orders of the Shī’īs and notably also of the Mālikīs, Ḥadd, impaled and burned, according to most authorities, in 768 (1364). The second shahid is Zain b. Din b. ‘Alī b. Ahmad b. Taqī al-‘Amili al-Shāmī. After fruitful activity in Damascus, Baalbek and Halaib and after much travelling, he was put to death about 966 (1557) in Cairo. In Akhtūrūd, (Agra), the honours of being the fourth shahid is given to by Muḥammad Mahdī b. Ḥiṣamī al-Maṣūmī al-Dīzmī, (d. 1035 (1629)), who expounded his theology in Sunnī al-Islam (printed in India in 1839). In more recent times Mullā Muḥammad Taqī al-Karwīnī, attained martyrdom, an opponent of Shaikh Ahmad al-‘Abādī (see below) and of the Bāhis, from among whom came his murderer in 1263 (1847).

The first two shahids were Sunnīs, the third lived in India. But Persia had become the centre of the Shī’a under the Safawīs from 907 (1502). The temporary persecutions under the Aḥḡānī from 1135—1142 (1722—1729) and under Nadīr (1148—1160 = 1736—1747) made no difference to this. A man whose family had the same native place and the same Shī’ī tendencies as the ancestor of the new ruling house, Ḥusayn b. ‘Abd al-Jāhī al-‘Ardayfinī al-‘Ujlī (the theologian) immediately adopted Persian culture as such and wrote his tracts and commentaries in Persian. In the still mainly Sunni country he was often forced to lead the life of a muḥadījī (wanderer) between Tabriz, Shirāz, Herīst etc. The necessary vitality was imported into the Persian ‘Uṣūrī from outside which is also important for the problem: Persia and the Shī’a. Those concerned were mainly Shī’īs from the Southern Syriac mountains of Amīl (Muṣṭaffa, p. 161, 162, 184, always writes: Amīl). The last Serbēdī ‘Abī Mu‘āyir of Sabawwī is said to have offered an asylum to an Amīl, the First Shahīd. These rustics scholars, because of the Safawī kingdom in increasing numbers. They settled there and receiving innumerable accessions to their number, retained the traditions of their home. Further Shī’īs came from Bahrain. This is why we find so frequently in the nisbas of Persian Shī’īs, Amīl or Baharīn, or names showing the origin more definitely like Karakī in the one and Ḥaṣīrī in the other. We can mention very few names for this later period here. Muḥammad b. Ḥusayn b. al-Hur al-‘Amīl al-Maghīrbī had a great success with his first book al-Dīn-wādir al-Sanīya (Tabriz 1202) because in it he collected, for the first time it is said, the Shī’ī ‘hadīth ‘aṣāsī’ (utterances of God not in the Kūfīn). But later the extravagance, volume and speed of his literary output, brought upon him sharp criticism even from theologians used to wholesale production; his 6 volume Taṣawwuf Wāḍī al-Shī’a ila Maṣūmī al-Shī’ī (Tabriz 1288) with a special index he has μαθηματικά ‘a-ndan is still however of value on account of the great mass of tradition that he worked into it, the fact that he gives the authors, al-Hur only migrated at the age of 80. After long pilgrimages he settled in Tūn and Isfahān. Among natives the leading family in its day was the Maṭīlī. Their most notable representative Muḥammad Bākī r b. Muḥammad Taqī, d. 1110 or 1111 (1608—1700), was appointed Shaikh al-Islām by Shaikh Sulaymān I. He aimed at reaching the people and wrote about half his works in Persian; he also translated edifying writings in Arabic by Abu l-Ḵāsim al-Turānī. His own largest work is called Bākī al-’Tawwīr, a great encyclopedia of law and theology in 25 volumes, which has been printed in Tabriz and Tehran. Several were translated into Persian, for example the thirteenth on the Malāḥī, by order of ‘Abī Ṣafīr al-Dīzmī.

The attitude to these Shaikhīs, who do not require an imām as mediator, and to whom the spiritual union with God attainable by every believing lover is something at the opposite pole from the inheritance of the ‘Divine part’ in the chosen imām, is naturally a hostile one, and also the reverencing of saints in the two schools is of course very different in origin and aim. The most notable encounter between the two was the active part taken by the
In the destruction of Hallaj, who indeed had severely injured the Shi'a by his claims to be the wali of the hidden lord of the age (see the article HALLAJ), the attitude of the philosophers is at least one of suspicion, since, as the case of the Ghulat warned the Imams, scholasticism might undermine them. But there are many offshoots, mystics and philosophers who profess to be conscious Shi'is and are not to be disposed of simply by the usual polemics. All the centuries therefore show examples of a fundamental revision together with that of mutual attraction. Khadija Najji al-Din himself the author of the mystical Shi'i work Angaf al-Ashraf (Teheran 1320) is in spite of the verdict of Ibn Babuya, Mu'af, Shaikh Tust and Ibn-al-Mahbar, an admirer of Hallaj; Radjab b. Muhammad al-Qasir al-Bursi is, it is true, censured as the "renewer of Shiism" since he built up his system on "deceitful fanciful interpretations" and ultra-Shi'i "exaggerations", but his books like Mas'udi al-Sam'awati written about 800 (1397) were used even by such an enemy of the Shi'a as Mardjas, although with caution, for the Bihari; and the fair-minded concede to Mullah Sadr i.e. Muhammad b. Ibrahim al-Shirazi, d. between 1040 and 1050 (1630-1641), that in the "Explanation of the Throne-Verse" (Sura ii. 256) he has kept himself free from Shi'i fancies; his commentary on the Surat al-Kafirun of Kalimi, the Mafath al-Dhahab (Teheran, n.d.) is also used and his version of the fourfold ascent to God in al-Ashraf al-ardhe or al-Ham al-madheb al-Sa'yi (Teheran 1882) is tolerated, but it is always objected to him that his commentary on the Surat al-Ish'ara of the mystic Subrawardi has too much of the language and sentiments of the mystics, his pupil Muhammad b. Muhammad al-Kahashi, called Muhe'mimi Faid, author of the Shi'i commentary on the Koran al-Safi (Teheran 1276) vigorously defended himself against similar approaches in Irqaf fi Bayan Tarikh al-Shi'a Arar al-Din (in the collected Rauh, Teheran 1301) and as a matter of fact he is cited by his pupil Saiyid N l'mat Allah al-Din'iri against the Shi'a. There is a better foundation for the orthodoxy of the two teachers of Mullah Sadr i, the two friends at the court of "Abbas I, Muhammad b. Husain Bahat al-Din or Bahat al-'Amili (d. 1030 = 1621) and Muhammad Bakir al-Astarhabadi (d. 1041 = 1631) called Mr Dama'd, as the son of the "son-in-law" of 'Abd b. Abd al-'Amir al-Kakaki, i.e. also an 'Amili and one of the many commentators on the Shura'i al-Islam. In spite of his many sided interests, Bahat's, who was also Shaikh al-'Amil, as a true Shi'i revives a very old Shi'i feature, the ritual interdiction of meat killed by the "people of a book", in the Rasa'il fi Tahriim al-Safi al-Khithe. His Li'mat al-Old al-Shaikh (Teheran 1309, Bombay 1319) contains decisions in the vernacular on all heads of the law relating to the kafir. Mr Dama'd although he also reverenced Hallaj showed himself a good Shi'i in his al-Rahle al-warniafis fi Sharh al-Shafi'i al-Mu'atta by (pr. 1311), and in al-Ka'baat (Teheran 1314) he reconciled his philosophy with orthodoxy, acknowledging that God existed from all times and is eternal and that the world is transitory. Philosophical discussions were further enlivened by the fact that they were interwoven with specifically theological problems. There were therefore both U'tifs and Akhbaris among the scholastic Mutakallimun. The conflict occasionally became so fierce, as recently as last century, that, for example in Kherbeh, books were only handled in a wrapper of cloth lest a member of another school might have used them. One of the chief leaders in the feud was Shaikh Ahmad b. Zain al-Din al-Habibi, a Bahri as his name shows. A theologian, poet, astronomer, and mathematician he fought against Shi'a philosophers and especially against the 'Abbadids and the 'Abbadis against the Akhbaris (cf. his Jawi(2) al-Khithe or Haiyat al-Nafa, Tabriz 1276). A much too philosophical belief in the resurrection which to the rigidity orthodox seemed ill founded, brought him on and his school, the Shagahiyya (cf. Shaikh Ali), the reproach of sectarianism, and as was later the case with Radjab (see above) the responsibility for the heresy of the baha'i. They themselves like their offshoot, the Bahai's, saw to it that even in quite recent times, the feud was vigorously maintained by means of pen. Nor was there a lack of other polemics. Mada'i was not the last to write against the Jews. War was waged on Christianity after the arrival of missionaries beginning with H. Martyn in 1195 (1781) and later C. G. Plunder's missionary pamphlet Mabn al-'陛下 in and in recent years the activities of the societies for distributing the Bible. Popular expression of the Shi'a creed is found in the legends of martyrs, maftulis, and passionists, ak'ab. The apocrypha are also numerous; the frequently printed songs and sayings of 'Ali (cf. Fleischer, 'Alia ten Sprachte, Leipzig 1837); the collection of his utterances in the Nukhji al-Balagha of Muhammad al-Rida', a brother of Shaikh Murtada; also many little books of prayers like the Sha'i of 'Ali, those of the fourth Imam 'Ali Zain al-'Abidin and those of the eighth Imam 'Ali al-Rida; also the Hadith buqsi of 'Ali collected by Bahat al-'Amili and finally commentaries on the Koran, which are attributed to the sixth Imam Dja'far Sadiq or the eleventh like the Tafsir al-Ashar (Teheran 1315), which the younger Ibn Babuya still used freely, though many later authorities express doubts as to their authenticity.

Bibliography: There is no thorough account of the Shi'a. Besides the works here quoted and those mentioned in the articles referred to, the catalogues of Arabic and Persian manuscripts should be consulted (cf. also Brockelmann, Gesch. der Arab. Lit., E. G. Browne, A History of Persian Literature in modern Times, 1924, p. 353 sqq., where also Shi'i biographies and bibliographies are utilised; Goldrider, Vorlesungen, ed. Babinger, Heidelberg 1925, p. 196 sqq.; Golubne, Les religions et les philosophies dans l'Arme Centrale, Paris 1866, p. 63 sqq.; Mer, Die Renaissance des Islams, Heidelberg 1924, p. 55 sqq.; Babinger in Z. D. M. G., xcvii, 126 sqq.; Noldke in Jb. xlvii. 70 sqq.; Andrae, Die Person Mohamedis in Lelt und Glauhen seiner Gemeinde, 1918, see also: Buhl, Altertumliches Stilling in Schrift oder Bild, Berlin 1910, 30, 5). As a systematic introduction the following are recommended in addition to sources mentioned in the text: Muh. b. Omar al-Kashshi, Marifat al-Kashshi al-ridad, Bombay 1317; al-Najadi, d. 1058, Marifat 'Imam al-'Rida, Bombay 1317;
also on the eastern slope of the Djebel Dufta' close against the rocky wall.

The town is separated by the Wadi Nahfah into a southern and northern part and according to the Defers is 8500 feet above sea-level. It is surrounded by a wall and has 2500 inhabitants but it is said to have been much larger formerly. The inhabitants told Glaser that several places which now lie outside the town were once within its limits and had been markets, namely El-Lejâr (the poultry-market), 500 yards from the town in the direction of Shâb, El-Herat el-lisâf (oil-market) on the road to Ayâl Sâbd in the north, two red mounds which are supposed to have been ancient palaces of the Himyars, and El-Malâbî (salt-market) on the road to Amrân, ed-Deftâ (butter-market) between the modern Jewish quarter, which lies on the north slope of the Lubâkhâ, el-Djaâr (a little higher and built against the Djebel Dufta'), el-Ader (pottery-market), consisting of a temple with a poorly housed school and mud-houses. The town is said to have had at one time four gates (Bâb el-Fedjûm, Bâb el-Ahjûr, Bâb el-Shykh, Bâb Mathâr). The chief mosque is a splendid old square building which in Glaser's opinion is as old as the Sabean period.

The tower is now much decayed and crooked but marvellously hewn black blocks 18 inches by 15 are used for the mosque which the natives say was a palace of the Himyars. The other mosques are also said to be ancient. Glaser mentions Khabâl Shemali on the road to Kawkabân. Mesejîd el-Geût, Mesadjîl el-Lejâr near the Jewish village with old walled cisterns, Mesadjîl el-Ziâyîd, Mesadjîl el-Hajest el-Khalike, Mesadjîl el-Dejût. The three gates of the town are Bâb el-Iasakh and two smaller ones called Bâb el-Maghâr. On the southern slope of Lubâkhâ are numerous chamberlike caverns of sandstone, reached by broken narrow steps along the cliff. They lie in tiers above one another, of different sizes, some large, some small, and are hewn out of the sandstone, quadrangular in shape. The entrance is formed by a door 3 feet by 2 and the floor of the chamber is 3 feet below the entrance. In one of these chambers Glaser found a grave so that they were probably used for burials. Shabâm is connected with Kawkabân by an old artificial path formed of steps. The country round the town is very fertile. Cereals, barley, maize and dîra, beans, mustard, clover, and the better kinds of fruit grow very well here and a mine here still yields the famous Yemeni carmelian, amethyst and alabaster.

The settlement is undoubtedly very old. The ancient south Arabian inscription Glaser, 110, s. speaks of the Akâyân of Shabâm and the later name Shabâm Bait Akâyân mentioned also by Al-Hamadân and others is no doubt connected with this. The town is also mentioned in the great inscription of Sîrwa (Glaser 1000 a. 15). The citadel of Shabâm was the original centre of the Hubar-Ramhân. The town is said to have been originally called Yabbeh and then to have been called after Shabâm b. Abd Allah b. Amr d. El-Hamadân. The town's history is complex, with later dates lived there who were descended from Abyah b. Bâbî b. Dhabit, who lived there. The Yabbeh at a later date lived there who were descendants from Yabbeh b. Bâbî b. Dhabit. From them the town gets its epithet of Sukhur. Al-Hamadân was still able to see in the town splendid columns of ancient date which supported a throne. The fortress was still considered impregnable after his time.
Yafūr ibn 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Hujwīrī was besieged in it in the raid by the generals of al-Mu'tāsīm al-Walīd and al-Mu'tawakkil. Ibn Rosta's statement that the district then contained 300 villages and at least 40 villages is of course an exaggeration. A silver mine was also worked here at this time. When Hānān b. Taghā ruled in the Yemen, the castle was in ruins. He built the village of Ghīrāt from the masonry of the ruins.

4. Shīhām in the ʿAwd al-Kasr in Ḥadramīt. One of the largest towns in the country, which is now under the Sūltān of Makāla. Th. Bent estimates the number of inhabitants at 6,000, while it is at 20,000, but the latter figure is certainly much too high. The town lies in the lowest part of the valley, on an eminence which has arisen out of the ruins of a series of earlier settlements, the brick buildings of which have supplied the material for its formation. The eminence commands the whole surrounding country and forms one of the best strategic points for miles around.

In the south lies the plain of Sūltān el-Bilād which is enclosed by the Djebel Khibba which runs in a west-southwesterly direction a good distance across in front of the town. The southern half of Sūltān el-Bilād is well covered with palm-trees but at an earlier date the palm-groves were considerably more extensive. Cereals grow in the fields and excellent fruit and vegetables are grown while indigo is also much cultivated. The town contains not less than 30 mosques and 2 palaces.

The settlement of Shīhām undoubtedly goes back to a very ancient date. The name of the town appears on a fine ancient South Arabian inscription which Bent brought back from Ḥadramīt which came from Sūltān on an inscription during the third century A.D. A number of graffiti scratched in the rocks about a few hours journey from Shīhām are further evidence that the town was inhabited in ancient times. A cave with South Arabian inscription, probably a tomb, is said to exist in the region. Shīhām is said to have been founded by the people of Shabwā, who abandoned the latter and settled in Ḥadramīt (cf. Shihawa). Al-Bakri knows the town by the name of Djarīma, "the large", as the most favoured town in Ḥadramīt. Its inhabitants however did not have a very good reputation, if we may believe Ibn al-Mudījāwī in the wars which the Banū Kinda waged in Ḥadramīt, Shīhām suffered a good deal and a considerable part of its mosques were destroyed. Idrīsī and Abu al-ʿFādī have confirmed Shīhām in Ḥadramīt with Shīhām Kawkāhān, as C. Niebuhr long ago pointed out.


(Adolf Gromann)

SHIBARGHAN, called by the Arab geographers Shiburkan and Saburkan, is a town of northern Afghanistan, situated in 36° 35′ N., and 65° 45′ E. It was formerly one of the three chief towns of the district of Darájan, the others being Yâhüdiya and Fâryâb. The oldest form of the name is Asparagán, from which it has been conjectured that it was an ancient seat of the Aza, or Asargarî. Aszari describes it as the capital of Dárájan, but this position is usually accorded to Yâhüdiya.
It lay on the old high road from Balkh, from which it is distant nineteen parasangs, or sixty-five miles, to Marw al-Kûd and Herat, and is frequently mentioned in the Zafar Nâma and other historical works. According to Mustawfi, its climate was temperate, and grain was sold cheap in its market, but he adds, somewhat disparagingly, that some little corn and wheat were grown there. Marco Polo, on the other hand, says: “It has great plenty of everything, but especially of the very best melons in the world. They preserve them by paring them round; and round into strips and dry them in the sun. There is also abundance of game here, both of birds and beasts.” The dried melons of Shibarghan were exported not only to Herât, but also to India and China, where they were famous.
The town and its neighbourhood are watered by underground channels (fânâr) from the mountains. Early in the nineteenth century, when Afghanistan was in disorder, Shibarghan was the capital of a small Uzbek state, but it long since lost its independence and is now a mere district of the kingdom of Afghanistan. It contains some 12,000 inhabitants, and the land about the town is richly cultivated, though it is on the verge of the desert.


(T. W. Hahn)

SHIBIL, AL-DAWLA NÂŞR B. ŞÂLÎH B. MARDÂS, the family of Mirdâsîd (see the account of them in the article on the history of Aleppo [Jalal, ii. p. 230] and also the article MIRDAS B. ŞÂLIH), inherited the town of Aleppo after the death of his father Şâlîh in the battle of UKhusâna on the Jordan in 420 (1029) while his brother Thimâl received the citadel. Nâṣr has won a place in history by his victories over the Byzantines in the defence of the northern marches. After Shibli’s death the Byzantine governor Spondîl (not Niketar, as the Arabic historians say) of Antioch thought the moment had come, by destroying the two Mirdâsid rulers to free the southern province of the Byzantine empire from the continued attacks, the so-called summer campaigns (âlîfîya) to which the Arabs felt themselves bound in fulfilment of the Holy War ordered by the Koran. Spondîl, who in spite of his incapacity held the important post of governor of Antioch was completely defeated by the brothers Nâṣr and Thimâl in the same year (420). In this year the Emperor Basil died and his ambitious successor the Emperor Romanos III hoped to gain glory from a campaign against these two princes and set out for Syria with a large army which included Bulgarian and Russian auxiliaries. In the meanwhile Nâṣr was not able to hold sole control of Aleppo and had taken advantage of the absence of his brother to seize the citadel. Thimâl, thoroughly roused at this act of violence, won the Arab tribes over to himself and advanced on Aleppo. Thus threatened Nâṣr sent his nephew as an envoy to the Emperor in Antioch and asked him for assistance, promising to recognise him as suzerain and to pay him tribute. But it did not come to fighting between the two brothers, as the tribes, who saw the necessity of uniting in face of the danger threatening from the Emperor, negotiated a peace between them. Nâṣr remained, as was only right from the political and military point of view, sole lord of Aleppo, and Thimâl was given Rabîba and Bâlis in compensation. Strengthened by the help of the Arabs, Nâṣr withdrew his allegiance to the Emperor. The latter therefore (421 = 1030) advanced on Aleppo via Antioch and pitched his camp north of the town in Tabbâl. A body of cavalry which he sent out to reconnoitre was wiped out by the Arabs. Thus encouraged, the Beduins began to harass the camp itself, to intercept the grain sent to bring provisions and water, so that the Emperor was ultimately so hard pressed that he had to retire hurriedly and leave vast booty to the Arabs. He is said to have been in such danger on the flight that he put off his tiara to avoid recognition. The victory of the Arabs brought no great results. The new garrison of Antioch was, it is true, also defeated but Nâṣr preferred to make terms with the Emperor. He sent an envoy to Constantinople, who was well received and sent back with rich presents for Nâṣr. The latter bound himself to pay the Emperor tribute of 500,000 dirhems. Peace ensued; henceforth between the two rulers. Nâṣr was also able later to gain the favour of the Fâtimid Caliph al-Zâhir and his successor, or of his vizier, in 427 (1035) by rich presents from the Byzantine booty so that he was confirmed in the possession of Aleppo and could rest in peace and security. Only the old enemy of the Mirdâsîd, Anashtikin al-Dâhirî, intrigued against Nâṣr and succeeded in gaining a promise of the Emperor’s neutrality in a war against Nâṣr; Anashtikin again succeeded in uniting the Arab tribes of Tay, Kabîl and Killâb. Thus reinforced he took the field against Nâṣr. In the battle of Lâmiâh Nâṣr was killed, his head brought to Anashtikin, who is said to have deeply lamented his death. Anashtikin became lord of Aleppo and it was not till four years later, after his defeat and death that Thimâl regained it for the Mirdâsîd.
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he died there in 334 (948). At first an official (and vati or deputy-governor of Dammuwa) at the age of 40 he became a convert to asceticism under the influence of Khair Nasabī, a friend of Djamālī; he brought into mystic circles in Baghdad the enthusiasm, at times cynical, of a dilettante, holder in words than deeds. The tragic end of the trial of his friend al-Hallājī [q.v.] frightened him; he denied him before the vizier and went, it is said, to accuse him at the foot of the scaffold (309 = 922); in the end whether deliberately (though remorse not to avoid possible persecution) or unconsciously (through an excess of asceticism) Shībīlī affected a bizarre mode of life, cultivating eccentricities of speech and action which caused his imprisonment in the lunatic asylum in Baghdad; these he used to discourse readily on mysticism in presence of distinguished visitors. 

He has left no works, but his sayings (or al-fadūn, ṣāḥāli) figure in the classical collections of Shībīlī [q.v.] as do his deliberate eccentricities, his ridiculous penances, humiliating or painful, such as putting salt in his eyes to prevent himself from sleeping. In the legend of al-Hallājī the part attributed to Shībīlī is very important. He seems to have revered him in secret after denying him in public. In dogma, his ideas are those of Djamālī; in law he followed the Malikī school, which saved him in his lifetime and caused him to be canonised after his death in legal circles, as a rule very hostile to Sūfīsm. In the classical transmission of khūrja (or ṣāḥāli) Shībīlī figures as a link in the chain, between Djamālī and Naṣrābādī, the latter indeed was his pupil. His tomb is still venerated at the Aṣāmya in Baghdad, beside the maqṣūd of Abī Hašīm.


AL-SHĪBĪLĪ (from al-Shībīliya, a village in Ummehāsan in Tumuskhāna) SEHER AL-DIN ABD AL-ḤAFIZ UMAR I SHAHK I AḤMED AL-GEZNAWI AL-DUWALATĀBĀDI AL-HIZI AL-DJAH BUDDI, celebrated Fāṭih. He was born about 714 (the date 704 must be wrong). He studied Fāṭih with Wadīj ibn Djin al-Dīn al-Dīnahwi al-Rāzī, šama al-Din al-Dīnj al-Khāṣṣah, Sīrād al-Din al-Thaqafi al-Dīnahwi, Rukn al-Din al-Dīnahwi and al-Fāhūn, pupils of Abu ʿAbd al-Malik al-Tanābi (d. 760), Ḥaddīth with ʿAbd al-Majīd al-Dīnahwi and others. In 740 he came to Egypt and became deputy for Djamāl al-Din al-Turkmanī al-Habīs; through the influence of Yūhḥubī he was then appointed Kadi ʿAlī b. ʿAskar; after the death of Turkmanī in Shāhān 769 he became chief Kādi (al-Kādi ʿAlī b. ʿAskar) of Egypt and held the office till his death. Kādi ʿAlī, 773: He had also Staff tendencies; in Mecca he was associated with Kādi ʿAbd al-Fārīd; he was later a follower of Ibn al-Fārīd (cf. below).

His best known works are: 1. al-Tawāṣú, a commentary on the al-Hidāya al-Marghānī (cf. Brockelmann, l. 376, No. 24); 2. a second commentary on the al-Hidāya in syllogistic form;
during the past years of his life. In 1892 he undertook a journey to the Near East to get acquainted with the literary and educational conditions there, and visited Constantinople, Beirut, Jerusalem, Cairo and other places. He was given a literary pension by the Nigun of Haidarabad in 1341 (1896) and resigned his Professorship in 1898; was Director of the Department of Ulum-ud-Urdu, Haidarabad (April 1901—January 1905), Hony. Secretary of the Dar ul-Ulum of the Nudwat-ul-Islam, Lahkna (1905—1913); was also, for sometime, Hony. Secretary of the Akbar Sahib-ud-Urdu, the monthly journal *Mufahi*t as its organ. Shibli's works are: *Urdi, Misrul-Masul*, a biography of the Khalifa, Agra 1887; *ul-Ma'min*, a biography of the Khilafah, Agra 1887; *Sirat al-Ma'min*, a biography of Abu Hanifa, Agra 1891; *al-Dizya* on the origin of the Agra 1891 (Eng. translation, *Aligarh*); Kutubshahi-i-Istakbariyya, Agra 1891 (Eng. translation, Haidarabad); *Safar-nama*, Agra 1893; *al-Farid*, Umar's biography, Kurnur 1909; *al-Qasari*, the illness's biography, Kurnur 1903; *al-Um al-Kalim*, *al-Aghir* 1903; *al-Kalim, Kurnur 1903; Smirshahi-Mahsuli Rahm, Lahkna 1902; *Mumtaz-munawar Al-Abdi*, a criticism of two Urdu poets, Agra 1906; *Sir al-Adhiam i-I.v.*, *al-Aghir* 1909—1912, *unpublished*, Aaghur 1919; *Sirat al-Nabii*, i—ii, Kurnur 1919—2020, *unpublished*, Aaghur; *Kulliyat-i-Urdu* (Poems); *Rasul-i-Shahid*, *Mabhibat-i-Shahid*, *Mabhibat-i-Shahid*; *Shahid, 2 vols.* (all published lately, Aaghur). Persian: *Kulliyat* (Poems), Aaghur. Arabic: *al-Dizya*, *al-Aghir*; *al-Ishtihab ila l-Tamaddun al-Islami li Qurdi Zaidan*, Lahkna.


SHIHAB AL-DIN [see Shihab Al-Din].

SHIHAB AL-DIN. [see MAHIKH].

SHIHAB AL-DIN AHMAD B. MAJID. An Arab Navigator of the 13th Century, Author of Navigating Instructions for the Indian Ocean, the Red Sea, the Persian Gulf, the western China Sea and the waters of the Malay Archipelago.

When Vasco da Gama had reached Malindi on the east coast of Africa in 1498, he was able to get a pilot there who took him direct to Calicut. This incident is briefly recorded by one of the sources in the expedition (Retrato da viage de Vasco da Gama in MSCCXXCXXVII, 2nd ed., ed. by A. Hereulano and Castello de Paiva, Lisbon 1661, p. 49); and in greater detail by the Portuguese historians of the 17th century, notably by Damião de Goes (Chronica de verissimmo Ret D. Manoel, Coluna 1798, i, Ch. xxxviii., p. 57), Castanheda (Historia de descobrimento i conquista da India peloos Portuguezes, 1833, Bk. 1, end, of chap. xxxii and beginning of chap. xli., p. 41) and Barros (Da Descoberta da Índia, Bk. iv., Ch. vi., p. 319—320 of the little edition of 1778) who give the name of this pilot as: *Malome Canama in Castanheda and Goes, Malome Cana in Barros, Malome al-Samarra-* an admirer of *master of navigational geography*.

This story is confirmed by an Arabic text; *al-Bahr al-ya'mani fi 'Isfah al-Oglumini* (MSS. nos. 1644—1650 and 5927, Arabic collection of the Bibl. Nat. [1]) by Kajbl al-Din al-Nahwawai (1541—1582, cf. above), but the pilot there is called Ahmad b. Majid. Kajbl al-Din records that, after several unsuccessful attempts, a Portuguese caravel arrived in the Indian Ocean. "Before they reached the west coast of India and while they were on the east coast of Africa, the Portuguese continued to search for any news of this sea [of Western India] until a skilful sailor named Ahmad b. Majid put himself at their disposal," the leader of the Franks called Almuni (Portuguese *Almirante*: "Admiral") had become friendly with him and he used to become intoxicated with the Portuguese Admiral. This sailor being intoxicated showed the route to the Admiral, saying to the Portuguese: "Do not approach the coast in this part [of the east coast of Africa of Malindi], steer straight for the open sea; you will then reach the coast of India and be sheltered from the waves." When they followed these directions, a large number of Portuguese ships avoided shipwreck and many ships reached the shores of western India" (MS. 1644, fol. 50r. l. 9 sqq.).

The story of the intoxication seems to be a complete invention; it seems that it was a pious fiction intended to excuse an action which the Muslims of Mecca where Kajbl al-Din lived must have regarded as treachery. On the contrary it is more likely that the Arab *mu'allim* agreed to pilot the flagship of the Portuguese squadron on the promise of a handsome reward for his services. The Portuguese reports, which had no reason to conceal the fact, give quite a different story to this Arabic text.

Barros, who gives the most detailed account of the event, says that while Vasco da Gama was at Malindi some banyans from the kingdom of Cambay in Gujarat came to visit the Admiral. These Hindus, who paid homage to an image of the Virgin (taking her for a Hindu goddess) were thought by him to be members of one of the Christian communities which existed in India in the time of St. Thomas. With them came a Moor [i.e., Muslim] of Gujarat (truly) called Maleno (*mu'allim*) Cama (*Benaka*). The latter was much for the pleasure he took in the company of our men as to please the king (of Malindi) who was looking for a pilot for the Portuguese, agreed to set out with them (to show them the route to India). After discovering with him, Vasco da Gama "was very satisfied with his knowledge, especially when the Moor had shown him a map of the whole coast of India arranged as those of the Moors are with meridians and parallels (i.e., degrees of latitude and longitude) in great detail without indicating the names of the winds. As the squares (formed by the intersection) of these meridians and parallels were very small (the direction of the coast by
the two thumbs N. S. + E. W. was very exact without the map being overloaded with the quantity (of signs indicating the direction) of the winds and the needle, as on our Portuguese map which served as a basis for the others. Vasco da Gama showed the Moor the great wooden astrolabe which he had with him and other astrolabes in metal, with which the altitude of the sun was taken. The Moor displayed no astonishment at seeing such instruments. He said the (Arab) pilots of the Red Sea used instruments of brass, triangular in form and quadrants to take the height of the sun; and of the (polar) star which they used most in their navigation. But he added, he and the sailors of Captains and the whole of India sailed with (the help of) certain stars, southern as well as northern, and other notable stars which crossed the centre of the heavens from east to west. They did not take their altitude with instruments like those (that Vasco da Gama showed him) but with another which he used himself, and he brought it at once to show him (on this instrument cf. Reinaud, Introduction Générale à la Géographie des Orientaux in Géogr. d'Abensfeld, i. p. cix, 199); it was an instrument made of three plates. As we are dealing with the shape and method of using this instrument in our Géographie (universelle), a work unfortunately now lost in the chapter devoted to instruments of navigation, it is sufficient to mention here that the instrument in question is used by the Moors for the operation for which we use in Portugal the instrument called by the sailors astrolabette, which is also dealt with, along with its inventors in the chapter just mentioned (of the Géographia Universall). After this discourse and others which they had with this pilot, Vasco da Gama felt the feeling that he had found a great treasure (paucaque ter nelle bune gum gia thcescor). In order not to lose him, he put to sea as soon as possible and sailed for India on April 24, 1498 (Da Asis, Decades i., BK iv., Ch. vi., p. 308-341, of the edition of 1748). According to Gosse and Castanheira (loc. cit.) the pilot in question was "a Gujarat pilot"; according to Barros "A Muslim of Gujarat," the description of him by the two Portuguese historians is a bilingual expression: volunta = Arabic mu'allim, in nautical language = "master of navigation" and Conunqua = Naukhi, the Tamil form of the Sanskrit ganaqna = "astrolabe" (cf. The Book of Duarte Barbosa, ed. M. Longworth Dames, Hkdl. Soc., 1921, ii. 61-62 with v. Kromel's correction in Museum, 1925, N°. 1, p. 18). On the other hand this volunta conunqua is undoubtedly the same person as Ahmad b. Majdil of the Al-Ba'i al-yamani; and we know from himself that the celebrated mu'allim was an Arab of Arab descent, and born at Djalil. The mistake made by Goes, Castanheira and Barros or rather by their sources is obvious but I am not able to explain it. We know Ibn Majdil from other sources also. In the preface to his collection of sailing instructions entitled al-Ma'khut, the Turkish Admiral Sidi 'Ali says: "During a stay of five months which I made at Ba'in (in 554) which lasted till the beginning of the moon, and during my three months voyage from Ba'in to India, from the beginning of the month of Shawwail to the end of the month of Shawwail (July 2 = Sept. 27, 1554), during these eight months I never missed an opportunity of talking day and night on nautical matters with the pilots of the coast and the sailors (of the country) who were on board my ship. Thus I learned how the old pilots of Hormuz and Hindustan: Lajit b. Kahlun, Muhammad b. Shidkh and Shahl b. Atbin used to sail in the Indian Ocean. I also collected the books that had been written by modern (pilots), like Ahmad b. Majdil of Djufar in the province of 'Omran and Sulaiman b. Ahmad (cf. the article SULAIMAN AL-MAHRI) a native of a town called Shibir in the land of Emirs (Southern Arabia), as well as the books entitled: Faw'lid, Jami' (by Ibn Majdil, see below), Tabyat al-fauhul, Minayl, Fadil al-ta'mim (by Sulaiman al-Mahri); and I studied each one thoroughly. For as a matter of fact it was exceedingly difficult to navigate the Indian ocean without these works. The (foreign) Captains, Commanders and sailors do not know how to sail here and a pilot is always indispensable for them because they have not the necessary knowledge. I therefore have thought it at least a duty to write down all that is best in these books and to translate it into Turkish and then to write a good book so that those who consult it may attain their goal without needing a pilot and not have to seek advice from a pilot. My translation from these Arabic documents was finished in a short time with the help of the Ottoman King (Allah). As my books contain all the extraordinary things about navigation it has been entitled al-Ma'khut, "what surrounds our coasts, what includes all in itself" (Die topographischen Kapitel des Indischen Seereises, Mu'lah, transal. M. Bittner, with frontispiece and 30 maps by W. Tomaschek, Vienna 1897, p. 55). Sidi 'Ali mentions Ibn Majdil later (p. 31) and speaks highly of him; he calls him the "reliable among the sailors, the mu'allim of the sea of India, most worthy of belief among modern (writers of sailing instructions)." So far as one can judge from the published extracts, the Ma'khut of Sidi 'Ali is only the Turkish version, often mediocre, of a part of the route-book and sailing instructions of Ibn Majdil and of Sulaiman al-Mahri. Neither Maximilian Bittner nor his predecessor, von Hammer, endeavoured to trace the Arabic texts, the titles of which are briefly given by the Turkish admiral and their authors. No literary history mentions them but they appear in the Catalogue des Manuscrits Arabes de la Bibl. Nat. under 2292 and 2559 (the former was acquired by the Bibliothèque Nationale in 1860, the latter according to a note made by the Syrian priest Joseph Ascri was already in the Arabic collection in 1732); these two valuable manuscripts contain all the works used by Sidi 'Ali and other texts which he does not appear to have known. The MS. 2292 which is a copy of the original is in 18½ folios of 270 x 180 mm, 19 lines to the page and contains 19 route books and nautical treaties by Ibn Majdil copied in the following order by a scribe who troubled little about chronology: 1. Kitab al-faw'lid fi nafiz 'ilm al-bahri wa 'tawfiqih, folio 1-88 (It is the text called Faw'lid by Sidi 'Ali). This work in prose, divided into xii. chapters, is dated 894 (1489/1490). The early pages deal with the legendary origins of navigation and of the magnetic needle. Ibn Majdil then deals with the 28 lunar mansions; the stars corresponding to the 32 rhums (bahri, pl. ahshiyun) of the compass; of the sea-routes of the Indian Ocean; the latitudes of a number of harbours in the Ocean and Western China Sea;
the landmarks (sūrā, dāgha) formed by birds and the outline of the coast; the landsfalls (mutahdha, class. Ar. madalāh) of the west coast of India; the ten famous large islands (Arabian Peninsula, island of Kom or Madagascar, Siamatra, Java, al-Chāhir or Formosa, Ceylon, Zanzibar, Bahrain, Tim Gan) in the Persian Gulf and Socratea); monsoons favourable for the voyage with the date in the Persian computation of each monsoon. This treatise concludes with a description of the Red Sea which gives in detail its anchorages, shallows, banks and reefs. "The style of the work", says du Sall (Caucas., p. 401), "is very prolix and full of technical terms the meaning of which was only known to those who sailed the Indian Ocean": This is only partly true. The texts of MSS. 2292 and 2559 have been certainly prepared by sailors and for sailors. Technical terms abound in them, as might be expected, and the nautical vocabulary which they have yielded to me will be an important addition to the Arabic dictionaries (2).

II. حمیسی al-کیسیر f. ۱ کلیم al-کیسر (this is the text mentioned by Sidi Ali under the title حمیسی) occupies ff. ۸۸۹—۱۱۷۹. The text in قِدیس verses is divided into 81 sections (قِدیس). After a brief prose introduction of 20 lines the first section begins, dealing with signs of the proximity of land which pilots ought to know. The second section deals with the lunar mansions and rhaps, the third with the knowledge of the years, Arabic, Coptic, Byzantine and Persian, the fourth with the knowledge of the معین on correction to be made in the position of certain stars, the monsoons (نیئ) of the معین, the months in which the stars appear, the fixed character of their latitudes, and their disappearance, the dates being represented in the Persian way; the fifth, the sea-routes on the coasts of Arabia, of the Hijāj, of Siam (i.e. in the language of Ibn Madjid, the west coast of the Malay Peninsula which in those days all belonged to Siam), of the extremity of the land of the negroes (lit. of the negro coast); the sixth, the sea routes on the coast of Western India, down to the countries situated below the wind (i.e. according to Ibn Madjid, east of Cape Comini), like the island of Bilinton on the east coast of Sumatra, [the land of the] Maharattā = Sumatra (cf. ff. ۱۰۱۰—۱۰۷۹) and China, Formosa; the seventh, the sea-routes along the coast of the eastern islands, Sumatra, the Malacces, Madagascar, Yemen, Abyssinia, the land of the Somalis, of al-Atvād in southern Arabia, and of Makrān; the eighth, the distance of the seaports of the Arabian coast from those of Western India; the ninth, the latitudes of the harbours of the Surrounding Sea (بکر al-مکب) which runs deeply into the north, i.e. of the sea of Western India; the tenth, on navigation in the strict sense of the word, on the knowledge of currents of deep seas and of the Surrounding Sea which runs far in between the coasts of the land of the negroes, India and China, i.e. the Indian Ocean of our maps; the eleventh deals with nautical astronomy. The حمیسی, which is frequently cited in the preceding treatise (3), is thus dated on folio ۱۱۶۹; this poem was finished in the month of the pilgrimage at Hajjāf (in the S. W. of the Persian Gulf), the native land of the یون (surname of Ibn Madjid), among countries on the day of the Ditch (نام al-Chāhir) (3), the finest of days which is specially consecrated to good works and to fasting, and it was my friend, in the year 866 A. H. (i.e. 18 Dhu 'l-Hijja 866 = Sept. 13, 1462).

Folios ۱۱۷۹—۱۳۵۸ are blank.

III. An urūfija on the navigation of the Gulf of Biber, the Gulf of Aden of our maps, from folio ۱۲۲۵—۱۲۵۸; it is dated ۸۹۰ (1485).

IV. A treatise in verse preceded by an introduction of 33 lines in prose entitled "Book on the sciences of Islam for the whole world". This poem, says the author, has been prepared especially for those who sail the Persian Gulf and its shores by travellers. It is dated ۸۹۳ = 1488 and occupies ff. ۱۲۸۵—۱۳۷۹.

V. An urūfija on navigation along the Arabian coast of the Persian Gulf, fol. ۱۳۷۳—۱۳۹۸; n.d.

VI. An urūfija on the Basant naḥ (۱۳۹۱) of the Great and Little Bear, fol. ۱۴۳۶—۱۴۵۴; dated ۹۰۰ = 1۴۹۴.

VII. An urūfija entitled "The treasure of the μαθηματικοὐχοι and masters of navigation and treasurers of the science of unknown things about the sea, the stars, the planets, their names and their poles". This is not dated but from the context it is before ۱۴۸۹, fol. ۱۴۵۴—۱۴۷۹.

VIII. An urūfija dealing with the landsfalls (یوک) on the west coast of India and the coast of Arabia from ۲۵ ن. to ۶۰ N.; n. d.; fol. ۱۴۷۹—۱۴۵۴.

IX. An urūfija rhymed in ن, n. d., dealing with certain northern stars, fol. ۱۵۲۴—۱۵۶۹ inclusive.

X. An urūfija entitled "A hand in the hands of the Commander of the Faithful All b. Abi Talib, dealing with the knowledge of Lunar mansions, their exact position in the heavens, their form, their number; a complete description"; before ۱۴۸۹: fol. ۱۴۵۹—۱۴۵۹.

XII. An urūfija entitled "The obligation of obligations" dealing with its utilisation of certain stars for navigation; n. d.; fol. ۱۴۸۹—۱۴۵۳.

XIII. An urūfija entitled "Urūfija attributed to the Commander of the Faithful All b. Abi Talib, dealing with the knowledge of Lunar mansions, their exact position in the heavens, their form, their number; a complete description"; before ۱۴۸۹: fol. ۱۴۵۹—۱۴۵۹.

XIV. Rhymed poem in ن entitled "The Mecen Poem", dealing with sea routes from Djiisd to Cape Fair (South Arabia), Kālikī, Dīblé, the Konkan, Gujarat (Western India); to al-Atvād, Hormūz; . . .; n. d.; fol. ۱۴۶۹—۱۴۶۹.

XV. Rhymed poem in ن entitled "The Rarities of the Generous" or al-Weiṣl, Dhakhaib and al-Ulayf; fol. ۱۴۶۹—۱۴۷۹ (before ۱۴۸۹).

XVI. Poem rhymed in ن entitled "The Golden Poem", fol. ۱۴۷۹—۱۴۷۹; before ۱۴۸۹. It deals with the investigation of reefs, great depths and what one should do there and shallows; signs indicating land like birds and winds, landsfalls on capes during the monsoon from the South-West, landfalls in wind from the West". It is mentioned on fol. ۴۰۷, ۱. ۱۰ and dated from the reign of the Sultan Abū Saif al-Dīn Kā'īl Bey (۸۷۳—۹۰۱ = ۱۴۶۸—۱۴۹۵).

XVII. An urūfija dealing with the observation of al-Dāfīdī, "the Frog" = ن of the Southern Placid or β of the Whale according as it is said to be the first or second. This poem rhymes in ن, and is called al-Fākā; it occupies ff. ۱۷۵۶—۱۷۸۶ and was written before ۱۴۸۹.

XVIII. Urūfijah rhyming in ن, entitled "Sulāfjāh, the eloquent", dealing with the observation of the stars Canopus and Arcturus; it occupies ff. ۱۷۸۸—۱۷۹۶; n. d.
XIX. Nine brief sections (fay) in prose, not dated, dealing with soundings in different parts of the Indian Ocean, &c.; ff. 179b-181b and last.

The second MS. in the Arabic collection in the Bibliothèque Nationale, No. 2559, is a small 4° of 215 X 150 cm., 187 folios of 15 lines to a page; it contains the following treatise by Ibn Mādič:

XX. Ṣūfīn ṣaltāna (divided into seven sections) because it deals with seven branches of nautical lore; ff. 93a-105b; dated 588 (1483). At the end it is referred to as the "Great Ṣūfīn ṣaltāna." The Golden poem (cf. XVI above) is reproduced on ff. 105b-109.

XXI. A ḫāṭība rhyming in ḫ dealing with astronomy; ff. 109b-111a; before 1489.

XXII. ḫāṭība entitled " ... and (in) observation regarding it and the stars which are useful for landfalls and the description of the landfall points and of the coasts from Dīn to Dabūl"; ff. 111a-115b. The proper title of this nautical poem is given on f. 115b in the following verse: "I have called this ḫāṭība "The good path of the muwālim because it is faultless." At the end he says: "End of the ḫāṭība called al-Ḥādiya (which directs into the good path)"; before 1489.

The first nautical treatise in prose (I) contains also quotations of verses taken from ten other treatises by Ibn Mādič which have not come down to us (XXIII-XXIX).

Chronologically these three treatises may be classified as follows:

(a) 1462. Ḥāwiyya (II).
(b) 1483. al-Ṣūfīn ṣaltāna (XX).
(c) 1485. The poem on the Gulf of Aden (III).
(d) 1488. The poem on the Kibla of Islam (IV).
(e) 1489-1490. The Book of Useful Information (I).

(1) 1494-1502. The Ṣūfīs (VI).

The texts VI, XI, XIII, XVII, XXI-XXX are quoted in z and w which places them in the period before 1489. XV is earlier than XVI and XIV which refer to it. IX is earlier than XV and XVI and XII than XIV. VIII, X, XVIII and XIX contain no hints to date them, even approximately.

The period during which Ibn Mādič published his thirty nautical texts lies between an uncertain date before 1462 and 1489/90. The most important work of the celebrated muwālim, for size as well as its practical nature is undoubtedly his Book of Useful Information (I). It contains 178 pages (folio 1b-88b with 48 lines) of 19 lines to a page, i.e. 3382 lines, in which are to be added marginal notes of one or several lines on 27 pages. Concluded in 1489/90 this book seems to be a compendium of the known knowledge of theoretical and practical navigation. It is therefore more and better than the result of personal experience and labour; we must regard it as a kind of synthesis of nautical science of the latter years of the middle ages. Ibn Mādič is at the same time the earliest of modern writers of nautical guides. His work is admirable. The description of the Red Sea, for example, has never been surpassed or even equalled, neglecting the inevitable errors in latitude, by any of the writers of nautical guides for sailing boats. The information given on the monsoons, local winds, routes and latitudes for crossing the whole Indian Ocean are as precise and detailed as could be expected at this period.

Indonesia is less well known to him than the continent and islands of the Indian Ocean. By an error, which is inexplicable, Java is placed lying north to south, contrary to its real orientation; and this same error appears again in the nautical texts of Sulaimān al-Mahri (MS. 2559) who lived in the first half of the xvth century, from which it passed into the Turkish translation of Ṣaltāna al-ʿAlī. It is the only important rectification necessary.

MS. 2392 incidentally contains some biographical information about Ibn Mādič and his family. He was called Shihāb al-Dīn Ahmad b. Mādič b. Muhammad b. ʿAmr b. Faḍl b. Bawik b. Yānūb b. Ḥasan b. Ḥusain b. Abī Maʿṣūk b. al-Sāliḥ b. Abī l-Raḥlāb b. al-Nāḍī (f. 2v, infra). He gives himself the title of "poet of the two Kibla's (Mecca and Jerusalem), who has performed the pilgrimage to the two noble sanctuaries, the descendent of the Lion (ḥusn) of the sea in fury (f. 88v)." He also says on f. 117b: "I, Ahmad b. Mādič, am the Arab muwālim!"

According to certain passages in MS. 2392 the father and grandfather of Ibn Mādič were muwālim, authors of nautical treatises and their son and grandson continued their work. "He who (sails in the southern Red Sea) sails on the route of the pilgrims to Mecca," he says on p. 784. *My grandfather knew it with accuracy and in detail; he yielded to no one in this respect. My father added the results of his revised personal experiences. His knowledge surpassed the knowledge of his father. When our hour came and when we had in our turn gone through these experiences for nearly 40 years, when we had corrected the scientific work of these two exceptional men, when we had put into writing the results of our own experience and our written observations, we saw appear facts and principles which no one had combined in our time and which are only found scattered through different writers."*

My father, he tells us on p. 785, was called by the pilots, "the pilot of the two coasts" (of the Red Sea). He prepared the famous nāfis called al-nāfis al-kabīr containing about 1000 verses. We have corrected the errors we found in it and have completed it methodically. There is another reference to this poem on f. 81v.

Regarding a reef on the eastern coast of the Red Sea, adjoining the island of Māma which lies to the south of the 20° Lat., Ibn Mādič says (f. 87v) that most people call it "Mādič's reef" because his father had moored his ship to it. This is evidence of his fame among seafaring people of his day.

On several occasions Ibn Mādič shows full confidence in statements made by his father, differing with the usual practice of the pilots of the xvth century. "I have own my safety," he says on f. 84v, "to the information given me by my father rather than to that of the pilots." Further on he shows by an actual incident that his confidence in his father's knowledge was justified. "When we were moored there (between Asmā and Masnad, two islands on the Arabian Coast of the Red Sea to the south of the 17°) in 1485, he says on p. 34v, the nabādūk and the pilot were agreed upon passing between the islands of Asmā and Masnad, but I did not agree with their opinion because I had read in a poem compiled by my father that *there is no
passage in the neighbourhood of these islands; therefore (he advised) keep away, avoid these islands, there are only reefs there and there is only one passage two fathoms deep". We discussed the question with one another, Ibn Madjid continues, after quoting this from his father's book and I said to them "The best thing to do in my opinion is to send the sambūk (a kind of skiff) to go a day in front of us". The sambūk set out with the sounding lead and found two fathoms of water. The sambūk confirmed what I had said and returned passing between Masnad and Sūthū. It found the passage and came back to us at the end of the day. And (the statements made in) my father's poem proved to be, in this place, the best part of my inheritance".

Regarding the legendary origins of navigation, the needle, the compass, the astrolabe, Ibn Madjid says: "The first to build a ship (f. 2 v. infra of MS. 2929) was Noah. He built it on the advice of the Angel Gabriel, who had been sent to instruct him by the Almighty Creator. The ark was built in the shape of the figure formed by the five (sic) stars of the Great Bear; the stern of the ark corresponds to the third star (f. 37), the keel to the fourth, fifth and sixth stars and the stern to the seventh. Even now (1489) the people of Zang (eastern coast of equatorial Africa), of Ḫumār (Madagascar), of Mirna (the African coast opposite Zanzibar) and of the land of Sofīta call the fifth and sixth stars of the Great Bear al-dārāb, "the keel of the ship". These two stars are observed for the determination of latitudes, at the moment of the culmination of al-Serfa (ε of Leo), in the absence of the foṣāid (β and γ of the Little Bear) because they have the form of the keel of the Ark of Noah. Traditionists differ as to the length and breadth of the Ark. It is said to have been 400 cubits long, 100 cubits broad and 100 cubits deep, not including the height of the masts. It had two oars (in the stern to act as rudder). When the ark was finished and the flood came, Noah embarked with those who were to accompany him. It carried them and saved them from the deluge and shipwreck. The Ark is said to have sailed seven times round the site where the Kaḥa of Mecca was later to stand. This place was then a region of red sand where nothing was built. The deluge did not reach it."

When (f. 3) the Ark was built and men had learned the art of navigating along the shores of the sea in all the climes [of the earth] which Allah divided amongst the children of Noah: Japheth, Sen and Ham [Son of Noah], who built the second Ark, each began to build ships in the maritime countries, the gulf and shores of the sea surrounding the earth until the world reached the epoch of the 'Abbāsids (103 = 750) which dynasty had Baghdad as its capital in Irāq Arābi. All Ḫorasan belonged to them. The road from Ḫorasan to Baghdad is three or four months' journey in length."

"At this time (i.e. under the 'Abbāsids) there lived three famous men: Mūḥammād b. Shāhān, Sahl b. Abīn and Mūṣā b. Kahlān (not Ibn Kamīl). I have heard that he wrote in a work [by Ismā'īl b. Ḥasan b. Sahl b. Abīn], the Bāb al-Mulūk [of Samarra] in a rāhmatī (or rāḥmatī) Fakhralī rāḥmatī, "book of the route") (9) dated 880 a. h. (1184/1185). They exalted all their efforts in composing this rāḥmatī which begins "We have expounded to thee that... None of it is in verse and the subjects dealt with are not linked together, which is not the case with a well composed work. Their book has neither finitude nor authority. It can be added to or have parts cut out of it. These men were compilers and not original authors. They only sailed on the Red Sea from Surāf to the coast of Makra (f. 4). They sailed from Surāf to Makra in seven days, from Makra to Kūsāsan in a month. They shortened the way, for before their time, it was a journey of three months. They had to disembark on every coast of the people of these seas and they have left a narrative [of their voyage]." In their time among the celebrated Mā'allūm were Ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz b. Aḥmad al-Maghribī, Mūṣā al-Kandarīn, Mā'mūn b. Khaṭīb and, a thousand before them (sic), Aḥmad b. Tahirīya [who had written nautical books]. They borrowed from the works of the latter and from those of the Mā'allūm Khwājg b. Vāsīf b. Šāhī al-Afrikī who had travelled in the year 400 (1009/1010) and the years adjacent to this date (and who had written a narrative) of what he had seen in travelling on the ship of Sūfībā the Indian. Among the famous Niḥāyāt of the time were Aḥmad b. Mūḥammad b. 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Abī 'Iṣāfī b. Abī Mūḥābir (or Mughīrī). Their principal knowledge lies in the description of their coasts and their extent. The majority of the countries described formed part of the lands situated under the wind (i.e. lands east of Cape Comorin) and on the coast of China. Now these ports and towns (which they described) have disappeared. Even their names no longer exist. The indications given by them are no longer of any use for our period (xvth century), lacking as they do the solid basis of our modern knowledge and experience and our discoveries which are recorded in this book. For it is a book in which everything has been checked and verified by experience and there is nothing superior to experience. The point reached by the predecessors should be followed from which their successor starts and here we are prejacent considerably their knowledge and their works. We have paid tribute to their work in saying "I am the Fourth after the Third". Sometimes in the work we have produced in what concerns the sea, there is a single leaf which contains more perfection, accuracy, utility, valuable advice than [all] they have composed" (f. 4b).

The Three borrowed their good points and their ability from the above mentioned individuals and others also. They took from each his knowledge of the coast and sea with which he was familiar; they made a story of it but they are compilers and not writers recording their own experiences, and I know no Fourth (who could be mentioned alongside of them, except myself. I honour them when I say: I am the Fourth [after these three famous authors]."

I have honoured them by taking into account the fact that they are before me in the era of the Hijāra. Certainly, after death another will come and there will be men who will put each of us in our place. When I studied the work of my predecessors and found it feeble without reality or certainty, without order, I adopted what was worth keeping and recorded the discoveries I had made; my corrections and the results of my experience, year by year in the verses of the (nautical) poems and in this book [which has been published or finished] in the year 880 a. h.
They have recorded it in the story of the City of Copper (9) and the astrolabe was included among instruments of navigation by others than the Three, Muhammad b. Ṣāḥibīn and his (two) companions; for the ships sailed the ocean by sighting by astronomical observation (with the astrolabe) in the time of the Prophets — on whom be peace! — Our Three (predecessors) only lived in the time of the 'Abbasids. Such is the story given in histories written by their hands."

Ibn Mājdīdh pays a tribute to his predecessors, by saying on several occasions that he is the fifth after the Three or the fourth of the Lions but he does not fail to warn sailors against the gaps and errors in their works, with which he contrasts the extensive documentation of his own Nautical Instructions. "Canopus, he says (f. 31b of MS. 2292), rises far from the south pole on the 22nd day of Nūrūs at dawn and sets on the 45th day of Nūrūs. If you ask a sailor, he will never know that; unless he has studied this book, he will not be able to answer the question, even if he had read for a hundred years the works of Muhammad b. Ṣāḥibīn and his two companions". It seems from a passage in 2292 p.5 (f. 126b, l. 5 seq.) that the works of the Ancients, i.e., of the Three, were still consulted in the first half of the 12th century.

According to the text of Ibn Mājdīdh, the Three, Muhammad b. Ṣāḥibīn, Sahl b. Alān and Luṭfī b. Kahīn, were neither maḥallīm nor masters of navigation nor sailors, but only learned authors of route-books and nautical instructions who had used for their works the stories of sea-voyages. The passage in question in the Book of Useful Information (1), besides, gives two definite statements.

— The Three or at least Sahl b. Alān lived in the first half of the 12th century a.d. and the above mentioned records of voyages contained more particularly the descriptions of the countries under the wind (East of Cape Comorin and of China), We can imagine that the works of the Three were based on records of travels in India, Transagantic India, Indonesia and China, like that of the merchant Sulaimān, published in 851 which was revised and expanded by Alī Žaid Ḥasan about 916 (10).

An amateur of geographical science, the latter lived in Baghdad and there collected all the information he could find in manuscripts or gathered from the sailors of his time, and it seems that this is what the Three did, whose continuator Ibn Mājdīdh calls himself, for he expressly points out that he differed from the others in writing of seafaring matters from a long personal experience.

According to Ibn Mājdīdh, the works of the Three mentioned towns and seaports which had disappeared in the 12th century. This reference is to ancient place-names which would have been of great use to us in identifying the geographical names preserved in Chinese text and in Ptolemy's Geography. But we have now lost this source of information it is nevertheless important to know that it once existed. Anything is possible in the east, even the chance discovery of a manuscript of the Three, of Almād b. Tabrūṣa, or Khawāṣir b. Yūsuf b. Sahl al-Afrikīt. The acquisition by the Bibliothèque Nationale of the MSS. 2292 and 2559 is a lucky chance which one can always hope may repeat itself.

The Khawāṣir (1), the importance of which can be seen from the résumé and extracts given:

1475/1476 (?). Men experienced in nautical science have approved my work, used it and taken it as a basis to solve the difficulties presented to them, such as, for example, the aspect of mountains, astronomical observations, names and knowledge of the stars, and the way to steer by them. The people of my time know very little more than what the ancients had handed down to them regarding, for example, the proper sea-routes, the ḍīfāt (co-efficient indicating the length of the route to be traversed to a given cape to obtain the same displacement in latitude as in the route to the north) and the ṣalāḥīd. As to distances, they did not know them.

We have already spoken of this in the commentary on the nautical poem entitled al-Dhahābiyya (8) and we shall refer to them again.

In reality, the people of the early ages had plenty of courage in their hearts, but they only sailed with the help of the sailors of the coasts who were endowed with considerable energy, while the others feared the sea and had an aversion for it. The sailors equipped their boats excellently; they never allowed the (favourable period of the) monsoon to pass; they did not load their ships above what was usually done. We however know more and have had more experience than they.

Every improvement in seafaring matters had an inventor. The maker of the Ark was, as we have said, Noah. As to the lodestone to which one trusts oneself, the art of navigation was not complete without it. It was David who invented it; it is the stone with which he killed Goliath. As to the lunar mansions and the signs of the Zodiac, the prophet Daniel wrote on this a book which was completed by [Nasr al-Ďīn] al-Tūsī (d. 1261).

But let us come back to our first subject, the stars (which correspond) the compass of the compass. Their names are found in an old book earlier than the work of the Lions, our predecessors. But these names and these ẓāw (3 hours sailing) are not absolutely exact data (i.e. the direction of the courses which they give and their duration expressed in ẓāw are only approximations and not certainties). As to the description of the courses (f. 5v) which we know from experience, we have written it with care and we only give it after reported personal experience. Our description of the coast is better than that of our predecessors..."

"As to the making of the house of the needle with the lodestone (i.e. the compass) it is said that Daniel was its inventor for he knew how to make use of iron and the properties of this metal. Others say that it was al-Khūdīr (cf. As-Khūdīrī) who invented the compass, when he set out to look for the well of life, when he penetrated into the land of darkness and the sea of darkness and when he travelled to one of the poles up to the place where he no longer saw the sun. It is said he found his directions with the lodestone. Others say that he found his direction with the help of light. The lodestone (f. 6v) is a stone which attracts iron. This is the only thing that it attracts. It is said: that the seven heavens and the earth are held in suspension by the lodestone and the omnipotence of Allah. Many other things are said on this subject!"

"The first inventor of the ʿAṭīlay (or astronomical observation) with the astrolabe", Ibn Mājdīdh goes on (f. 14v, l. 3 ḫira), "was Idris [q.v.]. He was the inventor of the astrolabe with degrees. The ancients] changed these degrees into ṣalāhat (finger)."
above seem to be the work of Ibn Majid’s ripe experience. We do not know the date of his birth.
If he was 25 or 30 in 1463 when he wrote the Hafta (II) he would be 52 or 57 when the Book of Useful Information appeared (I) and 53 or 63 at the time when he finished the poem (VI) which is dated 1494-1495. Three or four years later, in April 1498, Vasco da Gama arrived at Malindi where Ibn Majid embarked as his pilot. We do not know the date of the ma’alim’s death.

According to James Prinsep, the memory of Ibn Majid was still alive in India and the Maldives in the first half of the 18th century.

“I endeavoured therefore, says Prinsep to procure an Arabic compass, but not one could be met with in all the vessels—at length my friend Sayyid Husain Sidi found a drawing of it in one of the practical works on navigation—called the Maalim Kitab, *book of Maalim* or, as my Maldivian friend facetiously expressed it, the *John Hamilton book of the Arabs* in possession of a mahdi, and without ceremony, tore out the leaf to show it to me, as the captain was afraid of parting with the volume, without which doubtless he would have been greatly at a loss on his return voyage”. (*Note on the Nautical Instruments of the Arabs*, in *J.A.S.B.*, 1836, i., p. 788). The reference here is evidently to a nautical work analogous to MSS. 2292 and 2559, with the addition of plates showing the instruments used in navigation and perhaps charts; or perhaps it was even a copy of MS. 2292, whence it would have its name of Maalim Kitab or “Book of Maalim”.

In his *First Footsteps in East Africa or an Exploration of Harar* (London 1856, p. 3-4), R. F. Burton says: On Sunday, the 29th October, 1854, our manifold impediments were pronounced complete. Friend S. threw the slipper of blessing at my back, and about 4 p.m. embarking from Maala Bunder (the port of Aden reserved for foreign boats), we shook out our “muslins”, and sailed down the fiery harbour. Passing the guard-hunt, we delivered our permit; before venturing into the open sea we presented the Faith-harp in honour of Shaykh Majid (sic), inventor of the mariners’ compass, and evening saw us dancing on the bright clear tide...”. Burton adds in a note: “It would be wonderful if Orientalists omitted to romance about the origin of such an invention as the Dayrah or compass. Shaykh Majid is said to have been a Syrian saint, to whom Allah gave the power of looking upon earth, as though it were a ball in his hand. Most Moslems agree in assigning this origin to the Dayrah, and the Faith-harp in honor of the holy man, is still repeated by the phrase ‘mariner’. There is every reason to believe that Shaykh Majid is not a saint belonging to Syria but simply the maalim Ibn Majid who has found a place in Muslim hagiography for the eminent services which his nautical works have rendered to navigators since the 15th century. The process is obvious and many similar cases are known.

In 1913 my regretted colleague and friend Paul Ottavi who lived for some fifteen years at Zanzibar and Masehi, had a search made in these seafaring centres for nautical texts by Ibn Majid and Sulaiman al-Mahri, but the very names of these two maalim were unknown to the Arab sailors there.  

**Bibliography**


**Notes:**

1. There are numerous copies in Europe and in the East.

2. A second copy of MS. 2292 has just been accidentally discovered in Damascus and has found a home in the Arabic Academy; cf. *Revue de l’Académie Arabe*, Feb. 1921, Damascus I, p. 33-35. Another copy but incomplete of MS. 2559 was found at Djiada where our colleague Ahmad Zeki Pasha had kindly had enquiries made on my behalf.

3. The use of this specifically Shî’ite expression in place of the ordinary Arabic word seems to show that the author was himself a Shî’ite or at least had an inclination towards the partisans of ‘Ali.

4. Land-fall is here to be taken in the special sense of reconnaissance of a cape or land to enable one to ascertain the route.

5. Play of words on the name of his predecessor, Lailh ib. Khalil (lailh = lion in Arabic).


7. The book in question is however dated in all cases 965 A.H.

8. This commentary has not come down to us.


*(Gabriel Ferrando)*
The name of a town and district on the coast of South Arabia, which is still known as the Shebhrat coast. The learned Nasibin gives also al-Shihr as the dialectic pronunciation for al-Shihr, which latter he calls the correct form. This form is of interest because it recalls SABA, first suggested by A. Sprenger as the basis of the corrupt SABA in Theophrastus and Pliny; when the latter says the word means mysterious, this recalls Ibn al-Mudakhir’s derivation of the name Sabra, which is applied to the Mahra people, from sabr “magic”. That SABA is the coast district now called al-Shihr, which classical and Arab authors know as the land where the frankincense trees flourish, is in any case certain. The name Saba and Sibai given by the Portuguese to this region, recalls the apparently older pronunciation Sabra, which means “coast”. To the Arab geographers the name al-Shihr is synonymous with Mahra, the strip of South Arabian coast, which, extending from Toq Hwakal, is 400 parasangs long and about 3 broad, the eastern end of which is 500 parasangs from Maskat, while the western end is the same distance from ‘Adam. Al-Ashgha and Sam’an are given as old names of this territory, which was not reckoned a part of Hadramuit proper, and the names al-Ashghal and al-Ashkal are also of frequent occurrence. That the inhabitants, as is still the case, spoke a peculiar, unintelligible dialect, was already known to the Arab geographers. The South Arabian expedition of the Vienna Akademie der Wissenschaften in 1839 studied this language thoroughly, and the comprehensive works of D. H. Müller and M. Böttcher, also of W. Hein, A. Jahn and N. Rhodokanakis give us a complete survey of this peculiar idiom.

The coast of al-Shihr with its hinterland, has passed through various vicissitudes. At the beginning of the 19th century, A.D., it was taken by Hafiz h. Twakalik al-Khaleeli from the Ghassanid Amir h. Abd al-Wahlid, then king by the Portuguese who occupied the whole coast from ‘Adam to Maskat. After holding this stretch of country for thirty-five years, the Portuguese were driven out by the Banu Khajjan and all attempts to re-establish them failed. A fleet of twenty ships, sent to reconquer the lost territory, was sunk with every man on board, in a fearful hurricane. The Khajjan ruled the country for forty-five years, and then the coast was conquered by Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Amir b. Abd al-Wahlid b. Alhumairi. Various owners held the much disputed coast in succession until in 1866 Sulaiman Ghali b. Mulsplit al-Khaliji seized al-Shihr, but lost it the very next year to the Khajjan, who gradually won the whole coast.

The town of al-Shihr, which lies in the centre of a sandy desert, is surrounded by a clay wall, with square watch-towers and round forts. Formerly one of the most important ports of Hadramuit, from which were exported the precious frankincense and the amber known as ambar shajr, and which conducted a busy trade with Mokha, Aswan, Maskat and al-Hasa, it is now completely overshadowed by the much more favourably situated port of Makalla, as it only has an open roadstead for shipping. Remains of ancient civilization and former prosperity are still to be found. The houses, now much ruined, as nothing is ever renovated, frequently show beautifully carved stonework in the floors and windows. The mosque has a very picturesque situation, but has been much neglected; the minaret has a decided inclination to one side. The population is about 8000—10,000, and is mainly industrial. Dyed cottons are woven on primitive looms and loom-cloths, with gay and pretty patterns. White cottons imported from India are dyed here with indigo and madder. Smiths make all kinds of weapons, notably strong knives, which have a particularly good reputation. Silversmiths, of whom there are many, find plenty of employment in decorating these arms with silver, according to the local custom, and making the ornaments beloved by the women. More elaborate articles are imported from India, notably valuable sword hilts. The bazaars of the town are quite insignificant. Coloured cottons and other goods of European origin like soap, candles, ironmongery, Indian cottons and silks, petroleum, matches, dried dates, rice, durra, wheat, coarse wheat-flour, imported from India, coffee and tobacco are also dealt in here. At the flesh of goats and sheeps is relatively dear, the main food is the small sardine-like ‘alid fish, which is also used as manure and to make oil. Al-Maakkaddi long ago emphasized the wealth of al-Shihr in fish, and he reports that fish in his time were exported to ‘Oman, ‘Adam and even al-Hasa and the lands of Yemen. The ‘alid fish is probably identical with the little fish called mark, which according to Ibn Hawkal was the principal food of the inhabitants, and according to Idrisi was dried and given to the camels as food, which Th. Bent also saw done in Hadramuit. At the present day, salted and dried shark is an esteemed article of export into the interior. The trader of merchants, however, has few wealthy members, and the foreign connections are mostly with India (Makhes), Central Africa and al-Hasa. Gum-arabic and resin, especially frankincense are brought to the market by the Beduins and exported from here. The trade in these articles is, however, now quite insignificant, compared with what it was in antiquity.

In conclusion we may note that al-Agham in al-Bakri mentions a palace named al-Shihr in Hadramout; how far this is correct cannot be ascertained. There is probably a connection with the town on the coast, which however, as noted above, never belonged to Hadramuit proper.

**Bibliography:**


**THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM, IV.**

SHIKĀRĪ, a word formed from the Persian word šikārī ("sport"), in the sense of hunting or shooting) and meaning a hunter. There are many castes in India whose occupation is the hunting, trapping, tracking, or pursuit of birds and beasts, but the caste which has adopted or received the word Shikārī as its tribal name is found chiefly in Sind. A writer in 1822 said: "Shecarries are generally Hindus of low caste, who gain their livelihood entirely by catching birds, hares, and all sorts of animals," but the Shikārīs of Sind seem to have abandoned the occupation from which they take their name. They are described as outcast immigrants from Rādīpurā, found from Bangāl to the Khākhā, the origin of whose honourable appellation is unexplained, though they probably possessed, like other aboriginal races, a knowledge of wild animals and skill in tracking and were employed by the Mūsalmān nobility in quest of sport. They are now engaged in making baskets, and as sweepers and scavengers, and appear to correspond, in most points, to the Bhagīs of Bangāl and Hindūstān. They eat carrion, and, even when professing Islam, are considered unclean, and not allowed to enter a mosque, unless they undergo a ceremony of purification by fire, after which they are classed as Mādībīs. Those whose occupation is the taking of life are naturally held in small esteem in a land which has been permeated by the principles of Buddhism, D имени, and Brahmānism, but the purification ceremony demanded by Mūsulmān before admitting Shikārīs to their worship is an example of the extent to which Islam in India has been infected by the prejudices of Hindūism.


SHIKĀRṔṔṔ, a town of Sind, situated in 27° 57' N. and 68° 40' E., was founded in the seventeenth century by the Dādiputras, a tribe of warriors and weavers, who established their supremacy in Upper Sind and made their new town their capital. In 1701 it was captured by Vār Muḥammad Khān, the founder of the Kalhara dynasty, with the aid of the Sīkī or Tālpīr tribe of the Bāltī, and became, in turn, his capital, but the district in which the town is situated remained in the hands of the Dādiputras until it was conquered in 1719 by Nūr Muḥammad, the son and successor of Vār Muḥammad.

In 1739 Thatha and Shıkăṛ, with all that part of Sind lying to the west of the Indus, were ceded by Muḥammad Shāh of Dīlī to Nūrī Shāh, who in 1740 invaded Sind to punish Nūr Muḥammad Kalhara for concluding with Muḥammad Shāh's governor of the province an agreement which

Infringed his sovereign rights. Nūr Muḥammad was obliged to surrender and to relinquish his possession of Shıkăṛpūr and Sīhī, which Nūrī Shāh handed over to the Dādiputras, but in 1754 Muḥammad Murūd Yār Khān was recognized as governor of the whole of Sind by Ahmad Shāh Durātā, to whom the province was tributary, and remained thereafter in the hands of the rulers of the province.

Shıkăṛpūr has long been famous, both under British and under native rule, for the enterprise of its merchants, who carry on an extensive trade not only with other parts of India, but also with Persia and Central Asia, where many of them reside for long periods. The import trade of the Kīrānī province of Persia, in tea, sugar, and other commodities is almost entirely in the hands of Shıkăṛpūr merchants, who have taken advantage of the situation of the town on one of the great routes from Sind to Khorāsān via the Bolāt Pass, but since the middle of the nineteenth century, it has lost much of its importance owing to the construction of the North-Western Railway and its extension to Khetta (Quetta). It is still, however, a considerable entrepôt. Its great covered bazar is famous throughout Asia, and is continued by a modern structure, the Stewart's Grand market.


SHIKESTE. [See l. 391.]

SHĪK. Shīk (from the Arabic shīk) is the name of two diviners who lived shortly before the rise of Islam. According to the Syntaxis of Marco Polo, Shīk the elder was the first diviner among the Arabs of 'Arab. He is quite a familiar personage. Like the Cyclops, he had only one eye in the middle of his forehead and a fire which split his forehead into two (štāk to split). He is also mixed up with Dājjāl, Antichrist, or at least Dājjāl is of his family. He is said to have lived chained to a rock on an island where volcanic phenomena occurred. The second Shīk called al-Vaghtavari was the most famous of his time along with Šaṭī; he expounded a vision of Rabh's son of Nāṣr the Lakhmid prince of Yemen, foretelling the conquest of Yemen by the Abyssinians, its liberation by Ibn Dhi Vazan and the coming of the Prophet. According to Ka'amint the Shīk are a kind of Shafīi forming part of the group of Musalayjava; they are in the shape of half a man with one arm and one leg. The Nasānī, other half-men, of men, are produced from Shīks and whole men. These Shafīis appear to travellers. It is said that 'Alkama b. Sa'fwan b. Omayya met one of them one night near Ḥawmān and after an exchange of high words, the man and the djinn killed one another.


SHILLUH (in Berber: masc. n. shilha) is the name given to the Berber-speaking people of the High and Anti-Atlas (South of Morocco). This is the name they give themselves; the word is widely used in Morocco; it
The language called transitional, like the Berber language generally, is found in the form of many local dialects closely connected with one another, none of which has risen to the level of a language of culture. These dialects are among the most conservative of the Berber dialects; in phonetics they are occlusive, with however a tendency in the dialect of affrication (e.g. llaé gomid), in morphology they show many clear traces of archaism (cf. the verb of quality in particular). M. Lévi-Provençal has recently discovered an Arabic manuscript 800 years old containing a number of Berber expressions from this region. This valuable manuscript, in view of the scarcity of old Berber texts, gives confirmation of the stable character of these dialects.

This region, especially Sis, is one of the most studied in Barbary from the literary point of view. The poets there are particularly renowned and one of them, who may however be quite a legendary individual, Sidi Hamoud, has to speak become the symbol of poetry and all the poetic values are attributed to him. This literature is mainly oral; there are however a few Berber manuscripts in the Arabic alphabet; this is one of the few districts in Barbary in which they are found.

This region has had no unity from the point of view of historical continuity. A few places are known from the part they have played at particular periods, e.g. Timmel, Tazerwalt (cf. the separate articles).

Bibliography: A. Study of the language: there are a certain number of books all practically of the same period by H. Simumme. The chief is Handbuch des Schriftenkern von Tazerwalt, Leipzig 1889. M. Destain has undertaken a study of the dialects of the Id-El Semlou in five volumes, one of the best enquiries into the Berber language — only the first volume has so far appeared: Tachistit du Semlou, treveuclaire Francois-Berberis. Paris 1920: By Lévi-Provençal, Documents d'Histoire Almolide (in the press).


SHIN, thirteenth letter of the Arabic alphabet, whose numerical value is 300. It is distinguished from sin by three diacritical points, cf. I. 381 sqq. For linguistic particulars see SHN.

SHINASI (derived from the Persian shi, the root of shnshin, to know), poetical name of a number of Turkish poets (five in Hammer). See Index to Gibb, A History of Ottoman Poetry and to Hammer, Geschichte der osmanischen Dichtkunst; cf. Kien, Cantal, British Museum, p. 101.

The best known of the writers bearing this name is Ibrahim Shnasi Efenzi, who is according to some the father and according to others one of the first pioneers of modern Turkish literature (given new life as a result of the Tarih). The son of an artillery captain, a native of Bolu; Shnasi was born at Constantinople in 1242 (1826-1827) and soon afterwards lost his father, who was killed in the Russo-Turkish war of 1828-1829. His mother became an invalid and him admitted as a clerk in the General Artillery Office (Teşkiri-i 'amiri), where he attracted the attention of his superiors by his poems, yasidas in honour of the grand vizier. Rashid Pasha and other statesmen and his chronogram (tarih), more or less complicated (bism, wâ'ifurebber and yi) for monuments, for fountains and other monuments. A French officer, the Count of Chasteneuf, who was later to become a Muslim under the name of Nînî Bey, taught him the elements of the French language. The young civil servant poet thus found himself chosen among the first students who were sent to France. In his petition addressed to Marshall Fatih Pasha (Teşkiri-i mülkiyyet) Shnasi asked to be sent to Paris in order to perfect himself in the study of the French language (hâfi-i 'açab al-hayât-i fransawi), and asked for a pension to be paid to his mother during his absence. The decision of the Council of Ministers (mudafe-â-i wakil), approved by Rashid Pasha, which gave him 5,000 piastres for his travelling expenses and a pension of 500 piastres monthly for his mother, is dated the end of the month Rahî al-awwal 1265 (January 1849) but may have appeared after a certain delay. Tradition has it that Shnasi took a very active part in the Revolution of 1848, by holding the Republican flag on the Pantheon, and that he associated with scholars and men of letters such as Silvestre de Sacy, Renan and Lamartine. He stayed abroad for five years.

On his return to Constantinople, Shnasi was appointed a member of the first Council of Public Instruction, created in accordance with the plan which he had brought back from Paris. He worked also on the Finance Commissions with the object of elaborating certain administrative reforms, but having lost his protector Mustafa Rashid Pasha (who died in 1874) and being in bad odour with the bureaucrat, who even reproached him for not wearing a beard, he quit the government service and took up journalism.

He began by collaborating in the Terşîn-i şâmi, the first non-official Turkish newspaper, which appeared on the 35 Rahî al-hisâb 1265 (October 22, 1860) by Agâh Efendi, muvaffaqiyet of İsmi. Shnasi was the chief editor of this organ. But soon afterwards he was able to found a journal under his own name, the Taşvir-i Efkar, which, thanks to the energy of Shnasi's successors, Abu l-Ziya Tawfik and his son, was to survive with slight changes of title (Taşvir-i Efkar, Tehsin-i Efkar) until the recent suppression by the government of Angora (March 6, 1925). Shnasi's paper which, according to its sub-title, was an organ for information and public instruction appeared at first in a very modest and impersonal form; the first number alone contained a preface of several lines, signed by the author. Appearing twice weekly and printed on four pages, in a reduced format, the Taşvir-i Efkar had four rubrics: Home news (hâwikdar-i akhbariyye) mostly official appointments, foreign news (Akhbar-i akhbariyye), advertisements (Fâ'ihî) and a feuilleton (hayât-i Efkar) In these feuilletons were published the works of Subhi Bey (one of which is on numismatics), lectures by Ahmad Wafiq on the philosophy of history, and other works such as the Ma'sul al-âbâ' of Kutib Celbî. They also contained translations from Buffon, by Abu l-Ghabit (Shâhâr-i ürûd). The Taşvir supported the
In dramatic art Shinasi was also a pioneer, writing the first comedy or rather the first Turkish vaudeville, under the title "A Vie de voix:" an A'Poet's Marriage." Feecile in itself, this work has independently of the merit of novelty, that of criticizing the old-fashioned matrimonial customs; it deals with a fraudulent attempt to substitute in the place of a veiled bride, an uglger sister. It has been translated into German by Vehn. 

Shinasi, besides, collected in 1255 (1851-1852), about 2,000 Turkish proverbs to which he added some Arabic, Persian and French equivalents. This collection appeared under the title "Turk-"b"- "m'mal-xi-i amurkâ-y, at the Tayw. Efr. press in 1280 (1865) and in 1287 (1870-1871). Finally in 1301 (1881/84), "Abu 'l-Ziya brought out a third edition, which he enlarged by bringing it up to 4,004 proverbs (ed. J. A., 1863, ii. 299, 143 and 1871, ii. 147, 22).

The influence which Shinasi exerted on the development of Turkish literary movements cannot be compared to that of his young rival and postige, Namzi Kemen, but his part was considered in the restoration of the language; he contributed a great deal to simplifying the language by bringing it nearer to the spoken language and by combating scholastic influence of Arabic and Persian.
SHINASI — SHIR

Abu 'l-Ziyâr Tawfîk, Constantinople 1879, 2nd ed. 1886, Nâsimî-ı edebîyetê, p. 253; Abd al-Hâlim Mandalli, Tarih-i edebîyet-i armânîî, Constantinople 1306, p. 93—99; Sa'îd Pâsha (cf. above in the text of the article): Mehişniyât 'âsîh, pamphlets No. 23 and 24 of the collection Kütübhâne-i Eflû-s-Ziyâr; Ahmad Râfî, Sînâniân kitâbî tağlîl Pavarî gizmî, Türkce tâglîl engrâflimi mezâne, of 11th May 1341 (1925), p. 215—216; Paul Horn, Geschichte der türkischen Modernen, Leipzig 1902, p. 10—12 (cf. p. 5; the bibliography of this work); L. Bouzill, Della lingua e letteratura turca contemporanea, Venice 1892; Safer Bey, A travers la littérature turque (II), La Revue, formerly Revue des Revues, 1st September 1907.

J. DEY

SHINTARA (or Shantara), Arabic name of the modern Cînatra, a little town in Portugal, at a height of 700 feet above sea-level, 16 miles N.W. of Lisbon. It was quite prosperous under Muslim rule and the Arab geographers remark on the fertility of the country round; its apples were universally famous. Cînatra always shared the desrities of its great neighbour Lisbon as long as it was in the hands of the Muslims; it was reconquered in 1147 by Alfonso Henriques, king of Portugal. After it had become Christian again, it was the favourite residence of the Portuguese kings; it was in the palace of Cînatra that Dom Sebastian decided in 1578 upon the expedition against Morocco which ended disastrously on the banks of the Wadi 'I-Makhzin near al-Asrâr al-Kabîr. The modern Cînatra is dominated by the ruins of an old stronghold of the Muslim period. Of this fortress now called Castello dei Mouros built at a height of 1400 feet, there only remain two masses of masonry with the remains of a chapel and baths.


SHIR. [See ASAD.]

SHIR (a.), poetry. The earliest literature of the Arabs is poetical but the most ancient poems are not older than 500 A.D. We know nothing about its origin. We are told the name of the man who made the first ĥashîdan, but in matters historical the Arabs abhorred a vacuum. Throughout the pre-Islamic period poetry is governed by the same set of conventions, the stereotyped beginning, conventional epithets, stock similes, a limited and arbitrary choice of subjects. There is a long previous history. Indeed one poet complains that his predecessors have left him nothing to say. On the other hand, the words: "Let us weep as Abî Humân wept", suggest that the poet was following a new fashion in his art. It is obvious that poetry is closely connected with the rhymed prose (rubâ) of impassioned speech and it is probable that some of its measures had their origin in the song of the camel-driver or horsemen. There was something unsanny about poetry, as the name shows. The poet was ûzûhrî, the man of extraordinary knowledge, who knew things hid from common men, was in the council of unseen powers, had a familiar spirit. This comes out most clearly in the branch of the art called ṣūfî, commonly but badly translated satie. This was in origin a spiritual attack on one's enemies, supplementing the material assault of sword and lance, an attempt to destroy them by the use of supernatural powers. The declaration of such verse was accompanied by symbolic actions. This is another link with ruṣûq, the speech of soothsayers and wizards. Though in historical times the belief in the magical power of poetry was largely lost, yet verses that seem to us pointless had a shaking effect on those at whom they were directed.

Formally, Arabic poetry consists of metre and rhyme. With one exception, ruṣûq, all metres consist of a double line with the rhyme at the end only. Metre is quantitative and considerable freedom is allowed in the substitution of long for short syllables and vice versa. Indeed it is better to say that certain syllables are fixed long or short and the others are allowed to vary. In two metres the classic rule that two short syllables equal one long is followed. Pre-Islamic poets used 15 metres and another was added later. They did not use the ruṣûq for long poems. There was a feeling that it was doggerel not rising to the dignity of poetry and it was chiefly used in extemporâne verse. In addition to these, poets sometimes experimented with other metres but they did not find favour and are treated as irregularities. The rhyme may include as many as three syllables. Throughout a poem all the double lines have the same rhyme and the opening line has also in the single line. Only one poetic form was known, the ṭashî'dan; a poem with one rhyme and one metre, from 700 to 120 lines long. No satisfactory explanation of this name is known. Many fragments of ṭashî'dan's exist and it is probable that they were never more than fragments. At first the ṭashî'dan had no fixed plan save that it nearly always began in a desert camping ground which the poet recognized as the scene of a passage of love with some fair one (the mastûb). On this may follow a description of his camel of a journey — preferably by night — through the desert, an antelope hunt or indeed almost anything the poet chooses. His own warlike prowess or that of his tribe is a common theme. Often it is hard to say that the poem has any purpose. The poet speaks because he must. Later the ṭashî'dan was bound by fixed rules. The regular sequence of subjects was the amatory Prelude, the description of a camel, the journey and finally the main subject; usually the praise of some great man with a view to increasing his pocket. Two aspects of life are shown. A frivolous side where they drink, gamble away their goods and give presents to the girl who fills the wine-cup and sings, thus upholding the fame of their tribe for generosity and a serious side where the chief spends his substance in feeding the needy and all are ready to rush to arms to defend their honour. Although an Arab was always ready to fight, he was not necessarily in a hurry to be killed, and said so without shame. The poets were fond of commonplace moralising on the uncertainty of life and the certainty of death. Arab theory recognized the elegy (ruṣûq) as a special branch of the art but without sufficient reason. The form was the same but for the omission of the erotic introduction which was felt to be unsuitable. While but for the lamentation over the dead and the call
to vengeance (if he had died a violent death),
the subject-matter is very like that of other poems.
Very often women composed elegies; some poet-
exesses were famous. It seems that religion had very
little place in the life of the Arabs. A mild fatalism is
the limit of their experience.

Each line of verse had to be complete in itself.
So Arab poetry is essentially atomic; a string of
isolated statements which might be accumulated
but could not be combined. Sustained narrative
and speculation are both alien to it. It is de-
scriptive but the description is a thumbnail sketch;
it is the sightful but the result is aphoristic.
The poet looks on the world through a microscope.
Minute peculiarities of places and animals catch
his attention and make his poetry versified geology
and anatomy; untranslatable and dull. Forceful
speech is his aim and the result is — to Western
minds — often grotesque or even repulsive.

The comparison of women's fingers to the twigs of
a tree, or to caterpillars, are examples. There is
little connexion between the lines or parts of a
poem. The only bond of union is the personality
of the poet. Indeed it is the poet rather than the
poetry who is admired. A freeman among his
peers, he enjoys life to the full, often coldly
calculating, yet, when his narrow code of honour
calls, ready to risk all for a friend or the stranger
who has claimed his protection. Behind all is the
constant shadow of starvation and death; but they
cast no permanent gloom on the picture. Most of
the poets so described were Bedouin but there were
others known as town-dwellers. As a class they
differed from the Bedouin type. They show signs
of acquaintance with books, prefer other mates
to the favourites of the Bedouin and their subject-
matter includes fables and historical tradition.

Their language, too, inclined more to prose; a sentence
might run into two or even three lines of verse.
The men of Mazina were held to be the best of
these poets. Both Jews and Christians were poets
and their verses are often indistinguishable from
the work of the pagans. The homes of the various
Arab kings — especially Hira — were centres
of poetic activity. Thither came the Bedouin eager
to get something from the patrons of literature.

They also met at the several fairs where matches
of oral poets took place.

Bedouin poetry was preserved by oral tradition.
The poet declaimed his own verses and was
followed by a professional reciter (rāwās) who learned
and declaimed them. Many a poet began as rāwās
of another. This raises the question of the genu-
ineness of Arab poetry. It is generally assumed
that it was not written down till one hundred years
A.H. In that time the natural infirmity of human
memory and the peculiar character of Arabic make
great changes probable. The lack of connections
inside a poem help. Often different versions of a
poem exist and it is impossible to tell which
is the original. We cannot be certain what were
the exact words of a poem, all we can say is that
the philologists who collected the remains of pre-
Islamic literature during the second century read
a certain text. We know too that there was at least
some forgery. The conclusion is that the great
mass of the poems are genuine or at least ancient,
though it may not be possible to prove this con-
clusively for any one poem. (It has recently been
argued that writing was much more common than
is generally believed, that the poets were acquainted
with that art and that some variant readings can
only be explained on the hypothesis of written
copies.) A few dialectical variations are preserved
but for the most part poets used one language
throughout the peninsula. Possibly the wealth of
vocabulary is due to the inclusion of words from
the many dialects, though their origin is now
forgotten. There are some signs that the language
of everyday was dropping the inflections used in
poetry; had begun the series of changes that pro-
duced the vernaculars of to-day. When scholars
began to take an interest in poetry for its own
sake they gathered the remnants into diwans “col-
lected works” of individuals or tribes or in antholo-
gies some of which contained complete poems and
others fragments.

Islam made a great change; partly due to reli-
gion, for poetry was the devil's Kūr'ān; but chiefly
through the change of circumstances. The centre
of interest had moved outside Arabia and desert
life had not the same appeal. It is almost im-
desirable for one who does not live the life of the
desert to appreciate its poetry. Some kept up the
old tradition, finishing their poems with praise of
the caliph or some other great man whose patronage
was desired. Some kept the anatoly, premise and
then went straight to the business in hand. Others
broke from tradition and composed fragments
(šāfi'a, q. v.) treating of one subject only, it might
be love, religion or philosophy. In some of the
later poets we can admire the verbal skill that
fills a volume with extravagant and sometimes
blasphemous adulation, with scarcely a repetition;
but the utter emptiness and lack of ideas is re-
voltin. The rule of one poem one rhyme is still
observed, no new form is invented. A mystical
stanzas contains over 700 lines with the same rhyme.
It took several centuries for these changes to be
made. Another innovation was that the desired
rāyūs metre was used for long poems; the authors
using all their skill in the handling of words to
counterbalance the simplicity of the metre, with
the result that they are often unintelligible. Tra-
dition says that in the time of Hārūn a slave girl
started the fashion of making verse (pedants did
not consider it poetry) in the language of the
people. This style was called ḥajīn. In Spain it
was raised to literary rank in the sanjīl, a short
poem in stanzas. A variety of this but in fully
inflected speech was the mawṣūlah. At first this
was a poem in four or five line stanzas the last
line uniting the stanzas by a common rhyme. Each
stanzas had its own rhyme and one metre
was used throughout. The next step was the use
of more than one rhyme and metre in each
stanzas. Sometimes the bounding line was the
laḥān. For the most part however Spanish poets followed
the older custom; though they tried various ex-
periments in rhime. In subject-matter they broke
away from tradition and their work is much more
generic to Europeans than that of the poets
of Arabia. Perhaps the most interesting features
are a conception of love that suggests the
romances of chivalry and an almost modern sen-
sibility to natural beauty.

The early poets knew nothing of the theory of
metrical. This was discovered by Khallāb b. Ṭahmāb
[q. v.]. It is said that the idea came to him as he heard
a smith working with his hammer. The critics
hardly thought of a poem as a whole; for them
it was a string of detached beauties. It is true
that poets were praised for their skill in certain branches of their art; e.g., for the description of the cinnamon, but as a rule criticism dealt with details and words only. It tended to be finicking.

One is praised for his skill in managing the transition from the nastāt to the description of the camel and another is blamed for putting words of ill omen in the opening verse of a poem. In other ways also criticism ran wild. Some held that the pre-Islamic poets were—by that fact alone—raised high above all others. It was men of this type who denied to Mutanabbī and others the title of poet because they did not observe the early conventions. With no critical principles to guide and a tendency to imitate the old, modern Arabic poetry is not inviting; especially as it is written in what is essentially a dead language.

It would be absurd to attempt even an outline history of Persian poetry in the space available. The utmost possible is a description of the forms of poetry. The Persians borrowed their metres from the Arabs, and they have other favours. They also borrowed the auspicious and auspicious, about which it is not necessary to say more. The ghasal is really a ḥafī of a dozen lines or so with complete freedom in the choice and treatment of subject. It has less continuity and a looser connection of ideas than the ḥafī, though it is usually a love poem. Of native forms the chief are the mahmud and rūdšt or dāh-bāt. The former consists of two long lines in the metre named ramād trimeter catalectic rhyming at the end of the double verse, a sort of heroic couplet. It is the form used for long poems whatever their subject may be. The dāh-bāt is two long lines with the first second and fourth half-lines rhyming and occasionally the third. The metre used is one of the many variants of the hāsafī. A dāh-bāt is always independent, they are never combined into a longer poem.

The same desire as was felt in the west produced variants of the monothematic form which are all classified as mathnāwī. These consist of stanza of anything from four to ten lines in the same metre, each stanza having its own rhyme. Some forms have a refrain with a separate rhyme. The earliest Persian poetry dates from shortly after 900 A.D. and since then the language and the forms of verse have changed very little. Fashions have changed, now simplicity has been in vogue and now fantastic conceits, but the outward form remains the same.

Turkish and Urdu poetry are little more than imitations of the Persian. Urdu, however, does show some signs of Indian influence both in form and subject-matter; to a small extent in earlier times and to a much larger extent during the last few years.


(A. S. Taitton)

SHIR 'ALI, IRAKZAI, Amir of Afghanistan, was the third son of the Amir Dost Muhammad and succeeded his father, in accordance with his will, on June 9, 1863. His overtures to the Government of India on his accession were, unfortunately, coldly received. The Amir found it necessary to march, almost immediately, into the Kurrum district to compel his brother 'Azm Khan to swear allegiance to him and early in the following year both 'Azm Khan in Kurram and Afral Khan, the eldest brother, in Balkh, rebelled. Muhammad Rahmān, the Amir's most able officer, defeated the former and compelled him to flee to India, and the latter submitted to Shir 'Ali and was pardoned and restored to his post, but his son, Affāl al-Rahmān, fled to Bukhara, whereupon Shir 'Ali imprisoned Afral Khan. Early in 1865 Sharif Khan and Afral Khan, two other brothers, rose in rebellion at Kandahār and 'Azm Khan returned from India to Kurram. Muhammad Rahmān again expelled him and Shir 'Ali marched towards Kandahār. He met and defeated the rebels near Kailāt-i Ghrizā, but was subdued with grief at the loss of his eldest son, Muhammad 'Ali, slain by Afral Khan, who was also killed. He pardoned Sharif and was roused from his lingering by the news that 'Abd al-Rahmān had returned from Bukhara, tortured the state officials in Balkh and Muhammad Rahmān, and, having been joined by 'Azm, entered Kābul on March 2, 1865. Shir 'Ali marched against him, but was defeated, and fled with no more than 500 horse. The governor of Ghazni refused to admit him, and released Afral Khan, who joined his son and was proclaimed Amir Kābul. The Government of India recognized him as ruler of Kābul, but he died almost immediately and was succeeded by his brother, 'Azm Khan. In January 1868, however, Shir 'Ali returned from Afghanistan, entered Herat, and in June was received as a deliverer in Kandahār. His army marched on Kābul and compelled 'Azm to flee once more to India, where he died in exile. In January, 1869, 'Abd al-Rahmān was defeated and expelled, and Shir 'Ali re-established himself as Amir of Afghanistan. In 1869 he met the Viceroy, Lord Mayo, at Ambāla, but received nothing beyond vague expressions of goodwill, instead of the offensive and defensive alliance which he sought. Again, in 1873, alarmed by the Russian conquest of Khiwa, he sought an alliance from the Viceroy, Lord Northbrook, and on receiving another rebuff rejected proffered subsidies and entered secretly into relations with Russia. In 1876 Lord Lytton was authorized to offer Shir 'Ali the alliance which he had sought, but the offer came too late. The Amir ostentatiously received a Russian envoy and, though warned that war would be the result, turned Sir Neville Chamberlain, who was accredited as British envoy, back from his frontier. On November 20, 1878, the British Government, after vainly awaiting an apology, declared war, and on February 21, 1879, Shir 'Ali
died, and was succeeded by his son, Ya'kūb Khān.


(T. W. HAD)
those walls were repaired in the middle of the viith (sixth) century by Mamun Shih al-Imad, the rival of the Maghafirin. In 795 (1393) Timur arrived in the form of the town and was attacked by the Sultans of the Maghafirin, who lost his life there. It was taken by the Mongols in 1137 (1724). Karim Khan Zand (q.v.) made it his capital surrounded with town walls and ditches, paved its streets and erected fine buildings there, notably the great bazaar. It was laid in ruins by the earthquakes of 1813 and 1824. It had at one time an ancient citadel called Shish-Mohabat (Istakhri, p. 116). In the early centuries of Islam, it still retained two Zoroastrian fire-altars, one called Karmynian and the other Homran; there was also a third outside its gates called Masjahan in the village of Barskan (Istakhri, p. 115).

The wine of Shiraz is famous; it comes from the village of Khvall or Khullar, also noted for its honey and its milk cheese. Water is brought to it by the Rukhabd canal, sung by Hafiz and built by Rukh al-Dawla the Bledy, father of Anad al-Dawla and by the canal from the tomb of Sa'd. The city has three principal mosques: 1. Djemii Atik, built by Alam b. Lailat in the second half of the third century; 2. the new Mosque built by the Salghurid Atibeg Sa'd b. Zangi, in the second half of the fifth century; 3. Masjid Şokor, built by the first Atibeg of the Salghurids. There are also many saints' tombs which have earned for this city the name of Bursa al-Awliya "citadel of the saints," notably that of the "Ulul Ahmad b. Muhammad b. Mansur al-Karim, and those of the mystic poets Sa'd and Hafiz, to the north of the city. There are the gardens of Dilgush and Hafftan. The city manufacturing industry includes matam-kari, dress materials, goose, brolades, silk-floss. It was the birthplace of the poets Abur called Shaffi, Abur, Boushah (Abu Iskak Halabi), Hafiz, Sa'd, "Urs, Hulus Fighani, Muzaf, Madjar (Din Hamper, and of the religious reformer Al-Mahmud called the Bahr.

There is also a village of the same name on the north of Samarkand 4 parasangs, about 16 miles from it (Quatremere, N.E., iv. 400; J.A., Jan. 1852, p. 83; Burns, Voyage à Bouchara, ii. 207).


(From Huart)

Shirazi, Abi Iskak ibn-Ismail b. "Ali b. Yusef al-Firuzxari, a Shaffi jurist, born in Fruzn in 933 (1503). To study Fikhl he went to Shiraz in 410, then to Basra and in Shavwâl 415 (Dec. 1024) reached Baghdad, where he completed his studies in the Ulema with Abu Hâmid al-Kaswini (d. 440) and in the Fakhr in 430 (1038/9) he began to teach in Baghdad (Subhi, iii. 177); the fame of his learning soon became so great that students sat at his feet from all over the Muslim world. Many of his pupils held offices as Khâli and preachers in the east of the Caliph’s empire. In 459 (1067) the vizier Nasr al-Mulk appointed him to open the first public Madrassa founded by him in Baghdad, the Nashiriyate. But as Shirazi did not appear, it was opened by Ibn al-Sabbagh; when his pupils threatened to go over to the latter, he finally accepted the chair. Here he taught till his death (Ibn al-Sab’i in Ibn Khalilân, i. 304). When the dispute between Abi Nasr b. al-Khusraw (d. 514) and the Hâfiz in Baghdad over the teachings of Al-Ashârī came to such a pitch that blood was shed, Shirazi energetically took the side of the Ashârîs and persuaded the vizier to incorporate the Hâfiz Shahîk (Ibn al-Athir, x. 71, Subhi, iii. 96 sqq.; iv. 251). His journey to Nashiriyât on a mission from the caliph in Dhu ’l-Hijjah 475 (May 1083) is evidence of his great prestige; it was like a triumphal procession. At Nashiriyat the Imâm al-Harâmain came out to receive him and carried his cloak. He held disputations with him, in which the Imâm al-Harâmain recognized the superiority of his opponent. Shirazi died soon after his return to Baghdad on Dhumâd 2, 21, 476 (Nov. 1083) and was buried in the cemetery at the Bib Abrâz with great honour — the caliph pronounced the burial prayer. The Nashiriyât was closed for a whole year by its founder’s command, as a sign of mourning. The vizier Tadj al-Mulk (d. 486) had a turbe built and a madrasa near it (Ibn al-Athir, x. 147).

His principal writings are: 1) Kitâb al-Tawābr f. l’Ishâ, written in the year 458/453; ed. Juyboli, Leiden 1879, a legal compendium on which commentaries have been frequently written; 2) the comprehensive Kitâb al-wadadhâb f. l’Majâhid, composed in 455-456, still in manuscript, ed. Yaqut, Mufid, iii. 214; 3) Kitâb al-Ma’ali b. al-Madda, an Ishârâ work in several volumes on the teachings of the Hanâfite and the Shâfi’î who has apparently not survived. Hâfiz Khalifa, No. 2648; 4) Ṣabaqat al-Subhi, short biographies of jurists of the first two centuries and of the four Madhâbih and to his own day, a work often cited by the later biographers, e.g. al-Nawawi, al-Subhi, Ibn Khalilân, al-Karashi, as well as many times copied without mentioning the source (I am preparing an edition).


Shirazi, Abi ‘I-Husain Abi al-Mulk R. Muhammad, a mathematician, who flourished about the middle of the twelfth century. He studied Greek mathematics and astronomy. In his time there was already available a good Arabic version of one of the Comit Sections (sawda) of Apollonius of Perga by Hilal b. Abi Hilal al-Hijri (d. 883/884) and al-Ishaq b. Karr al-Harrani (1186-901). With the help of this he prepared a synopsis of the contents of the sawda, the Arabic version of which...
is in Oxford (Bohl. 913, 987, 988). There is also attributed to him a compendious version (Mukhtāsr) of the Almāgesist of Ptolemy, from which Kāb al-Dīn al-Shirāzi (1236-1311) [q.v.] prepared a Persian translation of the Magiḏ. The Arabic versions of the Celestial Sections of Apollonius are of great value for the history of mathematics because the three last of the seven books of this important work only survive in Arabic, while the eighth book of the Arabic (Mukhtāsr) had already disappeared from knowledge by the time of the Arab translator.


(AL-SHIRAZI, ṢADR AL-DIN (d. 1640) is one of the great unknown men in the history of human thought. Holding a humble and poorly paid post as a teacher he found time and energy to build up his own philosophy, ordering and shaping the whole knowledge of his time from new points of view. The great problems, which the older philosophers had handled down to his period were solved by him in his own way. His world-system is a theory of being. The real things of the world around us are "individuals of being," similarly limited sections of an endless prordial being, emanating from God as the primonial light like individual rays. From this fundamental principle, Shirāzī thinks out the whole arrangement of reality in a new fashion: what we take for "entity" in things is the separation of the individual rays of the "being" and what we take for "existence" in them is the presence of this ray. This gives a new solution of the age-long great problem of being and existence, each being a different aspect and side of the same metaphysical reality.

The idea of the transmigration of souls was still quite alive in his time. He transformed it according to his own metaphysics of existence; according to his originality, the soul of man attains to a higher stage of existence, likeness to God and union with God. The principle of this evolution is according to him, gnosis, the higher form of knowledge which by the creation of its content in man supplies the defects and wants of his being and thus makes for perfection. The cognition of our mind is an act which is influenced by the active intelligence and possesses relationship in essence with the creative activity of God. God is not only the prordial being but also the centre of values. The reflection of these prordial values are the things of creation. If we therefore find in the world and its confusing multiplicity reflections of truth, goodness, beauty and lovleness, these are the reflection of God, which shines upon us and points the way to God. The path to ethical perfection is thus at the same time indicated.

The three great intellectual aspects of Islam converge in Shirāzī for he is at once theologian, philosopher and mystic, taking up and equating the ideas of these movements. His special tendency, however, is the typical Persian mysticism of "Illumination" (Ishqāq) as Shahwari d developed it, which he based on Aristotelian proofs through Ibn Sinā and al-Fārābī; he developed the system further (in the doctrine of entities whose immutability he disputes). The objections of the Indian monistic type of Muslim mysticism, he also overcomes by his thesis of the emanations of being. That philosophy did not die out in Islam after 1100 but still flourished at a late period is proved by the existence of Shirāzī. He gathered together the higher culture of the brilliant epoch of Shah Ḥāfez into a synthesis planned on a large scale.


(M. HORTEN)

AL-SHIRBINI, YUSUF B. MUHAMMAD B. 'ABD AL-DAWAAD A. KHUDO, an Egyptian writer of the xix (xviii) century and author of a work entitled Hasr al-Khulṣ bi-Shahr Ḥāfidi Abī Shāhīfī. "The tossing of heads in the commentary of the poem of Abī Shāhīfī," No biographer devotes a notice to him. Al-Shirbini tells us incidentally that in 1075 (1664/1665) he was on the road from the Nile (Sa'd) to al-Ḳosar (al-Ḳaṣr) on the Red Sea (cf. the commentary on verse 13, 30, dunaf, Bulāq, 1308, p. 152).

Among his teachers he mentions Shihāb al-Dīn Ahmad b. Ahmad b. Sa'dīka al-Kalutī (d. end of Shawaḥil 1069/1659) and Ahmad b. 'Ali al-Sandūbī, who is said to have engaged him to compose the poem and to write a commentary on it afterwards (cf. p. 215).

In the first which is a kind of introduction, the author describes the fālītā (peasants) of the Nile valley and gives anecdotes in which he records their coarse customs, speaks of their food which no man to any degree civilised can smell or touch, describes the marriage ceremony among them etc. The last part ends in an urduīs in literary language in which he sums up the various customs of the fālītā which he has just described. The second part is a poem of 47 verses (and not 42 or 52) in the Egyptian dialect attributed to an imaginary Abī Shāhīfī in which each verse is followed by a full commentary in the classical language, spiced with facetious digressions sometimes fairly long, anecdotes very often sarcastic, quotations in verse and prose of those in the spoken language are more numerous than those in the literary language.

Al-Shirbini, a moralist in his own way and a highly educated man as well as a poet (cf. his Muwāṣṣihā, p. 193), describes from careful observation the customs, especially the bad ones, and particularly the vices not only of the peasants of the Nile valley but of his contemporaries in the cities; his gaulolistics suggest a comparison with Brahimī. His book has been lithographed in Cairo without indication of place and date, and at Alexandria in 1289 and printed at Bulāq in 1274 and 1308 and Cairo in 1322.


(M. BEN CHENE)

SHIRK (also Ishqāq, a.), association, especially associating a companion to God — honouring another besides God, polytheism. In the oldest strata of the Korān, during the so-called first Mecca period, the conceptions shirk and muṣḥirda do not occur. Muḥammad was probably at first exclusively concerned with his own fate, being
completely under the ban of the imminent Last Judgment, and only with the increasing hostility on the part of the unbelievers did he begin to take an interest in them. In the latter parts of the Qur‘ān they are often mentioned, and regular disquisitions with the Mushrikūn sometimes occur; in particular they are continually threatened with the Last Judgment; the mushrikūn will then receive their punishment (Sūra, xxviii. 62 sqq.). They think their idols will intercede for them with Allāh, but these cannot do this (Sūra, vi. 94; x. 19; xxxi. 12; xxxix. 4 and 39); quite the contrary, for they will accuse their worshippers on the Last Day (Sūra, xix. 84 sq.; x. 29 sq.) and they will become fuel for hell with them (Sūra, xxi. 98 sq.). The mushrikūn are not grateful to God for saving them from the perils of the sea (Sūra, xxi. 65). The believers are to keep away from them and not to marry the mushrikūn (Sūra, ii. 220) but they are not to revile the unbelievers but endure them unless the latter in their turn attack and molest (Sūra, ii. 109). In the year 9, however, Muḥammad finally casts off the mushrikūn (Sūra, ix. 3, cf. however earlier Sūra, xx. 94 sq.); the mushrikūn are anuncle (Sūra, ix. 28). The believers are not to pray for them, even if they are their nearest relatives (Sūra, ix. 114 sq.). Muḥammad had already earlier expressly declared shirk to be the sin for which God has no forgiveness (Sūra, vi. 51, 116; xxxi. 12) and rejected it as absurd (Sūra, xxi. 22).

This development is very similar to that of the conception of the kāfs [q.v.] in the Qur‘ān. Kāfs is the most usual term for the unbelievers, and comprises both mushrikūn and the “people of a book.” Thus Sūra xxii. 5, says “those who are unbelievers, the possessors of a scripture as well as the servants of idols will dwell eternally in Fire”! The commentators on this passage differ in their views. Some hold the view that the people of “a book” are to be included among the mushrikūn; and others have the narrower term used first, and then the more comprehensive one. Other commentators have distinguished the people of a book from the idolaters in the narrower sense and this corresponds to the use of the phrase which later became predominant. But everywhere in the Qur‘ān shirk is used in direct contrast to the possession of the oneness of God, which has been given its most pregnant expression in Sūra xxii. (Sīrat al-Tawḥīd or Sīrat al-ʿAllāh) and according to one but rather artificial explanation, a definite variety of shirk is made impossible by each single verse of this sura.

In the Hādīth literature, Shirk has usually the same meaning of “an external obscuring the belief in the oneness of God”. The mushrikūn are — as in the above mentioned Kur‘ānic passage — ungrateful to God and say in their vain boasting, “if we had not our dogs we would be robbed”, and so on.

For the rest, the hostile feeling against the mushrikūn in the period of the great conquests is reflected in the rest of the Hādīth literature. Before the battle the mushrikūn received the demand to adopt Islam; on one occasion Muḥammad even prays to God for right guidance for them; on another he curses them and calls down fire on their houses and tombs, and wishes for plunder and earthquakes. According to one hadith the believer very rarely fails before the shirk, and the Prophet says, full of confidence, “Shirk is in my community more difficult to find than a black seed on a hard rock in the darkest night” — or he says to ʿAbd Allāh, “I will tell a word to thee, the utterance of which protects thee against any shirk: O, God, I take refuge with Thee, lest I unwittingly give thee a companion, and beseech Thy pardon if I have done it unwittingly”.

In the Fīh books, mushrik is the proper legal term for unbeliever, although kāfs is often also found. The unbeliever according to the Fīh is in general regarded as an outlaw and of little value. Unbelievers, especially if hostile, can be killed without punishment, while on no account can a believer be put to death for the sake of an unbeliever. On this point in general, cf. the article ḲĀṬĪH and on special points ṬHĪKH and DĀR AL-QĀHĪ for the laws of warfare, and the articles ḲHIMMA, ḲHĀṬĪB and ṬHĪYĀ for the constitutional law. On some points the unbelievers are allowed to make legal arrangements among themselves, as for example in the law of marriage: — Unbelievers are at liberty to arrange the marriage of their children as they please; unbelievers can be witnesses at a marriage between believers; unbeliefing husband and wife must be divorced if one of the two adopts Islam. L. A. W. O F I N H E R I T A N C E : — Bequests from one unbeliever to another, even of different religions are quite as valid as in the case when either the testator or legatee is a Muslim; but in no case can anything be bequeathed to an enemy unbeliever. The Ḳāfī has to prevent the appointment of an unbeliever as executor to a will. On the law of slaves of the articles ʿAARB and ṭUṬTARĀ; and the article ṬHĪYĀ on the cases of urgent necessity in which a believer is permitted to conceal his faith.

The broadening of the Muslim outlook in the war of conquest had naturally quite early brought about a recognition of the fact that all mushrikūn are not the same and are not to be treated alike. In the books on Milāt wa-Nīḥkāl we find more or less full accounts of the different foreign religious systems, which term includes also the philosophers, star-worshippers and atheists, and in the apologetic literature, we occasionally find systematic expositions of the various foreign religions. Attempts are not wanting which explain psychologically the origin of idolatry. From such considerations the conception of shirk came to be divided into many varieties, with which we cannot deal here. But these researches had a practical legal significance inseparable as through the centuries the oaths came to be formulated, by which members of strange religions were sworn, to get a binding promise from them, especially in the case of recognition of the authority of Muslim State. An interesting collection of such formulas for oaths for the Mamlūk period is given by Kāṭbā Ḳanfūdī, Sīrat-āʾ Allāh, iii. 200 sqq.

In the course of the dogmatic development of Islam the conception of shirk received a considerable extension through the circumstance that the adherents of many sects had no compunction about reproaching their Muslim opponents with shirk, as soon as they saw in them any obscuring of monotheism, although only in some particular respect specially emphasised by themselves, and in the later systematised dogmatic works, which, as a rule in connection with tawḥīd, go into its
opposite shirk, one can trace in almost any sentence what sectarian view is referred to or refuted, and then trace the path by which the present formulation has come about. Shirk nowadays is no longer simply a term for the unbelief prevailing outside of Islam, but has become a reproach hurled by one Muslim against another inside of Islam.

The Mu'tazilis, for example, called their opponents muhrākun in as much as they, by adopting eternal attributes of the Deity, postulated their existence as eternal existence beside God. The attributes rather, they say, do no exist for themselves, but are inseparably one with God and not different from Him, and expressions like "God is all-knowing", "God is mighty", "God is living", simply mean "God is".

Quite in the same spirit, the Almohads, whose special program was the tawhīd, accused their opponents of shirk, because they held the doctrine of the non-creation of the Kur'an and their tawhīd includes the demand to recognize its miraculousness; only in this way is it possible to exclude the Kur'an from being a second eternal being besides God. Muhrākun to them also are the anthropomorphists who make God possess physical human qualities and thus affect the wujūdātānayn. According to their strict view, they alone are professors of the oneness of God (mu'āshūqūn) in the true sense, the whole of the rest of the Muslim world is muhrākun to them and the Christians Ahl al-Kufr. (The Isma'ilis also were fond of calling themselves mu'āshūqūn but this was not a distinctive name for them; for them every one who associates another with His Isma'il, is like one who associates another with God or the Prophet, i.e. is unclean.

The shirk theory of the Wahhābis went to the greatest extreme. Their hostility is directed against shirk which in their view infects the whole of orthodoxy. Islam in the form of the cult of prophets, saints and tombs. Besides, there have not been wanting in orthodoxy and elsewhere (cf. e.g. Goldscheider, ZKHIITEN, p. 353; cf. Struthmann, Kalim der Seiditen, p. 67 f.) those who condemn the cult of saints for reasons of tawhīd, and at bottom it is only tolerated as a concession to the overwhelming practice of the people. The Wahhābis also consider themselves the only mu'āshūqūn, all other Muslims are muhrākun and they alone are called to the ilāhān al-sunnah. The old sunna and the picture of the character of the Prophet and therefore the very heart of Islam has indeed been falsified by the worship of saints. Therefore they attack the very holiest places of Islam in the Sahā and Shari'a, because these in their area are regular strongholds of idolatry.

According to the theorists of the Wahhābis, they directed the opposition in detail against 1. shirk al-silm: prophets and saints have no 'ilm al-gaib except when it is revealed to them by God, who alone possesses it. It is shirk to credit or ascribe knowledge to them or to wooth re astrologers and interpreters of dreams. 2. shirk al-taqarrūf is the assumption that any one except God has power. Whoever then regards a saint as an intercessor with God commits shirk, even if it only, he thinks, serves to bring him nearer to God. Any kind of intervention (sha'rāt, q.v.) is therefore rejected on the authority of Sura xxxix. 45; the Prophet himself will only receive from God permission to intervene on the Last Day and not before. 3. shirk al-Sihād: the reverencing of any created thing, the grave of the Prophet, the tomb of a saint, by prostration, circumambulation, giving of money, vows, fasting, pilgrimage, mentioning the name of a saint, praying at his grave, kissing certain stones, etc. 4. Shirk al-adāt: superstitious customs like istihzām, belief in omens, in good or bad days, etc., in personal names like 'Abd al-Nabī, asking soothsayers for advice, etc. 5. Shirk fī al-'adāt: swearing in the name of the Prophet, of Ali, of the Imams, or Piras.

Shirk is a special meaning in Muslim ethics, notably in al-Ghazā'ī. To the refined ethical conscience "every kind of worship of God which is not absolutely disinterested" is shirk. Thus the hypocritical practice of religion which is performed for the sake of reward, i.e. to gain the admiration or applause of men, is shirk, because it associates consideration for men with the thought of God. Similarly arrogance and egoism are a kind of shirk.

Numerous grades of this shirk are further distinguished, and it is called also shirk fī al-ṣinā'ah or shirk al-ejāh in contrast to crude and obvious polytheism, shirk 'asirī; the ethical value of an action is based on the degree of admixture or omission that clouds the pure intention, iktībā'.

Just as the term 'ābi'īt for the Śūfis now has the meaning "exclusive devotion to God", so shirk has for them come to have the meaning "being prevented by something from exclusive devotion to Him". For example the mere illusion of the soul (nafsa) that it has something good in it and has a certain worth is a secret idolatry (shirk 'aṣirī). It is the same with the assertion "I know God", because here we have an admission of the duality between the subject, which knows and the object of knowledge. For the Śūfis seeking union with the deity, difference of rites and religions loss all significance, and this does not exclude Islam, and the following bold saying is ascribed to Tūlūnī, a pupil of Ibn 'Arabi, that "the Kur'an is absolute shirk; profession of oneness is found only in our (i.e. Śūfī) speech" (Goldscheider, Vorlesungen, p. 171).
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persons in common in such a way that each one had ownership in every smallest part of it in proportion to the shares allotted to him. This idea seems to be a general Semitic one. It is found similarly in the Talmudic *Naráh*, cf. L. Auerbach, *Jüd. Obligationenrecht*, § 45. Like this conception *širkā* was also later transferred to the different forms of trading companies. The jurists therefore understand primarily by *širkā* common property (*širkāt al-amā'īk*) which arises for example through inheritance, gift or indissoluble combination. One joint owner can only deal with his share with the approval of the others; the second kind of *širkā* is the company which is based on contract i.e. on offer and acceptance (*širkāt al-`alām*).

The conditions for its foundation are ability to give and undertake a commission (waṣili) or money or goods representing it. The *širkā* is a trading company; the profits are divided either into equal parts or in proportion to the shares. The relations of one company to another is a relation of confidence (amūnā). The company is dissolved (1) by the declaration of the wish of a member (renuntiatio), (2) by succession from Išām or departure into the *Dār al-farq* (cf. capitia diminutio) and (3) through death or mental disease (cf. *Dīg.* 17, 2, 41; 17, 2, 63; 10; *Basil.* xii, 1, 4). The heir can only continue the company through a new contract of association (cf. *Dīg.* 17, 2, 35, 36, 37 = *Basil.* xii, 1, 35, 36, 37).

The Hanafīs know four kinds of companies: (1) *širkāt al-muṣawā'ah*, when the shareholders are equal in respect of capital, right to disposal, shares in profit and loss, if every shareholder is not only "authorised agent" of the others but is also "surety" for them. *Muṣawā'ah* with slaves and unbelievers is not permitted. The *Mālikīs* do not recognise this form; by muṣawā'ah they understand a company in which the shareholders are only general agents for each other; profit and loss are divided among them in proportion to the amount of their shares. (2) *širkāt al-`inān*, capital and profits in indefinite shares; the quota of profit may be greater than the quota of capital in recompense for the work of management. Each member is responsible for his own transactions only and has only the right to demand from the other shareholders their share. This corresponds to what the *Mālikīs* call muṣawā', while by `inān* they mean a company in which the right of the shareholders to dispose of the capital is limited. (3) *širkāt al-ṣan`at* (or *šā. al-`aḥād* or *šā. al-Tālābīh*) when artisans combine on a common task. All the members are bound to carry out the work. Even if only one works, the other yet have a share in the profit. Among the *Mālikīs* however illness of some shareholders makes their contract invalid. (4) *širkāt al-`awdāh* (or *šā. al-Dīnām* or *šā. al-Mu`āfilī*) only permitted among the *Hannafi* members without capital and sell on credit.

The *Ṣābi`is* only recognise the *šā. al-`inān* but they only allow this company in the case of indissolubly combined things (e.g. money, cereals) and allow the distribution of profit and loss only in proportion to the shares in the company. Historically it is probable that this *šā. al-`inān* is the older form; there is evidence of it in the pagan period from the poet al-Nābihga al-`Bardh. On the other hand the *šā. al-Muṣawā'ah* (societas quaeaut) seems to have been taken over from Roman-Byzantine law. It is vigorously condemned by al-Shā`īrī (*Umma*, iv, 206) and disowned by Abū Hanifa also; on the other hand it is recognised by Ibn Abī Laila, al-Shāhīnī, and Abū Yusuf. Sūyūn al-Ḥawwī (in *Sarakht*, *Muhārī*, x, 153) is unique in making even a legacy to one of the shareholders become the property of the company (lucrum ex foris) which suggests the *societas omnium honorum* (cf. *Dīg.* 17, 2, 3, 1; *Basil.* xii, 1, 3, 1). The classification and doctrine of the *Hannafi* have been bodily adopted in the Turkish civil law (*Meqelle*, art. 1045, 1046 sqq.; 1329 sqq.).

On the other forms of companies see the separate articles: *muṣamāt, muṣīrāa, munākَt.


HEFFERNING

SHIRKū, ABU 'l-HĀKIT ANÁD AL-DIN, son of Shāḥīd, and brother of Ayyūb b. Shāḥīd, the father of Salādīn. At first a general of Nur al-Dīn, prince of Aleppo and of Damascus, he became vizier of the last Fatimid Caliph al-`Adīd, and in the last capacity bore the honorary title of Malik Manṣūr.

We first met with Shirkū at Takrit, where his brother Ayyūb was governor in the name of the `Abbāsīd Caliph, and it was after a murder committed by Shirkū that the whole family had to abandon the town, and offer its services to the prince of Aleppo, Zankt, who accepted them. Shirkū remained at the court of the son of Zankt, Nur al-Dīn Maḥmūd, and at his command, went to take Damascus which his brother Ayyūb was defending in the name of the Būrid princes. The matter was arranged without a blow being struck; Ayyūb kept Damascus, but on behalf of Nur al-Dīn who gave the territory of Hims to Shirkū as an appanage. Such was the origin of the Ayyūbid principality of Hims, which later passed to his descendants.

When in the year 558 (1163) Nur al-Dīn was asked by Shā`wār [q.v.] to assist him in gaining the vizierate, Shirkū was put at the head of the Syrian expeditionary force. With an army very inferior in number to the forces gathered by the vizier Dīrghām, Shā`wār and Shirkū obtained a brilliant victory near Tell Baṣṭa. Whatever may have been at first the designs of Shirkū with respect to Shā`wār, this battle marks an important point in the relations of the two men; Shirkū seemed afraid of the spirit of intrigue which animated Shā`wār. The assurance, verified in the result, which was given by Shā`wār that he had means of information in the army of Dīrghām was disturbing. With the installation of Shā`wār in the vizierate the quarrel broke out openly; Shirkū was unwilling to quit Egypt before the execution of the agreement concluded with Nur al-Dīn. Fighting resulted on several occasions and the different encounters which took place in the suburbs of Cairo, went against Shā`wār, who appealed for help to the Franks. Shirkū, besieged in Bilbais, had to capitulate. Before the end of the year 559 (Nov. 1164) he returned to Damascus.
In the year 562 (1167) Shirkuh again invaded Egypt to fight Shabar for a second time; the latter was still allied with the Franks. He won the battle of Bihain, which had been forced upon him by his adversaries. This very bloody victory did not lead to any final decision. Shirkuh found a base at Alexandria which he occupied with ease and where he installed his nephew Saladin as governor. This whole effort proved useless, because Shabar succeeded in recapturing the town after a long siege and brought about the departure of Shirkuh.

He had to be recalled two years later by the Caliph al-Ażīd when the Franks besieged Cairo; the third expedition was to prove decisive. After the departure of the Franks, Shirkuh threw in his lot with Egypt and refused to yield to the pressing appeals of Nūr al-Dīn, who was unwilling to be deprived of his services. After the assassination of Shabar, he accepted the office of visier to the caliph al-Ażīd, but it is not known if in his heart he was considering a dynasty of his own. The contrary can be believed, and it may be supposed that the idea of it came to Nūr al-Dīn, who determined to strike a double blow, to bring back his officers to his allegiance and whilst bringing them back to the Sunna, to reign in Egypt, which he would annex to his Syrian kingdom. Because of his relationship with Saladin, the question ought to be raised in an article on Shirkuh but there is nothing to indicate a definite attitude on the part of the latter.

His attainment of power coincided with a rising of the populace of Cairo, which pillaged even the offices of the visierate. Shirkuh, according to the account of William of Tyre was “viel, patte de cors et mont gras” joined his nephew Saladin. Historians praise his ability; although a Sunni, he wisely allowed the Egyptians, to remain faithful to their own religious opinions. His power was, moreover, of too short a duration to give a new political system to the Empire. Shirkuh died very suddenly after being visier for a little more than two months, on the 22 Djamād II, 564 (March 23, 1169). He died, the victim of his violent appetite, which was the cause of frequent indigestion accompanied by suffocation; as is generally the case in the East, poison was also spoken of. In accordance with his expressed desire his remains were transported to Medina, but not until sixteen years later. His successors included a certain number of Mamluks, who were known at the beginning of the Ayyubid régime under the name of Assalīya. The same niqab was used by the mamluks which he had built at Aleppo and at Damascus.

Bibliography: Cf. the article Ayyubid, and also Shāwak; Abū Shāmī, i. 8, 10, 15, 46-48, 55, 64, 67, 81, 96, 107-109, 120, 123-124, 130-132, 137, 141-147, 154-162, 166-174, 180, 210-211; ii. 67, 218; Ibn Shāmī, Tārīkh al-Ḫulūb, p. 112, 119; Kamāl al-Dīn, Hist. d’Al ḫ, transl. Blasch, p. 270; Dersenbourg, Qanāṭir, ii, Fr. part., index, p. 396; Ibn Khallīkān, ed. Billāh, i. 284-285, ii. 502; Yāḥyā, Tārīkh, ed. Margoliouth, ii. 247; Kākhashanī, Nāṭeš al-Ṯālīf, in. 112, x. 163-199, y. 60-90; Gaufre-Demombynes, La Syrie, p. 76; Makrizī, Al-Ḫadīt, ii. 343; Abu l-Mahāsin, Nāṭiḥ, ed. Popper, iii. 56; Ali Pāḥśī, Kāḥif dawāt, in. 199; von Krenner in S.B.A.E. Wien, 1850, iv. 305, 308; Sauvare, Destr. de Damas.


(G. Wiet)

Shīrwān, also written Shīrwan and Sharwan (e.g. in Yāḥū, iii. 282), according to al-Samāʿānī, ed. Margoliouth, p. 335), a district on the western shore of the Caspian Sea, east of the Kura, originally a part of the ancient Albania or the Arzān [q. v.] of the early middle ages. According to Iṣṭārkhī, p. 192 = Yāḥū, iii. 317, the road from Bardaghā [q. v.] led via Shīrwān and Şamāḵḫīya (in Yāḥū: Şamāḵḫī) to Derbend [q. v.]. The distance between Şamāḵḫīya and "Shīrwān" [according to Iṣṭārkhī], was three days' journey; in some MSS. and in Yāḥū we have "Şāḥbārān for "Shīrwān"; in the anonymous Ṣanūfī al-Maktab, f. 331, Shāhīrān (three written Shāhīrān) is described as the capital (ḵūna) of Shīrwān. This road as well as the town on it did not lose their importance until the Transcaucasian railway had been built. Şāḥbārān is still mentioned as a town as late as 1575 in the report of Tarkish conquests of that year (v. Hamann, G.O.R., ii. 485). In the seventeenth century a new town Kuba or Kubā appears as the capital of the Khān of this region, about fifteen miles N.W. of Şāḥbārān; by 1770 Gneisenau only found "miserable" ruins in Şāḥbārān of the old, now completely deserted town (S. G. Gneisenau, Reise durch Russland zur Untersuchung der drej Naturersicht, iii. 36); its importance as a trade centre had passed to Kuba. As late as 1851, the governor of Derbend, Wontschow, travelled to Tiflis via Kuba, Şemakhə and Gandja (Arkiv: Kaspira Vorontsova, pl. 405).

Şamāḵḫīya, Russian Shamakhi, the later capital of Shīrwān, is said to have been founded in the Muslim period and to have taken its name (Balḥān, p. 210) from Şamāḵḵī b. Shūkī, king of Shīrwān, during the governorship of Saʿūd b. Salim (the contemporary of the Caliph Hārūn al-Rashīd, cf. Yaḥū, Tārīkh, ii. 317, 395, and al-Ṭabarī, ii. 648). As the territory of the Shīrwānīs (see below) Shīrwān included the lands from the Kura to Derbend; the same frontiers are given in the Mongol period for Shīrwān (in Hamd Allah Kaşwini, Nūṣhū al-Kūnī, ed. Le Strange, p. 92-7). The capital Şemāḵxa was then as later of importance, especially as a centre of silk manufacture and of the silk trade.

After the abolition of the Shīrwānīs by the Sāfawīs, Shīrwān formed a province of Persia and was usually governed by a Khān, who is often called Ruyerbe or Emir al-Umarī; the inhabitants several times rebelled against the Shīrwī dynasty and as Sunnis appealed for help to the Sultan of Turkey. With other Caucasian lands Shīrwān was taken by the Turks in 1578, held after a series of battles with varying results, and finally ceded to the Sultan by the peace of 1590. Under Turkish rule Shīrwān was divided into fourteen sandjakas. It included Şakti in the north-west and Kubi in the south-east, i.e. practically the whole of medio-southern Shīrwān. Derbend, which had long been separated from Shīrwān, formed a separate governorship. Persian rule was not definitive restored till 1607. In the seventeenth century, Kubā and Şālūn were given as a separate principality to the Kaitak, which submitted to the Safawīs (cf. i, p. 989-997). In 1722 the Khān of Kubā, Husain Alt, submitted to Peter the Great and was confirmed in his dignity. By the treaty between Russia
and Turkey of the year 1724, the coast-territory with Bâkut, now occupied by the Russians, was for the first time politically separated from the rest of Shirwan, which was left to the Turks with Shemakha as capital. This division was retained as regards administration even after both parts were reunited to Persia. By the treaty of 1732 the coast lands north of Kura still remained to the Russians and the other parts of Shirwan and Daghhestan to the Turks; but only after Nadir Shah had taken their conquests from the Turks by force of arms (capture of Shemakha, Oct. 22, 1734) that the coast lands were ceded to him voluntarily by the Russians (treaty of Gandja, March 10/21, 1735). After the death of Nadir Shah, Persian rule could no longer be enforced in these regions; several independent principalities arose; the name Shirwan was now limited to the territory of the Khan of Shemakha, which was later under Russian rule divided into three administrative districts (Shemakha, Gökçai and Djiawd). Fath 'Ali Khan of Kuba (1758–1786) succeeded in bringing Derbend as well as Shemakha under his sway, so that, as Dorn observes, "a true Shirwânshah arose in him". During the last years of his reign, Fath 'Ali humbled himself with the idea of bringing Persia itself under his sway and ascending the throne as the true successor of the rulers of Iran. When the Kájárs had succeeded in restoring the unity of Persia, the sons of the Kájrál were no more able to maintain their independence than the other Caucasian chiefs and had to choose between Russia and Persia. General Zubow, who had been despatched by Catherine II., had already reached the Kura below Djiawd (1796) when he and his army were recalled by the Emperor Paul. The Khan of Shirwan (Shemakha), Mustafa, who had already entered into negotiations with Zubow, submitted to the Russians in 1805, who occupied Derbend and Bâkut next year (1806), but soon afterwards he made overtures to the Persians and sought help from them. By the peace of Gulistan (October 12/24, 1813), Persia gave up all claim to Derbend; Kuba, Shirwan and Bâkut. Nevertheless Mustafa continued to have secret dealings with Persia. It was not till 1820 that his territory was occupied by Russian troops. The Khan fled to Persia and Shemakha was incorporated in Russian territory. The outbreak of hostilities again in 1826 was taken advantage of by Mustafa and by an earlier Khan of Bâkut, Hussain, for an attempt to stir up their subjects against Russia, but without success. Since 1820 the former territory of the Khan of Shirwan has been united with Kuba and Bâkut to form one administrative area (at first the "Caspian territory"); from 1846 the "government of Shemakha"; from 1859, after the destruction of Shemakha by one of the earthquakes frequent there, the "government of Bâkut".

At present the ancient Shirwan forms a part of the Soviet republic of Aqsherbadjian with the capital Bâkut; the division into "governments" is abolished, but that into "circles" retained. The old capital of Shirwan, as late as the middle of the nineteenth century, had a larger population than Bâkut; according to Kriter's "Geographie-Statistisches Lexicon", 1864–1865, Shemakha had 41,550 and Bâkut 10,000 inhabitants. In the eighties the relationship was reversed (E. Weidemann, "Panorama" p. 406; Tiffen, 1888, p. 342 and 366; Bâkut 45,679. Shemakha 28,545). Shemakha is now quite a small town compared with Bâkut (1917: Bâkut 231,000; Shemakha 27,800).

Bibliography: See especially B. Dorn, Geschichte Shirwans unter den Staatshåltern und Chânâmen von 1528–1628 (Beiträge zur Geschichte der kaukasischen Länder und Volker, ii. = Mem. de l'Acad., etc., Ser. 6, Sciences politiques, etc., t. 317–413). (W. Barthold)

SHIRWANSHAH, a title of the rulers of Shirwan, probably dating from the pre-Muhammadan period (Balâghir, p. 196 infra). In the history of the conquest this ruler is called simply king (kâhânu) or lord (kâhânu) of Shirwan (ibid., 204 and 209). Yazid b. Uzaid al-Sulami, governor of Armenia under the Caliph Mamûs, took possession of the naphtha-wells (nâfûs) and saltworks of Shirwan (mâlârí) the eastern part of the land was therefore at that date of greater importance than the western (cf. what is said above on Shâr-bân as the capital of Shirwan). The title Shirwânshah is said to have been afterwards assumed by the descendants of the Arab governor Yazid b. Mazyad al-Shâihad. Yazid himself died in 857 (857–859) and when and why his descendants moved their residence to Shirwan is not known; according to a later source (Shâhirjâde, Mâtâh al-Tawârîkh, written in 1173 (1759), quoted in Dorn, "Schirwanshaher", p. 544, cf. now Brockelmann, i. 429) one of them, Halâhim b. Khâlid, declared himself independent during the troubles that followed the death of the Caliph Mutawakkil in 247 (861) and assumed the title of Shirwânshah. His dynasty (usually called Mâzyad) is said by the same source to have ruled till 460 (1067/1068). Contrary to this, Mas'ud al-Murîdî, ii. 69 says that in his time, i.e. shortly before 332 (943–944) after the death of the Shirwânshah 'Ali Hâmidî, the king of the Irânshâh (according to Marquart, Erânshâh, p. 119, this is the reading, i.e. "lord of Arâin in the narrow sense"); the manuscripts usually have Irânshâh) Muhammad b. Yazid, a descendant of the Sâsânis, seized the land of Shirwan and assumed the title of Shirwânshah; he is said to have held Derbend (Murîdî, ii. 5) and thus united the whole of the ancient Albania into a political unit once more.

Contrary to what was stated above, i., p. 460 sq., that Mas'ud's statements are confirmed by no other source, we can now quote the Hâmidî al-Akham (written in 327 = 982–983), i. 334, according to which the three lands Shirwan, Khurâsh and Khaan were at that time under the rule of one sovereign who had the titles of Shirwânshah and Khurâshâh (in Balkâhî, p. 196 infra, called Djurnâshah, as king of the Lake, i.e. of the Legion), viz. above i., p. 887 sq., and Irânshâh. His capital was the camp of his armies (seraâsh-bâd), far away from Shamakhi. The dynasty of the Khurâshâns was probably founded by Muhammad b. Yazid (Hâmidî Khurâshâh) and the centre of the Khurâshân principality transferred to Shamakhi, which later always appears as the capital of the Shirwânshahs. The rule of this house was perhaps interrupted for a short time by the Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Andali mentioned as Shirwânshah by Ibn Hawqal (p. 250, ii. 18), in no other literary sources is this name mentioned, but it is found on undated coins which from the epigraphy must belong to the fourth (tenth) century.

The next historical references to the Khurâshâns refer to their relations with the Seldjûk Sultân (Husnîzâ, Rûnîl el textes relatifs à l'histoire des Seldjûcides, ii. 139 sqq.). In the reign of
Malikșah (465-485 = 1072-1092) Fariburz is mentioned as king, lord of Shīrwān (al-Malek Şikh Şarşūr), and we still have coins struck by him. When Malikșah was in Arḡān, Fariburz, after some resistance paid homage to him and pledged himself to pay a tribute of 70,000 dinars; but at the negotiations this tribute was reduced to 40,000 dinars. On the death of the above-mentioned Muhammad b. Ahmad al-ʿArabī he paid the ruler of Adharbājān Marzbān b. Muhammad b. Mustawwī (who was a million dirhams). Under Sultan Mahmūd (511-523 = 1115-1127) Shīrwān was occupied by the Sultān's troops; the Sultān was asked by the leaders to come there himself; after his arrival the Shīrwānīkh (his name is not known) went to him and hoped to obtain justice from him but was imprisoned. The people of Shīrwān with whom the prince was very popular tried to procure his release but without success. This state of affairs encouraged the Georgians to invade Shīrwān but they were driven out by Mahmūd. The population suffered very much from the occupation of their country and these events became known as the "devastation" (ţohārī) of Shīrwān. The campaign took place in the first and last years of the vizier Shams al-Mulk, who was put to death by the Sultān's orders in Rabi' I, 517 (April 29-May 28, 1122-1123) in Ballākā, (probably on the way back to Persia from Shīrwān).

The same campaign appears in quite another light in Ibn al-ʿArīfī, x, 453 ʿah (cf. above i, p. 943). The campaign is said to have been caused by the invasions of the Georgians and the complaints of the people, especially of the town of Derbend. Soon after the arrival of the Sultān in Shamakhtī a large Georgian army appeared before the town, which terrified the Sultān; soon afterwards however a quarrel broke out between the Georgians and their allies, the Kipākhs, as a result of which the enemy had to retire "as if defeated" (ţuchīna t-munhasīmīn; they had therefore not actually been defeated). The Sultān remained for some time in Shīrwān and returned in Dhu‘ al-Dirāhī, 517 July 27-August 24, 1123) to Hamālān.

Neither the Minār nor the Georgian sources (in Broset, Histoire de la Géorgie, l, 368) give us any definite information regarding the name of the Shīrwānīkh concerned. According to Fariburz, the name of his son Manṣūrī is still apparent on the coins under the Caliph Mustazharī, i.e. before 512 (1118); the next ruler Fariburz, probably a brother of his predecessor (no coins of his are known), is said by Georgian sources to have fallen about 1120 in a war between Shīrwān and Derbend; he is referred to as a "martyr" (ţahārī) by the poet Khāštī. His son Manṣūrī II was according to his coins a contemporary of the Caliph Muḥtafī (530-555 = 1135-1160) and is said by Khāštī (in抗衡ow, Min. Asiai, d, 122) to have reigned for thirty years, so that he cannot have been dethroned in 517 (1123).

The dynasty's greatest period was under Manṣūrī II and his successors. Manṣūrī took the title not only of Shīrwānīkh but also "Great Khāštī" (Khatābī-Khāštī); from this title is taken the title Khalīlūllāh of his panegyrist Khāštī. But the Shīrwānīkh continues to appear on his coins simply as a vassal of the Seljūq of the Irbak; it is only after the death of this dynasty (Toghrūl b. Arslān, d. 590=1194) that we find on coins and inscriptions only the name of the Caliph as suzerain mentioned in addition to the name of the Shīrwānīkh (usually with high-sounding titles). Shīrwān at that time was actually completely dependent on the Georgian kings, who took the title Shīrwānīkh themselves. Marital alliances were several times concluded between the K ersānids and the Georgian royal house. The son and successor of Manṣūrī II, Aḥṣānī (no doubt owed to his powerful relative, ally and suzerain, King Georgius III, his victory over a Muslim fleet at Bākū and the reconquest of Shīrwān in 1127 [q.v.]). On the other hand the lands of Shakhī, Kuba and Mīkān, were later taken from the Shīrwānīkh by the Georgians (Nasawi, Strav Sultanī, Dżallāi al-Dīn; ed. Paris, p. 145 and 174). Political conditions in the first half of the xiiith century are not quite clear; neither the Shīrwānīkh Raşīdī mentioned by Ibn al-ʿArīfī under the year 619 (xii, 264 ʿah)nor the Shīrwānīkh Aḥṣānī b. Fariburz mentioned by Nasawi (p. 175), under 623 A. H., are known from coins; in place of these we find on coins as contemporary of the Caliph Nāṣir (575=622 = 1180-1225) Fariburz b. Aḥṣānī b. Manṣūrī and, following him under the same Caliph Farrāhūdī b. Manṣūrī and Garshāpb b. Farraḥūdī. In contradiction to the above accounts Nasawi says that the Shīrwānīkh paid Sultan Mahmūd a tribute of 100,000 dinars; the Khāʾirīshīkh Dżallāi al-Dīn therefore demanded the same sum from the Shīrwānīkh when he appeared in Adharbājān. According to Nasawi, the reply given him was that conditions were no longer the same as before, as a large part of the country was now in the possession of the Georgians. It was agreed to pay 50,000 dinars, but even of this 20,000 were remitted. Shortly before the Khāʾirīshīkh had driven the officers of the Shīrwānīkh out of the land of Gushkāstī at the junction of the Kura and Aras and forced out this territory for 200,000 dinars; on the other hand he restored to prince Shīrwānīkh, Mīkān, which had been ceded by his father to the Georgians (on the occasion of the marriage of the prince with a Georgian princess, daughter of Queen Ramsūn, 1223-1247). After the subjection of Shīrwān by the Mongols, coins were struck in the name of the Mongol Great Khāzān; the name of the Shīrwānīkh also appears, but without a title. Under the rule of the İkhāns [q.v.] no coins were struck in Shīrwān; the country belonged sometimes to their empire and sometimes to that of the Golden Horde; as a province in the empire of the İkhnāshī Khwarizmshāh brought the state treasury 11 timāns (the timān was 10,000 dinars) and 3,000 dinars (the dinar was not now a gold coin but a silver coin of 3, later 2 mithāls); cf. W. Barthold, Periods of the Timurids, p. 185. Gushkāstī had remained separate and paid 118,500 dinars. The Kersānīkh dynasty remained in existence; under the Kersānīkh of the İkhnāshī, the Shīrwānīkh Kal Khāzān and his son Khwāzī were again able to play the part of independent rulers (their coins were anonymous like the coins of several dynasties of this period); but soon afterwards Khwāzī had to submit to the Timurids [q.v.] and strike coins in their name. Khwāzī is said to have died according to Fath (in Dorn, p. 560) in 2775 (1373-1377); his son Hūšang was murdered by his subjects after reigning ten years and with his death the dynasty of the
Maxims which are said to have been left by him are quoted (Mirkhond, Rawdat al-Šifā, Bombay 1277, i. 12 sqq.).

Tabari, Annales, writes Shīth and Shāth (I. 153) and says that Shāth is a Syriac form (šīraqa). The name signifies "in place of, gift (of God)" because he was given in place of Abel (Gen., iv. 25).

Al-Maṣṣūma" [q. v.] holds that the name of the god Shāth was transferred from Adam to Seth (Murshid b. Tahār al-Maṣṣūma, Livre de la Création, vi. 90).

This idea comes from a Gnostic sect, the Sethites who were found in Egypt from the fourth century, and who possessed "a Paraphrase of Seth", to be more precise, seven books by this patriarch and seven others by his children, whom they called the "Strangers" (Epiphanes, Hær., xxxix. 5).

The Gnostics possessed the books of Jaldabaoth, the Demiurge, attributed to Seth (Epiphanes, op. cit., xxvi. 8). The Sahib of Harrān had several writings attributed to Seth, and the latter was associated with Adam by the Manichaeans (Prosper Alfric, Les Écritures manichaéennes, Paris 1918, p. 6, 9, 10). Seth is always associated with Adam by the Druids (Philipp Wolff, Drüen, Leipzig 1845: p. 151, 193, 372 sqq.).


(C. Huart)

SHĪTH, the name of a very old Persian fire-temple, is said to be the native place of Zoroaster. According to A. V. W. Jackson the name is said to be derived from the Avestan name of Lake Urmīya, Čāčasta; according to Yākuti it is an Arabic corruption of Lūm or Lūm i. e. Kusānaka or Gwāna of the classical writers or Ḥanjāk of the Pehlevi texts. The older geographers consider the two names distinct. A comparison of the description given by Yākuti from Mas'ur b. Muhallil (about 940) with the names which are now called Taḥšt-i Salmānī shows the two places to be identical. According to Mas'ur the town lay among hills in which gold, quicksilver, lead, silver, arsenic and amethyst were found. Within the walled town was a pond of unfathomable depth, the water of which turned everything to stone. There was also a large ancient fire-temple there, which was held in great honour from which all the sacred fires in Persia were lit.

The fire had already burned 700 years without leaving ashes. The Persian kings used to bestow gifts on the temple, so that it collected vast treasures. Mas'ur b. Muhallil went there specially to find hidden treasure. H. Rawlinson's photographs of Taḥšt-i Salmānī show the position of the town and the ruins of the temple.


(S. Joy)

SHORFĀ. This is the dialectic plural form used throughout the Magrib in place of the classical shorfa; the singular is shirf (class. Encyclopédie de l'Islam, IV.)
sherif, n. v.). Morocco is the country of the Muslim world in which are found the largest number, in proportion to the number of inhabitants, of authentic sharifs or those regarding themselves as such. Their groups have played a considerable political and social role in the country since the end of the middle ages; two of them in succession succeeded to the old Berber dynasties, the Almoravids, Almohads, and Marinids; and even before these medieval dynasties the consolidation and

sharif, hitherto overshadowed by the medieval dynasties, began to play a foremost role. The result was the fall of the Marinid dynasty and their Wattusid successors and the rise of the Saadian princes.

Henceforth Morocco became the chosen land of the Sharifs. The empire became the Sharifite empire, al-Syiafat al-Sharifat; the groups, originally constituted without any recognition from the central power, were given an imperial consecration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genealogical Table of the Idrisid Sharif</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Al-Hasan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Al-Hasan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>'Abd Allah Al-Kamil</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Idris I</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Idris II</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DATU. 'Umar</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Al-Kasim</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sh. Hammudiyun</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sh. Dabbaghiyun</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sh. Amghiriyun</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yahya</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Muhammad</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yahya</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ibrahim</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yahya</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yahya</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hammud</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>'Ali</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Muhammad</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>'Abd al-Wahid</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>'Abd Allah</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Muhammad</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>'Abd al-Rahman</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>'Ali</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sh. Tubkiyin</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sh. Shabbiyin</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Sh. Djufiyin)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

unity of the Maghribi empire had been brought about by a Sharifite family, the Idrisids. At the end of the middle ages the Sharifite movement in Morocco seems to be closely associated with the development of the cult of saints and the growth of the religious brotherhoods. At this period there was a revival of the Muslim faith in the country and the religious aristocracy acquired a predominating position. Maghribi Islam in the sixteenth century assumed the original form, although nominally orthodox, which it has retained to the present day. To resist the Christian peril and the designs of Spain and Portugal on Morocco, it appealed for leaders in a holy war and the

of nobility; each Sultan on his succession renewed their grants of privileges and fiscal immunities and granted them rescripts (ghibr) which became in each family a kind of "grant of arms". It was for example by a Sharifite rescript that the saib (q.v. and the article SHARIF) of each group was appointed. In the hierarchy of the Maghribi they occupy the first place. The Sharifs of Morocco are found especially in the towns but even in the country they are very numerous. It is not always easy to distinguish between the Sharifs of the genuine nobility and those who cannot prove their descent from the Prophet. There has gradually arisen a difficulty in distinguishing between the
Descendants of 'Ali b. Muhammad b. Idris. They are divided into branches which are found throughout the northern part of Morocco; among them we may mention the Sh. Shafkhawanyyun whose ancestor 'Ali b. Raghid founded the town of Shafkhawan (q.v.); the Sh. Liya'iyun and the Shorfa WXzzaniyyun (on the activities of this important branch of the article WXzzani: the Sh. Raisuniyyun and the Sh. Rahmaniyyun.

II. Kadarid branch. The Kadaris of Morocco claim descent from Mūsā al-Djawn, son of 'Abd Allah al-Kamil through the intermediary of the celebrated 'Abd al-Kadir al-Djilani. Their settlement in Morocco only dates from the end of the middle ages when they had to abandon Spain where they had hitherto lived. They finally settled in Fas at the end of the ninth century A.D. (14th A.D.) and since then have been one of the most important Sharfi groups of the Moroccan capital.

III. Sa'dian and Filali branches. These two branches each succeeded to power in Morocco after the fall of the old Berber dynasties. Both claim direct descent from Muhammad al-Nafs al-Zakri son of 'Abd Allah al-Kamil. They had a common ancestry down to the thirteenth descendant of Muhammad al-Nafs al-Zakri as may be seen from the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descendants of 'Ali b. Muhammad b. Idris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad al-Nafs al-Zakri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Kasim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isma'îl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd al-Rahman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Hasan al-Dakhil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaidan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahdi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Hasan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Sharif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad al-Kasim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harun al-Ameri'lih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa'diyyan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the circumstances of their accession to power see the article MOROCCO, History.

Jusuanid Groups. Two Sharfi groups of Morocco, of much diminished importance claim descent from al-Jusuan b. 'Ali through Mūsā b. Dja'far al-Sādiq b. Muhammad b. 'Ali b. Zain al-Abidin b. al-Husain. They are the Shorfa Saljuqiyyun (for Ṣaljuqiyyun = Sicilians), who are descended from 'Ali al-Raṣūl b. Mūsā al-Kasim, and the Shorfa Irakīyyun who are descended from his brother Ibrahim al-Murjad. They are found principally in Fas and some of them in the last century went and settled in Cairo. If one realises the special importance of the Sharfi groups in the Maghrib, one will not be surprised to find that it has resulted in a special
literature dealing with genealogy and biography. The first notable works on these subjects were undertaken by a Kādirīdī Shāfi of Fās, Abī Muḥammad ʿAḥbār al-Salām b. al-Tayyib al-Kādirī, born in 1058/1648 and died in 1110/1698 (cf. the writer's Histoire des Chorfa, p. 276—309). In addition to three monographs on hagiography, he wrote several works dealing with the Sharfīt groups of Morocco, first a general study of Sharifism in the Moroccan capital, al-Durr al-samīr fī badr man ʿaḥb al-ṣināwī al-massāli, which, in spite of its title, also includes the Ḥusainī branches; on account of the period in which he was writing, he deliberately left out the ʿUṣūrians, who in any case were to disappear very quickly for lack of descendants. This work was lithographed at Fās in 1305 and 1308 A.H. Al-Kādirī's other treatises deal with a. the Kādirī Shāfiʿī (al-ʿUrf al-qādirī fī man al-Durr al-samīr min abī al-ṣināwī al-Ḥusainī, and b. the Shāfiʿī ʿIrākīyīn (Maṣūṣ al-ʿIrākī fī ʿIrākīyīn min al-ʿIrāq). At the end of the sixteenth century and beginning of the seventeenth, two other treatises on genealogy were compiled in Morocco; one devoted to the Alawi Shāfiʿī of Ṣidjīlimānī was written by Abū l-ʿAbbās Abū Ṣafī al-Māliḳ al-Shāfiʿī al-Ṣidjīlimānī, and entitled al-Amāq al-samāʿī fī mušāḥ ṣināwī al-masālih; the other is entitled Shāfiʿī al-ṣināwī fī ʿIrāq nasaʾal, which was a sort of work of the Shāfiʿī of the Ḍrūlā al-ʿAlām, al-Tihāmi b. Muḥammad b. Abū Ṣafī ibn Rājīmī, who composed it in 1103/1693—1694.

In 1217/1755 a descendant of the marabout family of the ʿazwīyāt of Dīkā, Abū Ṣafī al-Māliḳ al-Shāfiʿī al-Ṣidjīlimānī, composed a new treatise on the hagiography of the Kādirīs, Kitāb al-ṣināwī fī ṣināwī al-masālih, which was published at Tunis in 1296 and Fās 1309, partially transl. by Weir, The first part of the Nuzhat al-Tuḥāqī, Edinburgh, 1901. A monograph was a little later devoted to the Shāfiʿī ʿIrākīyīn of Fās by a Kādirī, grandson of the author of the Al-Durr al-samīr, Muḥammad b. al-Tayyib al-Kādirī, d. 1137/1723: this is the Maktub al-badāʾijī fī al-ṣināwī al-masālih, which was published at Tunis in 1296 and Fās 1309. The composition of the Kitāb al-ṣināwī fī ṣināwī al-masālih, which the genealogists of Fās consider apocryphal, is attributed to Abū Ṣafī b. Muḥammad ʿAḥbār al-Māliḳ al-Ṣidjīlimānī, also dates from the end of the sixteenth century: we may mention the Tabāṣ fī al-ṣināwī al-masālih, 1300, by Hāmmūn al-Tahārī al-ʿĀṣirī (d. 1194/1777), lithographed at Fās in 1324 A.H.

The composition of the Kitāb al-ṣināwī fī ṣināwī al-masālih, which the genealogists of Fās consider apocryphal, is attributed to Abū Ṣafī b. Muḥammad ʿAḥbār al-Māliḳ al-Ṣidjīlimānī, also dates from the end of the sixteenth century: we may mention the Tabāṣ fī al-ṣināwī al-masālih, 1300, by Hāmmūn al-Tahārī al-ʿĀṣirī (d. 1194/1777), lithographed at Fās in 1324 A.H.

Finally we may mention of modern works, in addition to the information collected in the valuable Ṣaḥāb al-ṣināwī al-maṣūṣ of Muḥammad b. Ḥanbal al-Kātībī [see al-Kātībī], two works relating to the Sharfīt branches of Morocco. The first is the work of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥāfīz al-Maḍāni Gānūf, entitled al-Durr al-samīr fī mušāḥ ṣināwī al-masālih; the other, more important, is entitled al-Durr al-samīr fī mušāḥ ṣināwī al-masālih, which was lithographed at Fās in 1314. This book which is the work of Abū l-ʿĀṣirī Ḥanbal al-Maḍāni, died in 1316/1898-1899, is an excellent collection with much unpublished information, clearly presented.


SHOTT, Arabic Shāʾt [q. v.]. The principal Shāʾt are, on the high plateaus, the Tigri Shāʾt in the Moroccan territory; the Shāʾt Gharra formed by two basins, the Shāʾt of the Hāmaya to the East and the Shāʾt of Mahaya to the West, and the Shāʾt Ṣariq situated to the South of Saida. In the central district between the Tell Atlit and the mountains of the Üled Na'll, the Zahr al-Shāʾt and the Zahr al-Ṣariq, more to the East the Shāʾt of the Hodna was in the centre of the depression of the same name; other small Shāʾt form the bottom of the basin of El-Beida and of El-Tar. Lastly to the South of the Saharan Atlas a string of Shōt runs from West to East from the meridian of 83° far as the Gulf of Gades over a stretch of about 250 miles: Shōt Melghir, entirely in Algerian territory; Shōt Gharra, on both sides of the Algerian-Tunisian frontier; Shōt el-Ljerdi, the largest of all those which is a continuation towards the East of the Shōt El-Fedjel. The two Shōt further West lie 70—100 feet below the level of the Mediterranean. This peculiarity which was believed to be common to the most eastern Shōt, had suggested about the year 1898, the idea that it might be possible to create across the South of Algeria and Tunisia an inland sea by piercing the shore of Gades with the object of diverting into the Shōt the waters of the Mediterranean. Further investigation showed that this project could not be realised and it was abandoned.

Bibliography: See the Bibliography to the article SERRA.
SHUGHNÁN (SHUGHNÁN), a district on the upper Osus (Pandj); the part on the left bank now belongs to Afgan Badakhshán [q. v.], and that on the right to the Russian Pímar. The districts of Ghárin and Rúshán, the one above and the other below Shughnán, are also divided into two by the political frontier. Afgan Shughnán has fifteen villages with four hundred houses and six thousand inhabitants, its administrative centre is at Vawurdu in the little valley of Uydar. Russian Shughnán consists mainly of the valley of Ghand and Shahk-dara on the western face of the Pímar. The Ghand rises in Lake Veškhal-kul but the territory of Shughnán only begins at the village of Sardim (below the junction of the Ghand and its left tributary the Tó Qurúl-bolak). The Shughnán range (with a pass 14,000 feet high) separates the valley of Ghand from its more southern tributary, Shahk-dara, which in its turn is separated from the Wakhón [q. v.] by another chain.

The cultivated lands of the Tá-jíka begin near Sardim, at a height of about 10,500 feet. The lowest points in Shughnán (on the Pandj) are not below 6,000 feet. The population is industrious but remains poor and scattered. About 1897-1898 it was not over 512 houses with 3,400 inhabitants, but the Afgan statistics of 1923 gave 359 houses to Ghand and 340 to Shahk-dara. The administrative centre of Russian Shughnán is at Khárakh (Kharoq) near the confluence of the Ghand and Pandj.

The irrigated provinces of Shughnán speak the Shíghí dialect which belongs to the group of Iranian dialects of the Pímar and is more closely connected with the dialects of Rúshán, Vázqátán and Sarí-köl (Sarkol). This last valley is in China and on the sources of the làk-bundaryá towards the east of the Pímar. According to the traditions of the Sarí-kolins collected in 1873 by the Forsyth mission (Report on the Mission to Yarkand, Calcutta 1875, p. 53, 223), their ancestors in the seventh generation had come from Shughnán, the territory of which seems to have been larger in the past. Like the majority of the Tá-jíkas of the Pímar, the people of Shughnán profess Shíh Ismá'ilí doctrines. Their pír under whom are khásífis, as H. H. the Aghá Khán [q. v.] of Bombay is their head (cf. i., p. 169 and ii., p. 551). One of the striking features of the popular religion of the Ismá'ilis of the Pímar is their belief in metempsychosis, including the passage of the soul into animals. A large number of Ismá'il manuscripts coming mainly from Shughnán are preserved in the Asiatic Museum in Leningrad (including Unán al-Kitáb, Vázqát-i Din, Kúlam-i Pir, etc.). It is curious to note that the Dabítán [q. v.] speaks of the "Alt-Illíth (Ismá'ilí) living in the eastern mountains (Al-illíth-i woshíl) in proximity to (kmúríyn) the savage Umayyad of Yázdíya. Some whose town is Shwás. This name must correspond to Shughnán.

The Chinese writers call Shughnán She-kí-ní or (R. Chavannes, Documents sur les Tou-kías occidentaux, St. Petersbourg 1903, p. 152) "the kingdom of the five Shees (gorges)" which seems to refer to all the region of the Pandj ("the five rivers"). According to Huien Thang (630-644) the kingdom of She-kí-ní was 3,000 li in circumference (about 20 days' journey) while the circumference of the capital (K'ou-han?) was 5-6 li. The inhabitants were rough looking. The writing
resembled that of the Tokhtris but "their spoken language was different". In 846 envy of the She-k'ni visited the court of China. In 718 the brother of the king (yadgha) of Tokhtris confirmed the Chinese that the sovereignty of the yadgha extended over, amongst others, the king of Shughnan who had 50,000 men at his command. In 747 the general Kho-sien-ki crossed the land of She-ni, the inhabitants of which lived scattered among the gorges.

The Arab geographers refer to Shughnan by the names Shikinan, Shikinan, Shikina and Shikina. Ibn Khardadhbih, p. 37, and Ya'kabii, p. 292, make Shughnan dependent on Tokhtristan, for in enumerating the revenues of this last district they say that Shikinan paid 40,000 (7,400) dirhams in taxes and Wakhan 20,000 (7,000). This may explain an obscure passage in Ibn Khardadhbih, p. 175, where he speaks of a ford on the Dzisalan by which the merchants of Khottalin (a district between the Panj and the Wakhshan) entered "the land of the Turks (sic) which is called Shikina". As the writer places the mouth of the Akhthwa (the river of Kalat, Khi-Sarkhab) below this ford, the Shikina must have lived on the left bank of the Panj above the Afghan Darawz (cf. above i., p. 844). On the other hand according to Ya'kabii (p. 292) Shikinan and Badakshshen (lying between Khottal and upper Tokhtristan) were separated by a large valley (that of the Panj). The Araba (Ibn Khardadhbih, p. 173; Ibn Rusta, p. 89) further make the Indus (Mihran) rise in the mountains of Shikinan. Al-Biruni (ed. Sachau, p. 101) puts to the west of Kaghmir, first the lands of the Bolor-shah and then (those of the) Shikinan-shah (sic) and of the Wakhshan-shah which stretch to the frontier of Badakshshen. This order of enumeration suggests a direct control between Shughnan and the lands of the upper Indus.

According to Ya'kabii, p. 304, in the time of Harnin al-Rashid the Barmaeides Faqil conquered Shikinan. Al-Istakhri however (p. 267) asserts that people of this district as well as those of Karran (Darawz?) were non-Muslims.

Marco Polo (Yule and Cordier, i. 151) mentions the mountain of Syghnan which produces "balas" rubies, but the ancient mines now abandoned are in the adjoining district of Ghuraz.

The local historian of Shughnan begins with Chinese rule of which he quotes several memorials, for example a black stone in the valley Ghund bearing a Persian inscription weekly Khasian-27i. Such monuments must certainly relate to later expeditions (cf. Torebki-27i Rakhsh, ed. Elin and Ross, 1895, p. 94; Yule in his preface to Wood, Travels, p. xxxiii, mentions the Chinese expedition of 1759 to Badakshshen). After the Chinese, the "fire-worshippers" ruled over Shughnan. The inhabitants appear to identify these infidels with the "Siyaahpooh" of Kfaristan [q.v.] to whom are attributed numerous buildings, especially at Wakhan (Olufsen, Through the Unknown Pamir, London 1904, p. 172-174). Sir Aurel Stein however (Geogr. Journ., Aug.-Sept., 1916) does not believe that the Siyaahpooh were capable of building these monuments and attributes their origin to the Indo-Sctitic or Sasanian period. It is probable that the "infidels" were simply local non-Muslims (cf. Grierson, Jhikhsani, Zhahii and Yaqubshani, London 1940, p. 7). The principal centre of these "infidels" was Wiyar on the left bank of the Panj and their best known chief was Farhad Raw.

He was overthrown by a certain Saiyid Shah Malang sent from Khorasan by the Grand-Master of the Isma'ili. Shah Malang was followed by another missionary Shah Khambish from Shiraz. For three years he put his date at 865 = 1266. The descendents of these pirs governed Shughnan as hereditary muns. Shah Amir Beg has left an inscription at Khoragh dated 1193 (1779). His son Shah Wandji Khan expelled all the non-Isma'ilis of Shughnan and the "fire-worshippers" had to leave for Yatkan. According to Kuskhali, p. 187, this prince had extended his sway up to Badakshshen and Curit. The son of Wandi Khan, Kubad Khan, persecuted the Isma'ilis but was driven out by his brother; Visut. "Ali Shah grandson of Kubad, ruled both banks of the Panj but the Amir of Afghanistan, Shtr. "Ali Khan also tried to bring this area under his sway. In the reign of "Abd al-Rahman Khan the Afghans, objecting to the hospitality given to the Russian traveller Regel, by Visut "Ali, deported the latter to Khabi (c. 1300 = 1822) and established their rule over Shughnan (Kuskhali, p. 182-185). The inhabitants sent envoy to Bakhsh and to the Russian authorities in Turkestan. After long pourparlers and an encounter between a Russian force under Colonel Ionow with the Afghans near Yeşhis-Kul (in 1892), an exchange of views between the Russian and British governments took place in London on March 11, 1895. The Afghans had to evacuate the right bank of the Panj and the Amir of Bakhsh to give up his possessions on the left bank (Darawz).

Eastern Shughnan was restored to Bakhsh but its administration gradually passed into the hands of the Russian authorities of the Pâmir (the station of Khoragh was created at Shughnan in 1895). In 1918-1920 the waves of Russian revolution reached even Shughnan. In November 1920 the Soviet forces re-occupied the Pâmir and re-established all the military posts. [The following additions are due to the kindness of Mr. A. Semenow. The inhabitants of Shughnan call themselves Shughneen. Shughnan belongs at present to the Soviet Republic of Tadzhikistan, which possesses self-government. The tomb of Shah Khambish is at Kalta, Sarpuqand (cf. Troplin in Geogr. Magazine, ii., 1857, p. 10). Shah Wandi Khan died in 1314-1319. Visut "Ali Shah's government was tyrannical, which was the cause of the conscription instituted by the Afghans. The Wandi Khan has been published at Berlin (Kawiani-office, 1343), cf. Semenow, K. dogmatik paixamshag ismaelism (Tashkent 1929) where the latest works of the author are mentioned.]

Bibliography: cf. the articles AMIDARX BASHKHALKIJEN, CHINA, GHALCA, FAMIR AND TADZIK; Prince V. Musakai, Turkestanische Reisen, St. Petersburg 1913, p. 861 and passim; Olufsen, The Empire of Bokhara and his country, London 1911, p. 98 sqq. A. Semenow, Istoriya Shughnana, Probalaal Turkestan, kardin Rabiatleyi archeologii, Tashkent 1917, xli. 1-22 (based on the manuscript of Saiyid Haidarpooh of Shughnan and Russian official documents); Burhan al Din Kuskhali, Kuskhali-i Badakshshen, Tashkent 1926, p. 170-198 (Russian text, translated by A. Semenow, of an important Afghan publication based on the materials collected by the special mission of Moulzammad Nadir Khan).

SHUL, A country in China. According to Kudama (ed. de Goeje, p. 284) Alexander the Great conquered it and built there two towns, Shul and Khundun. This latter has been identified (de Goeje, Tomasevic, Yule) with Si-nan-fu. In Shul Marquart (Osteuropatische Streifzüge (Leipzig 1903) p. 90, and Erdreise (Berlin 1901) p. 316) sees the 'Turkish word Ceit which he translates by "sand" (desert), seeing in it a translation of the Chinese Shu-shan, "sandy districts". According to Bretschneider (Medieval Researches, ii, 1878) Shaou-shan, "sand city" (Marco Polo: Sachau) was taken in 622 A.D. As an alternative, Marquart admits a misunderstanding Shul instead of Shuk = Shuk-shan (Sn. 284).

It remains to be ascertained if this Shul does not rather refer to some colony of the Sogdian (cf. the Sogdian Sutk from "Soghdis, Tibetan Shukl, Russian Shulk, German Soglian, Sogdien, 1923, p. 46). 2. A tribe in Persia (Movahhyz).

SHULISTAN, "Country of the Shul", a district (buluk) in the province of Fars.

Three epochs must be distinguished in the history of the district: one before the arrival of the Shul, the period of their rule (from the vith/viiith centuries), and the period of its occupation by the Mamassan Lurs about the beginning of the xix/xvith century.

During the Sasanid period the district was included in the kura of Shapur-khura. The founding of its capital Nawbandjan (Nawbandjan) is attributed to Shapur I. This important town situated on the road from Fars to Khišistan was taken by Ullman b. Ahi l-Ay in 21/643 (Ibn al-Athir, ili, 37); it is often mentioned by Arabic historians and geographers. The district is watered by the river system which finally forms the river Zohra, which flows through Zaidan and Hindiyeh. In the old Fars-nama (p. 131) the river of Nawbandjan bears the name Khālidan. The river system is described in detail in Fars-nama-yi Nādirī, ii, 326. The principal water-course comes from the direction of Ardakan and is now called Ab-i Fahiljīn or Ab-i shir. The valley of Shul-bāwān situated about ten miles to the north of Nawbandjan, is considered, on account of its climate and the richness of its vegetation, to be among the four earthily paradises (Fars-nama, p. 147; Bode, i, 233). Another notable feature of the district is the fortress Kāl-i Safil, occupying (like Kāl-i Nūrī [q.v.]) an extensive terrace (four miles in circumference) on the summit of an almost inaccessible mountain; the Persians identify the place with the Safīl-dīx mentioned in the Šah-nama (Mohl, ii, 92; Vullers, i, 448); it was taken by Turmār in 795 (1393).

Sometimes the district of Nawbandjan bears the name of Anbarūn, but the Nushāt al-Kullāh makes the town of Anbarūn a dependency of Nawbandjan. Nawbandjan flourished until the interregnum which followed the fall of the Būyids [q.v.], when Abī Sa'id, the leader of a section of the Shabānbār [q.v.], destroyed the town. It revived under the Agābēg Čā'ull (died in 510) who governed Fars on behalf of the Sh洗sak, but finally fell into ruins.

The description of Fars (Fars-nama) composed in the life-time of Čā'ull does not yet give the expression, Shulistan, that is to say "the country of the Shul". This last tribe at first inhabited the territory of the Sāmānids, of which the half was under its rule about 300 (912). The great chief (čā'ull) of the Shul was Saif al-Din Mākūn Rūshītān, whose ancestors had governed the district from the time of the Sāmānids. We may here mention that the Rūshītān figure among the Lur tribes. At the same time as this čā'ull, Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfi mentions a governor (ḥākim) of the wāliyyat of the Shul, who was called Nadīm al-Dīn. From the year 500 (1106) the Kurd tribes and others from Djarāb al-Sumā' (in Syria) began to move into Lūrīstān. From these Kurds the dynasty of the Čā'úbegs of the Great Lur is sprung. Under the Čā'ūbeg Hashrau (560—565 = 1260—1262) the new comers drove the Shul back into Fars.

Towards the end of the thirteenth century, Marco Polo (Yule-Cordier, i, 83—85) mentions amongst the eight "kingdoms" of Persia, Shūlistan, which may refer to the new territory around Nawbandjan occupied by the Shul. The old Chinese map studied by Bretschneider (Medieval Researches, ii, 127) marks a Shu-la-tsu between Shūrak and Kūrān, which must correspond to Shūlīstān. Although the Muslim historians were ignorant of the Shul dynasty, the tribe in the time of Mustawfi had hereditary governors, the descendants (nawīn-dabān) of Nadīm al-Dīn Akbar. A new administrative centre replaces Nawbandjan: during the campaign of 795 Timur halted at Makūn Shul ("the estate") of the Atraves of the Shul being thus distinguished from Makūn = Idrāhjī: the position of this place between two water-courses, corresponds to Fahiljīn which is now the capital of the district.

The Shul must form an ethnically distinct unit. The history of the Kurds by Sharaf al-Dīn only
mentions them, incidentally perhaps because the author excluded them from his category of "Kurds." Ibn Battūta (Defremery, ii. 88), who in 748 (1347) met Shīl at Shīhrah and on his first stage on the road from Shīhrah to Kāhrūn (Dašt-i Arjān?) calls them "a Persian tribe (min al-aṣḥāf) inhabiting the desert and including devout people." The Persian dictionaries mention a peculiar dialect Shīlī (Vullers, ii. 451: *a kind of Rāmavand and Shākhi which is spoken in Fars*). Shīlī al-Dīn al-Umārī (who died in 749/1348) states that the Shīlī have very considerable affinities with the Shāhānšāhī (q. v.) and assert their generosity and hospitality. Their warlike character is evident from the remark of Raḥīl al-Dīn, who, in speaking of the Tārīfs, capable of killing one another "for a few words," compares them to the Kurds, the Shīlī, and the Franks (Bérénice, vi. 62). In 617 the Atābeg of Lurāstān, Hāzhāpād, advised Muḥammad Khwārizmshāh to entrench himself beneath the chain of Tangī-Talū (Balút: "oak") and to mobilise there against the Mongols, 100,000 Lurās, Shīlī, the people of Fars and Shāhānšāhī (Djouwānī, Gibb Memorial, xiv/2, 114). Raḥīl al-Dīn (Quatremer, p. 380) mentions amongst the valiant defenders of Māwsī in 659 (1260): "the Kurds, the Turkomans and the Shīlī". Established on the great road, the Shīlī nomads were themselves also invaders; the Atābeg of Lurāstān, Vizāfī Shīlī (673-687) attacked them and killed the brother of their chief Nadīm al-Dīn (Teʾrīkh-i Gāvada, p. 543); in 735 the Murqaffar Shīlī al-Shāh chastised them severely when they attacked Shīhrah (ibid., p. 660); in 795 ʿUmar Shāhī marching in the rear-guard of his father Timūr pillaged on his way all the unnminded "Lūrs, Kurds and Shīlī" (Zafar-nāma, p. 515).

The nomad (or semi-nomad) state and the warlike character of the Shīlī, the similarity of their speech to Persian, the invasions of their neighbours, all these factors must have contributed on the one hand to the dispersion of the Shīlī and on the other to their assimilation and final absorption. At the present day, traces of them are only found in the toponymy of the Fars: Shīlī Gāp, a mountain to the north of Būhīr; Darvāzī, namely, a section of the Turkish tribe Ḳaḳāhī (q. v.); Ḳaḳāhī, a village near Dālīkī and another village to the N. N. W. of Shīhrah. This last Shīlī, situated to the east and outside the dūlah of Shīlīstān might represent the last bulwark of the tribe, which has disappeared. Herford, who emphasizes the special character of the buildings of this village, says that its inhabitants are of Persian origin and seem to have kept the pure Persian type. According to Bode, the river Aḥ-ī Shīrī ("bitter water") is called also Shīkārīb ("sourer water"); this contradiction can only be explained by the confusion between the words Shīrī and Shīh, and besides, one of the most important tributaries of this river is called Raḥīlī-kī Shīlī: Kāmāfīrūz in Fārs-nāmah Nāṣīrī (Wells, *The South stream*).

At the time of the last Safavīs (Fārs-nāmah Nāṣīrī, ii. 302) or after the rise of Nādir (Bode, i. 266) Shīlīstān was occupied by new invaders, the Māmān Lūrs, after whom the district is now called bāltī Memāsūn. Its extent is now about 100 X 60 miles, between the following boundaries: to the east Kāmāfīrūz and Ardākūn; to the north and to the west Ranzīd and the country of the Khūsh-Gālīs (Khūsh-Gūlīya Lūrs; to the south Kāhrūn and the mountain of Mārām-Shīgīf (the northern slopes of the Maravek in Dašt-i Arjān). Of the six cantons of the district four (Ḏarābūn) bear the names of Memāsūn cantons: Bākšt, Džīwōd, Dūzhanmīzīnāt and Rustūm. In these cantons there are fifty-eight villages and five thousand families. The cantons are governed by their hereditary bāltīrās. The Memāsūn claim to possess the amals of their tribe and say they came from Sūstān (J. Morier, *J. R. G. S.,* 1837, p. 232-242): this legend must have attached itself to the name of Rustūm, the name of one of the four cantons. The language of the Memāsūn is a Lūrt dialect.

Of the two other cantons: Kāhrūn (to the north) was bought by the Kaghālī Turk of the Kaghāšī (q. v.) tribe; and Fahlīyan, with seven villages dependent on it, is still the administrative centre of the dūlah. In the time of the Safawīs this town is said to have numbered five thousand houses of which in the year 1840 no more than sixty-seventy remained (in Persp. Saiyids).


**SHURĀT** (as šahrk, the name which the extreme Khāβdasī [q. v.] give themselves. This name of a religious denomination is taken from the Kurān (iv. 76) and means, "those who sell their life to God" by vowing to fight to the death against his enemies.

The first Shūrāt were exterminated by ʿAlī at
the battle of Nukhaila. The most celebrated of their martyrs was Abu Bihli Mirza b. Djawar, of the Rabia tribe. They swore to fight, even when hope had gone, for the cause of justice "until only three amongst them should remain".

This state of extreme political feeling or ʿirāq is contrasted in Kūrdish terminology to the state of "triumph" (esign), or "defence" (ṣaf) and of "secret" (kistān).

The name of Shūrāt has been applied by extension to a group of Kūrīdī jurists, natives of Ūmam, Sīlaḏ, Allahsirdār, Shahrūnī, and Ḍabār, like Dībār b. Ǧansūb and Kāṭāli, who have written in justification of the attitude of ʿirāq.

The Malay custom of ʿamār sometimes takes the form of ʿirāq among Muslim Filipinos.


**SHURTA, police, police-officer.** The word ʿirāq (more rarely ʿirāf) in the plural ʿirāf, originally means "picked men who open the battle", "bodyguard" and then comes to be used in the sense of "police, gendarmerie"; an individual police officer is likewise called ʿirāf or ʿirāf (ṣaf). The title ʿajāb al-ʿirāf, "mender of the bodyguard" was at first given to the governor of a province or a town who settled all questions, religious as well as secular, but in the ʿAbbāsid period was reserved for a special official who was responsible for order and public security and whose duties therefore corresponded with those of our chief constables. Under the ʿAbbāsids, the Spanish Umayyads, and the Fāṭimids in the Maghrib and Egypt the ʿajāb al-ʿirāf had greater power than the ʿajāf, insomuch as he was empowered to take action on mere suspicion and to threaten any one with punishment even before proof was brought. Not all citizens however were under his power, but only the lower classes, particularly all suspicious individuals and those of evil repute. In Spain however a distinction was made between al-ʿirāf al-ḥābiḥ ("great ʿirāf") and al-ʿirāf al-ṭalḥī ("little ʿirāf"); the representative of the former could take legal proceedings even against high officials, if he had been guilty of anything, while the latter dealt exclusively with the lower classes. In the time of Ibn Khalīd, the ʿajāb al-ʿirāf in Spain was called ʿajāb al-marāṭa, in Tunisia ḥaġām, and among the Mamlūks of Egypt ṣafātī.

From the meaning of "policeman", "constable", developed in Spanish Arabic that of "hangman" and in the ʿarabic "night" we find ʿṣafītī used along with ʿajāfī in the meaning of "rogue, rascal" etc. In modern Egyptian ʿṣafītī means "pickpocket".

**Bibliography:** Lane, Lexicon; Dovy, Supplement; Ibn Khalīd, Muḥammad, ed. Quatremère, i. 400; ii. 30 (transl. by de Slane, i. 457); ii. 85; v. Kremer, Culturgeschichte der Orients, i. 182, 1992; Huart, Histoire des Arabes, i. 363.

(K. V. Zetettene)

**SHUSHTAR.** [See Shīrāz.]

**SHUSHI, a mystic poet of Andalusia, a disciple of Ibn Sahib [q. v.], author of masnawihā in vulgar Arabic.**

Born at Yordar near Guzidan (Wādī Ābī) about 600 (1205), he died at Sīnā near Damietta on 17th Sāfar 668 (October 16, 1268). Shusharti first studied under Ibn Surāta of Jīzār, who expounded to him the "Aswārī al-Muṭarrīf, of Shuwarwardī al-

Mardānī, he seems at this period to have joined the Madarij order. He then lived at Rābāt and the Mekeles (which he mentions in his poems) - a shahīd of the land of Meknes - Goes singing through the park - What do men want with me? - What do I want with them? -" and Fās. He then set out for the east. In 650 (1252) he was at Damascus with a remarkable poet, Nadīm b. ʿisārī (d. 676 = 1277) of the order of Rībīʿyya Fartihyya (Dīnārīn at Constantionople, Aya Sofia MS, N. 1644).

Finally in 654 (1253) he settled in Mecce; there he met Ibn Sahīb, then already famous at the age of thirty-eight; although his senior, he became his pupil and received his khīrī al-ṣāliḥīn (of which we know from Ibn Taimiyya that its dīwān was lāli Ṭālīa and that its lamāʾīa relied on the authority of Hallaj among other impious men, e. g. Socrates). When Ibn Sahīb was persecuted and put under police surveillance, Shusharti, taking his place at the head of the mawdūjārāna, brought to Egypt, before he died, about 400 adepts including Ibn Yāḥyā b. Mubahali, the hermit of the Bib Ūzawīla (Cairo).

Maʿṣūr enumerated five prose works by him; but there survives only a Khāliqa tabībīya on the poverty (Eucarp, MS. 168, f. 750–760). If its name is still known, it is owing to his Dīnārīn collection of masnawihā in vulgar Arabic; short, poignant poems quite modern in tone, for which music was at once provided, according to Ibn ʿAbbād Rundī. To this day to end the "shāhīd" in the sennets of the Shāhīlyān in Syria they sing his "Alī son tabībī son ar-rat al-ṣāliḥī - Hā'īn ar-rat al-ṣāliḥī...". Ibn Adja also annotated - Shusharti also wrote some ṣanas in the classical style; the best known is the Sāliya izāriyya, on which Nābulisi wrote a commentary.

**Bibliography:** Ghulīfāni, ʿUmar al-

**SHUSHI, SAYID NURE ALI B., SHARĪR MAṢĀRĪ, an original Shīʿa writer who defended imāmism against Sunni polemicists and at the same time mysticism against the anti-mysticists of the majority of the Imāmī doctors. Kāẓim of Lahore, he was condemned as a heretic by orders of Ḥāfiz and whipped to death in 1019 (1610). He is the third martyr (ajāb al-ṭarīq) of the Imāmī. He left two important works, in Persian the Moṭṭālī al-Muʿminīn (finished at Lahore in 1073 = 1664), a very fully documented biographical collection on the principal martyrs of Imāmī and mystic Islam; and in Arabic the Iḥāṣ al-ḥaṣab, a treatise on Imāmī apologetics.

**Bibliography:** Rieu, Catal. Persian MSS. British Museum, London 1879, i, p. 357; Goldscheider, Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte der Siʿra und des sunnitišen Polenik, Vienna 1874. (L. Massignon)

**SHUTRƯ or SHUSTER, a town in the Persian province of Arabistan, the ancient Khāṣtān, situated in
about 49° East Long. and 32° N. Lat. It stands on a cliff to the west of which runs the river Kärün [q. v.], the middle course of which begins a few miles north of the town. This position gives the town considerable commercial and strategic importance and has made possible the construction of various waterworks for which the town has long been famous. The main features of these constructions are: (1) the canal called Aḥ-ḥ-i Gerger (in the middle ages Murādšāh) which is led from the left bank of the river about 500 yards north of the town; it runs southwards along the east side of the cliffs of Shuster and rejoins the Kärün at Band-i Kār, the site of the ancient ʿAskar Mūnām; (2) the great barrage called Band-i Kajast, which is thrown across the principal arm of the river (here called Shustaf or Nahri-i Shuster) east of the town and is about 440 yards long; this barrage supports a bridge intended to connect the town with the west bank but now a considerable gap is broken in it; (3) the canal called Mināw (from Mīyān-āb) which begins above the barrage in the form of a tunnel cut out of the rock on the western side of the town; the citadel is above this part; the Mināw turns southwards and is intended to irrigate the land south of the town.

Shuster along with these canals was already in existence in pre-Muhammadan times. Pīrī knows a town called Sostra (xii. 78) and it appears as Šuhstār in the Liste géographique des villes d’Iran, publ. by Blochet (Recueil de travaux relatifs à la phalèse et à l’archéologie égyptienne et osyrien, 1895, xvii. No. 46); it is found in Syriac literature as a Nestorian bishopric (cf. Marquart, Ermland, p. 27). Persian tradition also regards Shuster as a very old town (e.g. Abu Ḭ-fīḍa, ed. Reinach, p. 315). This tradition is found in the Arab historians and geographers and most fully in the Tarifi-i Šuhstār of Aḥō Allāh al-Shahtart (cf. Bibliography). The story goes that the town was founded by the mythical king Ḥāshang after the foundation of Shāh (Susa). Shuster is said to be comparative from Shāh because its name is more beautiful "in reference to the site of the town (Marquart, note, etc. also regards it as a derivative from Shāh with the suffix of indication). The Arabic form Tustār is generally explained as an arabisation of Shustār (e.g. Hānsa al-Idfahāni and Yākūt, l. 848). Several sources record that the town was built in the form of a horse. Tradition also says that the Mināw canal, formerly called Nahri Dârriyān, was built by Dârâ the Great and that it was the Sāmān Ardāghti I who began to construct the barrage in the river below the mouth of the canal, after the latter had dried up because the bed of the river had sunk through erosion by the force of the current. The work was only completed however under Shāhī II by his Roman prisoners under Valerian II (cf. also Taḥarı, l. 827; Makātib Mūsā al-Mūṣāb, ii. 184). The Aḥ-ḥ-i Gerger was first dug simply to divert the volume of water. The Band-i Kajast was next constructed and called after the emperor and the bed of the river above the barrage was paved with huge slabs of stone bound with iron so as to prevent any further erosion. This paving was called Shikdr̲wān, a term which was also applied to the barrage itself. Ultimately a new barrage is said to have been across the Gerger.

From the xivth century the Aḥ-ḥ-i Gerger was called Dū-Dārīn and the Nahri-i Shuster Cāhār-Dārīn, because they contained respectively two- and four-sixths of the quantity of water in the Kärün. Muslim authors number these great waterworks among the wonders of the world (e.g. Hamza al-Idfahāni and Ibn Başṭāta). Although the authenticity of the tradition quoted could be for the most part disputed, it is not improbable that Roman prisoners of war took part in the construction of the barrage (cf. Nöckel, Geschichte der Perser und Araber, p. 37); local tradition further attributes to Roman colonists the introduction of a number of industries e.g. the manufacture of brocade (dībāq) and certain popular customs.

In the caliphate of ʿUmar the town was conquered by al-Baṣrī b. Mālik, whose tomb used to be pointed out in the centuries following. Tradition also says that the coffin of the prophet Dānīyāl was found there, which later on was brought to Shāhī. In the Umayyad period the town became one of the strongholds of the Kharijīs; the Kharijīs Ṣahīb made it his capital but after his death al-Ḥadhdhidād seized it; it was then that the great bridge over the barrage was destroyed. Under the Caliphs, Shuster was the capital of one of the seven provinces (sometimes a larger number is given, cf. Maqrizi, p. 404), into which Khūzistān was divided. When Baghdad became the centre of the empire, Shuster gradually became influenced by its proximity to the capital. One quarter of Baghdad, for example in the tenth century was called Māḥsilat al-Tustārīyān; it was the residence of the merchants and refugees from Khūzistān. The oldest mosque was built under the ʿAbbāsidas; begun in the reign of al-Muʿtāz (866-869), it was only finished under the Caliph al-Mustarshid (1118-1135). There was however a fire-altar at Shuster in the time of al-Halladī (Maqṣūmīn, La passion d’al-Halladī, i. 92).

Shuster along with Alwās has always been the chief town in Khūzistān; Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī calls it the capital of this province. It was conquered by Timūr and remained in the hands of the Timurids till the year 820/1414, when it fell to a Ṣūfī dynasty of Sāyiids under the suzerainty of the Ṣafawīs and became a centre of Sīfī propaganda. Several governors have founded little dynasties there. The town enjoyed most prosperity in the reign of Wāḥīḥī Khān (1632-1667) whose descendants kept the governorship till the end of the Ṣafawīs. In the beginning of the sixteenth century it was among the provinces governed by Muḥammad ʿAlī Mirzā, son of Fath ʿAll Shah, who restored, for example, the barrage and the bridge. At this period it is said to have had a population of 45,000, but the number has certainly diminished a great deal since, for Ravilison in 1836 puts it at 15,000 and Curzon in 1890 at 8,000. The area covered by the town is out of all proportion to the population. Sykes also calls Shuster the most ruined town in Persia; this description applies also to the water works. The houses are built of stone and brick; they contain cellars, here called hirvāsad, in which the inhabitants shelter in the excessive heat of somerest.

As to the inhabitants themselves, they are a mixture of Arab and Iranian or proto-Iranian elements. In the middle of the sixteenth century there were still a considerable number of Mandaeans here; Layard counted 300-400 families of them.
in 1840 (cf. also the description of them given by ‘Abd Allīh al-Shuṣhtārī on p. 24 of his local history). They have probably now disappeared. Modern travellers (Curnon and Sykes) describe the character of the present inhabitants as disagreeable and wantonly. Among the Persians the devotionalness of the inhabitants has earned the town the honorific title of Dūr al-Mu‘minin. On the other hand we find Shuster included among the Persian towns celebrated for the suavity of its inhabitants (Christensen in Storia Orientale, iii. 51). They live for the most part by commerce; the present state of the population seems however to justify the ancient tradition that Shuster is fated always to remain a poor town. Since the end of last century Shuster has succeeded Dirulf as the capital of ‘Abdārābīn.


For the extensive bibliography relating to the barrages and irrigation works cf. the article KĀRT and the bibliography given there.

(J. H. KRAMER)

SHUBIYA. Shūbīya, of the Kurān teaches the brotherhood and equality of all Muslims and verse 13 reads, “and We made you šubīya and šambūl in order that ye may know” — “each know the other” explains Bāduwī in loco (ed. Fleischer, ii. 276, 17), “not for prudential why with one another in ancestors and tribes”. Apparently šubīya was used in Arabic for non-Arab tribes (al-adjam) as distinguished from šambūl for Arab tribes (Lūm, i. 482, 43) and therefore this passage was used by those non-Arab who objected to the pride of the Arabs towards them. The Shubīya then, was the sect which either so objected or which exalted the non-Arab the Arabs or which, in general, despised and depreciated the Arabs (Lūm, i. 482, 43 sqqq.; Lane, p. 1557E). A member of this sect was a shubīl. This attitude showed itself in different forms. In the East on the part of the Persians and the Khūridjīs it was dynamic and political, and for the Persians also religious, involving heresy and Zandīgīm. It connected with the Shī‘a and other messianic. On the part of the Naháteans it was the conflict of the cultivated soil and its pasturage against the desert. It was thus a more or less successful attempt on the part of the different subjecting races to hold their own and to distinguish, at least, between Arabism and Islam. In Persia this meant even the restoration of Persian as the language of literature and the limitation of the use of Arabic (al-arabiya) and on its Islamic orthodoxy, but rejected the claims to superiority of the Arab race. The movement had therefore a certain kinship with the nationalism within Islam of the present day.

Bibliography: Goldziher, Muhammadanische Studien, i. 147—416; Die Su‘ūdīja unter den Muhammedanen in Spanien, in Z.D.M.G., iii. 601—620. (B. T. MACDONALD)

SIK SRI INDRAPURA, a self-governing district (Sultanate) belonging to the administrative area of Bengkalis in the government Oostkust van Sumatra, on the east coast of Central Sumatra and practically equivalent to the valley of the river Siak; a few islands off the coast also belong to it. The boundaries of the Sultan’s territory are inadequately defined in the agreement concluded in 1916 between the government of the Dutch East Indies and the native Government of Siak Sri Indrapura, published in the Kroniek 1917 von het Oostkust van Sumatra-Instituut. It consists of a very wide fertile alluvial strip of coast, swampy in places, intersected by many streams large and small; the ground rises only very gradually to the west and is for the most part still covered with forest. The most important of these are the leaves of the nipa palm which are used for roofing material; they grow rich, almost exclusively on dry fields, but the harvest is far from sufficient even for their own needs; considerable quantities of rice are imported from Singapore and cocomuts from Malacca; the Chinese alone grow vegetables.

Two main elements may be clearly distinguished in the population: (a) A few tribes who may be regarded as descendants of the original inhabitants of the east coast of Sumatra; (b) Another section usually given the name “Malays”. To the first group belong: (1) The Orang Talang on the Mandau river and in the forest country between Siak and Kampar; they are divided into four groups and are said to be descendants of subjects of the once powerful kingdom of Gasip, which lay on the river of the same name and according to tradition was destroyed by the Atchinese; (2) The Orang Mau on the upper Mandau River, also in the adjoining Rokan territory; (3) The Orang Akut, who are gradually dying out; (4) The Orang Utan and Orang Rawa; on the islands at the mouth of the Siak and Kampar rivers. These tribes are still very primitive. Physically they are different from the Malays and it is reported of the Orang Akut in particular that they have a negro type and show a striking similarity to the Semang of the Malay Peninsula. Sometimes lead a more or less wandering life; agriculture is little or not at all pursued; they live by fishing and on all that the forest yields them. The Orang Talang and the Sakai are said to have adopted Islam; but
their knowledge of this religion is only very slight and like the other tribes already mentioned they are still strongly attached to heathen customs. In family law and law of inheritance they follow the Minangkabau matriarchal custom. The other portion of the population, the Malays, is now very mixed in composition. They are descended from immigrants from the west coast (in the greater part of the country Minangkabau is the vernacular) and from Djohor on the other side of the straits of Malacca. It was no doubt with them that Islam came to this region.

There are said to be very old relations between Siak and Minangkabau; at the beginning of the sixteenth century Siak was under the suzerainty of the Mahara of Minangkabau who had however granted it a sultan of the Sultan of Djohor. Thus it came about that when in 1589 the Dutch East India Company opened a factory for the first time in this region, they did it on authority of a treaty with the latter Sultan. Siak may be said to have become independent in 1721 when Radja Ketjil (according to a chronicle a son of Sultan Mahmud of Djohor, according to another a Minangkabau adventurer) who, coming from Siak had at first succeeded in dethroning the reigning Sultan of Djo- hor, but was later forced to flee back to Siak where he was able to resist there against Djo- hor. Janggandaan Basar Shariff Ksaim 'Abd al-Jalil Salil Din whom since 1915 rules the country under the suzerainty of the Dutch East India Company is an indirect descendant of this Radja Ketjil.


(W. H. Rassers)

SIAM. Islam has made no converts in Siam. The Siamese of Thai (i.e. the mass of the population), Laotian, Birman and Mon origin who were long ago converted to Buddhism have remained impervious to it. Unlike what has happened in Western Indonesia, it seems that in the valley of the Mekong there is an incompatibility between the Buddhist faith and the doctrine preached by the prophet Mahammad. The Muslims in Siam consist of Malays, immigrants from Java, Afghanis and in larger numbers, Muslims from India. The majority live in Bangkok. The Muslims are the descendants of prisoners of war taken in the north in course of numerous campaigns of the Thai in the Malay Peninsula. We know that the first expedition dates from the end of the sixteenth century and is recorded in the famous inscription of Rama Katheng (cf. G. Coedès, Recueil des inscriptions du Siam, part i.; inscriptions de Sukhothai, Bangkok 1924, p. 48). Many expeditions followed and secured a considerable number of prisoners to the victors who had conquered the whole Malay Peninsula. A nautical Arabic text of the first half of the sixteenth century indeed tells us that "Singapore is the last land of Siam in the South" (cf. Gabriel Ferrand, Instructions Nautiques et Routiers Arabes et Portugais des XVIIe et XVIIIe Siecles, vol. ii., Paris 1925, folio 71 recto, l. 6).

The Javaneses, the Afghanis and other Muslims from India came to Siam to trade. In 1870 the Siam Directory mentions an appreciable number of "Muslim merchants", which had considerably increased thirty years later (cf. The Directory for Bangkok and Siam for 1898). In addition to these foreign Muslims there are a few Arabs from Basra (on the latter see the standard work by L. W. C. van den Berg, La Hagiographie et les colonies arabes dans l'archipel indien, Batavia 1886).

The Sunnis are in a minority. The majority of the Muslims in Siam follow the Shi'a. The procession of the 'Aghurra' on the 10th Muharram, in commemoration of the death of Hassan and Husain is annually celebrated. The procession of the "Aghurra" is preceded, as in Persia, by representations during the first nine days of Muharram, recalling the events that preceded the death of Husain (cf. the articles 'Ashura' and Muharram). The place where these spectacles are presented is called as in India 'ali or 'Ali (q.v.), the enclosure of the Imam.

The Muslims settled in Siam fast or rather claim to fast during the month of Ramadán, but this fast is far from being as strict as in the lands of Islam. At Bangkok the main features are the rejoicings which take place each night starting at sunset. On these occasions dates are specially eaten in memory of the Prophet, whose favourite dish they are said to have been.

The festival of 'Id-ul-Fitr or 'Id-ul-Az'ahir (q.v.) which closes the fast of Ramadán gives occasion for great feasts and rejoicings, the elements of which are borrowed from local sacrifices. The 'Id-ul-Aụshā or feast of sacrifices which takes place on the 10th Oμ 'l-Hijjâj (cf. 'Id-ul-Adha) is also celebrated with great solemnity and numerous sacrifices of animals.

The mosque of Bangkok is of comparatively recent construction. It is small, badly equipped and situated in the low quarter of the town.

The Muslims who live in Siam — one cannot talk of Muslim Siamese, since except for Malays from the Peninsula who are Siamese subjects, no one, as far as I know, has ever heard of the conversion of a Siamese Buddhist to Islam — the Siamese Muslims have become Siamesed so to speak, instead of having converted the Thai, Laotian, Birman and Mon among whom they live. In 1898, I happened to meet in Bangkok an envoy of the Shaikh al-Islam in Constantinople whose mission it was to visit all the Muslim communities of the Far East. It was the period of Sultan 'Abd al-Hamid's pan-Islamic policy and the Turkish Caliph wished to be exactly informed of the reception of the Islamic propaganda in Siam, Indo-China and China had received. The envoy arrived from China completely disillusioned and he did not conceal from me that his pretended
co-religionists in Bangkok were only Muslims in name. *Even those who profess to be Sunnis*, he added, *are regular infidels*. Indeed Islam has neither past nor present in Siam and probably no future.

The above notes are based on personal recollection and information kindly supplied to me by two confreres, Messrs. C. Otto Blagden and B. O. Cartwright, teachers of Malay and Siamese respectively at the School of Oriental Studies. So far as I know, neither old narratives nor modern works make any reference to Muslims strictly Siamese. In a letter from Fernão Mendes Pinto addressed to the Fathers of the Company of Jesus in Portugal, written at Malacca and dated December 3, 1554, he says: *But, my dear brothers, there are in this city of Sião (= Siam), the reference is to Ayuthia, the old capital* seven mosques of which the ministers (caisim) are Turks and Arabs and thirty thousand families (trinta mil fogos) of Muslims in the town which is a great shame on the soldiers of Christ!* (cf. Peregrinagem de Fernão Mendes Pinto, ed. J. J. de Brito, Lisbon, vol. iv., Lisbon 1910, p. 161). In vol. iii. of the same edition (1909, p. 37) there is also a reference to a certain Heredim Mafameido, i.e. Khaïr-al-Dîn Muhammad, a Turkish captain, who left Suez in 1538 on the Egyptian fleet sent against the Portuguese in the Indies, whose ship lost the way and landed in Tenasserim. Khaïr-al-Dîn entered the Siamese service and was employed on the Laoûds (probably Laoûs) frontier with an annual salary of 12,000 cruzados. Both these are cases of foreign Muslims who had come to Siam. It is obvious that the figure of 30,000 Muslim families living in Ayuthia in the xvi century cannot be taken literally. We shall not deal here with the Muslims from the Malay Peninsula who belong from the ethnographic, linguistic and religious point of view, if not the political, to the Malay Federated States. They should therefore be dealt with along with the latter.

(GABRIEL FERNANDO)

SIBAWAII was the personal name of the prominent grammarian of the Buddhist School whose proper name was Abu Bâhir *Amr b. 'Uthmân b. Kanbar; he was a client (muwâd) of the Arab tribe of al-Hârith b. Ka'b. This name is explained by Arabic philologists as meaning "scent of an apple", but we cannot accept this explanation as the name is never stated to have been pronounced with a diphthong, and from the analogy of many earlier names of Persians containing the end-syllable "ee" we must assert with much probability that the word was pronounced Sibâî and was a term of endearment meaning "little apple, Applechen". There is a great amount of uncertainty in the chronology of his birth and death, as well as regarding the place where he was born and died. From the most trustworthy authorities it appears that he was born in al-Balâdis, a place in the district of Shâris in the province of Fârs. He came as a youth to al-Basra and studied under the chief scholars in that city among whom al-Khalil b. Ahmad was one of the most remarkable, a man whose value to Arabic science has hardly been realised to the present day. Al-Khalil died in the year 775/791 and the earlier date given for the death of Sibawaihi is the year 777 A.D., when he is said to have been only 33 years of age, so that it may be possible that he enjoyed the teaching of al-Khalil during the last ten years of the latter's life. Ibn Khallîkân and others however have a large array of other dates. Ibn Kâmiî gives a date as early as 166 which is impossible, while other dates are 188 and 180, and Ibn al-Djawâr gives the year 194 and fixes his age at 33 years, a date which is also impossible on account of the known date of the death of al-Khalil. As regards the place where he died also a certain amount of confusion prevails, but the best authorities name the town of Sibawaih. According to the Tâhirîh Baghdîdî of al-Khalil it is stated that Ibn Duraiid asserted that he died at Shâris and that his grave is there. As Ibn Duraiid resided many years in Fârs and is by far the greatest transmitter of the sciences of the Başrians we may be safe to assume that his statement is the correct one. Sibawaihi was a most remarkable figure in Arabic learning if only for the simple reason that the work of a man who attained no great age should have been found such general acceptance, because Arabic scholars have always attached undue value to the works of men who have attained a great age. It must have been after the death of al-Khalil when Sibawaihi had his learned conference with al-Kisâiî (q.v.) in the presence of the Wâiz Yâhû b. Khalîl al-Hârithî (d. 182) on the Zurnûbiyya question in which al-Kisâiî got the better of Sibawaihi through the judgment of a Beduin, who probably was submitted for the purpose by the unscrupulous opponent. Sibawaihi received a handsome present from Yâhû, but the mortification at his defeat in the dispute was so great that he returned to his native country and never came back to 'Irâq. He is said to have died of grief.

The result of his studies Sibawaihi laid down in a large work on Arabic grammar (estimated at a thousand leaves by early biographers) which is not only the largest work of its kind which has come down to us of the activity of the Başrian school, but has ever since been the basis of all native studies in the subject and is known by the honorific title of al-Kisâiî the Booker). As stated Sibawaihi had studied under al-Khalil, but he also profited by the lectures of Yûnus b. Hâbîb, 'Ishâ b. 'Umar and Abu 'l-Kâthîr b. al-Khâfiî. Further the grammarian Abî Zâid al-Ansâri is said to have claimed that it is he whom Sibawaihi refers to when in his book he states that he learned a certain explanation from *a man on whom I can rely*. General opinion however associates with this person generally al-Khalil, and we cannot but give this general opinion more credence than isolated statements to the contrary by biographers. It proves however that the most prominent scholars were only too anxious to have their name associated with the Book. It is also fairly certain that Sibawaihi had no opportunity of teaching from his own work nor of reading it to pupils. This task was left to his teacher al-Khâfiî who after Sibawaihi's death undertook a thorough revision of the work. It was not alone among the Başrians that the Book was eagerly studied but we learn from a curious story that al-Djâhîn presented the Wâiz Ibn al-Khalîlî to a copy, which was in the hand-writing of the Wâiz of the grammarian al-Fârâbî, compared by al-Kisâiî and finally revised by the donor himself and was considered a priceless treasure. If Sibawaihi himself in speaking Arabic did so with a decided foreign accent his Book has
always been considered as a standard of good Arabic. As one of the earliest books in Arabic literature, it is in its style frequently very redundant and tiring by its prolix arguments, but it is filled with innumerable examples taken from the Koran and contains over a thousand verses taken from ancient poetry, fifty of which are by unknown poets, but they figure in later grammatical works as valid proofs on the great authority of the Book. These verses found a commendable commentator in the person of Abū Sa'īd al-Husayn b. 'Abd Allāh al-Sirafi (died 368 A.H.), who commented in a similar way on a number of the most celebrated works of the Bayanian school. After this time, commentaries on the books become very numerous and there is hardly one among the scholars who followed the Basarian school who has not either commented or added to the contents of the work. It will suffice to mention here some of the names of prominent scholars who devoted their energies upon elucidating the work: al-Mutarrad (d. 284); 'All b. Sulaiman al-Akhfash (d. 315); al-Rumami (d. 354); Iltu al-Sarrāj (d. 316); al-Zamakhshtari (d. 538); Illu al-Halidji (d. 646); Abū 'l-'Ala' al-Marjari (d. 449); and many more. The Book was studied in Spain with much eagerness and the Spaniard Abū Bakr al-Zaidati (d. 379) composed a short work al-Iltiṣar on additions of grammatical forms omitted by Shabawiti (edited by Guidi, Rome 1890); the commentary by al-'Alam has also been preserved. While in the East the Book was superseded by later and more compendious grammars, the study of Shabawiti appears to have continued in the Maghrib and though some biographers of Maghribiells tell us that al-Makki'di (d. 501) was the last who taught the Book of Shabawiti in Fāṣ, there is evidence from the lithographed editions of grammatical works of later authors in Fāṣ that the work was still eagerly studied there at a much later date and copies have been preserved in the libraries of the intellectual capital of the West.

We possess three printed editions of the work, besides fragments elucidated by European scholars, and a translation into German, of which the Cairo edition with the Commentaries of Sirafi and al-'Alam is perhaps the best, and the edition of Deroenbr dic (Les livres de Shabawiti, Paris 1853 pp.), the Calcutta edition of 1887 and the German translation by Jahn, Berlin 1894 pp., are far from being free of errors.

Bibliography: Fihrist, p. 51; Ibn Khallikān, Cairo 1310, l. 355; Zubaydī, Tabaṣṣaf; Anbardi, Nasāti, p. 71—81; Sayyūj, Baghdad, Cairo 1326, p. 356 and many other works of biography; Hādji b. Khaṣṣ al-Zanūn, Constantinople, ii. 221—283 where many commentaries are enumerated as also in Brockelmann, G. A. L., l. 100—102; Flügel, Gramm. Schulen, p. 42—45. (F. Krenkow)

SIBIR, wa-Ibir, a name for Siberia in the Mongol-period; in this form in Shihāb al-Dīn al-‘Omari (cf. Brockelmann, G. A. L., ii. 143), text in W. Tiesenhoven, Sbornik materialn., atomnykh Nakhnya i itori' Zolotoj Ordī, p. 317 at top; the same source has also Rastī Shīr or al-Sibīr (ibid., l. 6 and 221 below). More frequently Ibr-Sibīr, e.g. Rāhjī al-Dīn, Qāsim al-Tawārīkh, ed. Berezin, in Treurs Vest. Oth. Arch. Oktb., xvi. 168 (Ibr Sibīr, mentioned in connection with the Kirgiz people and the river Angara) and the Chinese Yīnshī (lit. Sibīr, quoted in Bretschneider, Med. Renaissance etc., ii. 88; cf. also ibid., p. 37). The same expression was heard in the beginning of the xvth century by Johann Schiltberger, who reproduces it in the form Bišibar or Bišibar (Montags und Travels; Hakluyt Society, London 1879, p. 174). The texts in which this expression occurs, are collected by Quatremère (Histoire des Mongols de la Perse par Rashid-al-Dīn, p. 413 sqq.), who sees in it (probably wrongly) an echo of the old names of two peoples, the Avar (Avars) and Sahīr (in Ma’sūfī, Ta’ārikh, ed. de Goeje, p. 53, 16; Sahīr; this is said to be the same the Khamars gave themselves).

[W. Barthold]

SIBERIA. [See den AL-BAWAWI, AL-MĀHSUDĪ, AL-TAWĀRĪKH.]

SICILY. In the history of Sicily is to be found in miniature the story of Western civilisation. It lies at the heart of the Mediterranean, and it lies likewise at the heart of medieval warfare, commerce and culture. The great movements of Phoenicians, Greeks, Romans, and Muslims met and fought their battles there, and there all of them have perished. The earliest days are clouded in the fusion of Sicels and Sicani, in the settlements of the merchants of Phoenicia on the promontories and along the sea-coast. A new era dawns when the Greek City States stretch forth their hands for new territory and settle at Naxus (735 B.C.), Corycyra and Syracuse (734). The process of colonisation was steadily forward for centuries, and the Greek element in the island became strong. At the opening of the Peloponnesian War (427) it seemed that Athens’ dream of Sicilian conquest was to be. The result, however, was neither the victory of Athens, nor the tyranny of Corinth, but the spread of classic culture. Meanwhile Hannibal was displaying his Phoenician prowess. In 406 he reduced Selinus and Himera and returned to his base at Catathage. Thus that rivalry began between Greece and Carthage, which alone was to signalise the story of the island for several centuries. Dionsius I and II, Dion, Timoleon and Agathocles, Pyrrhus and Hiero II, were all to rule under the constant terror of Semitic onslaughts, and not until Rome dealt the death-blow to African rivalry did Sicily enjoy peace. And yet through all this long period the genius of civilisation was displayed in the harbours of Syracuse, the amaranths of Tauromenium, the temples of Selinus, and the boculges of Theocritus. And even when Greece and Carthage had gone down before Rome, there still fed Sicily the Hellenic spirit. Although the yoke of Rome was not oppressive, yet the slave element in the island was so large, partly through her unique history and partly through the Roman demand for corn from her fields, that revolts broke out in 153 and 102 B.C. Rome, however, fell before Vandal and Goth, and Sicily was doomed to taste alike the barbarism of the one and the unexpected toleration of the other. Yet Bellarius was still to appear and restore Roman power and with the levithy of Roman decadence.

Meanwhile a great movement had been afoot in Arabia, which, if heralded by religious crises, was to lead to the overflow of a racial basin, and the bursting of the banks of an ethnic river. Muhammad died in 632, but his politically-religious crusade went on. In Syria under the sway of Mawiyah the Muslim arms penetrated to Alexandria, where the Byzantine navy was crushed (654), and maritime power was placed in Arab hands. In the same year
was launched the first attack on Sicily, and although no Arabic historian has recorded it, the testimony of Theophanes is enough. The Exarch Olympus defended the island, but the plunderers secured their booty, and sailed off for Damascuse, with ships laden with treasures of flesh and blood, silver and gold. They returned to taste the sweets of Syracuse, which they ravaged and sacked. These, however, were merely sporadic efforts out of the plenitude of martarian strength. There was nothing determined or political in them. The days of Umaiyyad strength passed and it was from another quarter than Syria that the power of Islam spoke; and yet the instincts of Arab and Berber found a new outlet in the islands of the Mediterranean. From the days of Mass onwards the Corsairs harassed all these parts, and cast a paralyzing fear over the islands of Corinca, SarDIM and Sicily. In 705 Syracuse was again plundered, this time by Africans, who time and again throughout the century returned to their quarry and made definite efforts on the island. So troublesome did these become that the patrician Gregory thought he did well in securing a treaty with the Saracens in 813 for ten years, which pact they honourably observed. But the prize was far too glittering. The request for help which came from Euphemius of Syracuse against Michael the Stammerer in 827 was a timely pretext for a thorough invasion. Ziyadat Allah, the Aghlabid of Kairawan, sent off his hundred vessels from Susa on the thirteenth of June, and the real conquest of Sicily began. Euphemius disappears from the scene, and the Saracen alone leads the pageant of the next few centuries.

A'ad a Bethor commanded a motley expedition. The unamiable spirits of the Kairawan court were driven into squads drawn from Venece and Khorasan, from Syria and Maghrib, soldiers of fortune all. They attacked and reduced the first town on the island, Mazara. Then they tested their strength against Syracuse, but pestilence wrought its havoc and robbed them even of their commander. Affairs at home were in real peril. No Khalid appeared among them to inspire victory. The siege had to be abandoned. Their gloom turned to despair, however, when they saw their escape cut off by the Greek fleet, and they had to make off for the mountains and fortify themselves in the town of Mineo. There they remained until a fleet of Spanish adventurers appeared and supplied them with provisions and the needs of war. But the court at Kairawan was now secure and still unsatisfied with conquest, sent off a great fleet of three hundred ships, with 20,000 men. Led by Asbagh, they besieged and captured Ghalgullia, where plague again achieved what Sicilian arms found impossible. Other enterprises, however, succeeded on the island. A division concentrated on Palermo and brought it to surrender. This with many smaller towns marked a real advance in Muslim conquest. It gave a very important vantage point for further subjugation. It provided a seat for the Amr. It definitely established the hold of the Saracens over Sicily. Indeed it made the attackers feel so sure of their new possession that they turned to challenging themselves, and that story of Sicilian schism begins which haunts the Islam administration to the very end. The Spanish and African elements in the adventure maintained a constant friction, and even this was vitiated by the distinction of Yemenite and Umaiyyad, Persian and Berber. By 840 a third of the island was under Muslim rule. Soon Napoleon asked aid, and the Arabian war-cry echoed on the slopes of Vesuvius, the plains of Calabria and the waters of the Adriatic. In 846 even Rome was threatened by the squadron of the Muslim, and its gates were menaced by plunderers, who, unable to penetrate, gave what remained without to the sword and violence and sacrilege. The churches of Saint Peter and Saint Paul were not only destroyed but desecrated. But another expedition was still to come from Kairawan. In 875 Djalfar led a well-equipped force against Syracuse, and after a three years' siege and civilisation's past, fell to the invader. The same tale of pillage follows, and follows also the passion and the jealousy, the faction and the dissension. Yet this victory gave a new charter to the plunderer, nor were the dukes of Spoleto and Tuscany innocent of sharing in the spoil. So complete in fact was the mastery of the Aghlabid that Pope John VIII deemed it wiser to pay tribute for two years. The Crescent had indeed eclipsed the Cross.

There still remained a few towns that had not bowed the knee. Along the coast the power of the Saracens was unable to subdue every place, and even within the large centres such as Palermo rebellion raised its head. In 900 serious insurrections troubled the peace of the capital. But darker still were the signs within the Muslim camp. What before had only been loud murmurers or covert moves, became now civil wars. Idrishim appeared himself in Sicily to vindicate his name, and under the spell of his presence Taurumien and Rametta fell (908), but his death only heralded another internecine strife and prevented the settlement of Eastern Sicily. It was with a sigh of relief that the Muslims completed their treaty with the emperor Constantine Porphyrogennitus in 936, and when they had retaken Taurumien in 953 and Rametta in 993, the race of the Muhammadan in Sicily had been run. For 138 years he had been struggling for the mastery of the island, and for 73 more he was to enjoy it. Throughout all this period there streamed into Sicilian minds and hearts the culture of the East, and blended there with the precious heritage of Greeks and Romans. The clash of mind with mind produced a type of life unparalleled in history. There was here all the mysticism of the East, all the beauty of the Greek and all the urge and activity of the Latin. Toleration was the only path to peace, and the Sicilian march if along no other road was certainly along the path of toleration.

After seventeen years of quiet the enemy knocked again at Sicilian gates, but Otto II, with a Western Empire behind him, had to retire discomfited from the fight. Only when the Eastern Emperor Basil II called his scattered forces together in 1027, for a final rush on the harassing landlords of his dominions, did success come within sight. Although he saw not the end of his work, his subordinates Manasses carried forward the scheme of conquest. Profiting by the disaffection of Abu 'T-Afar, he carried victory at every step for four years, and by 1042 Messana, Syracuse and many other cities were under Christian overlordship. Recalled however to satisfy domestic fears, Manasses had to leave his work uncompleted, and soon the Muslim had recovered ground. It seemed that the Empire could not rise
to the challenge of the invader. But in 1069 the hour struck and the man appeared. Messana still struggling against the doom of Saracen capture, appealed to the Norman Count Roger of Hauteville. Strong in the possession of Italy, the Norman had been but waiting his time for seizing the island beyond. He responded to the call of the citizens, captured the city, and constituted it the capital of his kingdom. By 1071 Palermo had fallen, and in 1072 Taranto was wrenched from Muslim hands. In 1085 Syracuse was won. Malta which had been taken by the Saracens in 570 was retaken by Roger in 1090, and thus was completed in a few years the whole conquest of Sicily. Norman rule prevailed over the whole island. Norman lords occupied the palaces, Norman troops commanded the forts. It seemed that all the glory that had been won was gone.

And yet right at the heart of the Norman conquest the Arab culture found its life-blood. Hitherto in the welter of bloodshed and unchecked rapine, they had forgotten the finer arts of peace, but now when events drove them in upon themselves they discovered the treasures of their literature and poetry, their law and their science. Not only were they now freed from fighting; they were definitely protected by Roger, who, unperturbed even in his Christianity, encouraged the men of Islam to cultivate their arts if not to advance their faith. He was even accused of being a Muslim himself. Being himself uncultured he saw the greatness of Arabian genius and learning with unsealed eyes, and he refused to crush its spirit. He gave full liberty to the Muhammadans to follow their religion, and even permitted Christians proselytizing among them. Under the Norman feudal system he made the yoke rest lightly on their necks. He maintained the Muslim system of administration, and even the same Muslim officials continued to act under him. The merchants of Palermo are said to have been mainly Muhammadan under Norman domination, and his best financiers were certainly of that faith. The land was entirely under the cultivation of the Moors, who in Spain had shown how skilfully they could make the land yield its best fruits. Papyrus, sugar-cane, flax, olives were all grown in abundance on the island. Where water was scarce great irrigating systems were laid down, and every part of the island utilized. It is said that in the Valley of Mazara no fewer than two million people lived at this period. The science of Medicine was cultivated also and the court of Roger was notable no less for the skill than for the number of its physicians. The Arabic language flourished there as the principal means of communication, and it was also the official tongue. There the Golden Odes and Romances, redolent of Arabian deserts, resounded with delight and charm in the ear of Greek and Norman. There the masterpieces of Plato and Aristotle were translated. There the Arab ideals of chivalry, permeating as they do every one of their romances, set Roger's court along a new line of European adventure, destined to add lustre to his name and dynasty.

None saw more clearly than Roger the greatness of his Sicilian prize, and well did he guard it both from political intrigue and religious rivalry, but the day soon dawned when his sons despised their birthright, and gradually Muslim thought, language, science and culture sank into disrepute and finally into oblivion. Yet so long as Greek and Saracen were protected and favoured, so long was Sicily the most brilliant of European kingdoms.

Biography: The best modern authority is Michele Amari, Storia dei Musulmani di Sicilia, 1854, 3 vols., and Biblioteca arabo-sicula nella roccolta di testi arabi che incompa la geografia, storia, biografia e la bibliografia della Sicilia, 1857—Consult also Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, vol. vi, Bayly's Edition; S. V. Scott, History of the Moris Empire in Europa, 1904, 3 vols.; Idris, Nof al-Maghrib, ed. and transl. by Dory and de Boeze, 1866; Ibn al-Atlir, al-Kamil, ed. Tornberg and also Fargan's selection of the occidental passages; Ibn Battuta, Paris, 1912 (C. Crouzine Cazou)

**At-Sid**, Spanish el-Cid, the Cid, the name by which the most celebrated and the most popular of the heroes of Castilian chivalry is known. He played a preponderating political part in Muslim Spain of the second half of the eleventh century, and we can now gain an idea of his real personality by removing all the legendary matter that has grown up around his life and his exploits. It is to the Dutch scholar R. Dory, that the honour is due of having established, as a result of his examination in 1844 of the manuscript of the Lhobhar of Ibn Bassam preserved in Zigha, that the story of the Cronica General of Alphonso the Wise relating to the Cid, which up till then had been considered a pure invention, is really translated from the Arabic, and probably from a copy of the Valencian Muhammad b. Khalid b. 'Alkama 428—508). The Cid is called the Bayam al-dawlah b. l-mawlos al-fiddah (cf. also F. Pons Boigues, Ensayo bio-bibliografico p. 176, No. 140) and that it is contemporary with the Cid. This historian was thus able to base his reconstruction of the biography of the Cid on solid and authentic foundations and to show, by a series of careful deductions, how all the romantic alterations in his story had arisen which had long been considered worthy of belief and had given birth to the legendary Cid of poetry and of the theatre.

This knight who was called Rodrigo Diaz da Vivar, was descended from a noble Castilian family and was born at Burgos during the first half of the 11th century. It has not been possible to fix the exact year in which he was born, but it was in 1026 according to some, 1040 according to others. It is known that in 1064 he distinguished himself on the side of Sancho II of Castile in a war which this sovereign waged against Sancho of Navarre. He defeated at this time a knight of Navarre in single combat and the success stood him in good stead in the Castilian army, whose commander-in-chief he became (or the "Standard-bearer of the King") with the title of Campeador (Latin Comitator written by the Arabs as abhambagyar, the equivalent of the Spanish Arabic mugher or barray, "the champion who comes out of the ranks, when two armies are ranged against one another, to challenge an enemy to single combat"). A short time afterwards he was taken to the counsels of Rodrigo Diaz, Sancho II made himself master of the Kingdom of Leon by taking his own brother Alphonso prisoner at Burgos. The latter was able to flee to the Muslim king,
of Toledo al-Mu'tamid, of the dynasty of the Banu Dhu 'l-Nu'man. On October 7, 1077, Sancho of Castile was killed before Zamora, which he was besieging. The principal Castilian knights then assembled at Burgos in order to elect a new sovereign. Reluctantly their choice fell upon Alfonso, King of León, the refugee at Toledo, but they determined to make him take an oath that he had had no share in the murder of Sancho. It was Rodrigo Diaz who took this oath from Alfonso VI in the Church of Santa Agueda or Gadea of Burgos. The new king of Castile always secretly felt a grudge against his human master, but swore this oath, but in order to conciliate the knights, then very influential, and to attach them to him he gave him his cousin Jimena (Chimene) Diaz, the daughter of the Count of Oviedo, in marriage (1074). Some years later Alfonso VI sent him to the 'Abbasid dynasty of Seville, al-Mu'tamid (see the article SEVILLE), in order to collect the tribute, which this Muslim prince paid in return for a nominal alliance with Castile. He was not able to prevent an encounter between the 'Abbasid troops and those of the Zirid king of Granada 'Abd Allah b. Badis; the battle took place at Cabrera. Rodrigo took an effective part and made several Christian knights prisoners, allies of the Zirid prince, amongst them a prince of the blood, Count García Ordóñez, whom soon after he restored his liberty. He himself returned to Castile, after successfully attaining the real aim of his mission. Alfonso VI, probably at the instigation of García Ordóñez, then accused Rodrigo Diaz of having appropriated a part of the presents which had been given to him at Seville to bring to the king, and he took advantage of the first opportunity — the expedition against the Muslims of Toledo undertaken without his consent — to disgrace him and to banish him from his dominions (1081).

It is from this time that the life of a "condottiere" led by the Castilian knight dates, that he began to fight, as occasion arose, the Muslims or his own co-religionists, on behalf of a third person or on his own behalf.

After an unsuccessful attempt to be taken into the service of the Count of Barcelona, Rodrigo Diaz offered his services to the Húdíd dynasty of Saragossa [q.v.], Ahmad b. Sulaimán al-Mu'tamid. The latter agreed to take him into his army with his mercenaries. He died in the same year and his son Yúsuf al-Mu'tamid succeeded him at Saragossa, while his other son al-Mundhir received Denia, Tortosa and Lerida. The two brothers lost no time in going to war with one another. Rodrigo Diaz continued in the service of al-Mu'tamid while al-Mundhir made an alliance with the King of Aragon, Sancho Ramirés, and with the Count of Barcelona, Ramon Berenguer II. Rodrigo Diaz soon won a great victory over the enemies of his master in spite of their numerical superiority, near the stronghold of Altamor, somehow in the north-west of Lerida, took rich plunder and made prisoner the Count of Barcelona, whose liberty he granted restored soon after. He made a triumphal entrance into Saragossa where the Húdíd ruler overwhelmed him with presents and with honours. He had acquired at one stroke prestige and an ascendancy without parallel among his Muslim soldiers who from this time began to call him "my master", sayyid, vizig. Sp. abd, which was translated into Spanish in the form of "el Cid" (the famous poem of the Cid was originally called "El Cantar de mio Cid"); and soon this name prevailed (with or without the employment of the possessive). Rodrigo Diaz, thanks to his military talents, had become in the eyes of the Muslims of Spain a champion and an irresistible leader in war, el Cid Campeador.

In 1084, after an ephemeral reconciliation with Alfonso VI, the Cid covered himself with glory once more in Aragon in the service of al-Mu'tamid. When this prince died in the following year, he passed into the services of his son and successor Almu'ad al-Mu'tamid II and from that date he decided to conquer the Muslim kingdom of Valencia.

This independent principality which the grandson of the celebrated hajjaj, al-Mansur, the 'Amirid 'Abd al-'Aziz, had founded on the fall of the Umayyad Caliphate of Cordova, had been united in 1065 to the kingdom of Toledo. When the Dhu'l-Nu'man prince Yahya b. Isma'il al-Kairir in the year 1074 ascended the throne in succession to his grandfather al-Mu'umin, he appointed Abu Bakr b. 'Abd al-'Aziz governor of Valencia, who almost immediately declared his independence and allied himself with Alfonso II of Castile. But in the year 1085, the latter without scruple sold Valencia to al-Kairir who had been deprived of it ten years before and now gave his capital Toledo to the Christian king in exchange. The Muslim prince aided by a body of Castilian troops under the command of the General Alvar Faíes was able to make his entry into Valencia without striking a blow but he very soon alienated the whole population of the town. When the Almoravid Sultan Yúsuf b. Tâhfin landed in Spain to fight against the Christians and put them to rout at Zallâga (October 23, 1086) Alfonso VI recalled Alvar Faíes from Valencia; and al-Kairir before the repeated attacks of al-Mundhir, prince of Tortosa, had to appeal for help to the King of Castile, and to al-Mu'tamid of Saragossa. The latter saw in this a good opportunity to deprive al-Kairir of his kingdom, and secretly entered into an agreement with the Cid to seize the town, all the booty to go to the condottiere. But the latter, mindful of the gifts which al-Kairir had bestowed upon him, refused to touch the town and sent a new token of his vassalage to Alfonso. Therefore with his army he made incursions into the whole district of Valencia, and in the year 1089, returned to Castile where he was received with honour by his sovereign. Then he regained the east of Andalucía with his army, numbering 7,000 men.

Profiting by the absence of the Cid, al-Mu'tamid of Saragossa had made an alliance with Berenguer of Barcelona, who was besieging Valencia. The Count of Barcelona retreated before the Cid, who promised al-Kairir, in return for a payment of ten thousand dinars a month, to hold but not put to flight against all enemy attempts. A short time afterwards Alfonso asked the Cid to come to his assistance against Yúsuf b. Tâhfin, and finding that his vassal did not hasten to join him, he quarrelled with him once more. Then the Cid, like a regular independent bandit chief, ravaged with fire and sword the whole eastern country from Orthaelsa to Játiva, marched against Tortosa, defeated the Count of Barcelona, and concluded a treaty with
him. Soon afterwards the Muslim princes of Tortosa once more sought his protection. He granted it in return for the payment of regular tribute. At this time, besides the sums which he received from the Court of Barcelona and the Muslim princes of Tortosa and Valencia, the Cid had also amongst his tributaries the Arab lords of Alfaracín (al-Sahla), of Alpuente (al-Dini), of Murviendo (Marbajar too-day called Segunto), of Segorfa (Shuribr), of Jerica (Shitika) and of Almenara.

However the quarrel between the Cid and Alfonso VI became more bitter and the King of Castile to put an end to the growing influence of his too powerful vassal, decided to deprive him of Valencia. Strong in the alliance of the Pisana and the Genoese, he came to besiege the town by land and by sea, while the Cid was engaged in helping the Muslim King of Saragossa against the Christian King of Aragon. Informed of what was taking place the Cid left Saragossa with his army and laid waste the country of Najera and of Calahorra, the particular chief of his sworn enemy García Ordóñez. The town of Logroño in the Rioja was completely destroyed by him and Alfonso VI had to raise the siege of Valencia without attaining any success.

During his absence, the Cid left at Valencia a Muslim lieutenant, Ibn al-Farajji, at the court of al-Kadi. The latter, in November 1092, was killed after a rising of the population incited by the kadi Ibn Djahhaf, who placed himself at the head of the city as president of the Valencian republic (dimmat), with a purely nominal representative of the Almoravid government at his side. Some months later, in July 1093, the Cid marched on the capital with the whole of his army, seized without difficulty the suburbs of Villanueva and of al-Kadiya, and agreed to make terms with Ibn Djahhaf, while maintaining a strict blockade of the town. Valencia now endured the most terrible privations and famine soon decimated the inhabitants. Compelled by these circumstances, the chief of the Valencian republic was forced to surrender the town to the Cid on the 15th June 1094. The Cid then took no harm to the population, which gave him proof of the respect which it had for him, and showed a real respect for its master. But the latter did not hesitate to burn alive a short time after the former president, Ibn Djahhaf, as a punishment.

From this time the Cid was absolute master of Valencia. After having, by a decisive sortie, put an end to an attempted siege by an Almoravid army, he henceforth thought only of extending his domains. In the year 1098 he had conquered Almenara and Murviendo. But he was growing old and felt that his career was coming to an end. He could hardly desire anything more. He had turned into a church the great mosque of Valencia and restored the bishopric of the town, which he gave to Jerome of Perigord. At last he was quite resigned. Alfonso VI of Castile, and he was allied to two royal houses of the Peninsula, through the marriages of his daughters, Maria with Ramon Berenguer III, and Christina with the son of Navarre Ramiro. He then tried to take Jativa (Shitika, q.v.) from the Almoravids but his army was routed. The Cid full of wrath and broken-hearted by this disaster succumbed not long after in the middle of 1099.

After the death of the Cid, his widow Jimena resisted, for about two years, the incessant attacks of the Almoravids. Valencia was besieged at the end of the year 1101 by the Lantul general al-Mahdali. It sustained the siege for seven months but on the advice of Alfonso VI, who had come to relieve it, Jimena decided to evacuate Valencia, which she ordered to be burned on her departure. When the Almoravid troops entered it, on the 28th May 1102, they found nothing but ruins. Jimena transported the body of the Cid to Castile; it was buried near Burgos, in the convent of San Pedro de Cardeña. Jimena herself buried there when she died five years later in the year 1104.


A complete European bibliography of the Cid is found in B. Sanchez Alonso, Encyclopédie de la history espagnole, Madrid, 1919, Nos. 648 to 683. Cf. also the recent work of A. González Palacios, Historia de la España musulmana, Barcelona 1925, p. 75—77.

E. LEVI-Provençal.

AL-SHIDIK (probably the Aramaic 'âydî), surname of the first cafîl Abû Bâkî, means "the eminently veracious" and he "who always accepts, or confirms, the truth". According to Ibn Ishaq, Abû Bâkî received this surname because when the Muslims' faith in Muhammad had been shaken by his account of the murâqâ, Abû Bakr testified that the Prophet's description of Jerusalem was strictly truthful, thereby restoring their belief in him. Another tradition relates that Muhammad had complained to Gabriel of his people's lack of faith; the Archangel replied: "Abû Bâkî believes in thee (yusul-'îdabaka), for he is al-shidîk".

The saying: mu-la-ilâha éfi'a Îbî, wâlî-muqaddasa 'ibî, in Sâma., 35, which has been rendered: "But he who brought the truth and he who accepted it as the truth", is referred, in a tradition attributed to 'Ali b. Abî Tâlib, to Muhammad and Abû Bakr respectively; this explanation seems to owe something to the last-named's surname.

In the Qur'ân the epithet al-shidîk is given only to Joseph (xii. 46), in the sense of veracious. Shidîk, in conjunction with muqadda, is applied to Idris (xix. 57) and Abraham (xx. 42); the virgin Mary is called sîdîka (v. 79), and true belivers in general are called al-shidîkân (xiii. 18 and iv. 18).

Those who claim descent from Abû Bakr are usually styled al-Bakri al-shidîk; when only one
of these assāl is used for brevity's sake, al-Šiddīqī is preferred.

Bibliography: Iba Hishām, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 204; Tabarī, ed. de Goeje, l. 1835; Ibn Sa'id, Ṣaḥāḥ, III, 1; Lane, Lexicon, iv. 1667; a and 1668, b, c, Barbor de Meynard, Sarchem et tabebixan dans la litterature arabe, in J. A. series 10, x. 62; J. Horovitz, Koranische Untersuchungen, Berlin and Leipzig 1826, p. 49; Frankel, De vocabulis in omni. cærm. arabi et in Corana perserizin, Leyden 1880, p. 20.

(Al-Vacca)

šiddīq Hasan Ḵān, al-Kanawdji, Sayyid Abū ʿl-Ṭayyib, Nawwāb Amir al-Mulk wa-l-Dīn Bihādīr, an Indian scholar, born at Barāʾ (Barailly) U.P. on Sunday, 19th Dhu al-Muḥādhir 1, 1248 (14th October 1832), the youngest son of Sayyid Awdīl Ḵān Ḵān of Kanawdji U.P. and his wife Nadīr bint al-Ḵayr of Barailly. He was a descendent of Ḥīṣāl al-Dīn Ḫānān Ḫānān (d. 755 = 1354), whose grandfather Sayyid Bihādīr came to India from Bihādīr and settled in the city of Barailly. When a young man he entered the Civil Service of Bihādīr and married the daughter of the then Minister of Bihādīr, Djamāl al-Dīn Ḵān (1821); he became the second husband of the Bāgum of Bihādīr (1870) and took part in the government of the State. He was active in furthering Arabic and Muslim studies and published a large number of works. His son Nawwāb Sayyid ʿAbdul Ḵān published a full biography of the scholar entitled, Maʿṭākh-i Sīddīqī in which (Part iv., appendix) he gives a list of 222 works (74 in Arabic, 45 in Persian, 103 in Urdu; they include 25 not yet published. Van Dyke's attack on him is not justified, Ṣīdīq Ḵān died in Bihādīr on the 20th February 1890.


(A. Siddiqi)

šiddīqī, a mysterious word in the Kurʾān, Sūra xx. 104: "The day in which we shall fold the sky as al-ṣīdīqī to the books." Derived from sigillum through σίγλην, the word is used in Arabic for written statements of contracts, records of a sīl in which his sentences are written, and, in general, writing, scroll or roll for writing upon or written upon. Lexicographers and commentators of the Kurʾān, while recognizing the word as foreign, have ascribed it either to Abyssinian or to Persian, one or both of these languages being usually made responsible for such like strange words; they have also tried to deduce its meaning from the Kurʾānic context, thus interpreting it as the name of an angel, who folds the written statements of men's works, or of a scribe of Muhammad's, or of mean men in general in the Abyssinian language. Such scribes or angels, al-Ṭabarī observes, are not mentioned anywhere, while sigillum in the sense of written document is well known in Arabic. The words that follow: ʿl-ḥurūb stand, according to al-Ṭabarī, for ʿala ʿl-kurūb.

Bibliography: Lane, Lexicon; al-Ṭabarī, Taḥfīz, Cairo 1328, ed. l. xii, p. 57; al-Suyūṭī, K. al-Maḥāna, Cairo 1318, ed. l. i, p. 139; Du Cange, Glossarium Mahon of infima Latinimata, s. v. sigillum; Frankel, De vocabulis in omni. cærm. arabi et in Corana perserizin, Leyden 1880, p. 17.

(Al-Vacca)
SIDJILMÄSA (the forms SidiJal- and -malas are also found), an ancient town of Morocco now in ruins, which was the capital of Tafillalt. It was built about 200 miles S.S.E. of Fas, on the outskirts of the Saharan, on the left bank of the Wadi Zir, 34° 80' N. Latitude N. and 7° 31' West Long.

Sidjilmása was probably founded in ancient times. It is not however necessary to heed the local tradition recorded by Leo Africanus, according to which the town was founded by Alexander (s= Tho I-Karmain) as a home for the sick and crippled in his army. But in the same author has preserved another tradition attributing its foundation to a Roman general who, starting from Mauritania, conquered the whole of Numidia and pushed on as far as Masa, a town of Sis on the Atlantic; it was at this time that he founded the town of Sidjillum more (≈ Massae), thus called because it was the seal of his victory. In this legend we have a distant memory of the Roman expeditions of Suetonius Paulinus and of Hasidus Geta (in the year 41 A.D. to the South of the Moroccan Atlas).

It is possible that it may even, if the town had actually an earlier existence it was completely in ruins at the time of the arrival of the Muslims, since al-Bakri tells us that Sidjilmása was founded in the year 140 (757—758) and that its development brought about the decline of the neighbouring towns of Tadgha and of Ziz. Its foundation was the work of the rebel Miknas Berbers who had adopted the heretical customs of the Sufiyas [q.v.] and had made themselves independent of the Arab governors of al-Kairawán.

Beginning with 155 (771—772), the town and its territory were governed by the Miknas dynasty of the Banu Midrā; the latter attained its apogee with Muhammad b. al-Fath b. Mainim b. Midrā, named sultan al-Shakkir Il Ithāth who returned to orthodoxy, took the title of Amir al-Muminin, and had coins struck in his own name (H. Lavoix, Cat. des Manusc. Muséum. de la Bibl. Nat., 1891, p. 401—402). He was made prisoner by the Ubaidi, general Djawhar, when in the year 347 (958—959) the latter besieged and captured Sidjilmása. In the course of time other Banu Midrā regained the government of the town, but in the year 366 (976—977) they were finally dispossessed by Kharrūn b. Falfal al-Maghrawi who, at the head of the Zanāta Berbers, was fighting on behalf of the Umayyad sovereign of Cordova.

Kharūn and after him his descendants were at first simply the governors of Sidjilmása on behalf of the Umayyads of Cordova; then after the downfall of the latter they declared themselves independent and founded the dynasty of the Banu Kharūn. But their tyranny and their impiety forced the inhabitants of the town to call to their aid Abd Allāh b. Yāṣun, the promoter of the Almoravid movement, who in the year 447 (1055—1056) seized Sidjilmása; where he massacred all the Maghrībis whom he found there.

This was the end of the independence of Sidjilmása and henceforth the town and its territory were always, theoretically at least, a dependency of the empire of Morocco; but on account of its eccentric situation on the edge of the desert, it was at all times a hotbed of sedition and of revolts provoked, sometimes by the local governments desirous of making themselves independent, sometimes by the turbulent Arab tribes of the neighbourhood, sometimes even by the inhabitants weary of the exactions of the central power and always ready to support its enemies, the kings of Tlemcen or pretenders belonging to the reigning family.

In 541 (1146—1147) on the fall of the Almoravid dynasty, the inhabitants of Sidjilmása took the side of the agitator Muhammad b. Hādī al-Khālī who had already stirred up the Šāhs and the Darā; but he was crushed by the Almohad chief Abū Ḥaṣan who then took possession of the town.

In the year 640 (1242—1245) the Almohad governor of Sidjilmása, Abū Allāh b. Zakārīya al-Khaṣrājī delivered over the town to the Ḥafid princes Abū Ḥaṣan, who had just seized Tlemcen, but the Almohad Sulṭan Abūl Saʿīd recaptured the place.

In the year 653 (1255—1256) the Marinid prince Abū Yaḥyā b. Abū al-Hāṣik took possession of Sidjilmása. But as early as 655 (1257—1258) a section of the inhabitants asked the Abū al-Wād of Tlemcen, Yaghmūrūsān to come and occupy it. Abū Yaḥyā, warned in time, came and took possession of the place which Yaghmūrūsān could only besiege without result.

In the year 657 (1258—1259) the Marinid governor al-Kīrīnī made himself independent; but the people rebelled against him and appealed to the Almohads.

In the year 660 (1261—1262) the Marinid troops came to besiege Sidjilmása without success. Later, under the pressure of the Arab tribe of the Munābbat, the inhabitants recognised the authority of Yaghmūrūsān. But when the Sulṭan Yaḥyā b. Abū al-Hāṣik had won the whole of the Magrib for the Marinids he went to attack Sidjilmása, at the siege of which artillery was employed for the first time in Morocco; the town was taken in Safar 673 (August—September 1274). The Abū al-Wād of Tlemcen, the garrison as well as the chiefs of the Munābbat, were massacred and the inhabitants reduced to slavery.

From this event dates the decline of Sidjilmása. Its name is often found mentioned in the history of the civil wars of Morocco and it seems to have had to suffer greatly from the oppression of the neighboring Arab tribes, especially those of the Abūlāh. Ibn Būṭās, who visited Sidjilmása in 752 (1351—1352) says that it is amongst the most beautiful of towns. But Leo Africanus, who spent six months in this district in the first part of the 14th century says that after a raiding of the people, who had killed the governor, the town was entirely destroyed and the inhabitants retreated into the country or into castles (<b>ajūr</b>) where they lived, some of them independent, others tributaries of the Arabs. Thus we must not be led astray by modern Moroccan historians who frequently use Sidjilmása for the "district of Sidjilmása" or of "Tafillalt".

For the last times Sidjilmása appeared in history when in the first half of the 16th century on account of the fall of the Almoravid dynasty of the Saṭāras, the Shurafa' made themselves independent and founded the present dynasty of the Alawīs or Fīlās (cf. Fīlās, SHORR). The Arab geographers have given us a glowing picture of the Sidjilmása of the Middle Ages. Situated in the middle of a plain, fertile because
well watered, it was surrounded by gardens and orchards which stretched along the Wādī Zīr for more than four parasangs from the town. There grew in abundance the most delicious varieties of grapes and dates which alone furnished the bulk of the food of the inhabitants; cereals grew very well there and gave harvests for three consecutive years without the necessity of removing. The crops of the neighbourhood included in addition cotton, emir, caraway, and ḍanā' which were exported into the whole of the Maghrib. As peculiar to the town, the Arab authors point out that flies are not found there, but dogs are eaten as well as a kind of fat lizard (būrdān) and that the inhabitants for the most part suffered from opthalmia. The only notable industry was the preparation of a magnificent material made from a very fine wool which the women excel in knitting. The town, well peopled and very extensive, was composed of strong castles, buildings and of houses each built in the middle of a garden. Its situation at the gate of the Jāfarīh made Siqīlima a very suitable starting point for caravans going to the land of the negroes, especially to Qādis or returning from there. Dates were the principal article of export; slaves were brought from the Sādān, gold dust, ivory and hides.

The people of the town did not content themselves with doing a thriving trade at home; they went themselves to the Sādān and showed great hardihood in their journeys. From Siqīlima several routes led to the chief centres of North Africa, Dar'a, Aghmīr Warika, Fās, Tāhābīr (part of the Nadānīm district), Ujdā, Timelcn and even to Cairo, by the desert and the Bāhās. Siqīlima with Fās was one of the two great centres for Moroccan pilgrims to assemble, going to the Hijāz and their inhabitants often supplied the amir rikāb al-qādiri. This is how it came about that one of them, at the beginning of the Mamlūk dynasty, having had occasion to go this country several times to the Hijāz became acquainted with the amir al-Hassan b. Khāsim at Yārib al-Nakhl b. Ḥasanid sharif, whom he asked to return with him to Siqīlima so that by the help of his baraka the fruit of the palm-trees of the town could attain maturity. The sharif accepted, arrived at Siqīlima in 664 (1265-1266) and became the ancestor of the ‘Aṣyrīs [q. v.] siqīlimisīyūn, who gave Morocco the dynasty which reigned from 1075 (1664).

At the present day the ruins of Siqīlima, visited by René Callièr in 1828, then by Rohlfis in 1864 and by W. Harris in 1893-1894, are euphemistically called by the natives al-masad ʿDīmāra, “the inhabited town”, and lie along the east bank of the Wādī Zīr for about 5 parasangs; there is nothing left but one minaret still standing, in a bridge across the Zīr, and enormous masses of clay walls everywhere somewhat ruined.


European authors: Gerhard Rohlfis, Reise durch Marokko, Bremen 1868, p. 61; W. B. Harris, Taftās, 1895, pp. 239, 261—267, 273—275, 283—285; E. Mercier, Siqīlima selon les auteurs arabes, R. A. 1867, p. 233, 274. (Georges S. Colín)

SIDON, the celebrated town of ancient Phoenicia, the name of which is found as early as the Tell Amarna tablets in the form Sūdūn, played only a modest part in the Muslim world. The Arabs call it Sādā. According to Bahāqārī, it was taken without difficulty by Yazūb b. Abī Safyūr; the future Caliph Mu‘āwiya commanding the advance-guard on this occasion. This text must have been about 637 A.D. The Arab geographers tell us very little about Sādā. They mention that it belonged to the administrative district of Damascus, Khāṣma observes that it was the military harbour of this region and Muṣḥaṣdaš also mentions that it was fortified. Iblī Khordādībīh says that the road from Antioch to Gaza touched the town. According to Ibn al-Fakhrī, Sādā was one of the most marvellous towns and noble provinces; this verdict is probably based entirely on literary tradition. Muṣḥaṣdaš condemns the language of the inhabitants as particularly “barbarous”.

The town only became a little more prominent in the Crusading period. Among the Crusaders the name appears as Sagitta (Sagettis, Seyette), a translation of the Arabic Sādā. According to Yāqūt, the town was also called Irībīl. The histories of the Crusaders record that the siege of the town was raised in 1107 on payment of a sum of money. According to the Arab version Baldwin retreated in 501 (1107/1108) when his fleet was destroyed by the Egyptians and a Muslim army was approaching from Damascus to relieve it. According to the French accounts, the town was taken on December 19, 1111 (Ibn al-Ajdār gives: 20th Dji-mādā' 1, 504, which corresponds to December 4, 1110). The siege lasted forty-seven days; sixty Frank ships (Norman and Venetian) surrounded the town on the sea side, and Baldwin advanced by land from Jerusalem. The town surrendered under favourable conditions, which were observed at first, but Baldwin later levied an indemnity of 20,000 dinars on the inhabitants, who remained in the town, which departed its prosperity. In 1157, Salahīd occupied Sidon (according to Ibn al-Ajdār on 29th Dji-mādā' 583, i.e. July 30, 1157); the Crusaders had left it without striking a blow and Salahīd had most of the fortifications destroyed. In October 1197 (Dhū 'l-Hijād 593, a.H.), there was a fierce encounter at Sādā' between Crusaders and Muslims, which lasted into the night and remained undecided, Abū al-Malik al-Adīl then had the remains of the defences destroyed. In 625 (1228) Sādā was taken by the Crusaders and again fortified. In 1249, it was taken by Ayyūb, in 1253 occupied and fortified by Louis IX of France, in 1256 sacked by the Mongols, in the same year; again taken by the Templars, who remained here till 1291 in which year it was taken by the Muslims for the last time and its defences raised by al-Ashraf. At a later period a great deal was done for the town by the Druze ruler Fakhr al-Dīn (1595—1654). His castle is now in ruins but the market erected by him for the European traders still exists as
the Khān Fransāwī. Unfortunately his fear lest the Turkish fleet might choose Sāidī as a base induced him to make the Southern (the so-called Egyptian) harbour useless. In 1271 Idrīsī praised the French merchants from the town. In 1280 it was bombarded by English and Armenian warships.

The modern town occupies the site of the ancient Sīdīn, but it stretches a little farther inland. A peninsula runs out from the shore under a shelter of which is the large south harbour, now useless, and the smaller north harbour still used by small ships. The latter is also protected by a ledge of rocks against the waves. Near the entrance is a little island, the Kāfṣat al-Bahr, which is connected with the mainland by a stone bridge. Further north-west is a larger island opposite the main island, called al-Djezire. South of the town, on an artificial mound is the citadel Kāfṣat al-Mūzan. The chief mosque was once the Church of the Knights of St. John and the mosque of Abū Naḥkil, a church of St. Michael. On the little island are the ruins of the Château de St. Louis which was partly destroyed in the bombardment of 1280. The town has about 12,000 inhabitants including 7,000 Muslims and Meṭwīlī, 5,000 Greek Catholics and Maronites and 500 Jews.

The Roman Catholic Church, the American Mission and the Alliance Israelite maintain schools here. Large gardens surround the town on the land side. Oranges, lemons, pomegranates, figs, almonds and pears flourish here. The commercial importance of the town is small. Grapes, corn, cotton and gall-apples are however exported. It is evidence of the intellectual life of the town that in 1221 the epistology of the Arab philosopher al-Farābī, the Kāfṣat al-Uṯūm, was first published in the columns of a newspaper, the 'Iṣfān.

The Sāidī mentioned in Nāgāha al-Dhubyānī (ed. Ahlwardt, i. 6) has been sought in the Ḥawrān.


(P. SCHWARZ)

SĪFĀ does not occur in the Kūrān but the infinitive mawfūṭ is used once and the impf. of the 1. stem 13 times in the meanings: "to ascribe or assert as a description, to attribute" and always with an implication of falsehood. Thus of Allah in Kūrān 100; xxiii. 93; xxxvii. 159, 180; xlix. 82 — all similar, fixed phrases; this standing implication is used in the Masūfārat of Kāfṣat al-Ishābān (p. 546, s. v.) to suggest that all descriptions of Allah are unsound. (a) In grammar sīfā means an epithet noun (on the epithet noun as opposed to the adjective noun; see Lasmān’s Arabic Grammar, p. 260 sqq.) and is defined in the Aṣīfa (ed. Dieterici, p. 225, a) as “a thing which indicates an idea (masūn) along with an essence or substance (ḏārāt)” and in the Mufṣalāt (ed. Broc, p. 45, 9) as “a noun which indicates one of the states (ṣawād) of a dārāt.” At the widest it covers the active and passive participles, the epithets assimilated to these (al-ṣīfāt al-amālāt ilāhāt, Wright, i, 135 sqq.; Mufṣalāt, 101, 5 sqq.), the wāsfi, of comparison and, doubtfully, the māta’; on the last see Mufṣalāt, p. 457, 77. When the active participle loses its temporary character and hardens into a substantive it becomes a sīfā al-ḏārāt (Baladhuri on Kūr, xxvii. 777; ed. Fleischer, ii. 747, 9). In syntax the qualifying clause to which the antecedent is undetermined and with which no relative is used, is not regarded by the native grammarians as a ḍārāt but only as a descriptive, a sīfā. (b) On the doctrine of the logical analysis of qualities and descriptors in philosophy and scholastic theology there is an elaborate discussion in the Dict. of ethics, terms, pp. 1489—95 (under wāsfi), giving classifications according to different orthodox and heretical schools. (c) The sīfāt of Allah are to be distinguished from his Names (ʿanān). The Names are the epithets, like the sīfāt above, applied to him as descriptive in the Kūrān, following the wide use of such epithets in the old poetry. On these Names see especially al-Ghazālī, al-maṣḥṣaʿ il-maṣūn. But his sīfāt are strictly the abstract qualities which lie behind these epithets, as ḍārāt behind ḍārāt and ḍārāt behind ḍārāt. A very important problem in theology is the relation of these sīfāt to his sīfāt. The resultant orthodox statement, after long controversy, is that they are eternal, subsisting in his essence, and that they are not He, nor are they other than He (fa huwa wa-l-la ḍārāt). See Tahāštān on Nasafi’s sīfāt with super-commentaries, Cairo 1821, pp. 67 sqq. and the commentary of Djeurjī on the Masūfārat al-Isbāṣ, Bulāq 1266, pp. 479 sqq. The struggle was, in part, to maintain the internal unity of the personality of Allah; in part, to do justice to the Kūrānic descriptives of him; in part, to determine what were primary and necessary of these and what could be regarded as merely relations and connectives of these with the material world. It was a struggle with unbelieving philosophers, with Muʿtazilite heretics and, within orthodox Islam, between Ashʿarites and Māturīdites; see Louis Massignon, La Passion d’al-Halaj, pp. 568, 571 and especially 645 sqq. and the translations from Nasafi al-Ghazālī’s Daqāʾiq in Macdonald, Development of Muslim Theology, pp. 399, 319 sqq. Also Sanūti’s Prolégomènes Théologiques, ed. and transl. by Luciani, pp. 162—216. Through it all ran the position of the Masūfārat [see above] that descriptions of Allah must be, at the best, inadequate and misleading, and, at the worst, impossible. On Allah’s mystical manifestation of himself by means of his sīfāt see Massignon, p. 514 and R. A. Nicholson, Studies in Islamic Mysticism, pp. 90, 98.

Bibliography has been given above.

(D. B. MACDONALD)

SĪFFIN, in Theophanes, Chronographia, 347: Sappho, was a Sinar inscription of the beginning of the ninth century C.E. (Chabot in J.A., 1900, p. 254), a place not far from the right bank of the Euphrates, west of Raṣṣā, between it and Bābīs, separated from the river by a strip of marshland an arrowhead broad (according to B.G.A., vii. 25, 50; 500 cyp) and two parseangs long, overgrown with dense willows and Euphrates palms, full of waterholes, through which a single paved road led to the Euphrates. The place was made famous by the great battle fought there in 37 (657) between Ali and Maʿnawi. When Ali arrived on his march from Kūfah, the Sýrians
were already encamped in the ruins of the city, which dated from the Roman period, and a detachment of troops under Abu 'I-Awar held the road to the Ephrizes. In spite of his representations and his insistence that he had not come to fight but to come to an arrangement with Mu'awiyah, the latter did not give way, although his wise councillor 'Amr b. al-As' advised him to do so. 'Ali then ordered his troops to attack and they succeeded in driving back the Syrians in spite of the reinforcements they sent them and gained the approach to the river. 'Ali then gave a new proof of his chivalry by allowing the Syrian water-carriers to get water alongside of his own men, which resulted in the latter fratriciding in harmless fashion with the Syrians. Some time was spent in negotiations, which came to nothing, as Mu'awiyah stubbornly insisted that the Caliph should hand over the assassins of 'Uthmān, which he neither would nor could do. The negotiations were however continued and when a quarrel threatened to break out, the peace-lovers on either side managed to prevent it. According to Dinawari, p. 180, this state of things lasted throughout the two months Rabī' II and Dhu'l-Qa'dah of the year 36. This would however give much too long a time for the preliminaries of the battle which, according to Ya'qūbī (Tanākht, p. 295; Ta'ārikh, ii. 219), began at the beginning of Sa'far and is corrected by Ya'qūbī's statement that the battle itself the approach to the water took place. Ubu 'I-Hudayja is probably also wrong when Ṭabarī, i. 227, says that 'Ali and Mu'awiyah in this month repeatedly — sometimes twice a day — sent out prominent men with foot-soldiers and horsemen to fight each other, which however did not result in a general battle, as both parties were afraid of the fatal consequences of it. As Wellhausen suggests, we must here have a duplication of the fighting that took place later. To keep open every possibility of coming to terms, it was agreed to observe a truce in the traditional sacred month of peace, Muḥarram of the year 37 (June 19—July 18, 657). But even this did not succeed, and war was finally declared at the beginning of Sa'far and the battle of Siffin began. To obtain a clear idea of its course is not easy, as the narrators record a mass of single combats which do not give a general survey and serve only to glorify the individual tribes. They also give very divergent figures for the size of the armies and the positions of the divisions and their leaders. The fighting was conducted in accordance with ancient custom and each tribe operated for itself, so that it was a clever move on 'Ali's part to place the parts of the various tribes in his army so that they were opposite their fellow-tribesmen. The fighting, which was continually renewed and increased in extent, was by all accounts bloody and various notable men met their death in it, such as on 'Ali's side 'Ammar b. Ya'qūb and Ḥāshim b. 'Urṭa, on Mu'awiyah's side Umar's son 'Ubadalāh (cf. the laudation on him in Ya'qūbī, iii. 403); 'Ali had great assistance from the brave and experienced al-Aṣhtar (q. v.) who had procured the Irāk troops free access to the water and now distinguished himself in several hand-to-hand fights.

The following is the account given of the issue of the battle. After fighting had gone on for a time without a decision being reached, al-Aṣhtar succeeded in the night known as Ṭailat al-karim (from ṭahir, "to whine"); cf. Yaḥyā, iv. 970) i.e. the night before Friday 10th Sa'far = July 28 (see Ahlwardt's Anonymus Chronik, p. 349, 3: according to Ṭabarī, ii. 727, 11 the night before the Thursday and on the following morning in driving the Syrians into such straits that Mu'awiyah lost heart and thought of flight, from which he was restrained by the memory of certain lines Ibn al-Itsāh (Yaḥyā, ed. Wright, p. 35, 573; Ṭabarī, i. 3300, 5).

In this dangerous position, the witty 'Amr b. al-As' advised him to fasten a few manuscripts of the Kurān to lance-heads to express symbolically that the fighting should cease and the decision be left to the book of Allāh, in contrast to 'Ali who sought Allāh's verdict in the outcome of the battle (Ṭabarī, i. 3322, 2). 'Amr's calculation that this proposal would produce a split among 'Ali's followers proved correct. A considerable number of them declared that such an appeal to the decision of Allāh could not be rejected; and thus 'Ali, who thought he had already won, was forced to call back al-Aṣhtar vigorously protesting, whereupon the battle ceased. The majority in his army also agreed to Mu'awiyah's proposal that each of the contending parties should choose one of two arbitrators, who were to meet a later date and come to a verdict according to the words of the Kurān. The Syrians chose 'Amr, as much to be expected, while the Caliph had forced upon him Abū Mūsā (q. v.), who was not favourably disposed to him. The agreement was signed, according to Ṭabarī, i. 3340 on the 13th Sa'far 37 (July 31, 657), according to Dinawari, p. 210, not till the 17th Sa'far and 'Ali remembering Muhammad's example of self-restraint at Hudaybiyya refrained from signing as Caliph. The armies then separated and went home, 'Ali's troops in deep dejection so that although undefeated they gave the impression of having suffered a reverse.

However attractive this story, with its good points and its sharp characterisation of the persons appearing in it, may be, it is doubtful whether it can be considered historical without further examination. All the accounts at our disposal betray a preference for 'Ali and an antipathy to Mu'awiyah and particularly to 'Amr, who is readily credited with everything wicked; and we therefore very much feel the want of an account of the battle from the other side, which could be used as a check. But even without this we can indicate several points, which make it probable that there is a certain amount of bias present, as is certainly the case with the story of the arbitration in Adhrib (q. v.) and particularly that much too important a part is credited to Mu'awiyah's evil genius, 'Amr. Even if we assume that it was he who proposed the demonstration with the Kurān, and that the necessary number of manuscripts was available in the Syrian army — according to Dinawari, p. 201; even the standard oscillator of the Kurān (cf. q. v.) kept in Damascus was one of them which was carried by five men on five lance-heads — it is evident that this means could only be effective if there was a receptive spirit present, so that it only gave expression to what many felt in their hearts. That this was actually the case is evident from several hints. Not only had 'Ali endeavoured to avoid the fatal war, in which believers fought one another and
members of the same tribe, even near relatives like father and son (Dinawar, p. 184); but the majority of the troops felt that it was unnatural and disastrous. This was why it was so long before the fighting actually began and why as a last resource they concluded a truce in Muharram. In this connection Dinawar records several features which supplement Mikhail's story in Tabarz on essential points. While in the latter the Kur'ān, Kur'ān-reciters form a separate body with their own leaders fighting ardently (Tabarz, l. 3273; s. 3283, 91; 3286; s. 3292, v. 3298, s. 3304, 91 and 3329, 91), and there is very little reference to Kur'ān-reciters in the Syrian army (3329, 91), in Dinawar these deviating men (e.g. Goldbauer, Verteilungen, über den Islam, p. 189) are eager advocates of peace who on one occasion succeed in stopping a battle which is about to begin (Dinawar, p. 181, s. 99). They were at once prepared to proceed to the appeal to the Kur'ān; and it was mainly owing to their influence that the fighting was stopped so quickly (ibid., p. 204) and when they agreed on the appeal to the Kur'ān, they negotiated with the Syrian Kur'ān-reciters before the two armies and recommended the choice of two referees (ibid., p. 205). If 'Amr really proposed the demonstration of the Kur'ān (a similar use of the Kur'ān is recorded in the battle of the Camel, Tabarz, l. 3186, 3188 sq.) he was only expressing an idea that was shared by many and therefore found ready support. It is also very possible that the striking point in the tradition, that 'Ali had already the victory in his hands, when 'Amr deprived himself of it by his diabolical plan, is one of the embellishments with which admirers of 'Ali later explained the unsuccessful issue of the battle. But on the other hand it is quite evident that Mu'āwiyah had everything to gain by the appeal to the Kur'ān, while it meant a severe blow for 'Ali, so that it was no wonder that far-seen men like him and 'Amr were eager for it, especially if they were afraid that the battle might result unfavourably for them. We must in particular remember that the battle had nothing to do with the question which of the two opponents should become Caliph. That Mu'āwiyah cherished far-reaching ambitions is very possible, but 'Ali was much too wise to let them be revealed at so early a stage. He kept strictly to his role as the avenger of 'Uthmān and declared himself ready to pay homage to 'Ali if he would hand over the murderers of the Caliph. This made him seem to be on the side of right and morality and, at the same time, as 'Ali could not satisfy his demands, it was a good means of preventing the conclusion of a peace. For 'Ali the appeal to the Kur'ān was absolutely annihilating; for the sacred book was to be consulted to ascertain whether his action in regard to the assassination of 'Uthmān made him unworthy of being Caliph so that he was de facto deposed at least for the time, while Mu'āwiyah's position was left unaffected by the result of the verdict. Finally we have to remember that from several indications, 'Ali's position among his own followers in spite of all personal sympathy for him had become rather weak, as the serious charges brought against him had made an impression, even on people unfavourably disposed to him, so that they must have come to wish that some higher authority should clear up the question. If right and wrong had been so simply and clearly appertained between the two opponents, as the narratives make it appear, the sons of Abū Bakr and 'Umar would hardly have kept on good terms with Mu'āwiyah. The move we put forward is confirmed in a welcome fashion by a very temperate tradition which goes back to al-Zuhair in Ibn Sa'd (lvi. 3), in which we are told that the two armies were tired of war and reluctant to shed more blood, which induced 'Amr to propose to Mu'āwiyah to have the Kur'ān displayed, and to summon the tracts to the book of Allāh, and thus effect a split among them. When 'Ali saw the apathy of his followers, he acceded to the demand of Mu'āwiyah and it was in reply to his question who was to decide by the Kur'ān, that Mu'āwiyah proposed the choice of two referees. The dramatic section in the usual story is completely lacking here. It was quite to be expected that apart from the rule credited to 'Amr, an explanation of the unsuccessful turn the battle took for 'Ali should also be found in the assertion that treachery was committed. The charge was made against al-Abābī (q.v.) whose post might certainly lend some support to the suggestion. All sources agree that he interceded vigorously for the appeal. According to Dinawar (p. 204) he feared that a continuation of the fighting might result in the enmities of the Arab empire invading all sides, a view supported by Mu'āwiyah when he heard of it. According to Tabarz, l. 3332 sq., he offered to go to Mu'āwiyah to ascertain his further proposals and 'Ali approved. On the other hand Ya'qūb says (l. 220) that Mu'āwiyah corresponded with him to bring him over to his side and that he threatened to abandon 'Ali if the latter rejected the appeal, whereby the Caliph was forced to accede, as all al-Abābī's Yanami fellow-tribesmen declared their readiness to follow him. After all that has been recorded above, such an explanation of what happened is superfluous and the fact that al-Abābī remained continually in 'Ali's service is decisive against it. How far someone could go in their efforts to explain the unfortunate result of the battle for 'Ali is seen from Tabarz, l. 3346 sq., where 'Ali is made to stop the fighting because he did not dare to risk the lives of the two grandsons of the Prophet. Bibliography: B.G.A.I., l. 23, 76: Yākūn, Mu'āqam, ed. Wüstenfeld, iii. 402 sq.; Anonymous arabisch chronik, ed. Alwardt, p. 349, 91; Tabarz, ed. de Goeje, l. 3265—3333, al-Ya'qūbī, Tārīkh, ed. Houtsma, ii. 218 sq.; Dinawar, ed. Guirgis, p. 175—205; Mas'ūdī, Tonb, ed. de Goeje, p. 295; Muḥāfīz, ed. Barbier de Meynard, iv. 3297—345, Ibn Sa'd, ed. Sachau, vyf, 5 sq.; Ibn 'Abd Rabbih, al-Ḫalīfa as-ṣawād, Cairo 1917, ii. 202; A. Müller, Der Islam im Morgen- und Abendland, l. 349—342; Muir, Amule of the early Caliphs, 1885, p. 376 sq.; Wellhausen, Das arabisch Reich, 45—51 sq.; Die religion-politischen Oppositionen im Mittleren Islam (Abh. Ges. Wiss. Göttingen, Neuf Ser., v., Nr. 2), p. 3 sqq. (F. Blum), al-SIFR (A.), the empty translation of the Sanskrit smāra in Hindu-Arabic arithmetic, the same for zero, and the origin of the Western words cipher, cifra, cipher, chiffre and zero with their derivatives (decipher, etc.). The question of the introduction or invention of the figures and of the zero has in spite of all palaeographical
research and study of the history of mathematics not yet been satisfactorily explained. In the oldest documents known to us, the Arabs, when they do not write out the numbers in full, use Greek numerals. Only at a later date do we find the "Arabic" numerals coming into use. The Arab mathematicians were made acquainted with the Hindu numerals and method of counting in the time of al-Ma'mun by the Eastern Persian Muhammad b. Musa al-Khwārizmī (q.v.); the earliest Arabic zero is found in the date 260 of a papyrus document (≈ 773/774 A.D.). The oldest absolutely certain reference to Hindu arithmetic with the 9 numerals was found by F. Nau in the Syrian Sermon of Sabokli (c. 662). It should not be concluded therefore that the zero, that fundamental advance in numerical notation, was not then in use, for even later than the nine numerals which we now call ciphers are distinguished from the special signs for showing that a space is left blank; we further know that Brahmagupta, the Indian astronomer (born 598), expressly prepared rules for calculating with the zero. On the connections with the abacus and the feud between the abacists and algorithmists cf. the literature mentioned below. The form of the zero is a circle among Hindus and Western Arabs, among eastern Arabs a point, presumably also in the Persian-Hindu tradition. The subscript zeroes like differential points in the Bhārtī, i. 18 st. are remarkable.


SIHR, glamour, magic. In the vexed folklore question of the relation between magic and religion the verdict of Islam is undoubtedly with the position of R. R. Marett that "religion and magic are two forms of a social phenomenon originally one and indivisible; primitive man had an institution which dealt with the supernatural, and in this institution were the germs of both magic and religion, which were gradually differentiated; magic and religion differ in respectability; religion is always the higher, the accepted cult; but between what is definitely religious and what is definitely magical lies a mass of indeterminate elements, such as "white-magic", which do not attain to the public recognition of religion, nor suffer the condemnation meted out to that which is unmistakably magical" (Sure, Zeitung, ed. xi. xvii. 36). For the magic of the masses in Islam and of what may be broadly called orthodox Islam Islam is a system of frank supernaturalism; for it there is our material world of the senses and behind that a world of spirits, in relation with which we can enter by means of either magic or religion. When we attempt to define the exact nature of that world of spirits, theories appear and bring the split between magic and religion. What is the origin and nature of these spirits? How do they differ among themselves? What is their independence of action? In what way can they be reached and controlled? Does such intercourse with them affect our relation to Allah and imperil our eternal salvation? For in Islam the orthodox and heretical, everything centres round Allah and our relation to him.

So in the Arabia of Muhammad's time, the original habitat of Islam, if we leave out the elements affected by Christianity and Judaism, the spirit-world consisted of Allah, the tribal gods and the djinn; and the links between men and them were khalim's (cf. above, ii. 624 sqq.), magicians and soothsayers, poets and madmen; the theory as to all these being one of unlimited "possession" by different kinds of spirits, in the sense of that term in modern spiritualism. "Magic", therefore, as a term of modern folklore is distinctly broader than the Arabic sihr, literally "glamour", when sihr is exactly limited; but clarity as to the facts of the case requires as to take sihr in the broad sense, and Islam itself has very often, indeed generally, done the same. Murtaḍa al-Zabidi in his commentary on the Ḥadīth (i. 217 foot) quotes Tādż al-Dīn al-Suhbī as saying, "Sīhr and astrology and sinīya are all of the same wādī". Further, when Islam spread out of Arabia it entered into contacts with all the supernatural beliefs and magical arts and rituals of the different races and countries which it conquered; these were blended with the KhOr. and Syrian concepts and usages and formed an amalgam of the most heterogeneous character as to vocabulary, ritual, attitudes and even fundamental conceptions. This was thoroughly recognized by the Muslims themselves who, as we shall see, traced different kinds of magic to different races. And the confusion worked in two directions: (L) the superstitions and nomenclature of Arabia were imposed on non-Arab and even non-Semitic peoples and (ii.) even fundamental Islam was deeply affected by completely alien beliefs. On all this see above the articles BUKHĀRĪ, IBN SĪNĀ, IBN TĀRĪKH, KĀDI, KHOZĪ, KHAJJA, and bibilography to these.

But sihr in its exact etymology suggests the limited form of magic called "glamour". The lexicons assert that it is the turning ( translates "1. 15 sqq.

" into something else which is unreal or a mere appearance (khayāt); tākhlīs is often applied to this, based on Kūr. xx. 69, and it might be what we now call *hypnotism*; but the more rationalistic tried to reduce it to simple jugglery (kāshī, "the magician"), chancing the eye (al-tākhlīsīyya wa-lākhīsī hī-l-Dā'ūr) by lightness of hand and flowery speech. So it comes to suggest the subtlety of working in nature, as of food in the body (this is traced even to imr al-Isān in Ḥadīth, vi. 12 foot, but the meaning there seems more the fundamental and beauty of utterance, as we speak of the magic of words (Sīhā, n. v.; Muḥarrama of Rāghūl al-Isbāhānī, p. 224 sqq. in Ḥadīth, vi. 11–13). Lane, 1516 sqq.). In the Kurān, however, the reference are much too definite to yield to such treatment. For the mind of Muhammad and for his environment sihr was a real thing, although the message given in and through it might, in great part, be false. On the psychological side, the first-hand phenomena strongly suggest hypnotism and, on the religious, the attitude of Muhammad was almost exactly that of the modern Roman Church towards spiritism. In the Karān situation the background was the spirit-world of the djinn and the shaitān's — evidently unbelieving and evil
**dżinn.** By far the most important Qur'anic verse for the whole subject is 96, which may be rendered: "And they [unbelievers in general and Jews in particular] followed what the shaitān’s used to recite in the reign of Sulaimān [or against the reign of Sulaimān] - and Sulaimān never was an unbeliever but the shaitān’s were unbelievably teaching mankind magic (ṣīh); and they followed what was revealed to [or by means of] the two angels in Bihāl, Hārūt and Mārūt; and they do not teach any one until they say to him: We are only a temptation (jinn); so do not disbelieve. So they [the learners] learn from the two that by which they may divide a man from his wife, but they do not harm by it any one except by the permission of Allāh. They learn that which harms them and does not aid them, having knowledge, indeed, that he who purchases it has no portion in the world to come. Evil, indeed, is that for which they sell themselves, if they had known it."

The construction of this passage is very loose and the points in the translation which are uncertain; more than indicated here. In spite of Baidawi’s compact style his position occupies more than a page (Fluscher’s ed., i. 76, and ii. 77). There is a page and a half in the Kanz al-Din of al-Zanahhari (Leets’ ed., l. 93-95). In the greater commentary it is treated at length as the leonus classici on magic; thus Tabaqat Tafsīr, i. 334-353 and Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī’s Muṣūf, i. 427-440, in ed. Cairo 1307. But the general drift is unmistakable. The shaitān’s, say these commentators, are the source of magic; they listened at the walls of heaven (see below) and added lies to what they heard there; they brought this to the jinn’s and made books of it; they taught these books to mankind, reciting them. This was widespread in the time of Sulaimān, to such an extent that it was said to have been the source of his knowledge and of his control over nature and the dżimm. The Jews even said that Sulaimān was not a prophet but a magician (Kāzi, p. 428). This verse is as answer to them. For Hārūt and Mārūt see article above and also more below. Elsewhere in the Kur’ān (xxvii. 6; xii. 11; xxviii. 5, Ixii. 8, 9, 34, 35; Ixvi. 2, 3) we are told that the dżinn used to sit beside (būn na’ām) the nearer sky (al-‘aṣwāf) and listen (istawā’u, istawā’u al-ʾāmm) to there the Heavenly Host (al-muṣāla al-ʾāmm) and that they are chased away from it by lamps (maqāṣib, tālāb) set it in for adornment but thrown at them as missiles (rīʿd dżimm) by the angels on guard (jāra, raqā, ḥāfīz). They used to listen thus regularly but now (al-ṣabāḥ, Ixii. 9) — apparently since Muhammad was sent — they have found the angels especially violent against them. See a full discussion in the Kanz al-Din (p. 1535) on Ixii. 9, where old verses are quoted and tradition cited on the ideas of the Arabs on this in the Dīghilya. These Arabs had known such shooting-stars and had their own views about them. But with the birth of Muhammad the vigilance of the angels was greatly increased. Yet this could have been only for a time; for the whole after-history of magic represents the dżinn as continuing to listen and to bring information to the jinn’s and magicians. Further, the dżimm (xxviii. 13) do not know the Unseen (al-ghaṣālt) at least accurately, although they dżimm inspire and lead astray the enemies of the prophets (vii. 112). In Kur’ān xxvi. 221-225 is a significant passage telling how the shaitān’s come down (zamānala) to every great liar (ṣaffāt) and that these receive what the shaitān’s have heard and that the most of them (the great liars of mankind or of the shaitān’s) are liars, or that the most of the information is lies. The straying poets, too, follow them (apparently the shaitān’s), wandering in every wādī and never doing what they say. This is connected by the commentators (Baidawi, xxli. 61, 62; even fuller and better in the Kanz al-Din, li. 1012-1014), and evidently rightly, with the dżinn listening to the talk of the angels, perverting it and mixing it with lies; but bringing it down to the jinn’s and false prophets and poets. On poetry as thus inspired by the dżimm see Goldziher, Abhandlungen sur arab. Philologie, i. pp. 1-121 and on this passage especially, p. 27, note 2.

It is only in Kur’ān ii. 96 that the word sīh occurs in connection with Sulaimān, but there are several passages (xxvi. 81, 82; xxvii. 15-45; xxviii. 11-13; xxviii. 29-39) which deal at length with his wisdom, knowledge and control of the world and later Islam traced all licit, or “white”, magic back to him. The other occurrences of sīh and its cognates are connected with the stories of Muṣā, Iṣār and Muhammad himself. To the memory of Muṣā and his contests with the magicians of Pharaoh belong almost all references in certain Sūras. Thus vii. 109, 110, 117, 129; x. 77, 78, 80, 81 (but verse 2 of Muṣūf); xvi. 103 (but v. 50 of Muṣūf); xx. 59, 60, 66, 69, 72-74; xxvi. 33, 34, 36, 37, 39, 40, 45, 48 (but verses 153, 185 of Muṣūf); xxvii. 13, xxviii. 36, 48; xl. 25; xxliii. 48 (but v. 29 of Muṣūf); li. 39. Only in v. 110 is magic connected with Iṣār. With Muhammad it is connected in vii. 2; x. 2; xi. 10; xv. 15; xvii. 50; xxi. 3; xxii. 91; xxvi. 9; xxvii. 153, 185; xxviii. 42; xxvii. 15; xxviii. 33; xxliii. 29; xlvi. 6; li. 15; lv. 2; lx. 6; lixiv. 24. There are certain significant phrases and usages: sīh is opposed to al-ḥām, “in reality,” in xx. 77, 78; xxliii. 29; xlvi. 6, and to the reality of Hell (al-mār), in li. 15. — “In the Fire they will be asked: "Is this glamour"?" — eyes are enchanted in vii. 113 (Muṣā) and similarly in xvii. 15. The pick of the looks (ahmaran) are made drunken (ṣubheru) and we are an enchanted (musthār) people”, i.e. we are gladdened, hypnotized, by them (Meccans); Muṣūf is “a man enchanted” (xxvii. 50; xxvi. 9) and Muṣā (xxvii. 103); Muṣūf is “deeply enchanted” (musthauṣ) in xxvii. 153, 185; in the story of Muṣā an appearance is produced (ṣhayā’ala) by sīh (xx. 69); in xxv. 3 qāf various accusations are brought against Muhammad — that his message is sīh; that it is "bundles of dreams (bayṣajad ṣubba), i.e. confused and untrue dreams; that he invented it (iftarāhu); that he is poet (ṣifār); he is required to produce a sign (ṣayf) like the former prophets; in xxvii. 3 Muhammad is a “lying magician” (ṣifār ḥaṣabuḥu) and Muṣā is the same in xl. 25; in li. 39 Muṣā is a sīh and musthār, possessed of a dżimm; sīh is called “plain” (mala) very often, musthār, “invented”; in xxvii. 36 and unnuṣnyar, “enduring, firm” or “continuous, consecutive" or “feeling" in li. 2; in lixiv. 24 (quite the oldest occurrence in the Kur’ān) the message of Muṣūf is called sīh yirṣūr, “a magic derived or learned” from some one else; in xxvi. 36 saḥūr seems to mean an “expert, professional magician” (story of Muṣā).
The passages connecting magic with Muhammad will bear closer examination and throw much light upon the ideas of his time and upon his own situation in it. The traditional interpretation of lxxv. 24 in the Sira (see Wustenfeld's Ibn Hisham, p. 171 sq.; Ba'adhwi, ed. Fleischer, ii. 308, 13 sq.; Kaka'sfayf, ed. Lees, ii. 1548 sq.) labours to distinguish between the kahim, the muqabim, the sibhur and the sibhir, evidently using for the definition of sibhir, K. ii. 96, but it is plain from the actual Kuranic usages that such distinctions are impossible and that these four classes were closely connected qua links between the spirit-world and our world. Kaha occurs only twice in the Kuran, in both places applied by the Meccans to Muhammad, once (lxxi. 29) joined with muqabim and once (lxxix. 42) joined with sibhir. Muhammad is called a sibhir in x. 2, xx. 3 sq. and xxxviii. 3; he is "enraptured" (masahhir) in xvii. 50 and xxv. 9 and "deeply enchanted" (masahhir) in xxxvi. 153, 185. The two last expressions as used of Muhammad were evidently disliked, for the commentators give alternate meanings, "one possessing lungs," i.e. an ordinary human being. Several times the Kuran, its message and proofs are called magic—xi. 10; xxxiv. 42; xlii. 29; lxi. 6; lxi. 2; lxii. 6; lxxiv. 4. And Muhammad did not show any other signs of being a magician. He was not a wonder-worker like Mi'raj, Sulaiman and Idris. In xxiv. 9 he is only "a man enchanted"; no angel is sent to go with him, nor is a treasury (kasam) thrown to him, nor has he a magic garden of which he can eat, i.e. objectively existing. In xxi. 3 sq. he does not work an a'ra in this sense. In vi. 17 if an actual book on a'risus which could be handled had been sent to them they would have called even it sibhir, i.e. they would have had such signs. In the case of these passages in this context of enchantment (masahhir) in the commentator, e.g. Zama'khshari and Ba'adhwi, are quite sure that the reference is to miracles (ammir bi'shira li 'l-fafa'), but the whole drift of the Kuran and even the passages themselves show that the reference is to the revelations which the Meccans thought proceeded from magic. The sibhir in the case, then, must have been connected with the way in which the revelations came. In xxi. 3 the Meccans assert that they are confused and untrue dreams; and there are passages in the Kuran which show that they, at least sometimes, came in what we now call "automatic speech". In xx. 13 and lxxv. 16 the Prophet is warned that he must not try to hasten the utterance of the Kuran when it is being revealed by conscious singing of his tongue; i.e. he must completely yield his speech-over to it and let it come at its own speed (cf. Sibhir of Bukhari, part i. p. 152 sq. of ed. Bulayk 1315 = Kitab al-uwa'idh). In v. 105 the bystanders and listeners when revelation is coming through are warned not to throw in sudden questions to the Prophet, as though he were an ordinary soothsayer. Being in the state of automatic speech he will certainly answer them, and truly, and they may not like the answers. See a mass of traditions bearing on this in Tabari's Tafsir, vii. 48-52 and a very clear statement in Baidawi, i. 275 ult. to p. 276, 11; the more rationalistic commentators, such as Zama'khshari and Razi, evidently did not like the subject. For automatic speech in later Islam see article FISRA above and references there; Islam has fully accepted and described the phenomenon.

From all this it is plain that to understand these passages in the Kuran we must combine the evident meaning of the text with what we know now of abnormal psychology. The phenomena above can be abundantly verified by any one in contact with a case of the very common automatism, "automatic writing", and they hold exactly of the much rarer automatic speech. But it was necessary for the early Muslim interpreters to make as firm a distinction as possible between the phenomena of Muhammad and those of the other links with the spirit-world. This they did by emphasizing revelation through Djibril as opposed to automatic speech through a possessing spirit. Probably many other references exist in the Kuran, as undoubtedly in the Old Testament, to such phenomena, which have been similarly obscured. Sibhir, then, on one side, was glamour and unreal, but on another, it was very real. For Muhammad it was heathen revelation, coming from the spirit-world and in so far real, but perverted and amplified by its intermediaries, spirit and human, and in so far false. In the Sahih of Muslim, part viii. pp. 229-231 of ed. of Constantineople 1333 (Kitab al-Zuhd, trad. 73), there is a long story of a heathen king, his magician (sibhir), an ascetic (inshir) and a jinn. The point is that heathenism is sibhir and jinn, just as Baidawi on Kuran ii. 96 (i. 76, 7) equates sibhir and jinn and lumps them in with kahtim.

In the traditions on the subject it is impossible to say what goes back to Muhammad and what arose in later controversy; much seems incompatible with his usual strong common sense. Reference may be made to a most miscellaneous farrago in the Sahih of Muslim (Kitab al-salat), part vii. pp. 13-41, on medicine (inshir) and spells (inshir), lawful and unlawful, magic, poisons, sha'tan, kahim, tabur, sar, all jumbled together. In part i., p. 59, if any one says, muqrawa bayn al-muqawwila, "we receive rain by such a star", he is an unbeliever, and on pp. 136-138 the 70,000 Muslims who will enter Paradise without reckoning or punishment are those who have put their trust in Allah and have not used cautery or spells or observed the flight of birds. Medicine, etc., is dealt with in Bukhari, chapter 328, part xii. 122-149, and the interpretation of dreams, Tabhir al-Kura', etc., in part ix. 29 sqq. On seeing the Prophet in dreams and on dreaming generally see Muslim, part vii. 50 sqq. All these subjects were, and are, in close association in the Muslim mind.

But though Muhammad was perfectly assured as to the reality of these phenomena, whether as glamour or as perverted revelation from unbelieving mediums, the early rationalistic theologians (al-Maw'ul al-salihin, alin salim; see article above, ii. 670-697) had many doubts. This comes out very clearly in the book of Ibn Kathira (i. 276 = 889) Mawal al-bad'ith (Cairo 1326, p. 220-235); see on it Goldziher, Med. Stud. ii. 136 sqq. The Mu'tazilites attacked, on grounds of reason and reflection (alj, mutif), the traditions which tell that Muhammad was bewitched; that was impossible in a prophet who was under the protection of Allah (muqawwila). Also, the magic spoken of in the Kuran e.g. in the story of Musa, was nothing but juggling (lakhsheji); the two angels in Kuran ii. 96 were two men called Malik and the verse was to be understood differently. Against
that, Ibn Katafa brings the universal testimony of all Scriptures and prophets and the unanimous belief in magic of the most diverse peoples; also the explicit testimony of Kuryan (kulli, c. v.), the two Mu'tamaddim also certain further traditions, especially a curious story about a woman who went to Bihari to learn magic from Hariri and Murtiri, thereafter sought the Prophet at Madina in presence, found him dead and made confession to Ali, telling her the whole story. It is a very strange story with folk-lore elements about the preparation of magic sandalwood remains of the Arabian Nights "Story of Badi Basiin and the Khawafa of Muhammad b. Salama (The Earlier History of the Arabic Nights, in J.R. A.S., July 1924, p. 374—379). A fuller form of the same tradition is in the Tafsir of Tabari (d. 920), i. 347, 348 to 348, 18, also in the Kitab al-Mabsuva of Ibn al-Bishr (d. 1036), p. 30, 160; vol. ed. Cairo 1314; in the Mu'adith of Rasu (d. 1209), vol. ed. Cairo 1314, p. 434, 29—30; there is such a sophisticated and philosophized form of the same story. And, otherwise, all the narratives vary greatly; the different forms were evidently adjusted to the magic known to each writer and current in his time. Sharabi (q. v.), tells it, too, in his commentary on the Ma'adith of Hariri, i. 134, has anything on Hariri and Murtiri and this story is not there (letter from A. J. Wensinck).

In the Fihrist (written between 372 and 400 = 987—1010) we find the magical system fully developed and with a rich literature behind it. The principal passage is in the Second Fann of the Eighth Maganta (ed. Fluegel, p. 308 sqq.). The position of Muhammad b. Iskand, the author, who was apparently a Sh'ite and, therefore, at least tinged with Mu'tassolin (cf. Kariim, vol. ii., p. 6732 above), appears in his statement. Magicians, have ways, licit and illicit, all assert that magic is worked by the obedience of spirits to the magician. Licit magician, whom he calls ma'uzim (from sa'ima, "spell"); the word is not in the Karan, nor the root in this connection, assert that they constrain the spirits by obeying and supplicating Allah, by abandoning fleshly lusts and practicing devotion and by bringing adjurations by Allah to bear upon the spirits; the spirits then obey, either out of obedience to Allah because of the adjurations, or out of fear, because in the peculiar property (bawiyat) of the divine Names there is something which subdues them. Illicit magician, whom he calls mas'imatim (from sa'ima, "spell"); the word is not in the Karan, nor the root in this connection, assert that they constrain the spirits by offerings (zaharat) and by evil deeds, displeasing to Allah, either omission of the ritual law or actual forbidden actions, such as shedding of blood, marriage with near kin, etc. This is openly practised (shahata) in Egypt and the adjoining countries, and there are many books existing upon it. The basis of the magicians is in Egypt; Ibn Iskand had been told of it by one who had been there and had seen actual survivors (bashirta), magicians male and female, there. It is to be remembered that he was probably writing in Baghda; this is still the attitude of the rest of the Muslim East towards Egypt. All these, licit and illicit, assert that they use seals (bawwara), various kinds of spells (maz'at, ruja', bashara), magic circles (mawwiid), fumigation (da'at), etc. A party of the philosophers and star-worshippers assert, he goes on, that they make talismans for all manner of purposes by watching the stars; these are engraved on stones, gems, stones in rings (safar). This is a widely spreading science among philosophers; Indians believe in it and do wonderful things by it; the Chinese have artefacts (zha'at) and a magic of their own; the Indians have especially "hypnotism" (Hindu-waak Bam; cf. J.R. A.S. for Oct. 1922, Waam in Arabic and its cognates, p. 316), Indian books on which have been translated into Arabic; the Turks have a science of magic and Ibn Iskand had been assured by a trustworthy person that they did wonderful things of a physical kind, defeating armies, slaying enemies, passing over rivers, going great distances in a short time, etc. The talismans in Egypt and Syria are numerous and plain for all to see; but the working has been stultified by the passage of time.

Licit magic, which the Fihrist calls "the praise-worthy method" (al-farzi al-mahamud), is traced back to Sulaiman b. Daws who was the first to enslave the spirits (al-salim w a'hayt) and make them serve him; the same is said for Persian magic of Djamshid. On Djamshid as a founder of knowledge and a controller of the gisim see Fihrist, p. 12, 47 sqq., p. 238, and for a fuller account of his place in Persian myth and of his confusion with Solomon see especially E. G. Browne's Literary History of Persia, i. 112—114. There was evidently an extensive magical literature ascribed to Sulaiman in Hebrew and Persian and due to that confusion; the names of three of his secretaries who compiled the books are given and there are further details on the names of these books in the long quotation from Djamshid's Kitab al-khod al-a'yur (first half of viii. cent. A.D.), Z.D.M.G., xx. 486 sqq., in de Goeje's article on the same, Gawarna's "Entdeckte Geheimnisse"; cf. also Fleischer in Z.D.M.G., xx. 274. A small part of this text was printed at Cairo (32 pp.; no year; Mau'ad al-muqash), omitting the introduction and extending only to Buh vi. in Fajr, iv., evidently with other omissions. There is also a complete edition, no printer or place but dated Djamshid 1130. Cf., further, the technical, non-philological study of the book, based on a printed text and several MSS., by E. Wiedemann in Beitr. zur Gesch. der Naturwissenschaften, xxv., p. 206—232. The Fihrist then gives a list of 70 names of spirits (nafsir) who entered the presence of Sulaiman and upon whom he imposed covenants (rashid, wati'at) using the Names of Allah. These nafsir continue to play a great part. A tiny, undated, Cairene lithograph of 16 pp. has them as an amulet; Hiddah al-khod al-nafsir al-mulaimidina li-sayidina Sulaiman b. Dawud. Another list of seven is also given, especially connected with the days of the week. This can be expanded from the account given in Kawauni's Ali conjunciation, ed. Wustenfeld, pp. 371 sqq., which also puts the name of Allah in Sulaiman's control. Further lists and descriptions are in Damiri's Hayat al-bayan, ed. Cairo 1313, i. 127—157; Jayakar's translation, i. 484—480. The Fihrist then gives the names of some individual magicians and titles of their works, from the Greeks down to his own time. This can be controlled and expanded in some points from Djamshid's list. All of these, even the
Greek Arios son of Stephanos, ascertently connected himself with the Sulaimanic system and controlled spirits by means of his treaties with these. The last is an Ablâ' Amr Uthmân b. Abl Rasûla, a man of high reputation among his fellows, the author of many books and the doer of wonderful works, whom Ibn Isâhâk had personally known and to whom he said once: "I wish you were close to anything and do anything with this affair" (yana'inden râ'â'â' 'l-'âsâ''u l-bûlâhâ'ī 'l-'âsâ'î), to which the magician: "For so odd years if I had not known this that it was really I would have abandoned it; but I have no doubt", and Ibn Isâhâk could only reply: "By Allah, mayest thou not prosper" — apparently in his magic.

I illicit magic, "the blasphemous method" (al-jâhiz al-mawdûd), or the method of the 'abara, is traced similarly to Iblis through his daughter's daughter, Baidîkhâh (see Hujjâ, above). She has a throne (al-â'ajj) upon the water (al-'âzâ'î); cf. the âjîb of Iblis upon al-âlîkhe in the Sahîh of 'Abd al-'Azâ', ed., Constantinople, part vi., p. 190, and the âjîb of Allah, al-âlî 'zâ'î in Kur'ân xi. 9, with the treatment of the âjîb in Bahâ'î, ed. Bilâl 1325; part ii., p. 124. When the postulant in magic (murâd, as though he were a sâlir neophyte) has done for her whatever he will, she makes him to serve him, whomsoever he wills and accomplishes his needs, and he is not separated from her by any barrier (âjîfâh), whoever makes sacrifices to her, animal, and man, although he abandons the absolute requirements of the canon law and practices what is ratione abominable. [The disjointed character of this statement is probably due to Ibn Isâhâk's having thrown together several statements made to him]. Others say that Baidîkhâh is Iblis himself. Others that she sits upon her throne and that the murâd is brought to her to obey her and that he worships her. One of these 'abara had said to Ibn Isâhâk that he, when asleep had seen her sitting as he had seen her when awake and that he saw round her people like the Nabateans of the Sawd, bare-footed and with cloven hoofs (mu'âa'âfâf 'l-ka'âs); he even recognized a certain individual among them. He (Ibn Isâhâk's informant; apparently) was one of the greatest of the 'abara, of recent date, and used to speak from underneath a basin (kâma-yâ'âfâf min yâ'âfî yâ'âfî; cf. kâma yâ'âfî, p. 310, 15). Individuals follow of and follow from some books by them, one is a Yamanite who professed to derive from a certain witch al-Zâ'ârâf (the Yamanite princess Taraffât; cf. above, ii. 625, 6 foot); another is Ibn Wâshâyâh (see above article, ii. 472) who professed to connect with ancient Chaldæan magic and certainly did so with Nabatean. The Fihrist calls him a Şâfi and says he claimed to be a šâbîr, working with Ũluma. A section follows (p. 312, 11-15) on simple jugglers (al-sulâbâ). Then there is a return to magic, taking in Callisthenes, Apollonius of Tyane, Horus, Hermes, and representatives of the magic of India. For the meaning of "artifices" (hijâl) above, the section on mathematicians and engineers may be consulted (p. 265, 15; p. 274, 3). Further books on magic, mostly anonymous, are given in the Fihrist of miscellaneous; p. 314, 7-15; p. 317, 18; p. 318, 4. As Isâlîn has always ascribed a great part of illicit magic and astrology to Chaldæan tradition, the first Fihrist of the ninth Maûtâla (p. 312, 15). on the Harrânian Chaldæans who called themselves al-Sibîlîn is of importance in the history of magic, and especially the story of the head which answered questions as to the future (p. 324, 12 foot) of the same holds of the tenth Maûtâla on alchemy where we again find a long notice of Ibn Wâshâyâh (p. 345) and his fellows. As Ibn Khâlîfî pointed out long ago, Shi'i, Shi'ism, Sufism, philosophy, astrology, alchemy, magic, all touch one another; cf. in the Fihrist (p. 354, 2) the different assertions as to the šâfîr b. Hâyiân, the names given to him and the affiliations ascribed to him (article upon him above, i. 957).

If the author of the Fihrist was in evident doubt as to there being any real magic and simply recorded biographical and bibliographical facts as he found them, al-/nsâhî (d. 595/1111) had no such doubts. From the spirit-world was very real to him; throughout the Isâ'â he enters on full details as to the dijinm and the shânâm and their activities (Macdonald, Religion Attitude ... in Islam, p. 274, 5); in his Munkâfîd (ed. Cairo 1303, p. 46) he gives the magic square Budîdî as of tested efficacy and it has since been called by his name: he wrote on the interpretation of the gems (al-sulâb fi 'rûm al-tawir, Aleppo, Mubâsîr, 1328: 30 pages). Kazwînî in his Akhîr al-âlîdî (ed. Wustenfeld, p. 272) records that he prevailed on a celebrated occultist, al-Tâbâsî (d. 482/1093; G.A.L., l. 496), to raise the djinn for him. He saw them like shadows on a wall and when he desired to speak with them al-Tâbâsî replied that that was the limit of possibility for him — al-Ghazâlî. See, further, for this side of al-Ghazâlî and for its development in legend Goldthorpe's introduction to his Šurû al-'Ilm Tramont, Alger 1903, p. 15 end. This means that his philosophical pragmatism led him to accept all those workings in nature and in man for which he found good evidence. The Budîdî square had "worked"; therefore he accepted it and all that it implied. The world was full of mystery and this was only a bit of it. But as a moral philosopher he had to consider and classify the practice of magic. This he does early in the Isâ'â (ed. Cairo 1334, i. 15, 26; ed. with commentary of Murtâdâ al-Zâ'âfî, who d. 1205 = 1795, i. 146, 216 end). On p. 15 he is considering the moral classification of the sciences (al-'ilmûn); they either go back to the prophets or they do not. Those that do not (derived from reason, experiment, or picked up from hearing or language) are either praiseworthy (mu'âsîr) or blameworthy (mu'âsîr), and the example of the blameworthy is the twin sciences of magic, including talismans, and juggling. On p. 26 he enters in further detail to explain how a "science" can be blameworthy, seeing that the act (hijâl) is knowledge of a thing as it is and is one of the qualities (iflâm) of Allah. It is blameworthy, he explains, not for itself (li 'ilmîh) but with respect to men for one or other of three cases: (i) it leads to hurt either in the practiser or in some one else example, example, example, magic; (ii) it is mostly (fî 'ilmîh al-'asr) hurtful for the practiser or it example, astronomy; (iii.) if he who busies himself with it can not draw any real scientific advantage from it example, scholastic theology or medicine to one who is a layman in these sciences. This is evidently the basis of that Muslim utilitarianism to which so very widely interested an investigator as Ibn Khâlîfî
fell a victim (Religious Attitudes, p. 119 sqq.) It is based on the tradition: "It is part of the beauty of a man’s Islam to let alone what does not concern him. (Mun ’umul islàm al-mar’i tukkahu wa lla’mah; Goldziher, Muk. Stud., ii. 157). Magic, though it is real (hijkah), as both Kur’ân and traditions show, should be let alone. Further, al-Ghazâlî describes magic as a science which makes use of the properties of substances (guru’dhir) and numbers under certain astrological conditions; it makes of the substances a magical figure (kašribat; cf. Dosey, Suppl., ii. 775); the word seems to indicate Jewish origin for this form of magic) in the person of the person to be enchanted; an astrological situation is awaited and words, evil and involving unbelief (lamr), are pronounced over it, by which the assistance of her’shi’s are secured, from all this there result strange effects (a’wâl gurûdhr) on the person to be enchanted "by Allah’s influencing the custom of things" (il-ahâm tâ‘rîf al-lîlâ ‘l-falâh). The commentary of Murta’d al-Zahabi on this is worth consulting. His great authority is evidenced by Fâhî al-Din al-Râzî whom he scholiasticizes still further. His quotations from his Malekshâhâh and his Sîr al-es‘lâm al-‘ahwâl which are still in MS. (G.A.L., i. 507), also from Maslama al-Maqrî’i (d. 598 = 1067; G.A.L., i. 243), Ghu’far (al-Nikba’l) al-birût which also is still in MS. But however even al-Ghazâlî, with all the weight of his influence, might draw up a strict scheme of life to purify and safeguard the soul — his Iklwy is constructed entirely from that point of view, the masses of Islam would have none of it. The position, which is quite clear in the Fihrist, of licit and illicit magic, was left unchanged and licit magicians could protest that their art, derived from Sulaimân, the Prophet of Allah, was orthodox and even pious. The boundary lines, too, between the licit and the illicit were, and are, very vague; as vague as the status of spirits in Islam (article dhîn, supra, p. 1045), in which a mass of the dhîn are "believers", the relation of the ghushûn’s to the dhîn is uncertain, and there is even record of a descending belief of Ibâs. Further, even the scholiasts found difficulty in the Ghazâlîan position. It was pointed out that, on the one hand, it was only the practice of magic for evil purposes which could be called blameworthy, and, on another, that a knowledge of magic was essential to any one who had to distinguish between the results of magic and the evidentiary miracles (mu’jâhid) of prophets and, still more, the qa’isâmawâ, kahâm[see article above] of the saints (Baizâwâ, ed. Fleischer, i. 75; Râzî, Mu’âfi’t, Cairo 1307, i. 434-7 from below, sqq.) The only printed materials we have for the position of Fâhî al-Din al-Râzî (d. 606 = 1209), apart from his stray references as by Murta’d al-Zahabi above, are in his Kur’ân commentary, Mu’âfi’t al-giha’, where he treats the subject at length in dealing with the Kur’ânic verses elicted of, ii. 96. He had been strongly affected by Mu’âfi’t’s positions and had come to accept some of them, retaining in the end Sunnite orthodoxy, coloured with scholastic intellectualism and a fondness for analyzed, systematic statements (Goldziher in Der Islam, iii, pp. 235 sqq.; Karmam Kutlug, pp. 123, 203 and by index under Mu’âfi’t). His essential position upon magic is shown by his treatment of the story of the woman who went to Hûsî and Mu’âfi’t in Hâbil to learn magic from them. After her "faith" (lîmûn) has gone visibly forth from her and ascended to the heavens, they say to her: "You will never will a thing so as to picture it in your imagination but it will happen" (Mun ’umul islàm al-mar’i tukkahu wa lla’mah; Goldziher, Muk. Stud., ii. 157). Magic, therefore, is essentially a psychological working with physical effects; whatever the magician images to himself in his wukûn comes about. On pp. 129—134 Râzî enumerates eight categories (sârîn) to which the term sîr he has applied. (ii) Ancient Chaldean magic, based on the worship and influence of the stars. This is added to a statement and a refutation of the Mu’âfi’t’s position on magic. (ii) Psychological magic (sihâr aqâb al-a’wâl al-imârah wa l-la’mah al-falâh) is the magical use of these are discussed. (iii) The same by means of the earth-spirt (al-arwâl al-arif), i.e. the dhîn. This kind, see the fict magic of the Fihrist above, is called arwâl wa’l-mahall tâ‘rûf al-’dîn. (iv) Gaining by holding and directing the eyes of the onlookers (ar-râja’lul wa l-’adâlah al-falâh) (v.) Wonderful operations by means of machines, automata and various scientific devices. (vi) Using properties of drugs and perfumes to stupefy, (vii) Gaining the foolish by large claims of possessing the Most Great Name and commanding the dhîn. (vii.) By slander (nâmâ) and secret exciting of discord. In the statement in the Dictionary of technical terms — a modern compilation — pp. 648—653, which is based almost entirely on Râzî, only the first four of these are given, and it is said that the Mu’âfi’t’s rejected all but the fourth. In the Cairo text of Râzî (p. 434-5 sqq.) the Mu’âfi’t’s are said to have rejected all but iv., vi., viii. Did they deny v. and vii.? In Ibn Khaldûn (d. 808 = 1406) the psychological position of Râzî is still further developed and clarified until it practically coincides with the modern psychological doctrine of automatism; he is the first to give a full description of the rationales of crystal-gazing, or "scrying", essentially in modern terms (Ibn Khaldûn, ed. Quatremère, i. 191—195). With Ibn Khaldûn’s description and explanations should be taken Theodore Besterman’s Crystal-Gazing: a study in the history, distribution, theory and practice of scrying, London 1924; also W. H. Worzel, Die, oil and mirror gazing ceremonies in modern Egypt, in F.A.O.S., xxxvii. 37—53. So Ibn Khaldûn had moved far beyond Râzî as to Râzî’s second and third classes of magic. But although a devout Muslim, holding by Kur’ân and Sunna, he went strictly by what he had himself experienced and tested. Soothsayers and magicians of various kinds he had known, tried and accepted; he had dreams and found them valuable of the miracles of the saints he was firmly convinced. But he had never known either dhîn or individual angels, although he felt compelled to admit the existence of a vague entity, the Holy one (al-mula’ al-dîn) with celestial — and satanic — influences upon the souls of men. So he entered all the Kur’ânic references which gave him trouble, either intellectually or because he had no experience of the facts to which they referred, among the mu’ajâhid verses, those of obscure interpretation, opposed to the mu’ajâhid
verses, those of firmly fixed meaning, following the interpretation of Kur'an iii. 5 which asserts that no one but Allah knows the meaning of these (ed. Quatremère, ill. 47; article Kahi in above, i. 6739). Thus the essential force of magic lay in the nafs of the magician; a magician was being made. He might aid his own power by drawing on mysterious powers outside, whether or not powers in the proportion of things or of numbers or in other spiritual, non-material existences. For philosophers, says Ibn Khalidin, the difference between pure magic and the art of talismans is that pure magic is worked by the soul of the magician without any helper (mutla) but in talismans he draws upon the help of the spiritualities of the stars and the secrets of numbers and the properties of substances and the situations of the heavenly sphere which affect the world of the elements our world (ed. Quatremère, iii. 133). Apparently Ibn Khalidin himself was in broad accord with this distinction, so far as he could control it by the facts he had himself known (Quatremère, i. 129 ss.). But he also considered that the apparatus of magic, as in geometry in which the operator makes dots and lines in sand and constructs figures out of them, to divine the future, are simply a means for the manipulation an internal state in the magician in which the physical senses are blunted and the spiritual world is directly reached. If the magician does not show signs of such an hypnotic state he is an impostor (Quatremère, i. 209). Further an attempt had been made by al-Buni (d. 622 = 1225; see article above), following the methods of some extreme Sufis (al-qulub, al-taṣawwuf), to draw up a system of licit magic, based on the powers of the letters in divine names and constructing from these magic squares and talismans. This was called Simita, mawla (Dozy, Suppt. i. 708). like the Jewish Kabbalas of the alphabetic and theosophic type connected with the Divine Names (cf. C. D. Ginsburg, The Kabbalah, ii. ed., London 1902, p. 127 sqq.) but in Ibn Khalidin’s opinion it was simply magic, because it professed to derive its forces from natural powers and not from Allah, although using his names, and so came under the condemnation of magic (ed. Quatremère, iii. 137 sqq., especially p. 143 sqq.). The great book of this al-Buni, Sama al-mawla’ (G. L., i. 497), is the prototype of all the numberless Muslims at the present day who study magic. The two authorities on magic to whom Ibn Khalidin refers are Džahir b. Haiyân and Maslama al-Madżrittj; on both see above.

It is plain from Ibn Khalidin’s theory that he was faced by the necessity of distinguishing, not only legally but also psychologically, between the working of magic and that of the powers inhering in saints and prophets. What was the difference between the prophetic, the saintly and the magical naṣf? It was easy to rule, as he did (ed. Quatremère, iii. 134, 140), that the one is worked by a good man for good purposes and the other by a evil man for evil purposes, with an essential kinship between the naṣf and this external power which added it — that was the old legal distinction; see Bajši against Kurän ii. 96, vol. i., p. 76, 8. Also that the saint in his wonders and the prophet in his evidential miracles did everything in and by the assistance of Allah alone, without recourse to any other helper — whether spirit or natural force. But there were the extreme Sufis who claimed control of the natural world; descendants, apparently, of the thaumaturgic wing of the neo-platonists. And there was the great multitude of folk-lore saints, really animists, who, under a Muslim disguise, continued the divining and miracle-working of the old faiths and usages. This held, and holds, especially of Morocco with its hereditary saintship. His own theory, too, of the magical naṣf brought back the confusion of old Arabia between the kahin and the wali. Thus the way was open for the continuance among orthodox Muslims of the study and even the practice of magic and for the very complete confusion which exists at the present day between licit and illicit magic.

For further details on Ibn Khalidin’s attitude to religion and magic, reference may be made to the present writer’s Religious Attitude and Life in Islam, lectures ii.—vi. For some on magic in Islam see E. Douté, Les Magiciens, Paris 1906, Les Astuces, Châlons 1906. Magic et Religion dans l’Afrique du Nord, Alger 1909 (the basic treatise on magic in modern Islam); E. Westerberg, The Moorish conception of holiness, Helsingfors 1916; T. H. Weir, The Shaitâns of Morocco, Edinburgh 1904; Emily, Shareef of Wazan, My Life Story, London 1911. Another of the many by which magic has survived among the Muslim masses has lain in the numerous popular stories in which unbelieving djinn and the magic and talismans of unbelieving magicians are overcome by the stronger talismans handed down from the early prophets. Two good examples of this type of story have been translated by Well, from a Gotha MS, in his later recasting of his Tausend und Eine Nacht.—Adventures of Ali and Zaher of Damascus and Adventures of the Tausend und Djuander, vol. iv. of ed. Bonn 1897, p. 194—112.

The Spiritual Life of the Man Who Is also of this type. By these stories, perhaps above all else, the equation, sikr = naṣf, has been stamped on the Muslim mind, with a loop-hole left by the fact that the orthodox talismans are, in essence, as much sikr as those of the unbelievers. Again, another of these means lies in the popular classification of philosophers as magicians. This universal tendency has been very strong in Islam and especially so in the case of Ibn Sinâ [q.v.]. There is in wide circulation an apocryphal Life of him as a magician (Hilâyât Abû ‘Ali ibn Sinâ, Ottoman Turkish lithograph, A. I. 1215 [?]; Arzabîighi, Kârân 1881; Arabic from the Turkish by Mustâf Efendi Mukhârî, Cairo 1305; and others, e.g., Potsch in Katalog der turk. Hzs. in Berlin, p. 466; Chauvin, Bild. ar., v. 143). In consequence there exists under his name (Cairo Mathâb al-madâfûn, no date, p. 32) a little magical treatise on the simina side, Al-kunz el-madân and ‘abîr el-mâjin, professing to be the result of his studies in the enchanted cave in the Mağrib which the apocryphal Life describes.

Thus in Kurân and Sunna, in orthodox theology, in mystical theology of all phases stretching to pantheistic theosophy, in philosophy and natural science of all kinds from almost experimental psychology to the speculations of the pseudo-Ibn Sinâ, in primitive animistic devotion, the existence of magic as a reality, though it may be a dangerous one, has been perpetuated.

The present status of magic in the Muslim world
can be illustrated by a little magical library formed by the present writer in Egypt in 1908 and since.

(1) The foundation is still the Shawa al-Ma'sirif of al-Bun' (large lithograph in 4 parts and 442 pp., written by Mirzâ Husain al-\"Ir\'isi, various dates from 1322 to 1324), recommended to me as such a foundation by a native scholar, professor in a government training college for teachers, who had been a pupil of Djamal al-Din al-Afghani [q.v.]. (2) Another universal treatise is the Al-\'Arsh al-Darajat, in 7 books (Cairo 1327 = 1909; pp. 252), by Ahmad Mîst al-Zajjâwi. This book by a contemporary magician was published by subscription with an imposing list of subscribers; it covers the whole field from astrology and astronomy to geomancy, magic squares and acrally. The author has embraced the position that the earth moves, which he knows as the Pythagorean, and has proved it from the Karan. In this and in other ways he is far beyond the childish sinâyat of al-Bun'. I have also a small calendar (nawiiqya) by him in its tenth year, dated 1326 = 1908, with astrological and magical appendices. (3) Two treatises on sinâyat of the minfi-rural, "tested", type were published together, Cairo 1324 = 1906; Hâfiz al-malik al-majid by Ahmad al-Darâîn (d. 1151 = 1738; J. A. L., ii. 323) and al-Munfi-rural by Muhammad b. Yâsuf al-Sânî (d. 1292 = 1876; J. A. L., ii. 252). The first of these must be very popular for I have also two editions of it separately, Cairo 1323, 1325. (4) Also of the sinâyat type is Kitiha al-\'awwâd, Cairo 1321, by Ahmad b. Abd al-Latif al-Sharîq al-\'Aamîn (d. 1292 = 1410; J. A. L., ii. 190) — a very popular third year. (5) A more practical and picturesque and less verbose pious book is Sinâyat al-\'armâl wa l-\'amîn al-arâf (at least two editions, Cairo 1322, 1325) by Ibn al-\'AbdAllâh al-Timânsî (d. 1237 = 1820; J. A. L., ii. 83); cf. Goldscher in Z. D. P. S., xxviii. 115-121. (6) Two books by a certain Muhammad al-Rahâwi (al-\'Ashâr al-majmû' fi l-\'ilm al-fa\'in al-minfi-rural wa Ghaybat al-sani'at fi l\'-\'ilm al-rahâlah) Cairo, no date, are of the same calistical type and the author names his predecessors or al-Ghâasînî, al-Bu\'i, Muyyî al-Din Ibn al-\'Arabi (d. 638 = 1240; J. A. L., i. 441 sqq.; cf. for this edition of Ibn al-\'Arabi the study of his Kleine Schriften by H. S. Nyberg, Leiden 1919), Shâhâb al-Din al-Kalâmi (J. A. L. i. 130) and al-Sharâ'îni [q.v.]. (7) Another contemporary Egyptian magician has three little treatises. He is Yâsuf Muhammad al-Awghânâshî (al-\'Afsâ'atî), known as al-Hindi, of the island of Shandawil in the Seul, but giving as Cairo a address the abode of (\"law\") of \"Ali Efendî al-Nâ\'î, N. S. Darb al-Dhulûb, in the Afât al-Shâhiq Mursîlî, over against the Mosque of al-Sulâ\'înî. There he is, or was, prepared to instruct in his art and give permission to exercise it to those who, after being tested, prove worthy. His books are: Al-ghaybar al-majbût fi hawwâl al-mun\'adh al-
Ghâasînî (see above on the Ghâssillian magic square); Al-as\'aset al-arabâniyâ fi tashkîl al-\'amîn al-\'rahîbat (on the subjugating of the djinn); Al-hayyat al-\'rabâniyâ fi mu\'ahhadat al-
Wâlî al-\'amînî (on the same subject). Only the last book has a date, 1325 = 1907. (8) Kitiha al-\'aqid al-\'amârah, Cairo, no date, is another treatise on the Ghâssillian square by Ahmad al-
Dinmûntî (d. 1192 = 1778; J. A. L., ii. 371, under the title \"Li\'f al-\'arawâ\"). (9) Muhammad ibn al-Bâmûntî al-Zâ\'afarî, Abû\'l\'Arabi al-\'Uyâfiyâ fi l-
\'ardâ'at wa l-\'as\'ib\'ah al-\'arâ'îyat, Menâfî 1322.

(10) Al-Hâdîq al-Sâ\'im al-Zanjîndî, Abû\'l\'Arabi al-
\'Ara\'bîyat al-\'amârah, Menâfî, no date. (11) Al-Hâdîq al-
\'Ardâ'at al-\'amârah b. l-\'Hadîq, Abû\'l\'\'Arabi al-
\'Alwânâ, Cairo, no date. (12) Al-hayyat al-
\'arâ\'îyat bi l-\'Hadîq, Abû\'l\'\'Arabi al-
\'Ara\'bîyat al-\'amârah wa l\'-\'Arâ\'ib, Cairo, no date; the author, it is known nothing. (13) Al-fâ\'alwât al-Yâmi\'nî al-
\'Ara\'bîyat al-\'Amârah Shi\'ah, Cairo, no date, astrology; cf. Fikrist, p. 239, 3 yiq\'; 257, 357 sqq.; 355, 389 sqq.; and notes. (14) Abû\'l\'\'Arabi [\'Uthmân b. Muhammad] al-
\'Alwânâ, Kitiha fâ\'alwât al-
\'Ara\'bîyat al-
\'Amârah bi Abû\'l\'\'Arabi al-
\'Alwânâ bi Sâ\'id, Cairo, no date; in Brill's Cat., No. 80. There is a copy of this work [No. 33], dated Cairo 1288; another printer and publisher has in this case nothing. (15) Muhammad al-
\'Ara\'bîyat wa l-\'Asqal, Kennedy al-
\'Ara\'bîyat al-
\'Amârah Shi\'ah, Cairo, no date; in Brill's Cat., No. 80. There is a copy of this work [No. 33], dated Cairo 1288; another printer and publisher has in this case nothing. (16) Al-\'Amârah bi Abû\'l\'\'Arabi al-
\'Alwânâ, Kennedy al-
\'Ara\'bîyat al-
\'Amârah Shi\'ah, Cairo, no date; in Brill's Cat., No. 80. There is a copy of this work [No. 33], dated Cairo 1288; another printer and publisher has in this case nothing. (17) Dâ\'ir al-
\'Ara\'bîyat (d. 611 = 1215), Al-
\'Alwânâ fi l-
\'iyadat wa l-
\'ikâma, Cairo 1324, J. A. L., ii. 135, No. 328; a compound of sinâyat and folk-medicine in 195 sections. (18) Abû\'l\'\'Arabi al-
\'Ara\'bîyat al-
\'Asqal, Shi\'ah al-
\'Ara\'bîyat (2 parts); Cairo 1310, 1312; a counter-blast to all the above with much curious information on popular superstitions, especially medical; the author is a graduate of the Kasr al-Ainai medical school and writes with the indignation of the qualified medical practitioner.
Khan Lodi, the governor of the province. The Nawab appointed him storekeeper to his household, and he performed his official duties for several years to the satisfaction of his employer. In his leisure hours he retired to the jungles for meditation, and tradition says that in one of these devotional excursions he was taken in a vision to the Divine Presence and there received his mission to preach to the world that "there is but one God whose name is True, the Creator, devoid of fear and enmity, immortal, unborn, self-existent, great and bountiful." Nanak now left the service of the Nawab and became (at the age of 30) a public preacher. He began a series of tours in the course of which he visited all parts of India, particularly in the sacred places of the Hindus and shrines of Muhummadanism. Wherever he went he held controversies with priests and shadaks, demonstrated the fatality of their belief in dogmas and rituals, and taught the necessity of self-denial, morality and truth. He is also said to have travelled through Persia and to have visited Mecca and Baghdad.

In Persia and Afghanistan he gained converts and even established dioceses (mandir), notably at Bukhara and Kâbul (Sewaram Singh, Life of Guru Nanak, p. 73). It is not stated, however, whether he knew enough Persian or Arabic to be able to preach to the people of these Islamic countries. The statement of the Siyâr al-Muta‘akkhirin that Nanak studied Persian and Muslim theology with one Saiyid Hassan has been rejected by the modern Hindu and Sikh critics. "This," says one of them, "appears to be an error on the part of a Muslim writer who did not understand the true meaning of Nanak's concepts; and, in addition, this tradition has not been transmitted to the teachings of Islam." (G. C. Nanang, The Transformation of Sikhism, p. 9.)

Macauliffe, however, is inclined to accept that Nanak was "a fair Persian scholar" (The Sikh Religion, i. 15), but does not mention the source whence he received his instruction in that language.

For the last ten years of his life Nanak settled at Kartarpur, a village founded in his honour by a millionaire on the bank of the Rawal, where he continued to preach his new religion to the numerous visitors whom his piety attracted from far and wide. He died at the age of 70 in 1539, leaving behind him a fairly large number of disciples (sihr) and two sons, one of whom named Shri Chand founded the Udasi sect (see infra).

Shortly before his death, Nanak nominated one of his devoted followers named Angad (a Khatri like himself) to succeed him as guru (apostle) of the Sikhs. After performing the ceremony of nomination he declared that Angad was as himself and that his own spirit would dwell in him. Nanak had already preached the doctrine of metempsychothis, but this particular declaration gave rise to the belief among the Sikhs that the spirit of Nanak was transmitted to each succeeding guru in turn, and this is why all of them adopted Nanak as their soor de placme in their compositions. Guru Angad occupied the office of apostle for 13 years until his death in 1552. Tradition ascribes to him the invention of the Gurmukhi characters in which the sacred writings of the Sikhs have been preserved, but it has been pointed out, notably by Grierson and Rose, that the Gurmukhi alphabet is of a different and earlier origin (J.R.A.S. 1916, p. 671; A Glossary of the Tribes and Castes of the Punjab, i. 672). The tradition may have arisen from the fact that Guru Angad adopted the script in recording the life and compositions of Nanak.

Amar Das, the third guru of the Sikhs, was nominated by Angad himself. His ministry lasted 22 years (1552-1574), and he marked this time by the taking the first steps towards a religious and social organization of the Sikhs. Missionary work was undertaken by him in a systematic manner; over twenty dioceses (mandir) were established in various parts of the country, where some of his zealous disciples preached the gospel of Sikhism. In order to promote feelings of equality and brotherhood among the increasing number of Sikhs, he maintained a public refectory (langar) where all ate together without distinction of caste or creed. Amar Das cultivated friendly relations with the Emperor Akbar who visited him at his own residence in Gobindwali (on the Beas) and granted him a large estate. This very much enhanced his prestige and helped to increase the number of fresh converts. He kept up the spirit of Nanak in his own ethical teaching and announced the superstitions common to the Hindus, particularly the practice of widow-burning (sat), and enjoined re-marriage of widows.

Amar Das was succeeded by his favourite disciple and son-in-law Râm Das, who propagated the tenets of Sikhism with a still larger measure of success. He had the good fortune to find in the Emperor Akbar a warm admirer who was ever keen to do him favour. The Emperor granted him (in 1577) a large plot of land in which he began the excavation of the sacred tank (meant for the devotional ablutions of the Sikhs) which was afterwards named amrit sar "the pool of nectar." Around the tank the Guru founded a small town which he called after himself Râmâñpur and which subsequently grew into the new flourishing city of Amritsar. The construction of the tank was completed by his son Arjan, the 4th guru, who, in the midst of it, founded the Har Mandir, the temple dedicated to God as a common place of worship for the Sikhs. To Europeans it is now known as "the Golden Temple of Amritsar." The Guru declared that: "by bathing in the tank of Râm Das, all the sins that man COMMITTED shall be done away, and he shall become pure by his ablutions" (Macauliffe, op. cit., iii. 15.) Thus was created a Mecca for the Sikhs — a centre for their national life.

Arjan succeeded his father in 1574, and henceforward the office of Guru became hereditary. Arjan took further steps to organise the Sikhs as a community. The greatest service that he rendered to the cause of Sikhism was the compilation of the Granth, the bible of the Sikhs. Guru Angad had already committed to writing the life and compositions of Nanak; Arjan carried the work further and added thereto the hymns of the next three Gurus, which he carefully collected. To these he added his own numerous compositions along with considerable extracts from the writings of several Hindu and Muhammadans saints anterior to Nanak. "It was one of the Guru's objects to show the world that there was no superstition in the Sikh religion, and that every good man, no matter of what caste or creed, was worthy of honour and reverence" (Macauliffe, op. cit., iii. 61.). The volume thus compiled by Guru Arjan (completed in 1604 after some years of labour) is called the Adi Granth ("the ancient scripture"), as
distinguished from the Dastan Granth or the Granth of the tenth Guru (see below).

Ardjan was an ambitious and enterprising leader. He combined business with spiritual guidance and deputed Mazuds (collectors or agents) to various districts of the country to realize the Guru’s desires, which so far were only voluntarily offered by the disciples. This brought him wealth and with it pomp and show. He styled himself maulvi gāndāhī *the true King*, which clearly marks his ambition for political power. He encouraged commerce among his disciples and sent them not only to various parts of India but also to Afghanistan and Central Asia for purposes of trade and propagation of the Sikh faith. In 1606, Ardjan financially helped Prince Khuruan who had rebelled against his father, the Emperor Dhañgār. After the defeat of the Prince, the Guru was imprisoned, by the Emperor’s command, at Lahore where he shortly afterwards died.

During the Guruship of Ardjan’s son and successor Hargovind (1606–1643), Sikhism made a great advance. The first four Gurus were peaceful teachers of quietism and self-denial, but Ardjan initiated the policy of secular aggrandisement, while Hargovind openly adopted active resistance, which marks the beginning of the military career of the Sikhs. He was by nature a soldier, passionately devoted to the chase and manly games. Systematic collection of tithe and offerings had made him extremely rich and he was now able to assume kingly authority. He cherished a hatred of Dhañgār to whom he ascribed the death of his father; a desire for revenge was certainly one of the causes of his resorting to arms. He enlisted, in his service, a number of outlaws, malcontents and freeloaders, *built the stronghold of Hargovind* on the Bās and thence harried the plunder. He had a stable of 500 horses; three hundred mounted followers were constantly in attendance upon him, and a guard of sixty matchlock-men secured the safety of his person” (Cunningham, History of the Sikhs, p. 56). The alarming reports of the Gurus’ military organisation reached the Emperor, who summoned him to his court and ordered his interment in the fort of Gwāilā. He was released after some time, but the imprisonment gave him a further cause of resentment. Soon after the death of Dhañgār and the accession to the throne of the Emperor Shab-djhān, Hargovind assumed a defiant attitude and took up arms against the government. In the course of six years he thrice defeated the troops sent against him by the governor of Lahore. But he feared vengeance on the part of Shab-djhān and retired to the hills where he lived unmolested until his death in 1645.

Under Hargovind, the Sikh faith was greatly transformed. They ceased to be mere recluse, and their Guru was no longer a mere spiritual guide, but a military leader as well. They felt their strength and saw the possibility of future political power.

Hargovind was succeeded by his grandson Harr Rai, who was, unlike his grandfather, of a retiring nature. He had intimate friendly relations with Dārī Sahīk, the eldest son of Shab-djhān, and in 1628 when Dārī wandered in exile pursued by the hostile troops of his younger brother Awrangzēb, Harr Rai assisted him in crossing the Bās and reaching a comparatively safe locality. Of course he incurred the displeasure of Awrangzēb who summoned him to Delhi to answer for this affront. He sent on his own behalf his son Rām Rai who was detained at the imperial court as a hostage to insure the peaceful conduct of his father. Harr Rai died in 1650 and his younger son Har Kīshān (a child of six) succeeded him. His right to the Guruship was disputed by Rām Rai who laid his own case before Awrangzēb. The infant apostle was invited to Delhi to settle the dispute with his brother. There he was attacked with small-pox and died (1664).

There followed a struggle for succession after the death of Har Kīshān, and it was after much opposition that Tegh Bahādur, son of Hargovind, was acknowledged as Guru from among a score of candidates for the pontifical throne. His opponents continued to assert their claims, and some of them were even set up as rival Gurus. Tegh Bahādur retired, in some bitterness to the Siwaliks and there founded Anandpur, a town which played a part of some importance in the subsequent annals of the Sikhs. Further, he set out on an extensive tour in India, visiting the Deccan and the Eastern Beqal where bishoprics of the Sikh Church already existed. In the course of his travels he resided for some time at Patna, the seat of one of the archbishoprics (tehā,q), where his son Govind Rai, the future Guru and the real founder of the political power of the Sikhs, was born (1666). Tegh Bahādur’s influence as Guru extended as far as Ceylon in the south and Assam in the east. After a time he returned to the Punjhāb where he “maintained himself and his disciples by plunder”. He “gave a ready asylum to all fugitives and his power interfered with the prosperity of the country” (Cunningham, op. cit., p. 64). The imperial troops marched against him and he was made prisoner and brought to Delhi where he was put to death by the order of Awrangzēb (1675). The popular story is related in the Gurnkhi chronicles that while in the presence of the Emperor, the Guru prophesied the coming of the English and destruction of the Mughal power at their hands. The words uttered, by him on this occasion, became the battle-cry of the Sikhs in the assault on Delhi in 1857 under General John Nicholson and thus the prophecy of the 9th Guru was gloriously fulfilled” (Mackenzie, iv. 381).

The figure of Tegh Bahādur’s son Govind Rai, who was saluted as Guru after the execution of his father in 1675, is perhaps the most prominent in the history of the Sikhs. He succeeded to the apostleship as a mere boy, but ended his career by completely transforming a community of mere devotees into a nation of warriors who were destined to rule the Punjāb for nearly a century. The violent death of his father seemed to have left a lasting impression on his young mind, and he cherished a bitter hatred towards Awrangzēb. But the power of the latter was too great to allow the possibility of revenge. He was therefore compelled to retire to the hills in order to be left in peace and receive the training necessary to befit him for the task of leadership. For twenty years he lived there, occupying himself in hunting and acquiring a knowledge of the sacred languages of the Muhammadans and Hindus and their religions. He nurtured his feeling of vengeance and formed his plans for the future with a view to destroying the power of the Mughals. He set about the task of uniting the Sikhs into a
nation by promoting among them feelings of democratic equality. He admitted both high and low into his fold and conducted a vigorous war against the caste system. In order to create uniformity in spirit as well as in form, he instituted the ceremony of initiation or baptism called *pahul* to be performed in the following manner:

The initiate, after bathing and donning clean clothes, sits in the midst of an assembly generally summoned for the purpose, some sugar is mixed with water in an iron basin and five Sikhs in turn stir it with a double-edged dagger chanting certain verses of the Granth. After this, some of the solution is sprinkled over the hair and body of the initiate and some of it is given him to drink. The *rahat* or rules of Sikh conduct are also explained to him. The solution is called *arivit* (nectar) which is supposed to confer immortality on the initiate, to make him a "Singh" (lion) and a true *Kabiriya" (Rose, *Tristes and Castes of the Punjab*, I, 696). After receiving the *pahul*, every Sikh was to leave his locks unshorn, to wear by way of uniform the 5 K's, i.e., 5 things whose name begin with a K, viz.: (1) *Kak\* or short drawers, (2) *Kirpan*, a dagger, (3) *Kara*, an iron bracelet, (4) *Kesh*, long hair, and (5) *Kangha*, a comb. The prefix "Singh" was to be added to the name of every baptised Sikh, the Guru himself to be called in future Govind Singh. He denominated his initiated disciples the *khalsa* (the pure, elect, liberated) or *khalsa* (from the Arabic root *khulqa* or khelusa). Govind Singh struck the keynote of his policy by thus addressing the Sikhs:

"Since the time of Baba Nanak *tarnangpahul* hath been customary. Men drank the water in which the Gurus had washed their feet, a custom which led to great humility; but the Khalsa can now only be maintained as a nation by bravery and skill in arms. Therefore I now institute the custom of baptism by water stirred with a dagger, and change my followers from Sikhs to Singhs or lions. They who accept the nectar of the *pahul* shall be changed before your very eyes from jackals into lions and shall obtain empire in this world and bliss hereafter." (Mauzulif, v. 93). *Abolition of caste, equality of privileges with one another and with the Guru, common worship, common baptism for all classes and lastly, common external appearance — these were the means, besides common leadership and community of aspirations, which Govind employed to bring about unity among his followers, and by which he bound them together into a compact mass before they were hurled against the legions of the great Moghuls" (Naranj, *op. cit.*, p. 82).

By his prolonged residence in the hills, Govind Singh wanted, besides carrying on his proselytising activities uninterupted, to secure the assistance of the numerous hill chiefs against what he called the tyranny of the Mahambad rule. But in these objects he was defeated, for the hill rajás whose dynasties had ruled independently since time immemorial, generally resented the principles of democracy being taught to their subjects and they unanimously resisted the religious propaganda of Govind. Failing to secure their alliance by friendly means, he tried the experiment of force. From his retreat at Anandpur he led marauding expeditions into their territories carrying away all that he could lay his hands on. The * Kadpur* chiefs of Bilaspur, Katol, Handir, Ejarotes and Niltagarh united to attack the Guru with an army of 10,000. He opposed them at the head of 2,000 of his followers, including 500 Pathans whom he kept in his service, and won his victory at Bhangaí chiefly through the help of Salyd Bhatti Shah, chief of Sadhora. Govind's power now increased; he had a number of retreats in the hills and his depredations in the adjoining territories grew more frequent and violent. The Khalsa jointly appealed for help to Awrangbe, who despatched orders to the governor of Sarhind to effect an alliance with them and attack the Guru. In the battle that ensued he was defeated and took refuge in the fortress of Anampur (1701). Here he was besieged by the imperial forces and the siege was prolonged. Provisions ran short and his followers deserted him. His family, including his mother, wives and young boys, effected their escape to Sarhind where they were betrayed and the two children were put to death. Govind himself escaped in disguise, and with a few faithful followers fled to the fortress of Camkaur (in the present district of Amhala) hotly pursued by the enemy. He was forced to leave Camkaur and again fly for his life. He wandered in disguise from place to place until he reached the wastes of Bhotinda, halfway between Ferozepur and Delhi. His disciples again rallied round him and he succeeded in repulsing his pursuers at a place since called *Muktsar* or the Pool of Salvation, constructed in commemoration of the Sikhs who fell in the action. For some time he settled at a place called Damdama "halfway between Hausi and Ferozepur", where he occupied himself in preaching and composing the *Daram Granth* (see below), which is regarded by the Sikhs as supplement to the Adi Granth compiled by Guru Arjan. Meanwhile Awrangbe died and was succeeded by his son Bahadur Shah, who, contrary to the policy of his father, sought to conciliate the Guru. He conferred upon him, the military command of the Deccan whether he proceeded to assume his charge. But shortly after his arrival there, he was stabbed by one of his Afghan servants for some private grievance, and he died at Nader on the banks of the Godlewari (Oct. 1708). On his deathbed he refused to nominate anyone to succeed him, but enjoined upon his disciples to look upon the Granth as their future Guru, and upon God as their sole protector, thus putting an end to the apostolic succession. Govind's end came before his object had been achieved, "but his spirit survived to animate the Sikhs with courage." Govind Singh was succeeded, not as a Guru but as a military leader of the Sikhs, by Banda, a Rupjut of Kashmir belonging to the Bairagi order. Meeting Govind in the Deccan, he was converted to Sikhism and styled himself "Banda," or "slave" (of the Guru). Banda was charged by Govind to return to the Punjáb and urge the Sikhs to avenge the murder of his children and unite to destroy the Mahambad despotism. The Sikhs "flocked to him, ready to fight and die under his banner." At heart Banda was ambitious, and under the pretext of carrying out the orders of the Guru he sought to attain to political power. He began his operations in the Punjab by committing highway robberies, freely distributing the spoils among his adherents. This attracted many criminals — scavengers, leather-dressers and such like persons who were very numerous among the Sikhs — to his person. The Moghul power, after
the death of Aawrangzüb was fast declining; constant struggle among his sons and grandsons for the throne left the Sikhs free to increase their power, and the criminal activities of Banda went unchecked. He proceeded, with an army of lawless freebooters, from town to town in the very neighbourhood of Delhi, plundering and mercilessly slaughtering the Muhammadans in thousands. Prospects of plunder and the sacred duty of avenging the death of the Guru’s children swelled the number of Banda’s followers. The accursed town of Sarhind, where the children were done to death, was stormed by them in May 1710 and freely given to plunder. The Sikhs perpetrated horrible atrocities on the Muslim inhabitants of the town, whom they butchered without distinction of age or sex. They extended their destructive activities to the very walls of Delhi. The Emperor Bahádur Shâh, who was away in the Deccan, was alarmed on hearing the reports of these outrages and forthwith hastened to the Pandjâb to make redress. The imperial troops defeated Banda, but he escaped to the adjoining hills. The death of Bahádur Shâh in 1712 was followed by a war of succession among his sons, from which Djahânsâd Shâh came out successful. He was however murdered, after a short reign of eleven months, by his nephew Farrukhshiyar, who now ascended the degraded throne of Delhi. These commotions were favourable to the Sikhs, who once more began to ravage the country under the notorious Banda. Farrukhshiyar charged ‘Abd al-Šamad Khán, governor of the Pandjâb, to put a stop to the atrocities of the Sikhs. With a large army he pursued Banda who was at last besieged in the fortress of Girânpur on the Kéwi. Finally he was seized, made prisoner and brought to Delhi where he was tortured to death (1716).

Banda’s character is by no means amiable. Even from the Sikh standpoint, he does not deserve reverence, for his motives were selfish and his means unscrupulous. Besides assuming sovereign authority, he aimed at creating a distinct sect of his own, and contrary to the dying injunctions of Govind Singh, he claimed to be acknowledged as the eleventh Guru. Moreover, he made certain other alterations in the Sikh beliefs and rituals — facts which led the more ardent followers of Govind Singh to revolt against his authority. However, there is no doubt that the stormy career through which the Sikhs passed under his leadership gave them a good deal of martial training.

The defeat and death of Banda was followed by a general reaction and a severe persecution of the Sikhs in the reign of Farrukhshiyar. They were declared outlaws; many of them abandoned their faith, but the more loyal among them were forced to take shelter in the hills and forests. Successive governors of the Pandjâb, notably the Mufti al-Mulk, better known as Mir Mammâ, carried out the repressive policy of Farrukhshiyar, and for a time it seemed that the Sikh nation would become extinct. But the Moghal power was rapidly decaying, and in the Pandjâb it was more notably weakened by the frequent invasions of Ahmad Shâh Abdalî. The distracted state of the province was favourable to the Sikhs who began gradually to reappear and reorganise themselves. They built several fortresses and acquired wealth by freely plundering the defenceless towns. The centre of their national activities was Amritsar, which they greatly enriched and fortified. Prince Timûr, who governed the Pandjâb in the name of his father Ahmad Shâh Durrânî was hostile to the Sikhs. In 1756, he attacked Amritsar, demolished the Har Mandar and filled the sacred tank with the debris. The Sikhs mobilised in large numbers to avenge this outrage and succeeded in driving the Prince out of Lahore, which they temporarily occupied. Their military leader Djasâ Singh Kalâl (the “brewer”) struck coin in his own name with a Persian inscription. But the advent of the Mahrattas under Ragboba (in 1758) made them retire from Lahore, and brought the ferocious Ahmad Shâh for the fifth time to the Pandjâb. He inflicted a crushing defeat on the Mahrattas in the memorable battle of Pânjpat (1761). The Sikhs became active as soon as he left the Pandjâb and regained their lost power. He therefore came back with the definite object of breaking their power and recover his territories. In a desperate battle fought near Ludhîna (1762) he totally defeated them with heavy carnage, but he had soon to leave the Pandjâb in order to suppress a rebellion at Kandhâr. The Sikhs recovered soon and in 1763 they defeated Zain Khân, the Afghan governor of Sarhind, which they sacked and destroyed. Once more they took possession of Lahore, and this time their hold was more permanent. They assembled at Amritsar and proclaimed the regime of the Khâla as supreme in the Pandjâb (1764). The sovereign authority was vested in a national council called the Gurmukh. The coin of the Sikh commonwealth bore the Persian inscription:

Dig u tigh u fath u muret bi dirang
Yaft at Nânak Gurî Govînd Singh

“Guru Govînd Singh received from Nânak
The Sword, the Bowl and Victory unailing”

(Khânzâd Singh, History of the Sikh Religion, p. 264).

Now that the common danger which confronted the Sikhs was removed, they became disintegrated and divided into a number of states or confederacies called Misal. These Misals were 12 in number, governed independently of each other by their respective chiefs (Sârbâr, q. v.), who were under no supreme authority and had nothing in common with one another except their religion. “They were almost constantly engaged in civil war, grouping and regrouping in the struggle for pre-eminence.” They were “loosely organised and varied from time to time in power and even in designation.” After thirty years of this variable rule in the Pandjâb, there appeared on the scene a strong man who united these jarring confederacies into a compact sovereignty. This was Randjît Singh.

Randjît Singh’s father Mahâ Singh was the chief of the Sakechakia Misal with its headquarters at Gadjarânwâla, 40 miles to the north of Lahore. At the age of 12 (in 1722) he succeeded to the barony of his father. He gradually rose to power through his personal character and genius with which he was gifted by nature. In 1799 he acquired possession of Lahore through a royal investiture granted to him by Zâmân Shâh (grandson of Ahmad Shâh Abdalî), who was still looked upon as virtual owner of the Pandjâb. Amritsar was reduced by Randjît Singh in 1802. The possession of Lahore and Amritsar, the two most important towns of the Pandjâb, made his personality conspicuous and enlarged his prestige. He assumed the title of Maharâdja and continued to
extend his possessions until gradually he annexed all the Mislis to his dominions. With the English, whose territories now extended to the Sutlej, Randjitt Singh had friendly relations. A treaty of alliance was concluded between the two powers in 1809 which Randjitt Singh very faithfully observed. He organised a powerful military force trained by some of the European generals, notably French, who had previously served under Napoleon, and after Waterloo came to the Pundjab to enter the service of the Maharaja. With this force he was able to reduce the whole of the Pundjab, annex Kashmir (in 1819) and Peshawar (in 1834). He died in 1839, leaving behind him a consolidated kingdom extending from the Sutlej to the Hindu Kosh, but no one among his heirs was capable enough to manage it. Three of his sons ascended the throne in rapid succession; conspiracies were rife and led to assassinations, civil war and enormous bloodshed. The army had become uncontrollable and spread terror throughout the country. The court at last found an outlet for its activities by inciting the army leaders to cross the Sutlej and invade the British territory. This led to the first Sikh war (Dec. 1845), in the course of which the Sikhs were defeated by the English general Sir Hugh (afterwards Lord) Gough in four successive battles fought at Ferozshah and Mudki (in the present district of Ferozepur) and Altwal and Sobraon near Ludhiana (Jan.–Feb. 1846). "The victory opened the way to Lahore which was promptly occupied by the Governor-General" (Sir Henry Hardinge). The Sikh Durbar accepted the British resident (Sir Henry Lawrence) to act as President of the Council of Regency to the minor Maharaja Dalip Singh, son of Randjitt Singh. The revolt of Daud Mubrâd, governor of Multân, against the government at Lahore (in 1848) tempted the Sikhs again to take up arms against the English. War was consequently declared and Lord Gough inflicted two heavy defeats on the Sikh army, first at Chillianwala and then at Gujrat (early 1849). The Pundjab was declared annexed to the British dominions and the Sikh rule came to an end.

Religion

Sikhism aimed at purifying the religious beliefs of the Hindus. The aims of the founders were therefore mainly negative. He strongly protested against caste restrictions and superstitious beliefs. He preached absolute equality of mankind; he taught that mechanical worship and pilgrimage do not elevate the human soul; that spirit and not the form of devotion was the real thing. No salvation is possible without a true love of God and good deeds in this world. Sikhism, like Islam, condemns idolatry and teaches strict monotheism. Its God is the God of all mankind and of all religions, "whose name is true, the Creator, immortal, unborn, self-existent, great and beneficent" (Dîrghît by Guru Nînak).

Reverence for the Guru is much emphasized, for although "God is with man, but can only be seen by means of the Guru." (Macauliffe, ii. 347). Sikhism also believes in the doctrine of Karma and Metempsychosis.

The theology of Nînak was not formal; his sole object was to bring about a social and moral reform. Sikhism remained a pacific and tolerant cult until the social tyranny of the Hindus and political friction with Muhammadans transformed it into a militant creed. Govind Singh made Sikh theology more formal and prescribed rules for guidance in private and social affairs. He forbade the use of tobacco and wine, though the latter is now more freely indulged in by the Sikhs.

The sacred book of the Sikhs is the Granth, which is held by them in great reverence. The first portion of it, called the Adi Granth was compiled, as mentioned above, by the fifth Guru Arjan. It includes the hymns of the first five Gurus together with selections from the compositions of saints and reformers anterior to Nînak, notably Kalârî, Namdev, Dâjî Dev, Râmânand and Shâhî Firdos. The Granth is composed wholly in verse with different metres. The bulk of it is in archaic Hindi written in Gurmukhi characters; other portions are in various other Indian dialects and languages including Sanskrit, together with a few verses and tales in Persian (written in Gurmukhi script). The second portion, called the Dâwan Granth (or Granth of the 10th Guru) was compiled by Govind Singh and includes, in the main, his own writings. The major part of it consists, like the Adi Granth, of hymns in praise of God, but it also comprises the autobiography of Govind Singh, called the Vichitra Nînak ("the wonderful drama") along with other miscellaneous compositions by the Hindu poets whom he kept in his service. The entire Granth usually forms a quarto volume of about 1,200 pages. Some of its chapters are used by the Sikhs as Divine Services and are repeated by them privately in the morning, evening, and at bedtime. Such are: (1) the Dînrît by Guru Nînak (see Macauliffe, i. 195–217); (2) Anâ Kî Fêr by the characteristics in 218 verses; (3) the Dîrghît by Guru Govind (op. cit., v. 261); (4) the Rohârî (op. cit., i. 250–257); (5) Sahib (ibid., 258–260) and (6) the Sikhsânit by Guru Arjan (op. cit., iii. 197 sqq.). They are also recited at the administration of the pahul or baptism.

The cosmopolitan views of Nînak were acceptable to both Hindus and Muhammadans; moreover, he did not prescribe any particular forms of worship, hence it is not surprising that he gained converts from both religions. But it was undoubtedly Hindoul — the fault of his own parents — whose social system he wanted to reform, therefore naturally his teachings were addressed to the Hindus rather than the Muhammadans. The majority of his disciples was derived from the Dîjâ, Arora and Khatri castes; to the last of them belonged all the Gurus excepting Nînak himself. To the Brahmins and Râjputs, whose social status was very high, the democratic tenets of Sikhism were less acceptable.

The sects and sub-sects of the Sikhs are numerous, but the main divisions are two: (1) the Keshâhârîs, otherwise called "Singhs", and (2) the Sahihârîs. The former represent the baptized and therefore more orthodox followers of Guru Govind Singh, while the latter were originally those who refused to accept his baptism and join the militant Keshâhârîs. Other important sects are: (1) the Nînakârâns, "known roughly as Sikhs who were not Singhs, followers of the earlier Gurus, who do not think it necessary to follow the ceremonial and social observances insculpted by Guru Govind Singh. Their characteristics are therefore, mainly negative; they do not forbid smoking; they do not insist on long hair; they are not
baptized with the \textit{pakul} and so forth\textsuperscript{1}. In other words, they belong to the \textit{Sahajdhāri} division. (2) \textit{Gurdāsī} (the remonstrants) are also, like the \textit{Nānakpāntī}, included in the \textit{Sahajdhāri} division. They represent the ascetic order founded by Sri Ānd, son of Nānak. They remain celibate and their tenets are very much tainted with the Hindu ascetic beliefs. (3) the \textit{Akhālsī} (worshippers of \textit{Ākāl}, the Immortal, Timeless God) differ essentially from all other Sikh orders in being a militant organization founded by Govind Singh. They are more orthodox than most of the Sikhs and still retain their characteristic militant spirit. (4) the \textit{Banda}s or \textit{Bandīpāntī} i.e. those who accepted Banda as the eleventh Guru, while the \textit{Līlā Khāla}s are strict adherents to the doctrines of Govind in opposition to the innovations of Banda. (5) the \textit{Mastkhās} (prom. \textit{Mastī}) represent members of the scavenger class converted to Sikhism by taking the \textit{pakul}, while the same \textit{Kīmūtī} (followers of Guru Rām Darā, by whom they were first initiated) is applied to \textit{Cāmūr} (leatherworkers) who have taken the \textit{pakul}. The Sikh shrines are scattered over the greater part of the Punjab, but the better known among them are to be found in the districts of Amritsar, Gurdāspur and Ferozepur — the holiest of them being the Golden Temple of Amritsar and Nānaknā Sarāb (near Lahore) the birthplace of Nānak, where annual fairs, attended by a very large number of Sikhs, are held.

According to the census returns of 1931, the total Sikh population is 3,238,803; of which 3,110,000 (all but 4\% of the Punjāb, the chief centres being the districts of Amritsar, Līlā Khāla and Ferozepur, and the native states of Patāla, Nānaknā Sarāb, and Ferozepur. The strength of the chief sects is as follows:

- Keōdhārs 2,876,320
- Sahajdārs 226,600
- Līlā Khāla 531,500
- Nānakpāntī 22,500

Ever since the English conquest of the Punjab (in 1849) the Sikhs have remained loyal subjects of the British Crown. As a community they are prosperous, physically they are superior to the rest of the Punjāb. Military service is one of their favourite occupations and they are justly looked upon as among the finest soldiers of the East. Sikh regiments rendered excellent service to the cause of the Allies in the great European war.

The Sikhs have made considerable progress during the last 40 years. There now exist several organized bodies working systematically for their social and educational advancement. The "Singh Sabha" was founded 30 years ago with the object of propagating the religious doctrines of the Khāla with its headquarters at Amritsar. Another body, called the "Chief Khālā Diwān" has undertaken the work of social reformation and spread of education. It has its branches in all districts and Sikh states. The "Sahomānt Gurudwārā Pārbandhak Committee" is another institution very recently established with the purpose of taking into their hands the management of the Sikh shrines which were formerly controlled by hereditary Hindu mahants. The Committee chiefly represents the Akālī sects but has received support from Sikhs in its campaign for the control of shrines in which it has attained a considerable measure of success. The Sikhs now form a distinct community entirely separate from the Hindus. Their ceremonies of birth, marriage and death are no longer presided over by the Brahmins, but by the Gyāns, the professional interpreters of the Granth. Like Hindus they burn their dead, but unlike they marry late and their widows freely re-marry. The Sikhs are also progressing numerically owing partially to the influx of converts from the Hindu depressed classes. The centre of all religious and social activities of the Sikhs is Amritsar where they maintain a large educational institution called the Khālsa College affiliated to the University of Lahore. Another similar institution exists at Gujranwālā, while their communal schools are scattered over the whole province.


\textit{Sikka} (from \textit{sakh}, die, coinage, currency, coin in general; \textit{sa} = mint). In the coin-legends of the Sulṭāns of Delhi of the
thirteenth (sixth) century, al-sikka is used only of the gold coins, the corresponding word on the silver coins being al-ṣafid. From 1250 to 1350, after which the formula was no longer used, sikka is applied to both gold and silver. Except for a sporadic occurrence of the denomination sikka moharrak on a rare coin of Humayyun, the name is not found again till the reign of the Moghul Shah Alam Bahadur (1707–1712 = 1119–1124), who introduced on his coins the formula, sikka or sikka moharrak followed by his titles, which remained usual till the end of the dynasty. The Persian verb sikka sad however regularly occurs in the couplets of the Emperors from Dazhnag onwards. The word sikka (pica) came for some reason quite certainly quite early in the xvith century. A.D. to be particularly associated with the rupee by the English in India and was applied to a recently struck rupee, not yet liable to discount for depreciation. The new rupee, issued by the East India Co. in 1793 to abolish the monetary confusion then existing, was known as the “19 san sikka” because it was dated in the 19th year of Shah Alam II and remained the unit of British Indian currency for 40 years.

Through Egypt and Italy (scaccino) the Arabic sikka has given us the word “sequin”, which found its way also into the Anglo-Indian vocabulary in the forms “chicken” and “chick”. (J. Allan)

SILKARI-DAR (A. V., “bearer of arms”), an officer of the Mamluk court, each of whom carried one of the pieces of the Sultan’s equipment and presented it to him when he required it. There were several of them; their chief, called the amir silkari, was in charge of the arsenal (silkari-khana) and of all that was used in it, or went in or out of it. He ranked among the amirs of a hundred (amir mi‘a) and had the title qānūn kārin.”

The Ottoman Turks retained the same title under its Persian form silk-dar. The silt-i-dar-agha and the hāl-i-dar-agha were the two chief officers in the Sultan’s chamber; at the mosque they thrice presented him with rose-water and perfume of wood of aloes. At the ceremony of khāt-i sharif [q. v.] the silt-i-dar-agha stood beside the relic; each time that it was kissed, he wiped it with a muslin handkerchief which he then presented to the individual who had just kissed it. Beside him stood an officer in charge of all these handkerchiefs. On the last day of Ramadan, after the midday prayer, the Sultan went to the apartments of this official, and from a raised kiosk witnessed the spout of tomak-qilt (tilling).

The silkadores were a cavalry corps as old as the Janissaries; they numbered 8,000 men under Muhammad II and 12,000 under Ahmed III. Its chief was called the silti-dar-agha like the Sultan’s sword-bearer, but did not enjoy the same privileges.

Bibliography: Makiats, Histoire des Mambouk, trans. Quatremerie, i., part i., p. 159, n. 365; d’Obsson, Tableau de l’Empire ottomain, ii., 365, 391; iii. 46; vii. 365. (C. Huart)

SIL泸州. See MAMBAKIN.

SILVEIS, in Arabic Sea (p. 365; d’Obsson, Tableau de l’Empire ottoman, ii., 365, 391; iii. 46; vii. 365. (C. Huart)

SILLOWAN. See MAHAFARIN.

SILVES, in Arabic al-Silw (ethnic: Silh), a small town in southern Portugal, the former capital of the province of Algarve (Ar. al-qādrā) and important metropolis of the (qādrā) al-Andalus under Arab rule. It was part of the district of al-Shāmīn, in the time of al-Idris. It was surrounded by gardens and orchards, and there were many water-mills. It had a harbour on the river, with timber-yards, where the wood of the forests of the region was prepared for exportation. Its figs were renowned. Its population, which claimed to be of Yaman origin, talked a very pure Arabic and had a reputation for its taste in literature and in poetry. The town was celebrated by a poem of the Abbāsid dynasty, al-Mu’tamid (ed. R. Dozy, Script. Ar. levi de Abbasid, i., p. 391).

After the downfall of the Umayyad caliphate of Spain, Silves, like many of the small capitals of the Peninsula, became the capital of a very small independent state, under the ephemeral dynasty of the Banū Muzaffar, on which the recent discovery of a fragment of history has enabled definite facts to be produced for the first time. In 1046 to 1049 the ḳāfi of the town declared himself an independent sovereign; he named himself Abu ‘I-l-Mu’talish iṣā b. Abī Bakr Muhammad b. Sā’ud b. Djamāl b. Sa‘d (author of a commentary on the Muqaddimah of al-Ma‘arik b. Abū ‘I-l-Mu’talish. He took the honorary title of al-Mu’aṣaffar and organised his state with a watchful eye on his powerful neighbour, the prince of Seville al-Mu’tafid (q. v.) of the dynasty of the Abbāsids. But this sovereign did not hesitate to attack him and ended by killing him in the course of a battle, at the end of April 1052. The son of Abu ‘I-l-Mu’talish, Abū ‘I-l-Mu’talish Muhammad b. Ibrāhim b. Abū ‘I-l-Mu’tafid. He, like his grandfather, was without doubt attacked by al-Mu’aṣaffar. He, blockaded him in Silves and cut off every means of communication. The town was besieged and its ramparts destroyed by means of siege-artillery and saps. The prince of Silves was beheaded by the victor in his own palace in Shawwāl 455 (October 1053). The little dynasty of the Banū Muzaffar was extinguished with him, after maintaining itself for only fifteen years.

At the end of the Almoravid dynasty, Silves was the starting point of two revolts: that of Abu ‘I-l-Kāsim Abīmad b. Abī-Husayn ibn Kāsim (Kasī) and that of Abu ‘I-l-Wali Muhammad b. ʿUmār ibn al-Muqaddith. At last in 1190 (1094) the king of Portugal, Sancho I, seized Silves, which was retaken a little later by the Almohad Abī Yusuf Yaḥṣūb. Some years afterwards, it passed definitely under Portuguese rule.


(E. Lévi-Provençal)
AL-SIMAK, "the prominent", the name of the brightest star in the constellation of the Virgin (magnitude I. 2). Virgin (al-
ṣathā) has from early times been represented as a woman holding an ear of corn (sumbula) in the left hand. The constellation is also called Sumbula. Al-Simak (Greek σπίκα, Latin spica) is close to her right hand. The Arabic word al-Simak was corrupted in the west to Asimac, or Efteimac. As it was thought that al-Simak was connected with Arcurus in Boötes by being placed opposite it, a distinction was made between al-Simak al-
ṣaṭīl (the unarmored Simak = Spica) and al-Simak al-ṣāmil (the Simak with the lance = Arcurus [magnitude I. 2]). From the adjective part of the Arabic name for Arcurus, al-ṣāmil, came the Aramean of the west. The dual forms al-Simakān and al-Anharān (the day-light and the rain-bringing) occur as general names of both stars. Al-Simak is the fourteenth moon-station.

Our constellation of Virgo was represented in Babylonian by the ideogram AR.SIM (= štāb, corn standing in the stalk). Spica alone had the same name. The stars ζ, ρ Virgins were allotted by the Babylonians to Leo. The constellation of the Virgin belonged to the Goddess Shala (wife of the weather-god Adad) along with Shubultu (ear of corn).


SIMANCAS, a small town in Northern Spain, situated eight miles south-east of Valladolid and now famous for its site where are preserved the archives of the kingdom of Spain.

The site is transcribed in Arabic as Simant Mānāh, in the Kitāb al-
Jabar of Ibn Khaldūn. It was near Simancas that in 327 (939) the armies of the Umayyad Caliph Ābū al-Rahmān III were severely defeated by the Christian king Ramiro II. This battle itself was only the prelude to a still more bloody encounter, the "battle of the ditch" (waqaf al-khandab), or battle of Alhandega, which took place soon after the fall of Salamanca, on the banks of the river Tormes.

Bibliography: Aḥḥār maṣjadi, ed. Lafuente y Alcántara, Madrid 1867, p. 155-156; al-Muqaddasī, Mughār al-
Dhabab, ed. Barher de Meynard and Pavet de Courteille, I, p. 363; II, p. 72; Ibn al-
Aṯīr, Kāmil, ed. Torquemada, VIII, p. 268 = Annales du Maghreb an l'Esparlante, part. trans. E. Fugain, p. 358, Ibn Khaldūn, Kitāb al-
Jabar, Cairo, iv. 129; al-Makki, Nāfi al-

SIMAW, a town in Asia Minor, 85 miles S. E. of Kutahia, 110 miles south of Brusa, the residence of a ḥākim-maṣjadi, capital of the baqa of the same name. Simaw has now about 6,000 inhabitants mainly Muslims, and has a neglected appearance. It played a considerable part as an earlier period. It is the site of the ancients, of which many traces still exist (ruins, inscriptions etc.). In the Byzantine period, Simaw was the seat of a bishop. In 783 (1381/1382) Simaw was conquered by Murād I and incorporated in the Ottoman Empire; cf. Ashū善于, Turāk, Istanbul 1332, p. 57; Simaw, which possesses nine large and three small mosques, four madras and a dervish monastery was the birthplace of several men of importance in the history of the Muslim religion, e. g. Shaikī Abū al-
Abī al-
Makāni (d. 896 a. H.), Kārā Simān al-
Makāni, Dīn (cf. Ewliyā, Şe'bebiyāt, iii, 377) and notably Shaikh Bād ar-Dīn Makāmillād famous for his rebellion, the "Son of the Ḥāfi of Simaw" (cf. Ibn Ḥanī Simaw, p. 416; F. Bahaier in Itil., xi, 1921, p. 1 sqq.; xii, 1921, p. 103 sqq.). Simaw has been visited and described in modern times by various European travellers, such as W. J. Hamilton, A. D. Mordtmann Sen, K. Buresch, Th. Wiegand, and Philippus et. al. The remains of the old defences which, in addition to the citadel commanding the town which was afterwards transformed, there are still ruins on a low mound not far from the town, would be worthy of fuller investigation, as well as the ancient inscriptions built into the mosques. Simaw which now lies off the line of traffic, will soon be opened up by the Balkan-Sri-Ushak (wrongly 'Ushak) railway. Near it is the Simaw-Göl, or Lake of Simaw.


(Franz Babinger)

SIMIYA, in form like šihrīyā, belongs to old Arabic beside šimā, šimā' (Kurān, lw. 23 etc.; Baldawi, ed. Flisheh, i, 264 sqq., 1513), in the sense "mark, sign, badge" (Lane, p. 1470; Şe'bebiyāt, xvi., ii, 200 of ed. Bâlûk 1282; Hambâla, ed. Freytag, p. 696; Iṣârâ, xv., 205). But the word, as a name for certain departments of magic, had a quite different derivation; in that sense it is from ša'mūs, through the Syriac ša'mūsa and means "signs, letters of the alphabet" (Dorsey, Suppl., i, 708 sqq. and references there; Payne Smith, Thesaurus Syriac, ii., col. 2614). In the Syriac-Arabic lexicon the Syriac word is regularly rendered by the Arabic al-
la'īn; šimiyā was taken over, apparently, in a technical sense. Payne Smith, following apparatus by Bruns, gives as the predominant technical meaning "chirography"; in Boëchor, Dictionnaire françois-arabe (l. 1543), under Chirographie, šimīyā is given as one of three Arabic renderings. By Barthelmaeus (d. 685/1286) the Syriac and Arabic forms are used together (Chron. Syr., ed. Paris, p. 14, 7; Mahātab, ed. Pococke, p. 33); according to these passages the science (ilm) was "invented" in the time of Moses by a certain šamā' (šimmā'), which Bruns and Kirsch rendered "Eunymus", but he seems to be quite unknown. The Muḥāf al-
Muḥāf (l. 1032) suggests a derivation from ʿalā, "name of Allah", and the Names of Allah certainly play a large part in šimmā' (Doutté, Magie et Religion, p. 344, who also suggests, p.
the elemental world and the ʿādīnā in it can be controlled by these names and allocations when used by spiritual souls (nawwāb rūḥānīyyāt). That is the doctrine of al-Būnī [q.v.], Ibn Ṭāmir [q.v.], and their followers. As to the nature and origin of this secret power in letters there is dispute. Some assign it to an elemental nature or constitution (mināḥij) and divide letters into four classes according to the four elements. Others ascribe it to a numerical relationship (mināḥ ʿuddālīya) based on the value of the letters as numbers (abjad). Ibn Khaldūn admits that there does exist such control of the material world but it is by divine grace in the hawâ mất [q.v.] and when those who lack that divine grace and insight endeavour to exert the same control by means of these names and allocations they are in the same class as the workers of magic by means of talismans, except that they have not the scientific training and system of these magicians. They may produce effects through the influence of the human imagination (al-ḥalîf) which for Ibn Khaldūn is the basis of all such working, licit and illicit—but these effects are contemptible beside those of the professional magicians Ibn Khaldūn, therefore, disapproves of this attempt by al-Būnī and others to produce a pious and licit magic; but there is no question that al-Būnī has imposed his system upon Islam.

There are many examples of this form of magic in Muslim literature; e.g. several references in the longer recension of “The Forty Veils,” transl. by Petis de la Croix (Histoire de la Sultane de Perse et des Vicissits), see especially an extended exposition, p. 186 sqq. of ed. Amsterdam, 1707.

The best description and a sympathetic exposition of this state of mind which sees in letters relations to the universe and a science of the universe is in Louis Massignon’s Al-Hallaj, p. 588 sqq.; cf. too, Doutté, p. 172 sqq. It is evident that this is a sister phase of thought to the Jewish Kabballah of the alphabetic and anthropomorphic type connected with the divine names, teaching that the science of letters is the science of the essences of things and that by letters God created and controls the world and that men by suitable knowledge of these can control material things (cf. C. D. Ginsburg, The Kabballah, p. 127 sqq.; article KABBALA by H. Loewe in Hastings’s Encyclopaedia of Rel. and Ethics, v. 622–628).

Bibliography has been given in the article.

(D. B. Macdonald)
the seed of all plants. It cannot be established from the Avestan text, what precisely is the relation of the salma to the tree; it may be, that, as in the Pahlavi Mn̄kila-bhreat, there is implied, that the dwelling-place of the bird is on that tree (comp. Sacred Books of the East, v. p. 89, note 1). In any case, in this fifth Yasht, the salma must be a mythical figure. The Bundāšāniya states, that the male of two kinds (i. e. aspects, awnāki) was the first of birds, but she is not a chief (veqa) of birds, for that dignity belongs to the bārghīšt-bird (Pahlavi Text Series, ill. 121). The Persian epic gives a more vivid notion of the Simorgh, less affected by Zoroastrian theology and cosmology. In the heroic tradition of Iran there are two Simurghs, viz. the bird-shaped guardian genius of Zal and Rustam, and, secondly, a monstrous bird, killed by Isandiyār. The first Simorgh, according to the Saβənāman, lives on the mountain Alburz, far from the dwelling-places of men; its nest has columns of ebony and sandal-wood; aloë-wood also belongs to the material of this building. The nest is once even called šāhā; to the impressive bird (huast-i murvâ) the awful nest (huast-i šanmān) is suited. When the Simorgh comes near, the air is darkened; the bird is like a cloud "whose rain are corals." Zal, the son of Sâm, who was after his birth exposed by order of his father, was found by the Simorgh, who bore him to her nest, where she educated the child. A heavenly voice announced to the bird the future glory of the race of Zal. The Simorgh has the gift of speech, like men; so she could teach the young Zal to speak. Later on, the bird delivered the youth to his father Sâm. She had given to Zal the name Dastān-i Zand. When parting, the Simorgh gave the young man one of her feathers; if he should happen to want the bird's help in times of distress and peril, he had only to burn (part of) it, to see the glorious being approach (baktiš hum amandar samān fasht). Afterwards, the Simorgh, being called by that feather-magic, gave counsel at the occasion of the birth of Zal's son, the famous Rustam, to the effect that the mother should be intoxicated and her side opened; she mentioned also the herb, which the mother must wash with milk and musk, would cure the wound; after that, the scar had to be rubbed with a feather of the bird. The second and last time the Simorgh was called upon, was on the occasion of the fight of Rustam with Isandiyār; the bird extracted the arrows from the bodies of Rustam and his horse, Rakshā, and cured his wounds, this time also by means of her feathers. Then she warned the hero, that whoever should kill Isandiyār, must be miserably in this world and the next. Rustam, however, insisted upon obtaining the means to conquer his antagonist. So the Simorgh conveyed him within the space of a single night to the place, where the fatal tree grew, from a branch of which the arrow was to be made, with which Isandiyār could be slain (Saβənāman ed. Vullers-Landauer, pp. 135, etc. 1705, 1707 etc.). In contra-distinction to this good Simorgh, which is called šāh-i sargalū (cp. cit. 139, 191) and farvārma (222, 1868; 1706, 1707), and which knows the mystery of fate (razi-i zipta, viz. the fact, that he, who slays Isandiyār, will be damned: 1705, 1706 etc.), the other Simorgh, killed by Isandiyār in the course of his seven adventures, is a noxious monster. It lives on a mountain, and resembles a flying mountain or a black cloud; with its claw it can lift crocodiles, panthers, even an elephant. It has two young ones, as large as itself; if they fly, they cast an enormous shadow. Isandiyār slew this being by a stratagem, using a kind of chariot (gurdūn), which was all set over with sharp weapons. The corpse of the monster covered a whole plain (Saβənāman, ed. Vullers-Landauer, p. 1597, etc.). Once, also this bird is called farvārmad (1959, 195). Except the name, there is no great resemblance between the Avestan salma and the Simorgh of the epic, although they have some features in common. Both dwell far from the inhabited world (on the relation of the Wourakahs to the Alibars see av. 638 [ii. 659, col. 0]); with the healing power of the epic bird, the relation of the salma to the medicinal tree may be compared; in turn, the Simorgh itself has a connection with the fatal, far-off tree at the sea of Cīn, where the baneful twigs grows, which can slay Isandiyār. Feather-magic is known to the Avesta, but not in connection with the salma. Yasht, xiv. 34 etc. a feather-magic is taught against enemies: it consists of rubbing the body with a feather of the bird of prey baṣtarnāgan; the wearing of such a feather as an amulet is also mentioned. In the same Yasht (45 and 46), to secure victory in battle, it is recommended to let fly four feathers, while uttering an appropriate spell, which helps also in mortal dangers. The difference here is great: the feathers are not those of the salma, they are not burned, and the procedure does not aim at summoning some one. The Avestan bird belongs to the good (non-Ahriman) creation, although it is not chief (veqa) of birds. That the epic Simorgh is called bašt-i murgān is nothing but a poetical conflation. The Simorgh, which appears in the story of Zal and his son may be considered as a kind of good genius (comp. also Noldeke, Das Iranische Nationalpoesie, p. 10, 29). If the malignant Simorgh in the adventure of Isandiyār is not merely an addition to the older epic tradition (for it is supposed, with much reason, that the series of Isandiyār's adventures is an imitation of Rustam's seven exploits), perhaps the statement of the Bundāšāniya, that this bird is of two aspects (kinds) would be compared, so that also in Zoroastrian lore there would have been a difference between two kinds of salma (sīm). The Yasht statement, however, is too indistinct, to be made use of in this respect. The role of the Simorgh as a guardian genius of heroes (on a possible parallel in: Achaemenian dynastic tradition comp. Noldeke, op. cit., p. 4) is not reflected in the Avesta. As it is very probable, that the cycle of Rustam and his family originally did not belong to Zoroastrian tradition (Noldeke, op. cit., p. 9 etc.), this principal feature of the epic Simorgh must also be due to a non-Zoroastrian origin. It may be then, that two different mythical conceptions have been subsumed under one name. The Avestan salma may, originally, correspond to one of the bird-shaped or antelope-shaped Aryan mythology. We may, however, suppose, that it has lost most of its characteristics in being accommodated to Zoroastrian cosmology. There are a few resemblances between the Iranian conceptions and some features of Indian bird-mythology: the salma lives far off on the tree in the sea, Wourakahs, and a king of birds (pākπir, is
Garuğa meant?) lives also far off in the varga Ḥiraṃmayā (Mahābhārata, vi, viii, 5 ef.). The sin, according to the Kāraṇṭ, when sitting at his nest, breaks off thousand twigs of the medicinal tree, and the story of Garuğa, tearing off and bearing away a branch of the Raahita-tree is well known (Mahābh., i, xxii, 39, etc.; cf. E. W. Hopkins, Epic Mythology, p. 21). One might also consider the fact, that, as the habāna stands in a certain relation to the healing herbs, so Garuğa to the varga, the drink of immortality, and the yavana, mentioned in the Arama, iv. 26 and 27, to the Sona. But these faint resemblances may be due to accident at any rate, they are insufficient to justify a comparison between Indian and Indian myth in this case. On a possible explanation of the sin as a sun-bird comp. A. J. Weeasineck, Tree and Bird as Cosmological Symbols in Western Asia, 1921, p. 42.

On the other hand, the principal characteristic of the epic Simurgh is its protection of the exiled child Zal, and, later on, its function as tutelary genius of Zal and Rustam. It must therefore be classed with the various guardian-animals we meet in the stories of the youth of some heroes or mythical heroes, as Cyrus, Romulus, etc. It is never true, that this Simurgh shows also features of a more fierce kind.

Thā'lība in his history of the Persian kings, renders the word Simurgh by 'Amīn [q. v.]. In non-epic Persian literature, the dwelling-place of the Simurgh is the fabulous mountain Kād (which originally may be the same as the Ahūr; on this question comp. sph. kār, p. 95g; Weniņček, p. c.). A more rationalistic view is, e. g., that of the Īmāk Mustawfi (Naḥbat, ed. Le Strange, i, 232; ii, 229) who says that on the isle of Rāmūn (Sinmār) the nest of the Simurgh is found.

In mystical literature, the Simurgh as a symbol of the deity is well-known from 'Aṭāf's Maṣūf al-Tūrī. The name of the bird, moreover, appears in Persian literature, very often in poetical similes. A few instances out of many are: Rāmūn, Mathūn, ed. Nicholson, i, vs. 1444; 2755; 2062; Rücker, Grammatik, I, 206, 271, 263, 206; Poestl, p. 21, as quoted in Ḥaft, Labbā, i, 99, where the synonym Amīn is used.

(V. F. BUCHNER)

SIN, twelfth letter of the Arabic alphabet, with the numerical value 60. For palaeographical details see above i, 390 and Arabia, plate i. Sin corresponds to: a) anthropic sin, Assyrian šē, Hebrew and Aramaic ש, whereas šē corresponds to Aeth. san, to Hebrew ס and Aramaic ס. Bibliography: W. Wright, Lectures on the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic languages, Cambridge 1890, p. 57 sqq.; C. Brockelmann, Granderichter vergl. Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen, Berlin 1908, i, 128 sqq.

SINĀN, usually called KūFA MīMĀN SINĀN, the greatest architect of the Ottomans. Sinān came from Kaşariya [q. v.] in Anatolia where he was born on the 9th Radjād 859 (April 15, 1559) the son of Christian Greeks. His father was later called 'Abd al-Mennān but his real name is not known. His non-Turkish origin (müktefî) is beyond question and is never in dispute, either among his contemporaries or among all serious Turkish scholars. The young Sinān came into the Senn in Stamboul with the levy of youths (devrûgme, q. v.), became a Janissary, distinguished himself in the campaigns against Belgrade (1521) and Rhodes (1522) by his bravery and was promoted to sânberdehî, i.e. chief firework-operator. In the Persian war (1527) he showed special ingenuity when he devised ferries for crossing Lake Van, which proved particularly effective. He continued to rise in rank and was ultimately appointed Șahzâdî (police magistrate). When Selim I advanced on Wallachia Sinān was in his train. He built a bridge across the Danube, which aroused further admiration and laid the foundations of his fame. Henceforth he was exclusively engaged in building mosques and palaces, commissions from the Sultan and grandees of the Empire. That, as is often stated, he began the building of the Selimîye immediately after Selim's 1st death, — the mosque which stands on the top of the fifth hill in Stamboul and which was finished in 1522, — is impossible even on chronological grounds; in dizzingly rapid succession from the end of the thirties arose the further creations of this master, which were built in parts all of the century, mainly by command of Selim the Great. Only the largest mosques can be mentioned here: in 1550 the Mosque of Roxelane (Khâseksi Khāram), in 1548 the princes' Mosque, in 1550/1556 the Selimîye, in 1541/1574 the Selimîye at Adrianople, built under command of Selim II. These are his finest efforts. In addition he built a countless number of small mosques, palaces, schools, bridges, baths, etc. The poet, Muṣṭafâ Sâ's biographer, gives 81 mosques, 50 chapels, 55 schools, 7 Kûrân schools, 16 poor-kitchens ('imḳer), 3 infirmaries, 7 aqueducts, 8 bridges, 34 palaces, 13 rest-houses, 3 storehouses, 33 baths, 19 domed tombs (türke), in all 343 buildings. Sinān was working for three-quarters of a century everywhere from Bosnia to Mecca. As Corn. Gurlitt points out, Sinān displayed an incomparable lightness of touch in his use of the dome. On a square, hexagonal or octagonal base he developed his interiors, always striving at the effect of a great ceremonial hall, a uniform architecture enclosing the worshipping rulers and their hosts. He is predominantly concerned with the interior and readily neglects the exterior for it. But everywhere, Gurlitt says, appears the peculiarity of the Turkish character, everywhere he creates models which are as little Byzantine as they are Persian, as little Syrian as they are Seldjûk, but are all the more Turkish (cf. C. Gurlitt, Konstantinopel, Berlin 1909, p. 94). Sinān had numerous pupils to assist him, including Ahmad Aghâ, Kamât al-Dîn, Dâwûd Aghâ, who was executed for free-thinking (cf. Ḥaftul-qawwām, i, 105), Yâtim Bâb 'Ali, Yûfû and the younger Sinâ, who is frequently confused with him, and to distinguish him from the latter he was later called Ḍâfû the "old." Yûfû, his favourite pupil, is said to have been the architect of the palace in Lahore, Delhi, and Agra, which were built by the Emperors Akbar and Jahângîr. This: Michael Angelo of the Turks died when nearly 90 (herein also resembling him) on the 12th Dûmâd 1, 986 (July 17, 1578). He was buried behind his masterpiece, the Selimânum Mosque, close to the offices of the Shaikh al-Islâm, beside a chapel, school, and well, built and endowed by him. The chronogram (tâ'rîkî) gives the year of his death without any possibility of doubt as 986 (cf.
I. MOSQUES (Zditar):


II. SMALL MOSQUES (Zditar):

of Mustfa Hâmid Efendi, at Azâhal-âmam, Stamboul; 33) Ch. at the türfenc-khâna, outside the walls (şehir); 34) Ch. of Serif-i aghâ Aga, at the Adrianople gate, Stamboul; 35) Ch. of the superintendent of the metalcasters (dokme-giller kâtipâ), in Aliyûb, Stamboul; 36) Ch. of the ağa-bashi, Aliyûb; 37) Ch. of the physician Kâsinürde, in Sülihdâre, Stamboul; 38) Ch. of the snow seller (bârâq) Salâmân, in Aliyûb; 39) Ch. of the snow seller (bârâq) Salâmân, in Stamboul; 40) Ch. of Ahmed Celebi, in Kirendiklî; 41) Ch. of Vâhiyân kâlia, in the Kâsîm Pasha quarter, Stamboul; 42) Ch. of Şakur iyevi (superior of the city) Hasân Celebi, ibid.; 43) Ch. of Şahîl Bây, Topkâna, Stamboul; 44) Ch. of Ilyászâde, ibid.; 45) Ch. of Hasan bâghi Memi kâlia, in Scutari; 46) Ch. of Mehemâd Pasha, ibid.; 47) Ch. of Hâmid Pasha, in Scutari; 48) Ch. of Murât-kâna, in Khâski, Stamboul; 49) Ch. of the şarraf, outside the Topkapu, Stamboul; 50) Ch. of the maqâm-i Ābdi Celebi in Şulu monastir.

III. SCHOOLS (Madrassa):
1) Sch. of Sultan Sâlîman, in Meckka; 2) Six schools, built by command of Sultan Sâlîman, in Stamboul; 3) Sch. of Sultan Selim I (beside the Kâşîk-i Âhmed-i Âlgâr, carpet-makers); 4) Sch. of Sultan Selim II, Adrianopol; 5) Sch. of Sultan Selim II, Corlu; 6) Sch. of Prince Mehemâd, in Stamboul; 7) Sch. of Khaşışi Khurram, on the women's market (sâvi-i hâsâris), Stamboul; 8) the school called Kâhiyâ of the Khaşışi Khurram, in Sultan Selim, Stamboul; 9) Sch. of the Sultan mother, in Scutari; 10) Sch. of Princess Mahrû-i Mihâ, in Scutari; 11) Sch. of Princess Mahrû-i Mihâ, at Adrianoupol, Stamboul; 12) Sch. of Mehemâd Paşa, K adîrîa liyami; 13) Sch. of Mehemâd Paşa, in Aliyûb; 14) Sch. of the mother of Oghmân Şâh, Ali serai, Stamboul; 15) Sch. of Rustam Paşa, Stamboul; 16) Sch. of All Paşa, Stamboul; 17) Sch. of the executed Mehemâd Paşa, Topkapu, Stamboul; 18) Sch. of Sulî Mehemâd Paşa, inARENTa, Stamboul; 19) Sch. of İbrahim Paşa, Stamboul; 20) Sch. of Sinân Paşa, in Stamboul; 21) Sch. of İkander Paşa, in Scutari; 22) Sch. of 'Ali Paşa, in Scutari; 23) Sch. of the Egyptian Muşaffî Paşa, in Gebîse; 24) Sch. of 'Abd al-Âhad Paşa, in İniyî; 25) Sch. of Kâzîm Paşa, in Scutari; 26) Sch. of 'Ibrahim Paşa, at the âda-e Gate, Stamboul; 27) Sch. of Shamsi 'Abd al-Âhad Paşa, in Scutari; 28) Sch. of Şahîl Kânî al-Din, in Scutari; 29) Sch. of the Mufti Hâmid Efendi, in Stamboul; 30) Sch. of the military judge Pirzâ Aghâ, in Stamboul; 31) Sch. of Khâsîık, in Stamboul; 32) Sch. of Aghara, in Stamboul; 33) Sch. of the Mufti Hâmid Efendi, in Stamboul; 34) Sch. of the military judge Pirzâ Aghâ, in Stamboul; 35) Sch. of Khâsîık, in Stamboul; 36) Sch of Aghara, in Stamboul; 37) Sch. of Vâhiyân Efendi, in Stamboul; 38) Sch. of the Dîrderdar 'Abd es-Salâm Bey, in Scutari; 39) Sch. of Tûfî Kâdi, in Stamboul; 40) Sch. of the physician Mehemâd Celebi, in Stamboul; 41) Sch. of 'Hasan Celebi, in Scutari; 42) Sch. of
X. WAREHOUSES (Messuhamat):
1) W. in Galata; 2) W. at the Imperial Arsenal, Stambul; 3) W. in the Serai, Stambul.

XI. REST-HOUSES (Karwan-Alurat):

XII. PALACES (Serai):

XIII. BATHS (Hasamsi):

Bibliography: No monograph dealing exhaustively with the life and artistic activities of Sinan has yet appeared nor is there any architectural survey of his buildings yet in existence. The main source so far is Müaffe Bâbi’s work, Tuchkheht al-Bihayrî, which contains a short bibliography of Sinan, of which there are two editions: one without date and place of publication (Stambul, middle of the sixteenth century), 16 p., small 8°; entitled Tuchkheht al-Ahlaviya; the second, Stambul 1515, II, press, 72 p. 8°. The two editions give lists of Sinan’s buildings which differ from one another in many points. Ewliya Celebi, Seyyede, seems to have known Sinan’s work. The following are references to Sinan in Ewliya Celebi: i. 147 (Trzit, i. 1 p. 69); ii. 147; (Trzit, i. 1 p. 72); i. 150 (Trzit, i. 1 p. 73); i. 155 (Trzit, i. 1 p. 79); ii. 159 (Trzit, i. 1 p. 81); i. 163 (Trzit, i. 1 p. 82 sq.); ii. 307 (lacking in Trzit); i. 308 (Trzit, i. 1 p. 167); ii. 309 (Trzit, i. 1 p. 168); iii. 310 (Trzit, i. 1 p. 169); iii. 311 (Trzit, i. 1 p. 169); a list of all his mosques in Constantinople is given on i. p. 313 sq. (Trzit, i. 1 p. 170 sq.): building
In Brussel (Caravanserai of 'Ali Pasha; not in Mustafa); II. 19; buildings in Ismid; II. 64 = Travels, II. 31. Almost all the Constantinople mosques built by Siinan are fully described in Hafiz Husain Efendi of Awansera (flourished in the second half of the xvth century), Gardens of the Mosques (Hadżāl al-Dżamā'ī), with additions by 'Ali Saiti, printed at Stambul 1281; Extracts from it were given by J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., Perst 1833, ii. p. 47-144 (Mosques), i. 148 sqq. (Schools, Mosques); Retracts zur Kenntnis des Orients, ed. by H. Grothe, Halle 1914, vol. xi. p. 67 sqq. (F. Babinger); Ilii, Strassburg 1919, vol. xii. p. 247 sqq. (F. Babinger); Yeni madrassa, Stambul 1917, vol. 13, p. 249-252 and vol. 14, p. 269-279 (AHMAD Rafik Bey; with pictures). On SIinan's pupils, cf. Quellen zur wissenschaftlichen Kunstgeschichte in Jahrhuch der asiesischen Kunst, Leipzig 1924, i. p. 35 sqq. — The two above-mentioned Tadikār's are as MSS in Cairo, National Library (cf. 'Ali Efendi Hilmi al-Dżehestani, Fihrist [Cairo 1306], 231 [listed in an old madrasa]).

**FINAN PAŠHA, name of several viziers of the Ottoman empire, mostly of Christian origin (as the name SIinan [al-Din Yüsuf] suggests; cf. Isl. xi. 20, note 1 and J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., ii. 536, note a). The most important are:**

1. Khodja SIinan Paša, vizier under Mahmed II the Conqueror. Molla SIinan al-Din Yüsuf Paša was a son of the famous Molla Khirdar Beg, who, as a son of the hāji of Siwri Ħāṣir Džalal al-Din, traced his descent from the celebrated Khodja Naqš al-Din. His father who died in 863 (1458/1459) was the first hāji of Stambul (cf. the title Khodja hāji). SIinan Paša was born in Brussel probably about 1438, was taught in his youth by his father, afterwards entered the train of Mahmed II whose teacher and counsellor he became. According to one story, probably erroneous, after the second deposition of the famous grand vizier Mahmod Paša [q.v.] he succeeded him but fell into disfavour about 881 (1476/1477) and was only later appointed mustišer in Siwri Ħāṣir and in Adrianople after a remarkable cure which the Sultan made him take (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., ii. 241). Sultan Bayzid who had taken a fancy to him granted him an ample allowance. In 887 (1482/1483) he retired, but a year later we find him acting as minister of Gallipoli. He died on Şafr 24, 894 (March 1, 1486) at Gallipoli where he was buried in a fakri restan by Mahmod II in 1247/1248 (1831). His two brothers also earned the title of Paša, namely Ahmad Paša and Yağkid Paša (cf. Tashkizāzade-Madjid, i. 196, 197). Molla SIinan Paša, called simply Khodja Paša by his contemporaries, was an important scholar and the author of several works on mathematics, metaphysics, astronomy, ethics and legends of the saints. He wrote a commentary on the astronomical works of Gaγhmun (Gâγhmu), and a commentary on al-Džāfīr's Mawâdhit fi 'ilm al-Kalam. His Mollâ 53 leaves with ethics and under the title Tadikār of a book he wrote a 'legend of the saints' (original manuscript in the New Otomaniya library at Stambul). A discourse on prayer from his pen entitled Mawâdhit was printed at Stambul (Abu l-Dīya Press).

**BIBLIOGRAPHY:** Tadikār al-Džamā'ī, i. 193-195, Stambul 1281; following him, 'Ali, Khudaj al-Madžid (part not yet printed) and Sâd al-Din, Tadikār al-Dżamā'ī, ii. 498-500, Brussel Mehmend Tahir, Oframāl Mül'eller, ii. 223 sqq. (thorough); Sâd al-Din, tüzāmī, iii. 101 sqq.; Sâd al-Din of Edirne of 1310; Regarding the tomb of Sîna Paša there are two different statements. The tomb (megra) is however still in existence in Gallipoli, according J. H. Montgomery; cf. also Ewliya, Sûhûdituri, i. 418 (monastery, mosque), 419 (poor kitchen, subutet), 420 (tomb), but see Brussel Mehmend Tahir, ef. cit., ii. 224, note 1. II. Khâdîm Sîna Paša, grand vizier under Selim I, Sîna al-Din Yüsuf Paša was probably of Christian descent; he was the chief of all governor of Rumelia and then of Anatolia. In the battle of Callidran (Aug. 23, 1574), he commanded with success the right wing of the victorious Ottoman army and when Herekekoglu Ahmad Paša, four times grand vizier, was suddenly dismissed on Ramaşan 9, 920 (October 28, 1514) he became his successor. Pei fer Bella Sîna un suo ricevo quasi era imbranò (e.g. emerber, master of the horse) e aveva 7 aspri eoli, e il biglieteghe di Notilia nuovo, reports the Venetian Bailo Antonio Giustinian, under date March i, 1516. In the campaign against Syria and Egypt, Sîna Paša was made commander-in-chief. On 29th Dha 'l-Hijja 923 (January 23, 1517) he commanded the Ottoman troops in the battle of Ridaniya, but was killed in personal combat with Sultan Tûman Bîy. His successor in the grand vizierate was Yûnis Paša [q.v.].

**BIBLIOGRAPHY:** J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., ii. 447, 466, 494, 496, 662; Sâd al-Din, tüzāmī, i. 107. The Italian sources mentioned in Jorge, G. O. R., ii. 330, note 1; Målûk al-Dżamā'ī, 214. III. Kordja Sîna Paša, five times grand vizier of the Ottoman empire. Sîna Paša was of Albanian descent; he was the son of a peasant in Dihr (Dubna) or according to others in Deltino (cf. Jorge, G. O. R., iii. 170, no authority given; note venir a Divinon all incontro di Corfo, according to Bello Matteo Zune in 1594; cf. H. Allberi, Relazioni, iii. 3, p. 420, Florence 1895). He entered the Serai through the levy of youths (daghîrmeh, q. v.); under Suleiman became Samâgirtt hâsch, chief captain, was later promoted to be mür-i fuwâ of Malaija, Kaşapmûnî, Ghazâa, Tarâbulûs (Tripolis in Syria), Erzerum and Halab, and in the spring of 1588 became governor of Egypt (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., 351). From here he undertook campaigns against the Venetians, which he conquered and the entire Ottoman empire. The Ottoman poet Nihâli celebrated this event in a poem entitled Fethâname. Venetian (MS., perhaps autograph in the Vienna National Library, cf. G. Flugel, Catalogue, l. 640 sqq.) and the Arab historian Mahmod Kağh al-Din al-Makkî describes fully in this and the following campaigns in a work dedicated to Sîna and entitled al-Bâk al-Yaânî f 'î Fath al' Oframâl (cf. S. de Sacy, N. E., iv. 4735; part ed. with Portuguese translation by L. Lopar, Lisbon 1892). For further panegyristos of Sîna Paša, cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., iii. 560, 779 from 'Ali, Khudaj al-Madžid. In 1571/1572 Sîna Paša was again appointed governor of Egypt and in the spring of 1574, in the campaign against Tunis he was given supreme command.
of the Ottoman land forces. Goletta (Hit al-Wadil) was stormed after a month's siege and Tunis incorporated in the Ottoman empire. Sinan Pasha who had become six vizier in 980 (1572/1573) was promoted two years later to be vizier of the cupola (ra'bad esiri). In the spring of 1556 he led the Ottoman army against Georgia and took the town of Karabac 985 (August 5, 1556) and was appointed grand vizier in succession to Ahmed Pasha who had died. Georgia was conquered but not subdued so that almost immediately after the conclusion of the campaign, difficulties arose which resulted on the 20th Dhu'l-Qa'da 900 (December 5, 1582) in Sinan Pasha's dismissal and banishment to Dimetoka, later to Malagha (i.e. Melikyeh Kazer) (cf. Selimkâ, Ta'rîh-i, p. 170; Gio. Tom. Minnado da Revigo, Historia della guerra fra Turchi e Persiani, Turin 1588 and Venice 1594, in which the writer describes the Persian campaign from his own experience). Through harem influence and a present of 100,000 ducats, however, he soon succeeded in exchanging his exile in Malagha for the governorship of Damasc (cf. Selimkâ, p. 215; G. O. O., iv. 183, from which he returned to Constantinople in Djamâdâ II, 997 (April 1589) as grand vizier. The vast wealth which he already possessed and which later assumed fabulous proportions, enabled him to make remarkable gifts (e.g. a grand admiral's flagship and seven galleys) and to erect splendid buildings. The handsomely fitted kôşgâh of the Serai on the shore of the Golden Horn which bore his name and was not destroyed till 1827 (cf. J. von Hammer, G. O. R., iv. 387 note d), owed its origin to him. He also took up the old plan of connecting the Black Sea with the Gulf of Nicomedia by digging a canal from the sea of Sâbadja (q.v.) to the Gulf of Nicomedia for which he hoped to utilise the skill of Sinân the architect (q.v.). This great undertaking seems to have fallen through as a result of the wars (cf. also Hâjsîdî Khalfa, Dîshân-Numa, p. 666 and the literature quoted under Sâbadja). On the 11th Shawwâl 999 (August 2, 1591) Sinân Pasha again fell from favour and was dismissed, but by the 25th Rabi' II, 1001 (January 29, 1593) a rising of the janissaries caused him to be sent out to fill the grand vizierate for a third time. Henceforth all his energies were concentrated on winning military laurels in the west, especially in Hungary. In the spring of 1593, he therefore assumed in person supreme command of the army in the Hungarian campaign, which he concluded with the capture of numerous castles and strongholds. A month after the death of Murât III on the 6th Djumâdâ II, 1003 (February 16, 1595), he had again to surrender the imperial seal and go into exile at Malagha, only for a few months however. On the 20th Shawwâl 1003 (July 7, 1595) he replaced his rival and relative Ferhad Pasha and a few weeks later began a campaign against Wallachia, which had rebelled. The rather inglorious close of this campaign and the loss of Gran, which was ascribed to the inactivity of his son Mehemmed Pasha, Beglerbeg of Rumelia (cf. the documents mentioned in J. von Hammer, G. O. O., iv. 445 sq.), brought about his dismissal and banishment to Malagha in the 16th Rabi' I, 1004 (November 19, 1595). But when his successor Lala Mehemmed Pasha died on the third day after his appointment, the imperial seal was again for a fifth time entrusted to Sinân Pasha. He was just engaged on plans for capturing Erzurum in Hungary when he died on the 4th Shawwâl 1005 (April 3, 1596). He was buried in his own turbe in the Söfîler quarter of Stambul. Sinân Pasha was an unusually cruel, stubborn, selfish man at the same time ignorant, man as to whose character Ottoman (notably "Ahi") and western chroniclers are entirely in agreement. He was feared among the European envoys at the Porte. Not all of them dared reply so sharply and to the point as the Austrian envoy Dr. Barthold Perzen (cf. Die Freiherren von Wratislaw merkwürdige Gesand schaftsreise nach Constantinopel, Leipzig 1787, p. 138; Engl. ed. London 1862, ed. by A. H. Wratislaw). The Venetian bâilti all agree in their descriptions of this powerful man, for example: Constant. Garzoni (1575, in Alberi, Relationi, iii. 1, p. 411), Antonio Tiepolo (1576, in Alberi, op. cit., iii. 2, p. 153 sq.), Lom. Bernardo (1592, in Alberi, op. cit., iii. 2, p. 355: fu fatto mansu [e.g. xeseli, depozed] per causa della calceatin [e.g. xaya dachtun], Paolo Costarini (1583, in Alberi, op. cit., iii. 3, p. 240), Girol. Moro (1590, in Alberi, op. cit., iii. 3, p. 326, 374 sq.), Mauro Zane (1594, in Alberi, op. cit., iii. 3, p. 45 sq.). He is described (1595) as "un giovane principe con una barba nera, e baffi a spazzole" (in A. M. L. S., p. 240) and "un giovane principe con una barba nera, e baffi a spazzole" (in A. M. L. S., p. 240). Sinân Pasha was immensely rich; his estate is fully described in H. F. v. Dier, Denkwürdigkeiten von Asien, Berlin 1811, part i, p. 101 sqq.; cf. Persich, Türk. Hist. Berlin, p. 79: MS. 39, fol. 1058; also J. von Hammer, G. O. R., iv. 358 sq. A biography of Sinân Pasha was the Beglerbeg Ayas Pascha (d. 1568) executed by order of Sulaimân the Great, who left two sons Mahüm Pasha (cf. Sîfîlî-e 'efâmî, iv. 314) and Muğafî Pasha (ibid., iv. 386). On Ayas Pascha, not to be confused with the grand vizier of the same name, who also was an Albanian (from Valona) cf. Sîfîlî-e 'efâmî, i. 447.

Bibliography (in addition to works already mentioned): the Ottoman historians most of whom have been used by J. von Hammer, also Haşdif al-Wanara, p. 35 sqq.; Hâjsîdî Khalfa, Fröhl. Ant. 76 sqq., followed word for word in Sîfîlî-e 'efâmî, iii. 103 sq. — An Arabic biography of Sinân Pasha is in the MS. Weststein 499 (Ashwardi, viii. No. 8471) on fol. 135b. — On Sinân's son, the Beglerbeg Mehemmed Pasha, cf. J. von Hammer, G. O. R., x. 587 below (Index s.v.) and Sîfîlî-e 'efâmî, i. 139; he died in Djamâdâ I, 1014 (September-October 1605). Among Sinân Pasha's relatives was the grand vizier Ferhad Pasha, who again was related to Pertew Pasha (cf. Marchantino Domini [1562] in Alberi, Relationi, iii. 3, p. 185 at the top; questo Pertew passa gia anni 55; è abitante e parente del magnifico Ferhad Pasha, vivono maritato nella madre di sua moglie) (Franz Buchinger).

SIND, consists of the lower valley and delta of the river Indus (Sindiah) from which the province takes its name, and lies between 20° 35' and 28° 39' N. and 66° 40' and 71° 10' E. The Aryans were settled on the Indus before 1000 B.C. and about 500 B.C. Darius Hystaspes conquered the valley, but Persian rule in Sind had passed away when Alexander the Great traversed...
the country in 325 B.C. After his departure it was included first in the Mauryan empire and then in that of the Bactrian Greeks. From the first century before, until the seventh century after, Christ India was invaded by various hordes from Central Asia, of whom the Ephthalites, or White Huns, settled in Sind and established the Kši dynasty, which was terminated by the usurpation of the Brahman minister Cā, whose son Dāhir was reigning when Sind was invaded by the Arabs. In A.D. 711 Mūhammad b. Kāšīnū Šakhī, invaded the country, by the order of the Kšišīfat al-Walīd, in order to avenge the maltreatment of some Muslim merchants who had failed to obtain redress, captured the seaport of Dāhibu, the town ofNERANKOT (the modern ƏHırdārābd), and Kārāw, where he defeated and slew Dāhir, and finally took the capital, Aror or Alor, and, in 713, Multān, where much treasure fell into his hands. He had barely had time to organize his conquest when he was superseded by Sulaimān, who succeeded al-Walīd in 715, and, as a protégé of the ƏHırdārābd, whose cruelty had made many enemies, was put to death with torture at Wāstā, on the Tigris.

A succession of Muslim governors ruled Sind, leaving the administration chiefly in the hands of the most prominent of whom enjoyed the free exercise of their religion; but the hold of the Kšišīfa on the province gradually weakened, and in 871 was entirely relaxed. Two Arab chiefs founded independent states in Multān and Mashāra, but when Māhmūd of Bāsra led his raids into India, Abu 'l-Fath Dāhir, governor of Multān and Sind, still maintained the fiction of allegiance to the Kšišīfa. His adherence to the ƏKıntārī heresy cost him his throne, and Māhmūd placed a governor of his own in Multān. In 1053 the Sumras, a Rāpjūt tribe, cast off the yoke of Farrukhābd and established their authority in Lower Sind, but the upper province remained subject to the Ghaznavids and was conquered, with the rest of their dominions, by Muṭīa al-Dīn Mūhammad b. Sām. His lieutenant, Nāţīr al-Dīn Kābāta, submitted to Kāth al-Dīn Aiḥak of Dīhi, but was defeated by Shams al-Dīn Itūtūn, whose authority he refused to recognize. At the beginning of the fourteenth century the troops of 'Abbās al-Dīn Khālid overthrew the Sumras and destroyed their capital, but in 1333 the Sāmīs, a Rāpjūt tribe converted to Islam, seized the reins of government, and set up a ruler of their own with the title of Dīm, Mūhammad b. Tughlāk of Dīhi died in March, 1351, on the banks of the Indus, while in pursuit of a rebel whom the Sāmīs had harboured, and Sind continued successfully with the imperial arms until the Sāmīs were reduced to obedience and vassalage by Firūz, Mūhammad's successor. With the decline of the power of Dīhil that of the Sāmīs revived, the greatest of their line being Dīm Nanda, or Nīzām al-Dīn, who reigned for forty-six years and died in 1509. In 1520 Sind was invaded by Shāh Beg Arūznīn, who, having been driven from Khandār by Bābur, succeeded in establishing himself in Sind. Dīm Firūz, the last of the Sāmīs, was driven out of Godārā in the year 1352, but was compelled to flee into Persia. On the death of Shāh ƏHısan, the last of the Aghāhāns, in 1554, the Tārkāhāns, another short-lived dynasty, became rulers of Sind, and witnessed the sack of Thatha by the Portuguese in 1555, but in 1592 Akbār defeated Mīrāz ƏDīn Beg Tārkāhān, and annexed Sind, which was incorporated in the Ṣubā of Multān. The province was a part of the empire, but owing to its remoteness local affairs remained much in native hands. The Dāḍūpūtrās were powerful in Lower Sind in the seventeenth century, and were succeeded by the Kalhoras, who in 1701 ousted them from Shāhkūrār and obtained from AḤmad Shāh a large grant of land. For the next forty years the Kalhoras increased their power, but in 1740 Nūr Mūhammad Kālhorā incurred the displeasure of Nādir Shāh, to whom that part of Sind lying to the west of the Indus had been ceded, and was compelled to surrender Shāhkūrār and Sītū and to pay a heavy tribute. In 1754 Ahmad Shāh Durrānī (Abdāl), to whom Sind had passed on the death of Nādir Shāh, drove Nūr Mūhammad to Dājālsalmer, where he died, but his son, Mūhammad Murād Yār Kāhān, appeased the Afgān and retained the kingdom. In 1768 his brother and successor, Ḥulām Shāh, founded Ḥīrdārābd on the site of Nerankot. The relations of the Kalhoras with the English East India Company, which in 1772 opened a factory at Thatha, were the reverse of friendly, and the factory was closed in 1775. Some years later Mīr Bidār, a chief of the Tālpūr tribe of the Balāfī rose in rebellion, and the Kalhorās compromised the matter by appointing him minister, but he was assassinated in 1781 after defeating an Afgān army near Shākjūrār, and his son 'Abbās-Allāh Khān Tālpūr drove 'Abbās al-Nāţī, the last of the Kalhorās, to Kālāt. 'Abbās al-Nāţī regained his throne and put 'Abbās Allāh to death, but the latter's kinsman, Mīr Fāṭḥ 'Abbās, defeated him and finally compelled him to take refuge in Dījōlpūr, where his descendants still hold distinguished rank. In 1783 Fāṭḥ 'Abbās, the first of the Tālpūr Mīrs, established himself as Ra'sī of Sind. The history of the country under its new rulers is bewildering, owing to its partition among different members of the family — (1) the Ḥīrdārābd Shāhī or Shāhīdūrābd branch, ruling in Central Sind, (2) the Mirpurī or ƏMmānī branch, seated at Mirpur, and (3) the Subāhīdī branch, ruling at Kāhārūr.

The early relations of the English East India Company with the Mīrs of Sind were unsatisfactory, and difficulties in connection with the passage of British troops through the province on the outbreak of the first Afgān war in 1838 led to the introduction of some degree of British control. The Mīrs were now amenable, but their army rose against the British, and in 1843 was defeated by Sir Charles Napier at Mānnī. Mīr 'Abbās Murād, the Subhābī branch, remained faithful to the British, and was permitted to retain his principality of Kāhārūr, but the rest of Sind was annexed, and has since been a British province. Under the administration of Sir Bartle Frere it remained tranquil during the Mutiny of 1857, and the only British regiment in the province was set free for the suppression of the revolt elsewhere.
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Khākānī, Bombay lithographed edition of 1832;
R. F. Burton, Sind, or the Unhappy Valley,
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1877; M. K. Haig, The Indus Valley Delta
Country, London 1894; H. G. Raverty, The
Mīrān of Sind and Its Tributaries, Journal
of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, lxxi, 1893;
The Imperial Gazetteer of India, xxii. 339.
Oxford 1908.
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SINDIBAD-NĀME (Syntipas), a widely
known collection of stories, which since
the time of Péris de la Croix has been much
studied by folklorists. The general theme is as
follows: A king entrusts the education of his son
to the sage Sindibād. The prince is ordered by
his tutor to keep silence for seven days; during
this time he is calumniated by the favourite queen
and the king is on the point of putting him to death.
Seven viziers, by each telling one or two stories
succeed in postponing his execution and on the
eighth day the prince, who has recovered the
use of his speech, is proved innocent. This cycle
is also known as the history of the seven
viziers. In another cycle (the history of the
ten viziers, Bakhtiyār-nāma), ten viziers are
invited to a banquet, and all but one, who
is kept behind to guard the door, are killed by the
drunken prince, who then goes out to rob the
doorman of his purse and the prince defends himself by relat-
ing these stories. The Tātī-Nāme studied by
Pertsch is another similar collection.
The book of Sindibād is referred to by Masʿūdi
ten cent.) alongside of The Thousand and One
Nights; at a later date it became incorporated in the
root Nights, but also retained an independent
existence. It is found in the Oriental literatures,
Syria, Hebrew, Greek, Pehlevi, Persian, Arabic,
Turkish and it entered the mediaeval literatures
of the West; French, Latin, Italian, Catalan,
Slavonic, Armenian and German versions are known.
India has stories of the same genre and Benfey
has attempted to derive the Syntipas from an
Indian prototype Siddhākṣati, which we do not
however possess; its Indian descent has however
not been rigorously established. It may be noted
on the other hand that the moral of these stories
and characteristic feature of the trial by silence
would recall Phrygian tradition.

Bibliography: The editions of the Thousand
and One Nights and the Cent Une Nuits,
transl. by M. Gaudreot-Denomblyne, Paris 1911,
a collection which contains an Arabic version
of the story of the Seven Viziers older than
the Persian versions that we possess; the Bi-
ligraphie des Ouvrages Arabes de Chaunin,
viii, Liège 1904; Clouston, The Book of Sind-
ibad, Glasgow 1884; René Basset, Deux man-
sucripts d’un ouvrage arabe intitulé le recueil
des Sept Vizirs, J. A. Ser. x. t. ii., 1903; do,
Contes arabes, Histoire des dix vizirs, transl.,
Paris 1883; Comparrelli, Ricerche rispetto
the Book of Sindibad, London 1882; H. A.
Keller, Le Roman des Sept Sages, Tübingen 1836.

SINDJĀB (Sendjāb), a Kūrd tribe in the
Persian province of Kirmānshāb. In summer the Sindjābī pitch their tents in the
plain of Māhdājāt and in the district of Dīwānā,
in winter they move to the lands south of the
Alwānd (in Kūrdish: Halawān from the older Hal-
wān, cf. Sarīn), a left bank tributary of the
Diyāla which it joins near Kānīnān. Here the
pasturages of the Sindjābī stretch from Sarīn
up to the mountains of Agh-dagh, Bighaṭ and Kāfār
(south of Kānīnān) and in the south stretch as
far as Ḫalāwij. The delimitation of the Turco-
Persian frontier in 1913 left a part of those winter-
quarters of the tribe on the Turkish side but the
convenience of this division was officially re-
cognised. On the left bank of the Alwānd the
Sindjābī occupy a narrow strip to the north and
west of Ḫaṣ-ḳī Shīrīn [q. v.] up to the present
frontier between Persia and the Ṭū̄fān; they have
some ten villages there.
The tribe consists of twelve clans (Calāb, Ḫalāwij,
Salmenevar, Shākh-i Nārīḵān, etc.). The number of families cannot
be over 2,500, of which not more than 500 are pure
Sindjābī; the remainder consists of incorporated clans: Lūrā (Arkawāz), Wātakwāz, Dījīf (Barzā)
and Gūrān (Tufangā). About 1,500 families of the
Sindjābī agglomeration winter on the Alwānd.
According to Soane they speak Kūrdi, i.e. the
dialect which does not belong to the Kirmānshāb
group.
The chieftains of the Sindjābī have often acted as
governors of the frontier district of Ḫaṣ-ḳī Shīrīn.
The tribe provided the government with a contingent of 200 irregular horsemen.
The Shācref-nāme does not mention the Sindjābī.
According to themselves they once lived in Bayāt
near Ḫaṣ-ḳī whence their chief Bakhṭīyār Kān
brought them into the province of Kirmānshāb
where they lived with the Gūrān for some time. This
may explain their conversion to the religion of
the Ahl-i Ḥaḳḳ (cf. ‘All-lāh), although they often
profess themselves outwardly *Twelve Shīrīs*
(*ithnaw-sahāri*). Under Ḥasan Kān Calāb, son of
Bakhṭīyār Kān, the Sindjābī formed themselves
into a separate tribe. The son of Ḥasan Kān,
Shīr Kān Ṣamān al-Mannikālī, became chief in
1903 and died an octogenarian in 1915. His sons
Kāsin Kān, Ali Abī Kān etc. played a certain part
in the military operations of 1916—1918;
being on the side of the Turks, they adopted a
hostile attitude to the English and Russians.
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SINDJĀR, the name of the capital of a
district in Diyar Bahri [q. v.] (Balād Sindjār)
and of the ranges running north of it (Bujbal
Sindjār). The town, which is identical with the
ancient Sīngha is situated a very little east of
42° East. Long. (Greenwich) and in 36° 22' N.
Lat. in a valley of the Tawk (now pronounced
Ṭog) range which is south of and parallel to the
Bujbal Sindjār, through which the Nahr Tharthūr
flows with the steppes on the south. On the alleged
navigability of the river in the middle ages cf.
Serre-Hersfeld (Bibl.), i. 193 sq. As the walls show,
the town was at one time much larger than now.
It was bound to be prosperous from its favourable
geographical situation and the fact that it lay on
a fertile slope surrounded by desert. According to
Ibn Ḥawkāl it was partly irrigated artificially so
that all kinds of fruits grew there. As a stage on
one of the two great roads from Mōsul to Beled
(Balāt, Eski Mōsul, see eski), to Ḫaṣ-ḳī [q. v.]
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BIBLIOGRAPHY:
- Critchlow, Putevjes javan, St. Petersburg 1875, passim; E. Soane, In Disquisitio de Meopotamia and Kurdistān, 1926; A. Orlov, Putevjes dnevnik de 1913 in Materialy po Vestnik, ii., Petrograd 1915; H. Rabino, Kermānshāb, R. M. M., March 1920 (an article with very full authorities). (V. Mīnorsky)
and on to Ra‘is al-'Ain, Sindjär was able to carry on an extensive trade in its own products. Now the conditions are entirely changed. Sarre and Herzfeld point out especially that in contrast to what the geographers say, namely that date-palms were extensively cultivated in Sindjär, there is not a single palm-tree there now, and the limit of fruit bearing by the date-palm lies much farther south. Sachau (Bibli.) however talks of fertile fields in the neighbourhood of the town. — The people of the Džabal Sindjär and of the town are Kurds, who belong to the sect of the Yazidis. The district was already Yazidi in the middle ages.

Bibliography: The ancient history of Singara is outlined in Sarre-Herzfeld, Archäologische Reise im Euphrat- und Tigris-Gebiet, 1911 pp. i. 203. The statements of the mediaeval geographers are collected in Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, 1905, p. 98 sq.; all the necessary references to the sources are given there and in Sarre-Herzfeld, i. 204. For the history of the town under Islam what is said under Sankü holds good. Al-Sam‘ānī, (G.M.S., xx, 1912), f. 312a-5, gives a few beads to the rise of the Sīnjaris in Sindjär. Modern conditions in Džabal and B. Sindjär are fully described by E. Sachau, Reise in Syrien und Mesopotamien, 1883, p. 322 sqq. and there are a number of notes in M. v. Oppenheim, Von Mittelmessur zum Persischen Golf, 1899 (Index s. v. Beled [does not distinguish the different places of this name] and Gebel Singär). The above account is mainly based on the full description of the mountains, town and monuments (with sources and bibliography) in Sarre-Herzfeld, index s. v. Džabal Sindjär, Nahr Tharthār and Sindjär (in the quotations from vol. ii. 355. 7) where further references are given. — Maps in the works just mentioned. General view of the town in Sarre-Herzfeld, ii., plate bxxiv. — On the Yazidi of Sindjär cf. Pognon, Sur les Yazidis de Sindjär, R. O. C., x., 1915/1917, part 3 (reference by Struthmann in Id., xiiii., 1923, p. 371); Pauli-Wisowa, Realens., s. v. Singara and Sínjar. (M. Plessner)

SINF (A.), pl. sinf; — synonyms ħifṣa; ḥār, pl. kārīṭ; šerṣa in Morocco.

Historical. The organisation of labour and the grouping of workers into corporations in Muslim cities dates from the ninth century of our era and is closely connected with a movement half religious and half social, socialist in origin, that of the Karmaţians [q.v.]. At this period, industrial development and the growth of urban populations produced serious crises under the 'Abdulid Caliphate. The servile war of the Qin id (q.v.) at Baṣra, riots in Baghdād in the first thirty years of the tenth century and lastly the anti-Arab nationalist (Shu‘ubiya, q.v.) reaction in the provinces.

The custom, Karmaţian in origin, of organising into gilds attained its zenith in the Muslim countries subjected to the new state which arose as a result of the propaganda of the Karmaţians, namely the Fātimid caliphate of Cairo (tenth-eleventh century). Then, in 1171, the reconquest of Egypt for Sunni orthodoxy affected it seriously. The gilds were subjected to strict police control and gradually lost all their privileges. Their organisation survived in very humble forms especially in the Ottoman empire, in the Pāndjāb, in Persia and in Turkestān, down to the last years of the sixteenth century (Kūdī described those of Damascus in 1883).

Since 1917 the ancient Muslim gilds have tended to become ṭa‘āb or syndicates for the new professions, dependent on the Third International (Moscow). This change was noticed in Java in 1920, then in Bağhdād, in Teherān, in Egypt and finally in Damascus since 1925.

Organisation. The earliest sketch of the organisation of the Muslim guild is found — unfortunately in too concise form — in the eighth of the Kasida (i.dh.) al-Safā (eleventh century) mixed with Hellenistic conceptions which suggest that they are Byzantine survivals.

From the xvth century we have (in manuscripts) a series of catechisms of initiation into the gild, called ḥusāb al-fatuwwa (q.v.; in Turkish ḥusāb al-fatuwu; in Persian ḥusāb al-fatuwu). They enable us to construct the hierarchy of the grades — ṭa‘āb (syn. ṭa‘īr, ṭa‘īf, amin). They describe the ceremony of initiation (ṣo‘d; q.v.); but they do not give any details regarding the regular working of the gild tribunal and the degree of its competence. We can only gather these details from historical and legal texts and from the narratives of travellers like Ibn Džabair and Ibn Baṭṭūṭa.

The master-craftsman is called mu‘ullaš, his journeyman ḥabīb, the apprentice wuqālīn, the labourer ḥanť. The members of each gild are pledged to guard the secrets of manufacture and to supply good work at a fair price; the whole body of traditional customs of the gild, orally transmitted, is called ḥusāb, a word which has become well-known since 1908 with the meaning "political constitution" and has been in use among the artisans from a remote period.

Since the ninth century the following have been organised into gilds, the Islamised clients (ma‘āall), enfranchised and converted, but not the Arab conquerors nor their mercenaries, nor their slaves. Alongside of the clients there have been constituted under their seign, certain Jew ish and Christian corporations, since it is to them alone that Muslim states permit trading in and working in precious metals and drugs.

Since for ten centuries, there has been no revolution in the technical processes employed by the Muslim artisans, the study of the distribution of the different gilds in the Muslim cities, Fez or Baghdād, Damascus or Cairo, shows that as a general principle there was a fixed topographical distribution of the trade gilds in any particular Muslim city. The principal fixed points were the offices of the money-changers beside the mint, the public market and the tribunal of the mu‘āštah: the ḥaṣīṣiyah (q.v.) at once general shops and the piece-goods exchange; the thread market; lastly the university, organised into a corporation from its origin (Karmaţian propaganda). We know of other centres, economic in origin, the specialised markets, the sale of goods brought to the town from the country or from abroad — the great caravanserāis (khan, eshāk).

A certain number of conditions, specifically Muslim in origin, affect labour in practice, the distribution of tools and the recruiting of labourers. Firstly there is the institution of ḥusa‘ or ṭawṣa‘, insaluble public property such as irrigation, canals, mills, baths, gardens, bridges, drains; the administration of the ḥusa‘ also affects the gilds,
through the shops, nearly all the fixtures of which are žďáří. Then there is the institution of the žďáří or control of the markets entrusted to a muhtasib. This institution, purely canonical in the early centuries, and fallen into disuse in the tenth to twelfth centuries in the great period of liberty for the gilds, was revived by the state from the twelfth century as a police office with the object of keeping a close watch on the gilds, which were suspected, especially in Egypt, Syria and Turkey, of Karmatian and revolutionary sympathies. The manuals for the žďáří by Nibrāwī and others show this; in Morocco, for example, the muhtasib ultimately established a compulsory weekly court. When, according to the law, he ought on the contrary to have prohibited the gilds from fixing compulsory rates (tučto) for provisions.

There arose a whole collection of moral problems in connection with the gilds. Muslim literature is rich in documents referring to the gilds of charlatans, rogues, immoral and criminal associations, and the theologians and jurists have handed down to us collections of cases of conscience and mental reservations (kiyāl), the importance of which has recently been shown by Schacht.

Bibliography: There is a general bibliography of the history of labour in the Muslim world in ch. 3 of vol. viii. of the K. M. M. and a summary chronology in vol. iii., p. 19-21. The connections with the Third International have been exposed in the same Revue, vol. ii., iii. and ivii.

Additional reference will be found in the Bibliography to the article SHADD.

(Louis Massingham)

SINGAPORE (from the Sanskrit Sīhākura, "the lion city") is the name of an island and a city thereon, situated in 1° 17' N., 103° 50' E. (Gr.), at the southern end of the Malay Peninsula, from which it is separated by a narrow strait recently bridged by a causeway which carries the line of railway running to Bangkok. In the Middle Ages Singapore was a port of call for the trade between India and China, and its native name Tēmaēek is recorded in Chinese, Javanese and Malay sources. Originally part of the South Sumatran empire of Sri Vijaya (Palembang), it enjoyed a brief period of practical independence (from circa 1250). In the early part of the 14th century it was unsuccessfully besieged by the Siamese. It is claimed in the Javanese poem Varākṛtīvīgama (1365) under the name of Tumamur under the name of Tumamur and was destroyed by the Javanese circa 1377. After that event it was superseded by Malacca, and dwindled into a comparatively unimportant place, though still occasionally visited by passing ships for wood, water and other provisions, and having a žďářímandar (port officer) under the Muslim Sultans of Malacca (down to 1511) and subsequently under their successors, the Sultans of Johor. On February 6, 1819 a British settlement was founded at Singapore by Sir Thomas Stamford Raffles on behalf of the East India Company. It was on the site of the old medieval port town and included only a small part of the island; but by a treaty made in 1824 the whole island with its adjacent islets was ceded to Great Britain in full sovereignty.

At the time of the British occupation the inhabitants numbered only a few hundred, partly Muslims (Malays) and partly wandering sea gypsies (Orang Laut) living mainly in their boats. The growth of the town was rapid. The trade is mainly in the hands of European and Chinese merchants, though other races, such as Indians and Arabs, also share in it. Three-fourths of the inhabitants are Chinese. In 1921 the population within municipal limits was 350,355, that of the island generally 418,358. Of this last number about 64,000 to 65,000 were Muslims, the bulk, viz. 53,595, being classed as Malays (though this latter figure included only 75,184 real Malays, 13,348 Javanese, 6,582 Boyanese, 1,142 Bugis and 349 Banjarneze, and a few others). The remaining Muslims comprised some 9,000 Indians and about 1,200 Arabs. The great majority are Sunni. The school of Shiite being in touch with the Muslims of Arabia and India on the one hand and with those of the Malay Peninsula and the Dutch East Indies on the other, Singapore, though mainly non-Muslim in population, is an important link in the chain of Muslim propaganda and in the pilgrim traffic to Mecca.


ŞiN-I KALAN (literally Great China), Arabic and Persian name (the Arabic şin is of course from the Persian šin) for the seaport of Canton in the Mongol period; it is known especially from the travels of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa [q. v.] (ed. Defremery and Sanguineti, iv. 271 sq.) but is used by other Muslims (Rašīd al-Dīn, Wāsāf) and also by Western writers (Odocone de Pordenone, Marignolli, also in the Carta Catalana; cf. the quotations in Yule, Cathay and the Way Thither, London 1866, p. 105, and Rašīd al-Dīn, Ḫāmus al-Tamārīk, ed. Blochel, 1911, p. 493). For ŞiN-I Kalan Ibn Baṭṭūṭa also has Şin-i-Şin; this latter name is according to Yule, taken from idrist [q. v.] who describes in the extreme east of the Chinese empire a large trading town under the name Şiniya-Şini (Geographie d'Édrisi, transl. A. Jaubert, Paris 1836—1840, i. 193 sq.). (W. Bartfield)

SİNÜB, a town and seaport on the north coast of Asia Minor between the mouths of the Sakarya [q. v.] and the Khastrı Mrak [q. v.] and about equidistant from the ports of Şamusun and Ineboli, 75 miles N.E. of Kastambol [q. v.]. It is the celebrated Seats of the ancients and has retained this name from Muhammadan authors know it by the name of Şinub (Ahu-T-Fidby, p. 392 and Ibn Faḏi Aḥlāf al-Umari, Milād il-Ādār, N.E., xii. 367). Şinub (Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, ii. 348). Şinub (Anon. Giese, p. 34: vol. i. and I. Beg, ed. Babinger, p. 73). Sinub (‘Ashq Pasha Zade, and, following him, all the Turkish historians and other writers). The town lies on an isthmus running N.E. from the mainland to
which it joins the peninsula of Bar Tepe Adast. This position gives the town two harbours but only that on the south, the safer of the two, has remained in use since ancient times. The strip of coast behind Sinûb is bounded by the great range, which borders the Central Anatolian plateau, and is particularly difficult to cross directly south of the town.

The history of Sinope goes back to a remote period. It was already an important port for trade with caravans from Mesopotamia and Cilicia, before it became a Greek colony of Miletus, in the 6th century B.C. Herodotus, Xenophon and Strabo describe it, but in the time of the latter it was no longer the great terminal port for continental trade (cf. Ramsay, *Historical Topography of Asia Minor*, London 1890, p. 27). The town however retained its importance; in the second century B.C., it was the capital of Mithridates of Pontus and after its capture by Lucullus in 70 B.C., it knew several centuries of prosperity as a Roman colony under the name of Colonia Julia Felix. When, under the Byzantine empire, the interior of Asia Minor gradually lost its Hellenism, Sinope remained a commercial centre, and with the rearward migration of Asia Minor by the Sarmatians in A.D. 832 had as one result that Themophobos, commander of the "Persian" auxiliary troops of the emperor, was proclaimed king of Sinope for a brief period; this episode is related by the Byzantine sources, Symeon Magister and Theophanes Continuatus.

As the conquest of Asia Minor by the Saldjûks was confined for the first century of the peninsula, Sinope remained Byzantine, but also served as a port for the merchants of the Saldjûk empire, who embarked there for the Crimea (Heyd, *Histoire du Commerce du Levant*, p. 298). At the beginning of the 12th century the town passed into the hands of the empire of Trebizond. The Saldjûk Sultan 'Abâd al-Din Kâlûbbâd took the town from them, Ibn Bibî, who gives a detailed account of its capture (Recueil des historiens des Seljoucides, ed. Houtana, iv. 54 sqq.) gives as the date of the capture the 26th Djuamâd II, 611, corresponding to the Nov. 2, 1214 (this day was a Sunday while Ibn Bibî talks of a Saturday). The Saldjûk Sultan had taken advantage of the discord between the two Greek empires, but the immediate pretext for attacking the town was the entry of the lord of Sinope (in Ibn Bibî and Barhebræus, *Chronicon*, ed. Bedjan, p. 429, called Eir Aleks, i.e. Kyn Alexis Commeneros, cf. Fallmerayer, *Geisch des Kaiserreichs Trapezunt*, Munich 1827, p. 94) had made its way into Turkish territory. Abu 'I-Fidâî seemed also to allude to this conquest (Tarttî, Constantinople 1256, ii. 122 under 611 A.H., cf. Fallmerayer, op. cit., p. 96); in any case Barhebræus is wrong in saying that Alexis was killed by the Saldjûks. The Byzantine historians do not mention the taking of Sinope.

The town was given a Saldjûk garrison and the church turned into a mosque. Some time afterwards, the town was given as a hereditary fief to the celebrated vizard Mu'min al-Din Sulaimân Perwâne, who built a fortress there, which is described by Ibn Battûta. It was about the same time that William of Rubruck passed through the town, which he calls Sinopolis, on his way to Russia. According to Mânedjdim Bahîl (iii. 34), Perwâne was succeeded at Sinûb by his son Mu'min al-Din Muhammad (676-696) then by his other son Mu'izz al-Din Mas'ûd, on whose death in 700 A.H. his lands passed to the lords of Kastamûn. But another authority (Ali, *Kâm al-Ahkâm*, v. 22, quoting Râbi') says that after the deposition of the Sultan 'Alî al-Din (in 1307) Ghâzân Khân granted all the lands in the north and northwest of Asia Minor to Ghiyâṡ Celebi, son of the Saldjûk Sultan Mas'ûd. This Ghâzân Khân is well known in history especially for his bravery in his acts of piracy (for example he dived under the water to destroy the keels of enemy vessels) which he committed against the Genoese and the Greeks of Trebizond, whence his ally he had sometime been. Ibn Battûta (loc. cit.) and probably Abu 'l-Fidâî (*Târîkh al-Buldân*, ed. Reinard and de Slane, p. 393) however make Ghâzân Celebi a descendant of Perwâne. After his death, Sinûb was taken by Sinûb al-Din Sulaimân Paşa, lord of Kastamûn (cf. Ifsênîdîrî Oghlî); it was shortly after this event that Ibn Battûta visited the town (c. 1340). During the 14th century, the town retained its importance as a commercial centre, connected with the road to Trabûn and Bârias (Taeschner, *Das anatolische Wegen*, i. 196). Trade was mainly in the hands of the Genoese, who probably had a consulate there since 1351; there was also a Genoese colony (Heyd, op. cit., i. 550). Sinûb was the last refuge of the Ifsênîdîrî Oghlî, when the Ottoman Sultan Sulaimân Bâyârî I had attacked them and in the end they abandoned the town to him in 797 (1394-1395), according to the old Ottoman chronicles (Ağâh Paşa Zâde, p. 72; Anon. Giess, p. 34). After the restoration of this dynasty by Timûr in 805 A.H. Sinûb again passed under their rule; it was the seaport by which the rebels against the Ottomans, like Shakîb Badr al-Dîn (cf. Bahânger, in *Ibul*, xi. 60) were able to escape under the protection of the Ifsênîdîrî Oghlî. It was however only in the year 1458 that Muhammad II definitely incorporated the town in his territory by a treaty with the Ifsênîdîrî Oghlî İsmâ'il Beg, who received in exchange fiefs in Rûm III. This event is recorded by all the Turkish historians and by the Byzantine Ducas and Chalcondylas; the latter mention the formidable defences, that had been erected in the town.

Under Ottoman rule the town never again became a seaport of importance. In 1614, it suffered from an invasion of the Don Cossacks (Nâmûn, i. 298), which resulted in energetic measures of defence being taken. Ewliya Celebi (ii. 73) says that it was forbidden to the commandant to go more than a cannon-shot from the citadel and that the attacks of the Cossacks stopped in the reign of Murât IV. The only serious event since that date was the naval battle fought on Nov. 30, 1853 between the Russians and a Turkish fleet in the roadstead of Sinûb; the Turks were completely defeated and the town was partly destroyed by the bombardment. This event was one of the immediate causes of the Crimean war (von Rosen, *Geschichte der Türk*, Leipzig 1867, ii. 192). Under the administrative reforms in the Turkish Empire, Sinûb became the capital of a sancak (district) of the vilayet of Kastamûn; the other sancaks are Boyûltûd and İstefan. Cuviet gives the population of the town as 8,749 of whom
5.041 are Muslims. From the description the town has barely changed in the last few centuries. The citadel is in the eastern part of the town and is surrounded by enormous walls of the Byzantine period; seen from the peninsula of Boz Tepe, the citadel looks like the bridge of a ship, according to Ewliya. Citiun mentions others remain of earlier edifices. The quarters inhabited by the Greek Christians were outside the walls of the town, on the Boz Tepe side. It was this part that suffered most in the bombardment of 1853. Among the mosques Ewliya gives pride of place to the Sultan 'Ali al-Din Djam'; he gives a detailed description of the minbar which was a marvel of art built of marble. According to Hâdîjî Khalîfâ, Sulaimân I wanted to transport the throne from Constantinople for the Sulaimânîya Mosque but when they attempted to move it, it cracked so that the Sultan abandoned his plan. The town has many other old mosques and türbes (including that of Sâyiid Ibrahim Bâllî and that of Sultan Kâttûn), the study of which will throw much light on the history of the town. The industry for which Sinûbis is more particularly noted is that of goldsmiths' work (especially filigree work). The yards of Sinûbis used to build the large Turkish warships of wood from the mountains to the south. Towards the end of the sixteenth century, the traffic at the port of Sinûbis was less important than that of Şamûn and Izebel. An attempt to revive the trade of the town has been made by building a road for vehicular traffic from Sinûbis to Amassia, but it is only finished as far as Boyfüdd.


(S. H. Kazemetz)

SIPÂHÎ, SIPÂHÎ, SIPÂH SALAR. [See SIPH.]

SIPIH, "celestial sphere", noun de plume (kasbâhî) of the Persian historian and man of letters, Mirzâ Muhammad Tahtî of Khâgân. After a studious youth spent in his native town he was settled definitely in Thrâna, where he found a patron in the poet-laureate (muhalî al-khâzîn) of Fath 'Ali Khân. On his accession (1250 = 1834) Muhammad Shâh appointed him his private pamphletist (maddâb-i khatîsâ) and secretary and accountant in the treasury (mângû wa-munânîy yâ dîvânî). The same Shâh entrusted him with the composition of a universal history. Nâsir al-Dîn Shâh also encouraged him in this enterprise and in 1272 (1855) conferred on him the title of Lâdin al-Muâlî ("Tongue of the State"). Sîph died about 1496 (1878). Gobineau who had known him speaks of his "gravité docte et administrative" in contrast to the "façons légère et riante" of his colleague Râhî Khân Hidâyât. The book entitled Barâkâh al-Adîm finished by Sîph in 1251 deals with Persian prosody; it is illustrated by examples from the Persian classical poets. The Divân of Sîph does not seem to have been published; his verses quoted in anthologies (Mâdhûbâ al-Fanâbî) while showing technical skill lack originality and taste. Sîphî's history, with the pretentious title of Nâsîkh al-Tawârikh ("Effacement of the Chronicles") according to the Indian catalogues, consists of fourteen volumes of which the last stops at the period of the 6th Shî'î Imam Muhammad Bâkîr (d. 113 = 731). Its style is evidently appreciated in India where extracts from it have been published, as texts for examinations in Persian, but the present-day Persians criticize it severely and say it is full of inaccuracies and anachronisms. Of more importance is volume v. (l) which, anticipating the full scope of the work contains the official history of the Kâdîjî [q.v.] dynasty. It consists of three parts coming down to 1267 (1851) with a later supplement dealing with events down to 1273 (1857). This chronicle has been much used by the historians of the Bâbî movement [q.v.], Gobineau, Kažembe and Browne. The latter pays a tribute to Sîphî's candour and accuracy ("scarcely surpassed by the witty and sarcastic de Gobineau") with which he depicts on the one hand the faults of certain representative Persian officials and on the other the courage and heroism of the adepts of the sect.


(V. Minorsky)

SIÎRA (A.), the traditional biography of Muhammad. The word seems to be used for the first time as the name of a separate branch of study in the title of Ibn Hibbân's work (ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 3. al-haddî fi tâlîb wa-râ'id ilâhî) but there is other testimony to its use to mean biography of Muhammad; it is already found in this sense in al-Wâhidí (Ibn Sa'd, Tâhâbî, 11/18, man râ'id 'ibrâna) and in his pupil Ibn Sa'd (ibid. 11/12. 152; hå'llîy an sam'î ha 'ls-rafî wa'mâhghis min gharîbîn). Besides, the word 'ira' at this time already had the sense of biography in general; it is known that a Siîra Mu'allîya waslânî Umaiyya by 'Awâna al-Kalîbî (d. 147 or 158 a. H.) or by Madîbî b. al-Fârîshî (al-Tamîmî, d. 231) existed (Fihrist, p. 91, 98).

The meaning of "biography" comes in its turn from that of "condottiere", "manner of living", which the word 'ira' had and which is a natural development from the root 3-r-7 to "betake oneself", "to travel" (ira' is found in the Kûrâ, 22. 22) in the meaning of "manner of being", "form". It
seems that at first the plural form, *sijar*, was used by preference in connection with the biography of the Prophet, having been probably applied to the narratives of the life of Muhammad in the style of the *al-madhhab* of Pekeli origin, with which the Arabs were acquainted at the rise of Islam (cf. Nöldeke, *Gesch. der Peper u. Araber*, p. siv.-xviii.). This term *sijar*, in the majority of references which we possess to the early productions of Arab literature relating to the biography of Muhammad, is constantly found associated with the term *mihqāl* “military expeditions” (cf. A. Fischer, in Nöldeke-Schwally, *Gesch. d. Qorān*, ii. 241) and the association of these two words helps to enlighten us as to the composite origin of the *Sira*.

I.

**The Origin and Character of the *Sira***

The idea of piecing together into a consecutive and organic narrative the story of the life of the Prophet from his birth to his death was not an early nor a spontaneous one in the community of Islam. If it is natural that the deeds and sayings of the founder of the new faith should have at once attracted the interest of and have recommended themselves to the memory of his contemporaries and still more to the believers of the second generation, it is not the less true that the character of this interest was anything but historical, in the sense in which we understand the word. It was rather concerned, on the one hand with fixing the regular practice of worship and religious law according to the teaching and example of the Prophet and on the other with celebrating, after the fashion of pre-Islamic Arabia, the warlike exploits of the Muslims under the conduct of their chief, who was regarded by the majority of his followers as an amīr, whose wisdom and bravery, favoured by divine assistance, had gained him the most dazzling successes but who did not differ markedly in character from the amīrs of the Diḥliyya. It was the former of these two motives which, as we know, gave the stimulus to the process of formation of the *sunna*, under the typical form of the narrative *hadīth* (i. 200—206), which, although presented as a collection of biographical data, in reality is quite different in aim and character. The second motif, in its turn, has given rise to an abundant crop of stories relating to the Medinan period in the career of Muhammad, completely filled with military exploits. These narratives are simply the continuation or development of the literature of the *ayīn al-ʿArab* (i. 270—281), the characteristic features of which had already become fixed at a period antecedent to Islam; they have in common with the latter the naïve freshness of style, the tendency to break up the narrative into a number of episodes only very slightly connected with one another, and the abundance of poetical quotations (cf. J. Horovitz in *Islamica*, ii., 1926, p. 308—312), which often must have actually formed the kernel around which the prose story later established itself. One cannot deny to this kind of production a historiographical character, but one must remember that we are not here dealing with history placed in a chronological framework but arranged on any definite plan and that we have rather to deal with a series of “war memoirs” in which the faithful reproduction (although often subjective) and the realistic description of one episode are found alongside of an inaccurate and distorted description of another, and in which, in particular, the linking up of incidents and a synthetic survey of the course of events are completely lacking.

Of quite another kind are the origins of the biography of the Prophet properly so called. The latter owes its origin to the transformation undergone by the personality of Muhammad, the religious consciousness of Islam and to the decisive influence which certain heterogeneous elements have exercised on this transformation. It was above all contact with Judaism and Christianity and the desire to set up in successful contrast to the figures of the founders of these two religions, that of the founder of Islam which encouraged the development of the legend with which the person of Muhammad has been surrounded and which has completely transformed and altered the nature of his character from his childhood (or even before his birth) to his death. The Prophet, who had so definitely declared during his mortal career, that he only considered himself a man of like nature who ultimately came to represent the visible manifestation of divine perfections: his life, becoming a kind of copy of that of Moses and of Christ, was given the stamp of the supernatural in its smallest details (cf. the fundamental work of T. Andre, *Die Person Muhammad's in Lehre und Glaube seiner Gemeinde, Stockholm 1918 [Archives d'Études Orientales, xvii.], especially ch. I.).

How are we to conceive the elaboration of this process, which appears completed in its main lines barely a century after the death of Muhammad? Does the actual narrative, which is its result, contain alongside of elements the fictitious and fabulous character of which cannot be doubted, statements which are based on a tradition more worthy of credence, in which the tendencies, corruptions and the panegyristic amplifications may perhaps contain a kernel of historical fact? Here we have a problem of historical criticism which, first raised by the great Eastern scholars of Islam in the second half of the last century, is still far from a definite solution, and one which, besides, belongs rather to the study of the personality of Muhammad and of the origins of Islam, than to that of the origins and editing in literary form of the *Sira* which forms the subject of this article. It will be sufficient to recall here that the influence of Jewish and Christian tradition (either in the form of imitations of stories from the Old and New Testament or in that of borrowings from the ṭāhir and ṭayyāra on the one hand, and the apocryphal gospels and Christian hagiography on the other) was long ago suspected by Schwally and that Nöldeke (Z. d.M.G., 1858, ii. 30—33) was the first to point out, by analyzing the stories of the conversion of the first believers, that very often the *Sira*, far from reflecting an authentic tradition only represents an anticipation, presented with a show of a historical documentation, of a state of affairs much later than the events related. The history of the beginnings of Islam was adapted and idealized for the greater glory of the families and individuals who played the leading parts in the history of the Arab empire. It was however Goldscheider's brilliant essay on the character of the narrative *hadīth* (Men. Stud., i. 1906, p. 169, which marked a decisive turning-point in the critical study of the *Sira*. It was recognised that the *Sira* in the literary form, in which it
has come down to us is simply a collection of narrative hadiths which do not differ substantially in their mode of formation from the more strictly doctrinal hadiths. In the case as in the other, the hadith gives no guarantee of historical". In its remaining lines: In the one as in the other, the text contains a formulation of doctrine in a polemical point rather than a historical statement (cf. Caetani, Amali dell' Islama, i, 28-58). The analysis of the literary processes that formed the Sira has been carried out to its extreme by Père H. Lammens in a series of articles in which the learned Jesuit has set out to prove that the whole structure of Muslim tradition regarding the life of the Prophet, at least for the phase preceding the Hijra, is quite without foundation. Every incident related by the Sira, each alleged historical detail is only the result of a subjective exegesis of a verse of the Koran, out of which the Medina school (where religious zeal for the memory of the Prophet was maintained with the greatest vigour) deduced by a process of "pious fraud" with the use of all sorts of learned combinations and foreign elements, the course which the life of Muhammad "must have taken" without the existence of any support in historical tradition for the reality of the incidents related. The Sira would thus be in substance only a great "Kuranic midrash", completely fabricated with the object of glorifying the Prophet and sustaining this or that other religious or political thesis. The rationalism of Caetani and of Lammens, which extends even to the apparently inconsequential details of the life of Muhammad, including his name and parentage, has seemed extreme to many scholars (cf. de Go ge, in Centenario Amalvi, Palermo 1910, i, 151-158; Noldeke, in W. Z. K. M., 1906, xxxi. 297-312; t., 1913, iv, 205-212; t. 1914, v. 160-170; Becker, in I. t., 1913, iv, 263-269: Islamstudien, Leipzig 1924, i, 520-527; a popular account of the question in my Storia e religioni nell Orientali sentite, Rome 1924, p. 138); nevertheless, if they have not succeeded in definitely triumphing over the views of those who think that even in that part of the Sira which relates to the life of Muhammad before the Hijra a number of statements retain a historical value, the cardinal principle which has guided them has proved extremely fertile. Detailed investigation has revealed from particular passages of the Sira, the midrash-like method which governed its formation (cf. especially Schrieke, in I., 1915, vi, 1-30; Bevan, in Beitrage zur Zeitgeschichte, ii, all. Ett. Wiss., 1914, xxvii. 51-61; Horovitz, in I., 1914, v, 41-53; 1919, ix, 159-153; 1922, all. 184-185); it may even be said that the character of learned combination seems to extend not only to the whole story of the Medina period at least to some of its episodes (cf. Horovitz in I., 1922, xii, 175-185; Vacca, in R.S.O., 1923, a. p. 87-109).

The formation of the Sira down to the period of its reduction to its "canonical" form seems to have taken place along the following lines: the continually increasing veneration for the person of Maham mad provoked the growth around his figure of a legend of hagiographical character in which alongside of more or less corrupt historical memories there gathered episodes modelled on Jewish or Christian religious tradition (perhaps also Iranian, although to a much less degree).

This material became organised and systematised in the schools of the Medina musulmind in, through a midrash, subacute and full of combinations, of passages from the Koran in which excesses had delighted to discover allusions to very definite events in the life of the Prophet. It was in this way that the history of the Medina period was formed. Religious pragmatism also seared upon stories relating to the Medina period and modified their character, often quite profoundly, but in this field it encountered more precise historical statements, which had already been elaborated after the custom and style of dealing with stories relating to pre-Islamic military expeditions. From the combination of these varied elements resulted the Sira in its vulgar form, which we find already fixed in its essential features by the beginning of the second century of the Hijra.

II.

The Reduction of the Sira to its Literary Form.

It was the Bayt al-Maghâbi of Wâhâb b. Mana bih (34-410 A. H.), the name of which is due particularly to works relating to Biblical and South Arabian history. But it was especially at Medina, as we have already seen, that the study of the Sira was cultivated in deliberate fashion alongside of religious tradition. The oldest author of a book on the biography of Muhammad, 'Urwa b. al-Zubair (d. 94), is well known as a jurist as a historian. The son of the famous companion of the Prophet took only a very slight part in the political activity of his brothers 'Abdâllah and Mas'ûd; early reconciled to the victorious Umayyads, he sent to the Caliph 'Abd al-Malik, at the latter's request, numerous explanatory notes on points relative to the beginnings of Islam (quotations in Tahtab, cf. Caetani, Amali, i, index to vols. i. and ii.; Fock [see Bibliography], p. 8, note 22). His biographical activity was, however, not confined to this, his correspondence for he also communicated his pupils some information collected by him, according to the practice of oral transmission guaranteed by the inmâd, which henceforth constituted the method of the Sira as well as of Hadith.

We see that the same rule was adopted by a contemporary of 'Urwa, Abâ b. al-'Uthmân (23-105), the son of the Caliph, who also was settled at Mecca; his teaching regarding the life of the Prophet was collected into a book by his pupil 'Abd al-Rahmân b. al-Mughîra (d. before 125). These earliest literary productions to the two names just mentioned, is added that of Shu'ârâ, Abâ b. Sa'd (d. 122) whose influence seems to have been slight) are given the same maghâbi, which, as we have seen, remained classical till a late date and suggests (as
This explains why in his work the use of the term was corrupted in such a way that the scholastic tradition of the *ilm al-hadith* was deeply shocked by it and unanimously refused him the title of a *muhađid*, worthy of credence (cf. the texts collected by Wüstenfeld, Ibn Hisham II, introduction). This verdict (which was pronounced even in the lifetime of Ibn Iṣhāq by no other than the great jurist Mālik b. Anas) was a result of which Ibn Iṣhāq found himself forced to give up teaching in Medina and to settle in the Ṣaṟaṯ. This is all the more important as it marks the clear separation between historical, and purely doctrinal hadith. It goes without saying that, in the collection of hadith in the strict sense like those of al-Bukhārī, Muslim, etc., we find biographical information of the first order (especially in the books devoted to the *mughāṣṣ and to the mubāqṣa*) but the fact of containing material in common only serves to accentuate still more the difference between the two literary genres.

The abundance and the variety of material collected by Ibn Iṣhāq forced him to enlarge the circle of his authorities and to accept a number of insufficiently supported traditions. He even takes steps to give the source, not always particularly clear, of some of his information, as we have seen, as is often the case, it goes back to Jewish or Christian sources. He does not neglect, contrary to what seems to have been the case with his predecessors, to use poetry to supplement his sources (he has even been accused of having collected a number of apocryphal verses) and he precedes the narrative of the life of the Prophet with abundant genealogical and antiquarian notes. To sum up, the character of Ibn Iṣhāq in comparison with the authors who preceded him is that of a real historian and in him we have the final fusion of biography of the religious type of the *muḥaddith* with that of the epic-legendary type of the *ṣayyid*. It is this original and personal character of the work of Ibn Iṣhāq, which, while it explains the hostility of the schools of tradition, justifies the immense success which it has enjoyed through the centuries, a success which has not only overshadowed similar previous works and some which closely followed him (like the *mughāṣṣ* of Abū Maʿṣūr [d. 170] [ii. 106] and of Yaḥyā b. Saʿd[. d. 194]) but made him a decisive influence on the future development of the *Ṣira*. In addition to Ibn Hisham's recension, Ibn Iṣhāq's biography was reproduced for the most part by al-Tabari in his two great compilations, the *Ṭawāṣṣ* and the *Ṭāfsir* and through the intermediacy of these two writers it has become the principle source of later historiography.

Only one other writer has a position alongside of Ibn Iṣhāq of hardly less importance, namely Muḥammad b. Umar al-Waṣāṣ (130–207) whose work as a biographer of the Prophet has come down to us by three different channels, the *Khitāb al-Mughāṣṣ* (abridged translation by Wellhausen, Berlin 1882: unfortunately we do not yet possess a complete edition of the text) which was transmitted by Muḥammad b. Shuqayl b. Ṭalḥīl (181–261): the *ṣira* which precedes the *Ṭabāṣṣ* of his pupil and secretary Muḥammad b. Saʿd (d. 230) (Ibn Saʿd, ed. Sahau, vol. 1 and ii.) in which, along with traditions going back to al-Waṣāṣ, we have others of different origin; lastly the *Ṭabāṣṣ himself*, especially in vol. iii. and
iv. for all that deals with the relations of Muhammad with his companions and with the part the latter played in the history of Islam before the death of the Prophet. With al-Wâkidî the Sîra loses this unity and this combination with universal history which Ibn Ishaq had given it, although he also, after the model of the latter no doubt, composed a Kitâb al-Tariqîd wa l-Madkhal 'il-Magâzi (Fihrist, 95 end): it rather assumes the form of a collection of detached monographs, of which the most elaborate are those devoted to the public life of Muhammad, his expeditions, his correspondence, the emmissaries which he received or sent. In comparison with Ibn Ishaq, al-Wâkidî shows little taste for poetry. On the contrary he had a great talent for chronology, the systematic treatment of which, as we know, goes back to him. On the other hand, in collecting the statements of tradition regarding the companions of the Prophet, al-Wâkidî founded through Ibn Sa'd, who arranged and added to the material supplied by his master, a new branch of the study subsidiary to the 'ilm al-hadîth, the development of which has been quite extraordinary viz. the 'ilm al-risâl, the biography and criticism of the traditions.

After al-Wâkidî (the regular source with Ibn Ishaq) of successive historians beginning with al-Baladhuri (q.v.) whose Sîra incorporated in his Anbâ' al-Ash'âr and goes back almost in its entirety to him (cf. de Goeje in Z. D. G. M., xxvini. 1884, p. 387—390), the sîra is no longer dealt with for some centuries in works of great importance (we know relatively little about those which al-Madâ'inî, the famous historian [d. 225], devoted to it, Fihrist, p. 101). The attention of the historians became attracted to the datâ'il al-mubnawâwâ and to the ǧâmâ'il (cf. Andrae, Die Person Muhammad's, p. 57 sqq.), a branch which broke off from the Sîra to assume a development of its own, while historical biography is restored, following the example of Tabari and in general after him, to the great works on universal history. The countless collections of biographies of the companions of the Prophet sometimes contain historical references to the Sîra differing from those that are taken from the well known sources of Ibn Ishaq and al-Wâkidî and some of which go back to a remote antiquity. A study, which has still to be undertaken of such works as the Ja'reb of Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, the Usd al-Ghâsba of Ibn al-Athir, the izba of Ibn al-Hasar, etc., aiming at identifying and collecting these statements might yield appreciable results; but in any case we have only scattered and fragmentary material. Still more meagre is the spoil that might be obtained in the comments on the Sîra of Ibn Hisâm of which the most known is the Rawf al-Schalli (508—581; cf. Brockelmann, G. A. L., I, 135, 413). The colossal compilations of more recent date supply an incredible mass of notices, which their authors, urged by their scholarly zeal to exhaust in the completest manner possible all the sources to which they have patronally piled up; as regards matter they give no more than is contained in Ibn Ishaq and al-Wâkidî; the most that one finds in them is only some legend of late origin, the importance of which is no doubt considerable for the history of the formation and development of the cult of the personality of Muhammad, but the value of which for his actual life-story is absolutely nothing; or they are simply variants of stories already known. Among these compilations, a list of which would immeasurably prolong this article it is sufficient to mention the 'Uyûn al-Aṣghar of Ibn Saiyid al-Nâsir (661 or 672—734); Brockelmann, G. A. L., II, 71; the al-Mawâbûl al-laduniyya by al-Kastallî (851—923); Brockelmann, ii, 73; the al-Sīrat al-Shâmiyya by Shams al-Din al-Shâmi (d. 942 or 974); Brockelmann, ii, 304), the al-Sīrat al-Hadîthiya of Nâr al-Din al-Ḥâlîî (975—1044); Brockelmann, ii, 307) and the commentaries on the two first works Nâr al-Nibrâ by Sîbî Ibn al-Âdjamî (d. 841; Brockelmann, ii, 67) and Shâbîr al-Mawâbûl by al-Zarkâlî (d. 1122; Brockelmann, ii, 319). The résumés and the versifications of the Sîra, in which Arabic literature is so rich, are of course of no historical value.

Bibliography: (in addition to works already quoted) Hillsdî Khalîla, ed. Flügel, iii. 634—636; Wustenfeld, Die arabisch. Geschichtsschreiber (Abh. G. W. Glott., xxvii.—xxix., 1882), passim; Spengler, Das Leben u. die Lehre des Mohammedanen, Berlin 1860, iii., liv.—lxxii.; Caeniani, Annali dell' Iskâm, Milan 1905, vol. i.; Nûldeke-Schwally, Gesch. d. Orient, Leipzig 1919, ii. 129—144; Ibn Sa'd, ed. Sachau, ii.l., Leydon 1906, introduction (Horovitz), iii. 1, Leydon 1904, introduction (Sachau); Nallino, Il prof. Gabriele e una inedita dissertazione di laurea intorno ad una fonte araba della biografia di Masometto, Rome 1915; Gabrieli, Ancora interno alla primitiva biografia di Masometto, Rome 1919 (two polemical pamphlets which however have very full references and some useful observations); J. Fück, Muhammad Ibn Ishaq, Literaturhistorische Untersuchungen, Frankfurt o/M. 1925 (also contains an excellent critical survey of the literary history of the Sîra before Ibn Ishaq); Ahlwardt, Verzeichnis d. arabischen Handschriften, Berlin 1897, ii. 110—187.

(5. LEVI DELLA VIDA)

SIRADJ AL-KUTRUB (a.), "the gnome's lamp," or according to Idrisi, "the glow-worm's lamp," (for other meanings of šîtrub see Lane, vi. 2543), the name for the mandragora (mandragora officinalis, l.), one of the Solanaceae indigenous to the whole Mediterranean area, with a turnip-shaped root often in two parts, thickly covered with root-fibres, bearing a clump of large, egg-shaped, sinuate leaves, between which grow the axillary petiolated bell-shaped flowers. The fruit is a reddish yellow berry about the size of a cherry which from ancient times has been used for medicinal and magical purposes, as a poison, narcotic or love potion, as early, for example, as the Old Testament under the name dâdâ'ân (Gen. xxx. 14). According to al-Tamâmî, the plant is also called yabadû al-mawâbî and bâdî'ar al-sanam. It is the queen of the seven mandragoras and according to Herme's the herb which Solomon wore under his signet which gave him power over the djinn. The plant is therefore also valuable against all illnesses caused by evil spirits, such as lameness, cramps, epilepsy, loss of memory, etc. According to Ibn Sinâ mandragora is given to a patient to destroy his sensitiveness to pain during severe operations. The most important for magical purposes are: the roots known as alrâmûs, the digging of which curious stories are told even in classical authors (Plinius, Hist. nat., xxv. 94; Josephus, B. J. Jud., vii. 6).
SIRAF, a town in Persia, on the Persian Gulf, once a commercial port of great importance (17th/18th century). The houses in several stories were built of brick and other woods brought from Zanghār; it was supplied with water from springs tapped in the mountain of Djamm which dominates it from close at hand. The creation of an emporium on the island of Kaiz [q.v.] ruined it by taking away its Indian trade. It had not a harbour properly speaking and the ships used to moor in an arm of the sea eight miles off, to be sheltered from the wind. The sailors who set out from it went to Maskat, Kalam, the Nicobar Islands, and as far as Kalah in the Malay Peninsula, whence they reached Canton in a month. The trade consisted mainly in the exportation of striped cloth for bath-towels (soldā), pearls, silks, balances, and in the exportation of hērēbār (Indian spices, B. G. A., iv. 187). The inhabitants were engaged in sea-trade and were sometimes absent for years; they had amassed great wealth by dealing in spices and other merchants. They had built sumptuous houses but they were noted for their voluptuousness and lack of serious thought. It was also the warmest place in the district, so hot that one could not take a siesta there. Under the 'Abbāsids it was the principal town of the district of Ardashir-Khurra; it began to decline under the Būyids; destroyed by an earthquake which lasted seven days in 366 or 367 (977) it was afterwards rebuilt. Its ruins may be seen at Bandar Tāhiri (Le Strange, transit of Nuzhat, p. 116, n. 2).

A legend says that the mythical king Kal-Kāzus when he tried to ascend to heaven, fell down in this country and asked for water and milk to be brought him; this story has been invented to justify a popular etymology (Pers. ṣārām, "milk", ṣār, "water"). According to Yāкūt, the merchants pronounced its name ǧhālām, which is connected with the above etymology. Mention is also made of a spring of fresh water here at the bottom of the sea.


Sīrāf, Aḥū Saʿādu ʿAlīās Aḥsan b. ʿĀd Allāh b. al-Mubakkar was born before the year 900 (1489) in the small town of Sīrāf [q.v.] on the Persian Gulf; the waṣīʿ Allāh b. Tās gave the year 280 as the exact date (Yāкуt, Ḫūṣraw, iii. 123). He made his first studies in grammar and law in his native town, but when he was twenty he crossed the sea to ʿOmrān where he devoted his time to ʿAḥsan law. Later he returned to Sirāf and went from there to al-ʿAṣqār, where he studied Arabic grammar under Mahrāmān (cf. Zubālī, Ṭabāḥī, No. 44; Sayyūl, Baghīyar, p. 74). Later he went to Baḡdād and studied there principally under Aḥū Bakr ibn Durādīr and became one of the principal pupils of this eminent scholar and propagator of his works. However he did not confine himself to linguistic studies but became an authority in all branches of learning then practised. He studied the sciences of the ʿUṣūl and ʿĀḥsan under Aḥū Bakr b. Muḥiṭ, grammar under Aḥū Bakr b. al-Sarrāj and mathematics under Mahrāmān, mentioned above, tradition under Aḥū Bakr b. Ẓiyād al-Nisābūrī and Muhāmmad b. Aḥū b. Aṣkār. He was reputed to have been a Muʿtazilī, but this cannot be proved from his writings. For over forty years he gave legal advice (jāzīb) in the Rūṣāf mosque at Baḡdād and the Chief Judge Aḥū Muhāmmad b. Muʾrif appointed him on more than one occasion his lieutenant on the Eastern side of the city of Baḡdād. He was also invited to assume a post in the Secretariat of State, but declined the offer. Most biographers describe him as a very pious man, devoting his time to prayers and fasting, refusing any gifts from the great, and we are told that he used to copy each day ten leaves of manuscript which he sold for ten dirhems which sufficed for his livelihood. Against this Yākuṭ tells us that he was accused of borrowing valuable manuscripts from two booksellers and, being too mean or too poor, he caused his pupils to make copies of them. At the end of these he wrote that the work had been read over to him, and such copies later commanded a higher price than the originals, on account of the reputation of al-Sīrāfī. Though a lawyer of the ʿAḥsan school his personal opinion was highly valued and the account of such a personal advice on intoxicating drink is given by Yākuṭ; and though against some of the accepted principles of ʿAḥsan law the words quoted on the subject are sound advice for any creed. His reputation as a scholar was so great that he frequently received letters from monarchs and ministers from various parts of the Muslim world. The Sāmānī prince Nuṣr b. ʿAbṣār sent him a letter containing over 400 questions and addressed him as Imām, while the ruler of Dālam in a similar letter called him Shaikh al-Islām; other letters were from the Egyptian waṣīʿ Ibn Khūzāb etc. of the ten works which are named by title by his biographers only his commentary on the "Book" of Sbawaihī is easily accessible, but this work enjoyed a great reputation even during his life-time and his contemporary Aḥū ʿĀlī al-Fārisī, also an eminent scholar of the ʿĀḥsan school, displayed his envy openly. He and his followers tried for a long time to get possession of a copy with the intention of finding in it errors which they could point out publicly. When Aḥū ʿĀlī in the year 368 was able to buy a copy for two thousand dinars he did not find the errors he had wished and it was late to meet Sirāfī, as he died the same year on Monday the third day of Raḏjab in Baḡdād and was buried in the Khairūrān cemetery. As stated above, his biographers attribute to him ten separate works: 1) A commentary on the "Book" of Sbawaihī which has been printed in Cairo 1317 and used for the translation of the "Book" by Jahān (Berlin 1894).
of Arab history and includes a wealth of older traditions. The story, in the Kitâb al-Âzâhâr of bow 'Antar, the son of a slave-girl, was adopted into the tribe of Banû 'Abas for saving them at a time of great crisis already bears the stamp of a flourishing but already legendary tradition. The Strät 'Antar far transcends the unconscious development of a legend. By a bold stroke 'Antar, the solitary hero, is raised to be the representative of all that is Arab, 'Antar the pagan is made the champion of Islam. The romance thus comes to reflect the vicissitudes of the Arabs and Islam through half a millennium; the tribal feuds of the old Arabs; the wars against Ethiopian rule in Arabia; the subjection of Arabia and especially of Iraq to Persian suzerainty; the victories of the rising Islam over Persia; the remarkable historical position of the Jews in Arabia down to the seventh century; the conquests from Christianity by the Arabs, especially in Syria; the continuous wars of the Persian and later of the Muslim East against Byzantium; the victorious advance of Islam in North Africa and in Europe; the influence of the Crusades is also undeniable. The contacts between East and West are numerous. The romance is written in smooth rhymer prose into which some have been interwoven some 10,000 verses. The editions printed in the East since 1296 A.H. divide the Sîrat into 32 little volumes, none of which, like the separate nights of the 1001 Nights, ever ends at the conclusion of a tale.

Contents. The romance brings us through numerous legendary stories from early times down to the period when King Zuhair is ruling over the Banû 'Abas. The 'Abîd hero Shaddâd on a raid captures the negro slave-girl Zabîha (not till the xvith book do we get the denouement that she is a king's daughter, who had been carried off from the Sû'dân), who becomes the mother of 'Antar. As an infant, 'Antar tears the strongest swaddling clothes, at two years old pulls down the tent, at four slays a large dog, at nine a wolf and as a young shepherd a lion. Soon he comes to the rescue of his oppressed tribe, for which he is acknowledged by his father and adopted into his tribe. He seeks 'Abîa, his uncle's daughter, in marriage; the latter promises her to him in an hour of need; but after 'Antar has averted the danger, he imposes the most dangerous conditions to be carried out before the marriage. 'Antar fulfills them all but is only allowed to marry 'Abîa after ten volumes of wonderful exploits. The area of his exploits widens continually. In his own tribe 'Antar has first to overcome the resistance of his father, then the hostility of 'Abîa's relatives, to win over his rivals, including the poet 'Urwa b. al-Ward, to put an end to the feuds of the Banû Ziyâd, Ramî and 'Umâra. In the feuds between the sister-tribes of 'Abîa and Fadîhîra, 'Antar proves himself the saviour of the Banû 'Abas; outside of his tribe, he fights and overthrows the strongest heroes and makes them his friends; such are Durâid b. al-Simmâ, Mî'âb b. Ga'âmî, Hani b. Masîid, the victor over the Persians at Dhî 'Ktar, 'Amir b. Mâdîkarib, 'Amir b. al-Tûsfâl, 'Amir b. Wûdî, the knight of the Harâm, Rabî's b. Ma'âshâm, the pattern of Arab chivalry and many others. He fastens up his mu'âlalâs in the Haram of Mecca after defeating the other mu'âlalâ-poets in a competition, overcoming all his rivals in duels and passing an examination in
Arab synonyms from Amru 'l-Kais. From Mecca he goes to Khaibar and destroys the town of the Jews. But 'Antar is also taken beyond the bounds of Arabia. The Sira does not lack and does not lack detail. This 'Abib's father demands a 'asif-camel as a bridal gift, which are only bred by Muthhir, King of Hira. This takes 'Antar to the 'Irak. From there he is summoned to Persia to fight the Greek champion Badrāmī. Next we find him in constant association with the kings of the 'Irāq, Mundhir, Nu'mān, Aswar, 'Amr b. Hind, Iyās b. Kabiṣa and their vixiers notably 'Amr b. Bukāila. He has also constant dealings with the Shāhs, Khusraw Anāṣhārān, Khudākand (no shah of this name is found in Shāhī history), Kawadd (probably Kawad Shīrō), sometimes as a dreaded opponent, sometimes as a most welcome ally. The son of the king of Syria woos the promised bride of a friend of 'Antar. The latter goes to Syria, kills his friend's rival, defeats King Hārith al-Wabhār (Aretas), beheads his friend and with the death of Aretas at the request of the princess Halima becomes guardian of the new king 'Amr b. Hārith, who is still a minor, and as such ruler of Syria. Here 'Antar comes into contact with the Franks, sometimes as an enemy and sometimes as their ally against the Persians. Syria is under Byzantine suzerainty. For the services which 'Antar renders the Christians here, he is invited to Constantinople and entertained and honoured. Lailāmān, the king of the Franks, objects to this and demands that the emperor should hand over 'Antar to him. 'Antar along with Heraclius, the emperor's son, then leads the Byzantine army into the land of the Franks, subjects them to the emperor, reaches Spain, defeats King Santiago, pursues his victorious march through his provinces in North Africa from Morocco to Egypt. When he returns from these conquests on behalf of Byzantium to Constantinople, an equestrian statue of him is erected out of gratitude; the statue of his two brothers, who had accompanied him to Byzantium, are placed on either side of his. Shortly before his death, 'Antar comes to Rome. The king of Rome, Balbām b. Markas, is hard pressed by Bohemund; 'Antar kills Bohemund and liberates Rome. On a campaign of reprisal against the Sūdānese, 'Antar goes from kingdom to kingdom deeper into Africa till he reaches the land of the Negus. Here he discovers in the Negus the grandson of his mother Zabība. Even more fantastic are the campaigns against Hind-Sind, against the Christian king Lailāmān in the land of Bajla, in the land of the demons. 'Antar's death is brought about by Wizar b. Dabīr called Asad al-Rahiṣ. 'Antar had repeatedly defeated him in battle and taken him prisoner but always set him free again. Wizar feels humiliated by this magnanimity and continually renew his attack. Finally 'Antar blinds him. Though blinded, Wizar learns to shoot birds and gazelles with bow and arrow from their sound. 'Antar is struck by one of his poisoned arrows, but Wizar dies before 'Antar under the delusion that he has missed. While dying, and indeed when dead, still sitting on his steed Abūjjar, 'Antar still wars the enemy off from his people. 'Antar's marriage with 'Āliya was childless but from his secret marriages and love-affairs, several children were born including two Christians, and indeed Crusaders, Ghadinār, Coen-de-Lion, son of 'Antar and the sister of the king of Rome whom 'Antar had married in Rome and left in Constantinople, and Djufrān (i.e. Godefroi, Godfrey), the son of 'Antar and a Frankish princes. 'Antar's children are exactly what and what they are and the death of their heroic father. Ghadanfar and Djufrān then return to Europe. 'Abīs also becomes a convert to Islam.

Analysis: The following are the main elements that have contributed to the growth of the Sira:

1. Arab paganism; 2. Islam; 3. Persian history and epic; 4. The Crusades. 1. To Arab paganism it owes the chivalrous and knightly Bedouin spirit of the work, the majority of the characters in it, who often have historical features, the feuds between the sister tribes of 'Abs and Fadhāra; in connection with the race between Dābīs and Ḥabara, the most powerful of the Ahhār-al-'Arab, like king Zuhair's marriage with Tumādir, Zuhair's death, Mālik b. Zuhair's death, Ḥārīth and Luma, Djaīda and Ḥālīd, anecdotes of Ḥātim Tātī, the splendid figure of Rabi'a b. Mūsāmād etc. 2. To Islam belong the introduction with a long midrash of Abraham, repeated legends of Muhammad and Ali, the conclusion of the work with Ayyub's transition to Islam; the tendency of the book, to make 'Antar really prepare the way for Islam; 'Antar's victorious campaigns through Arabia, Persia, Syria, North Africa and Spain are modelled on the conquests of Islam. Certain details give the Sira a slightly Shī'a colouring. 3. Persian influence is found in the knowledge of Persian history and the Persian epic, in places of the Persian language, in the conception of kingship by grace of God, in the knowledge of Persian court life and ceremonial (throne, crown, imperial carpet), court-hunts (falcons, cheetahs), pigeon-post, Persian offices and ranks (vizier, mōbedān, mōbed, māzāgān, pehlēwān, eyes and ears of the Shāh) even the zaḥārīja (écuyers tranchants). 4. Christianity and the Crusades. The Sira knows of Christians in the Syria of the Sūdānese, in Byzantium and among the Franks. The Franks appear as Crusaders (the romance even mentions the cross worn on the breast), fighting for Shīlohe and Jerusalem. Djufrān (Godfrey) besieges Damascus and sends troops against Antioch. The Sira mentions the cross, the dress of the priests and friars, the girdle of the order (which in the Sira is the most important symbol of Christianity next to the cross), the crozier, the bell (clapper), incense, holy water, prayers for the dead, unction, sacrament and of holy-days, Christmas, Palm-Sunday, is aware that among the Franks the clergy are first in Church and state, that marriages between consuls are illegal, seems also to know of excommunication. 5. The Sira describes a Spanish place of pilgrimage and day of pilgrimage. The Christians swear by Jesus, Mary, the Gospels, John the Baptist (Mānī b. Ḥabīb al-Ma'mādī, Vokhna), by Luke (Lībi), Thomas (Mar Tōma) and Simon. The Emperor Radjīm rules in Byzantium and his son is called Heraclius; Balbām b. Markas is king of Rome. The Christian rulers of North Africa have names which end with the -ī, common in Greek and Latin, e.g. Martos, Kardus, Hermes, Ibn al-'Urūsī, Kindaryas b. Kīrmās, Sindarīs, Thedoros. The king of Spain is called Santiago; of the names of Frankish kings and princes that of Bohemund alone is certain. The names of his brothers Mübīrt, Sīhert, Kīhert and that of the prince Sīhīrt of the Sea show what is perhaps the commonest ending
in personal names in Old French. 'Antar's son by the Frankish princess is called Djurfan, which conceals the old French form Jofroi, Jefroi, Geoffroi) of the name of Godfrey of Bouillon. As the romance of 'Antar knows nothing of Europe, but a good deal about Europeans, the author must have become acquainted with them outside of Europe, of course at the period of the Crusades; Bohemund is slain by 'Antar. Godfrey is the son of 'Antar, who comes as a Crusader to Asia, learns his paternity there, avenges the death of his father and then returns to Europe. Even the name of Tafur of the king of the beggars in the army of Peter of Armenia, seems to be preserved in the Sira: Djafur is the name of the usurper who drives the infant prince 'Amr from the throne of Syria but is overthrown by 'Antar. In regard to intelligent sympathy with and toleration of Christianity, the picture we get from the Sira 'Antar is far in advance of that which the mediaeval Christian epic reveals of Islam, where the Muslims are made to worship idols, like Apollo, Cahu, Gomelkin, Jupiter, Margos, Malquiendant, Tervagant etc. The romance of 'Antar regards the Crusades not without sympathy and admiration. It is true that Crusaders are mentioned, who go to the Holy Land to seek plunder and to escape punishment; but the Franks are fighting for God the Father, for the Son and for the spread of religion.

Folklore and literary parallels. There is remarkably little folklore in the Sira 'Antar but it includes several noteworthy features: a splendid witches' kitchen, fine examples of allegorical speech, of omens, life-token. Most of the agreements with other narrative poetry may be regarded as commonplaces of the epic; the strength and growth of the hero, his exploits, the killing of a lion, mu'ammara (longevity) is as common in the 'Antar as in the Şâhân-Şâma), dreams, visions, Amasa, fights between father and son, the Gudrun motif of the bride's fidelity, the motif of the stupid man. There are very few borrowings: Nu'man's lucky and unlucky day, Khusraw's bell of justice (the motif of the legend of the Emperor Charles and the snake), a flight to heaven in a box borne by eagles, several African traditions (probably taken from geographical works on Africa). There are also links with European legends. The marvellous signs at the birth of Charlemagne (in Pseudo-Turpin) resemble those recorded in our romance at the birth of Muhammad, but Pseudo-Turpin undoubtedly borrowed from an older source. Artificial birds made of metal, which sing in various tunes by means of bells and organ pipes are described in French and German epics and also in the Sira 'Antar. But here we have to deal with the historical marvel of the Chrysotriklinum in Constantinople, and with a similar thing in the Ctesiphon of the Sassanids and also in the capital of the Tatar Khans. Some coincidences are very striking. Harith al-Zailim beats his sword Dhu l-Hiyaj against a rock, so that it may not fall into the enemy's hands; the rock is broken but the sword is uninjured, just as in the case with Roland's Durandal. 'Antar instructs his son Ghalib, who wishes to slay Khusraw and seize the power for himself, on the subject of kingship by God's grace just as, Girard de Viane does his nephew Aimeri who wants to kill Charlemagne. 'Antar's horse Abdjar takes flight to the desert after 'Antar's death, so that he may not serve another master, just as Renaud de Montauban's Baisart escapes to the forests of the Ardennes. Very remarkable is the parallel between the duel between Roland and Oliver and that of 'Antar and Rab'bi b. Mu'addam; the sword of the one combatant breaks in two and his magnificent opponent gets him another; the duellists are reconciled and become brothers-in-law. But such poetical developments have their origin in a similar chivalrous outlook, the relations of the knight to his sword, to his horse, to his lord and to his opponent.

Chivalry in the Sira 'Antar. The Sira is rightly recognised to be a romance of chivalry. In the pagan period among the Arabs the ideal of masculine virtue was mu'ammara, futurama; alongside of this we have more frequently in the Sira 'Antar furusiya along with furawa and tefarra. The knight is called fâris. 'Antar is called "a father of knights," Abu 'l-Fawwâris, sometimes Abu l-Fursân, Abû l-Fursân, Fâris al-Fursân, Afrâmus. Not everyone who rides a horse is a knight. The knight's qualities are courage, fidelity, love of truth, protection of widows, orphans, and the poor (Antar arranges special meals for them), magnanimity, reverence for women (Antar begins and ends his heroic career protecting women; he swears by 'Abia, by 'Abia's eye, conquers in 'Abia's name), liberalty, especially to poets. The knights are also poets, especially poets of the Hijâj, who are found in hundreds in the Sira 'Antar. The Sira also knows the institutions of chivalry. We meet pages and squires, not only the mutâhâra (of Ctesiphon) 'Antar himself trains several thousand squires. The Sira even describes tournaments on a great scale, in the Hijāj, in Hira, in Ctesiphon, the most splendid in Byzantium where 'Antar's lance strikes the ring 476 times. These tourneys have many features in common with those of Europe, fighting with blunted weapons, tilting at the ring, decorating and befogging the lists, the presence of ladies and girls. These agreements have been explained in the most diverse ways. On the one hand Deléncluze saw in 'Antar the model of the European knight, in the Sira 'Antar, the source from which Europe had obtained all its ideas of chivalry, while on the other hand Reinard simply found European ideas, customs and institutions imitated in the Sira (J. A., 1833, i. 102-105). In this some have seen the starting point for the study of the question of the origin of the Sira 'Antar.

Origin. The Sira 'Antar itself frequently and readily talks about itself and its origin. It professes to have been composed by al-Asma'i in the time of the Caliph Harûn al-Rashîd as his court in Bagdad; Asma'i lived for 670 years, of which 400 were in the Dîhiliya; he was personally acquainted with 'Antar and his contemporaries, concluded the composition in the year 473 (1080) and recorded traditions from the mouths of 'Antar, Hamsa, Abû Tâlib, Hâtim Tâyi, Amru 'l-Kais, Hâni b. Mas'ûd, Hâzim of Mecca, 'Ubâdî, Amr b. Wudd, Durâd b. al-Shûma, Anîr b. al-Tamîl. In fact we have a regular romance regarding the origin of the romance. The repeatedly mentioned râsul, nâhil, mutâhâra, şâhân-şâma, şâhân-şâma, Asma'i and other authorities have the same significance for the Sira 'Antar as the Dîhîsû, Pehlevi books and the hoary authorities in Firdawsi, or as the chronicles of St. Denis for the French epic. It is
simply fiction, when the Strat 'Anfar tells us that it exists in two versions, one for the Hindja and the other for the 'Iraq. The invention of a Hindja recension is intended to make it believed that 'Aṣma'ī collected the information in the Hindja from 'Anfar and his companions, which was utilised in the romance. The Hindja as the home of the romance is a pure invention. On the other hand 'Iraq may really have made a considerable contribution to the composition of the Strat 'Anfar. For the date of origin of the Strat 'Anfar we have the following clues: 1. In a religious dialogue between a monk and a Muslim (Das Religionsgespräch von Jerusalem um 100 A.D. aus dem Arabischen übersetzt von K. Völlers, Ztschr. f. Kirchengeschichte, xxix. 19) the monk mentions the exploits of 'Anfar. 2. About the middle of the xiiith century the Jew Samaw'āl b. Yahyā al-Maghribi, a convert to Islam, describes his career and mentions that in his youth he was fond of long tales like that of 'Anfar (M.G.W. F., 1898, iii. 127, 418). 3. The evidence contained in the book itself. The appearance of Bohemund, Djiufri (Godfrey of Bouillon), perhaps also of the king of the beggars, Tafar, brings us to the period after the first Crusade, that is at the earliest in the first half of the xiiith century. The composition of histories of 'Anfar must therefore have already been begun in the viiith century — on the evidence of the religious dialogue above mentioned. According to Samaw'āl b. Yahyā a book of 'Anfar of considerable size was actually in existence in the middle of the xiiith century and if Bohemund and Djiufri already appeared in it, it must have been completed at the beginning of the xiiith century. At the same time the mediadha may have continued to add a great deal to it and in particular continued its Islamisation. The midrash of Abraham which is quite an inorganic addition and the legends of Muhammad and 'Ali could belong to any period. An original 'Anfar can be reconstructed with philological probability. In vol. xxxi., the dying 'Anfar reviews his heroic career in his swan-song. He proudly recalls his victories in Arabia, 'Iraq, Persia and Syria. But he mentions neither Byzantium nor Spain, nor Fes, Tunis, Barks, nor Egypt, nor Hind-Sind, the Sūdān nor Ethiopia. This original 'Anfar may have arisen in the 'Iraq (under Persian influence or perhaps in emulation of Persian epic poetry). The swan-song makes no mention of chimaera, and knows of only one love of 'Anfar's. This original 'Anfar therefore should be called 'Anfar and 'Abba. Following a genealogical stimulus, the later epic made royal ancestors be found in the Sūdān and royal descendants in Arabia, Byzantium, Rome and the land of the Franks. The Crusades next found an echo and a reaction in the 'Anfar. The Crusaders came from the land of the Franks via Byzantium to Syria. 'Anfar goes in a kind of reversed crusade from Syria via Byzantium to the land of the Franks and brings about the victory, if not yet of Islam, at least of Arab ideals and culture over European Christianity. The whole geographical area and historical range of the novel is filled with the exploits of 'Anfar.

The romance of 'Anfar seems to be first mentioned in Europe in 1777 in the Bibliothèque Universelle des Romains (J.A., 1834, iii. 256); it was first introduced to European scholarship in 1819 by Hammer-Parganst and to comparative literature in 1831 by Dumlop-Liebrecht (Geschichte der Prosaerzählungen, iii.—xiv.). The study of the problem of scholarship raised by the Strat 'Anfar was begun by Goldziher (mainly in his Hungarian works). The Strat 'Anfar was for long a favourite subject of study in France. In the Journal Asiatique the work was often discussed and partly translated. Lamartine went into raptures of admiration and enthusiasm for 'Anfar (Voyages en Orient; Vie des grands hommes I: Premières Méditations Politiques, Premiere Préface). Taine places 'Anfar beside the greatest epic heroes — Siegfried, Roland, the Cid, Rustam, Odysseus and Achilles (Philosophie de l'Art, ii. 397). These tributes are not unmerited. The Strat 'Anfar unfolds before us the ever changing, glowing panorama of a particularly attractive period with an extravagant power of imagination, a skill in narration which never fails throughout the 32 volumes, and a poetical style of inextinguishable richness.

Bibliography: A very full collection of references to the manuscripts, editions, translations and treasuries on the Strat 'Anfar is given in V. Chauvin, Bibliographie des ouvrages arabes ou relatifs aux Arabes, etc., ill; Louvain et les fabulistes. Barham 'Anfar et les Romans de chevalerie, Lütz. Leipzig 1898, p. 113—126. Cf. also: I. Goldziher, Der arabische Held 'Anfar in der geographischen Nomenclatur (Globus, 1893, lxix., N. 4, p. 65—67); do., Ein orientalischer Ritterroman, Pfeffer Lloyd, Mai 18, 1918; B. Heller, Der arabische 'Anfarroman, Ungarische Mundart, v. 83—107; do., Az arab Antartegy, Budapest 1918; do., Der arabische 'Anfarroman, ein Beitrag zur vergleichenden Litteraturgeschichte, Hanover 1923.

(bernhard heller)

SIR-DARYA, a large river in Central Asia, flowing like its sister stream, the Amu-Darya [q.v.], into the Sea of Aral [q.v.]. European geographers now regard its source as the Narin which flows through the territory of Djatl-Su (formerly Semirech'ye) and the north-eastern part of Farghāna [q.v.]; the native population has always (in the middle ages and at the present day) considered the Karī-Daryā in the southern part of Farghāna as the upper course of the Sir-Daryā. After the junction of the two rivers which form it, the Karī-Kul'da and the Tar, the Karī-Daryā flows past the town (now a mere village) of Udzund, whence it is sometimes called 'rivers of Uzdung'. The district between the Karī-Daryā and the Narin is called in Persian Miyan-Injil, in Turkish Iki-Şu-Aral; the length of the Karī-Daryā from the confluence of the Karī-Daryā and the Narin is over 1,750 miles. In Farghāna it runs southwest at first and then for the most part northwest. Numerous tributaries flow to the Sir-Daryā; both from east and west (in Farghāna north and south) from the neighbouring mountains of which only three now reach the main stream (the Čurb, Keles and Arfa). The Arab geographers mention further tributaries in Farghāna, which now for the most part enter the great Şah-i Kūhn canal which runs south of the Sir-Daryā; the canal was only led from the Karī-Daryā like the Yangi-Aflī from the Narin in the xiiith century. Whether any canals of any size were led in the middle ages out of the Sir-Daryā itself to water, for example, the so-called "Hungry Steppes"
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between Clunus and Djanak cannot be ascertained. Makadda's mention (only in the Constantinople manuscript, B.G.A., iii. 222) of an arm or canal (khabij) said to be 140 farsoks long, between Khodjand and Usvahan, is not confirmed by any other sources. The tributaries of the Sīr-Dāyrā have always been of incomparably greater importance than the main stream. Nor, unlike the Amū-Dāyrā, has the Sīr-Dāyrā— at least in the historical period—had any oasis of importance in its delta.

In Western Europe the Sīr-Dāyrā is frequently called by its old Greek name of Jaxartes; a Pathian form fanghār is assumed and explained by J. Marquart (Die Chronologie der alttürkischen Inschriften, Leipzig 1898, p. 6) as yakhcha arba "true, genuine pearl". Against this explanation is the fact that in the numerous personal and geographical names compounded with arba, this component is always found at the beginning of the word. Yet the word yakhcha "pearl" seems actually to be contained in the name; the Chinese (Cas-su-ko) and Old Turkish (Yelin-agüs) names of the river have the same meaning. The Chinese transcription of the native name is given as Yau-ch'a (E. Bretschneider, Med. Researches from Eastern Asia, London 1888, p. 75), Yau-ch'a (F. Hirth, Nachweise zur Inschrift des Tonjuk, p. 81, in W. Kadiroff, Die alttürkischen Inschriften der Mongolen, second series, St. Petersburg 1899) or Yau-ch'a (E. Chavannes, Documents sur les Turcs [Turco] occidentaux, St. Petersburg 1903).

In the Muslim period the initial sṭ was probably as in the land itself; the Arabic (Kīman Ma'sīlāt) of Birnāt, in A. Sprenger, Forschungen an den Ætnlichen Geographien, Hamburg 1877, p. 77, is connected with the word Aṭr although this latter, a Turkish name, cannot be found before the xvith century. The geographical name (B.C.A., vi. 1764, v. 1764) is mentioned in the name Khañart, which also appears in the Chinese name (Ch'ang-t'ai) and was used probably in the central course of the river only: cf. Dāyrā Gāng from Firdawsi in G. J. Pje, ii. 445. The Arabs introduced the name Sḥāba for the Sīr-Dāyrā like Djanak for the Amū-Dāyrā (cf. the names Djanak and Sḥāba in the south-eastern frontiers of Asia Minor). The Naukat (Naukat al-Kalāb) of Hāmid Allah Kazimi (ed. Le Strange, 217, n. 27, transl. and note ibid., ii. 210) appears the Guli Dāyrā which seems to occur nowhere else. Blochet explains this word (in Le Strange, i. 276, n. 276) as the Mongol guli zaričun = "cold river", probably wrongly, as the order of words should be reversed. The river is usually called in Arabic and Persian sources after towns and districts on its bank, most frequently "river of Khodjand" (Khodjand is now the only town situated immediately on the bank of the Sīr-Dāyrā). This name also was adopted by the Mongols (E. Bretschneider, Med. Researches, loc. cit., in Chinese transcriptions Ho-kwan-mu-lin, for Mongol mūrān, "river"). Other names: river of Banket, or Fanakat (in Yākūt, Mu'ājlān, i. 740: Banket) after the town on the right bank near the mouth of the Augren said to have been destroyed by Cingir Kahan (this destruction is not recorded by contemporaries); river of Shahrushiya after the town built by Timur in 794 (1392) on the site of the destroyed Banket (Zafar-Nāma, Calcutta ed. 1886, ii. 636); river of Akkhat (ibid., i. 441; cf. Guli) or river of Cūr or Shāhāb after the great oasis of Chūlūk. The last town on the Sīr-Dāyrā, Arabic al-Karadj al-Ḥadūthus, Persian Dīb-i Nāw (Gardev in Barthold, Obret o poladkhār v Srednyey Azii, p. 83), Turkish Yangikent, later sometimes Shahr- kent in historical works (Turk-χiki Ličhān Guliča, i. 69 below) and on coins, was one farsakh from the bank of the river and two days' journey from its mouth (now the ruins of Dījkent). The ruins were explored in 1867 by P. Lorch and the coins found there are of the viith (xvith) century. The river is said to have altered its course about this time and no longer entered the Sea of Aral but according to some was lost in the desert, or to others joined the Amū-Dāyrā; on these stories cf. above, i. 341 ff., 4194 on the other hand Abu l-Ghāzī in the xviith (xvith) century mentions the Sea of Aral the "Sea of Sīr" (Sīr Tehfīr) and knows nothing of the river ever having not reached the sea.

In the xvth (xvith) century the Sīr-Dāyrā is mentioned as a navigable river along with the Amū-Dāyrā (B.G.A., iii. 343, i.), in "times of peace or of truce"; food supplies were brought to Karadj al-Ḥadūthus by water (ibid., ii. 393, i.). Navigation is now interrupted by the rapids of Begowat which begin at the village of Koš-Teğermen, fifteen miles below Khodjand; these rapids seem to be nowhere mentioned in Muslim sources; Dhwaint's story (Turk-χiki Ličhān Guliča, i. 71 sq.) of the siege of Khodjand by the Mongols in 1220, and the adventurous flight of the commander Timur Malik presupposes an uninterrupted passage by water from Khodjand to the towns on the lower course of the Sīr-Dāyrā (cf. e. g. d'Ossian, Histoire des Mongols, i. 225 sq.). After the foundation of Russian rule on the lower course of the Sīr-Dāyrā (since 1747) an attempt was made to introduce steam navigation on the river; the steamers of the Aral fleet went up the Sīr-Dāyrā also and had their most important anchorage at the town of Kazalinsk founded by the Russians. After this service ceased in 1882, no further such attempts have been made, although several times proposed; traffic on the Sīr-Dāyrā is maintained solely by boats of native construction (bajīb).
and was the capital of Kirmân. The streets are broad, the gardens well irrigated, the climate healthy and temperate. The palace and mosque were built by the Buyid 'Aḥd al-Dawla. The canals which water it were dug by the Ṣaffarids 'Amr and Ẓahir b. Lālīth. Wood being scarce, all the houses are covered with brick vaulting. It had eight gates, two markets, the old and the new, with the mosque between the two. The minaret was surmounted by a lampholder of carved wood built by 'Aḥd al-Dawla who had also built a palace near the Bāb Ḥakim gate. Corn was grown, cotton and dates, cotton manufactured and kūrštī desks as at Kumm, but not so fine.

It was the capital of Kirmân in the time of the ʿAbbāsids down to the period of the Buyids, when the Buyid governor moved his residence to Bābdīst (the modern Kirmân). Owned by the Muṣaffārīds at the beginning of the eighth (xvii) century, it did not recognise the authority of Timūr and was unsuccessfully besieged by Ṣāḥib Shāhīk in 796 (1394); but, under pressure of famine, it surrendered at the end of two years. Since then it has been in ruins, and the site is still marked by the debris discovered in 1900 at Kašīr Sang by Sir Percy Sykes (Ten Thousand Miles in Persia, London 1902, p. 431), at 5 miles east of Saʿād Abād, the modern capital.


**SĪRṔN, Wādī, the name of a valley in North Arabia, which runs from the south end of the Ḥawāran south-eastwards for a length of 160 miles with a breadth of two to twelve miles. Its north end is marked by the fort of al-Āzarq and its southern extremity by the wells of Muṣṭafā. This whole valley is very rich in water and suitable for settlement. At al-Āzarq, there is even a large permanent pond, the only one in the whole of North Arabia. If the life and property of the inhabitants are secured, the ten large and small villages in this wādī, which are still inhabited, may be further increased. But under present conditions the inhabitants suffer a great deal from the nomads, for Wādī Sīrān is their natural road to Syria. The trading caravans, which used to go from Gerra and Babylon to Syria, used the road through this valley, the history of which as a caravan route can be traced back still further; for the Assyrian kings had tried to control this important trade route and even found themselves occasionally forced to use armed force. The army of King Assurbanipal undertook a campaign against the Bāṣara and Kharût who lived in Wādī Sīrān, the Bitz and Ḥadz of the Bible (Gen. xxii. 24; Job xxxii. 2; Jer. xxxv. 23) whose oases are still recalled by the place-names Bit and Ḥopqwa. In the Nabataean period Wādī Sīrān formed the eastern frontier between the Nabataeans and the nomads and was called "Syr-oian pellion". In the Muslim period the Wādī Sīrān was the much contested frontier between the tribes of al-Ḳaṣīn and Kalb and was called Bāṭa al-Sīr and was also used as the natural route of communication between al-Ḥira and al-Khaṣa and Syria. The pilgrim-caravans followed it and came to Medina via Taʾmīs. The Sīrān Wādī now belongs to the tribe of Rawāla of the "Amrē and forms the boundary between their lands and those of the Aḥl al-Shemal (Bani Ṣaqr and Ḥewīt b. Dāj). By section i. of the treaty of Ḥadda of November 1925, almost four fifths of the Wādī Sīrān fell to the Sūlān of Najd, while the northeast corner fell to Transjordan.


**SĪRṔN, the name of two ruined towns in South Arabia.**

1. A large ruined site in the land of the Ben Djebr (Khawāṣen), a day's journey west of Mārib in the Wādī Ḥaḳka. The castle of this town, which E. Glaser considered the oldest foundation of the Sabaeans, is mentioned in the Sabean inscription Bibl. Nat., No. 2, along with the two ancient castles of Ṣalmān and Ḥaqqan. The town of Sīrān (ṣāḥiba Sīrān) is mentioned in the inscriptions Glaser, 904, 15, 1571, 4; there is also a reference to it in the late Sabean inscription on the bursting of the dam of Mārib (Glaser, 618, 24) so that it must still have been of some importance in the fifth century A.D. although it could no longer have rivaled Mārib. The most important building among the ruins is the great temple of al-Maḳṣūdah built by the priest-king Yākhil Dhāḥir, which like that of Mārib is elliptical in shape. In the centre of the temple stands a stone prism seventy feet long, 35 inches high and eighteen inches thick, the two larger surfaces of which are covered with the famous Sabean inscription, Glaser No. 1,000, over 1,000 words in length, J. Halévy, when he visited the ruined site, still found numerous monolithic pillars, some upright and others overthrown bearing long inscriptions. The main group of columns like that at Mārib is now called Arāb Bilīq (throne of Bilīq). Opposite the temple ruins on a mound is the old citadel of Sīrān, part of which still existed in al-Hamdānī's time. A large number of legends have grown up around it. It is said that the djinn built it for Dūl Bata; others say it was built by command of Solomon by the demons
SIRWAH — SIRWÄL

for Bilkis, the queen of Saba. According to the learned South Arabian, Nashwan al-Himyari, 'Arn Dhill Sirwah al-Malik b. al-Harith b. Malik b. Zaid b. Sadaa b. Himyar al-Aghhar, one of the eight princes, built it. But this is probably more speculation by South Arabian genealogists. The Arab philologists connected the name Sirwah with zerbi, "high, commanding building", and interpreted it as "castell, palace". E. Oslander and following him H. v. Kremer correctly connected it with the Ethiopic zerbi "citadel". At Sirwah there were gold-washings, which were still being worked when Halévy visited them. Al-Hamdini already knew that gold was found there.

2. A ruined site in the land of the Beni Arhab, N.E. of Nariq in the vicinity of Medīn ʿAbd al-ʿArib. The best part of the ruins is the old temple which is now known as the masjid (mosque) and stands in the centre of the extensive area of ruins, 27 paces long and 19 broad. The walls of the temple run from south-west to north-east and are 4 feet thick. The outer wall has however fallen in and only survives to a height of 3 to 5 feet. The stones are very carefully hewn. This enclosing wall is pierced by two gateways, one 3 feet broad in the west front and another, 5 feet broad, in the east front. On the south side a niche 3 feet wide has been left in the outside of the wall, corresponding to a somewhat smaller niche in the inner side of the north wall. A sanctuary enclosed by pillars fills the inner chamber in the upper half and there is a basin also surrounded by pillars in front of it. The pillars of the sanctuary are all destroyed except two, which are 8 feet high, 16 sided, thickening at the top; the capital consists of six parts and is rounded off, and fluted in keeping with the shaft of the columns. The pillars around the cistern are octagonal and are also destroyed. To the west of the temple the old town probably lay. Mounds of ruins 20 to 24 feet high now lie there out of which rise great walls forming chambers. The ruins, called Ḥadjar Arhab by the Beduins, formed the gathering place of the whole tribe of Arhab for the discussion and decision of important matters. This custom may be a memory of ancient times in which the temple probably played an important part in the worship and legislation of the people.


On 2. J. Halévy, Rapport sur une mission archéologique dans le Yémen, p. 17; E. Glaser, Meine Reise durch Arabien und Hāschād, Petermanns Mittheilungen, 1884, xxx., p. 172, 182; do., Geographische Forschungen im Yémen 1884 (manuscript), fol. 103. (ADOLF GROHMANN)

SIRWĀL (a.), trousers. Trousers are not originally an Arab garment but were introduced, probably from Persia. From quite early times, other people have copied the thing and the name from the Persians and it almost looks as if Persia were the original home of trousers (cf. Nöldeke, Geschichte der Perser und Araber zur Zeit der Sasaniden, p. 136). The Greek παράβαξα or παράβαλλα, Latin sarabula (perhaps also Arabic sarballa), Daniel iii. 21; cf. Syriac sarabilla) and the Arabic sirwāl are all derived from old Persian širwārā, the modern Persian širvār (which is explained as from šīr = leg, with a suffix -vār) to sirwāl in turn may be traced the corresponding word among the Hungarians, Polos, Russians, Tartars, Siberians and Kalunks in the east and the Spanish and Portuguese in the west. The form sirwāl has probably been influenced by the word sirvāl meaning garment in general (explained as a development of the root v-s-l and an originally Semitic word). This occurs in the early Arabic poetry and in the Kūrān, but not sirwāl.

The Arab grammarians retained a memory of the Persian origin of the word. As frequently with loanwords, sirwāl shows several formations in Arabic, sing.: sirwāl(a), sirwāl(a), sirwāl, dialectic širwāl, modern also sharwāl and the question is continually discussed whether it is trisotite or dipotite; plur.: sarwāl and double pl. sarwālāt both also with š- and dialectic dipotite only but usually (like the word from trousers in many other languages) used with singular meaning and varying in sex between masc. and fem.: dimin. surwālāl, plur. sarwālāt; (fa)šarwālā has been formed as a denominative verb.

When the word entered Arabic and the thing was adopted by Muslims is not exactly known,
but the Muslims must have become acquainted with trousers in the very early days of Islam, at the latest during the conquest of Persia. Tradition usually traces them to the Prophet Muhammad and even credits pre-Islamic prophets with wearing them. A hadith says: "the first to wear trousers was the prophet Abraham, wherefore he will be the first to be clothed on the day of judgment". Another hadith tells us that Moses was wearing trousers of wool on the day on which God spoke with him. It is related in one tradition of the Prophet Muhammad that he bought trousers from the linen-drapers, but it is uncertain whether he actually wore them; on one occasion he replied to the question whether he wore them: "Yes, when travelling and at home, by day and night; I was commanded to cover myself and I know no covering really better than these". According to another hadith, he recommends the wearing of trousers in the words: "be different from the people of the book, who do wear neither trousers nor shawls". But other stories deny positively that he wore them and it is also disputed whether the Caliph 'Othman wore them. The intermediate view is that it is permitted to wear trousers, habba, la ba'a biki.

In contrast to the men, to whom all that has been said so far applies, the wearing of trousers is recommended for women in all hadiths. It is said for example: "Put on trousers, for they are the garments that cover one's body and protect your women with them when they go out" or "God has mercy upon the women who wear trousers" (yar-rama 'itkhla 'in-mustasawirilahi min al-mish) — or "a woman came past riding one day and fell off. The Prophet turned aside in order not to see her and was only put at his ease when he was told that she was mustasawila". Other hadiths fix the length of the trousers: — to the ankles, not longer; as a concession, as a protection against insects, they may be a little longer but must not trail on the ground.

The muhaffir is forbidden to wear trousers (along with certain other garments). But even the qa'it in trousers was makruh according to the strictest view and must be repeated; trousers are also considered unfitting for the mu'madhabin.

In actual practice, little attention has been paid to all such restrictions and numerous passages in historical and geographical literature, in books of travel and in adab-books show that trousers have probably been worn in most Muslim lands since the early centuries of the Hijra. It is quite exceptional to find the statement that in one region a so-called fiita was worn in place of trousers (e.g. in India). The word fiita is of Indian origin and means a simple cloth without a seam, which was fastened in front and behind to the girdle. A fiita of this kind — these from the Yemen were particularly noted — was also worn in regions, where trousers were usually worn by women in negligé, in the house instead of trousers (cf. Ibn al-Hajji, Kitab al-Mudhkal, Cairo 1320, p. 1138).

Oriental trousers differ very much in different countries. They are of all possible widths, from wide pantaloons, which are only drawn together at the bottom over the feet, to close-fitting shapes which look more like drawers and indeed are so-called by European travellers. They are also of very different lengths, from knee-breaches, especially for soldiers, to long trousers coming to below the feet. Colours were dependent not only on fashion (sometimes only natural colours were considered the thing, as a rule artificial colours never) but also on political considerations; the 'Abbasid colour for example was black and that of the Fatimids white. As regards material, a famous Persian speciality was silk trousers; in Egypt and the adjoining lands the white Egyptian linen was popular, trousers of red leather are mentioned as the dress of the women in the market of lights of Cairo, and so on.

In contrast to the European fashion, trousers in the east are worn next to the bare body under the other garments (cf. Djilali, Kitab al-Thajib, ed. Zeki Pasha, p. 154 below: the shirt and the trousers are siwar, the other garments dihtar are worn above) and are supported not by braces but by a special girdle tied round the body, called the tikka (modern dikka). Although the dikka were covered by the other garments and could not be seen they were the objects of a particular extravagance, being adorned with inscriptions, usually of an erotic nature; the most famous and valuable were the tikka made in Armenia of Persian silk. The prohibition against wearing them issued by the jihat had scarcely any effect. A thousand pairs of trousers of brocade with a thousand trouser bands of silk from Armenia (siwar satbitha bi-siwar tikka xarit arment) were, according to Makrizi, ii. 4, part of the estate of an Egyptian noble (cf. Ibn Khallikân, Babk 1299, l. 116); a thousand jewelled dikka's were given to the daughter of Khumrâwarâl b. Al'mâd b. Tallim on her wedding; the tikka was also used as a love-token sent by a lady to her admirer.

For practical reasons, trousers formed part of a soldier's dress. Tahât records that even the Umayyad soldiers already wore sarwâli made of a coarse cloth called mësh. Under the latter, they wore very short drawers called tubbah, which were made of hair. When Islam adopted the old Oriental custom of granting robes of honour, trousers were included among them; indeed they were sometimes regarded as the most valuable part of the gift, which, it has been suggested, is connected with the phallic worship of paganism. Originally the garments of honour given were not new, but had been worn by the donor; he ought to have worn them at least once.

As a kind of uniform and a garment of honour, the trousers play a very special part in the Muslim fawwaw organisations. In the ceremonial reception of a new member into the guild, an essential feature of the initiation ceremony (jâhah, q.v.), the putting on of the sarwâli al-fawwaw, often briefly called fawwaw. Here also stress is laid on the point that the kâfûr must have either previously worn them himself or at least gone into far enough to touch them with his knees. The sarwâli had occasionally a similar importance for the jâyân, like the kibûna [q. v.] for the Sîfs. An oath was taken on the sarwâli (this oath is however invalid according to Ibn Taimiyya); they could also be put on a coat of arms with a cup ku'i.

The putting on of the sarwâli al-fawwaw assumed a certain political significance under the 'reformer of the fawwaw', the 'Abdulaziz al-Qâir, about whose grants of sarwâli al-fawwaw old stories have been preserved by the historians. He sent embassies to the petty dynasts of Syria, Persia and India with the demand that they and
their nobles should put on the saruwál al-futuwwa for the Caliph. This was done with solemn ceremony and they thereby placed themselves under the protection of the Caliph as overlord of the jirān. The same Nāṣir seems to have limited the right of investiture to a very few and his successors also claimed the right for themselves. But others did it, for example the Sultān Ashraf of Egypt two centuries after Nāṣir.

When the futuwwa-gilds declined, other organizations with political or other aims adopted their external ceremonies, and laid special stress on the putting on of trousers. The gild of thieves in Baghdād for example under Muktāf and a secret Sunnī association in Damascus called the Nahwāl with anti-Sha'ī tendencies, mentioned by Ibn Djihār. But with the disappearance of the futuwwa, the original significance of the saruwál as a badge of chivalry was no longer understood and they became combined with the hirāc of the Sīsī into the hirāc al-futuwwa.

For the expression saruwál al-futuw wa also find ḥiṣā al-futuwwa with the same meaning "trousers" and in Egyptian Arabic, ḥiṣā (cf. Lane) acquired the general meaning of "drawers" (i.e. for men; for those of women there is a new foreign word ḥiṣirī). This circumstance is a circumstance for ascertaining the Egyptian texts in the 1870-100 Nights; they replace the word saruwál of the non-Egyptian texts without exception by ḥiṣā.

In many expressions saruwál is used metaphorically. Thus, munṣuruw is a pigeon with feathered legs, a horse with white legs or a tree with branches down on the trunk. Širwāl al-ʿābīn "rogue's trousers" and saruwál al-jukhš (cuckoo-trousers) (linaria elatice) are the names of plants (on the other hand saruwál or Širwāl or saruwál for "cypress" is formed of the well known word saruwál with the article behind it and has nothing to do with saruwál).


SIS, a town in Asia Minor, also called Sisī, (middle-)Latin Sisīa and Sīs; in French sources of the Middle Ages, besides the usual forms, also Assīs and Oussīs are found. The most obvious explanation of these last mentioned forms would be from al (the Arabic article) + Sī: however, attention must be paid to the fact that in the Arabic sources the name seems to occur more often without the article, than accompanied by it (for another explanation of these forms see Rec. des Hist. des Crusades; Dec. Arm., ii, p. xii). Sis is the ancient capital of the Cilician-Armenian kingdom, 65 K.M. N.E. from Adana, 290 M. above sea-level. The town lies against the slope of an isolated mountain, which belongs to the Taurus-system. The river of Sis rises in the Anitaurus; after uniting with another water-course, the Deli Şīa, it falls in the Delişān (Pyramus).

Before the Middle Ages, nothing is known about this town; the attempted identifications with antique localities (some have thought of flavias, others of Pindeniassus) are very doubtful.

In the Byzantine period we hear of the Arabs besieging in vain vē Šarābān kōrpē in Cilicia, in the 6th year of the reign of the emperor Tiberius III Apsimaros = 703 (Theophanes, Chronographia, ed. de Boor, i. 372). In the Latin text of Annalais' Chronographia Tripartita (Theophanes, ed. de Boor, ii. 237) we find expugnamosque Sinul cœtusum, where the form of the name of the locality is to be noted, as also the fact, that expugnamos is a wrong interpretation for the word ṣawrēn, as in the text of Theophanes.

In 'Abīsās' time, however, Sis belonged to the Muslim empire: it was reckoned among the ḥawār al-Sharmīya. It was rebuilt during the reign of al-Mutawakkil, under the direction of 'Alī b. Yahya al-Arman, but afterwards laid waste by the Byzantines (al-Balāḏūri, ed. Goeje, p. 170). There is also a tradition, going back to al-Wākīdī, of an emigration of the inhabitants of Sis to the al-šūrā in the years 194 or 195 (809/810 or 808/809), which event may stand in relation to the loss of the locality by the Greeks, in the interval: between the times of Apsimaros and al-Mutawakkil (al-Balāḏūri, loc. cit.; cf. Yūnīs, Muḥammad, ed. Wüstenfeld, ill. 217, where the years erroneously are given as 94 or 95). A further mention of Sis is found during the wars of the Ḥamdūnī Saif al-Dawla [q.v.] with the Byzantines. That prince, after rebuilding 'Ain Zarba (Anazarba), sent his bājāt with an army, which ravaged the Byzantine territory; the Greeks, in revenge, then took the stronghold of Sis (bhūn Sīsīa), in the year 551 (962) (Ibn al-Aṯīr, ed. Thornberg, viii. 404). It appears, then, that in the early Middle Ages Sis has been a fortified frontier-town.

The continuous history of Sis begins about the end of the 8th century of the Christian era, when it had become the royal residence of the Armenian kings of Cilicia (the Rubenids and the
Lusignans). But already before that time it is sometimes mentioned in the annals of the Cilician kingdom. It is numbercd among the places, conquered by the Armenian princes Thoros and Stephanius (Chronicle of Kirakos of Ganjak under 563 Armenian aera = 1113/1114); moreover, Sis belonged to the towns which suffered from the earthquake of the year 1114 (Chronicle of Matheuw of Edessa under 563 Armenian aera). Nerses of Lambron, writing in the year 1177, complains, that in the royal residence (tēkkānametē) Sis, there is no bishop, nor are there suitable churches. It is surprising to find the town mentioned as a royal residence as early as 1177, for it must have been Leo II (1187-1219), who transferred the royal residence for strategic and political reasons, from Anazarba to Sis. Since the time of this ruler, the kingdom of Cilicia is called, by Muslim authors, not only blūd al-Arman, but also blūd Sīs; an Armenian geographer (xith century?) cited by Saint Martin, ii. 436 sq. also identifies the names Cilicia and Sis.

Leo II caused many new buildings to be erected in the town. The chronicle of the connittōbe Šemmba speaks already under the year 624 Armenian aera = 1175/1176 of the new-built (nerāgīhu) town of Sis, in connection with the murder of the Rubenid prince Mich (dated in Hethum’s Chronicon erroneously under 613 Armenian aera = 1164; Sis is also here mentioned as the place, where that event did happen). If the, tolerably late, chronicle of Šembat is right in using the term “new-built” here, then there must already have been extensive renovations before the time of Leo II.

This prince, who in 1198 was crowned king (he himself before, and the older Rubenids only wore the title of baron) transferred, as stated above, the royal residence to Sis. His coronation must have been at Tarsus (a later chronicler, Jehan Dardel, erroneously pretends that it was at Sis), but the town of Sis is already called the “new-built” of Leo in a poem on the taking of Jerusalem by Salih al-Din, written by the Katholikos Grigor IV (†1189); in this poem the form, Sīsman is to be noted: Re. Hist. des Croisades; Doc. Arm., i. 301. In the year 1212 it was at Sis, that the coronation of Leo’s grand-nephew and co-regent Ruben took place. This ceremony was witnessed by Willbrand of Oldenburg, who in his Peregrinatio gives a short account of the town: “It was the capital of the king (capitanea civitas domini regis), with many and rich inhabitants. It had no walls, unde postis iam villam quam civitatem munimentum. But there was an Armenian archbishop, and also a Greek patriarch. Then the traveller mentions the stronghold of Sis (castrum... super se situm in monte valde munimentum); the town rises amphitheatrically against the mountain. The locality belonged in ancient time to Darius, who was vanquished by Alexander". This singular item may be due to a reminiscence of Alexander’s victory at the (Cilician) Issus. It is remarkable, that in the elegy of Grigor, cited above, after the mention of Sis, it is said that on that spot also the warriors of Alexander defeated Darius. In the neighbourhood of the town, Willbrand continues, the king had caused a pleasure garden of indescribable beauty to be laid out.

It is surprising that the town had no wall; it seems that the stronghold was deemed sufficient for defence. Still in 1375, when Sis was taken by the Egyptians, there was no town-wall; the royal palace, together with some other buildings, were enclosed with a wall; it seems to be this complex which is called by Jehan Dardel the “bouy”; and it must be distinguished from the castle on the mountain.

The kings of Cilicia, moreover, had a summer-residence in the Taurus, to the North of Sis, Ghebr, which was also their treasure-house. Likewise, in modern times, the inhabitants of Sis, during the summer, leave the unhealthy town, to take summer habitations (sayyākā) in the mountains.

The political history of Sis is, of course, intimately connected with the general history of the Cilician-Armenian kingdom. The chief feature of that history consists in the struggle for existence which this kingdom had to carry on against the sultanate of Egypt; it is therefore not surprising, that the chief events connected with the town are attacks of the Mamluk armies and ravages wrought by them. Other foes were of minor consequence: an attack of a Turkoman chief in the year of the accession of Leo II (1187) was repelled by that prince, but the Turkomans during the reign of the following kings remained a menace to the Cilician kingdom. These nomads, whenever a strong government was lacking, availed themselves of the opportunity to seize on pasture-grounds; we shall find them in the actual possession of the territory of Sis in the first half of the sixteenth century. On the occasion of the Egyptian attack of 1266, the town of Sis, with its cathedral, was burnt down and the royal tombs were desecrated. Other Egyptian incursions in the district of Sis occurred in the years 1275, 1276, 1298 and 1303: in the last named year, the city itself was plundered by the enemy. In 1321 the environs again suffered from hostile attack; this time it was the Mongol governor of Rûm, Timurğâ, who, on the instigation, as it seems, of the Egyptian sultan al-Malik al-Nâšir, carried his ravages in the district of Sis. A similar incursion was made by the then officiating governor of Aleppo, by order of the same sultan in the year 1340; the incursions from the amir of Aleppo were repeated in 1359 and 1369; both times the town was taken. In the meantime, Sis had suffered from the great epidemic, which in Europe, during that same time, is known under the name of the “Black Death” (1348).

However, the end of the Cilician kingdom was imminent: the last king, Leo VI (de Lusignan) was reduced to his capital, Sis; after the retreat of the Egyptians, the Turkomans fell upon the land; then, in the years 1374 and 1375 came the catastrophe. The sieges of Sis during these years by the Egyptians, and the final taking of the town, wherein the enemy was assisted by the treason of some nobles and of the Katholikos, are described in detail in the chronicle of Jehan Dardel, who had been chaplain to king Leo VI since 1377. Leo being then a prisoner at Cairo.

From the ecclesiastical history of Sis during the time of the Cilician kingdom, the following facts may be mentioned. Soon after the time when Nerses of Lambron complained about the desolate state of spiritual affairs in the town, we find Sis (since 1198, when the first archbishop is mentioned) an archbishopric, but depending on the see of Anazarba. There had also been some
church-councils at Sis, e.g. in 1238, under the reign of Hethum I, when the dogma of the processus Spiritus Sancti according to the Greek doctrine was accepted; in 1307 (March 19) another council aimed at unification with Rome, but obedience to its resolutions could only be compelled within the limits of the town of Sis itself. Two years later (1309) another church-council, not summoned by the king, was convened at Sis, to take stand against the innovations of 1307, but the king Awhin dispersed it, and had the ecclesiastics who had been convened, imprisoned. Another synod was held at Sis in 1342, under the reign of Constantine IV.

The patriarchs of the Cilician-Armenian kingdom fixed their seat at Sis in 1202. On June 29 of that year, Rûm Kâfa, which was the former seat of this patriarchate, had been taken by the Egyptians; so the new patriarch (Grigor VII) came to reside at Sis. There his successors have remained even after the fall of the kingdom, and after the renunciation of the patriarchal see of Edjinacîn (1441), which caused, of course, a schism in the Armenian church. The chief relic preserved by the patriarchs of Sis was the right hand of St. Grigor, the apostle of the Armenians, which, in 1295, was redeemed, with other relics, from the idolatry of King Hethum II.

After the Egyptian conquest, the patriarchs, at first, had no fixed residence; they came only to the town of Sis to perform some ecclesiastical duties, e.g. the benediction of the sacred oil (myron). Under the rule of the Rubenids and Langnaans the habitation of the patriarchs had been within the court of the royal dwellings. After the period of their wandering about, the patriarchs obtained from the Egyptian government permission to reside in the town. First, this residence of the patriarch was an ordinary house; in 1734, long after the Turkish conquest, a monastery was founded by the patriarch Lucas, which seems to have been the seat of the patriarchate until 1810, when the patriarch Kirakos founded another monastery, in which the patriarchate was established when V. Langlois visited Sis (1853). A little before 1874, the monastery was acquired by Sis, and migrated to 'Ain Tchab.

But if the ecclesiastical history of the town continued until modern times, politically Sis soon became insignificant. Immediately after the Egyptian conquest, Sis remained the capital of a new province, which included Ayas, Tarsus, Adana, Mersîta and Ramalâtnîya, the whole being dependent on Aleppo. In 893 (1488) Sis was taken by the Ottoman Turks, during the war between Bayazid II and Egypt. Afterwards, the town belonged to the realm of the Turkoman dynasty of the Ramâdnagûnî, whose members, however, since the time of the fifth prince, Kâhûl b. Mahmûd, were vassals to the Forte. Kâhûlî Kâhûlî, in the Dîkhamnûnî contrasts the once flourishing condition of the district of Sis with its uncultivated state in its time.

Under Ottoman administration, Sis belonged to the millet of Adana, and the nashirî of Kosan. When Langlois visited the locality, he found it to be a village, consisting of ± 200 houses, inhabited by Turks and Armenians. There was a masjid and a hadjû; the Turkoman beg of the Kosanagûnî tribe was virtually the ruler, for the pashû of Adana had no authority whatever in Sis. The village moreover paid no tribute to the Porte. There were several remains of old times, but the palace of the Cilician-Armenian kings was ruined; on its site was the monastery, where the patriarch resided. The church, belonging to that monastery, is consecrated to St. Grigor Illuminator and the Descensus Filii Unigeniti; the treasure of that church contains among other relics the right hand of St. Grigor, and two chapels from the sixth century of the Christian era. The archives and the library of the patriarchate, Langlois found to be in a deplorable state. Other churches of Sis, partly restored after the Middle-Ages, are consecrated to St. Sophia (the Çahîl hîlitê), to St. Sergius, to St. Peter and Paul (wholly ruined), to the Holy Virgin, to St. James (ruined). The mountain-stronghold of Sis, built by Leo II (Sis Kâ'a'-inî) was in a tolerable state of preservation.

According to a statement of 1894 (Sâmît Bey Fraszer) Sis then had ± 3,500 inhabitants, 2 masjids, 3 churches and 3 medreses. Its territory, though fertile, is insufficiently cultivated, but in its neighbourhood there are many gardens.


(V. F. Bûcherer)

SISAM. [See Samos.]

SISAR, a town in Persian Kurdistân, bounded by Hamadân, Dinawar and âdharbâdjan. The Arab geographers place Sisar on the Dinawar-Marâfghâ road 20-22 farsaks (3 stages) north of Dinawar (ibn Kâhûldîbîh, p. 119-121; Kûdûmât, p. 212; Mu'abbadis, p. 382). According to Badhûrî (ed. de Goeje, p. 310), Sisar occupied a depression (kâhûlûk) surrounded by 30 mounds, whence its Persian name "30 summits." For greater accuracy it was called Sisar of Sâdîghînîyâ (wâlibûn Sîsar bâd 'Aâd Sâdîghînîyû) which Badhûrî correctly explains as Sisar of the hundred springs; Kâhîlî in Persian (Kâhîlî in Kurdis) does mean spring; on the other hand the geographer (ibn Kürdrûlbîh, p. 175; ibn Rusta, p. 89) states the sources of the Sâdat (Kâhûlûk or Kûtûlûk) "at the gate" or "in the ravine" (kâhûlûk) as Sisar (Masîbîdî, Kit. al-Tawbûl, p. 62: in the nâbûzâ of S.). Finally Masîbîdî (ibid., p. 52), speaking of the Dîyûlûq (q.v.), makes it come from the mountains of Armenia (?) and talks of Sisar as belonging to âdharbâdjan.

These quotations show that the site of Sisar lay near the watershed between the Kûzîl-Uzûn (southern arm) and the Gâwârî (Dîyûlûq) i.e. near the col of Kargâbâd, where numerous streams rise flowing in different directions. According to the ingenious hypothesis of G. Hoffmann, the name of the town of Senna [q.v.] might be a contraction of the old form Sâdîghînîyâ. There is
not sufficient evidence however to show that the site of the modern Şennâ is identical with that of the town of Sisar.

It should be noted that while Ibn Khurdâdhbih and Kudzâma give the distance between Dinawar and Sisar as 50—52 faraskh, the whole distance between Dinawar and Mârjâ is put sometimes at 50—52 faraskh (same writers), sometimes at 60 faraskh (Mukaddât, p. 384; Ilekhât, p. 194).

If an error of 8—10 faraskh could be made on the stretch Dinawar—Sisar, the latter place might be put further north on the line of the watershed between the northern waters of the Sirwân (Diyâsla) and those of the Kirkûzan; at the present day names like Chîl-Chashma (‘mountain of the 49 springs’), Hatîr-Kânân (‘village of the 1,000 springs’) are common in this district.

In the district of Sisar (Baîdhûrî, p. 130), there were at first only the grazing-grounds of the Caliph Mahdi (153—160). This intermediate zone (‘badâ) between three great provinces soon became a refuge for caravans (al-gâdîk wa l-gâdîr) and the Caliph ordered his superintendents to build a town. The estates formed a separate district (khirà) which was extended by the addition of the following cantons (raštîb): 1. Mârippâr, detached from Dinawar; 2. Dîjlshâma (?), detached from the khera of Bara in Âdharbâjanî and 3. Khandîr (?). Harûn al-Rashîd stationed a garrison of 1,000 men at Sisar. Sisar was later the scene of battles between a certain Murra al-Rudaini al-Ijdi and the Khûrdis under ‘Uthâma al-Awli (Yâkût, ii. 215). The Caliph al-Ma’mûn made Hamân b. Hâni al’Abdi governor of Sisar.

In the viith (xiiith) century Yâkût is able to add very little to the information given by Baîdhûrî. In the viith (xviith) century Hamâdîth Mustâfî no longer mentions Sisar. On the other hand he talks of the “mountain of Sisar” forming the boundary of Âdharbâjanî and the “pass of Sisar” in the mountains of Kurdestân in which was the source of the Taghit. The Ljîhân-nâma, while marking correctly on the map the exact place and correct name of Taghatti, gives in the text the wrong reading n-f-sow which Norberg in his translation (Lund 1818, i. 547) renders by Nefta. Quatremère introduced the reading Naghatti found in an edition of Mirghondî. G. Hoffmann admits the identity of this river with the Khôrkhôra (a right bank tributary of the Dîjghattî). But there is no proof of the actual existence of the name Naghatti and the text of Mustâfî may simply indicate that in his day the frontier between Âdharbâjanî and Sisar was marked by the watershed between the Taghit (cf. Sîwaj Bâlûq) and Bûna. This last district had long been a dependency of Şennâ. In this way since the viith (xvith) century the name Sisar (Sînâ, Sîna) has become substituted for that of Sisar and its later history will be found in the article Şennà. As to the date of origin of this town, it may be noted that in 630 Khûrsâw Pâgha destroyed Hamânâtib which was the capital of the princes of Ardiân (von Hammer, G.O.R., 2, 1840, ii. 87). Only forty years later, Tâvârîsh (Lîn Sîc Yâsîm, Paris 1692, i. 197) speaks of his visits to Sulâmaîn Khân at Sînâ (Sennà).

The name Sisar on Hausachnecht’s map (G. Hoffmann, cf. cit., p. 256) has nothing to do with Sirâ, it refers to the pass to the south of Sennâ, the real Kurdish name of which is Sîn-â (“wearing out shoes”). There is at the present time a village of Sisar near Sardaşht and another south of Bûna, on the slopes of Sîrêkân (cf. Sîwaj Dîjeshä). This only shows how frequent such names are, and explains why the Arabs were obliged to define their Sisar by the addition of Şâlîschînya.

It may be added that the popular etymology of Şâlîsh ( freezes), according to Baîdhûrî, does not preclude the identification of Sisar (or of one of the Sisars) with Şîsîrî (Şîsîrî) of the Assyrian period. Şîsîrî was a fortress of the land of Khûrdis (cf. the name of the river Khôrkôr to the north of Sennà) on the frontier of the land of Ellîp. There are considerable diffrerences in the identification of all these names proposed by Billebsck, Das Sendebuch Sûlûmanîa, Leipzig 1898, p. 127, 133, 158; Justi, Grundriss d. iran. Phil., ii, p. 404; de Morgan, Mission scientifique, iv, p. 404; Streck, Z. A., xiv. 138—139; xx. 349, 379; Thureau-Dangin, La bibliothèque campagne de Sûrûn, Paris 1912, map; Forrer, Die Provinzialuntersuchung d. assyrischen Reichs, Leipzig 1921, p. 90, 92—93, 95, 102, 130. The identification of Şîsîrî with the capital of the Ma’mânas Isîrî (Streck, xiv, p. 139) is still only a hypothesis. In principle there is no difficulty in the equation Şîsîrî—Sisar, which would give Assyriologists a fixed point in a region, where all is still uncertain.


(V. Minorsky)

SÎSÎN, or SÎÎSÎN (from Sâkastâ, land of the Sakae, cf. its classical name Saka-ne), also called Nîmû “midday” — southland, south of Kurdistân; this name occurs often in the Sâkastân, and also on the coins of the Kayast chief (mâhîr Sîsîn; cf. F. R., C.S., 1904, p. 669), border district between Persia and Afghânistân. Its area covers 7,006 square miles, 2,847 of them being Persian, and 4,159 Afghan territory; its population being 205,000 persons (for 1906, cf. MacMahon in Geogr. Journal, xvi, 215).

The land is divided between the two countries by the (theoretical) boundary-line fixed by the Sisân Mission of 1872; this line runs “from the Band-i Sîsîn on the Helmand to the Kûl-i Malik Sîth, a hill to ‘the West of the Gawd-i Zârîsh” (Vâzîr, Khurramân and Sîsîn, p. 92). F. J. Goldsmid, the head of the Mission, distinguished “Sîsîn Proper” from “Outer Sîsîn”; the first may be said to correspond to the part, belonging to Persia. It is the more important portion of Sisân; its boundaries are according to Goldsmid: on the North and the West the Nairûr and the Hûmân; on the East, the old course of the Helmand; and on the South a line which includes the portion watered by the main Sisân canal. So, this country is enclosed by water on three sides, and can, to a certain extent, be called a
The depressions (Hāmūn) in which the rivers discharge themselves, may be described as follows: there are two lagoons, formed respectively by the Harūd Rūd and the Farāb Rūd (both coming from the North) and by the Hīlmand and the Khāshūrūd (coming resp. from the South and the East). To the South of these lakes extends the Nāizīr, a tract of country, covered with reeds. At the time when the Hīlmand is in flood, the two lagoons become united, and the inundation covers the Nāizīr also. A tract, stretching from North to South, reckoned from the Western of the two lagoons (the Hāmūn-i Farāb), then also becomes overflowed, so that a great lake is formed, which, lastly, discharges its redundant water through a course, called the Shāhī, in a third depression, the Gāw-d-i Zarīb [the vocalisation of Zarīb is not altogether sure, modern travellers write also Zīrāb. In the Shahinīnī (ed. Vallers-Landauer, 1373, 1977) the name rhymes with girīsh]. Cf. the articles AFPARID-ESHTIÂN (I. 1564), HĀMŪN and HĪL-MAND, and specially Sykes, Ten Thousand Miles in Persia, p. 364 etc.

The water-supply, and, in consequence, the cultivation of Sīstān, depends chiefly on the Hīlmand. Therefore, the distribution of its water has been, from ancient times, regulated by a system of dams and canals. The river has altered its course several times: this, and the fact that during Timūr's invasion of Sīstān many dams and canals must have been ruined (e.g. the Band-i Rustam is reported to have been destroyed by him), explain the reason why there are found in Sīstān so many ruined localities, towns and villages, now deserted because cultivation has ceased in their environs. The principal hydraulic work of later times is the great Band-i Sīstān (or Band-i Amīr), a permanent construction, near Kūhāk. The amir of Kūhāk, under whose authority the governor of Persian Sīstān stood, had ordered this dam to be built, some six or seven years before the time when Goldsmid was in Sīstān. A description of this dam is given in Eastern Persia, I. 281 sq.

The soil of Sīstān is alluvial, and consists chiefly of sand, mixed with clay. A part of the surface shows moving sands; the land is flat, but there are some low hills. The highest elevation of the soil is the Kūh-i Khwādja (1,500 feet high), which lies in the tract between the Hāmūn-i Farāb and the Gāw-d-i Zarīb; at times of complete inundation the hill lies in the midst of the water. It bears this name because the sanctuary of a local saint is situated at the Northern end of its flat surface. At the vernal equinox (Nawūrūs), the population celebrates a primitive feast, to the honour, as it seems, of this Khwādja; Sykes thinks, that in its ceremonies there are preserved pre-Muhammadan rites. The Kūh-i Khwādja is fortified.

Sīstān is fertilized by the deposit, left by the inundations of the Hīlmand and the canal system. The most important production of the land is grain, but also beans, cotton, oil-seeds and melons grow there. There is plenty of fodder for the cattle; in Sīstān cows are bred in large numbers as well as horses, though the country is notorious for horse-diseases and poisonous flies. Of wild-growing plants, the tamarisk is to be mentioned: the banks of one of the canals, the Mādār-i Ab, are covered with it in abundance; Sykes says of it: "one of the few jungles I have seen in Persia". There are not many trees in Sīstān, except in the Miyān Kangī, the district between the Rūd-i Pārīyān (the main bed through which the Hīlmand discharges itself into the Hāmūn) and the Sikār (a tributary stream to the Rūd-i Pārīyān; cf. the map of Sīstān belonging to MacMahon's articles in the Geogr. Journ., xxviii.).

In former times, the date-tree, which is no longer found, must have existed in Sīstān (Yate, Khwarazm and Sistan, p. 94). On the kinds of serpents (for the frequency of vipers in Sīstān cf. also al-Halabī, ed. de Goeje, p. 400, 402) and birds to be met with in this country, cf. Eastern Persia, I. 273. Of the climate not much good has been said by European travellers. The winter is cool, but not unhealthy; then, between March and August, there blows a North-Western wind, the so-called šāzā-ghūr or šāzā-šūr (the wind of 120 days), which clears the air from the misams, produced by the stagnating marsh-water, which in the other seasons cause fevers. Summer is hot and disagreeable. Rawlinson says, in respect to the climate, that "Sīstān is, in its present aspect, a wretchedly unhealthy country, only habitable for a few months in the year".

The population of Sīstān consists chiefly of Tajiks; there are also Balūdīs and Khāns, who have established themselves in the land; moreover, Mursh Shāh forced some nomad tribes of Shābāt to emigrate to Sīstān. Genealogical data about some Sīstānī families (e.g. the historical important Kayānīs who claimed descent from the mythical Iranian kings), and some Balūdī-clans resident in Sīstān are to be found in Eastern Persia, I. 415 sqq.

The Siyādīs (fishermen and fowlers), who live to the South of the Hāmūn and the Nāizīr, and speak a language of their own, are considered, by some authors, to belong to the aborigines of the country. They earn their livelihood on the lake, by fishing during the summer, and by catching wild fowl during the winter. To each group of families of them (mahadā), a piece of water is assigned (Yate, Khwarazm and Sistan, p. 94). In their neighborhood, but distinct from them, there is a class of men called Gāwadūs’s (cow-keepers). Sykes (Ten Thousand Miles, p. 367) supposes, that one Sīstānī tribe, that of the Sarbadis is connected with the Brahī; and therefore may be aboriginal; but, first, the question of the racial constitution of the Brahī is a very complicated one (cf. the article BALOČIŠTANI, I. 655, sqq.), and, secondly, there is reason to assume, that the Sarbadis (as also the Shāhrahis) are immigrants from Western Iran.

The language of Sīstān is described as "a species of debased Persian, somewhat similar to that spoken in Khurasān" (Eastern Persia, I. 259). On local names, important from a linguistic point of view cf. Beller, From the Indus to the Tigris, p. 269 sq. The people lives in a state of economic misery, all land and water belonging to the Government; as regards trade, it is chiefly carried on by caravans, which are sent by the different villages in common to Quetta and Bāndār ‘Abbāb, and bring back in return articles lacking in Sīstān, such as tea, indigo, sugar, etc. (cf. Yate, Khwarazm and Sistan, p. 85 etc.).

The original chief town of Persian Sīstān, Shīkhu, is cast into the shadow by Nāṣrat-šāh (built ± 1870). Shīkhuša is said to have contained (1872) ± 1,200 mud huts, of which Curzon,
in the year 1892, found no more than half the number inhabited. The town of נזרת (which, in Goeldin's time, was called נזרת) was founded by the amir of ק'ס'ין, there being wanted a residence for the Persian Government in סיסטן. The "new city" (شهر-ィなし) of the town, has gradually shut in the village of حسین-یاد, near which the building of נזרת begun. The "new town" is populated by ק'ס'ינים and people from ק'ס'יאן, but حسین-یاد retains its original سیستان inhabitants. The fort of نزارت is called شهر-ィなし ("the old city"). The town has a garrison, and it is the administrative centre of سیستان. Another name for نزارت is شهر-ィستان; this name is used almost exclusively among the inhabitants themselves. The remaining villages of سیستان are of little importance. The land, in the second half of the sixteenth century, was governed by a deputy of the amir of ک'س'ین, the title of the governor of (Persian) سیستان being حافظ کلیع. He was responsible to the Government for a payment of 12,000 dinars, while the revenue of سیستان (mostly in kind) was fixed at 24,000 خرwi (a 9.69 lb.) of grain a year, in addition to which, 2,600 dinars' worth (in cash) were levied (Yate, Khorasan and سیستان, p. 33).

Afghan سیستان, with its capital خشاکی in the Khash district, comprises the land on the left bank of the هندود, and East to the more eastern of the two lagoons (میناب-ی پا) up to the district of دیوان in the North. Also, the tract extending from the left bank of the هندود to the boundary of لاهیجان belongs to افغان سیستان. In this part of the country lies the مخلوط-ی زاراک. Cultivation is found in the district of خشاکی and along the banks of the هندود. The population here is similar to that of فارس سیستان, except that there are here, of course, also Afghans among them. In the tract east of the هندود, MacMahon found a great number of ruins, and also traces of ancient canal-systems and rivulets. He supposes, that "this must have been, not only a former delta of the هندود, but the delta, used by the هندود in, as far as existing ruins testify, one of the most prosperous times of سیستان history" (Geogr. Journ., xxvii. 219). For all detail there should be made reference to MacMahon's paper itself.

Historical outline. In antiquity, the land at the lower course of the هندود (آمیدان) was known as دریانگیا. This word has been compared with the old Persian word for "lake, sea," Avestan درایاه, old-Persian درایاه, but, as this etymology is not entirely certain, we can only say that the land has its name from the people of the دریانگی (other forms: زارانگی, زارانگیل, زارانگی; old-Persian: درایاه). The name سائکان (or پاراکان) belongs, according to خسروی of خرک, to the borderland of the middle-course of the هندود. It must be remembered, that the word سائکان is not found before the time of خسروی, and it is generally accepted, that this name has risen from the fact, that the سائکان conquered this land about 128 B.C. F. W. Thomas (J. R. A. S., 1906, p. 181 sqq.) has attempted to show, that the سائکان were found in these tracts already in Achaeonian times, and that the late occurrence of the name سائکان is to be explained by their becoming politically powerful not before the

Persian epoch (cf. the articles DRANGI, SAKAI, SAKASTAN, CARCÔ in Pauli-Wissowa, Realens., 2; Bartholomae, Altir. Wörterbuch, s.v. شهیرال).

The Avesta knows the هندود under the form هَازیم ("abounding in dams"), and also the lake خسروی, which is formed by the river. This lake, therefore, must be the هندود-system. In it, according to Zoroastrian tradition, the seed of Zoroaster lies concealed, from which in the future three sons will be born, the third of whom will be the saviour (پسال. ساکانی). It is also in the environs of this lake, that tradition places the origin of the mythical Kawa-dynasty (Kayānīs). All this leads us to suppose, that سیستان, in antiquity, was a principal seat of the Zoroastrian religion. On its relation to İranian epic tradition see below.

For the ancient history of the Sakai cf. the article SAKASTAN (i. 168 sqq.), and the articles SAIKAI and SAKASTAN in Pauli-Wissowa's Realens. 2.

The name سائکان (Sakastan, سیدجیان) in ancient and mediaeval times, denoted a greater area than the modern districts of فارس and سائکان (cf. al-Tabari, i. 7905; fa-کانس Saitan, اپن وس Saghān); this is already evident from the fact, that the name originally signifies the سائکان-state on the middle-سیستان. It is not possible, to define exactly, which districts at various times have been assigned to سیستان. It seems that a great area to the East, up to خندلک, was sometimes included under the name also.

Ardashir, the founder of the سائکان dynasty, among his other conquests, subjugated سائکان. The tie to the Persian empire cannot have been very firm, for the سائکان appear in the history of the سائکان epoch rather as allies than subjects. We find, accordingly, a second conquest of the land by Bahram II, who appointed his son, the future king Bahram III, governor of the district with the royal title of ساکانی. But during the reign of خسرو II, the سائکان once more appear as allies, not as subjects. In the سائکان period Christianity, in its Nestorian form, had made progress in سائکان, which even became the see of a bishop (Pauli-Wissowa, Realens., 1.A. 1812). At the time of the Muslim conquest of فارس, Ya'qubidjird III, after having been driven away from خسرو, turned to سائکان, whose king at first accorded to his protection, but the سائکانian having tacitly alluded to arrears of tax, the king withdrew his protection from him (al-Baladhuri, ed. de Goeje, p. 315). It is, however, not possible to find out: whether the "king" of سائکان at that time was a سائکان governor with the title ساکانی, or a national ruler, who only owed tribute to the Persian government.

The Arab conquest of سائکان began in 23 (643-44), when 'Asim b. 'Amir and 'Abdallah b. 'Umar made an incursion into the land and besieged زاردی (the old capital of سائکان, now ruined); finally the سائکانia concluded a treaty with the Arabs, to the effect that they should pay the خسروی. In the year 30 (650-51), the commander of a Muslim army, encamped in خسروی, sent to رابی b. Ziyād al-Harithi to سائکان. رابی traversed the desert between خسروی and سیستان (the داغ-ィ لین) and reached زلیک, which is described as a fortress, 5 farahāq distant from the frontiers of سیستان; the stronghold was taken,
and on his further march, al-Ra'id reduced two other localities, Karkāya and Ḥisūn (or, acc. to Ẓāhil: Ḥisūn — vocalisation uncertain), without bloodshed. After returning to Ẓāhil, he set out anew to take Zarandj. Before reaching that town, some minor localities, Ẓāhil, Nashīrūd and Sharwād were taken with much fighting; the marzūdat Aparwāt, who commanded at Zarandj, defended the town vigorously, but at last was obliged to surrender it to the Muslims. However, the city of Zarandj proved to be no secure possession to the conquerors, as two years after its capture, the inhabitants drove out the Arab garrison. The town was retaken by the new governor of Sistān, Abād al-Raḥmān b. Samura. This general also reduced Bust (which during the Middle Ages was included in Sistān), and Zābul. At the end of the khilafat of Ẓāhil, when Abād al-Raḥmān was replaced by another governor, a new rebellion of Zarandj took place. During the khilafat of ʿAli, the condition of Sistān remained turbulent; thereupon, in the reign of Muḥammad, the governor of ʿBayrān sent Abād al-Raḥmān b. Samura to Sistān once more. This energetic general subdued the land, and penetrated as far as Ḥarmul; he subjugated also Zābulāstān, which had revolted. This achievements caused the khilafat to appoint Abād al-Raḥmān as his immediate lieutenant in Sistān; he remained there, till Ziyād b. Abī Suḥayl nominated Abād al-Raḥmān b. Ziyād al-MMārāhī in his stead. Abād al-Raḥmān died at al-Bayra in 570H. After leaving Sistān, the king of Kābul drove the Muslims out of his land, and the new governor of Sistān had to make head against the Iranian prince Rūbout (this is no proper name, but a title, like Ḥibālī, and the like) who conquered Zābulāstān and Rukhkhdād (then included in Sistān), and penetrated as far as Bust; there he was defeated by al-Ra'id. This latter being also deposed by Ziyād b. Suḥayl, the following governor of Sistān made peace with Rūbout. But this prince remained a turbulent element till his death, which occurred while Abād al-ʿAṣir b. ʿAbdallassāh b. ʿAmir was wali of Sistān. Another Rūbout (son of the former?) held his own against the Muslims in Sistān and Zābulāstān, from the time of the khilafat of Abād al-MMārāhī. Sometimes, however, the Iranian paid tribute, which payment he stopped altogether during the last years of the Umayyad rule. In the reign of al-MMāsrūr the Muslim government adopted vigorous measures against him; but the princes of Sistān paid, as it seems, none the less, their tribute to the ʿAmīrs of al-MMāhdi and al-MMārid, though rather irregularly.

Under al-MMāmūn the tribute (jāmā) was doubled; during his khilafat the king of Kābul embraced Islam, and, also in al-MMāmūn’s reign, Kābul (and of course also Sistān) obtained connection with the governmental post-routes. (For the history of the conquest, and the Umayyad and “Abbasid governors of Sistān cf. al-MMārāhī, i. 2705 ff.; al-MMā fashionable, p. 392 etc.)

In the Middle Ages, Sistān in a wider sense included also the districts of Zābulāstān, Dāvar and Rukhkhdād. Among its cities were Fašt (q.v.), Djuvalīn (q.v.), Bust (q.v.), and Ghausa (q.v.). The boundary to the East cannot be precisely defined; to the North it bordered on Khurāsān, to the West on Khiṣhtān and the great desert of Kirmān, to the South on Makrān. But the name does not always imply this greater area: al-MMāṣūsddast, e.g. says, that some authorities include Bust and Ghausa under the name Khurāsān, not assigning them to Sistān. Amongst the localities of Sistān, al-MMāṣūsddast cites Zarandj, Kuvain, Ẓāhil, Karmin, Karwādān, etc. The capital was Zarandj, near the Sanārā canal, an important city, containing not only buildings of the two first ʿAbbāsid princes, Yaʿqūb and ʿAmr, but also of the Sassanian Ar-Raḥēr and Khusrāw I (al-MMāṣūsddast, p. 300). Zarandj was taken and destroyed by Tahirī (785/1383), and has remained ruined ever since (cf. Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 335, note 1).

The only time Sistān has played an important part in medieval history has been during the reign of the ʿAbbāsid dynasty, whose founder, Yaʿqūb b. ʿAmr b. Ẓāhil, was himself a Sistānī (born at Kābul). Sistān was, of course, the central land of this dynasty (cf. ʿAbbāsīs, ʿAMR B. AL-MMĀRĀH). After the downfall of the ʿAbbāsīs, Sistān belonged successively to the empire of the Sāmānids and the Ghausawīs (coins of Sabuktig and Maḥmūd have been found in Sistān, cf. J. R. A. S., 1904, p. 681). The land had, however, its own native rulers (malīk) under the suzerainty of the greater dynasties. By the Sāmānīs Nāṣr b. Abūrād was the ʿAbbāsīs’ viceroy of his native country, Sistān (500 = 912/922). Nāṣr was succeeded by his son Khālah, who was dispossessed from Sistān by Maḥmūd the Ghausawī, who conferred the land on his (Maḥmūd’s) brother Nāṣr. Afterwards, during the Salīḥī period, a descendant of Khālah, named Tahirī, obtained the rulership of Sistān from the Salīḥī government. It is this Tahirī, whom the ʿAbūlqaysī Nāṣirī seem to regard as the first ʿAbbāsī malīk of Sistān. For this text says: “These Maliks claimed descent from the race of Kai Kāṭā’ān”.

It is, however, doubtful, whether they are from the same stock as the Kayānī family which ruled in Sistān during the epoch of the ʿAbbāsīs, and later. The relation in which the ʿAbbāsī family stands to these medival Sassanians is also very obscure: it is very doubtful whether the line from which Tahirī descends, really originates from al-MMārāhī, the father of the great Yaʿqūb. Tahirī died in 480 (1087). The following list of his successors, up to the time of the invasion of the hordes of ʿAbūlqaysī, is given after the ʿAbūlqaysī Nāṣirī. The chronology is very doubtful and rather improbable; for all detail reference should be made to the ʿAbūlqaysī themselves:

Tādī al-MMānī I Abū l-MMāri 480/1087 — 559/1163.
Shams al-MMānī Muḥammad 559/1163 — ?
Tādī al-MMānī II al-MMālik al-MMārid 614/1215 (cf. the article ʿAffūzīs, ii. 171f).
Bahrām Sābūsī al-MMālik al-MMārāhī 612/1215 — 618/1221.

After Bahrām’s death, his sons Rukh al-MMānī and Nyārat al-MMānī contended for the kingdom. At last, the former was victorious, but both brothers were killed in the massacres wrought by the Mongols. It appears, then, that the ʿAbūlqaysī ʿAbdiyyūn Giyūṣī (1118), uses a less appropriate phraseology, when it seems to imply that the Mongol invasion did not afflict Sistān as much as other countries, but that the Mongol ravages reached only the frontiers of the land. Djuvalīn, which in the Middle Ages was included in Sistān, the author of the ʿAbūlqaysī
Djâhistân Guškâš explicitly states to have been taken by the Mongols (loc. cit.); the Tâbašt-i Nâzîvâr (trans. by Raverty, p. 195) say that Sistân was ravaged by them in a barbarous manner. This is not to be wandered at, as the Sistân ruler Bâhrâm Shâh was an ally of the Khârijân Shâh.

After the departure of the Mongols from Sistân, its history becomes confused. Several persons pretended to the supremacy; finally we find the land included in the estates of the Harawi ruler Shams al-Dîn Muhammad Kûrt. But there have been, also, in the later Middle Ages, native Sistânî princes (on their coin, cf. F. R. A. S., 1904, p. 669. There exists a genealogy of them in manuscript, the Shâfi'âyat al-Mulâhîn.

After suffering from an invasion of the Čaghatâi (700 = 1300/1301), Sistân once more sustained fearful damages at the hands of Timûr. It was this conqueror who ruined Zârânj and took prisoner the mulâk Khuth al-Dîn Kayânî (785/1383); he destroyed also the canal system of the country. But up to the epoch of the Şāfawî Sistân had its internal tranquillity and also a turbulent nobility; the mulâk Mu'izz al-Dîn Husain, for instance, was murdered by the aristocracy (1359/1455).

The Şāfawî Shâh Ismâ'îl conquered Sistân in the year 914 (1508/1509), and the princes of Sistân remained vassals to the Persian empire, till the Afghan invasion of Mir Mahmûd, about 1134 (1722). The Kayânî Muhammad, by means of a disloyal treaty with the Afghân, secured for himself the possession of Sistân and part of Khusâsân, and in consequence thereof dethroned the reigning king, his kinsman Asad Allâh Kayânî, Nâdir Kûlî Kûhân, the general of Shâh Tahmûsp, put to death Muhammâd, but permitted the succession of the former king, Asad Allâh, to the throne of Sistân. This mulâk however died very soon, and was succeeded by his son Husain. This latter revolted against Nâdir, whose forces besieged him and his brothers Fatî and La'îf. 'Ali and La'îf 'Ali for several years in the fortress of the Kûh-i Khâdîja. After their submission, they remained vassals to Nâdir. This last, still being in the service of Shâh Tahmûsp, was by that monarch formally placed in the possession of Sistân, together with Khusâsân, Mazan-dârân and Kirmân (1143/1730). After the death of Nâdir (since 1148/1736 Shâh of Persia), Sistân came under the suzerainty of Ahmad Shâh, the Durrân ruler of Afghânistan. This prince married the daughter of the then reigning Sistânî mulâk Sulaimân Kayânî, son and successor of Husain. Sulaimân's successor, Bâhrâm, vexed by the Sardâbî and Shahrahi tribes, which Nâdir had imported from Persia in Sistân as colonists, called to his aid a Balûch chieftain; these doings caused Timûr Shâh, the successor of Ahmad Shâh, to depose the Kayânî, and to appoint a Shahrahi chieftain as ruler in Sistân. This man being killed (about 1191/1777), Bâhrâm was restored to the government, but under the control of the Afghân governor of Kûh. Troubles went on in Sistân without ceasing. The last Kayânî who had some power was Bâhrâm's successor Djâhistân al-Dîn. This latter was expelled by the Sardâbîs (1838). The authority in Sistân since then was exercised by the local chiefs, and the land became a bone of contention between Habât and Kandahâr, until the Sardâbî chief 'Ali Khân allied himself with the Persian government, hoisted the Persian flag on the fortress of Shikhte and sent his sons as hostages to Maghânî (1853).

'Ali became in fact a Persian governor in Sistân; his rule was, however, disliked by the Sistânîs who revolted. 'Ali Khân perished on the occasion of a night attack on Shikhte, and was succeeded by his nephew Tâdij Muhammad, who ruled at first independently of Persia (1858). Soon, however, he made overtures to the Persian government, and 1862 he declared himself a Persian subject, being in fear of the progress of the aims of Afghânistan, Dâšt Muhammad Khân, in the direction of Herât. Dâšt Muhammad Khân died 1863 and was succeeded by Shâr 'Ali Khân. With the beginning of this reign coincides a disagreement between Tâdij Muhammad the Sistânî and the officers, the Persian government had sent from Târânân; this caused the Sistânîs to incline towards Afghânistan. But as Shâr 'Ali had enough to do with his own affairs, and could not lend effectual aid to the people of Sistân, Tâdij Muhammad again applied to Persia. Finally, the Shâh's army took possession of Sistân (1865); two years later, Tâdij Muhammad was deposed, and Sistân was placed under the authority of a Persian governor with the title of Hâshmat al-Mulk. These complications between Persia and Afghânistan finally led to the British arbitration and the delimitation of the border by the Sistânî-Commission of 1872, which was conducted by Sir Frederick J. Goldsmid. The Persian forces, in consequence of this regulation, evacuated the part of Sistân they had occupied on the right bank of the Helmand, and the borders were fixed, leaving what was called 'Sistân Proper' to Persia. As the whole border was not marked off entirely, the border-work had to be completed by the MacMahon Mission (1903–1905).

Sistân in Iranian epic tradition. Sistân is the home of the greatest Iranian epic hero, Rustam, and of his family. Originally, Rustam does not belong to the cycle of Avestan heroic legend; but he is connected with it by an artificially composed genealogy, which makes his father Zal descend, through the medium of Avestan heroes, from Dâmad Pîrâmî (Vima). This theory, put forth by Noldke, Das Iranische Nationalge5, 9 sqq. is more probable, than the opposite view, which identifies Rustam with the Avestan hero Kâršâsâpa (cf. G. Hüsinger, Kyranâsî im Schlangentrieb, p. 2, and the authorities cited there), and would accordingly include him in the Avestan cycle. The legend of Rustam might belong to the old inhabitants of Drangiana, not to the Sakae (if, indeed, that people did not appear in the Helmand-country before 128 B.C.); cf. Noldke, loc. cit. The Shâhâmûsâ (ed. Fellers-Landauer, p. 1537, 495) represents Rustam as reigning in Zâhâtulân, Bust, Ghasîn and Kâbûlistan, i.e. in Sistân in its widest sense. He refuses obedience to the Iranian king Gauštâp, whom he regards as an upstart (Shâhâmûsâ, p. 1537, 495 etc.). But he is not, in Ferdowsí's epic, represented as being an infidel; this idea only occurring in al-Dinawarî, and seemingly representing a rationalistic view of the old tradition, which only knows of a conflict between Rustam and the special champion of Zoroastrian faith, Išâfîyâr.

Already in early times, we find names and facts of the Rustam legend localised in Sistân. The Arab conquerors found in the locality al-Karistân the stable of the horse of Rustam (al-Balîdhûrî, ed. de Goeje, p. 394); in Karkâya, north of Zârânj,
in medieval times there was a fire temple, whose cupola's were said to have been built by Rustam (Fauly-Wissowa, Reauleau,2, u. v. Carcoe). Such data are of more value for the history of epic tradition, than those of the same kind, noted by modern travellers, as these latter suppose a tradition among the people, in most cases not differing from the actual one extant in the Shâh-nâmâ; indeed, these localizations are very likely to have been borrowed from the Shâh-nâmâ itself. Among these are, e. g., the fact, that the Sîtanâs call the Kâhid Khwâja by another name Kâhid Rustam, and identify its fortress with the stronghold of the robber-knight Kâhid Kâhidshâh, which was, according to a spurious episode of the Shâh-nâmâ, taken by Rustam (Yate, Khurraman and Sîtanâ, p. 86; Sykes, Ten Thousand Miles in Persia, p. 278 sq.). This would even suppose a tradition borrowed from an interpolated recension of the Shâh-nâmâ. A ruined fortress Kâhid Sîm exists between Dowlattabad and Sîhkâla (Sykes, op. cit., p. 230): Sîm is the grandfather of Rustam, but belongs to the artificial genealogy of this latter, which the Shâh-nâmâ traces. There was also a dam made by Gârshâp, and later on destroyed by the order of Shâhrukh, the son of Timûr (Eastern Persia, i. 236). Gârshâp (the Avestan Khêráshpa) is also a forefather of Rustam, but, again, belonging to the artificial genealogy. Localizations of this kind, therefore, can tell us nothing of an earlier form of the legend than that which is known by literary tradition. The following case, however, seems to be an exception: the locality Hawaldâg dâr is said to be the spot, where the dead body of Firûmuz, the son of Rustam, was impaled upon a stake by his enemy Bahram (read: Bahman), the son of Isfandiyâr" (Eastern Persia, i. 256). Here is a difference with the tradition preserved in the Shâh-nâmâ, for according to that text, Firûmuz was taken prisoner, hung upside down and killed with arrows (1573, 97 sq.), but later on, the king (Bahman) permitted his body to be buried (1575, 113).

Finally, regarding topographical matters in general, there may be noted, that the Shâh-nâmâ seems to know the Gewd-dâ Zarih: Kai Khursaw crosses the Ab-e Zarih, when pursuing Afrâsiyâb, but it appears, that Firdušt, or rather his source, had no notion whatever of the real state of things, as Khursaw, according to the text, has to sail on it for several months (1573, 97 sq.). For the rest, the Shâh-nâmâ also knows the Helmand (under the form Hirmand: 1750, 36).

she brought back stability and order to the state, filled the treasury and organised the army. Her rule was severe but salutary, and she won the respect of her subjects. Unscrupulous state officials were impartially punished and she was swift to quench any outbursts of sedition in Egypt or in the provinces. By intrigue she captured Abd al-Rahman, the rebellious governor of Damascus, whom al-Hakim had appointed as his successor (Wa'il 'l-Ahd). She had him imprisoned in Cairo. Then when she became ill and knew there was no hope of recovery she ordered him to be slain.

Three days later she died (425/1414).


(J. Walker)

SIWA, a group of oases in the north of the desert of Libya. From its situation at the intersection of the two great western roads of the Libyan desert, Siwa is the key to Egypt. To the south the line of oases Bahariya, Farafra, Dakhla, Kharga, connects it with the ancient Thebes. To the north, a track now taken by automobiles puts it in rapid communication with the Mediterranean coast, at Marsa Matrīth, the Parothonium of the ancients. It is the central stage in the desert route from Awdjila to Egypt via Jalo, Djaghlib, on the one side, Magharra and Kerdaa on the other. It is 200 miles from the sea, 260 from Awdjila, 80 from Djaghlib, 270 from the Delta and 200 from Bahariya. Siwa marks the limit of Egypt on the west and the beginning of Barbary.

Siwa and the various oasis grouped together under this name occupy the bottom of a depression running from west to east at 60 feet above sea level, 35 miles in the length from Magharra to Zaydin, its bounds are not well defined except on the south where the Marmaric cliff marks the geological boundary. The sand invades it on the south, below it begins the Libyan Erg, the largest of the known ergs. The bottom of the basin is not uniformly level; gūra like islands rise out from among the palm groves. Two of them shelter the gūra's at present inhabited, Siwa and Aghurmī, which lie two miles apart.

Barely a quarter of the depression is cultivated. The remainder is desert or occupied by salt lakes. The two largest lie, one to the west of Siwa and the other to the east of Aghurmī. Magnesian or sulphurous water, perfectly limpid is abundantly supplied by numerous springs fed by a deep subterranean pool. The most important, rif mounazi, which seems to have been dug by the Romans, still shows beautifully worked stones around it. The soil, strongly impregnated with salt, nourishes a prickly plant, asfar; the asfa grows in the sands.

The total number of inhabitants scattered among the oases or collected in the gūra of Siwa and Aghurmī is estimated at about 4,000. This includes the people of Gars, Umm al-Qadwd, the "Mother of the Little Ones", the name of a wretched village which is regularly included in the Siwa group although it lies some 65 miles to the east. Siwa itself has over 3,000 including the many Südänese, who are mainly occupied in agriculture.

The town of Siwa, for the most part in ruins, is built on a long and narrow gūra lying along the line of the Marmaric. The walls of its houses, built along the cliff, make a rampart of red earth, which has a very picturesque effect, rising to a height of 200 feet at the east end and partly demolished on the northern front. The interior is a labyrinth of narrow tortuous dark streets often covered by a roof of palm tree trunks, which is used as a foundation for erections above them. Almost entirely abandoned by the present Ktarians who are building other more accessible dwellings at the foot of the cliff and near the gardens, the high town recalls the not very remote period when the prime consideration of building was defensibility.

Aghurmī, closely built on a rocky plateau, dominates the palms on all sides. The little village has retained its Berber name: aghrum or ihkern means a gūra, a town and the diminutive eigkremn, common among Morroccan Berbers, means a stronghold, a fortress, a country-house defended by towers at the corners, with walls pierced with loopholes. Aghurmī contains all that is left of a temple of Jupiter-Ammon, a few pieces of walls of huge stones incorporated in the miserable native houses.

The Ktarians of Siwa, who are settled and are gardeners, live in houses, as a rule roomy with flat roofs and made of the salt clay, mriq of stone. There are several types, from the one made habitable to the modern country house and the oldest houses, several stories high. The ground floor is used as a stable, the first a granary and the second contains the living rooms. The feature of the architecture is the pyramidal appearance of all the buildings, broad at the base and narrower at the top.

The chief object of cultivation is the date-palm. There are over 160,000 of them. The dates are harvested in October and they are spread out in a kind of granary in the open air, called bawed, of which each farmer has a share in proportion to the importance of his crop. The ground is tilled with the hoe. The Ktarians are not acquainted with the use of the spade; they use the ass which is of a fine breed and not the camel, which is rare in the country.

The date is the basis of their food supply together with bread made of barley-flower. They also eat rice, couscous on feast days, camel-meat, and exceptionally mutton. Tea which they call jābala is their favourite beverage and palm-wino of which they drink a great deal on days of festivals and cleaning of wells. Barley is subject to a kind of tabu. Every year in October they spend a week in the gardens; during the first few days, they live almost entirely on garlic but they do not eat it for the rest of the year.

Industry is of the most rudimentary nature. The men make baskets, mats, other woven articles of asfa and palm leaves with designs in colours. The negroes make a valued oil with the help of mills and crushers. A woman at Aghurmī makes
pottery and decorates it in black and red by the archaic process still in use in the Berber world as far as Tangier. The women weave, but little, a few blouses with designs in colour, coloured *djabbê*, which form the essential part of the native dress.

The other parts of the dress the *khiik, akharam* and the double white and red shirts come from Tripoli; the trousers and shoes from Alexandria. The women also wear trousers, a black blouse (*ahbar*) trimmed with coloured embroidery and a long veil of cotton, in which they wrap themselves up completely when they go out. The most curious of their silver jewellery is a heavy collar (*aghraa*) which young women wear up to their marriage day and which is sometimes formerly to be attached a little round ornament called "the disc of virginity". The women are not tattooed, they do not load themselves with anklets—they are worn only by little girls—not do they hang a *ring* or button on the nose like the Nubians and the Beduins of the coast. They use henna less than the Maghrabis but, use a great deal of *kohl* and *znakh* to brighten their lips and vermillion to colour their cheeks.

The Islâm of the people of Siwa seems somewhat barbarous and sectarian. Some are attached to the San斐iya and others to the Medâni sect. They hold their local saints in great esteem; they celebrate them every year in the course of ceremonies called *swâled*, the most important of which is that of Sidi Shimal the patron saint of the town. This individual is said to have lived at Siwa in the 10th century but was originally a member of the tribe of the Banî Shimal of the Hijaz. The importance of the ceremony is shown by the belief that the worst calamities would fall upon the country if it were not celebrated every year with great splendour. It is of an undoubtedly agrarian and even in origin at least of a licentious character. It is celebrated at the end of the harvest, lasts three days and takes place partly beside the tomb of Sidi Shimal. The felâna eat on the treshing floors of the gardens a sheep, whose throat has been cut the night before in the *fâr* and intoxicate themselves on palm-wine. They go there in groups to the sound of flutes escorting a young boy dressed as a girl. They return in the evening by torchlight after submitting to ritual aspersions at the spring of Tmîsât.

The two canonical feasts are celebrated at Siwa as throughout the whole of Islâm. The rich alone kill on their roof the sheep of *Id Kabir*, the skin of which they eat chopped into minute pieces. Following a custom observed everywhere in Barbary they retain—contrary to orthodox rites—a part of the victim which they eat at *Asghiria*. The last festival, the most popular of the year perpetuates the ancient festival of the summer solstice. On this day the houses are covered with long palms. The children go about singing all the night with lighted torches and little erections (*seghâba*) ornamented with rags soaked in oil.

The different events in family life, birth, circumcision, marriage, and funeral, are accompanied by rites which are magical in their origin. The third and seventh days after the birth of a child are marked by important ceremonies. The seventh in particular is the day of purification and for giving a name. The hair is cut for the first time immediately if the child is the first born.

The girls are married, before they reach the age of puberty, at 8 or 9 years of age. The amount of the dowry in no case exceeds 120 Egyptian piastres but the fiance is bound to give to his future wife, jewels and clothes, the number and value of which are the subject of bargaining during the preliminaries of marriage. On the marriage day at sunset the bride is led in great pomp to the Tmîsât spring, into which formerly she threw the disk of virginity which hung on her heavy silver collar. She is then taken back to her home where a professional hairdresser attends to her nuptial toilet. Next morning at dawn the women and relatives of the bride come for her and pretend to fight with the members of her family after which she is taken to her new home carried on the shoulder of a negress. Polygamy is nominally unknown but the men divorce their wives with such ease and so frequently in the course of their lives that there is not a clearly marked line between marriage and prostitution.

It is the custom for all the men to have to attend the funeral of every dead man. While they are at the cemetery, the women take the widow to the spring of the Tmîsât where they wash her and clothe her in mourning dress. They then shut her up in her house. She is then regarded a *ghila* or ogress. No one except her nearest relatives can go near her during the legal period of her retirement. On the evening of the last day, the public crier announces the ghila intends to go out. He also indicates the route she will take to go to the spring which is the goal of her first visit. For fear of meeting her, the men go to the gardens and do not come back till the evening. Cleansed by her bath of all the evils that attached to her, she resumes her place in society and may re-marry at once, if the opportunity occurs.

The Kâsîrians have beliefs about treasures hidden in the caves and in towns buried in the lakes or sand of the desert. They people the subterranean world with *djîlis*, with *afrit*, who sometimes assume the forms of men or animals or disappear in whirlwinds of dust. They attribute to the evil eye all the ills that befall them, their cattle and their crops. They preserve themselves from it by covering themselves with amulets and by hanging amulets or pots blackened in the fire to the walls of their houses and to the trunks of their palm-trees. They say that the ostrich understands human speech. They also think that when a dog howls at the moon or the owl hoots it means that a death is imminent.

Language: Like their brethren the Tûyreg, Kabyls or Barbâs, the popular literature consisting of stories, legends and songs written in Berber is so far only known from very few specimens. Arabic is in practice the language spoken and understood in the oasis along with Berber which is still the native tongue. Berber is spoken not only at Siwa, Aghurmi and Gara but also at Mânhîyat al-Agâza, in the oasis of Bahariya, which marks the extreme eastern limit of Berber territory.

The words and the few phrases recorded by travellers who have visited Siwa in the last century are not sufficient to enable us to characterise the dialect of Siwa.

The Orientalists, Hanoteau, Stammes and notably R. Basset who have studied them have been able to connect a certain number with Berber roots
still in use. Horneman was the first European to identify them with the language of the Tuareg and of the people of Twa, i.e., Berber. But the Arab writers, al-Maqrizi first of all, had already remarked the Berber origin of the people of Sen-
tarya and even connected their dialect with the Zenata group.

The arabisation of the dialect, unknown to an
equal degree in any other Berber dialect, consti-
tutes the most marked characteristic of the dialect.
The vocabulary is very much affected. It would be
difficult to quote several hundred Berber words from it. Even the morphology seems in some
cases to have been affected. The phonetics on the
other hand, have remained Berber in their essential
features and offer points of resemblance to the
dialects of Tripolitania and Southern Tunisia.

Certain grammatical forms and syntactical pecul-

iaritys regarded as common to most dialects can
no longer be found in Siwa. There is no longer
any trace of the participial form or of the passive
in a, nor of the particles d and n. The feminine
forms of the imperative and aorist, except that of
the third person singular, have also disappeared.
Negation does not affect any vocalic modification
in certain verbal roots conjugated in the pretérite
and does not affect the pronouns direct and
indirect. The latter retain in all cases a definite
place following the verb. The initial vowel of the
noun undergoes no modification whether the noun
be governed by a preposition or be the subject
of a verb and placed after it.

The study of the dialect of Siwa on account of
its so marked arabisation is of obvious interest;
but it is clear that it can only be made by a
comparison with the dialects which offered a stronger
resistance to the Arabic invasion. One can foresee
its disappearance at no remote period. The estab-
lishment of a school where the teaching is given in
Arabic by Egyptian masters on modern methods
can only precipitate its extinction.

History: Siwa is the historical centre of the
Eastern Sahara. The Egyptians called it Sehri-
mit, "the camp of the palm-trees", the Greek
and Romans, Ammonium, the early Arab was
Sentarya. The present name seems to correspond
to the Sua of al-Ya'qobi and the Timu of Ibn
Khalid, both derived from the names of the Berber
tribe of Banu 'I-Waswa, who according to al-Maqriz
were Lwûta of the province of Mantiq.

The ancient Siwa owed its extraordinary pro-

sperity to a ram-headed deity Ammon, whom the
Egyptians identified with their great Theban deity
Ammon-Ra, when at a comparatively late date in
the middle of the sixth century B.C. they effectively
occupied the Libyan oases. By this time the fame of
the Libyan Ammon was solidly established. For
nearly a thousand years, people of note came
from all parts of the ancient world to consult
him. He was an oracular deity who unveiled the
future. In 351 B.C. Alexander the Great landed
at Paroecithi with an army, which was saved
from thirst by a shower that fell unexpectedly in
the desert, thus learned with satisfaction that
he was really the son of Zeus. The colonists of
Cyrene and the Greeks of Athens held him in
great veneration. They assimilated him to Zeus
just as they had assimilated the king of gods, the
Theban Ammon, to their great divinity. The
Phoenician and Carchagian colonies also gave
him a place in their Pantheon, very soon identi-

fying him with their own Ba'al Hammon as a
result of a quite fortuitous resemblance of name,
according to M. Gaët. It is to the oracular god
of the Great Oasis that the Romans refer, when
they speak of Jupiter Ammon.

As to the original nature of the Libyan Ammon
we are reduced to conjectures. Oric Bates thinks
that the primitive oracle was an oracle of the
dead. It is however almost certain that the ram
was, in ancient times, a deity protecting the Libyan
herds, whose character may have developed, in
course of time. He had solar attributes at the
period when he first appears in history. The cult
with which he was honoured and the manner
in which he uttered the oracles were at this time
essentially Egyptian.

Relics of these days still exist; besides the
ruins of Agurumi, there are the remains of an
other little temple situated a few hundred yards
from the modern village and called by the natives
Oman al-hida; they consist of a piece of wall
standing in the midst of an area covered with
large stones, completely covered with cartouches,
their characters and figures of the gods of Egypt.
As far as one can judge the monument belongs to
the Ptolemaic-Roman period. Farther south the
hills of Tafrir are riduled with tombs regularly
cut out of the chalk; some still have the fine
framework of stone of the same period which
marked the entrance. The adjoining girs and the
flanks of the Marmarie also contain such tombs
by hundreds. Siwa was a vast necropolis. One of
its girs even has a half-Arabic half-Berber name of
ad-dar 'lamu, "the hill of the dead", and thousands
of bones still litter the soil there.

The Romans occupied the Great Oasis. Under
Augustus they made it a place of banishment
for political prisoners. About the fourth cen-
tury, Christianity reached the oasis. A little later,
no doubt, its inhabitants joined with the Mazikes of
the coast (Imazighen) in attacking the Byzantine
world which was everywhere threatened. When
about 640, Egypt was invaded by the Muslim
armies, the people of Siwa seem to have been
free and independent.

It is not known how the Muslims conquered
the Libyan oases. The Arab historians and geo-
ographers on this subject only record stories or
legends of no great interest. Siwa was too remote
from the main route of invasion which led the
conquering armies and migrating tribes to Magrib
al-Aṣṣ. We may suppose that small bodies of
Arabs came and settled in the oasis and then
became mixed with the population, which has
remained Berber to our day.

In the beginning of the xviii century civil
war broke out between the Ghariyûn or "people
of the west" and the Sharqiyyûn or "people of the
east". These feuds which are barely settled
to-day led in 1820 to the occupation of the
country by the Turks.

European travellers began to visit Siva at the
end of the xviii century and especially at the
beginning of the xixth. They were first visited in
1792; Horneman followed six years later, Caillaud
in 1829, Bricheotti-Robecchi, Baron de Minstoli,
in 1820-1821, then Scholz, Bayle St. John,
Pachyn, Hamilton in 1852 etc. All or almost all
complain of the hostile attitude of the people
towards them.

About 1836 Muhammad al-Sanûz made a stay
of several months at Siwa. He preached his doctrine there and made several converts. The cave which he used as an oratory is still shown at Ḫasr al-Hattina.

In the course of the Great War, Siwa and the line of oases regained their strategic importance. The chief of the Sanūtūs, Sāidī Ahmād, went to war with the Anglo-Egyptian forces. In 1915 he occupied Sellūm which the English had evacuated, but defeated before Maṣrīḥ he took refuge in Siwa, from which he organised a new line of attack on Egypt, at Dakhla and Kharga. He returned to Siwa in the early days of 1917. His last forces were surprised at Girba by English troops brought up in motor cars. He was then forced to take to flight. He reached the coast with difficulty whence a submarine took him to Constantinople. His cousin Sīdī Muhammad Isrāʾīl, grandson of the great Sanūtūs succeeded him and with his accession peace reigned once more in the Libyan desert.


SIWĀS, Turkish wilāyāt, was, up to the new administrative partition of Turkey, the largest wilāyāt of Anatolia (Sāmī Bey Frāshērg, Khāmis al-Aʿlām, i. 2794). Situated between 38° 30' and 41° N., 35° 30' and 39° E., it corresponds to part of ancient Cappadocia; on the N. its boundaries are the wilāyāts of Kaşantum and Trebizond, on the E. those of Erzĕrüm and Maʿmūret al-Aʿzīz, on the S. those of Aleppo and Adana, on the W. those of Angora and Kaşantum.

Its entire surface covered about 30,000 square miles, its population, at the end of the sixt century 11,086,015, divided as follows: 89% Moslems, 279,834 of whom were Siwās, especially Kašl-bāshī, 29,134 Greeks, 30,433 Protestant Armenians; 10,477 Catholics; 76,068 Orthodox Greeks.

The wilāyāt was divided in 4 sandājs: Siwās, Toḵād [q. v.], Amāna [q. v.], Ḫara Ḡisr Sharṭā, subdivided into ḫasas and māḏiyas; its capital was the town of Siwās (Sebastā)
A new epoch of progress will dawn with the construction of the Angor–Siwás & Šamun–Siwás railways, already progressing thanks to the Kemalistic Republic's government.

**Bibliography:** besides the sources quoted above, see: Cunet, *La Turquie d'Asie*, i. 613—779; 'Ali Djevd, Constantinople 1314, ii. 404—473; Ewliya Celebi, *Seyahetnâmesi*, iii. 195 sqq.; M. van Berchem and Khalil Edhem in *M.I.F.P.A.O.*, vol. xxxix. (E. Rossit)

**SIWRI HÎŞAR,** also written **Sivri Hıçısar**, *i.e.* strong castle (cf. Ahmed Wefik, *Letheti Oğlumânı*, p. 459), the name of two places in Asia Minor.

1. A little town lying in the centre of the plateau bounded on south and east by the upper course of the Sağırı and in the north by the Pursaık, c. 85 miles southwest of Angora. Siwri Hıçısar is on the northern slope of the Ginesis Dagı; the citadel of the town was built on this mountain. The town does not date beyond the Satılık period and has no remains of archaeological interest. But it was already known as a strong place to Karzîn (Geography, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 359) and to Hammad Allah Mustawfi (ed. Le Strange, p. 99). In the xivth century it formed part of the possessions of the Karamut-oglu, who occupied it again after Timur's conquest. The latter had his headquarters there for a time. But under Muharram I, Siwri Hıçı̇sar was annexed to the Ottoman dominions (cf. e. g. Aşık Paşa Zade, *Tanzih-i Alî Oğlumânı*, ed. Giese and *Alî, Kunû al-Akbar*, v. 177). In the xvith century the town belonged to the sandjak of Khudukwendiğüz (Hādji) Khâfis, *Liţan-nunûn*, p. 656 but in the new system of administrative division, it became the capital of a *kaşâ* in the sandjak of Angora. Toward the end of the xviith century it had about 11,000 inhabitants of whom 4,000 were Armenians (Sāmî). There is a mosque there attributed to the Satılık vizier Aμn al-Dīn MiKhâl, with a library of 1,500 volumes. The principal industries are goldsmith's work and weaving.

Siwri Hıçı̇sar does not lie on any of the main routes of Anatolia — but since the construction of the railway to Angora which runs along the Pursaık, the north part of the kası which has received a new economic stimulus — but near it there are relics of important centres of classical and Byzantine times. These are the ruins of Pessinus, near the village of Billa Hıçı̇sar, four hours S.E. of Siwri Hıçı̇sar (Textier, *Description de l'Asie Mineure*, ii. pl. Isii); and towards the south, on the other banks of the Sağırı, near Hâdiag Hanım, the remains of the Byzantine town of Amorium, known to Orientalists as *Amultiyya* (cf. AMORIUM).


*J. H. Kramer*

**SIYÄLĶÜT,** officially spelt SİLLİKT, is a town in the Pândjâb situated in 32° 30' N. and 74° 32' E., the fortress of which is attributed by legend to Râjâ Sîllî, the uncle of the Pâna-daws, and its restoration to Râjâ Silwîhan, in the time of Wirkan-dînîyâ. SİLLİKT had two sons, Pâran, killed by the instrumentality of a wicked step-mother, and thrown into a well, still resort of pilgrims, near the town, and Kâsil, the mythical hero of Pândjâb folk-tales, who is said to have reigned at SİLLİKT. In 1190 the fort and city were destroyed by Kaşâr Nâzârî with the help of the Ghânzâris of the Vândzâr country, and the fort was not restored until it was rebuilt by Muṣîz al-Dîn Mûhammad b. Sām to overawe the turbulent Khokars, who preferred the feeble rule of the later Ghânzâris to the more energetic domination of their conquerors. Under Akbar Siyâlkî became the headquarters of a *sârî*, or fiscal district, and in the middle of the seventeenth century it fell into the hands of the Râjdîû princely house of Djamâlî. The mound in the centre of the town, crowned with the ruins of a fort, is popularly supposed to mark the site of SILIMÎN's stronghold, but it is in fact all that is left of the fort of Mûhammad b. Sâm. Siyâlkî also contains the shrine of Hâfiî Nâzâk, the first Sikh guru, where an annual fair is held. In 1849 the district passed, with the rest of the Pândjâb, into the hands of the British, and the old fort, now dismantled, was gallantly defended by a handful of Europeans in the Munshi of 1857.


*W. H. Hajo*

**SKANDERBEG** is the name by which the national hero of Albania is generally known in Europe. It is based on an Italianised form of the name Iskander Beg, which was given him in his youth when he was serving at the Ottoman court; the name contains an allusion to that of Alexander the Great. His real name was George Kastriot, of the family of the Kastriotis of Serbian origin, who had once ruled Epirus and Southern Albania. Born about 1404, he and his three elder brothers were given as hostages to Sultan Murad II, so that he was brought up in the Muslim religion as âl oğlu. His ability won him the office of sandjâgbeg at quite an early age. He played no part in the campaigns of 1435 and 1436 when the Ottoman generals 'Ali and Tarâkahîn effected a partial submission of the Albanians. From this time Skanderbeg lived at Dibra in Central Albania and showed himself a more or less faithful vassal of the Turks, although he was already negotiating with the Venetians and Hungarians. His first rebellion against Turkish rule took place in 1443 after the defeat suffered by the Turks at the hands of the Hungarians at Nish; he captured Kroya (Turkish Ağa Hıçı̇sâr) by a ruse; it is in the mountains not far from the coast between Durazzo and Alesio. It was here that the Albanian chiefs of clans came to join him and he made it the centre of his power. He had by now returned to
Christianity and this marked a very definite change of attitude to the Turks. A Turkish army under İsa Beg failed to take the town. Skanderbeg also attacked the Venetian possessions on the coast but in 1448 a peace was concluded between him, the Sultan and Venice but it did not last long. Murad II commanded in person the expeditions against Albania in 1449 and 1450. The Turks took Dibra and Setigrad among other places. Skanderbeg was able to hold out, however, thanks to the mountainous nature of the country and in spite of the temporary desertion of his nephew Hamza who had joined the Turks during this period. He made an alliance with the king of Naples whose suzerainty he recognised. He was also supported by the Pope and by the Hungarians so that when hostilities again broke out in 1455, he was usually able to resist the Turkish generals. In 1466 however, Muhammad II forced Skanderbeg to conclude a truce by which he agreed to pay a tribute. The Albanian chief then went to Istanbul where he sought for the King of Naples. Soon afterwards he returned to his native land where, supported by Venice and other Christian powers, he resumed a guerilla warfare against the Turks. At last in 1466 Muhammad II began his second Albanian campaign. He succeeded in subduing the country and built it in the centre the fortified town of Ilihasan (il hasan, i.e. "dominating the country"). Next year Skanderbeg died at Alessio (Jan. 18, 1467).

The history of Skanderbeg has been much studied in Europe since the very circumstantial but not always reliable biography written by Barleisio of Scodra in the second half of the xvth century. Other sources are the Byzantine historians Chalecocondylas, Phrantzes and Cretoboulos, and Venetian documents (publ. by Ljubić in Monumenta spectat...). The Turkish sources are on the other hand, the chroniclers of the empire (e.g. "Ashay" Fehan Zade, p. 124, 133, 169 and the Tabiblik Al-i-Othman, ed. Gjes, pp. 66, 70, 73, 113) and the later historians (e.g. Mündiféli Bašbi, iii. 352, 361, 383) are not at all explicit and, as to dates, they do not agree with the western sources. The Turkish histories only mention the first revolt of the Khil'in Iskandar in 846 (1442/4443), the campaign of Sultan Murad in 851 (1447/4448) and the last campaign of Muhammad II in 871 (1466/4667).

Within ten years of the death of Skanderbeg, all Albania was subjected to Muhammad II. Nevertheless the memory of the greatest national hero of the Albanians has remained alive among Turks as well as Albanians. It is after him that the Turks named Scodra Iskenderya. Towards the end of the xviith century, the Albanian Muslim name of Skanderbeg Frishërti (brother of Sasi Beg, q.v.) devoted a great Albanian epic to him entitled Skander Beg, pub. at Bucharest in 1868.

Bibliography: Marini Barletii Scodresis, De vita et landina Scanderbegii sive Georgii Castriatoni Epistolarum Principe libri XIII, Strasburg 1539: this work was several times reprinted and translated into several European languages; Joan Ochoa Lesalde, Cronica del esforzado Principe y capitán Jorge Castriato Rey de Epirus á Albania, traducida de lengua portuguesa, Madrid 1592; von Hammer, G.O.R., l. 480 sqq.; ii. 46, 91 sqq.; Georges T. Petrovich, Skander-beg, Essai de bibliographie raisonnée; ouvrages sur Skander-beg écrits en langue française, anglaise, allemande, latine, italienne, etc., Paris 1884; F. Pisco, Skanderbeg, Historiche Studie, Vienna 1894; Slami, Kânsu al-Islâm, ii. 927; Jorga, Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches, l. 449, 453: l. 83, 93, 137, 141.

(J. H. Kramers)

SKUTARI. [See SKUDOBA]

SLAVS. The Arabic word for "Slav", شاهب, more rarely ضابط (also ضابط) or ضابط, pl. ضابط is probably taken from the Greek Σπαλαδας, Σπαλαδας. Slav mercenaries had been settled in the eastern frontier provinces of the Byzantine empire in the seventh century A. D. so that the Arabs must have made the acquaintance of the Slavs in their very earliest battles with the Byzantines. During his campaign against Constantinople (715-717) Maslama is said to have taken a "town of the Slavs" (madinan al-Salbika) immediately after crossing the Byzantine border (Fragm. hist. Arab., ed. de Goeje, l. 25, 1). The Slavs found a refuge in the mountains of the Khasars (between the Caucasus and the lower course of the Volga). During the reign of the Caliph Hâlid (724-743) Marwân b. Muhammad (afterwards the Caliph Marwan II) is said to have transported 20,000 Slavs from the land of the Khasars and settled them in Khokheta (Khâkhat); there *they killed their emir and fled, whereupon he (Marwan) pursued and slew them* (Baladhuri, p. 208 at the top); but these Slavs are still mentioned under the Caliph Marwân (754-775) among the colonists settled on the Byzantine frontier in Cilicia (ibid., p. 166). The red (or reddish) hair and complexion of the Slavs is always emphasised, for example as early as the first century A. H. in the Divan of Akhtal [q. v.], ed. Shâbili, Bairût 1891, p. 18, 15. In spite of this physical characteristic, the Slavs were chased with the Turks as descendants of Japhet (Arab: Fâdhah). Each of the three sons of Noah is said to have had three sons in their turn; Wahb b. Munabbih (in Tabari, i. 211, 1) gives as the sons of Japhet, Türk, Gog and Magog, while soon afterwards, Sa'id b. Musayib (d. 95 = 713/714) gives the descendants of Japhet as the Turks and Slavs and Gog and Magog united into one people (al-Baki in Kunik and Rosen, p. 18), as do Ibn Isâk (Tabari, i. 211 sqq.) and Gardizi (in Barthold, Ostet, etc., p. 80) on the authority of Ibn al-Muqaffa' [q. v.]. Sa'id b. Musayib adds that all three sons of Shem (the ancestors of the Arabs, Persians and Greeks) were well brought up while those of Japhet and Ham were good for nothing. The Slav master of the Muqaffa' al-Tamurîkh, who wrote under Turkish rule in the ninth (ixth) century (text in Barthold, Turkestam, etc., p. 19) makes an exception for Türk and Kazar among the sons of Japhet. They were intelligent but there were nothing good about their brothers. According to a story told by Ibn al-Muqaffa', Japhet's son Şahhâb was brought up on bitch's milk; this is connected with a Persian etymology شاب, dog, šab, šap (Gardizi in Barthold, Ostet, p. 85). In the same source (ibid., p. 86) the Kirges are described as descendants of the Slavs on account of their "red hair and white skin". The ruler of the Bulgars on the Volga is called "King of the Slavs" by Ibn Fadlan [q. v.]. not
only in Văcăț (Mu'āṣām, i.e. 723, 11); but, as is now certain, also in the original Răița (Răițețin de l'Acad., etc., 1924, p. 244); the story of the raids of the Khwarazmians on Bulgârâ and Slavs in Izn Ħawjāl (B. G. A., ii. 281, 13) is to be similarly explained. It is also probable that these Slavs were subjects of the king of the Bulgârâ. It is perhaps to the same ruler that Ya'qūibu’s (ed. Houtou, p. 598) story of the “lord” (qābiḥ) of the Slavs refers, for whose assistance a Caucasian people appealed against the Arabs about 850 (855/855) at the same time asking for the help of the “ruler of the Greeks” and the “ruler of the Khazars” (another explanation in J. Marquart, Osteuropäische und osteuropäische Streifzüge, Leipzig 1903, p. 200). On the other hand Tāfarī’s story (iii. 2132) under 853 (896) of the campaign of the “King of the Slavs” against Constantinople refers to the war between the Cæs of the Danube Bulgârâ Simeon (890–927) and the Emperor Leo VI in 903. The name “Slavs” for the people of the modern Southern Russia has been gradually ousted by that of “Russians”. The Don, the course of which was thought to be an arm of the Volga, was first called “River of the Slavs” (Nahr al-Saṣāḥilâ, B. G. A., v. 271, 31; vi. 154, 12) and later “River of the Russians” (Nahr al-Khâṣî) (ibid., ii. p. 276, 16, and also by the anonymous author of the Persian Ḥudud al-ʿAlâm, cf. Zâr, x. 137).

The connection between the Slavs and the peoples of the west seems to have been first noticed by Ibn al-Kalbî (Ḥiḥâm b. Muhammad, cf. ii., p. 609). According to Văcăț (Mu'āṣām, iii. 405) it describes the Slavs as brothers of the Armenians, Greeks and Franks and descendants of Yūfān b. ‘Uṣayf, giving his father as his authority. More accurate information regarding the Slavs as neighbours of the Greeks seems to have been contained in the works of Muslim b. Abī Muslim al-Djarmî who was released in 845 after being eight years a prisoner among the Byzantines; on the authority of Muslim, Ibn Khordâdbeh (B. G. A., vi. 105, 13) mentions a “land of the Slavs” (Būṭtīd al-Saṣāḥilâ) west of Macedonia. In Mawrådī (Mu'āṣām, ii. 66) the Franks, Slavs, Longobards, Spaniards, Gog, Magog, Turks, Khazars, Burgджąn (q.v.), Alans and the (Spanish) Djâlīlâ (Galîrâns) appear as descendants of Yūfān. In another passage (iv. 38 sq.) the lands of these peoples are dealt with in geographical succession from east to west; the land of ‘Uṣalam of the Slavs is placed between that of the Burgджân and the land of the Greeks. A reddish colour (qānīrā) is mentioned as the characteristic feature of the Slavs and Greeks (iii. 133). The Bulgârâ and Slavs for the most part adopted Christianity and submitted to the lord (qābiḥ) of Rome, the capital of the Franks (B. G. A., viii. 181 sq.). The banks of the Danube are mentioned as the abode of a large section of these peoples (ibid., p. 183 infra; cf. the still more obscure passages in the Ḥudud al-ʿAlâm; in the manuscript we have Dīnā for Dīnā, nor Kīrā as in Zâr., x. 133 sq.). The Greeks, Romans, Slavs, Franks and their neighbours on the north spoke a common language and formed a joint empire (A. N. R. T., viii. 83, 9). The latest notices of the Slavs in Europe are found in the travels of the Spanish Jew Ibrahim b. Ya'qūb in 965, translated by al-Bakrī (cf. i., p. 606 sq.); in it Slavs are mentioned on the Adriatic Sea, as well as in the frontierland of the Slavs, in the northeast, the land of the Polish prince Mieszko (Muḥḥi) about 900–902, the neighbour of the Russians and Poles. On the other hand, Idrisi only mentions a land of the Slavs (Bīḥād al-Saṣāḥilâ) on the Balkan Peninsula in connection with Venice (Geographie d’Edrisi, transal. A. Janbert, Paris 1836–1840, ii. 286); in the description of the Slav lands from Bohemia to Poland (q.v. ci., ii., p. 375 sqq.) no reference is made to the common Slav origin of the population of these lands. From that date the words Saṣāḥilâ and Saṣāḥilâ gradually disappear from Muslim literature and are used only in quotations from older works. The word “Slavs” for example never occurs in Djuwainī’s (G. M. S., vi. 224 sqq.) and Ragîd al-Dîn’s (ibid., xviii. 43 sqq.) accounts of the European campaigns of the Mongols. The modern Turkish Dîlamî is borrowed from modern European scientific usage, probably from the French.

Like the Turks, the Slavs were sometimes introduced into Muslim lands as slaves, especially as white eunuchs (cf. B. G. A., iii. 424 sq.; v. 84, vi. 92, 3). Special regiments were formed of Slav troops, as of Turks, and their leaders were sometimes able under favourable circumstances to rise to found dynasties. On Slavs in the service of the Fātimids in Egypt cf. e.g. K. Inostrancev in Zâr., xvii. 29 and 86; on Slavs in Spain, e.g. Doyz, Recherches, etc., Paris-Leiden 1881, i. 227 sqq. (Prince Khārîn al-Amarîa, cf. i., p. 373 sqq.) and 235 sqq. (the Slavs as allies of the Arabs against the Berbers).

stationed at first at al-Dar al-baidha" (Casablanca) from 1292–1293 (1875–1876) and made two stays at Marrakesh, were he was employed in the financial administration of the imperial household. He then lived some time at al-Djadidah (Mazagan) where he was attached to the customs service. He next spent some time in Tangier and Fas and towards the end of his life returned to his native town where he devoted himself to teaching. On his death he was buried in the cemetery at Saâd outside the Bab Ma'allika Gate. Al-Nâṣiri al-Slâwî was a minor civil servant who was also a man of letters and a historian. In addition to his historical work, which gained him a certain reputation even outside of Morocco, he left other works which would alone have sufficed to attract attention to him and secure him an honourable position among modern Maghribi men of letters. These are, in addition to the six little books detailed in my Historien des Chorfa (p. 353, note 1): 1. A commentary on the Shumâkah-mâzâya, a poem by Ibn al-Wannân which he called Zahr al-Afânîn min Hâditht Ibn al-Wannân (lith. at Fas in 1534 A.H., vols. 2); 2. A survey of the heresies and schisms in Islam entitled Ta'zîm al-Minna bi-Nuyrât al-Summa (Rabat MSS. No. 66; cf. my Catalogue, i. p. 23); 3. A monograph on the family of the Nâṣiri dynasty to which he himself belonged: Ta'zîm al-Nasyîrî bi 'l-Nasîb al-agâfî (lith. at Fas, 2 vols., a French synopsis has been given by M. Bodin, La Zâwiya de Tâmgirt, in Archives Berbères, 1918). This work, which the author finished in 1309 (1881), is a good work of the Zâwiya of Tâmgirt, with much interesting information, which compensates for all the discussions in which the historian tries to prove the authenticity of his family genealogy, with the help of somewhat unconvincing arguments.

Ahmad al-Nâṣiri al-Slâwî's great work is the Kitâb al-İstîqâh li-Ahâlîr Dâwal al-Magribî al-Âzîzî. Its publication was an event unparalleled in Maghribi historiography. The author produced not a limited chronicle but a general history of his country. Welcomed by European orientalists on its publication, it was not long in attracting the attention of the historians of North Africa, for whose work it became a much consulted document, especially as a French translation in the Archives Marocaines soon made the last quarter — the history of the 'Alawi dynasty — accessible even to non-Arabists.

It was soon recognised that this chronicle was like all the other products of western Arab historiography: it was only a compilation, the most appreciable merit of which was to have collected in a continuous narrative, items of political history scattered about the chronicles or biographical collections written in the country. But it must be confessed that al-Slâwî was the first of his compatriots to attempt to exhaust a subject of which his predecessors had only dealt with parts of it, but not this in particular. Not his primary object: I have shown elsewhere (p. 357–356) that the starting point in the compilation of the Kitâb al-İstîqâh was a work of some length on the Marinid dynasty of Morocco, based mainly on the historical works of Ibn Abî Zarî and Ibn Khalîdîn, to which he had given the title Kâshf al-Arin fi Layâlk Basi Marîn. His residences in the different capitals of Morocco, having enabled him to get access to sources for other dynasties also, he had the idea of composing a complete history of Morocco. He finished his work on 15th Djamâd I, 1298 (May, 15, 1881) before the end of the reign of the 'Alawi Sultan Mâwîlî al-Îsâni to whom he dedicated it. But he was poorly recompensed for this act. On the death of this ruler, the author decided to have his chronicle printed in Cairo, after continuing it down to the year of accession of Sultan Mâwîlî 'Abî al-Îsâni. The Istîqâh thus appeared in Cairo in 4 volumes in 1312 (1894).

The reader may be referred to the work quoted above for an examination of the Arabic sources of the history of al-Nâṣiri al-Slâwî, and for a list of works from which he adopted or quoted textually passages. Here we shall simply point out that the chronicler was the first Moroccan writer to use European as well as Arabic sources; he only learned of them by chance; these were the history of Mazagan (Ar. al-Djadidâh) under Portuguese rule entitled Memórias para historia da praça de Mazagão, by Luís Maria do Conto da Albuquerque da Cunha, Lisbon 1864; and the Descripción histórica de Marruecos y breve review de sus dinastías, by Manuel P. Castellanos, Santiago 1878; Orihuela 1884; Tangier 1898.

In the arrangement of his chronicle al-Slâwî does not differ from the other historians of his country. But he sometimes gives evidence of a critical sense; we have a feeling that he is a historian by accident and a literary man by vocation. He sometimes gives evidence of considerable independence of spirit and of some breadth of view. As to his style, it is clear and chastened and only rarely resorts to metaphors and rhymed prose. The writer seems to be the modern Moroccan historian who writes with most facility and elegance.


Bibliography: A full study of the life and work of al-Nâṣiri al-Slâwî has been made by E. Lévi-Provençal, Les Historiens des Chorfa: essai sur la littérature historique et biographique au Maroc du XVIIè au XXème siècle, Paris 1923, pp. 350–368. The full bibliography of this author is given in the notes.

(LEVI-PROVENCAL)

SMALA. 1. French form for samâla, in the Algerian dialect of Arabic, "camp of a tribe or of an important personage, containing his family and his servants, as well as the beasts of burden". The word passed into the French language as a result of the fame of the samâla of 'Abî al-Kâdir b. Mubîyî l-Dîn [q.v.] the capture of which made a great stir in 1843.

2. In Algeria under Turkish rule, the name samâla (plur. samâli) was given to some tribes forming a kind of mounted police (cf. the articles DÎWÎN and ZMÂLA.

(G. S. COLIN)

SMYRNA. [See IZMIR.]

SOFÂLA, a district and town in East Africa in the southern part of the Portuguese colony of Mozambique. — The name Sofâla is generally connected with the Arabic root sofâla "to be low-lying" and in support of this etymology the pas-
sage in Mas‘ūdī (Marwānī, i., 331—332) is quoted, where it is stated that wherever a mountain stretches for some distance below the sea, it is given in the Mediterranean name al-sofāla”. Apart from the question of a submarine mountain this interpretation is not tenable; the district of Sofāla as a matter of fact consists of low-lying ground. But it should not be forgotten that the name of the ancient Indian port of Surparaka, near Bombay, has likewise become Sofāla in Arabic and that there is no question of low-lying ground here. It is therefore not impossible that Sofāla may represent an original Bantu place-name, which however has not been recorded in Oriental texts or in western travellers. As the Arab geographers know two ports of Sofāla both situated in the Indian Ocean and relatively close to one another, according to the Ptolemaic conception of the Indian Ocean which they had adopted, they were differentiated as Sofāla of India, the ancient Surparaka and Sofāla of Zeng (Zenj) or “golden” Sofāla, its homonym on the east coast of Africa.

Mas‘ūdī (945) tells us in the Marwānī, i., 253, that the land of Sofāla lies at the utmost end of the land of Zeng (cf. Zenj) and in the lowest (i.e., most southerly) parts of the sea of Zeng. It adjoins the country of Wākōṭak. In vol. iii. of the same work (p. 6) we are told that the Zengs were settled in Eastern Africa as far as Sofāla, which is the extreme limit of the territory they inhabit and the limit of navigation for ships from ‘Omān and Siraf. The sea of Zeng ends at the land of Sofāla and of Wākōṭa. It is a land which produces gold in abundance and other marvels. The climate is warm and the soil fertile. It was there that the Zengs built their capital; then they chose a king whom they called ṣafāliʿi (read ṣafāliʿi; “whose name is in their language sofāla-e; “kings”, in the singular sofāla-i”) — the text has wrongly for ṣafāliʿi and ṣafāliʿi — which shows that in the tenth century the eastern coast of Africa south of the equator was already inhabited by Bantu negroes.

In his Book of the Wonders of India, the seacaptain Buẓur b. Shahrīyar of Rām-Harmūs tells how a captain of Ṣamāl called Ishāq-al-tawāsa was twice driven by the tempest to Sofāla of Zeng (the first occasion in 310 = 922; the second a few years later), which was inhabited by cannibal negroes (p. 51 sq., 177). There are in this land birds which seize beasts in their beaks, or claws, carry them off in the air and then let them fall to kill and crush them (p. 64, evidently an allusion to the gigantic bird, the rādāf); one man said he had seen there an animal in the shape of a lizard the male of which had two persons and the female two vaminals; its bite was incomparable; snakes and vipers swarm there (p. 173). In 334 (945) the Wākōṭak (sic) plundered many towns and villages of Sofāla of Zeng (p. 175). A bird of the country the name of which Buẓur’s informant could not remember captured and tore to pieces an elephant which ḥa was busy devouring when captured (p. 178). The story also recalls the legend of the rādāf.

“She thought” says al-Biruni (c. 1030 A.D.) in his Indica (ed. and transl. Sachau p. 100 of the text and vol. i., p. 204 of the transl.) that the gāpard was the same animal as the ḍarbardān (chincoros, from the Sanskrit ḍardāndana, “sword-toothed”) until some one who had visited Sofāla of Zeng told me that the ḍarbardān (or ḍarbardān), the horn of which is used to make knife-handles, better answers the description. In the language of Zeng (i.e., Bantu) the ḍarbardān is called impala (more accurate impala; cf. Sushilī gora, Makua pela)’.

On p. 125 of the text (i.e., 370 of the transl.) we are told that one cannot sail on the sea which is beyond Sofāla of Zeng. No one that ever tried this foolish venture has ever returned to tell what he had seen. Farther on (p. 253 of the text i., 104 of the transl.), al-Biruni says that if Somanath in Kashiwara has become so celebrated it is because it is much frequented by sailors and is the starting-point for those who make frequent voyages between Sofāla of Zeng and China.

According to Idrisi (1154) there are in the land of Sofāla famous iron mines, and gold is found in abundance there (transl. Jaubert, i., 65, 66, 75 and 79). Among the towns of this region the Sicilian geographer mentions those of Dhabasta and Daghila but the readings are not certain and they have not been identified.

According to al-Wāṣqa (Marwānī, iii., 96) Sofāla is the last known town of the Zeng. The same stories are told of it as of the land of gold of the southern Maghrib. Merchants bring their goods there and leave them. They then go away a short distance, wait a certain time and come back. The natives have in the meanwhile put beside each article its equivalent in the products of the country (this is the practice known as secret trading, which is known among many peoples). The gold of Sofāla is known to the merchants who trade to Zeng.

Manuscript 2234 of the Arabic collection of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris is entitled: *The Book collected and arranged by Abū b. Sa‘d al-Maghribi al-Analaut of the Book of the Geography (of Ptolemy), in seven climes and he has added the exact latitudes and longitudes from the Book of Ibn Fārisā*’. Ibn Sa‘d (twelfth century) says that the names of the towns of Sofāla are not known. The capital is Sayluna (It is undoubtedly the Selwān of Barros, Des. ii., Bk. i., Ch. iii., p. 22 [1777] which the Portuguese historian locates between Malevdi and Monbarsa), which is 99° Long. and 2° 30’ Lat. in the sixth section of the inhabited world, below the equator.

In this town dwells the king of the Sofālānis. They and the Zeng worship idols and stones which they anoint with the fat of large fish. Their principal resources are gold and iron. They wear the skins of panthers. Horses do not live in their country. Their army consists of foot-soldiers’. Farther on in the same section the writer says the mountains of the town of Repentance (al-‘Adaya) on the north coast and in the channel of Kom (Mozambique Straits) is the town of Daghila. It is the last town of Sofāla and the last of the inhabited places in the lands adjacent to this Indian Sea. It is in 109° Long. and 12° Lat. (South) (cf. Relations de voyages et textes géographiques arabes, persans et turcs relatifs à l’Extrême-Orient, ii., Paris 1914, p. 325 and 327*).

In his Kitāb al-Buldān (p. 29) Kāzwinī (1203—1283) records that Sofāla is the last known town of the land of Zeng, that there are mines of gold there and secret trading is practised. He mentioned a bird called the āmūr, which speaks
better than the parrot and does not live more than a year (on p. 20 of the same book at the end of the notice of Zabag [wrongly written Zânag] i.e. Samatra there is a reference to the same bird on the authority of Zakariyâ2 b. Muḥammad b. Khâthîn, the name of which is written ā Hawaiî, smaller than the pigeon, with a white belly, black wings, red claws, and a yellow beak, it speaks better than the parrot3). He also mentions white, red (or yellow) and green parrots. Muḥammad b. al-Djaḥm says on the subject of Sofâla, "I have seen men eating flies, they believe that that prevents ophthalmia and as a matter of fact they are not at all affected by diseases of the eyes".

Abû 'l-Firdâs (1275-1311) only devotes a few lines to the subject of Sofâla. According to the Khânûn al-Maṣfûdî of al-Bīrûnî,4 he says, "It lies in 50° Long. and 20° Lat. south of the equator. Sofâla is in the land of Zeng. According to the author of the Khânûn, the people, who inhabit it, are Musulmânîn. Abû 'l-Firdâs also gives some information taken from Mas'ûdî and Ibn Sa'îd and ends by saying, "I may note that Sofâla is also a country in India." (Geography of Abû 'l-Firdâs, 11, 1122-223)."

Shîhâb al-Dîn Abû Abdallâh Muḥammad al-Dimishqî (c. 1325) thrice mentions Sofâla. In chapter ii., sect. 4, which deals with precious stones, he gives the following, citing Aristotlè as his authority.5 "The oil stone is red with a bluish light; touched by oil, it is changed for the worse, the oil going right to the centre. It comes from Sofâla of Zeng. When it is rubbed over a garment stained with oil, it completely removes all trace."

In his Nasbaat al-Kalûhî, Hammâdhî Mustawfî records that there is in Sofâla of Zeng a cavern measuring nearly 500 parasangs in every direction. On account of the mass of shifting sands in this country and the heat and aridity, it is not thickly inhabited. (C. Huart, Documents persans sur l'Afrique in Recueil de mémoires orientaux publié par les professeurs de l'École des langues orientales à l'occasion du XIVe congrès international des orientalistes réuni à Alger, Paris 1905, p. 95-95. This passage is not found in the edition and translation of this Persian text by Guy Le Strange, G. M. S., vol. xxii. 1 and 2)."

"(golden Sofâla), says Ibn al-Wardî (c. 1340) (Cairo 1328, p. 51 infra), "adjoins the land of Zeng. It is a vast country with mountains containing deposits of iron which the people of the country work. The Indians come to them and buy the iron at a high price, although they have iron-mines in their own country; but the iron of the mines of Sofâla is better, purer and more malleable. The Indians smelt this iron and make steel of it (with which they make tools and weapons with fine cutting edges). It is in this country (India) that Indian swords and other things are made in abundance. One of the wonders of the land of Sofâla is that there are found under the soil, nuggets of gold in great numbers; the weight of each is 2 or 3 miskhâls or even more. In spite of this the people of the country only wear ornaments of copper which they esteem more highly than gold. The land of Sofâla adjoins that of Wâkâ." Ibn Bâjitâ (c. 1355, Ribâla, ii. 192) only says that Sofâla of Zeng is situated half a day's journey south of Kalâb (read Kilwa).

Ibn Khâlidî (c. 1375) in his Prolegomena (i. 119 of translation) is hardly more explicit. "Further to the east (south) of Ḡoḳālah (Meydânu) is the land of Sofâla which lies on the southern (western) shore of the sea of India, in the seventh section of the first clime. Then to the east (south) of Sofâla on the same southern (western) shore is the land of Wâkâ.

According to Bâkıwî (beginning of the 14th century, in N. E., 1789, ii. p. 401), Sofâla is a town of the land of Zeng, famous for its gold mines. The gold of this country is much sought after by merchants. There is a kind of bird that speaks better than a parrot (it is the Hawaiî mentioned above in the extract from Khâzîn).

In his al-'Umâd al-mahriyya fi Qâqâ al-Ulûm al-bâ'yûsî (Gabriel Ferrand, Instructions nautiques et routières arabes et portugais des XVth et XVIth siècles, vol. ii.: Le pilote des mers de l'Inde, de la Chine et de l'Indonésie, Paris 1925, p. 29 verso), the ma'allûm or sailing-master Sulaimân al-Mahriti (first half of the 16th century) places the harbour of Sofâla, 6 ìpsî from the Great Bear or about 18° south — the exact latitude is 18° 13' — but, which is peculiar, the text says that Sofâla is opposite the Timor islands of Indonesia which are 16° further north.

About 1490 Sofâla was visited by Pedro de Covilhão. But he was not the first European traveller to visit south-eastern Africa, for the ma'allûm Ibn Māḥjīd definitely says in two verses of a nautical treatise dated 1506 Ibn al-Hûdîfîs 866 = September 13, 1402, "It is said that in former days the ships of the Franks came to Madagascar and to the coast of Zeng and Western India, according to what the Franks say". The same verses seem to allude to the voyage of Pedro de Covilhão.

But the question will be treated in detail later (vide infra Zengs)."

On May 18, 1506, Pero d'Anhaya or da Nhaya left Lisbon with six ships to go and build a fortress at Sofâla, Castanheira (Bk. ii., Ch. x., p. 34. of the edition 1833) gives an account of the reception which was given him by the king Çufe (Çufîfî). But this ruler belonged to the royal family of Kilwa and his entourage consisted of Moors, i.e. Muslims, which tells us nothing of the natives of the country.

Barros (Dec. 1, Bk. x., Ch. i., p. 372-388) says that the great kingdom of Sofâla lies on an island between the two arms of the river Kusma and the sea and is over 650 leagues in circumference. It is so thickly populated that the elephants are leaving it. The natives say that every year 4 or 5,000 die, which explains why so great a quantity of ivory is sent to India. The nearest gold mines are at Manica which is about 50 leagues west of Sofâla. The gold which is gathered there is gold dust (or nuggets) which is found at 6 or 7 palms' depth (c. 5-6 feet). The most distant mines are 100-200 leagues from Sofâla. There are others also in the land of Toros which is also called the kingdom of Butabu. There is a fortress built of hewn stones, very well built of stones of astonishing size, joined without cement. The wall of the fortress is over 28 palms (23
feet) thick and its height is not proportionate to its width. On the gate of this building is an inscription which several educated Muslim merchants have seen, but they could not read it, nor say in what alphabet it was written (this is probably not accurate as no inscriptions have been discovered in this region). Around this building on eminences are others built in similar fashion; one of them is a tower of over 12 stories. All these erections are called by the natives simbabe (read simhahabu) which they say means house (royal residence: simba-bwe literally means stone house and in eastern Bantu this name is given to any house of the king or chief).

In the xvth century, Sofala was the only port in this region that exported gold. Gradually the merchants began to go north to Quelimane, north of the Zambesi, and about the middle of the xvth century, the annual exports from Sofala amounted to only 500 patares (c. 350 lbs) whereas that of Quelimane was over 3,000 patares (c. 2050 lbs). A century later Sofala had practically ceased to exist.

The early Portuguese narratives and certain European scholars located at Sofala the biblical Ophir from which the fleets of Solomon and of Hiram brought back every three years cargoes of gold, silver, ivory, apes and peacocks (I Kings, x. 22; II Chronicles, ix. 21). In a short but solid study, Sylvain Lévi (Autor do Búzurca-fustáu, in Annaire de l'École pratique des Hautes-Études, Paris 1913—1914) has shown that Ophir is not to be sought in India. Nothing so far makes it likely that it can possibly be located at Sofala.

The old town of Sofala seems to have been very important, if we may judge by its ruins of commodious houses which are evidence of the wealth of its inhabitants in the xvth century. It was abandoned later and rebuilt in the vicinity.

The new Sofala was described as a little town in 1764. It lay in 20° 13' Lat. and 34° 45' Long. It was 252 fathoms long, 60 broad and included 35 houses, one of stone and lime and a of wood with thatched roofs and 32 of wood covered with thatched roofs. The famous mediaeval emporium lost its importance at the end of the xvth century. In 1883 João de Andrade Corvo speaks of the old kingdom of Sofala which was so rich under Arab rule. In 1889 the authors of the Elementos para un diccionario chorographic de la província de Moçambique write the melancholy words: "The district of Sofala, so rich in historical memories, is now poverty-stricken and abandoned".


(Gabriel Ferrand)
SOTA, a popular pronunciation of the perf. pass. sükkä from the Persian verb sükhūn, to burn, to set on fire; literally then one afire, in flames, i.e. consumed by the love of God or learning. Sota in Turkish is particularly applied to students (At. pālī), especially the beginner in the sciences or in theology. After his first courses, the student is usually called dənənəddom. Raisings of the Sota's, who used to rebel en masse have repeatedly played a dangerous part in Ottoman history.


SOGHĐ, Al-Soghđ or Al-Soghđ, a district in Central Asia. The same name (Old. Pers. Suguda, late Avestan Sughda, Greek Sogdiak or Sogdianoi [the people] and Sogdiane [the country]) was applied in ancient times to a people of Iranian origin subject to the Persians (at least from the time of Darıš, 422-446 B.C.), whose lands were stretched from the Oxus (cf. Xvū-DARYȳ) to the Yaizarës (cf. śrā-DARYȳ), according to the Greek sources. The language and especially the terms relating to the calendar and the festivals of the Sogdian Zoroastrians are very fully dealt with in the Muslim period by al-Birūnī in his Chronology of Ancient Nations, ed. Sachau, Leipzig 1878, cf. p. 46 sq., 233 sqq. and transl. London 1879, p. 56 sq., 220 sqq. From al-Birūnī's information, modern Iranists (notably F. C. Andreas and F. W. K. Müller) have been able to identify as Sogdian the language of numerous fragments of manuscripts found in Chinese Turkestan (commercial documents, Buddhist, Manichean and Christian texts).

As in classical times the Sogdians still appear in al-Birūnī (cf. cit., p. 45, sqq.) along with the Khwarizmians as an indigenous people with a Zoroastrian civilisation in Má Warā al-Nahr. References to pre-Muhammadan Sogdian colonies in remote regions are found, not only in China, but also in Muslim sources, cf. Hadd al-Ālam (unique Tumansky MS. now in the Asiatic Museum in Leipzig) in W. Barthold, Die historische Bedeutung der alttürkischen Inschriften, p. 4, note 1, appendix to W. Rudloff, Die alttürkischen Inschriften der Mongolen, New Series, St. Petersburg 1897, on the Sogdians in the land of the Tughurghus (cf. Shuču) and Maḥmūd Kāgārā (Diyān Lūghat al-Turk, Constantinople 1333, i. 31 and 301 sqq.) on the Sogdian settlers (Soguš, as in the Orkhon inscription) in Bāšağlın [q.v.] who had adopted "Turkish dress and customs" and on the Sogdian and Turkish speaking peoples from Bāšağlın to Lāndšt or Stáfrú (on the name of "white town" given to the latter, cf. ibid., iii. 132 sqq.) The fact proved by R. Gaëtjot that the Uighurs borrowed their alphabet from the Sogdians seems to have been known in Muslim times, cf. Pāhk al-Din Māhrak Shāh (beginning of the sixteenth century) in E. D. Ross in 'Adijā Nūma, A Volume of Oriental Studies presented to E. G. Browne, Cambridge 1922, p. 405. Turkish Kent meaning "village, town" is already described as a Sogdian loan-word in the Kândayça text (in W. Barthold, Türkistan v epochu mongolskogo namhestvia, i, Petersburg 1898, p. 48).

As the name of a country Soghd had a much narrower application in the Muslim period than in antiquity, according to Īṣākhā (B. G. A., i. 316) Soghd proper comprised the lands east of that of Bukhārā from Daḥšāya to Samarkand; he also says that others also included Bukhārā, Kūshā (Kāsh, q.v.) and Nesef in Soghd. Kāsh sometimes appears as the capital of Soghd, e.g. B. G. A., vii., 299, i4 (Yāḵhū); it is possible that the oldest Chinese name for the region of Kāsh, Sa-hōi (old pronunciation Su-gi) is a reproduction of the name Soghd; it is so taken by J. Marquart, Chronik der altslawischen Inschriften, Leipzig 1898, p. 37. In another passage (B. G. A., vii. 293) Yāḵhū describes Samarkand as the capital of Soghd; Kāsh and Nesef are included in Soghd but Bukhārā is separated. It is not known what geographical connotation Soghd had for al-Birūnī; whenever he associates a Soghdian festival with a particular district, it is always some village in the territory of Bukhārā. Nerskhāyī (ed. Schefer, p. 47) quotes a few expressions in the dialect of Soghd and these are explained as Soghdian by F. Rosenberg (Prále Linguistiques, ocharwamte J. Badiner'sen de Courtenay, Cracow 1921, p. 94 sqq.). According to Īṣākhā (p. 314), they were spoken in Bukhārā. According to Mahmūd Kāgārā (i. 39 sqq.), Soghd is the land between Bukhārā and Samarkand. In modern native toponymy Soghd is only a part of the territory of Samarkand and a distinction is made between "Half-Soghd" (Nim Sughdu) on the island between the two arms of the Zarafshān (Aḵ Dārā and Kārā Dārāy), and "Great Soghd" (Sughd-i Kalīn) north of the Aḵ Dārā. The language of the Sogdians seems to have disappeared earlier than that of the Kūshārians, ousted like other Iranian dialects, partly by the Perāzīan literary language and partly (especially in the colonies) by Turkish. The language called "Middle Sogdian" by F. C. Andreas still survives in a single modern Soghdian dialect, the isolated Yakhnobī (cf. Grundris d. trans. Phil., i, Pt. ii. p. 291).


(W. Barthold)

SOGŪD, a little town, capital of a kaḏā of the same name in the sandjak of Ertogrul, belonging to the wilayet of Khudawendgār in Asia Minor. It lies to the south of Sakariya between Lefke and Sskā Sāhr and is a day's journey from each of these places (Qhehā-nūmā). Sogūd lies at the mouth of a mountain gorge, very deep and very narrow, and is built in an amphitheatre. The country round the town forms part of the fertile region which forms the transition between the Central Plain of Anatolia on the
south and the lands on either side of the lower course of the Sakarya to the north. It was the country of Sultan Ollu, and is famed in Ottoman history as having been the cradle of power of the Ottoman dynasty. According to the unanimous tradition of the Turkish historians, Ertogrul, father of Oghuz, received this district as a fief from the Seljuk Sultan Alaaddin al-Din; the mountains of Taurus and Ermenc were the yilul of the tribe of Ertogrul and Oghuz were their vart (צב多种形式 פaska 3že, p. 4 and Uruḍj Bey, ed. Babinger, p. 7, 83). The türbe of Ertogrul is at Söğüt; this tomb has a little cupola and lies two leagues from the town, a little to the left of the road to Lefke. Tradition still tells that one of the brothers of Oğuzman, Saryat or Sowla is buried beside his father; Oğuzman himself is also said to be buried in this türbe and not at Brusa (Ritter).

As regards the pre-Ottoman period we find in the Tağziw al-Tawwarik of Hâdisî Khalîfa the legend that the Caliph Hârûn al-Rashîd conquered Söğüt in 1057 (977). The name Söğüt is pure Turkish and means "willow"; the oldest form seems to have been Sûgûdtyk or Sûgûdtyk (thus Tawwarik, Ali Oğuzman, ed. Giese, Uruḍj Bey, and as late as the xvii century, Mehmet Edin, cf. also Taeckner, Das anatolische Weltgesetz, l. 101). The modern pronunciation is rather Sûwîd.

One of the four çives of Söğüt is attributed to Ertogrul and another to Sultan Muhammad I. After the capture of Constantinople the town was situated on the main route of pilgrimage to Mecca. It was never large; in the xvth century Ewliya counted 700 Turkish houses there and at the beginning of the xvi century the number had hardly risen (cf. the traveller's records in Ritter). Towards the end of this century Sâmi gave 5,000 as the population. The product for which the country round Söğüt has always been noted is a preserve made of grapes cut up and steeped in vinegar (عین شوگی). Silk worms are also grown and there is some weaving in the town.


J. H. KRAMERS

ŞOHAR. [See ŞEHREH.]

ŞOKOLLU, MUHAMMAD PASA, surnamed "Ta’wil", "the Tall", one of the most famous of Turkish grand viziers. He was born in the early years of the xvi century in the village of Sokol in Bosnia. His family was called Sokolévitche, of which Şokollu is the Turkish form. According to the panegyrical biography written about 1570 entitled Qemâshir al-Mahalik (cf. T. O. E. M., No. 29, p. 257 sqq.), which is regarded as the best authority for the youth of Şokollu, Sokol means "falcon's nest". He was the eldest son and was taken from his parents under the devshirme in the early years of Suleiman I's reign. His remarkable abilities gained him important posts on the staff of the Seray where he finally reached and held for a long time the responsible post of Çapulçagi Rüâyat. At this period he brought his parents to Constantinople and his two brothers, who died soon afterwards, and also a cousin who later became Mustafa Pasa, Beglerbeg of Buda.

In 1553 (1546) Şokollu left the Seray to become Kâpîdan Pasha in succession to Khair al-Din Pasha Barbarossa, which was an exceptional promotion. In this capacity he conducted expeditions into Tripolitania. Three years later he was appointed Beglerbeg of Rum-Il. He there took part in several campaigns. In 1559 (1554) he took Temeswar towards Hungary, but in 1561 (1554) he accompanied Sultan Suleiman in his campaign against Persia (capture of Nakhîrwan) after which he obtained the rank of vezir-i tâlibî. When the struggle began between the two princes, Selim and Bâyazid, in 1553, Şokollu was in command of the troops assisting Selim against his brother. Henceforth he was associated by close ties with Selim whose daughter Esmaîhân he married in 1563. When he was 40 years his junior. After being vezir-i tâlibî, he was finally appointed grand vizier in June 1568 on the death of Ahmâd Pasa.

Şokollu held this office till his death in 1579 so that he was grand vizier for the last 15 months of Sulaiman's reign, the whole of that of Selim II, and the first four years of Murad III. For the greater part of this period Şokollu was the real master of the empire (masâdik-i mevni, cf. Peçevi, i. 44) especially during the reign of Selim II [q.v.] who hardly took any interest in the affairs of state. By his experience and sagacity, Şokollu was the obvious man to consolidate the glorious traditions of the time of Sulaiman. His efforts were mainly directed to the maintenance of peace abroad and order at home. Although we know of nothing very brilliant done by him, he was nevertheless the moving spirit in all the great events of his time. Very characteristic of him was the manner in which he kept secret the death of Sulaiman before Sâiget until the new sovereign had had time to reach the army, and again when Selim II refused to give the accession gifts, against Şokollu's advice, the latter only intervened at the last moment to pacify the mutinous Janissaries. After his return from the Sigrîj campaign the grand vizier took no further part in military expeditions. The fact that none of the documents of his time however show that he was active in all branches of administration. During his grand vizierate the empire was especially the capital, passed through the richest and most glorious period in its history, while the old simple traditions were still strong enough to check the moral decadence, which was already beginning to appear. The only opposition that Şokollu encountered in his domestic and foreign policy was that of the coterie led by the Jew Yisrâf Nâsi, the favourite of Selim II and by the latter's Jewess favourite. The Jewish bankers had control of the customs and had a grip on the whole economic life of the state and Şokollu was not able completely to counteract their influence, which showed itself for example in the deterioration of the coinage. In the foreign policy of Şokollu we have probably to recognize a pan-Islamic tendency. Up to the last year of his grand vizierate, the peace with Persia (concluded at Amasya in 1561 — 1554) was not broken, while the empire endeavoured to assist Muslim rulers in India and Further India against Portuguese attacks (on the expedition to Atcheh cf. T. O. E. M., No. 10) and the Khans of Transoxiana against the Russians. Şokollu's European policy was likewise peaceful: he was con-
continuously on his guard against Russia, under Ivan the Terrible, against Austria and Spain, and he hoped to hold these powers in check with the support of the friendship of France and Poland. He was however unable to prevent the occupation of Cyprus and the naval war with Venice and the other powers which resulted from it. The occupation of Cyprus was mainly due to the influence of Yiğit Nasi and his friends with the Sultan. But once the decision had been taken, the grand vizier did his utmost to secure the success of the expedition. It was likewise entirely due to his energy that a new fleet was built in less than a year after the destruction of the Turkish fleet in the battle of Lepanto (Oct. 7, 1571). Şokolli was less fortunate in other more peaceful enterprises, like the digging of a canal between the Volga and Don and the piercing of the isthmus of Sam. He was further very skilled in the field of diplomatic negotiations, which he conducted with courtesy (he had his portrait painted for the Venetian Museum, which later was in the collection of the Archduke Ferdinand of Austria). His finesse but sometimes with harshness. The peace concluded with Venice (March 7, 1573) left the island of Cyprus to Turkey; it was as if the battle of Lepanto had never been fought.

The personal position of Şokolli was remarkable. He was neither unusually popular with the people, nor a particular favourite of the Sultan, but everyone respected him. In keeping with his character, he was not a patron of literature and poetry (Gibb, History of Ottoman Poetry, iii. 7); nevertheless the poet Baski celebrates him in his başdak. In his palace in Stambul (later bought by Ahmet I) to build a mosque on the site) Şokolli maintained a vast suite. Through his great influence he was able to rid himself of his enemies, without, however, having any real friends. He was able to prevent difficulties that might have arisen from other influential men of his time like Lala Mustafa Paşa and Sinan Pasha (q. v.). His most intimate confidants were his secretary Feridun Bey (q. v.), later Rü'ü' al-Kutzhâ and his Kâyâ Djafer Agha. Şokolli is further depicted as a religious and incorruptible man. The latter quality did not prevent him from accepting huge presents, which, added to his own income, made him one of the richest of men. Western sources accuse him of avarice, but he built many public buildings in the provinces, especially karâvanserâys, besides two mosques in the capital, a mosque and tekke in the Kaifirgha quarter and a mosque and medrese at Arab Kapâ (cf. Hâdiât al-İâzâmî, I. 193). He is also accused with some justice of having favoured too much his numerous relations and compatriots whom he brought from Bosnia, many of whom occupied important positions. The historian Ecewîlî İbâhîm was the son of a female cousin of Şokolli.

After the accession of Murad II, Şokolli's great influence began to diminish. The favourites of the new Sultan, like Shams Paşa obtained the offices from which Şokolli's privileges were dismuted. But before the dismissal of the grand vizier himself — which seemed to have become inevitable — Şokolli was murdered on Oct. 17, 1579. An individual, disguised as a beggar, came up to him as he was leaving the diwân and stabbed him. He was buried in a hürâhe which he had built at Aiyûb (cf. Ecewîlî Celebi, Şeyhâhatâvâr, I. 408).

Bibliography. The principal sources for the life of Şo kolli are the Taríkîh of Peçewî, Selanîk and of 'Ali (Kumâl al-Abharî, part still unprinted) and the Tuğfâl al-Kilâr of Hadjiî Hâliî. There are other biographies of him in Münâdîdîm Bâshî, Şahîrfî al-Abhârî, III. 332 sqq.; Othmân Zâle, Hâdiât al-İerwârâ, Constantinople 1271, p. 32 sqq.; Thireiîa Efendi, Sicûliîa- Othmânî, iv. 122; Hâfiz Hüsain al-İâznîrîî, Hâdiât al-İâzâmî, Constantinople 1251, i. 193. Among western contemporary sources the most important are the Tagebuch of Gerlach, Frankfort 1674, and the Relazioni of the Venetian Alberi. All these sources have been used by the modern historians like von Hammer, G. O. R., ill. and iv.; Jorga, Gesch. des Osm. Reiches, iii. (especially p. 165 sqq.); Brosch, Geschichten aus dem Leben dreier Grossweizers, Gotha 1893; Ahmet Reftî, Şo kolli, Constantinople 1924 (an important appreciation of Şo kolli and his period partly based on original documents, the provenance of which however is rarely mentioned). On the genealogy of Şo kolli, cf. von Knorrika-Gießenhorst in Mitteilungen der Osmanischen Geschichts, 1925-1926, ii. p. 261.

(J. H. Kramer)

SOKOTO or SAKATU is the name of a town in the western part of the Haussa country, situated on a left bank tributary of the Niger called Gulbi-n-Sokoto, which means in Hausa the river of Sokoto. The town seems to have been of little importance before the sixteenth century; in any case it was much less known than the other towns of the Haussa, such as Zafura, Gober or Tessa wa, Katsina, Zinder, Kano and Zegleg or Zaria. It formed part of the kingdom of Gober, which like the other Haussa states then contained very few Muhammadans, almost all foreigners. There were a few colonies of Pal or Fulbe among the native population, which, as at the present day, lived mainly by agriculture and commerce. It was in 1801 or 1802 that Sokoto became the capital of a kind of empire founded by a Tuculor Shaikh from Futa-Toro (Senegal) belonging to the Tundoube caste (singular Turodo). This conqueror was called Usmanu (Ulmân), and was the son of a certain Muhammad surnamed Fodjo, i.e. "the wise, the jurist". The Shaikh "Usmanu having left his native land to go on the pilgrimage to Mecca was in Gober, where he was preaching Islam in 1801 when he received a deputation from the Fulbe, seeking his protection against the king of Tessa wa, against whom some shepherds had a complaint. Usmanu, who was only waiting a pretext to declare a holy war, took up the cause of these men, whom he regarded as compatriots because Fulbe and Tuculor, although of very different stocks, spoke the same language. Having collected an army of followers, he took the field against Yunfa, the king of Tessa wa, and conquered him. Continuing his conquests, he was not long in becoming master of several other Haussa provinces (Liptako, Kebbi, Vauri, Nupe, Korofou, Bautghi, Adamawa), imposing Islam on the inhabitants by force and placing at the head of each kingdom or province a kind of governor called amaru, chosen from the members of his family or caste. Thus there was created for the benefit of a small Tuculor aristocracy of the Turodo caste, an empire, military in character, including almost all the lands to the south of the Sahara between the eastern course of the Niger (which it reached in the west also in Liptako),
Bengu, Logone, and Chad, with the exception however of Bornu, which, although invaded in its turn by Usman's hands, succeeded in recovering its independence in 1810. The general name of empire of Sokoto is given to these conquests because it was in the eastern quarter of Sokoto, at Wurno, that Shalik Usmanu took up his permanent residence, and his successors lived.

But on the death of Usman (1816 or 1818) the empire broke up into three all-powerful nations: in the west that of Gando, including the Kebbi, the Yauri, the Nupe and Liptako; in the east that of Yola, comprising Korofina and Adamawa and in the centre that of Sokoto including all the Hausa country and Bauta. Abdullahi, brother of Usmanu, became king of Gando, Modibba Adamu of Yola, which he gave his name (Adamawa) and Muhammad Bello, son of Usmanu, succeeded his father at Sokoto where he reigned from 1816 or 1818 to 1837.

He had a difficult task to maintain his authority. The natives everywhere abjured Islam and rebelled, supported in their rebellion by the Fula and the Sulfin of Bornu. After suffering several reverses, Muhammad Bello's troops finally established him in power. A rather poor soldier, reluctant to take part personally in battle, this prince was on the other hand a distinguished writer. In Arabic he composed a considerable number of works in prose and verse, one of them a history of the Suddin which is not without value. He was the patron of men of letters, gave a good reception to the explorer Clapperton (1828) and exercised a strict control over the doings of his judges, who feared his enquiries and censure.

His brother and successor Atiku (1837-1847) claimed to be a reformer of morals and made himself very unpopular by prohibiting music and dancing. His puritanism did not prevent his governors committing all kinds of excesses and depredations, which resulted in the rebellion of the provinces of Gober and Katsena.

In the reign of Aliyu, son of Muhammad Bello (1843-1860) who received the explorers Overweg (1851) and Barth (1852 and 1854) at Sokoto, civil troubles and risings increased in extent. Gradually the authority of the emperor was lost and usurped by various pretenders to the throne. The five last sovereigns of the Tornado dynasty—Ahmadu, son of Atiku (1860-1866), Aliyankarami, son of Bello (1866-1867), Ahmadu Raffiu (1867-1872), Alubakari (1872-1877) and Moyasu (1877-1904) —showed themselves incapable of efficiently governing an empire, which was too large and too badly organised, and collapsed at once in 1904, simply on the entry of Sir Frederick Lugard's troops into Sokoto.

At the present day the town of Sokota forms part of the British colony of Nigeria, while the rest of Gober and his capital Tessana are included in the French colony of the Niger. (MAURICE DELAFOSSE)

SOKOTA (Socotra), an island in the Indian Ocean on the east side of the Gulf of Aden, about 550 miles from Ras Isfar (Cap Gorfudai) with the smaller islands of the group, notably Abd al-Kuri, the "brothers", Sembja and Dersi, and Sambiya (Sambia; Saboyla of the older maps since Wellsted) and the Farin rocks, the geographical and geological continuation of the coast of North Somaliland. It is 75 miles long (from Ras Shoaib in the west to Ras Rededsea in the east), and has a maximum breadth of 20 miles and an area of 1,520 square miles. The elongated shape of its horizontal section gives it its characteristic configuration (the figure "about 240 miles" for the distance from Cape Guardafui in Theodore Bent, Southern Arabia, London 1900, p. 345, who gives the length and breadth of the island county as 72 and 17 miles, is a misprint). Sokotra was known in classical antiquity as the island of Dioscorides, Σωκότρα, < Διοσκορίδης καλόγραφος in the Peripitus maris Erythraei, 30 (the MS. has διοσκόριδης; C. Müller, Geographi Gratiæ minores, i. 280 in the text Διοσκόριδης, but see his note; Fabricius in his edition, Leipzig 1853, gives διοσκορίδης) after the mention of the Sallachian Sea (coast of Shey, east of Ras al-Kehb) and of the promontory of Syagros (Ras al-Fartak); it is mentioned as a territory of the king of the land of frankincense, Elesaros, who lived in Σαβιδίμα (Shabwat) (27; on the genitive form of the name Elesaros, found in manuscripts, of the kind known from inscriptions as P'ax, which Fabricius, wrongly following C. Müller on § 26, altered to Elesaros, see the articles ELEASAR and ELEB in Pauly-Wissowa's Realencyklopädie der klass. Altertumswiss. [henceforth quoted as R.E.]); also Elesaros, in Ptolemaeus, viii. 22, 17 and Διοσκοριδής in πόλεως, v. 7, 45 (vari Διοσκορίδης, πόλεως), the oldest and the only classical reference to the capital of Sokota, η πόλεως καὶ καλόγραφος in Cosmas Indopen, p. 178 (for the form of the name cf. Διοσκορίδης in Stephanus Byzantinicus).

The island is called by Flinny, Nat. Hist., vii. 153: "clara (insula) in Asania mari Dioscuridaria" (similarly also Amm. Marc., xxiii. 6, 47) and is referred to by ecclesiastical historians (see below). Agatharchides (§ 103) (preserved in extracts in Diodoros and Photios; see the article SAHA, p. 7) refers to the whole group; after describing the land of Saba' he remarks that near the coast lie the νησιά κτλιμαντ, the earliest reference to Sokota and the adjoining islands, which he considers to belong to South Arabia. It may be assumed that Sokota is included in the frankincense islands of Arabia mentioned by Theophroclus, Hist. Plant. ix. 4, 10. On the identity of the island with the Bantu island of Sokota cf. Ritter, Erdkunde, Berlin 1845, xii. 64, 336 (following Vincent, etc.); C. Müller, op. cit., 190 etc. Bochart (Geographia sacra, Leiden 1692, f. 456) had already derived the name, which is found in the form Sukātṟa among the Arabs (Yakkāt, Mudījarum, quotes besides the regular form, iii. 101 also Sukātırā, i. 543, also Sukāţara, Ibn Rusta, B. G. A., vii. 82, Sukāţara; on the other form Uskātī, see Kūmir, i. 381 and Tāḏī al-'Arab, iii. 273) from the Sanskrit uskāṭa, 'fortunate isle' and this explanation of the name which agrees best with the name in Agatharchides (cf. Edośvām, 'Aspāfra) has been adopted by Bohlen, Das alte Indien, Königshofen 1830, ii. 129; Beney in Ersch-Grüber's Enzyklopädie, sect. ii., vol. vii., p. 20; C. Müller, op. cit., i. 280 (cf. Ritter, op. cit.) and more recent writers (Bent, op. cit., p. 391 was not acquainted with the literature before Schweinfurth). The Greek name arose, like many other Greek corruptions of Oriental names by a popular etymology, connecting the foreign name with some mythological figure familiar to the Greek circle of ideas. The
name Δυσκότρα λιμ. (Ptolemy. iv. 7, 5) a harbour on the west coast of the Red Sea, is similar in origin. This corruption was all the easier in this case as it was facilitated by the Greek idea that the appearance of the constellation of the Dioscuri (Gemini) was a good omen for navigators. The Indian origin of the name is supported by the statement in the Periplos (30) that the island included Indians amongst its inhabitants (there are still Hindus on Sokötra), that sailors from India there bring rice, a cereal that does not grow on the islands, Indian cotton and slave-girls and receiving turtles (31) and by the note of Agatharchides (Diodorus, lli. 47) that Indian merchants traded with the जोको त्रितमुन्ने. In ancient times Sokötra, specially noted for its frankincense was of importance as a centre of sea commerce between India, Arabia and East Africa (Azania, the coast between Ras 'Asir and Zanzibar), as a result of its situation at the entrance to the Red Sea and in spite of its lack of proper harbours. Bent's idea (op. cit., p. 391) that Sök (the name still survives for the ruined site of the ancient capital) the Zoko of the 17th-century Portuguese, is a survival of the original Sanskrit form of the name, has little to commend it. Sprenger's suggestion (Die alte Geographie Arabiens, Bern 1875, p. 88) that the name Sokötra is perhaps derived from जोली, the popular name for the resin of the dragon-blood tree, is untenable on philological grounds.

F. Hommel's assumption (Grundriss der Geographie und Geschichte des alten Orients, Munich 1904, p. 312, note 2), that Sokötra is in some way connected with Skudur = Thrace and that the island might have received its name from Graeco-Thracian colonists, cannot be defended at all.

W. Golenishev connected with Sokötra the magic island of A-a-penenska or Pa-anca (island of the genius) the abode of the king of the frankincense country, of which we are told in the old Egyptian fairy tale in a papyrus in St. Petersburg (French translation by Golenishev in the Verhandlungen d. V. Orientalistenkongresses, Berlin 1882) of the period of the middle kingdom (about the beginning of the second millennium B.C.). G. Schweinfurth agreed with this on the whole and accepted identification first in a lecture to the geolog. Versammlung deutscher Naturforscher at Freiburg i. B. (Ein Besuch auf Sokötra, Freib. i. B. 1884), then in Erinnerungen von einer Fahrt nach Sokötra (K. Westermann's Monatliche, 1891, xxxiv. p. 603 sqq., xxxv. 29 sqq.); cf also E. Glaser, Schätze der Geschichte und Geographie Arabiens, Berlin 1890, ii. 182 sqq., and Das Weinrauchland und Sokötra, reprint from the addition to the Allgemeinen Zeitung, No. [1] 120 and 121, Munich 1899, p. 4, 11, Hommel [9 below]. Glaser (Weinrauchland, p. 4 and Punt, M. V. A. G., iv. 1899, p. 43) said that the island of Pàxàna (also called 'Ià'pà) described by Diodorus, v. 41 sq. (from Euhemerus) was identical with the frankincense island of Pa-anca, and therefore with Sokötra. Ritter, op. cit., p. 364 had previously discussed the possibility that the legendary frankincense island of Panchaia, mentioned by Strabo, Pliny, Roman poets and others, should be located in the vicinity of Sokötra. The similarity of the names Pa-anca and Sokötra is certainly worthy of note; the plants mentioned in the fairy tale are in keeping with the flora of Sokötra (cf. Glaser, Weinrauchland, p. 3 sq.). But Glaser's hypothesis (ibid., p. 20 sq., 23) that the old Egyptian name of Sokötra was really not Pa-anca but Pancha or Ponech, i.e. "the Punic island" and that this is the root meaning of Panchaia, is untenable, as is its effort to support by it his main thesis that the original inhabitants of South Arabia and Sokötra were Phoenicians and Habasha (ibid., p. 12 sqq.), the South Indian and Sokötra men no less than the African were direct descendants of the Phoenicians or of the people of Punt (cf. his Schätze, ii., p. 250, 297 sqq.; Punt, p. 1, 31, 65) and that the language of Sokötra was Habasha, a descendant of Phoenician. In spite of the fictitious character of the story of Euhemerus about Panchaia, there is no doubt that a definite island forms a real background for the scenery. Among the common features in the various descriptions of the islands is further the fact that Diodorus, v. 41, speaks of the wealth of Panchaia in frankincense, myrrh trees of excellent quality and all other kinds of spices, which agrees with modern reports on Sokötra. Diodorus, v. 43 (vii. 1) speaks highly of the rich vegetation of Panchaia (on the particular charms of the flora of Sokötra see Wellent, Repert [see below], p. 145 sqq.; Schweinfurth, op. cit., p. 614, 620 sqq., 38, 42 sqq.; Bent, op. cit., p. 367 sqq.; on the multitude of palm-trees, Vákey, op. cit., ii. 102; quoting Jamdami [Sifat, p. 53, see below], Tadj, loc. cit.) Among the features common to the various ramifications of the traditions about the island, which, taken together, form an important factor in the varying identifications, is the fact that according to the Periplos 30 there are very many snakes on the island of Dioscorides and the Egyptian story makes the royal genius of the magic islands assume the form of a snake. Pliny, vi. 169 (also Mela, iii. 8) mentions among the people of Troglodyte the Panchaei, quos Ophiophagos vocant, serpentinus vasiti adhibit, a people who bore the same name as the inhabitants of Panchaia. In the legendary description of the two islands adjoining Panchaia (Diodorus, v. 41 sqq.) the reference is to the islands near Sokötra, similar to Agatharchides' statement on the जोको त्रितमुन्ने. Hommel, who made use of the Greek idea of Panchaia for his Die Insel der Seligen (Munich 1901), which deals with the history of the idea of the island of the blessed in the different literatures of antiquity (p. 1, 14 sq., 32) identified the idea (p. 15) "the small rocky island 150 feet high" described by Schweinfurth with the little island 7 stadia from Panchaia described by Diodorus. As Panchaia as a legendary duplicate of the island of Dioscorides gradually became separated from the latter in the geography of the ancient, it is no wonder that many writers like Diodorus and Pliny mention them as two separate islands. The identification recommended by Glaser, Schätze, p. 337, 432; Weinrauchland, p. 11 and Bent, op. cit., p. 345 of Sokötra with the Iskudura of the Naq-si Rastam inscription of Darius has nothing to recommend it, but a similarity of name. There is no real evidence that the Sutru (often read 'To-Nutra "land of the gods") of the ancient Egyptian monuments, a name of the land of Punt, rich in spices and usually referred to South Arabia, can refer to Sokötra, as Mariette Bey (in Bent, op. cit., p. 345) thought, although it may be granted that the island was already known to the ancient Egyptians as a land of frankincense. The identification of Sokötra with Σακάσια in
Pausanias, vi. 26, 9 (Hommel, Grundzüge [Ethnologie], Munich 1926, p. 650), lacks any foundation.

Among the names in literature for the legendary fortunate frankincense island, Hommel (op. cit.) included also the island of the Phaeceans of the Odyssey and (p. 23 sq.) the land of the blessed in the x. and xi. book of the Babylonian epic of Gilgamesh. While very much in what he says about the part played by Sokötrā as an island of Paradise in the very earliest mythology among Babylonians and Egyptians (see his Glossen und Exkurse, iv. Neue krit. Ztschr., ii. 1892, p. 281 sqq., 290 sqq.) can only be described as fanciful hypothesis, including his etymology identifying the Egyptian name of the island "Island of the Spirits," θεονομική, from θεονομική, his suggestion of the similarity of the real name of the island of the Phaeceans Στρυπί to Shilh [q.v.] (Sāḥil), the old name of the Ḥaframawt frankincense coast is worthy of serious consideration, especially as Στρυπί cannot be satisfactorily explained as regards form and meaning from the Greek. Continuing this line of research, I have sought in Paul Wisowa, R. E., n. v. Sāḥa, col. 1405 sqq. by quoting the etymological meaning of the name Soḳōtrā, which is in keeping with the fundamental idea of the poetical conception of the island of the Phaeceans, and to the agreement in substance of almost every sentence of the Egyptian fairy story, of the sailor thrown upon the island of the spirits and the mythical matter of the adventure of Odysseus on the island of the Phaeceans, to make it probable that Soḳōtrā was the real prototype which suggested the chief features of the epic idea of the island of the Phaeceans, later developed by legend and poetry, which, as is well known, shows Oriental colouring.

Among Arab geographers, al-Ḥamḍānī, Sīfat Liqā'at al-Arāb (ed. D. H. Müller, Leiden 1884, p. 53) gives brief notes on the nationality and religion of the people of Soḳōtrā, saying that on the island there are representatives of all the Mahra tribes and the number of meo able to bear arms is about 10,000; they were Christians; Kīṣat (Khasraw) transplanted a number of Byzantines there; Mahra tribes then settled beside them, upon whom some adopted Christianity. Yāḥṣūb, Muḥamm (ed. Wüstenfeld), iii. 102, 3 gives a similar story (word for word the same as Ḥamdanī, op. cit., p. 54, v. 55, 6, cf. al-Kaṣāwī, Komographie, ed. Wüstenfeld, Göttingen 1848, ii. 54), but, agreeing with the opinion held by the people of 'Aden, that no Byzantines came to the island, he considers the people of Soḳōtrā to be Greeks of the time of Alexander the Great, who lived without marrying after the introduction of Christianity and died out, whereupon Mahra tribes took their places. With these statements on the origin of the people of the island may be compared the older story in the Periplus (30) that the few inhabitants of the island were immigrants, a mixture of Arabs, Indians and Greeks who came there to trade, the similar statement in Diodorus v. 42, that on the island of Panchaia there were Indians, Scythians and Cretans (Greeks) in addition to the natives and with Agatharchides (103) says about the sea-trade to the west coast, Persia, Caramania and the rest of the adjoining mainland. At the present day Soḳōtrā still has a mixed population, which on the north coast includes besides native Arabs, Somalis, Swahili and Indian elements. According to the above mentioned passage in Cosmas, who rightly traces the Helleneism of Soḳōtrā to colonisation by the Ptolemies, the Greeks had retained their language and were Christians, who got their priests from Persia. Glaser's suggestion, Skizz, p. 184 (1858) that one or other of the three Greek cities of Arabia, Arethusa, Lauria, Chalkis, mentioned by Pliny, Nat. Hist., vi. 159, should be sought on Soḳōtrā is without foundation. Idrisi, who knew about the traffic by sea between Soḳōtrā and the Mahra coast, connects (l. 48, Jauberi, Paris 1836) the story of Alexander's campaign into Arabia on account of its wealth of frankincense, with Soḳōtrā, which was colonised with Greeks on the advice of Aristotle on account of the excellent arches growing there (similarly in Taqī al-Arāb, loc. cit.). The Christianisation of the island may have been effected by the Abyssinian rulers who conquered Arabia for a time. On the notices of Christianity there in Africano, Theodoret, al-Mas'uddī, Abu 'l-Fida and his contemporary Marco Polo, see Bent, op. cit., p. 344. When Persian civilization gained the upper hand in Arabia and after it Islam, Christianity was gradually driven out of the island. The final disappearance of the church was comparatively late; the last traces are found in the beginning of the xviii. century (according to the Carmelite monk Vincenzo, cit. Bent, p. 355).

It is significant for the conditions of navigation to Soḳōtrā that al-Ḥamḍānī, op. cit. (cf. Yāḥṣūb, op. cit.), says that one who sails from 'Aden to the land of al-Zinjī (opposite the Zanjībar coast, the land of the Sawāhīlī) first shapes his course for 'Omān and leaves the island of Soḳōtrā on his right and then sails around it into the sea of al-Zinjī until he has the island behind him. Sprenger (p. 57) rightly observes that this circuit is caused by the prevalence of south winds on the East African coast, and not as al-Ḥamḍānī, op. cit., p. 52, thought, by the fact that the Gulf of 'Aden is enclosed by a barrier of the sea of al-Zinjī (on this see also Yāḥṣūb, op. cit.). According to the Kūmūs and the Taqī, loc. cit., Soḳōtrā is on the left on the voyage from al-Zinjī. He who wishes to go to Soḳōtrā from 'Aden sails to Rās al-Fartak along the Arabian coast (Sprenger, op. cit.). This may be the reason why, in ancient times, the position of the island was defined with respect to this cape, as in the Periplus, 30, according to which the island lay between Syagros and the African cape Aromata (Cape Guardafui) but nearer the former (in reality the contrary is true) and in Pliny, iv. 53, who gives the distance of the "a monturium Syagros" fairly correctly at 280 miles. The direction of the sailing route eastwards round the island may explain the fact that it seems to be placed in Ptolemy's map too far west of the promontory of Syagros. The calculation given in the Taqī, loc. cit., is based on a direct voyage, according to which Soḳōtrā is three days and nights distant from Mokhā. The length of the island is given too long in Ptolemy (cf. Sprenger, op. cit.) and also in al-Ḥamḍānī, at 80 parasangs; it is barely a third of that.

Among the statements in Greek literature about the island of Soḳōtrā which have been confirmed and explained by modern research is that of the Periplus, 30, that the few inhabitants of the island are to be found on the north side; even at the
present day, the largest and most numerous settlements, including the capital Tamarind ('date-town'); the native name is: Hadibo) are on the north coast; the west coast is less accessible and the other coasts are also thinly populated. The white cattle mentioned in Agatharchides (103) whose cows have no horns are explained as zebras (Ritter, op. cit., p. 249; cf. Bent, op. cit., p. 367 for harmless cows).

The first more accurate information about Sokotra was obtained on the voyage of the ship Palmarius from the South Arabian coast to the island in 1834 under Captain Haines, who was sent by the East Indian Company to survey the coast and collect material for a chart. Lt. J. R. Wellsted produced the first topographical account of the interior, which was naturally very incomplete. He published the geographical and scientific results of his exploration of the island in his Report on the Island of Socotra, J. A. S. B., iv., 1835, p. 153 sqq., Memoir on the Island of Socotra, J. R. G. S., v., London 1835, p. 129 sqq. and in shorter form in Travels to the City of the Caliph, ii., London 1840. The island, which as even this first report showed, seemed a promising field for the natural historian, was studied from the botanical, zoological, and geological point of view by J. H. Balfour (On the Island of Socotra, Rept. Brit. Assoc. for the Advancement of Science, 1881, p. 486 sqq.); and the petrological material brought back by him was published by T. G. Bonney, On a Collection of Rock Specimens from the Island of Socotra, Philos. Transactions of the Roy. Soc., clxxiv., London 1883, p. 273 sqq. In 1881 the Riebeck expedition, one of its members being G. Schweinfurth (see Das Volk von Trucan, Onser Zeit, 1813, his lecture of 1883 already mentioned and his Erinnerungen [cf. p. 477]), explored the country round Tamarind for about five weeks (cf. the picture in Western Monatsh., xxxv., 1883, p. 33, and p. 34 and 49) and the adjoining parts of the Hageri hills. Schweinfurth's botanical notes were worked up by Balfour (cf. his Botany of Socotra, Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, xxxi., 1888) and his geological by Sauer, Zeit. deutsch. geol. Gesells., 31, 1888, p. 138 sqq.). In the winter of 1897 Th. Bent spent two months on the island with his wife, devoting two observations mainly to archaeology. His Travels, published by his wife after his death, includes a good map of Sokotra. His companion, the zoologist Bennett was, we believe, the first to ascend the summit of Hageri (being followed in 1899 by the two Viennese, O. Simony and F. Kosmat). In November 1898, the Vienna Academy of Sciences sent out an expedition on the Swedish steamer Gottfried, to investigate the archaeology, ethnology and natural history of South Arabia and Socotra. The expedition (Landberg, D. H. Müller, Simony, Kosmat, Jahn and Piaulay) were joined in 'Aden by W. A. Bury and O. Forbes and W. R. Ogilvie-Grant, who were to collect botanical and zoological specimens for the Liverpool and British Museum. After the unexpected break-down of the expedition in South Arabia, the majority of the Vienna explorers went to Socotra in January 1899 where they spent two months, investigating the hitherto insufficiently known south and west of the island; in January they also went to Semla and 'Abd al-Kuri. The scientific results were published in vol. ixi. of the Denkschriften der Akad. Wien, math.-naturn. Kl. 1907 (see Bibliography) and in H. O. Forbes, The Natural History of Socotra and 'Abd el-Kuri, Liverpool 1903. D. H. Müller published specimens of the language taken down from the lips of natives in Die Melih- und Socotri Sprachen, Schriften der sudarabischen Expedition, 1905, 1906, 1907, 1908. The first edition of Bent's book was augmented by the second edition. The first account of the occurrence of frankincense on the island (Pflüg. xii. 32). The frankincense is thus confirmed (cf. previously Glaser, Schier, p. 185), and Bent also speaks (op. cit., 344) of three excellent kinds of frankincense, several varieties of myrrh etc., and (p. 380 sqq.) of valleys of frankincense, myrrh and other spices, while Glaser, Weinrauchland, p. 4, had said "Socotra has no myrrh". Ch. I. Cruttenden's statement (Narratives of a Journey from Makka to Sa'da, J. R. G. S., viii., 1838, p. 278 sqq.) about the occurrence of the frankincense tree in Socotra is obscure because he called it zakhir or zahir but this (pahic [q.v.], zubr) means "aloes". Diodorus' remark (see above, p. 477) about the quantity of frankincense on Panchaia thus becomes intelligible. According to the authorities, Sokotra has only two kinds of frankincense tree, Boswellia Socotrana and Boswellia Ameero Balfour fil. (For details of the localities where they are found, see Vierhapper in the article quoted below in the Bibliographia, p. 374 sq. of the collected volume already mentioned). The Sokotran name for frankincense is soro hom al-dhahr. Al-Hamdiání speaks (op. cit., p. 51, 53) of the Socotran species of myrrh as does Mu'addas, B.G.A., ii. 98 (cf. Bent, op. cit., p. 380, 384). Al-Hamdiání reports that the aloe is plentiful (p. 53); the Suri frankincense is said to be the best of all and was a special article of commerce (of course also Kaikin and Täfif, q.v.; on similar testimony of al-Nuwaiti, Ibn Sina, etc., cf. E. Wiedemann, Beiträge, S.B.P.M.S. Erl., 1916, slvii., p. 20). The native name for the aloe socotrana according to Wellsted is bayof, more correctly tafi in Bent, p. 381; tafif in Glaser, Weinrauchland, p. 4, i.e. tafi according to D. H. Müller, the Arabic abtal. Bent saw a very fine quality in great quantities (p. 344, 377; cf. Wellsted, Report, p. 143, etc.); on localities where the aloe Ferruyi Bak. grows, see Vierhapper, op. cit., p. 336; on the method of getting the resin Bent, p. 381 (cf. Wiedemann from al-Nuwaiti, op. cit.). Aloes are still exported from Socotra, although not to so great an extent as before (Bent, op. cit.; cf. Wellsted, op. cit., p. 143; Schweinfurth, op. cit., p. 421; A. Grabmann, Südarabien als Wirtschaftsgebiet, Vienna 1917, p. 165 sq.; cf. also C. Niebuhr, Beschreibung von Arabien, Copenhagen 1772, p. 284). The finding on Sokotra of the dragon-tree, Draca Kissambki, from the resin of which dragon's blood is obtained, as is mentioned by Pflüg. (15, 7; 33, 115 sq.), recalls the testimony of the Periplus, p. 30, that on the island, the so-called Indian dragon's blood (moluk in the regional dialect) flourishes, which is collected on the trees in the
form of tears. On the dragon's blood in Soçoťa, which is mentioned for example by al-Hamdānī, p. 53 (also the Ḳānūn and Tādīq), see Wellsted, Repert., p. 144; Cruttenden, op. cit.; Schweinfurth, p. 624, 56; Bent, p. 344, 379, 384 (see the picture at p. 387); Glaser, Wehr durchs Land, p. 43; especially accurate in Vierhapper, p. 336 sqq. With illustrations the better is the description in al-Di'ār al-malakī is given in the Tādīq), the Soçoťa itah (i.e. Wellsted, loc. cit. [who gives dam khalil as the Arabic name]; Bent, p. 379; cf. al-Hamdānī, p. 53; i.e. idāfah in Müller and al-Hamdānī, vi., p. 34 sqq., on further names in Nuwairit, see Wiedemann, op. cit., p. 22. The description "tear of an Indian tree" from Alū di'ār al-Dīnawārī (ibid.) recalls the Ḳānūn of the Periplus (see above) and the Ḳānūn of the frankincense on Panchala in Diodorus, v. 21 (cf. Dioscorides, i. 23). On the gathering of the resin, see Bent, p. 381 sqq. The export of dragon's blood from Soçoťa (on which see also the Ḳānūn and the Tādīq) has decreased very much in modern times, as it is found also in India and Hafrāmawī (see the summary of the earlier notices in Grünmann, op. cit., p. 121).

The population of Soçoťa is estimated at 13,000 Muḥammadans. The people along the coast on the north devote some attention to agriculture; the Periplus, 30, records that there is no corn and no wine-grapes on the island; Wellsted, op. cit., p. 146 and Schweinfurth, op. cit., p. 620 mention only wild grapes on Soçoťa. With Hamdānī's story (p. 53) that 'anbar is washed upon the coast of Soçoťa, may be compared the account of the gathering of 'anbar in al-Mas'ūdī and in Marco Polo (see Bent p. 344) (on amber on Soçoťa cf. Wellsted, op. cit., p. 160; D. H. Müller, op. cit., vi., 109 sqq.). Of the three towns mentioned in the Tādīq, Minēsá (described as the residence of the king of the al-Zindjā) can be found on the maps (Minasá in Bent). Bent describes the customs of the native (p. 347 sqq.). That trade relations existed in early times is evident from the scanty reference in classical authors (Periplus and Agatharchides; see above) and the references in the Ḳānūn and Tādīq. Bent (p. 346, 557) mentions that Soçoťa was butter, now almost the only article of export, is esteemed in the markets of the Arabian coast (Mās'āṣ) and East Africa (Zanzibar). We have already mentioned that the export of spices has declined. One obstacle to traffic is the fact that the island, which is exposed to the monsoons, has no bay which would form a safe anchorage all the year round. For this reason and in consequence of its general situation, Soçoťa is shut off from the main traffic-routes of the world and is only used for provisioning by Indian traders and whale-fishers: Tamerjda has still the best roadstead; east of it is Bender Delōgha. The rest of the island, which is watered and has a more vigorous vegetation. It is true that this part of the statement refers in the Periplus, that the island is rich in water and has (perennial) rivers. In the Tādīq there also the existence of streams is mentioned. Ruins in the east, e.g. at Rās Momi show that there was once a higher culture here.

The Soçoťa language occupies a singular position, a result of the ethnological mixture in the population and is not easy to fit into a linguistic genealogical table. The statement of Philostorgius (Glaser, Wahr durchs Land, p. 25) that the people of Soçoťa speak Syriac is due to an intelligible misunderstanding, and has nothing to do with the fact that Soçoťa has phonetical analogues with Armenian. It is connected on the one hand with the two other Mahra languages Mehill and Shḥarīn and on the other with the Yemen Arabic; but is also markedly different from both. Ibn al-Majdīsī says that the Mahra used to live in Soçoťa and had a language of their own, which no foreigner would understand (Sprenger, op. cit., p. 91). The contacts with Ethiopia are noteworthy (cf. Hommel, Grundzüge, p. 153; Glaser, Wahr durchs Land, p. 18). Glaser's suggestions, already mentioned (p. 477) according to which the language is "Habashi" (op. cit., p. 12), a hypothesis first put forward by him, which means to him sometimes a single language and sometimes a group of languages, are untenable. He even mentions the possibility (p. 24) that the Minasēna, Sabseans and Kāthārīans may be descendents of the Phoenicians and explains the Hālābat language allegedly to survive in Soçoťa as a direct descendant of Phoenician. The language of the Hālābat is quite different from the Hālābat.

D. H. Müller's explanation that Mehill and Soçoťa are descendents of the old Minaeo Sabsean language, attacked by Glaser (p. 18) or that Soçoťa has evolved from Mehill (op. cit., vi., p. 372) certainly requires modification. There is a wealth of linguistic material in M. Bittner's monograph: Charakteristik der Sprache der Insel Σοκοτρα, in Am. Wien, 1918, 8th., viii.; Vorstudien zur Grammatik und zum Wörterbuch der Σοκοτρα-Sprache, i., S. B. A. K., Wien, cxviiii. 4, 1933; ii., ibid., cxxxi. 4, 1918; (also studies on Mehill and Shḥarīn, ibid., cxxii., 1909 sqq. [in greater detail in his Charakteristik, p. 48, note 2]). He characterises Soçoťa as a sister of the two other Mahra languages (cf. D. H. Müller, op. cit., vi., p. 2.), Soçoťa, as spoken by the Beduins, who have lived among the hills from early times, may be the form in which the dialect of the original inhabitants has survived, which, probably, is coming from South Arabia, in contrast to the contemporary forms of Mehill and Shḥarīn and formed a linguistic group with these alongside of which may be placed the Minaeo-Sabsean as a sister language in South Arabia. The combination of original elements, of the strictly Soçoťan with the Mahri and Arabic to form a single language, may also however be interpreted as an isolated trace of the migration of an old language from South Arabia to Abyssinia.

Small fragments of inscriptions had already been noticed by Wellsted; Riebeck and Schweinfurth (in his diary) had copied some (those of Eriogh) (see Glaser, Skizze, p. 184). A rock inscription at Kālınniya was said by Bent (p. 351) to be late Finyār or Ethioptic; the reproduction of his copy (Pl. vi. of the "Appendices") clearly shows Sabsean letters. Traces of the graffiti at Eriogh, which Riebeck had thought Greek is, according to Bent (p. 354), Ethioptic. The camel- brands which he copied (also reproduced in the Appendix) are obviously Sabsean.

Geographically Soçoťa belongs to North East Africa, but politically it has always gone with Arabia. In this respect the island has changed little in the course of centuries (Bent, p. 345, 392).

The linguistic conditions suggest close connections
SOKOTRÅ — SOLAK.

with Mahra. In the time of the Periplus (see saba, p. 9) it was dependent on the king of Ḥḍramawt, the lord of the land of frankincense (see above, p. 496b). Sabatha, its capital (= Shab-wat) was wrongly explained by C. Landberg, Arabica, Leiden 1898, v. p. 239, as Saḥa in the Wâdi Djerdan; M. Hartmann's assertion (Die arabischen Reiseberichte. In Der islamische Orient, ii., Berlin 1900, p. 434) "The statement in § 31 of the Periplus that Soḵotra, like Arabia, is subject to Charibæus is significant", is incorrect as the unambiguous language of the Periplus shows in what respect the dependence of Arabia on Charibæus is compared with the dependence of Soḵotra on Eleazar. C. Müller was also wrong in his note on Soḵotra (map xi. and xii. of his Atlas to the Geographia Orientis Minore); "Charibæus subjecta". On the relation of Eleazar to the Sabaean-Hamitic kingdom, it may be deduced from the Periplus that Eleazar reigned independently in Ḥḍramawt, the kingdom adjoining Saba. In modern times it has again been erroneously deduced from the statements of Pliny, v. 154; xii. 32, supported by an erroneous textual emendation, Saba for Saba in Pliny (cf. saba, p. 6) that Ḥḍramawt, which according to the inscriptions of Saba was independent, soon lost its independence; for in Pliny the Atraimacæi (i.e. Ḥḍramūtātāi) are described as a province of the Sabaeans. The truth is just the reverse. From the time of Juba, Ḥḍramawt was liberated from Sabean suzerainty and in the Periplus Ḥḍramawt is under its own king, who acted independently, on equality with the king of the Ḥimyar (cf. the article saba in R.E., col. 1475). Eleazar had, according to Periplus 31, formed out the revenues of the island and placed a garrison on it, perhaps against the Himyari (Glaser, Saba, p. 152)."-

Arab merchants were still, as in the days of the Periplus, busy on Soḵotra and also in Zambīb. Yâḳūtī like the Periplus, talks of Arab predominance in the island, and we can say the island, was under the influence of Arabian culture down to the xviith century. The island was little known down to modern times on account of its position and lack of harbours. In the middle ages, it was notorious as a nest of pirates (cf. also Ibn-Bāṭīzī quoted in Bent, p. 344). The first contact with Europe was the Portuguese occupation in 1507 but this was not permanent. The Imām of Māskat for a long period extended his suzerainty over the island and later the Sūṭan of Ḥīṃla. In the xviiith century Christian missionaries were working there. At the beginning of the xviith century the Waḥšāī movement swept over the peaceful island also. As late as 1834, P. Roberts (Embassy to the Eastern Courts etc., New York, 1837, p. 361) agreeing with Wellsted, translated in p. 51, testifies to the political and economic dependence of Soḵotra on the Imām of Ḥīṃla. In 1835 English influence was felt for a short period when the East India Company erected a coaling-station here. This was abandoned when the English occupied ʿAden in 1838. In 1876 for political reasons, English interest in the island was revived and the British government made a treaty with the successor of the island, the Sūṭan of Ḥīṃla, securing it as a sphere of influence. The Sūṭan living on the island was a relative of the Sūṭan of Ḥīṃla. In 1886, Soḵotra became an English protectorate as a dependency of ʿAden and belongs to the Indian province of Bombay.

Bibliography: The names of the principal books and pamphlets (Wellsted, Bent, Schweinfurt, D. H. Müller, Glaser, Bittner, Kossmat, Forbes) are, along with the scattered references in the Arabic geographers and lexicons, given with detailed references in the text of the article. There is also for the earliest information: Yule. Marco Polo, 1903, p. 406 sqq.; for the Portuguese period. Commentarios de grande Affonso d'Albuquerque [1557], (Commentaries... translated by) W. de G. Birch, London 1875—1884, passion; for the period at the beginning of the xviiith century, the account of the French expedition to Yemen in 1708 in Viaggio nell' Arabia Felice, Venice 1721 (J. de la Rocque, Voyage de l'Arabie heureuse, Paris 1716, p. 222 sqq.). A good bibliography down to his day is given by J. Jackson, Socrat, Notes bibliographiques, Paris 1892. We may also mention the section Nieuw eikana of the article saba in Pauly-Wissowa, R.E., s.v., col. 1402 sqq., and in addition to the purely geological literature: F. Kossmat, Vorläufiger Bericht der geologischen Untersuchungen in Sohkra, S. B. Abh. Wien, mathem.-naturw. K., lxxxix. 9, 1894, p. 73 sqq.; H. O. Forbes, The English Expedition to Soekía, in The Geogr. Journal, London 1899, xiii. 6, p. 633 sqq.; J. W. Gregory, A Note on the Geology of Socrat, in Geogr. Magazine, London 1899, vol. vi., p. 529 sqq.—Of the already mentioned collected volume lxxi. of the Denkmäulheiten Ab. Wien (presented 1901—1906) the following articles deal with Soḵotra: F. Kossmat, Geologie der Insel Sohkrat, p. 1 sqq. (with map, the topography of which is based on the Admiralty chart founded on Haines and Wellsted's observations and Balfour's map, but the orography of which is based on the author's own observations); A. Pelikan, Petrographische Untersuchungen, p. 65 sqq.; L. Steiner, Bearbeitung der... auf Sokrat... gefundenen Felszen, p. 93 sqq.; F. Kohl, Hymenopteren auf Sokrat, p. 123 sqq.; F. Vierhappes, Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Flora Südarabiens und der Insel Sohkrat, Semna und Ādāl al-Kūbā, p. 321 sqq. In this connection may be mentioned Wettstein in Vegetationsbilder, ser. 3, part v., Jena 1906. The article SOKOTRA in the Encyclopædia Britannica, ed. 11, 1911, with special reference to physical, geological, climatological, zoological and botanical conditions, is based for the most part on Forbes. — The Pilot of the Gulf of Aden contains accurate geographical details (on it and on A. Juhn's Tinorar, see Kossmat, op. cit., p. 9). Finally see also the article MAHRA.

(J. Tratsch)

SOLAK was the name, in the old military organisation of the Ottoman Empire, of the archers of the Sultan's bodyguard. The word solak is an old Turkish word meaning "left-handed". The relation of this meaning to that of archer is not quite clear. The solaks belonged to the Janissaries, of which they formed four iva of the 60th—63rd, each of 100 men under the command of a Solak ızâbi, and two lieutenants (ezvâr solakâ). They were, however, used exclusively as bodyguards, a duty they shared with the ızâbi of [q.v.]. They had the same uniform as the Janissaries, except that they wore a cap (ażâb) with a long plume on the top. The solaks always went on foot and surrounded the sovereign whom they also accompanied to war.
SHOLAKZADE, an Ottoman historian. His real name was Mehmed and his nickname HEMD MENT. He seems to have been the son of a sheikh and was born in Sinjir. Not much is known of his life. He probably adopted an official career. He is said to have died in 1068 (1657/1658). On account of his musical abilities he was called "miştah (also miştah)." He was a kind of shepherd's pipe; cf. Eyllih, Seyyedetnuma, i. 446, 509, 636 (passages, of which the second at least must refer to the historian).

Mehmed Sholakzade was the author of a condensed history of the Ottoman empire, which he wrote during the reign of Sultan Mehmed IV. The existing manuscripts as a rule come down to 1654. The work was originally called "Fihrist-i Şahân." It had a wide circulation on account of its succinct and very luscious style and is still a popular book. It cannot however claim to be valuable as an independent historical source except for the reign of Murad IV. Continuations were made by Serrl Efendi (d. 1124 = 1729) and by Mufid Pasha. The book was printed at Sinjir in 1297 (1870), 6 + 12 + 773 p. In an earlier lithographed edition (1271 = 1854) was never completed. On the manuscripts of the work see F. Balinger, Die Geschichtsschreiber der Osmanen (Leipzig 1937), p. 207 sq.


SOLMAN. [See SULAMAN.]

ŞOMAL, a Kurdish district in Erzurum near the Turkish frontiers. In Kurdistan, Şamal means "view" (cf. in Persian Shom, "terminus, finis, scopus"), Vullers, ii. 534). To the north Şomal is separated from the basin of the Zohar (Şepinrû, Samû, q.v.) by the mountains of Brez-din, Undî-ı, Aghur, and Aghur, on the east the canton of Anzal separates it from Lake Urmi; to the southeast lies the Shahr-Balad range, to the south the canton of Bardost; to the south, the peak of Koltû, towards the west the ravine of Bânegh runs into the interior of Turkish territory (the Turkish cantons of Bâširgân and Gewer). Şamal is sometimes used to include the cantons of Şepinrû and Anzal-i Illâh.

Şamal is watered by the northern tributaries of the Nîkûzû, several of which drain the main valley and one (Hasan, Bardûk) comes from the ravine of Bânegh. They unite east of Bardûk, flow towards Bardost, where they are joined by the tributary from the valley of Bâširgân and then, joining the Nîkûzû, enter the lake north-east of the plain of Urmi. [q.v.]

According to the Shahrûnûn, Şamal and Bardost were at first governed by secoons of the Kurdish dynasty (Hassanîvîhâd) who had taken refuge in the north after the death which the Bûyûk Şamal-d-din had inflicted in 405 (1014) on Hûlûi b. Ilâhê [q.v.]. At the beginning of the 18th century, the Shahrûnûn mentioned a member of the family, Nîkûzû b. Sulûn Ahmed, who for his exploits was granted by Shah Isma'il the cantons of Şamal, Targar, and Dast, but later went over to Sulûn Zalma. His descendants, who were under the will of Wân, broke up into various branches. The last mir of Şamal mentioned by the Shahrûnûn is Âwîlî Beg (from 985 = 1577).

When in 1605 (1654) Eyvâli Celebi [q.v.] visited the country between Wân and Urmi the strongest castle of Şehr-Keçûn still stood on a cliff commanding the plain of Urmi, while the western part of Şamal was occupied by the Pîyânî tribe (whence now lives in Turkish territory in the Kâdî of Gever and Albaş). The lord of Bardost was called Colik ("the one armed") Mir 'Aziz; the strong castle stood some distance below (șez-ğalû) Kar flî Pîyânîsh, which may be identified with Bânegh (3—4 miles above Bardost).

It is not very clear whether the mirs of Şamal who, shortly after the visit of Eyvâli Celebi, erected several curious monuments were of the same tribe of Pîyânîsh. At Bardost is a mosque of white and black stone and a cemetery with the tomb of Nigar Beg, son of Gîhêl Beg (d. 1077 = 1667). His son Sulûn 'Ali Sulûn, whose title shows that he had consolidated the power — for Kâlûn means a chief for which one has received investiture — built the very imposing and picturesque castle near Bânegh. A reconstruction of the old Kâlû Pîyânîsh probably also dates from this time (1078 = 1667). On a rock at the entrance to the tower can still be seen the remains of a rudely carved inscription şez akîd- Sulûn Murad bin Sulûn — (?). Below the fort is an "Sârî-Şâhûn" built by a certain Zaflî Ali (1103 = 1693) and a mosque. The style of these buildings recalls that of the castle of Maḣmûdî (Kâshûh) cast of Wân (cf. Jûndâr, p. 126—128).

In 1536 (1736) the hereditary chief of the šâlûk of Şamal, 'Abdun Khan, is a rainy for his hosts, driven from the Ottoman government the adjacent cantons of Salâma [q.v.], Kerâbâzâlê (?), Karabâğh and Anaz [cf. v. Hammer, G. O. R., i. 211].

In the 16th century the Shahrûn [q.v.], encouraged by the Persians gradually occupied Şamal. According to Darwâz Pasha, Bânegh was destroyed by 'Ali Agha-Shâhêk (about 1627 = 1841).

In 1651 Çelebî was still able to speak of a "hereditary ruler of Şamal," Parru Khan, who had also seized Bânegh. In 1643 the Shâhêk killed At Ghanî the last representative of the family of mirs, a certain Koltû Khan.

Among the antiquities of Şamal may be mentioned: 1. the citadel of Zendji-jâfà (between Şamal and Salamû, q.v.) which must correspond to the "Shahrûnûn" building of Karûn-valîsh, mentioned by Eyvâli Celebi (iv. 281) the name of which (alas Farîd-i-kapû) is found in Bânego, Peters, Mift., 1803, p. 201—210; 2. a chamber carved out of the rock on Mount Koltû; 3. similar chambers where the Nîkûzû enters the plain of Urmi. All these monuments must date from the Varaman period (cf. Minorsky, Kitâbî, in the Zâli, 1917, xxiv. p. 190).

SOMALILAND, a large country in east Africa inhabited by the Somalis.

a. Geographical outline. Somaliland comprises the borders of the Ethiopian plateau declining eastward to the Gulf of Aden and southward to the Indian Ocean.

In the basin of the Gulf of Aden in front of the eastern edge of the plateau at a short distance from the shore there is a range of rocky and barren hills (the highest elevation of the range seems to be about 6,000 feet); among them is the small island called Ras Alsabsa, beyond which lies the fresh water stream called the Ras bin Jane. Beyond this range of hills it rises gradually to the Ethiopian plateau, which further is in its southern portion furrowed by the upper valleys of the Shebelle and Djib rivers. The country, owing to its features, is divided by the natives into three regions: the gaban (literally: burnt land) that is the region of the sand-banks and dunes on the coast with a torrid climate, only fit for pasturage for a few months during and after the rains; the djo (literally: upper land) that is the region of the aforesaid hills with a more temperate climate, but still of more little value for agricultural purposes; the region of the tag (Torrens) that is the valley between the hills and the plateau, into which flow the streams springing from both sides of the depression and form thus northward the Tag Dhe the deep torrent and southward the Tag Niguli. This is the best zone of Northern Somaliland particularly fit for cattle and horse-rearing. Even more to the interior, westwards of the Tag zone, the Somali portion of the Ethiopian plateau is inhabited by the Ogaden, a tribe whose name probably means etymologically 'those of the plateau'. On the side of the Indian Ocean, however, the country is very different from the northern regions; the plateau in its southern portion does not fall rapidly towards the sea but slopes gradually and its furthest spurs are 200—300 miles from the coast; then its waters do not form short torrents but great rivers which flow, not only in some seasons, but throughout the whole year although with a variable level.

The Somali natives distinguish four regions, which are found in the following order by the traveller going from the coast of the Indian Ocean to the interior: firstly the moveable sandhanks (Somali: loo'ud) on the shore; then the hills or short plains of white and hardly consolidated sand (Somali: arra la 'white land'); next the finest red sand covered with jungle, in the most part perfect (Somali: arra crocul *red land'); then along the rivers the strip of alluvial ground (Somali: arra mada *black land'), comparatively rich in fertile humus, a country particularly suitable for agriculture.

In the region between the Djib and the great lower bend of the Shabelle there is, after the aforesaid "black land", another vast zone of "red land", called by the natives day), which is the most rich in pasturages in Southern Somaliland. Across the Ery from North East to West runs a range of granite hills which from the borders of the Shabelle's basin reaches to Buir Meddaq to the borders of Djib's valley. Beyond the day even more in the inland, are found the "black land" regions of Buir Hakkaha and the Bajowa plateau (1,500 feet). Through the ground rises gradually as far as the zone of Bokkel wells near the boundaries of Ogaden.

River system. The high flood of both Somali great rivers and the average volume of their waters depend closely on the rains falling on Ethiopian plateau and are only very slightly influenced by local rains of Somaliland. High floods take place twice in the year according to the light and heavy rainy seasons in southern Abyssinia. This is a favourable circumstance to agriculture, because Abyssinian heavy rains fall during the months June 15—September 15, which are on the contrary the most severe dry seasons in Somaliland; and in this way the high flood and sometimes the overflowing of the rivers can be considered, at least by some tribes, as a compensation for the damages of the Somali summer.

The river known as Juba in European maps and as Djib by the Arabs is called by the Somali Webi Gimmis, which is really a double name: the gomis or gomel means precisely river in Galla Barana dialect and in some Sidama languages (the name is grammatically a plural according to the common rule ofKushitic languages that all the names of liquid substances may used only as plural).

The other Somali river, called Shabbi in European maps, is known by the neighbouring natives as Wëbi-ga: "the river". The name Shabbi was given to this river probably because the Ogaden natives designated it to the first travellers coming from the coast of the Gulf of Aden as Webi Shabilla "the river of the Shabelle region" that is the river passing through Shabilla, the most wealthy and best known country founded by this river in its upper valley. Then the usual translation of the name "the river of the leopards" must be corrected to "the river of the leopards country" (Shabilla means literally: where there are leopards).

The most common kind of vegetation is the jungle of thorny acacias, less dense in white lands than in red lands; high trees, especially sycamores, are found on the rivers and form sometimes little forests in a stretch of about one mile on both sides of the rivers. Sorghum durra (Somali: minto) and Indian corn (dallug) are cultivated in black lands; dura, millet (masaba) in red and white lands; sesame and In. few districts sweet (American) potatoes (Somali: bata) and manioc (Somali: ngugi); cotton and sugar-cane in European settlements (the most important of these are the S.A.S. settlements founded by H. R. H. the Duke of the Abruzzi, Luigi di Savoy and the Djinalla settlements established by Count De Vecchi). The general physical formation of Somaliland described above has been in past times very useful to defend the natives against foreign invaders, because one must pass, before reaching the only zone economically
valuable, that is the black lands, through the sandy desert of the coast and then the jungle of the red lands, where the characteristic Redousia akinitching by sultan and ruse is strongly helped by the same natural feature of the ground.

v)Political divisions. Somaliland is now divided into:

I.French Somaliland, officially known as Gnte Frances des Somalies (5,790 square miles; 65,000 inhabitants), is administered by a civil governor. Its boundaries are determined: with Italian Eritrea under the Franco-Italian protocol of January 24, 1900, and July 10, 1901; with British Somaliland by the Anglo-French agreement of February 2 and 9, 1885; with Abyssinia by the Franco-Abyssinian convention of March 20, 1897. In spite of its name only the southern portion of the Colony is inhabited by Somalis, the northern regions being inhabited by Danakil. The capital is Djibuti (8,500 inhabitants), a port of considerable traffic, especially on account of the French railway Dji-

II.British Somaliland Protectorate (68,000 square miles; 300,000 inhabitants) administered by a civil Governor. Its boundaries are determined: with French Somaliland by the aforesaid agreement; with Abyssinia by the British-Abyssinian protocols of May 14 and June 4, 1897; with Italian Somaliland by the Anglo-Italian arrangement of May 5, 1894. The capital is Berbera (30,000 inhabitants).

III. Italian Somaliland (140,000 square miles; 650,000 inhabitants). The Colony, administered by a civil Governor, is divided into: Northern Italian Somaliland, viz. the protectorates of the two Somali sultanates of the Madjértrans and Hobyt, and Southern Somaliland, formerly known as Bandar. The boundaries with British Somaliland are determined by the aforesaid agreement; with Abyssinia by the Italo-Ethiopian treaty of May 16, 1908; with Italian Oltre-Giuba by the river Diras: The capital is Makabola (21,000 inhabitants).

IV. Italian Oltre-Giuba: "Beyond the Diras" (25,000 square miles; 60,000 inhabitants). This is the territory granted by Great Britain to Italy under the treaty of July 25, 1924. The capital is Kimhali (12,000 inhabitants). But this territory has now been annexed wholly to the Colony of Italian Somaliland and has been administered by the same governor since June 30, 1926.

V. Abyssinian Somaliland, that is Ogaden. It is divided in two feiks: the former comprises the upper valley of the Shabellaha and depends on the feudaltry of Harari (which is actually Eba Tafari, the heir Apparent of the Abyssinian throne); the latter comprises the basin of the Djib and depends on the feudaltry of Konso territory, who actually is Fidikul Habiya Gigiroya.

VI. Kenya Colony: The districts of Tanaaland and Northern Frontier and that portion of the late Jubaaland that has not been granted to Italy have a Somali nomadic population of shearers.

vii) Ethnography. The Somaliland may be divided in three groups: Northern Somali, who are called by the others Edji; Hawiya; Sab. The northern Somali, the greatest group, are divided into I: 1st, Dir, Dárdá, The Dir, who according to the tradition should be the first Northern Somali group inhabitants in the region actually called Somaliland, are now dispersed in the whole Somali territory, probably as they were driven out by successive invaders. The Dir have sent forth to the following tribes: the Lë in French Somaliland, the Banâl in Italian Somaliland, the Fakir Muhammad in the middle valley of the Shabellaha near the boundaries between Italian Somaliland and Ogaden. Besides those tribes, little groups of Dir families living with more numerous tribes of other origins are found in Ogaden, in Italian Northern Somaliland, in Oltre-Giuba. The latter inhabit the western portion of British Somaliland and the market-places on that coast: Zeila (Arabic: Zalla); Somali: Awdal; Galla: Afdaal), Berbers and Bulahâr. Their principal tribes are the Habar Awal, Habar Yûnis, Habar Dîjib, Habar Garanqîa. The groups live also in Oltre-Giuba, especially retired clerks of the British colonial Administration with their families; another larger group is in 'Aden, where they are for the most part workmen or boatmen in the port.

The Dârâd, traditionally enemies of the Ibs, are the most numerous Somali group. They inhabit the eastern portion of British Somaliland; northern Italian Somaliland: "Oltre-Giuba": the Somali districts in Kenya Colony, and almost the whole Somaliland coast of the Ethipic plateau. The principal Dârâd groups are: 1) the Kakallahìa, who are divided into Kooma and Kûma. The former comprises the Geri Kimba tribe, living in the neighbourhood of Harar, and the ancient federation of the Harari tribes that is the Madjértrans, who inhabit the whole Northern Italian Somaliland; and the Dâhîla, who live with the Madjértrans. The Kûma comprise, besides the little groups Galimoa, Wààsû, Ràjá and Djidwik, the great tribe of Ogaden, and then occupy the most part of Abyssinian Somaliland and the central regions of Oltre-Giuba. 2) Another Dârâd group is the Sidda, whose principal tribe is the Marefahân inhabiting a portion of Northern Italian Somaliland and the northern regions of Oltre-Giuba. Dârâd families (Madjértrans have occasioned the little inhabitants Abdi and Abdi Gubba in Italian Dunkali (Kirero). The Hawiya inhabit the whole valley of the Shabellaha, in Italian and Abyssinian Somaliland. According to the local tradition, the Hawiya were preceded in their present territory by the Adaxa, a tribe of kindred origin, who probably were the first group to migrate towards the river. The Adaxa are now dispersed and divided into four principal groups: the first living with their flocks and at the Capyrans, the boundaries between Italian and Italian Somaliland; the second in the low valley of the Shabellaha, South of Afgoy; the third near the Djib in the territory of Bitufhra; the fourth in Kenya Colony, Northern Frontier district. The region inhabited by the first group is called Shabellaha (see above); as the Adaxa are there proportionately few in number the most part of the tribe being former slaves or freedmen, the Ogaden often call this group the Adda, viz. the slaves, who have been incorrectly considered by some ethnologists as a Bantu tribe or a Bantu-speaking people. The other principal Hawiya groups are: the Gurgundjabe, who comprise the tribes Egida, Djadibé, Ida, Adda, Gaaljaal, who inhabit South of Shabellaha region as far as Mahadjik in Italian Southern Somaliland; the Gurgato, who comprise the tribes Habar Gide, Aabul (a very numerous group of tribes, as the Wa're, the Awaal, the Ebi, the Mantin, the
Yais, the Agon-yar, the Warengali Abgal, the Mollàn, the Wa’dàan, the Hillib; they occupy the zone from the southern boundaries of Gunggàfàbe as far as the Ocean and the Sab territory.

The Sab who inhabit the territory between Wàhiyya territory and the Djinb are divided into the different Somali tribes which are none other than the name of Digil, who was probably the common ancestor of both. The Digil comprise the following principal tribes: Djinb, Tumë, 'Irrola, Daliara. The Rahanwàn comprise two groups of tribes: the Sjìyyà ("the right") and the Sàggì ("the nine"); the principal tribes are the Eylli, the Liànà, the Haryà, the Haddìmo, the Lübà, the Galàdi, the Geélà. While the other Somali tribes are formed on the principle of a common origin from the same ancestor, whose name is generally the name of the tribe, the Rahanwàn tribes are formed, besides a very small group of descendants of Rahanwàn, by families or sections of different origins, federated in one common language. Besides the last great groups and some tribes of uncertain origin, viz.: Garra, living separately in Southern Somaliland, in Kenya Colony (Northern Frontier district) and in Abyssinian Somaliland (it is to be noted that the two last groups at quite a recent date spoke both Somali and Gallà), we must mention the freedmen, the outcast groups and the population of the towns on the coast. The slaves, for the most part of Bantu origin but now entirely somalized, delivered or escaped from their masters, have formed in some regions tribes like the Shille in the middle valley of Shábèlla; the Elày freedmen on the plateau of Ràjìfà, independent from their late masters but still living in black lands of big Hakkah; and the so-called Wàgàghà in the low valley of the Djinb. The outcast groups, that is the groups considered as impure on account of their trades, live with the high caste tribes to whom they are subjected. In Northern Somaliland the low castes have the general name of Sah, which, as we have seen above, is on the contrary in Southern Somaliland the name of a group of tribes. They comprise: the Yìbir, magicians; the Midgà, hunters; the Tumàl, smiths. Among the Hùwiya the low castes have the general name of Bon, which is really the name of a Bantu population in Kenya Colony and comprise: the Elà, hunters; the Madàràala and the Gàggàb, tanners; the Darfàwà, weavers; the Yàhà, magicians; the Tumàl and Kàlmàgàbà, smiths. By the Sah the low castes are: the Rìbì, hunters; the Waràbày, smiths.

The towns on the coast are inhabited by groups of the Somali tribes of the inland and by families now somalized but of the most varied origins, for the most part Arab immigrants to Somaliland or Bantu; some families would claim Persian origin and there are traditions on the origin from Madagascar of other few families.

Language. Somali is a language belonging to the Cushitic family, to the group called by Keuléb "low Cushitic" and thus akin to Sudani. "After the Jidàwà and Gallà languages, Somali, which during its history has been less influenced than Gallà by non-Cushitic languages, has not received in its phonetic system the typical consonant sounds followed by glottal occlusion, the true consonant diphthongs which are common to Gallà, to some Sudani dialects and have been admitted although in a different measure — in the modern Semitic languages of Abyssinia. It is therefore in Somali a velar explosive pronounced as in Arabic; ñ is praesencaminíal and is dialectically liable to be changed into r. It is also to be remarked that there is in Somali a very wide tendency to palatalisation from the influence not only of the Turkic but also of the liquid ñ, as in the case of the feminine article -à and, the suffix of the reflexive form -t, which are palatalised in -nà or -ñà when preceded by t final of the nouns or verbs (jëbà, jëb being successively changed in jëbà, jëb by assimilation). While other Somali dialects have kept the laryngeal ñ, the Sab dialect has changed ñ in ñ and ñ in ñ. As to morphology, there are found in Somali both kinds of conjugations used in Kushitic, viz. by prefixes and suffixes or by suffixes only, while on the contrary Gallà has kept only the second kind. But on the other side it appears by comparing Somali and Afsar-Saho that in the latter language the conjugation by prefixes and suffixes is more frequent than the other (perhaps on account of the strong influence of the neighbouring Semitic languages), while Somali has kept typically the aorismoid conjugation by prefixes and suffixes only in five verbs (which, however, express the most common ideas) that is: to be, to be there, to know, to come, to say. It is noteworthy that already in Hùwiya and Sab dialects two of those verbs are found used in both kinds of conjugation. Somali syntax (as there is not a declension of the nouns and especially on account of the use of the prepositions which are not placed before or after the noun, but are all placed in the verb itself) gives to the language peculiar characters and causes it to be in some degree difficult to foreigners. For instance our phrase: "the camel and the horse were bound with this rope" is translated: kàrèggàn ràttìgà iyyà fàrašà. Ì là ìì bà là ììàrì, that is literally: "this rope the camel and the horse they were with-from-by bound" (the group from-by expressing the idea that the two animals were not bound together, but every one with a bit of the rope in question). The genitive case, which is translated in Sao-Afar by placing the word meaning the possessed thing before the word meaning the possessor and in Gallà, on the contrary, by placing the word meaning the possessor before that meaning the possessed thing, is translated in Somali by the same way as in Gallà or more frequently by placing before firstly the name of the thing followed by the master's name with the possessive adjective; for instance: "Umar's house" may be translated literally: the house Umar or Umar his house.

The Somalí dialects are distinguished, according to the ethnic divisions, in the groups: Dàròk, Hùwìya, Sab. 1àk dialects have kept the originary ñ praesencaminíal; they form the durative verbs with the suffix -yn; they distinguish in the pronoun the first plural person inim "inclusive" used in which speaks both who hears and who exclusive (that is: who speaks and another person). Dàròk dialects change ñ praesencaminíal when placed between two vowels in ñ (Ogàdèn dialect) or ñ (Madjaríen dialect); their durative verbs are formed with the suffix -yn; they have also kept the aorismoid two "we". Hùwiya dialects change ñ intervocalic in ñ; they form their durative verbs with the infinitive mood followed by the verb ñ; they have not
the double "a". Sab dialects have changed, as we have said above, ąż into ą and in i; they have kept the modal relatives in -are, which has been changed in the jussive in -a in other Somali dialects; the negative imperative is formed by the prefix -ax- followed by the verb with the suffix -ay (in the other dialects it is used in this case the prefix ax- followed by the verb with the suffix -ax).

As to vocabulary, Somali has been very little influenced by Arabic, and even Arabic loanwords, when received, have been wholly assimilated according to Somali phonetical rules; neither had Gallal, if we consider the common origin, a great influence on Somali, except perhaps Sab dialects; we may, however, find in the Somali lexicon some evidence that the Somali and the Sidama were neighbours before the great Gallal invasion.

History. Although the native legends may have Islamicized Somali history by tracing their origin from 'Aql b. Abū Tālīb, cousin of the Prophet, and whatever may be thought — on the other side — about the question whether Hamitic populations may have come in Africa from Asia, there is however no doubt that the Somali occupied their present territory by various and subsequent invasions of groups following and pushing on each other, but all starting from the African coast of the Gulf of Aden. Thence came the Dir, expelled by other Somali invaders, and a portion of them through Ogaden and the region between Djib and Shabelle reached the low valley of the latter river giving origin to the Bimah tribe. From the Gulf of Aden came the Sab, who went first to the valley of the Djib and going down from the plateau along the valley of the Web advanced abruptly to East from the neighbourhood of Mogadishu and invaded their present countries, fighting against the Wardaj that is a Gallal tribe. From the aforesaid Northern coast departed Isak and Dārcāl to conquer their seats by driving away the Dir and the Gallal. From northern regions came the Hawiya, who at first stopped North of Harāb; while their brothers Adjaran subdued the Shabelle's valley against Gallal and Djēddu; but then the same Hawiya advanced to the river and scattered the Adjaran. Therefore we may distinguish in the history of the occupation of the Somali territory two periods: the wars against the Gallal, and then the wars among the Somalis. But a most interesting written tradition (of which I have been able to get a MS. in Arabic) tells of the war that was fought before those told in Somali legends; that is the war between the Gallal and the Wardaj (the Bantu populations) inhabiting the basin of the Djib. The series of the occupiers of Somaliland may be, of course, thus traced: Negroses (Bantu) then Kughites Gallala; then Kughites Somalial.

While these tribes successively occupied the interior, the cone along the seashore has been many centuries in close commercial relations with Arabia; this trade, which had already begun with the commercial colonies of the South Arabian kingdom (see Ḥimyar) became even more intensive in the Muslim period. Results of this Arabic colonisation were the two little states of Zaila and Maqslaha, formed and ruled generally by local dynasties of somalized Arabs or Somali strongly influenced by Arabic culture. The kingdom of Zaila, which was prospering from the ninth century A.D. could live and thrive on account of the trade of the inland, where it was supported by the many Muslim states of the Southern Abyssinia, till its strength was exhausted during the great war fought against Abyssinia under the command of Garīb (q.v.; cf. also Abūsīnīa; Harar; Zaila). Maqslaha, however, had only a short period of prosperity in the eleventh century A.D.; then almost rapidly began its decline, as its population was not able to overcome the resistance of the Somali Beduins inhabiting the interior. Through various vicissitudes Maqslaha continued to be independent under the dynasty of the Maqslaha till the sixteenth century; in the seventeenth century it was occupied by the Imam of 'Oman, who, after several years left the whole coast called Bankul with Maqslaha to its inhabitants, insisting only that they recognize him as their sovereign. When the state of Maqslaha was divided into the Sultanate of 'Oman and the Sultanate of Zanzibar (that is at the beginnings of the sixteenth century), Maqslaha was allotted to Zanzibar, and then the Salāms tried to get a more real dominion there by establishing a warm with garrisons of soldiers in Maqslaha, Marks, Bwa; but after a short period of rule (sixty years about) Zanzibar sold those towns to Italy.

Nevertheless in the interior the Somali tribes had during many centuries enjoyed a full independence. Somali traditions have not kept any remembrance of the great Gallal invasion in Abyssinia, which divided in the sixteenth century the Somali from the Sidama and separated them from those little centres of culture. There is however to be considered the hypothesis that vestiges of a culture superior to the present Somali culture which are found in some inland regions and are referred by the natives to the Adjaran or the Madinil, may have been rather the work of Somali already in close touch with the Arabs of the Southern coast rather than of natives influenced by the culture of the Sidama states of the North.

The interior of Somaliland remained thus independent till the end of the sixteenth century, when France (in 1854), Britain (in 1854), and Italy (in 1895) occupied their present Colonies.

Islam. The Somali are all Muslims and follow the madhhab of Shāhī. Neither the Imam of Maskāh nor the Salāms of Zanzibar during their short rule on the Somali coast had in any way propagated their Ibadite views among Somali peoples; therefore since the Salām's willi retired from Somaliland there has not been any reign of Ibadism. Among the Arabs recently migrated to Somaliland as soldiers (tarkāli) or workmen in European settlements there may be found a few Zaidites, who, however, generally do not publicly profess their faith.

The diversity of formation and historical vicissitudes between the populations of the seashore and those of the interior has caused also a different influence of Islam on them. The towns on the coast many centuries in touch with the Arabian centres of Islamic culture and organised as communities of tradesmen, bound together by ties of citizenship, and not by tribal relations, have been naturally more easily assimilated than the tribes of the interior independent, hostile and distrustful of the populations of the seashore, and firmly united in their large territory with the bonds of the common origin; Islamic propaganda has been
The Somali names of the Heaven-God (Eebba and Haa) are now applied to Allah; even the heathen genius’ name (gul; Galla; balle; Amharic: gol) is used in modern dialects to mean “fortune”.

An even more strong reluctance has been opposed to Islam by Somali customary law, which is based on a social stage very similar to pre-Islamic Arabian life and is therefore often in evident contrast to the Muslim law. We may quote here the characteristic precepts about the levirate and the price to be paid by the widow to the late husband’s relatives if she desires to marry again with a man other than the brother of the dead (it is, however, to be remarked that, by the Somali, the sons of the second husband, brother of the dead, are not considered as sons of the first and continuation of his progeny as is the case with the Semites; but on the contrary the first husband’s offspring is regarded as sons of the second); the marriage by rape; the blood-money conceived in the Somali mind as a price of redemption of the killer from a right that the crime causes the killed man’s relatives to have on the killer’s person ex delicto; the women excluded from hereditary rights; the outcast groups into which one cannot marry or come in any way in contact with, as they are said to be in a perpetual condition of ritual impurity (miliga) (note the skilful imitation of the ancient custom); customs which may be still found in Northern tribes and the remarkable traces of marriages concluded between two tribes rather than single persons.

On the coast, however, in the centres of Muslim culture, particularly after the recent increase of trade in the second half of the sixteenth century, Muslim scholars’ works formed a little local literature written in Arabic specially on mystic subjects. The principal printed works are: al-Majmu’a al-Mudrabah by Sheikh Abdallah b. Yusauf, a native of the Shakah group, who has had his work printed in Cairo; and the Majmu’a al-Ka’id by Sheikh Khais b. Mahdi ‘I-Din, a native of Brava (Barawa). The latter work is only a collection of poems of many Somali authors; al-Majmu’a al-Mudrabah however is formed by five treatises by Sheikh Abdallahi about the fanumus, but its real interest is placed in the third and fourth treatises entitled the former. al-Silkin al-Dhabihah ala ‘I-Kitab al-Nabiha, “the knife that slaughters the barking dogs”, and the latter Nasr al-Munimin ala ‘I-Murad al-Muhillin, “Victory of the believers on the rebellion of the heretics”, which contain violent polemics against the Tantuq Shiiyita. Another distinguished Somali scholar was Shihgh Aweis [Uways] Muhammad al-Baraw, who besides two poems published in the aforesaid Majmu’a al-Ka’id composed five poems in Somali language which he was the only one to write in the Arabic alphabet; one of these poems is directed against the Mad Malla’s followers. We must also mention Sheikh Abd al-Rahman al-Zaali, who wrote many mystic poems in Arabic (the most diffuse is the Siraj al-Takfi wa l-Siraj al-Tawassul bi-Shaikh ‘Abd al-‘Abdurrahman b. ‘Abdallahi, a native of the Shashu group in Maghribi and commonly known as Shikh Siit; he is the author of the Shahjara al-Yaftin, “the tree of the certitude” or al-Nubahah.)
al-yâhun fû Maqâmih bâhur al-Bâriyya, "the certain portion of the miracles of the Best, among the creatures", published in al-Madîrijûna al-Mudârâka and very popular in Somali schools of mysticism.

A MS. found in Brawa contains a translation of the Ḥamīṣta by al-Bûṣrî in Sahālii verses. It is very probable that further researches may cause other more ancient MS. or Arabo-Somali documents to be found.

Four Muslim brotherhoods are found in Somaliland: the Kâdiriya (see 'ABD AL-KADEM AL-DULÎ or GILÊN); the Ahmadiyya, that is the followers of the mystic rule of Ahmad b. Idris, died in the first half of the sixteenth century at Šâbâ in 'Asir; the Šâlîyya, which is a more recent branch of the Ahmadiyya (its founder and leader was Muḥammad Šâlîb, who had his seat in Makka and had been a disciple of the Sudanese mystic İbrahîm al-Raḫîrî, disciple of Ahmad b. Idris); the Rifâyta following the precepts of Sayyid Ahmad al-Rifâyî. The Kâdiriya, which has among its adherents almost all the scholars mentioned above as authors of mystic works, is the most learned and modernized Somali brotherhood; it has only few settlements and has no economic organisation, but it is more devoted to teaching than to agriculture. The Kâdiriya in Somaliland have been for many years separated from the Šâlîyya by a schism; firstly the polemics had been directed by the Kâdiriya against the Mad Mulla, who had begun his campaigns by proclaiming himself to be a true follower of Muḥammad Šâlîb (see the art. MUḤAMMAD B. 'ABDALLAH HAŠÇAN); and caused Šâlîb Awdâ b. Muḥammad al-Barîstî to be killed by the Mulla's followers in 1327 (1999). The polemics began again, although in a less rough way, after the publication of Šâlîb Ibn 'Abd'allah's book (al-Madîrijûna al-Mudârâka) and a poem of Šâlîb Khâim Mahły ʿI-Dîn al-Barîstî, where the Šâlîyya were offended by the refrain lâkum dinukum maw-tî dîtî! The Šâlîyya, on the contrary, have been particularly occupied with obtaining political influence over the tribes and forming, specially on the banks of the rivers, an organisation of agricultural communities. The Mulla's movement, the rebellion of Sayyid Muḥammad Yâsen against Abyssinia in Wel's valley in 1917 were led by Šâlîyya leaders. On the other side the "black lands" along the Sha'bâ's valley, the best for agriculture but formerly undervalued by Somali Bedouins only applied to cattle rearing; were in many territories the goal of the Šâlîyya's aim and they were skillful enough to take advantage of contests between the tribes or other political circumstances and thus they have tried to get granted to them by the tribes the best zones for agriculture. The Ahmadiyya are less numerous and have been directed like the Šâlîyya to acquire lands, although they generally take more interest in teaching than the Šâlîyya. While the Kâdiriya and the Ahmadiyya have not a true hierarchical organisation, the Šâlîyya are in Italian Somaliland led by the chief of the Šâlîyya Miṣrâb (in the middle of Sha'bâ's valley), who is the vicer of Muḥammad Šâlîb in the whole region.

the same name was retained to describe the kingdom thus enlarged and all its inhabitants, as well as the language spoken by the majority of them, the language of Dyenné, of Timbuktu, of Gao, of Dendi and of the land of the Zerma or Djerrma.

The state of Songhay is said to have been founded in the 11th century A.D. by an individual of Berber origin, whose dynasty ruled at first at Gungiya or Kukiya in the island of Bentia, 100 miles below Gao until about the year 1000, then at Gao itself or Gagoting. The princes of the dynasty bore the title *gu* or *ga* until 1335, and then that of *sonni*, *jami*, *kair*, or *lo*. It is said that the founder of the dynasty, called Alyamada, was a Christian. The first of his successors to adopt Islam was the *gu* Kosoy or Kosay, who reigned in the 12th century, about the time when the capital was transferred to Gao.

In 1325 Songhay was annexed to the Mandingo or Mali empire, the ruler of which at that time was celebrated Gogone MUSA or Kankan MUSA. The latter, returning in this year from his pilgrimage to Mecca, went to Gao and there received the homage of his new vassal, the *gu* Assiyou or Alhaby, whose two sons he brought back to his court as hostages. One of the latter, Ali-Kolun, later escaped from the Mali capital and returning to Gao had himself proclaimed king there with the title of *sonni* (1335).

In 1464 (or 1465) there came to the throne another *sonni*. Ali, called *Ali Ber* (Ali the Great), who delivered Songhay from Mandingo suzerainty and considerably extended its boundaries below and especially above Gao, capturing Timbuktu in 1468 and Dyenné in 1473. We may regard him as the original founder of the enlarged Songhay which through him rose from a little vassal kingdom to a powerful empire. But he did not leave a good reputation behind him in the country; the chroniclers of Timbuktu accuse him of having been cruel, impious and a libertine, and of having persecuted men of learning and religion, although, nominally at least, a Muslim himself. He died in 1492, being accidentally drowned in a torrent. With his son and successor Bakari or Baré, who only reigned a few months, the line of al-Yaman died out in 1493, after having been on the throne for about nine centuries.

Ali Ber's best general, a Sarakolle of the Silla faction named Muhammad Ture, seized the throne in 1493 and founded a new dynasty, that of the *askiya*. It was in his reign, a particularly brilliant one, that Songhay attained its apogee. Superficially a convert to Islam but tolerant to those who were still pagans, the *askiya* Muhammad made the pilgrimage to Mecca in 1496/1497; in the course of his journey he made the acquaintance of people of eminence like al-Suyuti, whose advice he sought and in the holy city, on the proposal of the *Abbasid* Caliph of Egypt, made a pilgrimage to Mecca in 1496/1497. On his return to Gao he was received by the Grand Shariif Mulay al-'Abbas as investiture as *khilafa* for the lands of Takrir (i.e. of the Sudân). The Grand Shariif even sent to Gao one of his nephews named Ahmed al-Sakhat. The celebrated reformation of Tlemcen, al-Meghassy, was in constant correspondence with the *askiya* Muhammad, whom he even went to visit at Gao in 1502. This prince by a series of successful expeditions extended his conquests to the lower Senegal, in the west to Air, and to the frontiers of Bornu in the east, and to Segu in the south; Songhay assumed the place previously occupied in the western Sudân by the Mali empire. At the same time he organised his country in a remarkable way, creating a permanent army, a flotilla of supply-ships on the Niger, a system of taxation and payments in kind to fill the public treasury, and instituting military, political and administrative offices with well defined spheres of activity, provincial governments, magistrates and a police. With all his power and by every means, he protected scholars and learned men, heaping favours and honours upon them and encouraged the opening of schools in Timbuktu, which became a real intellectual centre and a noted home of Muslim culture.

Unfortunately this able sovereign's successors were mediocrés and sometimes detestable. Becoming blind, he was dethroned in 1528 or 1529 by his own son MUSA, later interned by his nephew Benga Koria in 1531 on an island in the Niger, and died miserably in 1535. Eight rulers occupied the throne of Gao from 1528 or 1529 to 1653. They were for the most part cruel, selfish and debauched, occupied in murdering one another or in satisfying their cupidity and passions; they soon allowed the great work accomplished by the founder of their dynasty to fall to pieces. Only one, the *askiya Daoud* (1549—1553) one of the sons of Muhammad, tried to stop the decline begun by his brothers and cousins. It only became more rapid after him.

On this, the Saltan of Morocco, Ahmad al-Mansur al-Dhahabi, desirous of gaining possession of the salt-mines of Taghasa, then the property of Songhay, and of gaining the gold of the Sudân and his treasure, sent against Gao in 1550 an expedition of 3,000 men, mostly Spanish renegades, under the Pasha Djiedere. This expedition lost on the way from hunger, thirst and exhaustion two thirds of its effectives; but with the thousand soldiers that remained, who had the advantage of fire-arms, Djiedere defeated without difficulty on March 12, 1551 at Tondibi, a little north of Gao some 40,000 infantry and foot-soldiers, armed only with javelins, arrows, sword and lances, who formed the army of the last *askiya*, Ishayi. Djiedere then entered Gao without striking a blow, made his headquarters at Timbuktu where he installed an *askiya*, chosen by himself who was a mere puppet in his hands. The region below Gao, which the Moroccan troops could not subdue, remained independent and formed a little kingdom called Dendi, governed by *askiya*'s of the line of Mahammod. But the state of Songhay had ceased to exist. If we reckon its definite foundation to date from the *sonni* Ali Ber, it had lasted 127 years (1465—1591).

(MAURICE DELAFOSSE)

SOSO — or *Soo* according to the Malinke pronunciation — is the name of a place in the French Sudân, 125 miles N. N. E. of Bamako, once the capital of a kingdom inhabited and ruled by Sarakolles. The kingdom of *Soo* was originally a dependency of the famous Ghana empire. It became independent, towards the end of the 16th century, this empire broke up after its capital had been taken by the Almoravids (1076). The dynasty, then ruling at *Soo*, belonged to the Sarakolle Muslim family, that of the Djariss. It was overthrown about 1180 by a soldier, also a Sarakolle but a pagan, a member of the caste.
of smiths called Djàra Kante. His successor, called Sumanguru (Sumahoro) Kante, considerably increased the hitherto slight prestige of the kingdom of Soso, by adding to it several provinces, north and south of its old frontiers, notably Wagadu and Baghane, which contained Kumbu, the capital of the old Ghana empire and Manding or Mali, lying on either side of the Upper Niger above Bamako. It was in 1203, according to Ibn Khaldun, that the Soso army took the capital of Ghana. An erroneous interpretation of the text of Ibn Khaldun, has sometimes attributed this conquest to the people of Soso or Soso, who have always lived in Futa-Djallon [q.v.] or on its western slopes, at least 350 miles S.W. of Soso and who have nothing in common with this town except a quite fortuitous similarity of name. The king of Soso, who was a pagan, persecuted the Muslims of Ghana; the latter to escape his exactions migrated about 1224 to Fura or Walla, which they made a centre of Muslim life. It was after taking Kumbu that Sumanguru Kante undertook and achieved the conquest of Manding. A tradition records that he put to death, almost as soon as they succeeded to the throne, eleven kings of Manding from 1224 to about 1230. But he met with fierce opposition, from the twelfth, called Mari-Djata by Ibn Khaldun and known throughout the western Sudan under the name of Sun-Djata or Son-Djata, who belonged to the family of the Keyta. This prince succeeded in raising numerous followers not only in Manding, but also in the adjoining provinces, which like his own country, were eager to escape the sanguinary tyranny of the king of Soso and he marched against the latter. The two armies met near the Niger at Kita, not far from Kullikoro, about 1235. According to the story, Sun-Djata disposed of his adversary by shooting him with an arrow pointed with the spur of a white cock, the tome (tumbe) of Sumanguru. The latter, pierced by the arrow, vanished from sight or was turned into a rock, which is still pointed out, commanding the village of Kullikoro. In any case, Sun-Djata liberated the Manding from the bondage of Soso, conquered the town, and all the country of which it was the capital, and extended his conquests northwards, as far as the ancient capital of Ghana, which he captured about 1240 and destroyed completely; he thus substituted the hegemony of Manding or Mali for the ephemeral hegemony of the state of Soso.

(Maurice Delafosse)

SPAHL. [See Sepoy.]
SPARTEL, a cape forming the extreme N.W. point of Morocco and of Africa, 7° or 8° S. the west of Tangier. Al-Idrisi does not mention it; al-Bakri knows of it as a hill jutting out into the sea, 39 miles from Arrilla and 4 from Tangier, which has springs of fresh water and a mosque and is called a ribat. Opposite it on the coast of Andalusia is the mountain of al-Agharr (Turf al-Agharr > Tafalgar). The name Ishhartal (probably connected with the Latin spartael = places overgrown with esparto) given by al-Bakri is not known to the natives.

Bibliography: al-Bakri, Description de l'Afrique Septentrionale, Algiers 1917, p. 113.
(G. S. Colin)

ŚRI WIDJAYA. [See Wàdcag.]
ŚU (v.), water; fluid; a decoction, e.g. of aloes.

SUAHILI. [See Zanzibar.]
SU is an Arabic substantival from the verbal root suha, yahuha ("it poured forth"); meaning primarily a collection, or heap of wheat, dates, earth, etc. In the reign of Akbar it was adopted as the official description of the great provinces of India, to which historians had previously applied such words as zebib, kâtipa, etc. Akbar's empire consisted at first of twelve and finally of fifteen suhar, named either from their capitals, as in the case of Dihl, Agra, and Khásahd, or from the old names of the tracts which they covered, as in the case of the Pandh, Bangâl, Barâ, Malwa, and Gondârat. After Awrangzib's conquest of Bidjâpur and Gulkunda, when the empire of the Timurids reached its greatest extent, other suhars were added. By the English the word has often been wrongly applied to the governor of a suha. The error seems to have arisen from the designation dhib, meaning "lord of a province", and synonymous with suhar (q.v.), in which the first word has apparently been mistaken for a purely honorific title.


SÚBADÁR, the governor of a province, or suha (q.v.). It was Akbar who first regularly divided the empire into provinces, styled suhatar, but in his reign the title suhador was not in use, and the governor of a province is styled suhatar (commander-in-chief) in the Akbari.

His successors employed the term suhador or suhâr al-suha (lord of a province), but the use of these titles was neither uniform nor consistent. The governor or viceroy of the Dakkan is usually styled suhador, but the governors of Awadh and Bengal are more often styled nawâr ahad and mowâdah-nagin in the eighteenth century. Europeans, as Orme, himself an offender, remarks, once called a suhador; the error is undoubtedly the form zebib-suha, the first part of which was mistaken for a purely honorific title. The title suhador seems also to have been applied by Europeans to inferior officials, such as the governors of towns or districts (zarkhâr).

The title suhadar has also been applied, since the formation of a native army in India, to the chief Indian officer of a company of sepoyos (q.v.) or a troop of regular, but not irregular, cavalry; under the original constitution of such companies or troops its actual captain. This use of the title, and its former application to civil officials, are perhaps due to the habit of mind, common in India, which seeks to please by conferring complimentary titles upon inconsiderable persons, but etymologically zhaba may be as correctly applied to a company as to a province.

SUBAṬILA (Šešṭla or Šeaṭšla, ancient Sefutula), a town in Tunisia at a distance of 81 miles southwest of Kairouan and 57 miles southeast of Tebessa, in the centre of a large plain on a plateau to the east of which lies Wādī Šešṭila. The ancient town has been often described, notably by Guérin, Tissot, Diehl and Merlin. In the history of Muslim Africa it is only mentioned in the period of the conquest and its importance cannot be ascertained sufficiently. In A.H. 26 (646/647) an army of 20,000 soldiers commanded by Abū ʿAbd Allāh b. Saʿd marched by Byzantine patrikios Djuḏurj (Gregorios) at the head of 120,000 men before Subaṭila. According to al-Baladūrī, however, the battle took place at Aṯrūb. The year before, Djuḏurj had declared himself independent from the Emperor of Constantinople (Theophanes, ed. Bout, i. 525) and, according to some authors, he had chosen Subaṭila as his capital. The battle was won by the Muslims; Djuḏurj was killed and Subaṭila sacked or placed under a Muslim governor.

The detailed accounts of the Arabic authors, especially those of Ibn Ḥubbār and Nawair, are full of legendary features; Djuḏurj’s daughter appears unveiled at the top of a tower and is promised to him who will kill Ibn Saʿd. The role described to Abū ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Zubair seems to have been intentionally accentuated. It is he who takes the direction of the battle; fortuitously he kills Djuḏurj with his own hand; with great discretion he conceals his gallant deed and is chosen to report the tidings to the caliph. It is equally improbable that the patrikios should have chosen Subaṭila instead of Carthage as his capital. The Muslim chroniclers, who did not possess reliable sources for the history of North Africa, are inclined to represent the capital of the country to have surrendered at the first blow. It may be admitted, however, that the patrikios had occupied, on the first appearance of the Muslim troops, this important point at one of the main ways from the South, in order to come in touch with the native populations whom he sought to win (Diehl) as well as to protect Tunisia, then a fertile and populous country. It is certain that at the end of the 7th century Subaṭila was a very fortified post. It was defended by a number of fortifications built around a central point, which was formed itself by the enclosure of the three temples of the Capitol.


SU BASHI, ancient military title in countries of Turkish civilization. Although later popular etymology has always regarded the first element as the word με, “water,” this interpretation is probably erroneous. In old Eastern Turkish this word was very possibly taken from Chinese signified army “water,” and so “su-bashi” therefore meant commander of the army (cf. Maḥmūd Kāshghari, Divān Lughaṭ al-Turk, iii. 156; Houtsma, Ein türkisch-arabisches Glossar, Leyden 1884, p. 14, 30). It is not surprising, however, that this title has been connected with the word designating water, because in practice the responsibility for keeping the waters for irrigation in repair was often in the hands of a very influential functionary (cf. al-Maqrīzī, p. 330 who says that the amir having charge of the waters of Merw had 10,000 men in his service). And in Turkestan, as in Asia Minor, there have always been officials in control of the irrigation (see Skrine and Ross, The Heart of Asia, London, 1899, p. 337; and for Asia Minor Ahmad Raki, Sebili, Constantinople 1924, p. 108). But these functionaries have always called themselves mir-i-ah and never mu-bashi. There is also an Arab expansion of the title, deriving it from the Arabic word ibīr “evil.” Thus Muḥammad Ḥāfṣ, in his al-Durar al-ma’nāthibat al-mantuhāra fî tātib al-ghalibat al-ma-zāhirā, p. 260, declares mu-bashi to be a translation of the Persian ser-bakh (see also von Hammer, Staatsverfassung, l. 121).

Su Bashi became a very well known military and police title in the Ottoman empire, but it was found in Asia Minor as early as the times of the Seljūqs. In the 11th century Ibn Bibi (Houtsma, Recueil de l. ref. à l’hist. des Selj., v. 210) speaks of a mu-bashi of the town of Kharpūt [q.v.], who was probably under the sultan of Konya. Every town of any importance had a mu-bashi; when Ḫūṣān took possession of his first capital Karaja Hijār, one of his first acts was to appoint as mu-bashi his cousin Alp Gündüz (Tanzūrî-ki-i ʿeh-līn, ed. Giese, p. 7; Uṣūl Ḳeg, ed. Babinger, p. 12).

As the Ottoman supremacy became confirmed, a differentiation of the functions and the position of the mu-bashi in the provinces and in the capital was introduced. In the provinces they obtained a position in the feudal organisation, which also proved the military origin of their functions. The mu-bashi had their own ûsil (fīrūz) and they exercised police control over the other sipahi and the inhabitants of the district under their charge. Administratively they were under the authority of an alay-beg, who again was subject to the Sanjak-Beg [see. SINDI]. These su-bashís had many privileges, which varied according to the different provinces: they had the right to a certain amount of the imposts and the fines extorted from the people (see Kāraba-nâm-i ʿeh-līn, ed. Arfī Bey, Constantinople 1330, appendix to Nūm. 13 and 14 of T. O. E. M., p. 28).

In the capital the su-bashi became one of the chief officers of police, who assisted the Ǧaḥn Bashi, whose function is most likely that of minister of Police. With the Muḥirr (Muḥīr) Aga and the ʿAss Bashi he was responsible for the carrying out of all the judicial sentences and in general for obedience to the police regulations in the capital. Besides this title of su-bashi is used to designate a certain military rank in the cavalry corps of the ʿUffādālī.

Bibliography: Ricaut, Enl ordre du l’Empire Ottoman, Paris 1670, p. 345; von Hammer, Des osmanischen Reiches Staatsverfassung und Staatsverwaltung, i. 370; ii. 121;
SUBHĀ (S., also pronounced ṣubha), also pronounced ṣubha, the rosary, which at present is used by nearly all classes of Muslims, except the Wahhabis who disapprove of it as a ḫidr. There is evidence for its having been used at first in ṣūfī circles and among the lower classes (Goldziher, Rosairt, p. 296); opposition against it made itself heard as late as the xvi century A.D. when Sayyid composed an apology for it (Goldziher, Verleihungen über den Islam, 1st ed., p. 165). At present it is usually carried by the pilgrims (cf. Met, Die Renaissance des Islam, p. 441) and the darwishes.

The rosary consists of three groups of beads made of wood, bone, mother of pearl, etc. The groups are separated by two transversal beads of a larger size (imān), while a much larger piece serves as a kind of handle (yad); Snouck Hurgronic in Int. Arch. f. Ethnographie, 1884, p. 154 and plate xiv No. 12). The number of beads within each group varies (e.g. 33 + 33 + 34 or 33 + 33 + 34); in the latter case the imān and the yad are reckoned as beads. The total number of a hundred is in accordance with the number of Allah and his 99 beautiful names. The rosary serves for the enumeration of these names; but it is also used for the counting of eulogies, ḥikāʾs and the formulas at the end of the ṣalāt. Lane (Manners and Customs, Register) makes mention of a ṣubha consisting of a thousand beads used in funeral ceremonies for the thrice one thousand repetitions of the formula Lā ilāha illa 'llāh. 

Masāḥib (plur. of masahaba) are mentioned as early as the year 800 A.D. (cf. A. Met, Die Renaissance des Islam, p. 318). Goldziher (Verleihungen, p. 165) thinks it certain that the rosary came from India to Western Asia. Still, Goldziher himself has pointed to traditions mentioning the use of small stones, date-kernels, etc. for counting eulogies such as ṣābhir, ṣābhir, ṣubha.

From such traditions the following may be mentioned: *on the authority of Saʿd b. Abī Waqās ... that he accompanied the Apostle of Allāh who went to visit a woman, who counted her eulogies by means of kernels or small stones lying before her. He said to her: Shall I tell you what is easier and more profitable? "Glory to Allāh" according to the number of what he has created in the earth; "glory to Allāh" according to what he has created in the heaven; "glory to Allāh" according to the number of what is between these; "glory to Allāh" according to what he will create. And in the same way Allāh akbar, al-hamdu lillāh and *there is no might nor power except in Allāh* (Abū Dāūd, Waṭr, bāh 24; Tirmidhi, Deʿawāt, bāh 113)." 

The tendency of this tradition is elucidated by the following one: Ṣafiya said: the Apostle of Allāh entered while there were before me four thousand kernels which I used in reciting eulogies. I said: I use them in reciting eulogies. He answered: I will teach thee a still larger number. Say: "Glory to Allāh" according to the number of what he has created (Tirmidhi, Deʿawāt, bāh 103). To a different practice points the tradition according to which the Apostle of Allāh *counted the taḥālīf* (Naṣār, Sahī, bāh 97). The verb used here is *aḥāda*; its being translated *to count* is based upon the fact that the lexicons give it among others this meaning. Probably this is based in its turn upon traditions like the one just mentioned, and like the following: *The Apostle of Allāh said to us (the women of al-Madina): Pray five taḥālīf, taḥālīf and taḥālīf, and count these eulogies on your fingers, for these will count to give account!* (Abū Dāūd, Waṭr, bāh 24; Tirmidhi, Deʿawāt, bāh 120). According to Goldziher, in these traditions the counting of eulogies on the fingers is contrasted with their being counted by means of stones etc. There is, however, a tradition that makes it a matter of doubt whether Allāh in connections like those mentioned has always the meaning of counting and not its proper sense of tying. I have in view a tradition preserved by Ibn Saʿd (viii. 348) according to which Fātimah bint Ḥusain used to say eulogies aided by threads in which she made knots (bī-khāyāl māʿūn fī ṣūḥ). The term ṣubha does not occur in classical tradition in the meaning of rosary; it is often used in the sense of supererogatory ṣalāt, e.g. wāḥidat al-ṣubha (Muslim, Mutawāfūrūn, trad. 81). Al-Nawawī explains the term by nāḥā (Commentary on Muslim's Sahih, Cairo 1285, ii. 204). Ibn al-Athīr, Niḥaysa, s.v. asks how it is that the ideas of nāḥā and ṣubha coincide. He answers: Eulogies (taḥālīf) are supererogatory additions to the obligatory ṣalāt's. So supererogatory ṣalāt's came to be called ṣubha.

If Ibn al-Athīr's opinion is right, the semiological evolution of ṣubha took two directions:

- supererogatory eulogies in ṣalāt
- supererogatory ṣalāt


(A. J. Wensinck)

**SUBHĀN ALLĀH** (Ar. *praise to Allāh*), a religious formula, frequent in the Qurʾān. It is an accusative of exclamation from a root which does not occur in Arabic (the verb sabha is rightly explained by the grammarians as derived from the noun), but which goes back as a loan-word to Aramaic and was also adopted in Hebrew and Ethiopic, viz.: ṣebaḥ "to praise." Muḥammad probably found the expression somewhere among the possessors of a scripture*, as it is not probable that he himself should have created such a form from a non-Arabic verb. It is also evidence of an extensive use of the word that subḥān is found in a verse of al-ʾAʾrān without a genitive with a following min as an exclamation of surprise (Ibn Yāqīn, ed. Jahn, p. 43, p. 148, etc.). As a regular formula in the Qurʾān it is placed in the mouth of Moses (vii. 140), Jesus (v. 116), the blessed in Paradise (x. 10) and the angels (li. 30; cf. xxvii. 38). It is used on different occasions to express the impression made upon the speaker by Allāh's overwhelming greatness and His wonderful deeds. Thus: *Praise be to him who made his servant travel in the night* (xvii. 1),
"Praise be to Him, who has subjected all this to us" (xlii. 12), "who created the pairs" (xxxvi. 36), "in whose hand is rule over everything" (xxxvi. 83), "Praise be to Allah (i.e. praise ye him) morning and evening" (xxx. 16); when the pious hear the recital of the Qur'an they fall upon their faces and say "Praise our Lord!" (xlvii. 108); it is also found in a confession of wrongdoing: "Praise be to Allah, we have done wrong" (Ixxvii. 17). As an expression of Allah's absolute superiority and perfection, it is specially used, when anything is rejected than which Allah is greater, and which would injure his nature (cf. xvii. 45 where it is connected with ta'allu'um). The thing rejected is often introduced with tawٰ (xvi. 22; xxix. 67; lii. 43; lxxvi. 23). Thus Muhammad is fond of using the formula when in the meccan Suras he is combatting the worship of other gods than Allah as blasphemous (ix. 31; xii. 108; xvi. 5; xxvii. 45 etc.) or when he is filled with horror at the idea that God should have a son (ii. 110; iv. 169; v. 116; xxxiv. 6; xliii. 82) or sons and daughters (vi. 100; xvi. 59; lxxvii. 157, 180). It is in a similar connection that the pious say "Thou hast not created the world in vain (sabilu'um), subhanaka (how much thou art raised above it! lit. 188) or that Musa recognizes that God cannot be seen (vii. 140) or that Muhammad turns aside the demand of his countrymen for miracles by saying he is only a man and a messenger (xxvii. 95). In this way the expression may be weakened to mean almost "God forbid!" (xlvii. 13).

The derivative suhba^kha early came to mean "to pray", especially of the supererogatory prayers: suhba^k for e.g. Hasan b. Thabit in Detectus, Ixxvii. 14 (not in Hirschfeld); cf. Lane, Lexicon.

(F. H. Buhl)

SUBHÎ MUHAMMAD, Turkish historiographer. He was born at the beginning of the xvth century (the date is unknown) as son of Beyhâkî Khalîf Fehmi Efendi. He entered upon a long administrative career, beginning with the office of âdwan kâtibî. Soon after, before 1150/1737, he was appointed wa^f a-wurâs as successor to Shâkir Husein Bey and he combined this position with other functions till the end of the year 1156 (Feb. 1744) when he was appointed beyhâkî. The wa^f a-wurâs was then given into the charge of Sulaimân İzzat [q. v.]; Subhi Efendi died in Safr 1183 (June 1769). His Tu'rîs was printed in Constantinople, together with those of his two predecessors Sûrî and Shâkir in 1198/1785; the last year of which he wrote the chronicle was 1196. His Turkish biographers commend him for his style and his poems.


(J. H. Kramers)

AL-SUBKI, Nîsha from the place Subhî in the district of the mamlîk, district of Mamîs, Memphis ("Ali Pasha Mûbârak, al-Khît aÂlîjia, Imla 1195, xii. 7).

A. The ūlî family of scholars al-Subkî (the numbers beside certain persons in the family tree refer to the descriptions which follow) for the whole cf. F. Wüstefeld, Die Academien der Araber und ihre Lehrer, p. 119).

1. Sâdr al-Dîn Abû Zakariya Yâhûdî, Khâtîf of al-Mâqâm and later Professor at Cairo, died 725 (Academic, No. 183).

2. Ta'āfi al-Dîn Abû l-Fâlîh Mûhammad, b. 704, Professor at Cairo and Damascus, d. 744; wrote a Tu'rîs; his correspondence Ahlwardt, No. 8471, 24 (Academic, No. 97; al-Khît aÂlîjia, xii. 8).

3. Bahâ' al-Dîn Abû l-Bakrî Mûhammad, b. 708, Professor, Khâtîf and Hakim in Damascus and Cairo, Wâlî of the Sa'dîn and Khâtîf of the Umairiy mosque in Damascus, d. 777; three unfinished writings (Academic, No. 52; al-Khît aÂlîjia, xii. 8).

4. Wâlî al-Dîn Abû Dâr 'Abdallâh, b. 735,

Professor, Khâtîf, Khâtîf and financial officer in Damascus, d. 785 (Academic, No. 98).

5. Bâd al-Dîn Abû 'Abdallâh Mûhammad, b. 747, Professor, Muftî and Khâtîf at Cairo, Damascus etc., Khâtîf at the Umairiy mosque; unpopular on account of the influence he allowed his son Djalal al-Dîn to exercise over his affairs, d. 802 or 803 (Academic, No. 531; al-Khît aÂlîjia, xii. 8).

6. Shâhî l-Islâm Ta'âfi al-Dîn Abû l-Hassan 'Ali, b. 683, studied in Cairo principally, Professor, Muftî and Khâtîf at Cairo and Damascus, Hakim at Damascus, Khâtîf at the Umairiy mosque, d. 756; produced more than 150 works, of which the following may be mentioned with a view to corrections to the list of those still extant by Brockelmann, G. L. E., ii. 87 sq.: 3) printed at Halâdashî 1315, Bulât l1318; 12) also Ahlwardt, No. 9599; 16) that of a Kitâb also in Ahlwardt, No. 8482, fol. 41v; 18) Answers to legal questions, Ahlwardt, No. 5026, 1: 19) al-Durr al-nâmî as Taťâr al-Kâ'nî al-aÂlîjia (unfinished); 20) Taťâr as uayhâ 'l-Rasulîn ku lî min al-Târijîlî as sîyâh (Kûnî, xxii. 53); 21) al-târîkhîs as Shârî Mînkâhî (Brockelmann, l. c. 395, l. 12 [not quite correct] unfinished; cf. below, No. 7, 22) a commentary on al-Mukhâshâh of al-Shirâzî unfinished; cf. Brockelmann, l. c. 387, 9, 1); 23) al-Râjî as-lâri as Shârî Mûhînî as-Tîrijî (Brockelmann, l. c. 393, 24); 24) Raj as Shâhî as Malâkat al-Târijî; 25) 26) al-Dur as-dâdat as Shâhî as-Mâmîs, al-Kâ al-Târijî; 26) 27) al-Dur as-dâdat as Shâhî as-Mâmîs; 27) Mu'ayn at-Fâlîs as mû'ah Dânî l-Wâlîs; 28) al-iyâd as-âlîjia as-umâd al-Hâris; 29) al-Sâkî al ra'îsî as bâd Dânî al-Ghârib; 30) al-Ghârib mish Mîhîrî as-Mâqâm; 31) ar-Râjî as-Mûhînî as part al-dâdat u'l-pîmâl; 32) al-Kâ al-Târijî as-Târijî; 33) al-Kâ al-Nâmî al-sanûfî as l-Mukhâshâ as-Mînkâhî; 34) al-Tarîkî as-ru'fî as l-Mukhâshâ as-Mînkâhî; 35) al-Nurmî as l-Kâ'ashî as-wâdîjîn as-Tâmâbî; 36) al-Târijî as-dâdat as l-Nâmî; 37) al-Kâ al-mahîmâ as-Tâmâbî as-ru'fî as-Tâmâbî; 38) as-ru'fî as-shâ'arî as Bâlîkî; 39) al-Târijî as-lâmî as-dâdat al-Ismâî; 40) Hakâm as-ru'fî as-lâmî as-dâdat al-Ismâî; 41) al-Târijî as-ru'fî as-mâmîs; 42) al-Fâlî al-Tâmâbî; 43) al-Dur as-dâdat al-Ismâî as-Tâmâbî; 44) al-iyâd as-âlîjia as-umâd al-Hâris; 45) jîlî as-Nâmî as-sâlî as-râjî as-Tâmâbî; 46) many of his shorter writings are in the collection of his Fu'ad (Academic, No. 49; al-Khît aÂlîjia, xii. 7); Hâdji Khalîfî, ed. Flügel, Index, No. 8265; Brockelmann, ii. 86, 9 in which there is an even longer list of literature; complete biography in the Tabakh of his son [here No. 9].
7. Baha' al-Din Abu Hmaid Almrad, b. 719, Professor, Mufti and Kadi in Cairo and Damascus, d. in Mecca 7731; wrote 1) an unfinished commentary on al-MMadi di al-Kawin (cf. Brockleman, i. 394, 29, i); 2) a supplement to the unfinished commentary on the Minhadii-commentary of his father (see above, No. 6, 21); 3) Dhar al-Tanind (or al-Munhsndard) (Hadjjl Khalifa, ed. Flugel, vi. 157); 4) Arus al-Afrab fi Sharh Tahtat al-Misn (cf. Brockelman, i. 295, 10); 5) an unfinished commentary on Muhshirat of the K'diya of Ibn al-Hadji from al-Baaijawi (cf. Brockleman, i. 305, 6); 6) a Kadda on the meaning of the word 'Amin (Ahwardi, No. 7065, 1 as also in 6973, 3 and in 7334); 7) a niddle-poem on the Nile (with the answer of Shalih al-Din al-Safad [Brockleman, ii. 31, 3] thereupon: Ahwardi, No. 7866, 1 also in 6114); 8) another poem by him Ahwardi, No. 8471, 28; 9) writings addressed to him Ahwardi, No. 7869 and 8471; 24 (Academi, No. 50; al-Khafat al-didata, xii. 8; Hadjl Khalifa, ed. Flugel, Index, No. 1899).

THE SUBKI FAMILY


Yahya (1)

Abd al-Latif

Said b. 'Ali

Abi Muhammad

Abd al-Barr

Muhammad (2)

Abd Allah (4)

Zain al-Din

Abd Muhammad

Abd al-Kafi

(d. 735)

Abd (6)

Ahmad (7)

Abd al-Hasan (8)

Abd al-Munshid (9)

Muhammad (5)

Muhammad (10)

8. Ijma'il al-Din Abu 'l-Tayib al-Husain, b. 722, Professor in Cairo and Damascus, in the latter previously also deputy Kadi; d. 755, probably to his father; wrote a book on people with the name of al-Husain b. 'Ali (Hadjjl Khalifa, ed. Flugel, v. 159); his correspondence Ahwardi, No. 8471, 24 (Academii, No. 73; Ahwardi, al-Khafat al-didata, xii. 8).

9. Tadj al-Din Abu Nasr 'Abd al-Wahhab, b. 727 (or 728 or 729), Professor, Mufti, Kadi and Hakin in Damascus and Cairo, Khatib of the Umaiyyad mosque; in 769 he was thrown into prison for about 60 days, but was able to re-habilitate himself; d. 771 of the plague. To Brockelmann's list of his surviving works, ii. 89 sq., should be added: 1) Ahwardi, No. 4401 is autograph from 762; the commentary of al-Zarkaht also Ahwardi, No. 4402; printed with the commentary by al-Mahalli and the super-commentary by al-Buni also Bultak 1297 and 1801, with the same commentary and the Tahtat of 'Abd al-Rahman al-Sharbatay (Cairo 1309 and 1318); ed. D. W. Mynheer, Luzac Smith & Test Series, London 1908, xviii; abridged and translated from the Arabic by O. Rescher, Constantinople 1925; 88).

B. Shihab al-Din (or Sharaf al-Din) Ahmad b. Khalil b. al-Habib al-Masri al-Shahri, d. 1032, at the age of 93; wrote 1) a gloss to Kitab al-Shikha of al-Kafi 'Iyyad (Brockleman, i. 369, 5, 1, b.); 2) Fatih al-Mubut fi Sharh Tahtat imd al-Tahtat (Brockleman, ii. 151, 150); 3) Fatih al-Ishaffar fi Mansunaat al-Kubira (ibid. 1); 4) Fatih al-Mubut bi-Sharh Mansunaat Ibn Thani al-Din (cf. Brockleman, ii. 94, 4); perhaps erroneously attributed to him, cf. [Pertoch, No. 1080]; 5) Hadjl al-Din ibn Masulit al-Lehmi 11, b. 1140; 6) Manush al-Hadjl al-Musmit; 7) al-Paghirra; 8) besides these he collected the Fatwa of al-Ramli (cf. Brockleman, ii. 321, 13) (al-Khafat al-didata, xii. 8 sq.; Biography also Ahwardi, No. 8471, 15).

C. For the modern Egyptian Ahmad Bey al-Subki b. Ahmad b. Sulaiman al-Tujjai, cf. al-Khafat al-didata, xii. 9. (JOSEPH SCHACHT)

SUEDA, a town in the Yemen in South Arabia. It is built on a rocky ridge running S.W. to N.E. with a peak in the centre. The citadel (kisra) stands in the centre of the town which is also its highest part, a strong lofty building reached by a kind of staircase on the
The expression *Bilad el-Sudan* properly means "land of the negroes." It would appear then that the word Sudan which comes from it ought to mean all the parts of Africa inhabited by negroes. Among Arabs, as well as Europeans, it has become the custom to restrict the application to the northern part of these regions or in a more general way to the area of *sub-Sahara* Africa which has been penetrated by Islam. In practice this area is divided into three parts: Western Sudan, containing the basin of the Senegal, the Gambia, the upper Volta and the middle Niger; Central Sudan including the basin of Lake Chad and Eastern Sudan or the Egyptian Sudan, confined to the basin of the upper Nile. It may be mentioned that the English use the word Sudan alone to mean the Egyptian Sudan and that the French officially apply the name "Somme Francaise" to one of their colonies, which really corresponds only to a small fraction of the large Sudanese area which they occupy. In this article we shall take the Sudan to include all the lands lying south of the deserts of the Sahara and of Libyan, from the Atlantic in the west to the western frontiers of Ethiopia in the east, the southern limit following roughly the 10th of North Latitude.

It is probable that from the earliest times there were relations between the Sudan and Mediterranean Africa. The ancient Egyptians obtained slaves by making expeditions into the land of the negroes and they had also commercial relations with it. Caravans setting out from the Phoenician colonies, especially Carthage, used to buy in the Sudan, gold, ivory, and slaves, in exchange for cloths, copper and tools. This intercourse then took place via the Nile or across the Sahara continued in the Greek and Roman period and later after the conquest and conversion to Islam of North Africa, it was continued by the Arabs. By the end of the seventh century a.d. Muslims of Egypt, Ifriqiya and the Maghrib were attending the great markets of the Sudan. Some were even settled there as correspondents and agents for their governors on the shores of the Mediterraean. But according to the Arab authors who give the earliest notices of the land of the negroes, it is evident that these Muslims were only interested in commerce and did not proselytise and it was only in the 10th century that Islam began to spread among the Sudanese. Several traditions, it is true, make the conqueror 'Oghba b. Nafi' come to the Sudan but they do not appear worthy of credence.

We should not however deduce that before the 10th century there was no civilisation or political organisation worthy of the name in these regions. While many of the princes who have ruled various parts of Sudanese territory from the 10th century have professed Islam, it was not always nor everywhere thus. Indeed several of the Sudanese states, including the most important were well governed before the beginning of the conversion of their country to Islam and had already attained a power and fame, in some cases considerable, and possessed institutions which Muslim rulers of a later date were pleased to adopt and which still exist to-day. In those kingdoms that have remained pagan, like the Musi of the Upper Volta, such as are described in the 10th century by al-Ikhni when he tells of the pagan kingdom of Ghana.

The religion formerly professed by all the Sudanese was the same, apparently, as that which is found at the present day among those of them who have not been affected by Islam, i.e. a form of Animism based on the worship of ancestors and of the spirits of nature.

Christianity had penetrated into several parts of the Sudan; it was predominant in Nuba from the 11th to the 16th century and it is said that the princes reputed to be Berber origin, who founded the kingdom of Songhay (q.v.) in the 16th century were Christians.

Islam must have spread very early among the Nuba or Nubians of the valley of the Nile, but it appears that it took a long time to reach the provinces of the eastern Sudan which lie at some distance from the main branch of the river, when it was only introduced towards the 18th century by tribes of Arab origin who at this period pushed south-westwards and came into contact with the negroes of this region. It was on the western part of the Sudan that a deep and lasting impression was first made by the teaching of Muhammad. It reached there, not through the Arabs, but through Berbers of the Saharan, who at this time launched the Almoravid movement.

At this time the Ghana empire was flourishing in the Western Sudan, founded at an unknown date by princes who were said to have belonged to a white stock, but whose rulers at the time were negroes of the Sarakelle tribe (allas Soninke, or Wakooy or Marka), who lived at Kumbi, S.S. W. of Wilata, in the province called Waggagou or Bagha, and who bore titles of tunka, kayanagha, and ghana. It is this last term extended from the ruler to the town that the Arab writers use for the town of Kumbi. The Ghana extended his sway beyond the proper limits of his kingdom over the greater part of the Western Sudan, and notably over the goldmines of the left bank of the Upper Senegal, as well as over the majority of the Berber tribes of the Sahara and in particular over that of the Lemtuna and over their capital Awdaghoost, probably situated at some distance to the S. W. of Tighit (Titchi).
In 1043, the Berber reformer 'Abdallâh b. Yâsin, left the rûqûb or monastery which he had conducted on an island of the Lower Senegal and began to preach Islam to the Berbers of the Adara and Tagant, and to the negroes of Takrit (Futa-Tooro), ancestors of the Tukorof or Tuculor of our day and to several other Sudanese peoples, then more or less vassals of the Ghana. His preaching was all the more successful at it was addressed to people, black or white, anxious to cast off the yoke of the suzerainty of the Sarkin of Kumbi, who were also a bulwark of paganism. The king of Takrit and his family—the first of the negroes without doubt to do so—adopted Islam and even supplied contingents to the Almoravid army. The king of Manding or Mali, who lived on the Upper Niger soon became a convert also and the conversion of the king of Songhay in the region of Gao on the middle Niger is put about the same date. Awdaghost which remained faithful to the Ghana, was attacked and taken in 1054 by 'Abdallâh b. Yâsin and about 1076 by Yusuf b. Tashfin at the head of the Mali body of the Almoravids was conquering Morocco and preparing to invade Spain, his cousin Abû Bakr b. 'Omar of the Leentuma tribe with the Almoravids came and established on the threshold of the Sudan, seized Kumbi and put an end to the long period of Ghana domination. Compelled by force to adopt the new religion, the Sarakole became converted to Islam en masse and began to spread it in the different kingdoms which they still ruled and which had taken advantage of the fall of the Ghana their suzerain to declare themselves independent: kingdoms or provinces of Dûna or Kanyaga (near the modern Nyoro), of Gumbu (south of Kumbi), of Sûr (between Gumbu and Bamako), of Djakha or Bô (western Mâina) etc. The death of Abû Bakr b. 'Omar in 1087 and the departure for the north of the last Almoravid forces which had supported him, did not prevent the propagation of Islam from going on and at the end of the 12th century some Muslim Djelas converted by the Sarakole of Djakha, carried the new faith up to the dense forests of the Gold Coast, to which they used to go to buy kola-nuts.

Progress was then checked for a period, then about 1224 a religious and commercial centre was organised at Walata and soon Timbuktu and more particularly Djenné were reached. In the following century Timbuktu became the Muslim metropolis of the western Sudan. The Mandingo empire, the hegemony of which had succeeded to that of the Ghana, was then at its zenith. In 1325 its ruler, who at this time was the famous Gongon-Mian (popular Kankan-Mâin) had mosques built in Gao and Timbuktu by an Arab of a Granada family whom he had brought from Meccâ; these mosques had flat roofs, and pyramidal minarets and introduced to the Sudan an architectural style which spread rapidly there; the éclat which he gave the Muslim religion contributed to consolidate Gongon-Mian's authority over the other countries. It was under his successor that regular diplomatic relations began between the Sudan and Morocco.

The progress of Islam became still more rapid at the end of the xiiith and beginning of the xiiiith centuries as a result of the policy of the greatest prince of Songhay, the sultân Muhammadu Tûre. On the other hand it suffered a considerable setback in the middle of the xiiiith century in Senagal, as a result of the conquest of Takrit or Futa-Tooro by Fal and Manding hordes from Koli-Tengelle and the establishment in this country of a Fal pagan monarchy which held power from 1559 to 1776. Contrary to what one would have expected, the conquest of Songhay and of Timbuktu by a Moroccan expedition in 1591, was a further signal for a decline in the Muslim faith, on the middle Niger and for the beginning of the decline of Timbuktu as an intellectual and religious centre.

It must however be thought that Islam had ever won over all the Sudanese. According to the Arab geographers and historians and to the local chronicles, the new religion had made its converts mainly among the kings and high dignitaries; except in the case of a few tribes like the Tuculor, the Sarakole, the Djela and Songhay, the mass of the population except in the large towns had remained pagan.

It was in the xviith and xixith centuries that Islam made most progress in the Western Sudan and a progress more marked than it had ever since the Almoravid period. The original temperament of the Tuculor caste of the Toreibo (sing. Toreibo) of Takrit was the main factor in this movement. It had begun about 1720 with the creation at Futa-Djallon (q.v.) of a kind of theocratic monarchy. It was strengthened in 1776 by the foundation at Futa-Tooro of a similar theocracy as a result of the victory which the Muslim Tuculors then inflicted on the Fal, who still remained pagan and of whom the majority were now forced to adopt Islam. Gradually the Wolof of Lower Senegal were also converted to Islam. Prophets soon arose among the Toreibo of Futa-Tooro and among the Fal of Mâina. The first was the Tuculor Usmanu Fônjo who preached the holy war between the Niger and the Chad, converted a section of the Haussa, and founded the empire of Sokoto (1802). He was followed by the Ful Sekü Humunu Bâ, who secured the supremacy of Islam in Mâina and built a capital there which he called: Hamâllâh (1810). Then the Tuculor al-Hajj 'Omar, who in the course of his pilgrimage to Mecca (1820) had been invested with the title of Khalifa of the Tijânites for the Sudan, began in 1838 a series of missionary and military campaigns which made him master of Manding (1845), Kaara (1844), Ségou (1861) and finally of Mâina (1862). At his death (1864) he left a vast empire in which Islam was a sort of official religion but it was to collapse before the French conquest (1890-1893). A little later in 1898, an attempt to set up another Muslim empire between the Senegal and the Upper Volta began by the conquering Mandingo Samûl Tûre was definitely checked by the defeat of the latter, who was captured by the French troops.

In the Central Sudan, Islam had made its first appearance in the xviith century. It had been introduced to Kémè in the reign of Umar whose dynasty, which remained faithful to paganism, was overthrown in 1394 by a Muslim dynasty of native origin, that of the Mar, which transferred its capital to Bornu at the end of the xviith century. But it was only at this latter date that the Muslim faith took firm root in these regions by establishing itself solidly on both sides of Lake Chad. It was only at the end of the next century in the reign of the Mbang 'Abdallâh (1661-1667) that it reached Bagirmi and it was only at the beginning...
of the xviith century that the prophet Sulayh, said to have been of Arab origin, brought Islam to Wasit, where it was not firmly established till 1635 onwards. Very much later Islam spread southwards under the stimulus of the adventures of Rabih (1878-1900).

In the Eastern Sudan, the Nuba formed almost the only native Muslim population down to the xvith century. At this period Darfur, after long being like Wasit and Kordofan under the authority of the Idalomas, Tandjar princes, said to have been of Asiatic origin, was partly converted to Islam by the founder of a new dynasty named Sulun-Sulun. One of his successors, Tharawil, conquered Kordofan and converted the Koraiti of the Karlo it is said, to Islam. The rest of the Eastern Sudan made more rapid progress towards the end of the sixtith century under the influence of the Mahdi Muhammad 'Abd Allah [q.v.] who belonged to a Nubian family of Dongola and who conquered Kordofan, Darfur, Bayal al-Ghazal, Semnun [q.v.] and finally Khatrinn (1851-1885) and under his Khalifa 'Abd Allah, one of a tribe of Bagdara of Darfur, who extended his conquests into the province of Equatoria (1892), to be finally driven from Khatrinn by Kitchener in 1898. Around 1850 the broad 'Al shat and 'Al jay'a in 1859, by a force under Colonel Wingate. At the present time (1925) the Sudan as a whole has a population, that may be approximately estimated at 25 or 30 millions, composed of Muslims and Animists in about equal parts. The former predominate in the larger centres but are relatively less numerous outside the towns. Some tribes between are all or for the most part Muslims; these are from West to East the Wolof, the Tukulor, the Senoufo, the Songhay, the Kanuri and Kanem, the Tsu of Tiou, the Mafa, the Koura, the Kordofan, the Nuba and a few others of minor importance. Some are partly pagan like the Ful or Fulbe, the Mansinga or Malinke, the Serer of Buss, the Hades, the Bagirimi, etc.; and lastly many are entirely or for the most part Animists, like the Serer, the Djola or Fula, the Bamari and Konougu, the Mambas, the Bobo, the Dogon or Tombo, the Seno, the Mafa, the Garunai, the Lobi, the Ungaré, the Senoufu, the Baname, the Gurma, the Berba, the Kanem, the Bauri, the Mandara, the Masai, the Mounda and the number of the Central and Eastern Sudan grouped together by the Muslims as Kafiri, Kirdi, Ferti, Dajukhan, etc.

Arabic as a spoken language has made very little progress in the Sudan; it has only enriched the dialects of the Sudanese Muslims with words relating to religion. These dialects, like those of the Sud fantastic Animists, all belong to the African Negro family. On the other hand, Arabic is the written language for all the Muslims of the Sudan who have any education and there has existed since the xviith century a regular Sudanese literature in the Arabic language. Sometimes, at least as far as the Ful and Hausa are concerned, the characters of the Arabic alphabet are used to write the native languages.
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Selim I (1517) it revived as a naval station. At this time the water from the Bêr Suez, a league and a quarter distant on the road to Cairo, was brought to the town by an aqueduct, traces of which still remain. This water according to 'Ali Bey (1706, ii. 30) was brackish. Water was also brought (about 8 miles) from the Walls of Moses (Cayûn Mîna), celebrated in legend (Ibn al-Wardî, Paries des Merveilles, in N.E., ii. 31). "All Bey declares that the wells yielded a disagreeable and fetid kind of water." In modern times, however, a fresh-water canal was cut in 1863 between Cairo and Suez. By the beginning of the 19th century the town had once more fallen into decay and insignificance ("Ali Bey, Hist., ii. 29). But it revived again when the overland mail route was opened in 1837 between England and India, and still moves after the construction of the Canal.

An etymology of the name Suez can be found in Deor. d' l'I'q. i. 87. Yâkîr mentions, on the authority of al-Mahallî, the presence in the neighborhood of magnetic rock (mugâhîrîn) whose powers is decreased or increased according as it is rubbed with garlic or vinegar.

An ancient canal, called Ammi 'Iraqam, although much older than the Roman occupation, once existed between the Nile and the Red Sea. One of its terminus was at Kâmu’in. Amr b. al-As b. re-opened this ancient waterway to enable grain supplies to be shipped direct to the Haramain (Butler, The Arab Conquest of Egypt, p. 345 sq.); soon afterwards it was filled up again until restored under the Mamlûks (c. 780 A.D.). In the year 977 A.H. Hasan the Karmajani captured the city. During the middle ages the commerce of the Indies passed steadily through the town. Caravans from Farm (Phumus) took four days; from Cairo, three (see J. M. Hartmann, Edrisi, Africâ, p. 449; Yâkîr, Mu‘jam, u. v.).


(J. Walker)

ṢUFIYAH. [See TÂRÂWÎ.] AL-ṢUFIYIH, one of the principal branches of the Khârijîyâ [q. v.]. Historiographic tradition, established as early as the middle of the 7th century by Abu ‘Abd Allâh al-Mâlikî (al-Ṭabarî, Annali, i. 517 sqq.), places its rise in 65, when the ‘Imami ‘Abd Allâh b. al-Ṣaffâr, a Khârijî of al-Basra, broke away from his colleague Nâsîr b. al-‘Arakî on the question of the strây (the murder of adversaries and their families), propounded by the latter, and subsequently from ‘Abd Allâh b. Ibâdî, who maintained that non-Khârijî Muslims should not be regarded as polytheists. The account of Abu ‘Abd Allâh shows, as it has been aptly remarked by Wellhausen, a spirit of pragmatism, which regards the three great branches of the Khârijîyâ, the ‘Alawîyâ, the Azârîyâ (l. 563/564) and the Adbîâ or Abîkâ (l. 34/37, 137/137), as the simultaneous product of a conflict of principles. Another historian, Nâṣr al-Mardhûfi, ed. Al-Àhidârî, p. 82—83, names as founder of the Sufiyâ ‘Ubaïida b. Kâbi’; theological sources on the other hand, assign this role to Ziyâd b. al-Àsaf, after whom the Sufiyah have also received the name of Ziyâdîyâ (al-Baghdâdî, Fârîq, p. 70; al-Shahrustânî, ed. Cucuteni, p. 102; al-Khârijî, Mu‘galî, ed. van Vloten, p. 251; al-Samâni, Anûbî, vol. 354а) or to al-Ànumî (Câbrîn, Eliftî, i. 354 below) ed. iv. 178, below); all of whom a few persons are equally obscure. In reality the Sufiyah began to take part in the Khârijî movement in the month of Safar 76, when the great revolt raised by ‘Abîl b. Mâlik b. Mâlik (or Muhammad b. Mâlik, ed. Tabbârî, i. 881, note E) broke out, after his death led by Shâbl b. Yarîd al-Shâbîlî [see above, p. 261—262]. Shâbl b. Musarrîh, who was regarded by his followers as a saint, and whose tomb remained an object of veneration for a long time (Ibn Kûtâba, Mu‘alîfî, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 209 = Ibn Dârusî, ‘Abîkâ, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 133), represents the type of devotee with ascetic tendencies who becomes a propagandist and ends by being engulfed in the turmoil of a bloody war in spite of his pacific temperament; he is represented in the account of a contemporary, who in all probability writes with authority (Tabari, i. 885) as opposed to the anthropomorphic methods of the Azârîyâ, a point which has invariably constituted a characteristic of the Sufi theory, although its adaptors have not always observed it in practice.

After the defeat of Shâbl b. Yarîd b. Shâbl b. Yarîd b. Shâbl b. Yarîd b. Yâ’qûb [q. v.] towards the end of the Umayyad period. At the same epoch they are found spread over the whole of the Islamic world; they are mentioned in the Maghrib from the year 117 (Ibn al-Àhidîh, Kâmî, ed. Tomberg, v. 143 below), where, a few years later, guided by their chief Abu ‘Abd Allâh b. ‘Abd al-Karîm, they established the town of Sidjillâna [see above, p. 432—433], where they long maintained their independence (Ibn al-Àhidîh, Bayân al-Maghrîb, ed. Dory, i. 35 sqq.; Ibn al-Àhidîh, vi. 499 sqq.), they joined the Ikhsâni in the general rising of the Berbers, and ended by being absorbed by the former, who in North Africa as elsewhere became dominant. Another conflict between ‘Abîkâ and the Sufiyah, where the latter were overthrown, took place in ‘Umâra, in which the Sufiyah had taken refuge in 134, after having been defeated by the ‘Abdâl Khâriq b. Kharîma (Tabarti, i. 37 sqq.).

It is principally as exponents of Khârijîyâ...
that the Sufiyya are of importance; they seem to have been the first to attempt a systematic exposition of their religious principles, and one of their very earliest imāmas, the poet ʿIṣṭāḥ ʿAli b. ʿAbd ʿAl-Rahmān b. Ṣaʿīd Ḧafṣ (d. 140), also known as poet and lexicographer (cf. Wattenfeld, Gencocheatsschreber, N° 20, where the patronymic is incorrect; Ibn Daud, p. 193; Ṣahib, i. 193; ʿAlīb, Hayyānī, l. 152; Ibn ʿAbd Allāh, Tadhkīrāt al-Tadhkīrāt, l. 310, etc.), al-Kāsim b. ʿAbd ʿAl-Rahmān b. Ṣaʿīd Ṣaʿīd, Mūsā, etc. The principal themes which divided the Sufiyya from the extremist Azīrī, though not quite squaring the moderation of the Iṣṭāson, are, according to the systematic tract by ʿAbd al-ʿAlī b. Ḧafṣ al-Ṣaʿīdīh and al-Shahrastānī, the admission of the sect (temporary) submission (al-taḥawwul), the admission of the children of infidels. In moral doctrine also the strictness of the Khārijīs is somewhat modified by the Sufiyya; one of their subdivisions maintains that sins do not produce in the sinner the quality of an infidel (kāfir) nor of a polytheist (mujāhīd) as long as it concerns infractions of righteousness for which the religious law provides a definite punishment (ḥadd), this expression has not been included in the translation of al-Shahrastānī by Hašrī, which, only in those cases in which there is no punishment in the law. Other peculiarities of the Sufiyya refer to questions of ritual and equity.

The Sufiyya, as a religious school, seems to have especially pre-dominated, in the eastern half of the Islamic world, where they maintained themselves up to a comparatively recent period. Ibn Ḥasan (d. in 456) affirms that they were the only branch of the Khārijīs who existed in his time, besides the ʿAlībīs (al-ʿAzīzī & al-ʿĀrifī, l. 190) to which only, he says, it appears there was a gradual absorption of the other schools of Khārijīs into that of the Sufiyya, which seems to be confirmed by the fact that Ibn Ḥasan ranges with the Sufiyya the schools of Ṣaʿīdīh, ʿAṣīrād (l. 149; l. 381), Baḥshīyā (l. 617) with their subdivisions, while ʿAbd al-ʿAlī b. Ḧafṣ al-Ṣaʿīdīh and al-Shahrastānī consider them as independent schools.

The origin of the name Sufiyya is greatly disputed, the etymologies that are derived from the supposed founders (Ibn ʿAbd al-Ṣaʿīd, ʿAlīf ʿAbd al-Sarīf) seem somewhat artificial; it is a term, possibly, of slight elevation, due to the celebrated philologist al-ʿAḍna b. al-Jāmī, that is the one which, admitting the vocalisation ʿSūfiyya, attaches it to the word ġfr *zero* and supports it by an anecdote according to which an imprisoned Sūfī was accused by one of his companions in captivity with the words: "You count for no more than zero in religion!" (Laud al-ʿArab, vi. 135 = Tadhkīr al-ʿArab, iii. 337). A third etymology deserves more credit, although it is not entirely beyond doubt: it is that which derives the name from ʿSūfī, the "yellow cloak", which their faces had assumed in consequence of their devotional practices (al-Baladhūrī, ed. Aldward, p. 82-83; al-Mubarrad, Kāmil, p. 604, 615-616; cf. Ṣahib, i. 881, 84, where he says of ʿAlī b. Masarious, that he was a man of "yellow countenance" [ṣaffar al-ʿawdah]). This etymological uncertainty is the consequence of the obscurity that covers the origin of the movement itself: ʿAlī b. Masarious, who as we have seen, seems to have been the original starter, is not recognized as such by the later Sufiyya, who name as their first īmāma Īmān b. Ḧafṣ (al-Baghdādī, Fīrāq, p. 71); al-Baghdādī, p. 89, hesitates to attribute to Īmān the denomination of Sufi and al-Shahrastānī, p. 95, in mentioning the school of the Sūfiyya says that they do not enter into any of the known categories of the Khārijīs.

According to al-Muʿīzī (Kūfī, 2nd ed., 179) the Sufiyya also bore the name of ʿAlībūyān, "the deniers" because they reproved (like all the other Khārijīs) a part of the conduct of ʿUmmān, ʿAll and ʿAbdul; but the passages quoted by Dey, Supplement, ii. 224, which shows that it is an insulating appellation applied to Khārijīs in general.

Bibliography: see article Kharījī.

(G. LEVI DELLA VITA)

SUFIRY (vulg. Sofārī, ʿAbū: Sofārī), a small town to the north of Morocco, 33 km. S.E. of Fès (Fas), 500 metres above sea level, at the foot of the northern spur of the Middle Atlas. The town, watered by the Wādī ʿSufrī, is surrounded by beautiful orchards, principally cherry. The quarters are N. Tāzhābī and Shubbābī, E. the ʿAṣīr in fort. S. Meṣḥābī and Zemrit, surrounding the Mellāb or Jews' quarter on all sides. The town is protected by a high wall restored in the sixteenth century by the Sultan Mawlay Sulaimān, who also built a mosque and a hamman. The population exceeds 5,000, of whom more than 3,000 are Jews.

The principal sanctuaries of Sufiyya are those of Sādī al-Bīn-Saghir, Sādī al-Bīn-Aṭīr and Sādī al-Bīn-Mādī in Haydān. The last is the most important; at the end of the summer a spring near to the sanctuary is the object of a water-cult; it has the virtue of curing madness and idiocy. These sacred spots were visited in 1179 (1765-1766) by the Sultan Fāṫūn b. Sulaimān who came from Marrākesh to Fès for the express purpose of visiting these sanctuaries.

It was in the environs of ʿSufrī, that in the Berber tribe of the Ait Vünters the learned and versatile ʿAllāḥ b. Mābūl al-Vünter (d. 1102/1691) was born; his tomb is at the aṭwārī called Sādī Lahabīn in the S.W. of the town; he is still greatly venerated by the Ait Vünter, who hold a mawārin there every year.

Nothing is known of the date at which Sufiyya was founded. Leo Africanus (who calls it Sofret) says that it was built by the "Africans", which means that for him its origin is lost in antiquity. It would seem to have been in existence at this time of the foundation of Fès (1037 A.H.); he was not slow to enter into conflict with the inhabitants of the region of Sufiyya and al-Baladhūrī, who, in the religion seems to have been strongly impregnated by Judaism, and conversed them to Islam. The memory of an ancient Jewish population is preserved in the name of wādī l-Yahsīb (the name of the lower part of wādī Sufiyya) and by that of the grotto called Kaf al-Yahsīb, which
among the Jews in the town is the centre of a true naturalist cult.

The importance rapidly attained by Fès, the new and adjacent capital, accelerated the decline of the ancient Berber city. Scruffy, however, as a necessary point of passage for the caravans bound for Siújilama, always retained a certain vitality; it was, moreover, the natural depot for the products of the Middle Atlas, destined for Fès: fruits, wood, skins and cedar wood.

In 1070 (1661-1662) on the east side of the Unaiyad xilijate of Cordova, Scruffy, which was a fief of the lord of Fès, al-Mu'izz b. Ziri, was taken by him from Wànàdùn b. Kharrùn al-Magrùr, lord of Siújilama and of Dam'a. In 1055 (1662) Ysuf b. Tàshùfù took Scruffy by assault and massacred all the Maghùrin who had shut themselves up in it. In 1141 (1736) Scruffy was seized by 'Abd al-Mu'min for the Almoravids.

Speaking of Scruffy in the 13th century, al-Bakri only says that it is on the route from Fès to Siújilama and that it is a city surrounded by numerous watercourses and trees. In the 12th century al-Idrisi describes it as says that it is a small and secluded civilised town, where there are not many markets. Its inhabitants are mostly agriculturists, who cultivate a quantity of cereals; there are also a large number of large and small cattle. The waters of the land are sweet and abundant.

Scruffy suffered greatly during the civil wars which devastated the region of Fès during the dynasty of the Banàl Wàtînà and of the Sàdîdàs. After the accession of the Alàwîs, it was again the city which was waged by these subdus against the rebel Berber of the Middle Atlas.

In 1806 (1682-1683) Mawliy Isâmiyu passed through Scruffy upon an expedition against the tribes of the Middle Atlas and the High Molouya. In 1736, the inhabitants of the town and the neighbourhood were massacred by the Sultan Mawliy Muhammad b. Isâmiyu, called Ibn 'Arabîyya, infuriated by the protection which the Berbers of the district had given to his rebellious brother 'Abd Allàb; their heads were transported to Fès. In 1811, in the course of the great revolt of the Berbers they came as far as Scruffy to surround an army that was sent against them; they pillaged the camp and sacked the whole region. In 1835 (1819-1820) the Sultan Mawliy Sulaimûn had three hundred men of the rebellious neighbouring tribe of the Ait Yûsî assassinated in Scruffy.


(S. G. S. Colyn)

SÛFYÂN AL-TÀHWÀRÌ, Abù 'Abd Allàh Sâfûyân b. Sa'd (according to some Sa'd b. Hammàd al-TÀHWÀRÌ al-Khàtî, a celebrated theologian, traditionist and ascetic of the second century A.D. His name al-Thawri is derived, according to the view generally held by the biographers, from Thawr b. 'Abd Mannûf... b. al-Yàs b. Madâr, who was among his ancestors (cf. Wüstenfeld, Register de den genan, Tabellen d. arab. Stämme u. Familien, 1852, p. 452; Ibn al-Dairàd, Tàhath al-Moràúa, ed. Wüstenfeld, 1854, p. 113; Samà'ân, 'Abûnàd, G. M. S., xx, fol. 1171); Ibn Khallikàn, Wàfayàt, ed. Wüstenfeld, Nî. 265 (transl. by de Slane, 1842, 1, p. 576 sqq.) gives as the date of his birth 951, 956 or 974. On the other hand, all the other sources agree in giving 977 (1175-1176) as the date (Caustiani, Chronographia Islamica, i. 5, p. 1120, Nî. 26 puts the date of Safûyân's birth as 960, on the authority of a unique manuscript). Sûfyân received his first instruction in hadith from his father, a learned Kûfî, who died in 126 (according to others in 128, cf. Caustani, loc. cit., p. 1607, Nî. 73) and is quoted among his authorities by different names in the bibliographical dictionaries to be mentioned below. Sûfyân was one of the old school of pious men, who showed their dislike of the new regime by declining to accept offices in the government; and as the wrath of the court upon their heads, Ibn Sa'd, Tàhât, ed. Zetterstèen, 1909, 1, p. 238, says that Sûfyân on one occasion accepted money and gifts from a Wolff but ever afterwards refused them. In 150, he left Kûfû and went, like so many others (cf. Meas, De Reformatione des Islam, 1922, p. 200) beyond the bounds of 126 to escape appointment as jàdî. He went to the Yemen and made a living as a merchant by giving other merchants goods to dispose of on commission and settling up with them annually; so that he finally possessed a fortune of about 200 dinàrs (according to Ibn Kutaühà, Mûsafrî, ed. Wüstenfeld, 1856, 1, p. 250 his estate at his death amounted to 150 dinàrs in goods). But even there, he was not safe from persecution by the Baghûd court. He was sought out but went to Mecca. The amir of Mecca, Muhammad b. Ibrahim, was ordered by the Caliph in the year 158 (the year in which al-Mahdi succeeded al-Mangûr; therefore the sources vary as to which Caliph gave the order) to find him (safûyân, most sources; in al-Nawasî, Tàhât al-ísm, ed. Wüstenfeld, 1844-1847, p. 287, and Ibn al-Hasan, Tàhât al-Tàhât, 1345, iv, p. 114, however some wood merchants who were coming to Mecca are ordered by al-Mangûr to crucify him, fa-zûlûkân, which is certainly not only a copyist's mistake, but it suggests another story). The governor, however, did not carry out his orders; according to Ibn Sa'd, loc. cit., he warned Sûfyân so that he was able to go promptly into hiding. While al-Tabari, ill. 385 sqq., says that he had already taken Sûfyân prisoner but then set him free again. The whole story is embellished in the different versions with details of interest to the student of the life of the time. It seems certain in any case that Sûfyân was actually forced to seek refuge from his pursuers in the Kûfû (Ibn Sa'd, p. 250). In the end however, Mecca also became too hot for him and he went to Baghûd to Yahyâ b. Sa'id, where many learned jurists came to study hadith under him. In Baghûd also he had to change his abode for the sake of safety. Hammàd b. Zàld advised him to make peace with the court. Sûfyân began negotiations by correspondence, which led to a satisfactory result, but before he could set out for Baghûd
he became Ill and died at the age of 64, in Sufyân ibn al-Thawrī. His burial was recorded in Ibn Khallīkin's biography of Sufyân from al-Masâ'ibī, Mūsâ ibn al-Thalâthī, 1325, No. 3206: "Sufyân an-Nafeq. At the same time, he is credited with other "qualifications of the first rank", as collected in Goldscheider, Mākāmum Stud., ii, 142. He is occasionally rated higher than Mālik b. Anas. The only reproach made against him is that of tudlī, that he used to trace traditions directly to recognized authorities, although he had only received them indirectly or from transmitters of less authority (cf. Gāthā, s.v. and Goldscheider, loc. cit., p. 48, and the passages there quoted from Ibn Khallīkin). Ibn Hadžal, Tuḥbaṣ al-Mudallilīn, Cairo 1322, p. 9 places him in the second rank of the mudallilīn i.e. those whose tudlī the Imāms have tolerated, because they were such important personalities and their tudlī amounted to very little (kullā tudlīkā) and gives as his authority al-Nasā'i (Broekelmann, G. A. L., ii, 199) and al-Bukhārī (s.v.). Sufyân’s tudlī however does not prevent the biographers vying with one another in telling stories to his credit. He was one of the first to commit to writing the wealth of traditions stored in his memory: cf. Abu ‘l-Mahāsin, Anwâr, ed. Jouyboll, l, 1895, p. 387 sq. and Hājī Khalīfa, ed. Flagel, l, 86 sq. The Fīhirīṣ ed. Flagel, l, p. 225, for example, gives a number of examples of his authority: 1) al-Dīnārī al-habīb; 2) al-Qūṣhī al-ma‘ṣūrī; 3) Kālid ibn al-Kalid and 4) and 5) two epitaphs of the subject of which is not recorded. Then there is his commentary on the Kūfī Tafsīr, which according to Hājī Khalīfa, No. 3248 is quoted by Thalāthī. These works however have not survived; several bio-

graphical record that on his deathbed Sufyân commissioned a friend whose name is not given (cf. Fīhirīṣ, ii, p. 98, note 5, on p. 225) to burn them, which was done. The reason for this action is said by Hājī Khalīfa (l, 126) to have been that he felt remorse at the traditions with weak authority which he had admitted into his books; the reproach of tudlī already mentioned therefore does not seem to have been made against him unjustly. The most comprehensive list of his authorities and pupils is given by Ibn Hadžal (loc. cit., p. 111 sq.) but names not included here are given in other biographical sources. Al-Nawawī and Ibn Hadžal give as the best Kufī Tafsīr: Sufyân from Manṣūr b. al-Muhāmar, see Nawawī, p. 578; from Ibn Khathīr al-Nakha‘ī, see Nawawī, p. 135 from ‘Alī ibn al-A‘rāfi, see Nawawī, p. 433 from Ibn Ma‘ālikid (s.v.).

As a faqīḥ he was the founder of a madhhab which however later disappeared (cf. Mzec loc. cit., p. 202 sq. He was a strict follower of the Ašrī al-Hadīthī (s.v.) and as regards theology belonged to the Shāfi‘ī i.e. he recognised the qualifications of Alī and'Ibrāhīm, the two Karans as existing in the literal sense and peculiar to him; cf. al-Shahbāzī, Masal, ed. Carron, l, 65, 160 (transl, by Harbrücker, l, 92, 242). That he was a Sunnī is proved, if it were necessary, from the profession of faith which he is said to have dictated to Sulābī b. Dārīcr, cf. al-Dhahābī, Taḥdīrāt al-Hufuf, l, Hādirāhād, 1333, p. 193. In this, after speaking of the uncreated substances of the Karan, he says that bātūl, awāl and nilās (see also al-Tarjān) constitute theImām (rah), that it can increase and decrease (cf. Goldscheider, Vorlesungen, ed. 2, 1913, p. 311), that pre-eminences (i.e. over ‘Ali, cf. van Arendonk, De opkomst van het middeleeuwse inmaat in Yemen, 1919, index, s.v. bātūl, da heidelc is due to the two shaykhs (Abū Bakr and ‘Umar), that in the minor nihār (masīl) the washing of the foot-covering is permitted in place of the feet (al-maṣūkh al-kaḥfus) (cf. Goldscheider, loc. cit., p. 369), that it is better to recite the bismilla in a low voice than as a loud one (cf. Goldscheider, Brunsvig, Litteraturgeschichte der Sū‘, S B. V., lxxviii, 1874, p. 435 sq. 457), that one must believe in predestination (see Al-Dābās), that one may pray on Friday and at the two festivals behind any imām, but at other times must choose one in whose piety one has confidence and of whom one knows that he is a Sunnī and finally that the Shī‘a will exist to the day of judgment (see Hughes, Dict. of Islam, 1885, p. 244sq.) and that one should obey every person in authority, whether he is just or unjust. It is easy to see that the majority of these articles represent well-known points of difference between Sunna and Shī‘a, which are all decided according to the Sunnī view. Nevertheless Sufyân is credited with an inclination to the Shī‘a; thus the Tuḥbaṣ al-Hufuf, loc. cit., mentions among his authorities the imām al-Mu‘īn al-Stāwī (s.v.; Ibn Kātība, Maṣā‘īf, p. 301 mentions him in a list of Shī‘is, and al-Tahāb, iii, 2516, gives a story according to which he was a Shī‘ī but met two scholars in Bāṣra who persuaded him to change. He has, however, also been claimed as a Shī‘ī, cf. Fīhirīṣ, p. 178, and, thereon van Arendonk, loc. cit., and, in the above mentioned index s.v. “Corpus Isra’s” al-Zaid ibn al-A‘rāfi, ed. Griffini, 1919, p. clxxiv. with note 3 and index s.v.
These are doubtless inventions. Massignon, La Parition d'Al-Hallâj, 1922, p. 72, sees their origin in the fact that for men like Sufyân, al-Ṣufâ‘î etc. reverence for the Prophet implied reverence for his works which, in consequence, included the Ahl. The explanation given by Bergmann in his review of the Corpus Juris, O. L. Z., 1922, col. 122 sqq. seems to me much more illuminating, namely that the Corpus in many cases is in conformity with the jurists of the Ḥarîrî-‘ābî whom Sufyân was one. As it thus comes about that he often taught the same as the Corpus (except that in reality it was the latter that borrowed), he might be claimed as a Zâdî. It must have been similar with his Shî‘îs. — The above-mentioned requirement of aṣâbî as an essential of islaâm is directed against the Mur’dâbî; cf. thereon Goldscheider, Vorlesungen, p. 351, where it is related (on the authority of Ibn Sa‘d) how Sufyân refused to take part in the funeral of a mur’dâbî.

That Sufyân was an ascetic is beyond doubt. Here also the biographers cannot quote too many stories about him. The best evidence of his asceticism is however that he is claimed by the Sûfi as one of their fore-runners. Fârîd al-Dîn ‘Aṭîq, Taḏdhib ar-Râ‘îlî al-Musulmânî (ed. Nicholson, i., 1905, p. 185 sqq.), devotes an article of nearly 9 pages to him, which however contains nothing characteristic and of which H. H. Schasch’s remark (Iṣlâm, xiv., p. 1) on the biographies of the devout men of the past in general in ‘Aṭîq’s book, namely that they are "very much modelled on a single pattern of mystical piety" Sufyân is however mentioned by the Fûhrer, i. 183, in a list of ascetics who wore the šaykh and Abu Nasr al-Sarrâj, Luma‘î, ed. Nicholson (G. M. S., xvii., 1914), p. 32 actually quotes him as evidence of the antiquity of the Sufiyya. His relations with al-Djûnayd (q.v.) are several times discussed, although the two could not have known one another; cf. e.g. al-Hudjwîrî, Kâdhîf al-Makhtûsî, transl. Nicholson (G. M. S., x., 1911), p. 158. The reference is apparently only to intellectual kinship; it is difficult to understand it otherwise when Abu ‘Abd al-Makhtûsî (loc. cit., ii. 213) says that al-Hallâj (q.v.) was acquainted with Sufyân (lukhâya). On the other hand, one need not doubt the truth of the story recorded by the same author (l. 424) that Sufyân was on friendly terms with the ascetic Shâhîb al-Râ‘î (d. 158) who lived the life of a hermit in Lebanon.

These remarks on Sufyân viewed from different angles, corresponding to different currents in the intellectual history of Iṣlâm, are of course nothing more than grotesques; they cannot take the place of a monograph on him, the necessity of which must be evident from the manifold variety of what we have said above. Bibliography: On the sources it should first of all be noted that al-Djâhâlî’s Taḏdhib ar-Râ‘î al-Sufâ‘î, i., p. 102, depends on his own great historical work in which he dealt at great length with Sufyân. The volume, in which the article must have been, is however not quoted among the manuscripts of the separate volumes mentioned in Brockelmann, G. A. F., ii. 47. Al-Djâhâlî also refers to a book on the Maṣâ‘ulî of Sufyân by Ibn al-Ḍawârî (q.v.) but this has not survived. — The bibliographical, historical, and geographical works quoted in the article almost all contain articles on Sufyân, which have been utilised here. So far as they have appeared in European editions, the indices should be consulted, i.e. Sufyân, for scattered references to his life and teaching. The reader may also be referred to the story of his meeting with Ma‘âmî’s, Allah in al-Kiffî, Talîkâî, ed. Târîkh, p. 387, to his refusal of the office of kiffî, as it is told in al-Hudjwîrî, i., p. 93 and to his meeting with al-Musâfrî (Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihi, Ḭadîd, Cairo 1331 (i.e. p. 108). — The indices of the European works should also be consulted for passages not quoted here. There is further Goldscheider, Die Richtungen der islamischen Karonenlegung, 1920 (in: Muḥ. Stud., ii., the reference in p. 58 is not in the Index — on it cf. D. B. Macdonald, Development of Muslim Theology, 1903, p. 97 sqq.), Browne, Lit. Hist. of Persia, 1909, l. 424—426 (p. 434 he adopts the already mentioned story of Sufyân’s meeting with al-Hallâj). — (M. Plessner)

AL-SUFYANî, [See AL-MERARI]

SUGHD. [See SOGHDI]

SUGHD, once a great seaport, now a little town in the Crimea, Greek Zevola or Zovi, also Zovyola, Latin and Italian Soldaia or Solduzia, Old Russian Surod; the Arabic form Sholţâja in Idrisi (transl. Jouaher, ii. 395) is probably connected with the Italian form. The name is connected with Sugd (q.v.), the name of a country in Central Asia and explained as Iranian; its foundation is therefore ascribed to the Alans (see ALANA). The Alans are mentioned in the region (east of the Tauric Chersonese) as late as the seventh and eighth centuries. Like the Greek cities, Sugdâia had an era of its own, according to which the year of its foundation was 213 B.C.; but the name is not found in Pliny nor in any other geographer of antiquity. It is first mentioned in the viith century by the Anonymous writer of Ravenna (Romanae Anonymi Cosmographiae, ed. Finder and Farthey, Berlin 1860, p. 175 sqq.; Sugdâban). At that time the town had a Greek bishop although it was not under Byzantine but Khażar rule. It was only after the destruction of the Khażar empire and of the Russian principality of Tmutarakan that the whole southern shore of the Crimea passed to Russia. During Latin rule in Constantinople this region belonged to the kingdom of Trebizond. Twice, in 1223 and 1328, Sugdâban was sacked by Tatars. It is to the intervening period that the very full but undated account in Ibn Birš (q.v.; Houtsma, Recueil de textes relatifs à l’histoire des Slaves cèdètes, iii. 329 sqq.; iv. 134 sqq.) of the invasion by Turks from Asia Minor belongs; Husân al-Dîn Čôban the commander sent by ‘Ali al-Dîn Kağîdubâd (1616—634 = 1219—1269), succeeded in defeating the Greeks in Sugdâban and their allies, the Russians and Kipchaks. In Sugdâban the bells were broken in pieces, a large mosque built in less than a fortnight, a murderer, a khaftî and a kajî appointed and a garrison left; but the Turks seem (op. cit., iii. 355; iv. 138 sqq.) to have been very soon driven out again. In 1249 the Tatars were forced to leave Sugdâban whereupon the Greek governor (Schoutte) had the population counted. The total was only 8,300, which probably refers only to male adults. In spite of its small population Sugdâban was then of great importance for sea-trade, especially for trade with Venice, as is evident from Venetian documents.
and from Marco Polo (ed. Vule-Stidio, i. 2 sq.). Sughdak suffered a heavy blow in the reign of Ozbek, Khan of the Golden Horde (712–744 = 1322–1350); on Aug. 8, 1322, the town was occupied without resistance by Kara-Bulat, sent by Ozbek, all the bells were carried off, all images of saints and crucifixes smashed, and all the churches closed. In spring 1327 Ozbek ordered his governor Tolaktemir to destroy the citadel and several churches. When Ibn Battuta [q.v.], visited "Sardak" (for Sughdak) it looked like a Turkish and Muslim city; only a few Greek artisans were left. The harbour is described by Ibn Battuta as "one of the largest and best. The causeways were mainly of wood and slabs, Paris, ii. 414 sq.). The Christian population soon came back again. The conquest of Sughdak by the Genoese in 1365 and the treaty between them and the Tatars of 1380 were important events in the history of the town. The district of Sughdak in those days extended as far as Alajhata and included 18 villages, almost the same number as the corresponding Turkish kayli in 1774 (19); they must have been the same villages, as the most westerly one, Alajhata (Arab. Shabihata), did not belong in the Genoese period to the district of Sughdak. Sughdak, henceforth, down to the Turkish conquest of 1475, belonged to the Genoese colony of Gazur or Gazaria and was administered by a separate commissary subordinate to the consular of Kaf. In the sources dealing with the Turkish conquest only the fighting round Kaf is fully described; no details of the fall of Sughdak are known. Unlike Kaf, Sughdak experienced no revival under Turkish, nor later under Russian rule. Broniewski (1578) describes Sughdak as a town in ruins. The present ruins (pictures e.g. in Marco Polo, ed. Vule-Stidio, i. 3; Yu. Kulakovsky, Prehistor. Taverci, Kiew 1914, p. 130; L. Kolli, Ist. Taur. Arkh. Komitit, xxiv., p. 4) date mainly from the Genoese period.


AL-SUHAIL, i.e. the Kawsheq (Canopus) of the ancients, the star Ḟāsī in modern star catalogues and 8 Tauri in the heavens (magnitude = 0.9), is always mentioned as the brightest star in the heavens north of 37° of Latitude; for it has a declination of δ = 52° 38’ 54”’ while its right ascension is h = 6° 24’ 18”. In the northern Muslim lands, therefore it scarcely rises above the horizon and for example about the year 2000 n.C. in Babylon its altitude of culmination was only 3° 47’. It was therefore the southernmost of the fixed stars marked on the spider (al-ansūh) of the Arab astrolabes.

The name Suhail was given by the Arabs to several stars in the southern heavens; but suhail al-Yaman, suhail Ṣabur, suhail al-waw, or suhail alone, always meant Canopus i.e. the bright large star in the south of the southern hem in the constellation of al-sagia (the ship). As in the northern parts of the Indian Ocean, Canopus rises in the S.S.E. and sets in the S.W., in the nautical language of the Arabs, according to G. Ferrand, S.S.E. is indicated by muftāl al-suha’il, S. by Ḟasī al-suha’il and S.S.W. with muṣgrib al-suha’il. In Central Arabia Canopus is called Ḟasī al-suha’il; it is used to find the south. According to J. J. Hess, the Bédouin of Central Arabia says: un rātib Ḟasī al-suha’il fī waqfahkh (‘when thou diest, Canopus is in thy face’).

Various suggestions have been made regarding the derivation and meaning of the word suha’il. Ideer points out that suha’il can be explained as diminutive of ṣālīh, ‘level’, but finds Battuta’s explanation the least forced, that al-suha’il received this and the two names Ḟasīr and al-awas because it only rises a little above the horizon in the lands where these names are given it; it is therefore called ‘the heavy’, ‘the earthly’, Ḟasīr from the earth and ṣālīh from the plain, above which it rises very little. Eratothenes tells us that it was called Ḟasīr, ‘terrestrial’ for this reason by the ancients.

According to F. X. Kugler the Babylonians placed Canopus in the constellation of Nuni, = Eritha (= constellation of Erithu i.e. Vela + Southern Foppus + Canopus). On the Greek name Kawsheq the following may be noted. Kawsheq was the steersman of the ship which was to bring Menelaus back to Greece. A storm drove the ship on to the Libyan coast. Kawsheq died here of a snake-bite. Menelaus, deeply mourning the death of his excellent friend had a splendid memorial built in his name and called the settlement of Spartiates that arose here Kawsheq in honour of Kawsheq. It lay on the western mouth of the Nile, a few geographical minutes north of the site of Alexandria (cf. also Tafrihi Aun, ii. 60: ‘Condidere id [uppidinam Canopun] Spartani, ob sepulcrum illius rectorem navis, Canopum, qua tempestat Menelaeus, Graecum repetens, diversam ad mare terramque Libyam delectatis est’).

The Egyptian name for Canopus is not yet certainly known. In the Deian list (cf. Brugsch, Thebanum inscriptionum Egyptiacarum, Leipzig, p. 148, 173), there is the name of a dekan Ḟasī Ḟasī (= he in the boat) but that is a steersman, not alone the steersman Kawsheq, cannot be proved, on the contrary it is improbable that the dekan star is to be sought in the vicinity of the ecliptic.

According to Athanasius Kircher, Canopus was the god of moisture and of fertility and as, he had his abode in the Nile, in Egypt; he was the god of water generally, comparable to Poseidon and Neptune. He was therefore naturally credited with influences relating to seafaring in astrology, i.e. in the horoscope of a new born infant. The following reference to this is found in Hieronymus Vitalis (Lexicon Mathematicum, Turin 1668, p. 63): ‘Argo Navis sidus in caelo ad Australis plagam stellas contineat secundum commanum, namebro, at secundum Beyer, 53. Omnes fere de natura Sainzur, partem Jovis, intra qua una fulgenter in Canopo existas primae magnitudinis, armine Rubali(!). Haeo in Horoscopo, inquit Pontanus in Uramia (cf. Pontanus, Giovanni Giovanni da Caresto, De vegn inuolfibus, lib. xiv., Florenta 1530), facit Nauremon et praeest fortissim in navigationibus, praeerit si Venetis benigno radio fulcitar: at in occasum cum Saturno partiliter reperta, portendit mortem in aqua’.

The treatment of the Arab astronomers and court physician Sinait b. Thabit b. Ḥura Abā Sa’d.
Suhar, a seaport on the coast of Uman. By 24° 37' N. Lat. and 50° 45' East Long., with about 7,500 inhabitants. The harbour has a good roadstead and excellent anchorage and is well protected in the north and west by the promontory of Fanja and from the south by Cape Sawwaha. The most important building is the palace of the lord of the town, which is richly ornamented, having pointed arches, slender round pillars, coved vaulting, projecting balconies and turrets. The palace stands upon a little eminence within the town and is approached by a triple wall and a ditch, which is crossed by a bridge leading to the inner gateway. On the wall are old field guns and four great cannons before the entrance. The palace lies on an open square planted with trees which stretches to the walls on the south. The town is defended by walls on which a few old guns still stand and is guarded by a ditch against the land side. The market-place is large and has a busy trade. The market-hall called Kalajar (q.v.) is vaulted with great swing-doors and is long and spacious; most of the artizans are weavers, smiths, gold and silver-smiths or copper-smiths, and are masters of their crafts. The town is picturesque.

The two or three storied houses are often connected by archways over the narrow streets. The town is probably about two miles round; it is connected by a broad road with neighbouring towns like Maskat; the hinterland is very fertile, well watered, and thickly populated. Fishing is very much followed, and it plays an important part in providing the food supply of the population.

Although A. Sprenger's identification of Suhar with the Oman of Phrae cannot be maintained, there can be no doubt that we have a very old settlement here, which cannot be traced back to the pre-Islamic period at least. How ancient the town is in the eyes of Arab scholars may be seen from the legend which traces its foundation to Suhar, the son of Sama, Nuf. The Persians who were at one time supreme in the gulf called after Yemen were probably the first rulers of this town. The old name of the town, Masin, which the older Arab writers mention, is also Persian. Suhar first appears in history in the year 3 (629/30) when the envoy of the Prophet Muhammad, 'Amr b. al-'As al-Samumi and Abu Zailah al-Ausri, landed the Prophet's message to the two princes of the town, Gallefrey and Abd (or 'Abbadh). They accepted Muhammad's offer and adopted Islam; the first mentioned of the Prophet's envoys remained as resident in 'Uman. The number of the town was again mentioned in the accounts of the burial of Muhammad where it is recorded that the corpse of the Prophet was wrapped in two robes of Suhar manufacture (other texts give Suhit); the textile industry of the town was even then apparently highly developed, which may have been due to Persian influence. The general unrest which ensued the whole of Arabia after the death of the Prophet also affected 'Uman and particularly Suhar. In the war against the leader of the pagan party in 'Uman, Dhu-l-Taqi Lahab b. Malik al-Azdi, in which the leaders of the Muslim party were the two brothers 'Abbad and Dijlah of the al-Djeldjana family, the latter had for a time to abandon Suhar and take refuge in the mountains. But they apparently surrendered in returning to Suhar and handing the resistance against the pagan party there under the two brothers. 'Abbad was taken prisoner in 12 (631/32) but like the rest of 'Uman it was only very loosely attached to the Muslim empire. The situation was altered when the notorious Umayyad governor Hadjajib b. Yumam conquered 'Uman and united it to al-Itak in 751 A.D. the land again became independent and chose a ruler for itself in the person of al-Djeldjana. B. Mau'd al-Azdi, the first imam of 'Uman. The capital however was not Suhar but Nuseyra. By the tenth century A.D. Suhar had attained considerable prosperity. It was considered the most important town of 'Uman and the most beautiful of all Arabia, being a perfect example of a town regular and busy, more important than either Suhur or Nuseyra, healthy, with wonderful markets and pleasant surroundings. The fine houses were built of brick and earthen. The great Friday mosque was built by the sea; the splendid building with a lofty minaret stood on the spot where the Prophet's camel had knelt down. The suhara had a winding staircase which presented different colours, yellow, green and red, from different sides. A small chapel (sajzilat) lay in the centre of a palm-grove. Springs with good water and canals of fresh water provided the town's water-supply and its climate was considered excellent. The caravans from the east and the planks were also of importance for the trade of Yemen. It had an advantageous position for trade with the east. The harbour which was always busy with ships entering or leaving was a parascan in length and breadth. The language of business was Persian, as al-Muhaddi expressly tells us. Merchants from all parts of the world met here. There was constant intercourse with Yemen and China for which expeditions were equipped here. The rich land which produced dates, grains, figs, pomegranates, quinces, and other fruits attained wealth and prosperity. There was also constant intercourse with al-Balqim for which a road ran from Suhar along the coast over the mountains to Dijlah, but its decline soon set in. In the campaign of the Caliph androidx al-Rashid and that of al-Muwaffik the latter of whom tried with more success to gain 'Uman for the Caliphate, do not seem to have seriously affected Suhar. Suhar was destroyed in the Karmatian troubles but rebuilt again. In 362 (972/373) there was an encounter before Suhar between Abu Harb b. 'Adai d al-Dawla's general and the Zindji who had occupied 'Uman. Abu Harb was victorious and seized Suhar, the population of which had to take refuge. In 433 (1042) the Persian king of Kufra sent a Persian army by sea to 'Uman which had risen against him. The fleet anchored before Suhar, occupied the town and brought the people to submission. But neither the Byzantines nor the Seljuk
ruled of Persia, who had succeeded to the inheritance of the Caliphs of Baghdad did anything to revive the prosperity of Shahar. About the middle of the twelfth century A.D. the trade of Shahar with the Par East was ended, when a governor of Yemen by a clever coup seized control of the Persian Gulf and not only strangled traffic by sea but also plundered the coast so that trade went more and more to 'Aden. According to Ibn al-Muqaddasi, who is well informed, Shahar was already destroyed in the first quarter of the seventh century A.D., but its trade had passed to the Persian empire of Hormuz, and to the Arabian harbour of Khadh. Shahar seems to have revived again later and to have been rebuilt for Marco Polo mentions it under the name 'Scor' and says that it traded in horses with Malabar. Ibn Battuta also mentions Shahar in his Observations. On Sept. 16, 1506 a Portuguese fleet, which was conducting an attack on Hormuz from Sokotra, passed for the first time before the town, which the Portuguese called 'Scor'. The town and also the fortress were occupied by them. In 1528, they built a new fort which was restored at the beginning of the sixteenth century, and was surrounded for a circumference of 8 miles with tamarisks and fields of corn and vegetables. The yield from taxation and other revenues was not unimportant and amounted to 1,500 Xerati. When the Ya'rubid Najar b. Murshid b. Sulaim, who had gained a following in the towns in the interior attacked the Portuguese possessions in Umran, the Portuguese could only hold the fortified coast towns of Shahar, Masqat, al-Matraq and Karyat. Their influence on land in any case had never been important. In order to take Shahar, Najar b. Murshid had a fort built on the coast and threatened the city; this attack was so far successful that the Portuguese were only able to hold the citadel of Shahar and also lost Karyat. They were able to retain the fortified market-place for a time on payment of tribute to the Imam; about 1650 they were finally driven out. In 1724, Shahar was taken by Khalil b. Muhirak the rival of Muhammad b. Najar but later surrendered to the Ya'rubid Saif b. Sulaim. In 1738 Shahar was besieged by the Persians, who after the conquest of Masqat had been defeated at Shahar by its governor Ahmud b. Sa'id, but returned to attempt the capture of the town. The stubborn defence under Ahmud foiled all their efforts. The town must have suffered severely — its important commerce had already been ruined by the Portuguese — for according to C. Niebuhr it was of so great importance. A heavy blow to it was the raids by pirates who had settled in the stronghold of Shinak at the beginning of the sixteenth century. Slight relief was brought by English intervention, which led in 1819 to a naval battle between the pirates and ships of the English navy off Shahar. J. K. Wellsted, who visited the town in 1836 describes Shahar as the most important and by far the largest town on the thickly populated Umran coast between Shinak and Birzana, and next in importance to Masqat as a commercial centre. It had 40 large bazaars and maintained a considerable trade with Persia and India. The number of inhabitants including those of the adjoining small villages is put by Wellsted at 9,000, including 20 families of Jews who had a small synagogue and made a living by money-lending. It is evidence of the importance of the trade of Shahar at this time, that the Shah of the town drew a revenue of 10,000 dollars annually from harbour dues and in 1825 the tribute paid by Shahar to the Imam of 'Umran amounted to 24,000 dollars. The treaty concluded by England on Jan. 8, 1820, with the pirates guaranteed for a brief period peace and security in the waters of the Persian Gulf so that the trade and commerce of the ports prospered. But while the then Imam of 'Umran, Saiyid Sa'id, was intent on extending his possessions in East Africa, his authority was undermined in his absence, piracy was again revived and the pirate chief Hamid b. 'Arash seized Shahar and Rasht. The Imam Sa'id could not do much against this and in 1834 was forced to recognise his rival. Two years later he went with the help of the Wahhabis to drive Hamid out of Shahar. The town was blockaded by land and sea but the siege led to no decisive result as Sa'id was afraid that if they took the town it would fall not to him but to the Wahhabis. Sa'id was forced from his dilemma by an English warship which brought Hamid to Masqat, where he was forced to sign a treaty handing over the town to Shahar for his son Sa'id. As the latter did not fulfil the pledges made to his father, and refused him his due share of the revenues, Hamid had his son murdered in 1839 and assumed power himself, but with the approval of England was seized and imprisoned by Sa'id. His brother Sai'ib b. 'Arash succeeded him in Shahar but had to hand over the town in 1852 to Saiyid Sa'id under superior military pressure and to be content with ruling over Rasht. From that date Shahar has again formed part of the imamate of 'Umran, which now for the most part belongs to the kingdom of Ibn Sa'id.

SUHRAWARI

SUHRAWARDI, SHIHAB AL-DIN AND HAFS 'UMAR B. ABUALLI, A SUIFI AND THEOLOGIAN OF THE SHAFI'I SCHOOL, was born in 539 (1145) at Suhrawardi in the province of Dihlab in Persia. He pursued his first studies of mysticism under his uncle Abu'l-Nadjiht, whom he often quotes in his 'Amurâr al-Mâsi'irf — and under the celebrated Shatkh 'Abd al-Kadr al-Dufi. He settled in Baghbad, where he was received at the court of the Caliph al-Nâsir. There he became chief of the Sufis and died at a great age in 632 (1234). Šâdi, when he stayed in Baghbad, studied under Suhrawardi of whom he relates an anecdote in the Bustân (ed. Graf, p. 150). Suhrawardi, who performed the hajj on several occasions, met the poet Ibn al-Farîd during a pilgrimage to Mecca in 1231. On this occasion the two sons of the poet were invested with the khirka ('q.v.) by the celebrated Suhrawardi. 'Umar Suhrawardi is a representative of orthodox Sufism. His best known books are the 'Amurâr al-Mâsi'irf and the Kâjîh al-Nâdjiht al-Šâfi'îya wa-Kâjîh al-Fâdîkh al-Šâfi'îya both dedicated to the Caliph al-Nâsir. The first is one of the most popular treatises on Sufism. It was published in Cairo on the margin of the Isha' of Ghasâli, and translated into English by H. Williborde Clarke (from a Persian version) as an appendix to his translation of Ḥâfi. It is more particularly a treatise on ethics and practical mysticism, but it at the same time contains interesting historical notes and is of value for our knowledge of the Sufi terminology. The Kâjîh al-Nâdiht is a polemical and critical work on the study of Greek philosophy. In it Suhrawardi gives, on the model of the Kâtîf and of Ghasâli, a criticism of the hellenizing philosophers but reveals a much inferior comprehension of philosophy to that of the author of the Táhijât. A curious feature of the book is that in it the Caliph al-Nâsir, who himself taught, is frequently cited as an authority in support of traditions.

Al-Suhrawardi, Shihâb al-Dîn anâ Hâfiz 'Umar b. Abu'Allû, a Sûfî and theologian of the Shafî'i school, was born in 539 (1145) at Suhraward in the province of Dihlab in Persia. He pursued his first studies of mysticism under his uncle Abu'l-Nadjiht, whom he often quotes in his 'Amurâr al-Mâsi'irf — and under the celebrated Shatkh 'Abd al-Kadr al-Dufi. He settled in Baghbad, where he was received at the court of the Caliph al-Nâsir. There he became chief of the Sufis and died at a great age in 632 (1234). Šâdi, when he stayed in Baghbad, studied under Suhrawardi of whom he relates an anecdote in the Bustân (ed. Graf, p. 150). Suhrawardi, who performed the hajj on several occasions, met the poet Ibn al-Farîd during a pilgrimage to Mecca in 1231. On this occasion the two sons of the poet were invested with the khirka ('q.v.) by the celebrated Suhrawardi. 'Umar Suhrawardi is a representative of orthodox Sufism. His best known books are the 'Amurâr al-Mâsi'irf and the Kâjîh al-Nâdjiht al-Šâfi'îya wa-Kâjîh al-Fâdîkh al-Šâfi'îya both dedicated to the Caliph al-Nâsir. The first is one of the most popular treatises on Sufism. It was published in Cairo on the margin of the Isha' of Ghasâli, and translated into English by H. Williborde Clarke (from a Persian version) as an appendix to his translation of Ḥâfi. It is more particularly a treatise on ethics and practical mysticism, but it at the same time contains interesting historical notes and is of value for our knowledge of the Sufi terminology. The Kâjîh al-Nâdiht is a polemical and critical work on the study of Greek philosophy. In it Suhrawardi gives, on the model of the Kâtîf and of Ghasâli, a criticism of the hellenizing philosophers but reveals a much inferior comprehension of philosophy to that of the author of the Táhijât. A curious feature of the book is that in it the Caliph al-Nâsir, who himself taught, is frequently cited as an authority in support of traditions.
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Al-Suhrawardi, Shihâb al-Dîn anâ Hâfiz 'Umar b.
Abu'Allû, known as al-Mâshî, was born in the middle of the 11th century. He studied law at Marâsh and becoming a philosopher and Sufi lived in Isfahan, then in Baghbad and Aleppo. It appears that at Aleppo the viceroy al-Malik al-Zâhir, son of Šâh al-Dîn, at first granted him his patronage but when his mysticism rendered him suspect to true believers and the orthodox party demanded his execution, al-Malik had him put to death in 578 (1181). He was then 36 or 38. He was called al-Mâshî to show that
he was not to be considered a martyr (ṣīḥā). 

Suhrawardi declared himself a Peripatetic and a Shī ṣī, in his interpretation of Aristotle, he is influenced by Ibn Sīnā. While Ibn Sīnā, just like the Greek commentators on Aristotle by whom he is inspired, does not, as a rule, make use of mysticism except to supplement or extend Aristotle's thought by certain Neo-Platonic theories when in his view presents lacunae, or to develop mystic tendencies which he thinks are already implicit in the work of the master, one finds in Suhrawardi alongside of Peripatetic ideas all that mystical philosophy which Ḩasan obtained from Hellenistic syncretism, that mixture of Neo-Platonic doctrines and Hermetic traditions, occult sciences, Coptic traditions and Neo-Pythagorean elements. For Suhrawardi and other Muslim mystics, as had been the case with Hellenistic syncretism, the Neo-Platonic Asclepiades, for example, had composed a treatise "On the Agreement of all Religions"—all philosophical systems and all religions express only one single truth and he claims as his masters Agathodaemon, Hermes and the "five greatest philosophers of Greece", Empedocles, Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato and Aristotle and at the same time Dāmmāq and Buzurgmīr. With patriotic pride he regards the latter as the true precursor of the Greek thinkers (the Jewish historian Aramaeans first century a. c.,) had already (in the sense that Moses was the teacher of Orpheus and was known to the Greeks as Musaeus) and according to him it was they who — far from being dualists were the first to express the truth of absolute Being and contingent Being under the symbols of Light and Darkness. But, although he professes agreement with Aristotle and Plato, he gives in his principal work, Kitāb ʿIkmāt al-Ṭahrār (lithogr. Tehrān 1316 = 1898) a prominent place to an attack on Aristotle. The extreme liberalism of his ideas even allows him, while teaching in other passages the theories criticized, to repeat the criticisms which the Kālīlm had formulated against certain fundamental theories of the logic and metaphysics of Aristotle, e.g. against the theory of the definition of essence (by the argument, of sceptical origin, that we could only find the universal by complete induction from the particular cases which are infinite in number), and against the doctrine of matter (by the argument — of Stoic origin — that the possible has no objective existence, if this were not the case, it would be at once potential and actual). As a rule we find, quite frequently in him, those theories and arguments of the Sceptics and Stoics which the Kālīlm had taken up; he teaches for example the theory of the Stoics — revived by Leibniz — of the identity of the indivisibles and the theory of the Stoics in the sense of the Sceptics, of the subjectivity or the impossibility of relations and he shares with the Kālīlm the optimism of Stoic (or Neo-Platonic) theology — revived by Leibniz — "that everything is for the best in the best in the possible worlds".

But what is most characteristic of his work is his metaphysics of light, of illumination (ṭahrār). It is the Neo-Platonic theory of light, a spiritual light which serves as a symbol of emanation but at the same time is regarded as the fundamental reality of things. We find this theory, which has played a great part in Christian and Muslim philosophy and mysticism, in most of the Arab philosophers, especially in Fārābī, Ibn Sīnā and Ghazālī, but no one, I believe, has made so much use of this symbol as Suhrawardi. Necessity and contingency, being and non-being, substance and accident, cause and effect, thought and sensation, body and soul, are all explained by his doctrine of ʿahlā ṭahrār; he regards all that lives, or moves or has its being as light and even his proof of the existence of God is based upon this symbol. It is particularly for his metaphysics of light that he is known to posterity; he was the founder of a sect, whose name al-ṭahrārīyān is derived from ʿahlā ṭahrār and the order of dervishes, who trace their foundation to him, are similarly called Nūrākhhāyya.


SUHUF. [See SUFI.]

SUFI (A.), market, frequent in street- and place-names. The word in this sense is, according to Fraenkel, Die arab. Fremdwörter im Arab., Leiden 1886, p. 187, borrowed from the Aramaic. Fraenkel was especially induced to come to this opinion by the consideration that "market in this sense must have been unknown to the earliest Arabs". This may be true for the early period during which the word may be presumed to have been borrowed from the Aramaic; but it is certain that regular markets were already in existence among the Arabs before Islam; on this the most recent reference is H. Lammens, Le Marché et la ville de l'Hisn (M. L. F. A. O., 8, 3, 1924), p. 57—58 (153—154), from whose quotations it is evident that suh was used not only in the meaning of "market-place" but also in that of "market".

The whole complex of social, economic, and legal problems of the Muslim world associated with the conception of "market" can only be hinted at here. Preliminary studies dealing with special aspects of these questions do not exist; on the other hand, in many works of the most varied nature there are occasional notes which still have to be submitted to a systematic examination. The most important thing to remember in such a study is that Islam, in a very short time conquered an enormous territory, and the separate parts of which, being early independent kingdoms, with very different economic and legal histories, at once formed into one state with a uniform government with a system of law based on a single canon and administered by organs of the central authority and not by an independent local authority. The importance of this lies in the fact that Islam by its whole structure prevented the growth of
civic communities, possessing the right of making laws of their own, and able to use them in the local market, as was the case in the west during the middle ages. At the same time, it is recognised that in Islam the existence of a market with much more independent of the protection of the town, in which it was situated than was the case in the west, in legal theory at least, and probably in fact also. The historian of the market in the Dar al-I’imam will thus have to trace back to pre-Muhammadan times the local history of the markets in the different regions and to ascertain to what degree the Muslim conquest interfered with their development, and finally will have to ask whether typical developments were found after a study of many different cases as far apart geographically as possible, which are characteristic of different parts of the empire and whether and how these types differ from the markets of these towns, which were only founded by the conquerors or at any rate after the conquest. Such an investigation would be very important not only from the point of view of social, economic, and legal history, but it would be to a very special degree throw light on the relation between shar’ia and practice, and on the question whether the difference between the sects and the madhahib in the different parts of the world of Islam favoured a varying development of this relation in certain fields, for example, on that of the history of the market, which is not to be traced to the fact that the regions in question belonged to different kingdoms before Islam.

The Bibliography which would be required to study this problem is almost boundless; it is easier to mention Muslim works which are valuable for our subject than those that are. There is the whole theological, historical, geographical and adab literature, as well as applied philosophy and a part of the poetry. Only philology, metaphysics, mathematics and some natural sciences can be dropped, in so far as they do not deal with valuable goods.

There is much economic material in modern travel, etc.; but these do not deal with questions of historical development. A few observations might serve as starting points are to be found in Max Weber, Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft (Grundriss der Socialkonomie, 3rd ed., 1922, p. 599) and in the posthumous Wirtschaftsgeschichte der same writer (1923), Index s. V. Vorderer Orient (Jünger’s Perioden).

Special mention should be made of al-Dinshah, K. al-Isa’ar ila Muhajir bi Tahrir; cf. H. Ritter, Ein arabisches Handbuch der Handelswissenschaft (Leipzig, 1892), p. 529 sqq. (cf. I. H. Schaeder in Ital., xiv. 1925, p. 5 sqq.) and in the posthumous Wirtschaftsgeschichte of the same writer (1923), Index s. V. Vorderer Orient (Jünger’s Perioden).

SUK. A small town in Iraq on the right bank of the Euphrates, about 25 miles to the east of N'Gyapa, opposite the mouth of the canal al-Bâdi'a, an arm of the Shatt al-Haiyeh. The distance to Basra as the crow flies is about 100 miles. The town is surrounded by date-groves extending along the river bank, but the marshy country, that extends into Basra, makes the air very unhealthy. Suk’ al-Shuyukh was founded in the first half of the twelfth century as a market-place (sâq) of the confederation of the Musafik [q. v.]. Azabu, 4 hours to the east there was formerly the residence of the chief Shifâ of the Suk’; called Kit’ al-Shuyukh; the plural shuyukh designates the members of the clan of this chief. To the end of the eighth century Suk was a small town with a mosque, surrounded by earthen walls (muqaba) and in the beginning of the ninth century it is described as an extremely dirty town, inhabited by 6,000 families and having a lively commercial intercourse with Basra and even with Baghdad and Bâbîyûn. According to Frézer the Suk’ Shifâ was established to live in the town, but in Petermann’s time (1854) he had a house there; the last-mentioned traveller estimates the number of the population at 3,000. At the end of the sixth century the number 12,000 is given (Cânet), of whom 2,250 were Samani, possessing two mosques (qâbiyya) and 3,770 Shifâs with one sanctuary (masjid).

The population also included of 250 Jews and 700 Mandaeanas or Shobâ. The latter lived for the greater part in the suburb Sabûkû on the opposite bank of the Euphrates. Before 953 the Mandaeanan population had numbered 260 families, but the oppression of the Musafik had caused 200 families to emigrate to Amâra. The German orientalist Petermann in the year 1854 visited in Suk’ al-Shuyukh the high priest of the Mandaeanas, Shifâ Yâbûs. As these people are here silversmiths; they are also builders of a special type of boats.

Under Turkish administration Suk’ al-Shuyukh became the capital of a hâshîa of the same name in the sanâ’iyyat of Mandaeanas. The tribes living on both sides of the town (Bâdî’ and Bânt Asal) are Shifâs. The number of the population of the hâshîa is given as 50,000 (Cânet).


SUKAINA, daughter of al-Husain b. ‘Abî Tâlib and of Rabab bint ‘Abd al-‘Iqal b. ‘Abî ‘Abd. The poetess, who gave her daughter the name of Sukaina (sometimes called Sakina, but the Kamûs has Sukaina). Her real name was Ummâna (according to Ibn al-Kalbi quoted by Ibn Sa’d and the Kamûs) or Ummâna but more probably Amâna or Aminah (according to the Kamûs). The date of her birth is not known; but she was a little girl at the time of her father’s death (definitely stated by ‘Abu Tâlib, ib. 234 sqq., and by Ibn al-A‘thâr in telling of the death of ‘Abd al-Mu’inn, ib. 73; the same writer says that she had the survivors of the day of Kerbela—of whom Sukaina was one—brought to Medina under a strong guard, and that her father’s mother died of grief a year later (ibid., iv. 76/74). Sukaina is particularly famous for her successive marriages; very contradictory statements are given regarding their number and order. According to the Kitab al-Aghani, a proposed marriage with her cousin Hassan b. al-Husain b. ‘Abî ‘Abd
to nothing and the latter married Sukaina's sister Fátima. Ibn Kutaba and Ibn Sa’id give lists; the
former three lists in which the order varies, the
second two lists; the Ágāhí gives six contra-
dictory lists. It is best in the circumstances to
accept the oldest order, on which Kutaba and
Ibn Sa’id are almost in agreement; the order adopted
by Ibn Khallíkán. His first husband, slavery when
this, was Muṣa‘ab b. al-Zubair b. al-Mughíl b. Anbíá (d. in
70 or 71 in a battle fought against Abú al-Mallik
b. Marwán; cf. Ibn al-Aš’ír, iv. 263 sqq.) Muṣa‘ab
gave Sukaina a considerable dowry when she was
given him by her brother Ali (cf. the satirical
verse in Thálibí, La’áfí, p. 53); they had a
dughter whom Sukaina gave her mother's
done; this daughter married the brother of Muṣa‘ab
and died young. The second husband of Sukaina
seems to have been Abdalláh b. Uthmán, nephew
of Muṣa‘ab b. al-Zubair; from this union was born
Uthmán called Kurání (and according to Ibn Sa’d,
two other children Hákím and Raḥím), a union
not always peaceful (according to the Ágāhí). The
third husband was, according to Ibn Sa’d,
Zaid b. Amr b. Uthmán b. Ḥafṣ; the Ágāhí
describes him as unreliable and unreliable and speaks
of continual quarrels with Sukaina, who survived
him. According to Al-Ash’írî, b. Abú-l-Atlâ b. Marwán (d. 360),
brother of Umar b. ’Abd al-As’î and governor of
Egypt from 75 A.H., married the divorced Sukaina
without ever consummating the union (too much
stress need not be laid on the differences of
the biographers on this question; while Ibn Kutaba,
followed by Ibn Khallíkán and Sa’dí makes al-
Aṣbagh the third husband of Sukaina, Ibn Sa’d
and a verse quoted by the Ágāhí makes it
her fourth husband). According to Ibn Sa’d, besides,
Sukaina married, immediately after Zaid b. Amr,
Ibráhím b. Abú-k-Rá’ám b. ’Áfí al-Zanjírí with
whom she lived three months; they were divorced,
and it is said by orders of Hákím b. Abú al-Mallik,
which is not at all probable; according to Ibn
Khallíkán and Ibn Kutab (Ma’aráf) Ibráhím died in
76, aged 75; the marriage must therefore have been
earlier. Ibn Kutaba further records, without
giving an authority, that Sukaina married Amr
b. Hákím b. Ḥasán. The statements of the Ágāhí
about a marriage between Sukaina and her cousin
Abdalláh b. ’Ásín b. All may be rejected. Sukaina
was generally recognised to have been of the
most remarkable women of her time. One of the
authorities quoted by the Ágāhí (xiv.) describes
her as chaste, fastidious, full of a dignity which
did not exclude a fondness for cudgelling (jest
and hoaxes quoted, xiv. and xvii., p. 94, 97, 101).
The length of her hair was celebrated; she had
a particular method of arranging it; at a later period
Umar b. ’Abd al-As’î strictly prohibited
this coiffure. She was very proud, not only of
her beauty but of her ancestors (Ágāhí, xiv. 164)
and of her daughter whom she liked to cover with
jewels. She also gave evidence of the possession
of courage, if we may believe Ágāhí (xiv.) in
the stoicism with which she submitted to an
operation on the eye. She was also a woman of
wit, devoted to poetry and some numerous anecdotes
(Ágāhí). She spent her life in the region of
the sacred cities and died at Madinah on Thursday
5 A.H. (April 7, 735). Her burial was postponed
for several hours because the governor ordered that they should wait till he could arrive.
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a reed produces honey "without bees" and Maga-
athenes, who went to India several times as an
ambassador, about 300 B.C. tells a similar story.
Theophrastus speaks of ἀμπέλος [nature un-
known, the translation "reed honey" is doubtful];
later writers hardly add anything new. Pliny never
mentions the sugar-cane; on the other hand the
word σάμπαρης is found first in him and in Dios-
cutides, applied to a kind of "liquid honey from
India and Vasia" which is found in a reed and
looks like sait". In the Periplus (c. 77 A.D.) a
"reed-honey" called σάμπαρης (see above) is men-
tioned as an article of export from Banygaza (the
modern Barouch). Galen quotes Dioscutides, but
hardly makes any use of the scarce stuff which
was difficult to obtain. According to E. O. von
Lippmann, σάμπαρης is not a product of the
sugar-cane and should not be identified with our
sugar. In Sanskrit the word means something
friable, of the constitution of sand or grains of
corn. The purification of sugar was first known
in India about 350 A.D.; the first certain European
mention is in 627 A.D. in connection with the
conquest of Damascus, the capital of the Persian
king Khosrov II, when sugar is mentioned among
the Indian treasures of the Persian king. It may
be assumed that the manufacture of sugar and the
cultivation of the sugar-cane reached Persia at the
same time, as the flat and moist low-lying lands of southern Mesopotamia and Kūtāista
afforded excellent conditions for its cultivation.
At first cultivated only to a small extent for
medical purposes or as a valuable sweet, the
sugar-cane was very rapidly spread by the Arabs
after the conquest of Persia, anywhere that the
climatic conditions were suitable to the plant,
notably Egypt, along the north coast of Africa
as far as Morocco (Sa'a-at-Alia), Spain and Sicily.
India and Persia however still remained the main
centres of production.

All the sources for the history of the sugar-cane
and sugar, including Oriental ones, as far as available
up to 1890, were utilized by E. O. von Lippmann in his Geschichte des Zuckerbaus, Leipzig 1890. A new
work on the subject which will take note of the
new literature of the last 40 years is desirable in
the near future. Below are given also a few works
dealing with the narrower field of Islam and Persia.

Bibliography: E. Wiedemann, Über den Zucker
bei den Muslimen, Beitr., iii. 60,
Nachträge zu den Aufsätzen über den Zucker,
376; P. Schwarz, Die Zuckererzeugung von Arabien,
in Zbl., 1920, p. 209; L. Immanuel Löw,
Der Zucker. Ein Kapitel aus der Flora der

AL-SUKKAR, AL-HASAN B. AL-HUSAYN B.
Ubaidallah Abu Salih, an Arabic philo-
logist, pupil of Abu l-Fadl al-Riyahi, the pupil
of al-Ash'at, who is also sometimes wrongly
mentioned as one of his teachers, although this
is impossible on chronological grounds alone, and
of Muhammad b. al-Hajjih and of Abu Hāmid al-
Sidqiyya, born 212 (830), died 275 (888). His
activities were almost entirely devoted to the
collection and editing of old Arabic poems. Of the
Divan of various tribes collected by him, only that
of the Hasha'is has survived but is incomplete.
That he had the help of other collections for this
edition (see Goldhaff, D. L. Z., 1895, p. 1455) is
very probable; but when Abu al-Kasir al-Baghdadi
in the Kitab al-Adab, ii. 317, speaks of a
copy of the year 200 A.H. the quotation cannot be
from the commentary of al-Suwaiti, that is to say
here a certain manuscript in the possession of the
Divan. Besides the editions by Rügmen, Well-
hausen and Heil we have also Suqar's commentary
edited by E. B. H. Mehdi and published by the
Commission pour l'encyclopédie d'al-Suqar,
Académie Osmenne, 1923. Of his still frec-
quently quoted Abu'l-Hasan al-Latibi only the
Divan of Tirmidi, ed. W. Wright in Osmume arabica,
Leiden 1858, 76-95, survives. Of his editions of
the Divan of various poets we presently possess
only the Divan of Imm al-Alaik in the Leyden MS.
Warn, 901 (1, Catalogus cod. ex. bibl. ac.
Art. Bibl., 7 ed. i. 347, No. 55), and perhaps
that of Kais b. Kinahin, see ed. Koemel, xxxvi.
His only share in the surviving recension of the
Nawfah of Abu 'Ali al-Ash'at was that of a transmitter
from his teacher Muhammad b. al-Hajjih. Quotations
from other works are given in G. L., i. 105.

Bibliography: Ibn al-Nadim, al-Fihrist,
p. 78, 20-27; Ibn al-Anabi, Nishat al-Alba'id,
p. 274-275; Yalbugh, Irshad al-Azhar, ed. Mar-
goloschitz, ii. 82-94; al-Suyuti, Bughyat
al-Wafa', p. 200-203; Flügel, Die grammatisch-
schulischen Schriften der Araber, p. 89.
(C. Brockelmann)

SUQMAN (SUQMAN) B. OTTO, MH., AL-
Dawla, lord of Hīmān Kaftā. After the death
of his father Ottok in 484 (1094/1095) Suqman,
jointly with his brother Tīghitā [q. v.] received
the city of Jerusalem as a fief from the Saldūkī
Sultan Tustābac b. Alp Arslan. But by Šukbān
489 (July-Aug. 1069) it, according to another
theless reliable statement, in 491 (1098), it was
taken from them by the Pātīmis. The two brothers
then went first to Damascus from which Tīghitā
went to al-Ṭarrīk and Suqman sought refuge in
Edessa. After the inhabitants of this town, who
were mainly Armenians, had called in the Franks
and given them rule over the town, Suqman
collected an army with which he went to al-Ṭarrīk.
He was successful in taking the town of Sābīrāt
but when he met the enemy soon after
it was defeated and had to take to flight
(Rabī' 1, 494 = Jan. 1101), whereupon the victors
wrote a fearful massacre among the people of
the town. After some time Hīmān Kaftā was taken
by Suqman. The amr Kūri كتابq. v.] who lived
in al-Mawṣull died in Abu l-Fadl al-Riyahi, 495
(Aug.-Sept. 1102) and when his governor in Hīmān Kaftā, Mūsā al-Turkmānī, quarrelled with Dājkārī, the
lord of Dājkārī Ibn 'Omar, his troops abandoned him
and went over to Dājkārī, whereupon Mūsā
in desperate straits sought help from Suq-
man, who was then in Dīyār Bakr, and had to
give him Hīmān Kaftā in return. In time Suqman
succeeded in bringing Mūsā and under his rule.
In Rabī' 1, 496 (Dec. 1102), Sultan Bāṣrīyāqūd
[q. v.] appointed Gümüştekin al-Kaṣārī governor
of Baghdad, although Tīghitā had already been
given this office by Bāṣrīyāqūd's rival, his brother
Muhammad. With the help of his brother Suqman
and the lord of al-Hilla, şāñakah b. Manṣūr [q. v.],
Tīghitā was soon able to dispose of Gümüştekin.
When the Franks attacked Harrān in 497 (1104),
the old enemy Suqman and Dājkārī, who were
just preparing to attack one another, made
up their quarrel. The people of Harrān were

already negotiating their surrender to the Franks, when the two amirs, who had met on the Khâbûr, arrived in time to relieve the town. A battle was fought on the Ballûh, a tributary of the Euphrates, and the Franks were completely defeated. Count Baldwin of Edessa and Pescocin were taken prisoners, while Boemund and Tancred succeeded in reaching Edessa with great difficulty. In spite of the brilliant victory it wanted little to arouse once more the old jealousy between the two Muslim leaders, as the rich booty which fell to Sukman's men aroused the envy of their allies and only Sukman's skillful diplomacy enabled the threatening danger to be averted from the victors. After the resistance of the Franks had been temporarily broken, Djkermish took possession of Harran and then turned his attention to Edessa. There Tancred commanded, while Boemund remained in Antioch. The latter was at once sent for, but as difficult roads delayed his march, Tancred resolved to risk all on one throw and made a bold sortie early one morning. He succeeded in surprising the besiegers and put them to flight. Soon afterwards Ibn 'Ammâr, lord of Tripoli, appealed to Sukman for help against the Franks. Sukman declared himself ready to assist and set him out for Damascus, but died on the way (beginning of Şafar 498 = Oct. 1104). In Hîşan Kâsit he was succeeded by his son Ibrahim, and in Mâridm by his brother Ikhâzî.


**SULAHFÎT, the tortoise, or turtle.** Land (tortoise) and sea (turtle) varieties are distinguished as al-barnât and al-khâbût. Al-Damîrî and al-Kawrî give practically the same names about their habits. The turtle attains the size of an island. As it cannot hatch its eggs on account of the hardness and coldness of the shell on its belly, it looks after the eggs until God allows the young ones to come out. If the eggs fall into water, turtles are born from them. Magical qualities are attributed to them by the Kitâb al-Khâbûtî of Bâlânûn and healing properties are mentioned by al-Kawrî and al-Damîrî. Combs are made from the shell. The stupidity of the tortoise is proverbial.

Sulahfît is also the Arabic name of the constellation of Lyra, compared to the Greek glâρides, and al-Kawrî, Al-Masâbîrî, al-Damîrî, al-Harîrî, al-Ḥayâwânî, transl. Jayakar, ii. 55; L. Ideler, Sctenaen, p. 68. (J. RUEKA)

**SULAHIB.** The generic and proper name of this Arab pariah tribe living in Central Arabia and the adjoining territory, usually called Sulahib (pronounced Şîlib), is (according to a letter from the Carmelite father A. M. de St. Élie) Sulahîa (pronounced Şîba). The collective form is derived from the singular Sulahib (pronounced Şîbîy), fem.

Sulahîya. The plural al-Sulahîs is also found (in Wetzstein, Z. d. d. Ges., xlii. 125). Hess only knows the term Şîba. The diminutive form, which is commonly used in Arabia with a contemptuous sense, from Sulahib is Sulahîb, or sg. in Sulahî or Sulahîba. The combination with šâli and šâliy is also occasionally found but is probably not correct, as in Arabic geographical proper names no essential alteration took place in the oldest recorded form of the name in the form or combination of these names from the period of the oldest tradition. This applies even to the use of the Arabic article al-.

The most varied explanations are given of the meaning and origio of their name. Those who connect the word Sulahib with totemism have most in their favour, of all the explanations given in Pieper's work (p. 65—69); for the same [q.v.] of that tribe is said by some (St. Élie in Mackriq, Wetzstein and Palgrave) to be the cross eš-šâli (q.v.j.; but Huber (197) gives their tribal badge as another symbol, a short stroke with a semispherical knob at the end (mezqâ); according to Massignac, Ammérieur du Monde Musulman, p. 93: eš-mêka); probably a parrying-shield such as is known by the people of the Upper Nile and the Dinka. Another tribal mark is eš-šâliem, which looks like a "K" and is branded on the left shoulder of their animals, while the mezqâ is put on leg, neck, and upper cheek (Massignac, loc. cit., p. 75). The other less probable interpretation, which, according to Doughty (L. 283) and Pelly (189), is the Bedouin etymology, derives the tribal name from the expression yâbûl al-ʿ Arab (= the Arab's stock, from the back of the Arabs = the dregs of the Arabs). On the other hand the Arab derivation from yâbûl (= hard, hardened, steadfast, i.e. in faith; St. Élie in Mackriq, p. 674) is only to be adopted with some misgiving as perhaps illuminating but hardly scientific in my opinion. A connection of the name Sulahib with Greek gods of agriculture, according to St. Élie (loc. cit., p. 674) were called "Sulèves" may on the other hand be at once rejected as it is little probable that the Sulahib, being in the main hunters, should have formerly worshipped agricultural deities. Nor can the name be derived from names of places, e.g. from Sulahib (Şolîb; St. Élie, loc. cit., p. 674). Their name does not seem to be a patronymic, not simply because the compound name Banû Sulahib is hardly to be found and is incorrect but also because neither in the Arab legends so far known nor in the scanty references of the Arab historians and geographers is there any mention of the name of a possible ancestor from which the name of their tribe could be derived (their legendary ancestor Dahân does not come into question here). The suggestion that they are descended from the Crusaders (Şolîbî, Şolîbya; cf. St. Élie, loc. cit., p. 613, first made in the Paris periodical Le Reveil de Marie, 1864) is very improbable for practical reasons and because historical references suggesting such a thing are entirely wanting.

Their origin and descent is obscure because they have already remarked, the historical sources give negligible information about them and their important points in particular, which may be due not only to their small numbers and slight importance, but particularly to their low social status as a despised and barely tolerated pariah tribe among the
Beduins: In the earlier Arabic literature they are not called by their proper name Sulabh, Sulab, etc., but are called al-Za'abah (according to a letter from St. Elie). So far as I know there are no genealogies of them in existence, nor even fictitious ones. Their legends and those of the Arabs form only a very poor substitute for this deficiency. Common to them — and this is very significant — is the statement that the ancestors of the Sulabah once held a much higher social and economic position than they do now (St. Elie, loc. cit., p. 675; Doughty, l. 283), which however they forfeited through arrogance etc. (until of the Fall; a Christian survival). Felly (p. 189) says that an Arab once had sexual intercourse with his mother and the Sulabah are the descendants of this act of incest. Quite apart from the fact that it is the regular custom in Arabia to discharge the descent of one's enemies or people one holds in contempt — even beyond the bounds of truth — the story given by Felly recalls a significant statement in Strabo (xvi. 4, 93); according to him the Nabataeans recognize marriage with the widowed mother of the death of a father, a peculiar degeneration of the true Semitic institution of the levirate marriage. Wright, p. 43, records another legend, which may be important for dating the age of this people. Their ancestors are said to have left Husain b. 'Ali and his followers and companions 'in the lunch at the battle of Kerbelah' (61 = 650) and thus contributed to the guilt of their massacre. This is unusual as it suggests the Zufah and a connection with Mesopotamia. More positive facts however throw light on the present position of the Sulabah, their customs, ideas, and social position with regard to the other Arabs. It is decisive for their whole existence and peculiarities that they, like the Himyar (pronounced Hatim or H'tim), Al-Az, Arab and Arab gypsies (Nawar, sing. Nūrī) — are a race of pariahs. The area over which they are found is the whole of the interior of the northern and central part of the Arabian peninsula. The southern frontier of the country over which they wander corresponds roughly with the Tropic of Cancer on the southern boundary of the fertile zone of Najd. Assertions to the contrary by Felly, p. 189 and Doughty, l. 282, are not so very important in my opinion, as there had been no previous mention of them in South Arabia and Yemen by Europeans who had travelled there, which would be remarkable in the case of a people of such striking appearance as the Sulabah. This does not of course mean that we deny their occasional appearance in these regions. A further argument in favour of this assertion is that the Sulabah are reckoned with the Ahl al-Shemal (cf. Curtius, p. 46, note 2). The large towns on the borders of the steppes and deserts are only occasionally visited by the desert Sulabah to buy provisions, arms (Wettstein in Z. D. M. G., xl. 492) and nutritions and other necessaries or to sell their manufactures and booty of the chase. On the other hand some of them are settled in the fertile parts of Mesopotamia, Syria, Palestine and Transjordania. Within the area above defined, especially in the steppes district, the desert Sulabah wander northwards or southwards, according to the season, following the movements of the game, their chief source of food, which depends on the growth and decline of vegetation. They, like the Beduins, are not settled. The few Sulabah in the more fertile zones on the edge of the Arabian deserts need hardly be taken into account, especially as they are also for the most part half nomad. Their unsettled and migratory form of life is connected with their way of living. Unlike the Beduins, they live for the most part by hunting or handicraft. This also causes them to split up into very small groups whether settled or migratory — here again unlike the Beduins. They are found, according to Raymond and Martinet, p. 30—35, in little groups of two or three families, but it sometimes happens although rarely, that larger bodies are found wandering or camping together. This is all the more remarkable as in Arabia the tribes acquire all the more prestige and are less exposed to hostilities the greater their numbers. The Sulabah share this peculiarity with the other wandering pariah tribes of Arabia. But in particular places in Arabia the Sulabah are said to be found in larger bodies. According to Doughty, l. 283, this is particularly the case in the oases of Taimk and Wejifa. The fact that they are so thinly distributed makes it difficult to estimate their numbers and the estimates vary very much. St. Elie, loc. cit., p. 675) at the end of 1898 (?) puts their strength at over 700 tents which, as a mean, is probably nearest the truth, for Curtius, p. 46 note 1, gives 400 and Huber, p. 496, 1,000 tents for al-Hudayr or al-Hudayra alone. The latter figure can only be taken with scepticism. They are divided into different small tribes and these again into classes. According to Raymond and Martinet, p. 30—35, supplemented by the publications of St. Elie, the best living authority on this people, and letters from him to me, the Sulabah have been divided since the last century into three sub-tribes as follows:

1. Sulah (Sulab), who are divided into the sub-tribes of:
   1. al-Malēh;
   2. al-Tümil [Tumeil] (the shameless);
   3. al-Madjid in Lower Mesopotamia or filial al-Munafik [dial. also: al-Mayyad];
   4. al-Durairī [Duraib] (the nimble, alert, active);
   5. al-Kalibāwâ (the faithful, reliable) [dial. al-Gabâin];
   6. al-Benâ'îk [dial. al-Banâ'î] (those who hunt partridge with extraordinary skill);
   7. al-Nâ'îm;
   8. al-Tarîs;
   9. al-Ḥazīm and
      and Martinet, loc. cit., wrongly called:
      Shelpat).

II. Sub-tribe of al-Ṣāridin; clan: al-Amiru and

III. Sub-tribe of al-Ghumuri or al-Ghumin, also wrongly called: Barfi Ghumarni [Bani Gh'amar].

Another division on a geographical basis is given (in a letter) by St. Elie. I. Sub-tribe of desert-Sulab or Khaliwiyâ [Khaliwiyâ], sgl.: Khalawî [Khelawi] or Khalawa [Khelaw], who are divided into the following clans:
   1. al-Majdī in Nakha Banu Khalid in Najd;
   2. al-Rashīdīa;
   3. al-Awâsîm: Rashîdīa and 'Awâsim meet in the hinterland of al-Kuwait;
   4. al-Ḥizm at Nukẖāth [Nukhbat], at Tobūl Tathal and at al-Salām, i.e. in the land between Lower Mesopotamia and Najd;
of Sulaba, so far as I know, are the little sketch by Euting in the second volume of his Travels and the group (the only picture to some extent satisfactory) in v. Oppenheim, i. 220, which however is not sufficient for any far-reaching deductions. In any case from all the evidence available, this people seems, according to Christian (Staats-Ber. Wien. Anthrop. Ges., 1923/1924) and Littman (cf. Pieper, p. 75), to belong to the Mediterranean branch of the human race and also to be of Semitic stock.

As to their character, the Sulaba are readily distinguished to their advantage by their universal cheerful and open nature. Although the lower and always suspicious Beduins. They are not ungracious, musical and poetically, whence they can earn a living in the tents of the Beduins, and are kindly, peaceful, of gentle and amiable disposition and hospitable like all Orientals. According to a letter from St. Elie they are on the other hand not very liberal on the match or on their passages through the desert so that travellers who want anything from them have to threaten them. Their moral standard, as with all parish peoples, does not seem to be very high.

Much more important for ascertaining their racial connections are their mode of life, customs, ideas and particularly their position with regard to the people among whom they live. It is this that marks them as pariahs. As to their mode of life it has already been mentioned that they make a living in quite a Semitic fashion (Christian, op. cit.) for the true Semite of these lands earns his livelihood either as a cattle-rearing nomad or as a trader, sometimes also as an artisan and soldier—mainly by the chase. Their main booty is the gazelle (gazella dorcas), the saber antelope or hajjar waqif (oryx elgazl, Pall.), the wild goat (capra hircus nubiana-sinaitica, Hempr. Ad rhueb.), and of ground game the desert fowl or the black bird (perdiculae exulata, L.), bustards, e.g. the habar (Houbara obsidulata, J. scq.) ostriches (struthio camelus, L.) in spite of their statements to the contrary by several travellers (e.g. Musil, iii. 19), are no longer hunted as they have been driven away or by the south. Besides these wild creatures, anything else that is at all possible is eaten by them as being pariahs, they have no prohibitions regarding food either from custom or belief. They even eat the vulture and the dog, despised by the Arabs as unclean (Huber, p. 192; Doughty, i. 281; Pelly, p. 189). Pieper, p. 31-34 gives a detailed account of a Sulaba hunt, which is conducted either on foot by stalking or from the back of an ass. Another main business of the desert Sulaba with whom we are mainly concerned here, is the rearing and sale of the Sulaba ass, highly esteemed for its excellent qualities, also called Sulahit (Stall). Their strength and endurance and appearance are described by Musil, op. cit., iii. 291, and Butler, p. 524. As a rule they are light, almost white in colour, Huber, p. 588; however (cf. Wright, p. 59) says that a clan of Sulaba on the Djebel "Awdjik" about 1850 also bred dark coloured asses. According to Musil, op. cit., the Sulaba catch wild asses (equus asinus aferrem, Fitz.) and use them for breeding whereby the strength of their asses is maintained at a high level. On account of their excellence these animals are very highly esteemed by the citizens and soldiery of the lands bordering on the Arabian deserts who do not share the prejudice of the
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Beduins against the ass, and exported even to Europe under the name Baghdadi or Moroccan ass. At the same time that only rarely — this must be emphasised — individual Šulabs, e.g. those parts of this people who lived under the rule of the enlightened and vigorous amir of Ḥa'il, the well known opponent of the Wahhabi, Muḥammad b. Rashid, also rear camels (camelus dromedarius, L.). Each family among them has on an average three or four camels. But this must be considered exceptional. As a general rule if the Šulabs were to accumulate or possess wealth to any considerable degree in the larger domestic animals, desired by the robber Beduins (with the exception of the ass which they detest), they would no longer enjoy protection and security from their attacks. This immaturity has also a material foundation: the Šulab pay their hosts a tribute, the so-called "brotherhood tax" (ḫawwara; cf. in Raynau and Martinet, p. 32, the list of their 9 ḫawwara) for permission to graze and sojourn among them. Huber, p. 197 and Butler, p. 524, however, say that they are attacked and persecuted by several Beduin tribes, e.g. the "Aḏjašt, and on religious grounds by the Ḧijjāt also, according to Huber and according to Butler, out of covetousness by the robber "Anze [q.v.] as soon as they become prosperous. They also keep — although not in such large numbers as the Beduins — sheep and goats, less for their meat than for their wool, milk, and milk products. The Šulab further work as day-labourers among the fellahin of Ta'īma and other oases during the date-harvest (Huber, p. 588) or work as smiths and carpenters. The latter may be evidence in favour of a great antiquity for this people (cf. Eisler, for Wirtschaftsgrünen, Freiburg, 1919, p. 741). They are, like the (Arabian) gipsies, with whom they have nothing racial in common, as the latter's origin has been established beyond all doubt by de Goeje (Bijdr. tot de geschied. d. Zigeunen, and Mém. sur les migrations d. Triganes, etc.), skillful tinsmiths, make and repair weapons, sickles, domestic utensils of brass (šabbı al-khīlawiya) etc. and wooden frames for the saddles of pack-camels, wooden screws, wooden vessels, etc. They are thus indispensable to the Beduins — a further ground for their immunity. They are well known and welcome for their medical practice on men and animals (St. Élie in Mackenzie, p. 680 sq.) which consists partly of cauterisation (hāy) and partly of argents, manipulations which follow definite rules, known only to the experts. Their fortune-telling is also mentioned (Blunt, ii. 110) and their begging (Dooghy, i. 284; Barckhardt, p. 14). Their dress and dwellings are most primitive. They wear a garment of skins (farwa) made of 15—20 gazelle-hides dried in the sun and sewn together with the hair outside (cf. the picture in von Oppenheim, i. 220). Unlike the "uṣūd" of the Beduins it is not open the whole length in front but has an opening at the neck (ud-ghaḥ) through which it is slipped on. The sleeves reach to the roots of the fingers and contract at the wrists. The garment has a hood which suggests Hamitic north African influence. The farwa is held together with a girdle of dried lamb-skin. To wear a shirt (thākā) below this garment or a cloak above it is considered by them to be a luxury. The two sexes dress practically alike. The Šulab usually go bare-footed but they sometimes wear sandals (abd-ḥahā) as a protection against thorns and sharp stones. The Šulab wear a head-cloth (kaftār) and veil (ṣāfāt) in the same way as the other Beduins of Arabia. Their garment of skins is further remarkable, as it is either a survival from an earlier period of development or an adaptation to the special circumstances under which they are forced to live; perhaps it may prove to be of use in eventually ascertaining their origin. The farwa is convenient because it wears better than woven material and by its desert colour suits the conditions of light and ground in the desert, which is very useful in hunting and enables the game to be successfully stalked.

The arms are old fashioned carbines with six chambers which therefore get the Persian name of ḥālīb-ḵōn (St. Élie, op. cit., p. 677 sq.), and the meqīb, a parrying-stick (Christian, op. cit.) which has already been mentioned, and as clubs the mīzĪr which consists of a rather short wooden handle with a knob of asphalt as a head, those made entirely of iron mainly in al-Kaṭif (cf. the pictures in v. Oppenheimer, ii. 103). The Šulabs are still said to use also the bow and arrow (Pieper, p. 22 and 32). But they do not seem to be armed to the same degree as the Beduins. As they are extremely peace-loving and do not allow themselves to be involved in the feuds of the Arab tribes nor have any of their own, it is probably hardly necessary for them to be so well armed.

They live like the Beduins in tents (ḥālīb, ḫiyūl) which are made either of mats, of goat's hair (ṣaffārīyeh), or like their dress from the skins of the victims of the chase. These are of varying size: Burchhardt, p. 24, once saw a Šulab tent which according to him could shelter 20—30 families. The cleanliness in and around their habitations is not very great (Wright, p. 51). They also use caves to shelter themselves and indeed, being children of nature with no wants, they often spend the night in the middle of the ḥālīb when on a hunting expedition.

Their customs show traces of ancient Christian and Sabaean elements. Nominally they are Moslems. According to St. Élie (in a letter to the writer) the Christian survivals only began to disappear in the last century; till then the Šulab had remained true to the faith of their forefathers. He tells me for example that polygamy, divorce or repudiation, circumcision etc. only began to be adopted by them in the second half of last century. Whether this development is directly or indirectly due to the Wahhabi movement; as was the case with the Murrekēde and Merrekēde Arabs (cf. Burchhardt, p. 145—146) awaits further investigation. In any case their long adherence to Christian beliefs and customs seems to have been not without influence on their position as outcasts among the Beduins. We find undoubted reminiscences of Christianity in their religious beliefs and usages, for example the use of the cross on such special occasions, baptism on the tenth or fortieth day after birth in addition to circumcision which they also practise. According to Pelly, p. 189, at baptism they dip the child seven times into the water, which is the practice of the Johannisites or Mandaeans. The Šulab also believe in the existence of a supreme being. In praying they stretch their arms out sideways so as to form a cross. According to Pelly, p. 189 sq., the Šulab have a place
of pilgrimage and a holy town in Harrân and their kinsmen living there have older and purer forms of prayers and psalms composed in Chaldaean or Assyrian (probably Eastern Aramaic); but this, like the whole of Pelly's account, is very much to be questioned as, according to other authorities (St. Eile, Curtiss, Littmann), they have no special language of their own but speak a bedouinised Arabic. According to Pelly they still adhere to the old Arabian star-worship. They worship the Pole-Star and a star in the constellation of the Ram. Like the Jews, they pray three times a day, at sunrise, at midday and at sunset. They have priests and priestesses. Doughty p. 281 mentions a patriarch of all the Şulahe. The priestesses enjoy special reverence and according to Curtiss, p. 63, 268, are called fekira (female anchorites). They heal the sick by the laying on of hands. It is still an open question whether the Şulahe may not still be crypto-Christians. Old Semitic ideas are also apparent in their conception of sacrifice (Curtiss, p. 37, 107). Peyer, p. 59—56 in his account of the Şulahe describes their festivities and dances, the morals of their women, marriage, divorce, funeral customs etc., which cannot be gone into here for lack of space. But it may just be mentioned that they tolerate polygamy, although it is rare among them on account of their poverty.

The alpha and omega of the study of this people, one of the most remarkable and most interesting of the peoples among the peoples of Eastern Asia is and will be, as already mentioned, the question of their ethnology. Peyer, p. 67, 70, 74 sq. thinks that till the question is definitely settled they must be regarded as Semites. For several important reasons it is very difficult to uphold this view at the present time. The rigid way in which they are cut off from the other Arabs of the peninsula, who would never marry a Şulahe woman and consider themselves as high as the heaviest among these pariahs, is in my opinion evidence of non-Arab origin. Occasional exceptions to this statement about mixed marriages are found but very rarely (Doughty, ii. 461; Curtiss, p. 34, 46). According to St. Eile (in a letter to me) they are undoubtedly pure-bred Arabs. Peyer might be right in so far as they, if they were not originally Semites, might have very much arabicised their mode of living by intermarriage, although only to a very small degree, for hundreds and perhaps thousands of years. The view held by Blunt and v. Oppenheim that the Şulahe are gipsies is rightly rejected by Peyer (p. 69—73). From what has been said above it will be seen that there is much more probability in the hypothesis that they might originally have been a fragment of some, perhaps of Hamitic, people which had become a way into Arabia; for we find Hamitic memories in their skin-dress with hood, and the parrying-shield and their living by hunting. As St. Eile claims to have found clans of the Şulahe in Palestine and even in the Sinai Peninsula, and on the frontiers of Palestine and Egypt, e.g. the Tarabin, al-Khantadir and Ma'ara, we cannot see why Hamitic tribes, reversing the direction of the Arab immigration into North Africa, should not have entered Arabia and Palestine by the old route through the Sinai peninsula. The last link in this chain of argument, historical tradition, is however lacking. Careful investigation of their somatic qualities etc. by the methods of ethnology might provide some compensation for this historical material which will barely be obtainable. In this connection, reference needs to Müller's essay (Die Agitzer und ihre lebendigen Nachfahren, Z. D. M. G., 1924, lixvii. p. 45—59) particularly to the Thunmah there mentioned, who according to Müller show in many respects a really striking similarity to the Şulahe. The present position of the Şulahe, their customs, etc. suggest in my opinion, that they are the victims of some great and catastrophic war or nations.

of Mazar in the mountains of Ḥarās to the West of the city of Ṣan'a'. They were quickly besieged by a large triumvirate, but with the utmost speed fortified the village in such a way that its capture was very difficult. 'Alī appears to have made very little material progress at the beginning of his career and the small kingdoms formed after the disruption of the Ziyādī dynasty more than held their own while the kingdom founded by the Abyssinian slave al-Nadjarī in the lowlands (Ṭihmā) of Yaman was always a serious obstacle to the Sulayhī becoming rulers of the whole of Yaman. 'Ali obtained the sovereignty over the Ṭihmā and the city of Ṣabīl in the year 453 (1061) by having al-Nadjarī poisoned by a slave girl whom he sent to him. This event probably (though the historians are silent as to the grounds) led the Zaidī Imām al-Kāsim b. 'Alī to send an army against 'Ali under the command of his son Dā'īzar. 'Ali however surprised this army and in the month of Sha'bān of the same year, he routed Dīzar's army and the latter is killed. After this he attacked the strongholds of the Zaidī Imām and took the castle of Yānū of mount Ḥādir. After defeating Ibn Abī Hājīdī near the village Sa'wī he proceeded to Ṣan'a' which he took in 455 (1063). After this he devoted his attention to the conquest of the city of Ṣabīl in the Ṭihmā over which he appointed in the following year his brother-in-law As'ad b. Sīhātī and one year later he took possession of 'Adan, where he allowed the two sons of the late ruler al-Karam, al-'Abbās and Mas'id to remain rulers as vassals, because they had assisted him in the conquest of Ṣabīl. They agreed to pay to his daughter-in-law Suyūṭī an annual tribute which amounted to approximately 100,000 dinars, which tribute was regularly paid till the death of 'Alī. How great the power of 'Alī had become by this time is proved by the fact that in the year 455 he was able to install as ruler of Mecca Abī Ḥājīm Muḥammad. He also sent from this time annually the covering of the Ka'ba and restored the treasures which had been carried to the Yaman by the Ḥasanīs. Some smaller principalities still remained to be subdued and in the year 460 (1068) when one Ibn Ṭārī who ruled in Zarbīb having invoked the help of the Abyssinians rebelled, he and his allies were defeated and this mountainous district was conquered. After this event 'Alī returned to Ṣan'a' which he did not leave for the next twelve years. The various districts of Yaman were administered by trusty governors and he took the precaution of keeping in his entourage the princes whose dominions he had conquered, a system followed by the rulers of Yaman to this day.

In the year 473 the rulers of Mecca abandoned the mention of the Fāṭimid caliphs in the public prayers and returned to the mention of the 'Abbāsid caliphs of Bagdād and it was probably this which induced 'Alī to leave Ṣan'a' and proceed towards Mecca as if wishing to perform the pilgrimage. He took with him the princes whom he had with him at his capital, leaving his son al-Mukarram in charge of the capital. When they reached the district of al-Mahjūm in the Northern Ṭihmā he pitched his camp near a well named Umm al-Duhaim. While they were off their guard the camp was attacked by followers of Sa'īd, the son of al-Nadjarī, who murdered 'Alī and his brother 'Abd Allāh and consternation reigned throughout the camp. Sa'īd spared some of the princes who were with 'Alī, as hostages, but most of the army were massacred. Among the captured was the queen Asmā', daughter of Sīhātī and mother of king al-Mukarram, whom he took with him to the capital of his father, Zubayd, which now opened its gates to Sa'īd.

Asmā' was kept closely guarded by Sa'īd and it was not till the year 475 (1082/1083) that she was able to send her son a letter in which she stated that she was with child by Sa'īd. She wrote this to incite al-Mukarram to rescue her with all possible speed. The power of al-Mukarram had diminished considerably, because most of the vassal principalities had declared themselves independent like the rulers of 'Aden. He urged his followers at Ṣan'a' to avenge the honour of their tribe and king. They marched against Zubayd which was defended by 20,000 Abyssinians, while the army of al-Mukarram is stated to have numbered only 6,000. He himself took command of the centre while his brother-in-law As'ad b. Sīhātī and an uncle of the queen led the wings. After a fierce battle the city was taken by storm and al-Mukarram with two followers was the first to reach the place where his mother stood. He ordered the head of his father and uncle which had been put up on poles to be taken down and buried honourably. Then, after appointing his brother-in-law As'ad b. Sīhātī governor of the Ṭihmā, he departed with his mother to Ṣan'a'. Asmā' died in Ṣan'a' in 479 (1086) and in the same year al-Mukarram instituted a new coinage called Malikī Dinār which monetary standard remained in force for a long time afterwards. However the sons of al-Nadjarī, who had fled to the islands of the Red Sea returned to Zubayd in the same year, drove out As'ad and made themselves masters of the city and the Ṭihmā. Al-Mukarram retook the city and Sa'īd, the son of al-Nadjarī, was killed under the walls of the city in the year 481 (1088) while his brother al-Dāīyū, had gone with his wastes to India by the way of 'Adan. They remained there for six months only, then returned to Yaman and again gained possession of the city of Zubayd.

Al-Mukarram appears to have been an incapable ruler and we find the singular spectacle in Islamic history of a woman, his queen Suyūṭi, taking the most prominent part in the management of the affairs of State. She was born in 444 and was brought up under the care of the late queen Asmā'. She was married to al-Mukarram in 461 and bore him four children, two sons and two daughters. After the death of his mother, al-Mukarram gave himself up to wine and pleasures and handed the cares of the State to his wife who demanded from him full freedom of action. One of her first actions was that she left Sana'a and took up her residence at Uḥūb Dībāla, a place which had been founded by 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Sulayhī, who was slain with king Ṣan'a' at al-Mahjūm, in the year 458. The capital of the country was henceforth transferred to Uḥūb Dībāla and a palace and chief mosque erected in which queen Suyūṭi was subsequently buried. It was due to her that the death of Sa'īd b. Nadjarī was brought about. Al-Mukarram died in 484 (1091) and having no surviving sons the office of Dīr was bequeathed by him upon Sana'a, son of 'Abd Allāh b. al-Muṣaffar b. 'Alī, the Sulayhī. He however
did not gain possession of Dhī Djjība where the queen Saiyida resigned with the consent of the nobles and populace. Saba' therefore first turned his attention to the conquest of the Thīmā and the city of Zabīd, but was attacked unaware by the troops of Dāsiṣṭah and barely escaped to his stronghold of Ta'kār with his life. He then corresponded with the Fātimid caliph al-Mustanjir and from him received a letter in which Saiyida was instructed to marry Saba'. This letter was conveyed to her to Dhī Djjība and after much hesitation she consented to the marriage and a dowry was fixed. Saba' came personally to her capital to contract the marriage, but her majesty and other causes prevented him from completing the marriage contract and after the first night he departed again to his residence without consummating the marriage.

After this the queen placed her reliance principally upon al-Mufaḍḍal, son of Abū 'l-Barakat to whom she had granted the castle of Ta'kār which lay on one of the highest mountains overlooking the Thīmā. There the treasures of the Sulāḥīs were stored and the queen was in the habit of making it a place of residence during summer, returning to Dhī Djjība for the winter. It was through Muḍaffal that she regained the revenues of 'Adan and a partial submission of the lowlands. In 504 (1110/1111) Muḍaffal laid siege to the city of Zabīd and his absence was used by men of the tribe of Khwālān to get possession of his fortress. Muḍaffal returned but died under the walls of the castle. Then the queen herself marched with her troops from Dhī Djjība and by a ruse again got possession of the fortress, in the following year (12th Rabī' I, 505). As the Khwālānīs however did not act with justice towards the inhabitants of the district she ordered 'Amr b. Urfūţta al-Djambī to drive them out. Though not actual ruler of the country the queen managed to exercise during the following years a kind of suzerainty over the various small principalities which had sprung up in all parts of the country till the arrival in Yaman in 513 (1119) of Ibn Naḍīb al-Dawla, who was sent as an emissary by the Fātimid caliph and who for the next six years waged war against the smaller principalities reducing them gradually to obedience. The queen having aged, he made in 519 the attempt to wrest the power from her and wished to place her in seclusion, but she received such strong support from the various princes of the country that he was forced to desist from his design. As Ibn Naḍīb al-Dawla began to intrigue in the Yaman in favour of the anti-caliph Nizār, he was arrested at the request of the caliph al-'Amir and sent in letters to 'Adan to be shipped back to Egypt and though the queen repented and was desirous to have him back, his keepers left. 'Adan by ship for Sawki (Suqīm) but the ship was wrecked on the voyage and all on board drowned. After the fall of Ibn Naḍīb al-Dawla the queen appointed one Ibrahim b. al-Ŷusin al-Ḥamīdī, but learning of the death of the caliph al-'Amir she replaced him by Saba' b. Abī Sa'dīd, the first ruler of the Zaurā'ī dynasty [q.v.] who were the successors of the Sulāḥīs until the conquest of the country by Tūrānīs. The queen survived for some years and died in the year 532 (1138) when the dynasty of the Sulāḥīs came to an end. Some of the princes held isolated fortresses and as late as 569 we find a prince 'Arwa, daughter of Abī b. Abī Allāh b. Muḥammad, in possession of the castle of Dhī Djjība.

It would be wrong to assume that the Sulāḥīs, except under the first ruler, were in possession of the whole of the Yemen. The Abyssinian dynasty of the Banū 'l-Naḍībīs was practically the whole time in possession of Zabīd and the lowlands, while 'Adan and other important points of the country were ruled partly and independently, partly in semi-independence by various smaller princes. The historians do not give many details about the Zaidī Imāms who had their headquarters in the town of Sa'da, but they too seem to have enjoyed unrestricted rule. Though the Sulāḥīs were the actual representatives of the Fātimid Shī'a caliphs of Egypt, there remained a large following of the Sunnī doctrines as is exemplified by the temporary seizure of the fortress of Ta'kār by the Shī'a tribesman of Khwālān. The chief historian of the dynasty, 'Umār, is unfortunately far from lucid in his account, Wafayāt al-'Ayān, and the later chroniclers follow mostly in his footsteps. The account given by Ibn Khaldūn is as so often with him, very fragmentary and full of errors.

Bibliography: Yemen and its early History by 'Omāro al-Hakam, ed. Kay, London 1892; Ibn Khallīkān, Cairo 1370, i, 368; Eşāqī, Salīh, MS, Paris 2127; and the manuscripts enumerated by Kay in the Introduction of the History of 'Omāra. There is in the John Rylands Library in Manchester a large history of the Yemen by a Zaidī Imām which may throw further light upon this period but I have unfortunately not been able to make use of it.
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SULAIM B. MANGUR. This powerful and energetic tribe belonged to the group of Ka'ās or Ka'ās-Allāh [q.v.]. It does not appear in Arab history until the middle of the 7th century A.D. Its lands lay along the frontiers of Najd and the Hijāz and were bordered on the north by the territory of Medina and on the south by that of Mecca. On the east its neighbours were its relations, the tribes of Ghatafa, Hawzain and Hillī. Down to the end of the Umayyad period the district of the Sulaimān area seems to have enjoyed very considerable prosperity. It was a succession of volcanic fārs, of mining centres and wooded hills and of oases which were intelligently exploited. Some of these were al-Radhāsī (famous for Abū Dhiyān [q.v.]) sojourn there, Farīn, Ma'din al-Bahr, So'ain, Sawāirīya, etc. The last two named still exist. The oasis of Sawāirīya stretched for a length of several days' journey with its banana and pomegranate-trees, and vines, not to speak of palm-groves. The Sulaimān had numerous horses, which in the desert is another sign of prosperity. They were on good terms with the Jews of Medina. In Mecca the Kurāsh financiers and business men early realised the necessity of cultivating the friendship of the Sulaimān, who possessed mineral resources and commanded the road to Medina as well as access to Najd and the Persian Gulf. Many Meccan families had joined them as their lords and jointly with the Sulaimān exploited the agricultural and mineral wealth of the country. Evidence of the latter is found in the richness of the name Ma'din (mine) in Sulaimān place-names. Their main mineral wealth lay in gold and silver. Tradition asserts that a Sulaimān "companion" used to send Muhammad a tithe of the precious metals extracted from his mine. In the mining district of Sulaimān we find in the caliphate of Abū Bakr a resumption of activity and the mines continued to be exploited under the Omayyads whose treasury derived an appreciable revenue from them. The Sulaimān held in reverence a stone or beryl called Ẓāmūr. Having common interests with Mecca, they were at first hostile to the Prophet, but when they saw that the triumph of Islam was assured, these politically-minded Bedouins professed it ostentatiously. In the year 8 (629/630) a strong Sulaimān contingent took part in the easy conquest of Mecca after the battle of Ḥumaym. Their chiefs after the victory claimed as the price of their assistance among others the poet Abū b. Mirdās [q.v.], son of the poetess al-Khansā' [q.v.].

During the troubles which marked the reign of the third caliph, the Sulaimān as a rule took the side of 'Uthmān. This attitude earned them the favour of the Caliph Mu'āwiyah I, who numbered among his best lieutenants the Sulaimān Abu 'l-Awar [q.v.]. It was part of the policy of the Omayyads to conciliate this proud tribe, settled along the route of the pilgrimages and in the neighbourhood of the holy cities, the rebellious populations of which they could keep a watch upon. This sentiment lasted until the death of Mu'āwiyah II. Along with the other Ka'ās, the Sulaimān refused to recognise his successor Marwān I and proclaimed for the anti-Caliph 'Abdallāh b. al-Zubair. The defeat of the Khāzim at Marjāl Rāḥi [q.v.] provoked the definite split between Yemen and Ka'ās and opened a war, so the death between these two sections of the Arab race. Two Sulaimāns, Umar b. al-Hābīb and Djiāhīf b. Ḥākaim, distinguished themselves in it for their ferocity rather than their valour. The poems of Abījad [q.v.] preserve the memory of this merciless feud.

After the Hijārā a part of the tribe settled in western Mesopotamia. In 109 (727) a hundred Sulaimān families were allowed to go to Egypt and they soon multiplied there. In 530 (744/45) the Sulaimān of Arabia along with their cousins of Hillī sacked the town of Medina and brought a bloody retribution upon their heads. In the time of the Fāṭimīds Caliphs of Egypt, they took the side of the Karmātians and attacked the pilgrim caravans. This was the beginning of a period of anarchy in which the Sulaimān part of Arabia suffered a great deal. In Egypt their Karmātian sympathies embittered them with the Caliph of Cairo. In 944 (1052) the Fāṭimīd Caliph al-Manṣūr, anxious to get rid of these troublesome Beduins, sent them with the Hillī to the conquest of North Africa where many of the tribes were connected with the Sulaimān. For a long time fighting in which they were engaged, cf. the article HILĪ. Bibliography: Ibn Durayd, Kišīb al-Iṣṭigāḥ, p. 187—189; al-Kindī, al-Mašūṣ al-kabīr, ii. 63; al-Hamdānī, al-Iṣṭaṣara, p. 132, 154, 170, 171, 183, 185, 205, 220; Yaḥyā, Muḥājam, ed. Wustenfeld, iii. 403; iv. 572; v. 865; Yaḥyā, Kišīb al-Buldān, ed. de Goeje, p. 335; Wustenfeld, Register genealogisch. Tabellen, 426—430; de Goeje, Weltkunde, Reise arabischer Heidentumskn, p. 68; Blau, in Z. D. M. G., xxii. 586; Lammens, Le Bercou de l'Islam, p. 99—100, 136; de Raucourt, La Mosquée à la veille de l'hégire, p. 196, 197, 198 (extract from M. F. O. B., i., fasc. 3); de Raucourt, Études sur le règne du calife Ma'āwiyah le 1er, p. 43, 337, 423; de Raucourt, Le Chantre des Omeyyades, notes sur le poète arabe Abū al-Abbas b. Dijāz, p. 123 (extract from T.-A., 1894); G. Gabrieli, La nuda ed il cannoniere della posta. araba al-Ḥijāz, Florence, 1899, p. 11, 194, 197. (H. Lammens) SULAIMĀN B. 'ABD AL-MA'LĪK, Ummayyad. Sulaimān was born in the year 60 (769/760); his mother was Wallūda bint Abūl-Abbas b. Dijāz. After the death of 'Abd al-'Azīz b. Marwān [q.v.], his brother, the caliph 'Abd al-Malik, had homage paid to his sons al-Walid and Sulaimān as heirs-apparent. Towards the end of his reign, al-Walid wished to make an arrangement with al-Ḥājlīdān b. Ṭāṣuf [q.v.] and Khātib b. Muslim [q.v.] governor of Khordāz to exclude Sulaimān from the succession in favour of his own son 'Abd al-'Azīz, but he died before the necessary steps had been taken, so that Sulaimān succeeded him in Djuḏma'īn II, 96 (end of February 715) as Commander of the Faithful. When Sulaimān heard of his brother's death, he was in al-Raml, which he himself had founded when commanding the Muslim troops in Palestine and which was continued to be his headquarters. As soon as he had assumed the reins of government, the supporters of al-Ḥājlīdān, now dead, had to pay for the enmity between him and the new Caliph. In the very same year, Ummānī b. Ḥajāj b. al-Murrī, the governor of Medina was dismissed and the same fate threatened the devout Khutaba b. Muslim. Relying on the fidelity of his troops, he tried to persuade them to rise against Sulaimān; but the daring plan came to nothing and Khutaba was surprised and killed. Yāfar b. al-Mahallāb
SULAIMÂN B. AL-'ASH'AL. [See 'Abd Dawûd.]

SULAIMÂN B. DAWût, the biblical King Solomon, is an outstanding personality in Muhammadan legends. There were, as in Arab histories recount, four great world-movers, two of whom were infidels, Nimrod and Nebuchadnezzar; and two of whom were believers, Alexander the Great and Solomon. Of these the last was the most resplendent figure. Special emphasis was placed on his wonderful powers of magic and divination. The most puzzling riddles and the most abstruse subjects were within his ken. Perspicacity and discernment dwelt in his eye; wisdom and justice were gravestone on his forehead. His knowledge was deeper than the Jordan Valley. In the Qur'an itself he is frequently mentioned, and along with Alexander enjoys the distinction of being designated a true Apostle of Allah, a divine messenger and prototype of Muhammad. The Qur'anic passages tell how at an early age he even surpassed his father David in skilful administration of justice (xxi. 78, 79). And when David died Solomon was chosen from amongst the other sons as successor (xxvii. 16). He had admirable endowments. God had granted him esoteric knowledge. He was acquainted with the speech of birds and animals (xxvii. 16, 19), a tradition based on I Kings iv. 32. A strong wind was subjected to him (xxi. 81; xxxviii. 36). It blew in the morning for a month, and in the evening for a month, while a fountain of molten brass was made to flow for his benefit (xxxiv. 12). At his command were legions of satans to do whatever he wished. They were employed, for example, in diving for pearls (xxxi. 52); and (xxxviii. 36). The djinn were forced to work his will. If they disobeyed they were threatened with the pains of hell (xxxiv. 12). They constructed for him shrines and statues and costly vessels (ibid. 13). His armies were recruited from men and djinn and birds. The hoopoe (hujâhab) was the first to bring him tidings of the kingdom of Saba and of its illustrious queen, Bilqis (q. v.). Solomon, as a prophet, corresponded with her and summoned her to Islam. And after an exhibition of his strength and wisdom, she submitted (xxvii. 20–44). The devils frequently sought to convict him of infidelity, but in vain (ii. 101). On a certain occasion he failed in the observance of his religious duties, and that was when his admiration for his stud of horses led him to forget his prayers. In atonement he sacrificed the birds, cutting their legs and necks (xxxviii. 31–33). For a time he seems to have lapsed into idolatry. As a punishment he lost his kingdom, his throne being occupied by some one in his own likeness. When he had asked forgiveness, he was restored to his place, and promised divine favour in Paradise (xxxviii. 34, 35, 40). When he died he was resting on his staff, and no one knew of his death until a worm bored its way through the prop and the body collapsed. Then the djinn were released from their labours (xxxiv. 14).

Later legendary lore has magnified all this material, which is chiefly Rabbinic in origin. Solomon's control over the djinn and his use of them in his building operations are derived from the Midrash on Ecclesiastes, ii. 8. His kingdom is even made universal, perhaps after the analogy of that of the 40 (or 72) kings of the Pre-Adamite djinnen, who were each named Solomon (Lane, Arabian Nights, Introd., note 21; d'Herboulot,

(K. V. Zettersten)
Bibliothèque Orientale, v. 372). His renowned wisdom included "the wisdom" for which Egypt was famous, i.e. occult science. Pythagoras is said to have received his knowledge from Solomon in Egypt (Šuyūṭī, Ḥaṣīm al-Mubādara fi Ḥakīmāt i. 27). Solomon is said to have been the pupil of Mambres the Egyptian Theurgist (G. R. S. Mead, Three Great Orientals, ii. 285, note). Hence his reputation in tales as a magician. This magic power of his was effected by means of a talismanic ring engraved with "the most great name" of God. Permission to use this was also vouchsafed to his wars, Šašā D. Barḥiyya (q.v.), who transported the throne of Biliaks from Sheba to Jerusalem in the twining of an eye. Solomon was in the habit, when he performed his ablutions, of laying aside this ring from his finger, and entrusting it to one of his wives, Amina, Šāhīr, one of the Satanic spirits, assumed the form of the king, parodied the magic seal, and for forty days ruled, while Solomon was forced to wander as an outcast. The demon, however, lost the ring in the sea, whence Solomon recovered it when he cut open a fish which had swallowed it. Thus he regained his throne. It is said he was punished in this way, because of the idolatry of the royal consort, Ḏarānda, the daughter of the king of the Sidonians. Some say the counterfeit body that occupied his throne was his son who died. The 13th of the month is regarded as unlucky because on that day Solomon was exiled by God. The Persian Nawrūz festival and its customs are said to date from the restoration of Solomon to his kingdom (al-Bīrūnī, Chronology, ed. Schau, p. 199). Because he boasted that 1,000 wives would bear him 1,000 warriors, he had one son only who was misshapen, with one hand, one eye, one ear, and one foot. Then in humility he prayed to God, and his son was made whole. In his capacity of warrior, he conquered many kingdoms (Baidawī, v. 19).

Some of the marvellous works of Solomon may be briefly mentioned. Shortly after his accession he was in a valley between Hebron and Jerusalem, when he received his authority over winds, waters, demons and animals from the four guardian angels in charge of these spheres. Each one gave him a jewel which he placed in a ring composed partly of brass and iron. With the brass he sealed his orders for the good qīnūm, while with the iron he sealed his orders for the evil qīnūm. The seal is said to have held a mandrake (Frazer, Folk-Lore in the Old Testament, ii. 390). Solomon's seal (Khaṭūm Sulaymān) is a common charm, in the form of a six-pointed star, often inscribed on drinking cups. The Table of Solomon (Muṣūdat Sulaymān) and other marvellous relics, according to legend, found their way to Spain where they were discovered by Ṭārīk at the capture of Toledo. They had been taken from Jerusalem as booty (Ibn al-Athir, Annalles du Maghreb, ed. Fagnan, p. 37 sqq.; Ṭabari, Chronique, ed. Zobenbarg, iv. 183; Dory, Recherches, i. 52). The Table was made of green beryl, had 360 legs, and was inlaid with pearls and rubies. There was also a magic mirror which revealed all places in the world (Carr de Vaux, Abrégé des Merveilles, p. 122).

The blocks of stone for the building of the Temple were hewn by means of the miraculous pebble-Samur (Šaṃur) which the demon Ṣāḥīr procured from the sea-eagle. Solomon sheltered himself from the heat of the sun under a canopy composed of all the birds of the air. A magic carpet of green silk for aerial transportation was woven for him. On this he could leave Syria with all his equipment in the morning, and reach Afghanistan by evening. Untold wealth of precious stones and gold and silver was accumulated with the help of the servile qīnūm. They also assisted him in erecting palaces, fortresses, baths and reservoirs. Various relics of these operations are pointed out in Palestine, Arabia and elsewhere (Revue des traditions populaires, ix. 190; Naṣīr-i Khosrow, Seyf-Šāhīn, p. 56, 76, 84, 85). He had 1,000 glass-roofed houses containing 300 couches and 700 wives (Thaṭlabi, Kiṣāt, p. 204). Besides the building of the Temple, during which he outwitted the qīnūm, the Farrār Mosque is likewise claimed as his work (Mīrkhōnd, Rūsafa al-Saʿfa, ii. i. 76). He is even credited with founding a mosque in Alexandria (Šuyūṭī, op. cit., i. 37). Part of his leisure time was spent in acquiring the art of basket-weaving, that he might have some means of earning a livelihood if the need arose (Mīrkhōnd, op. cit., p. 79). The tradition seems Rabbinic in character. His throne was constructed of pure gold. The whole natural world was so completely under his sway that on one occasion the sun stood still to enable him to say his evening prayers. The evil qīnūm he imprisoned in vessels of lead (cf. Zechariah, v. 8). Ṭāhārīb, on the Red Sea, was assigned by him as a place of incarceration for the demons (Naṣīr-i Khosrow, op. cit., p. 297). His knowledge of the speech of the animal world enabled him at times to display his clemency. Once he turned aside his armed hosts in order to avoid smashing the eggs of a bird; while on another occasion, he had compassion on a colony of ants (Bīrūnī, op. cit., p. 199; Sura xxvii. 17, 18).

A claim is put forward that he invented the Arabic and Syriac scripts, and that he was the author of many Arabic treatises on magic. He is compared with Dżḥakhir, and there were, undoubtedly, Iranian influences at work in the Solomon Sage. His personal appearance is variously given, e.g. as "a large-headed man riding on a horse" (Mīrkhōnd, op. cit., ii. i. 83), and as being "fair, well-built, of lastrous beauty, with a plentiful supply of hair, and clothed in white garments" (Thaṭlabi, op. cit., p. 254). When he died he was aged 53, having reigned for forty years. The exact location of his tomb is uncertain. Some place it in Jerusalem, in the Kabhāt al-Šahīr; others, near the Sea of Tiberias. The Prophet said (according to Ṭabari, Chronique, i. 66) it was "in the midst of the sea... in a palace excavated in a rock. This palace contains a throne on which Solomon is seated with the royal ring on his finger appearing as though he were alive, protected by twelve guardians, night and day. No one hath arrived at his tomb except two persons, Ṭāfān and Ḫāliya." (Lam, op. cit., xx. 96; see Mīrkhōnd, op. cit., p. 102-103). The tomb is placed also in the Andaman Islands (Les Merveilles de l'Inde, p. 154). Solomon has found his way into Malayan folk-lore. Poultry use his name for nipping pigeons (Frazer, Golden Bough, ii. 418; Folk-Lore in the Old Test., ii. 476 sq.). Regarding Solomon and the EvilEye, see W. B. Stevenson in Studia Semitica et Orientallia, Glasgow 1920, p. 104 sq., and the references therein. The Ethiopic Legends of Solomon
and Mekedik, Queen of 'Aẓb, may be found in Bezdol, Kobra Negast, and in Wallis Budge, The Queen of Sheba and her only Son Menyulik (see art. antiq.). Examples of the Solomonic riddles may be seen in Th'labi, op. cit., p. 202; Jacques de Vlères, P. P. T. 3, p. 17.

**Bibliography:** besides the works mentioned in the text, consult the Kur'an commentaries; a great many Solomonic legends are contained in Th'labi, Kisa al-Anhyd, p. 200 sqq.; see also Tahari, ed. de Goeje, index; Chronique, ed. Zotenbor, index; Idem, Description de l'Afrique, p. 140, 173, 188; Mas'udi, Murçithi, 1. 110, sqq.; al-Hamadani, Şifa, ed. Müller, p. 141; Abu l-Fida', Ta'rīkh, p. 25, 67; Well, Bibliotheca Legenda Regum, p. 247 sqq.; Grünbaum, Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sagengeschichte, p. 189 sqq.; Salser, *Die Salomo-Sage in der semit. Lit.*; Solomon Tempelbau und Thron in der semit. Sagengeschichte; R. Führer, König Salomon in der Tradition; W. A. Clouston, Flowers from a Canaan Garden, p. 235 sqq.; Baring-Gould, Myths of the Middle Ages, index; Hanauer, Folklore of the Holy Land; Wallis Budge, Alexander the Great, index; Seymour, Talis of Solomon; J. C. Mardrus, The Queen of Sheba; John Freeman, Solomon and Ballads; Gabrielli, Fonti semitiche d'una leggenda solomonica, J. A., 1868, p. 475, 1881, p. 59; De Vogüé, Le Temple de Jerusalem, p. 13; R. Basset, Mills et Un Cent, Récits et Légendes Arabes, l. 356 sqq., do., Contes populaires berbères, p. 27. (J. Walker)

**SULAIMAN b. KUTULUMSASI, ancestor of the Saldjiks in Asia Minor.** After Kutulumsasi had fallen in 456 (1065/1064), his son Sulaiman became chief of the Saldjiks of Asia Minor and in a few years succeeded in founding an independent kingdom. Malik Shah who had succeeded his father Alp Arslan in 465 (1074) entrusted him with the conduct of the war against the Byzantines and he was given the supreme command of all the Saldjik troops in Asia Minor. Here a considerable part of the poor parasity in Asia Minor had come completely under the power of the rich landowners and many estates were worked by slaves. Sulaiman declared them freemen on payment of a certain tax and he thereby won their active sympathy while misfortune followed the Byzantines. Their general Isac Commens was weakened by a mutiny of his Norman mercenaries and then defeated and captured by the Saldjiks near Caesarea. When his successor Caesar Ducas tried to deal with the Norman mutineers, they took for Nicolao. They then won him over to their side and persuaded him to rebel at their head against his nephew, the Emperor Michael VII. There was nothing left for the latter but to appeal for assistance to the Saldjiks and in 1074 (466/467) he concluded a treaty, approved by Malik Shah, with Sulaiman, who promised to send forces to assist the Emperor and in return was given the Byzantine provinces at that time in Saldjik occupation. Ducas was captured by the Saldjik auxiliaries; but a few years later Michael abducted and retired to a monastery. In 1079 (471/472) Niccephoros Malisemos rebelled. To strengthen his position, he made an alliance with Sulaiman and concluded a treaty with him by the terms of which Sulaiman, in return for troops, was to receive the half of any towns and provinces taken in the war against the Emperor Niccephoros III. Cysicus and Nicsea fell to the Saldjiks at the beginning of the year 1081 (473). Sulaiman chose the latter as his residence. In 1084 (1085), he also took the city of Anfaktiya. The Greek governor, Philaretos, who paid tribute to the Ukullid Muslim b. Kuraigh, had gone on a journey and in his absence his son, whom he had thrown into prison, came to an arrangement with his deputy and opened the city gates to the Saldjiks. Sulaiman then came into conflict with Muslim about the payment of tribute and there was a certain amount of raiding on either side. Finally in Safar 478 (June 1085) there was a battle near Antioch in which Muslim fell. Sulaiman then advanced on Aleppo and laid siege to it but had to return after a few weeks without attaining any success. After some time he again demanded that the governor there, Ibn al-Hutat, took 'Abbad to surrender the town to him; but the latter delayed replying, under the pretext that he wanted to get Malik Shah's approval, until the lord of Damascus Tutush b. Alp Arslan and the Emir Orto b. Akasbe were able to come up. When Sulaiman met them, his troops took to flight and he himself perished (479 = 1086). Whether he was slain by the enemy, or as some say, killed himself with his dagger, is uncertain.


**SULAIMAN b. MIHR, [See Al-Masli].**

**SULAIMAN b. ŠUAD AL-KHAUCHI, a Shī'ī.** He was originally called Vasid; but when he adopted Islam he received from the Prophet the name Sulaiman. He enjoyed great prestige in his tribe and when the Muslims began to settle in Kufa, Sulaiman also migrated thither. In the battle of the Camel and at Siffin, he fought on the side of 'Alī. After the death of Mu'awiya in Rashīq 60 (April 680) he showed himself again one of the most ardent supporters of Ḥusain (q. v.) but he did not maintain his first enthusiasm. He was one of those who invited Ḥusain to come to Kufa to lend them against the Umayyads but when Ḥusain was approaching the town in answer to the invitation, Sulaiman did nothing to help him. After Ḥusain had fallen at Kerbela on 10th Muharram 61 (Oct. 10, 680) the Kufans who had enticed him from Mecca regretted their cowardice and inactivity and considered themselves sinners, whose guilt could only be wiped out by avenging his murder so that they received the name al-Tawleṣa núm the penitents. After some time they organised themselves and chose Sulaiman as their commander-in-chief. None of the party was under 60 years of age; they had not agreed upon any definite measures and "vengence for Ḥusain" was simply a rather obscure aim which they never clearly visualised. Sulaiman wrote to Sa'd b. Ḥudhayfa b. al-Yamān in al-Madī'in and al-Muthanna b. Mūktarib b. al-'Abdī in Baṣra and secured their cooperation. But as long as Vasid was alive however, they worked in secrecy; it was only after his death in
Rabi' II, 64 (Nov. 683) that the movement sought wider scope. But when Sulaimän’s followers wanted to displace the Kufi Amr b. Huraiṯ al-Mukhtar b. Ziyād who lived in Basra, Sulaimän refused to allow it and advised caution. Nevertheless Amr b. Huraiṯ was expelled by the Kufans. They then paid homage to Abū Allāh b. al-Zubair as Caliph, whereupon he appointed Abū Allāh b. Yazīd al-Amārī as governor of Kufa. In Ramaḍān 64 (May 684), the latter arrived in Kufa, but al-Mukhtar b. Abī Ubaid [q.v.] had already entered the town a few days earlier. The latter wished to expel Sulaimān and he was suspected by the Shīʾa on account of his inactivity. Many left Sulaimān and joined al-Mukhtar. When Sulaimān finally came out openly and asked his followers to take the field against Abū Ubaid Allāh b. Ziyād, who was in Syria with a large army, the governor Abū Allāh b. Yazīd placed no obstacles in his way and even promised to support the Shīʾa; but no active cooperation took place between Sulaimān and the governor. The Shīʾa proved less enthusiastic than Sulaimān had hoped. When he appeared on 5th Rabi' II, 65 (Nov. 15, 684), in al-Nakhaʾ near Kufa, instead of the 16,000 men who had promised to follow him there were only 4,000. Messengers were at once sent to all the Shīʾa who had promised their help and gradually reinforcements came in. On the 5th Rabi' II (19 Nov.) they set out. They spent 24 hours in Karbalāʾ at Ḥusain’s tomb, confessing their guilt and giving evidence of their penitence. They then continued their march. Reaching Karbalaʾ they were supplied with provisions by Zufar b. al-Hāthic al-Kilāsit, who was in command there and obtained information regarding the movements of Ubaid Allāh, who was in al-Kaʾkā. Sulaimān then continued his march till he met the enemy at Arīn al-Wardā under the command of Ḥusain b. Numair. The battle began on 22nd Dhuʾ al-Ḥijja I, 65 (Jan. 4, 685) and lasted three days. Sulaimān fell on the third day; at the age of 93 and the fiercely contested battle ended in the complete rout of the Šīʾa. Their supporters from al-Madāʾin and Basra, who did not arrive in time, had to go back without striking a blow for the cause.


(S. V. Zettersten)

SULAIMĀN b. WABI b. SAʿID b. ABī AYĪN, an Abhāsād vizier, belonged to a family which had originally been Christian but had later gone over to Islam. His father had been in the service of the Barmecide Liʿfar b. Yahyā [q.v.] and later in that of ʿAbd al-Faqīr b. Sahl [q.v.]. On the latter’s death he was given the governorship of Fāra and Kirman. At the age of 14 Sulaimān became secretary to the Caliph al-Muʿtaḍid; he later entered the service of the generals Ṣaḥḥ and Aḥsān, the former of whom held several important offices in the reign of al-Muṭawakkil but finally was sacrificed to the cruelty of the Caliph. We find Sulaimān mentioned as vizier as early as al-Muḥtaḍid (255–266 = 869–870) and in Dhu l-Maʿṣūm 263 (Aug. 877) al-Muṭamid gave him the same office. But he did not hold this office long, being dismissed in Dhu l-ʿAṣaʾ 269 (Aug. 878). Sulaimān died in prison in Saʿfar 272 (Aug. 885); according to another statement he died in the preceding year.


2. The son of the preceding, ʿUbaid Allāh b. SULAIMĀN, who also began his career in the public service as a secretary, was promoted to be vizier of the Caliph al-Muʿtaḍid in Saʿfar 278 (June 891) and filled the office in the reign of al-Muṣṭaḥfiz also. He died in 288 (900–901).


3. Sulaimān’s grandson Abū ʿI-Husayn al-Kāsim, succeeded his father ʿUbaid Allāh as vizier and took the title of Wali al-Dawla, “administrator of the kingdom”. Even before the death of al-Muṣṭaḥfiz in 289 (902) al-Kāsim was conspiring against his son, the heir-apparent al-Muqtasid, and on the latter’s accession he had the governor of Fāra, a freedman named Badr, put to death because he had been a confidant of his and he was afraid he might betray him. Al-Kāsim died in 291 (903–904).


SULAIMĀN I, the tenth and the greatest of the Ottoman Sultan, reigned from 1520 to 1566. The Turks call him ʿAḡaʾuni SULAIN, and western authors SOLIMAN the Magnificent. Some Western historians like Lechevalier and more recently, Jorga call him Sulaimān II, the first Sultan having been, according to them, the son of Baysard I who lived at Adrianople. In Turkey however the opinion that Sulaimān the Legislator is the first of the name has prevailed; he is always called Sulaimān ʿAḡaʾuni and the ten ʿA.sha of the four sultans of the Sultanate mosque signify, according to the ʿA.sha al-Qaram (p. 16) that Sulaimān is the tenth Sultan. A very special symbolic significance has even been credited to the number ten in the life of the Sultan (G.O.K., ii. 4) and the name Sulaimān was also regarded as a national and religious symbol; in the documents issued by Sulaimān we frequently find allusion to passages in the Kūrʾān where the royal prophet Solomon (Sulaimān) is mentioned.

Sulaimān was born in 900 (1494/1495), the son of Sulaimān Sahib and ʿAsha Sulaimān (d. 940 = 1533, cf. Sulaimān Ṣawāri, i. 49), daughter of Mengli Giray, Khan of the Crimea, celebrated for her beauty. In the reign of his grandfather Baysard, Sulaimān had held the sanjak of Kaffa and under
Salim I he had lived in Maghānā as governor, without playing any important part in the state. No doubt therefore had any idea what to expect of the new sovereign when he arrived in the capital on Sept. 30, 1520, eight days after his father's death.

The most striking feature in the career of the Sultan, by nature peace-loving according to the Venetian reports, is that he took part in person in thirteen great campaigns — ten in Europe and three in Asia — which were so many stages in the extension of the power and territory of the Ottoman empire: so that their enumeration coincides for the most part with the very important military history of the empire in his reign. The first campaign was that of Belgrade which was provoked by the ill-treatment inflicted by the king of Hungary on the Turkish envoys who had come to demand the payment of tribute by him. The capture of Belgrade by the grand vizier Piri Paša (Aug. 29, 1521) was preceded by the taking of Szolnok (Turkish: Bőgdulâen) on the Danube and was accompanied by the devastation of Syrmia by the Turkish troops. On Aug. 30 the Sultan made his entry into the conquered city which received a garrison under a Sandjak-beg. In the following year took place the conquest of the island of Rhodes from the Knights of St. John, who had long been a menace to Ottoman power because they supported the Christian corsairs. Sulaimān left Constantinople on June 15, 1522 and crossed Asia Minor to the port of Marmara; the fleet sailed under the vizier Mustafa Paša and was reinforced by an Egyptian contingent sent by Khair Bey of Egypt. The siege inflicted great hardships on the Turkish troops and towards the end of October the fleet had to take refuge in Marmara. But in December the Grand Master of the Order, Villiers de l'Isle Adam (called by the Turks Migâl Masûlû, from the Greek Megalomastros), capitulated and soon afterwards left the island. A son of Djem, brother of Kızâ, was in the Christian army was killed. Shortly after the return of the Sultan to Constantinople, he deposed the grand vizier Piri Paša and replaced him by his favourite İbrahim Paša (q.v.) (June 27, 1524), who remained the faithful companion of Sulaimān on all his campaigns until his sudden execution in 1536. The bond between the two was strengthened in 1524 by İbrahim's marriage to the Sultan's sister. In 1525 new military preparations were made, without their object being revealed; negotiations with Poland and France, guerilla warfare in Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia (especially the exploits of the Paša of Bosnia who tried in vain to take the town of Jajce) and a mutiny of the Janissaries of the capital had been further indications of a great military enterprise. In April 1526 Sulaimān set out with İbrahim; they arrived at Belgrade on July 15, while a fleet had also gone by the Danube. On July 30, Ibrahim took Peterwardein (in Turkish: Varadin). The army then crossed the Drave at Essek and met the Hungarian army, weakened by the number and quarrels of its commanders at Mohács. Here on August 28 was fought the battle which cost Louis of Hungary his life and destroyed the power of Hungary to resist further, so that it was henceforth open to Turkish invasion. The Sultan and Ibrahim immediately resumed their advance and on Sept. 11 occupied the capital Buda (in Turkish: Budin or Budun) which became a prey to the flames in spite of orders to the contrary. This occupation of the capital was however only temporary. The Turkish army crossed the Danube and returned by Seegedin, laying waste the country and crushing the resistance offered by several forces that met them. In November Sulaimān was back in Constantinople, where he had to deal with trouble in Asia Minor. For the two and half years that elapsed before the second Hungarian campaign, the war continued in Bosnia, Dalmatia and Slavonia; at the same time broke out the rivalry between Ferdinand the "Roman King" and John Zápolya, the voivod of Transylvania (Erdei Rûn) for the Hungarian crown. Both sent an ambassador to Constantinople. Zápolya's envoy was able to secure the goodwill of the Sultan who set out in May 1529 for his new campaign, the Vienna campaign. On Aug. 10 they reached Mohács, where Zápolya, recognised by Sulaimān as king of Hungary (Királyánca), came to pay homage to his suzerain. İbrahim Paša was now appointed ser-asker and the Sultan set out to install his new vassal in his capital which was occupied by Ferdinand's troops. On Sept. 8 Buda capitulated and Sulaimān had Zápolya installed as king of Hungary without himself being present at the ceremony. On Sept. 27, the Turkish army began the famous siege of Vienna but was forced to raise the siege on Oct. 15 and to begin to retreat, not without ravaging the environs of the town. In the two years following, the war with Austria continued and the various embassies from king Ferdinand had no success. In 1532, Sulaimān had undertaken what the Turkish sources call "the German campaign against the king of Spain" i.e. Charles V, who claimed the "țarâh-bîriurile" (Chronicle of Rastam Paša). The most remarkable event of this campaign was the taking of Güns (Turkish: Kösek) after a long siege (Aug. 21). During the next few months Sulaimān was in Styria, where his armies ravaged the country without meeting an army of the emperor. The Sultan's return to Constantinople in November was soon followed by an armistice with Austria, concluded on Jan. 14, 1533. Sulaiman's sixth campaign was directed against Persia. It was caused by the Turkish claims to possession of Bitlis (the governor of which, Ulama, had abandoned the Turks) and Baghdād. The grand vizier İbrahim occupied Tabriz in July 1534 while the Sultan himself entered it in September. From Tabriz the army set out for Baghdād by way of Hamadan without Shah Tahmâsp offering any resistance. Baghdād was left defenceless; İbrahim occupied the town and a few days later Sulaimān made his ceremonial entry into it on Nov. 30, 1534. During the four months that he spent there he built the mausoleum of Abû Hanifa and the sources mention a large number of holy places which the Sultan visited at Baghdād, Nishàf, Kāfa and Kerbēla. As the Persians had regained the greater part of the Turkish conquests, Sulaimān set out for Persia again, this time by Arbil and Marāḡa to Tabriz. The Shah continued to avoid a battle and the Turks were able to take the strongholds of Ardâbâlād and İrak-i A'dam. The only fighting was during the return march when the rearguard had occasionally to fight the Persians, for example at Wān. On Jan. 17, 1536, the Sultan was back in Constantinople and two months later (March 15)
there took place the disgrace and death of İbrahim, grand vizier and intimate favourite of the Sultan and up till then this companion on all his campaigns. His place was taken by Ayâş Paşa. In 1537 the Pâdişâh accompanied the expedition against Corfu but stayed himself at Walona. The Turks were forced to raise the siege of the citadel of the island which was defended by the Venetians on Sept. 7. This campaign is specially remembered for the raids made on the coast of Apulia led by Lüfti Paşa [g. v.]. In the following year a rebellion by the voivod of Moldavia forced the Sultan to military intervention which he also took part; it ended in the capture of the capital Suceava; after the installation of a new voivod and a new delimitation of his frontiers Sulaimân returned to Adrianople. The two following campaigns, those of 1541 and 1543, took him again into Hungary where the war had broken out again after the death of Zâpolya in 1540.

The widow of the latter was incapable of defending the rights of her infant son against the claims of Ferdinand of Austria. Sulaimân arriving before Buda — which had just been besieged in vain by the Hungarian Peter Ferenci — in August 1541, annexed it along with the kingdom of Zâpolya with the exception of Transylvania which was to be left to the queen dowager Isabella; henceforth Buda was the residence of a beglerbeg and Turkish administration was introduced into Hungary. Ferdinand's claims were of no avail and his attempt to take Pest in 1542 also failed. Sulaimân's campaign in 1543 brought a number of conquests, Valplo, Sihlós, Fünfkirchen (Pécs) and other towns. The Pâdişâh then went to Buda, after which Gran (Esztergom, in Turkish Ustârugân) and Stuhlweissenberg (Ustrin-Belgrad) were taken in September. The Sultan returned to Buda, where he crossed the Danube and returned to Constantinople on Nov. 11. This last campaign was followed by a pause of five years in the military activity of Sulaimân. The grand vizier Sulaimân Paşa, who had succeeded Lüfti Paşa in 1544, who had in turn succeeded Ayâş Paşa (d. 1539), was displaced and replaced by Rustam Paşa who had married Mihrâb Mihâ, daughter of Sulaimân and Khurram Sulţân; it is from this time that harem influence begins to be active in politics. As a result of this, relations with Persia became more actively hostile, while the Hungarian war was terminated by a treaty making a seven years' truce with Ferdinand of Austria, who promised to pay an annual tribute of 30,000 ducats. The campaign of 1548-49 of Sulaimân against Persia was provoked by Elânî Mirezâ, brother of Shah Tahmasp, a refugee at the Ottoman court. The Sultan went to Erzerum and then to Tabriz without the Sâbit offering any resistance. But circumstances forced the Turkish army to retire to Diyar Bakr, while the Persian army ravaged the frontier towns. Sulaimân spent the winter at Aleppo and passed the following year in inactivity also; the vizier A Bu made some conquests in Georgia. In December Sulaimân was back in Constantinople. The following years were occupied with military operations provoked by Austrian intervention in Transylvania, the only part of Hungary which so far had never seen a Turkish army. The Sultan took no part in these operations, the control of which was taken by Şokollu Paşa [g. v.], beglerbeg of Rum and future grand vizier (taking of Temesvár in 1551). Sulaimân had not intended to take part in the new Persian campaign of 1553 either; Rustam Paşa had been appointed Serasker for it. But the rumour which reached him — through the intermediary of Rustam — of a rebellion said to have been organised by prince Muşafâr, the governor of Amsa, decided the Sultan to rejoin the army in person. He set out on Aug. 18, 1553, accompanied by prince Salim. At Ereğli in Amsa Sulaimân took place the sudden and tragic execution of a prince Mustafa who had come to greet his father (Oct. 16). One result of this act of violence, inspired by harem intrigues, was the temporary replacement of Rustam Paşa by Ahmad Paşa (until his execution on Sept. 28, 1555). Military operations on a large scale did not begin till 1554 and resulted in the destruction of Naqheh-ân, Eriwa and Karâ Bagh (in July). In September negotiations for peace began at Erzerûm but it was not till May 29, 1555 that a treaty — the first Persian peace — was concluded at Amsa. In this last town the Sultan received the famous Austrian embassy under Busbecq which could only obtain an armistice. In August, Sulaimân returned to Constantinople. Ten years passed before his thirteenth and last campaign, that of Szigeth. In spite of the uninterrupted negotiations of Busbecq, the war in Austria went on because the Turks insisted on their claims, notably for recognition by the West in vain; in 1566 the grand vizier Rustam proved a particularly difficult person to negotiate with. It was only after his death (1561), that peace was concluded by his more amenable successor 'Ali Paşa in 1562. Austria had to abandon Transylvania and after the death of Ferdinand (1562) this peace was renewed by Maximilian. The last years of Sulaimân's life were darkened by the death of Khurram Sulţân (April 1558) and by the war between the princes Salim and Bayazid, which ended in the execution of the latter (cf. Sélim II). In 1565 hostilities with Austria were resumed and the Christians gained some successes. This gave the aged Sulţân a reason for taking the field once more at the head of his armies. He left Constantinople on May 15, 1566, with the new grand vizier Mehmèd Şôkolli (appointed in June 1565 after the death of 'Ali). At Zemlin, John Sigismund, son of Zâpolya, received with remarkable honours. Although the original plan had been to attack Erzû, the information he received decided the Sultan to lay siege to Szigeth (Signetvar) defended by Nicholas Zrinyi. The siege began on Aug. 2 and on Sept. 8 the town fell before the Turkish assault but the great Sulţân, who had died on the night of Sept. 5/6, did not live to witness its capture. The death of Sulaimân was kept secret by Şôkolli for three weeks to prevent trouble in the army and to give Sûlim II time to gain possession of the throne. Salim met the army near Belgrad; the body of Sulaimân (his heart was buried in the mausoleum near Szigeth, cf. Jacob, Aus Ungarns Türkensait, p. 24) was sent in advance of the army to Constantinople, where it was buried in his hürdl in the Sulaimânîya mosque.

This résumé of the campaigns of Sulaimân I reveals the extraordinary energy of this, the greatest, Sultan of the Ottoman Empire but does not give a complete picture of his personality. Unfortunately the sources do not supply us with sufficient data to reconstruct this personality. The Turkish sources
rarely contain anything but exaggerated praises, while the European sources, although more critical, are less well informed and often biased. There is however no lack of brief personal touches, such as the short but fervid prayer which Sulaimān uttered before the battle of Mohacs (G. O. R. ii. 59) the humility with which he assisted the bearers of the bier of Gül Baba after the occupation of Buda in 1526 (Evelyn, vi. 248). His piety is shown by the eight copies of the Kur'ān copied by Sulaimān himself and kept in the Salāmānyas, while his Muslim orthodoxy is evident from several ghāzal in the Dīwān composed by him. The chroniclers further describe him as an ardent lover of the chase. In its case Sulaimān must have been a born ruler, of remarkable dignity, a striking figure in the midst of his brilliant court, on such occasions of ceremony as the festivals of the circumcision of his sons as in 1530 or the marriages of the princesses, his sisters. His great affections were in his youth for İbrahim Paşa and for his favourite Khurram Sultan [q.v.], whose influence made itself felt in politics, but it was not the latter's children that Sulaimān loved best (the princes Sultan, Bayazid, and the princess Mühr-numâ). It was rather prince Muhammed, who accompanied him on several campaigns and of whose death he learned (Nov. 6, 1543) on his return from the campaign, who was his favourite son. In memory of this prince he built the Şah-şadet Džami in Stambul (financed in 1553). In memory of his prince Djalālzad [d. in 1553 soon after the execution of his brother Mustafa also buried in the Şah-şadet Džami] another mosque was built on the banks of the Top-khāne.

In the history of the Ottoman empire the name of Sulaimān is greater than that of any of the other sultans; the name marks an epoch, the epoch during which the empire became an undisputed power, in the Christian world as well as that of Islam, and one which left its stamp upon later political and cultural developments. The part played by Sulaimān himself in this development is difficult to determine; we may note however that during his reign Turkey possessed a large number of able and remarkable men, like the Kapudan Paşa Khair al-Din [q.v.] Barbarossa, the muhafiz Kemāl Paşa-Şahe [q.v.], the architect Sinān [q.v.] and many others, but that much of them seems to have played their part in his own proper sphere. There seems to have been a lack of great personalities in the immediate entourage of the Sultan, with the possible exception of the grand-virer İbrahim Paşa.

On the other hand, the development of the Ottoman empire under Sulaimān may perhaps be largely explained by the internal political system of the state. The foundation of this development has been laid by earlier sultans but under Sulaimān the state institutions had been perfected to such a pitch that we may with justice speak of a system. Following the principle of his predecessors, Sulaimān elaborated this system by the promulgation of the Kānān [q.v.] which were later collected into the different Kānān-nīmes (cf. the Bibliography).

It is this legislative activity which has gained him the epithet Kānān. The Kānān dealt mainly with the organisation of the army and military feuds, the laws of landed property, the police and the feudal code; one of the principles of the "system" was the exploiting of the Christian element in the empire through the Dowkhirūn and conferring of high offices of state to renegades. This was not without influence on the cultural developments which were the result.

The elaboration of the new ideal of the Ottoman state was not realised, however, without a certain amount of opposition from representatives of the old order of things, in the newly acquired provinces as well as in Asia Minor. Among these demonstrations which broke out mainly at the beginning of the reign may be mentioned the last remnant of independence shown by the 1200 't-Kurşunghil, suppressed by Farhād Paşa in 1526, and the rising in 1527 in It Ili and the rebellion of Ka-landeroghil in the same year put down by İbrahim Paşa; the mutiny of the Janissaries in 1525 in Constantinople falls into the same category. In the provinces peace was broken in 1527 by Ghaşlī, governor of Syria, and in Egypt by the attempt to regain independence under Kânsî and later in 1524 under the governor Ahmâd Paşa. The government further had to intervene on several occasions in the dynastic troubles in the Crimean and in the principalities of the Danube.

The enormous expansion that the empire underwent under Sulaimān was also a result of the system, especially of its military side. For, as contemporary writers (e.g. Demouchman) make him say, permanent peace is an impossibility; one of the country would have had nothing to support itself upon or to pay the Janissaries and the other turbulent soldiery. At the same time the great victories brought about a fundamental change in the place of the empire in international affairs. The Christian states had lost all hope of driving the Turks out of Europe; it was in the reign of Sulaimān that the famous alliance with Francis I of France was concluded which led to negotiations when he was in Italy as a prisoner of Charles V. One of the consequences of this alliance was the famous capitulation of 1535 which settled the privileges of the French in the Empire, notably consular jurisdiction.

This capitulation is the starting point for the capitulations between the Christian states and Turkey in the centuries following, although similar privileges had already been granted by Ottoman Sultan, notably to Venice. Another consequence of the French alliance was the great naval activity of the Turkish fleet in the Mediterranean against the Spanish fleet under Andrea Doria and against the African, Italian and Dalmatian coasts especially after Khair al-Din Barbarossa had become Kapudan Paşa (1536—1546); it was under him that the Franco-Turkish expedition against Nice took place in 1543. In the Red Sea and Indian Ocean, a Turkish fleet under Sulaimān Paşa waged war on the Portuguese (sieve of Dū in 1538). This expedition secured to Turkey possession of Aden and the Yemen. From 1550 it was the Kapudan Pîyale Paşa [q.v.], Torghud Re's and Sâlih Re's who spread the fame of the Ottomans in the Mediterranean especially in the ports of the Maghrib. In 1565 took place the large expedition against Malta in which Torghud Re's was killed. The Turkish fleet did not succeed in taking the island. To the same period belong the expeditions and adventures of Pir Re's and Sidi Re's in the Indian Ocean.

Alongside of these political developments at home and abroad, the Empire experienced a cultural
advance which may be said to be more independent than that of preceding centuries. Ottoman civilisation gained its own special character in the field of literature as well as that of art. Sultān Sulaimān played a part in the literary life of his time as a poet under the taḥlīlīyat of Maḥjubī and as a patron of the great poets of his time. In another way he and his glorious reign contributed to the development of literature by inspiring poets like Bāqī to write panegyric καθισά and various šāh-nāma, and prose-writers to write histories (cf. the Bibliography). But it is in the field of architecture especially that Turkish culture owes much to the initiative of Sulaimān. Of the mosques which he built in the capital first place must be given to the Sulaimānīya built between 1550 and 1556 and containing the türbe of Sulaimān (Sulaimānī II and Aḥmad II are also buried here); next comes the Salımdye built in memory of Salım I and finished in 1522; the Şahzade Daǰārī built between 1547 and 1548 in memory of prince Muḥammad, also contained the tomb of the prince Daǰāhīr; the mosque founded in memory of the last of Topkāhān is now destroyed; the Şahsavan Daǰārī was built in 1534 in memory of Şahram Salımdye; lastly may be mentioned two mosques built, one at Şambil and the other at Skutari, in memory of princess Mihr-ān-Şah, wife of Rustam Paşa. Great except the除外 the Sulaimānīya all these mosques are the work of the architect Salım Şahin [q.v.] who also built a large number of other mosques in the capital and elsewhere, for the grandees of the empire who followed the Şah’s example. Among other buildings of Şahin for Sulaimān are the aqueducts of the capital and the palace at Skutari.

Of the edifices erected throughout the provinces in large numbers by Sulaimān’s orders, the most remarkable are the tomb of Aḥū Ḥanīf at Baghānid; the mosque over the tomb of Daǰāl al-Dīn Rūmī at Kōnī, the restoration of the walls of Jerusalem (cf. al-Kūnīs), the restoration of the Kab’ah (after authorization by a farād of Abu l-Suṭūd, q.v.) and of the aqueducts of Mecca.

Bibliography: The contemporary Turkish sources which have been printed or translated are the Chronicle of Mahbūl ‘I-Lidin which forms the last part of the Taравīkh-i 3eli ʻOṣūmal, publ. by Giese, Breslau 1922, p. 136–153 (to 980 A.H. [1573]); Kemāl Paşa Žāde, ʻOṣūmal Muhāż or Muḥāž-nāma, publ. and transl. by Pavet de Courteilles, Paris 1859; Rustam Paşa, Taγrīk-i 3eli ʻOṣūmal, transl. by L. Forrer, Die osmanischen Chronik des Rüstem Paşa (to 1561) in Türkische Bibliothek, Leipzig 1923, vol. 21; the last years of the reign are described in Şahıc, Taʔrīk, Constantinople 1281 (from Şahīc 563) the Journal of Sulaimān describing day by day the last eight campaigns is printed in Ferdih, Münhağa-ishi-sfāha, Constantinople 1275, i. 567 (Belgrade campaign), p. 529 (Rhodes), p. 554 (Moháda), p. 567 (Vienna), p. 567 (Vienna), p. 524 (Tabriz and Baghānid), p. 597 (Walona), p. 602 (Moldavia); the Vienna campaign was published and transl. by F. A. Behzad, Sultān des Gezegeteh Tugebuch auf seinem Feldlarge nach Wien, Vienna 1828; the Munfażhār of Ferdih also contain many documents of the reign of Sulaimān (i. 500–ii. 86). There seems to be more complete collection in MS. No. 327 of the National Library of Vienna (Flügel, p. 293): Munfażhār we-suʔa wa-da`t-i Sulaimān Sulaimān Kāhin, which von Hammer considered the eleventh work, of the original compilation by Ferdih (cf. Şahind, p. 133). Other contemporary sources not yet published are the Ta tarafīkh of Lufti Paşa (only MS. in Europe at Vienna; Flügel, No. 1010; the last part of A’il, Awa al-aďār; Dājdī Zāde Muṣṭafā Čelebi, Taʔrīk al-mühāžlī wa-derazḏāt al-mālūk (to 962 [1554]; No. 1010; Ferdi, Taʔrīk Sulīm Sulaimān (to 949 [1552]; Flügel, No. 998; several Ta tarafīkh of Ruđačok (von Hammer knows those of Rāmaṇ and of Wasi, cf. also Flügel, No. 1067); Ghawīn-e rua mawwāl-e Ḡaḏrāh, by Šahīn Čahān (also von Hammer, cf. Flügel, No. 1006); finally several Ta tarafīkh, or which von Hammer cites those of Šahān, Aḥmad Pasawar-zāde and Maḥran. Another Ṣahān-nāma is that of Hūǧāta (quoted by Aḥmad Reği in Şahīc) and a poem Ḡānīm al-mawṣūmāt in the Library of Leyden (Cod. iii. 26); a Ta tarafīkh Sulīm Sulaimān at Vienna (Flügel, No. 1006) is rather legendary in its matter and belongs to the 18th century. The most important contemporary writers since the death of Sulaimān are: Peştāwī, Taʔrīk, Constantinople 1284; Kuṭa Čelebi Zāde, Sulaimān-nāma (written as a continuation of the Ta tarafīkh of Sa’d al-Dīn), Bilāk 1248, and by the same author, Rauat al-aďār, Bilāk 1248; Merah, Fatn-nāma-i Šāhévar, G. O. K., iii., p. vi. and Flügel, No. 1002; finally the historical works of Šahān Zāde, Ḡāḏrā, Kuṭa, Nuṣāḥ, Dājava, Kuṭa, etc. Wiliyāh Čelebi is also sometimes a source for the life of Sulaimān.

For state institutions in the time of Sulaimān a important source is the ʻAṣaf-nāma of Lufti Paşa, publ. and transl. by R. Tschudi in Türkische Bibliothek, No. 12, Berlin 1910 and the ʻAṣaf-nāma of Sulaimān. These ʻAṣaf-nāma, which have been collected are edited at different times and found in large numbers in the Libraries of Constantinople; edition are: Aṭif Bey, ʻAṣaf-nāma-i ʻA’ll-i ʻOṣūmal (iḥādi) ed. by the Nisbātī Sīrī Beg, in T. O. E. M., No. 15–19 (Aug. 1912–April 1913) and ʻOṣūmal ʻAṣaf-nāmal (ed. by Abu l-Suṭūl and the Nisbātī Rāmaṇ-Zāde Muḥāzam) in Millī teknebâb madżmūnāt-i, Constantinople 1334; translations in A. L. M. Petis de la Croix, Cano du Sultan Selim IV, reprinted at Sultan Muḥam IV pour son instruction, ou état politique et militaire tiré des archives les plus secrets des princes ottomans et qui servent pour bien gouverner leur empire, Paris 1735; Cano du Sultan Selim conservant la police de l’Egypte in Digeon, Nouveaux censures turcs et aravés, Paris 1781; partially in von Hammer, Die Osmanischen Reiches Staatserforschung, Vienna 1815, i. 384–427; other documents in Aḥmad Reği, Cemal b. Ḡādirī Nisbāt İstanbul hāyāl, Constantinople 1333.

The Turkish poems of Sulaimān (Mûḥāżīb) were printed at Constantinople in 1308 under the title Da’āwāl Mûḥāżīb. A commentary which contains an appreciation of the great qualities of Sulaimān, was written by Aḥmad b. Abd Allah Pašri, entitled Aḥāzāl-i Sulaimānī (Flügel, No. 665); G. Jacob, Sultan Selim des Großen Iran in einer Auswahl, herausgegeben, Berlin 1903.

Among contemporary western sources first place should be given to the Relazioni of the
Venetian ambassadors publ. by Alberi, then the narratives of other envoys like Busbecq, accessible in Forster and Danieli, *The Life and Letters of Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq*, London 1881; the Tagebuch of his companion Hans Den
cschwam, ed. Balinger, Munich and Leipzig 1913, is very useful for its description of Turkey in the
in time of Sulaiman; Lewenklaw, in *Neue Chronika Türkischer Nation*, Francfort 1590,
gives in the appendix an important document (e.g. on page 418 the stages of the second
campaign in Persia); Bussard, *Vita et fama Sultani*orum Turcium*, Francfort 1596; 

The modern historians beginning with von Hammer have also used, sometimes most exclu-
only, western sources (Hungarian, Austrian, Kosman, etc.): von Hammer, *G. O. R.*, iii.
1—495; Zinkein, *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches* in *Europa*, Gotha 1854, ii. 611—936;
iii. 1—380; Kapulies, *Die Kämpfe Österreichs mit den Osmanen von Jahre 1525—1537*, Vienn
1899; Jorga, *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches*, Gotha 1909, ii. iii. Modern Turkish works are:
Thurayia Efendi, *Sidilli-i Ώθωμανί/, in. 143; 
Nami Kamal, *'Όθωμανί/, Constantinople 1396—1398; Khair Allah, *Derweli Ώθω-
μανί/, Constantinople 1292, vol. ii., monographs by the historian Ahmed Raffik: 
dekder*, Constantinople 1336.

A. H. Likeyer, *The Government of the Magnificent, Empire in the time of Sulaiman the Magnifctent,
1—9; 
ii. 72, 100, 186. 

**SULAIMAN II, twenty first Ottoman Sultan**, reigned from 1597 to 1619. He was born
in 1593 (1642) (on 15th Muharram = April 15, according to von Hammer, *G. O. R.,* the
Sidilli-i Ώθωμανί gives the 25th Safar = May 25), and was the son of Sulaiman I.; from the
accession of his brother Muhammed IV he lived the life of a prisoner in the palace with his
brother Ahmad. On the deposition of Muhammed IV, the result of the defeat of the Turkish armý
at Mohács, Sulaiman was placed on the throne on
Nov. 8, 1637, mainly through the efforts of the *Fâtim-STAR/ım* Köprülü Muştafa Paşa. In the
precarious position of the empire, great hopes were placed upon a second Sulaiman, but the latter
had not the necessary qualities. He is described as
being of a resolute, warlike character, and indeed he twice took the field at the head of the
army; a weak constitution however prevented him
from carrying out his good intentions. Soon after his
accession the mutinous army returned from Hungary and invaded the capital and committed un-
precedented excesses in which the grand 

**Bibliography:** The principal Turkish source is Râshid, *Turhâh*, Constantinople, 1282,
i. 15—159 and several works not yet printed: —
Deffterdâr Muhammed Paşa, *Zamâhat al-Wa-
'kât*, Flügel, Vienna Catalogue, N. 1079;
*Sa'id-i Ώθωμανί*, of Olu 'L-Paşar Efendi (Flügel, 
N. 1078); *Abd al-Qâhid Irini*, *Umûdat al-
Tawârîh* ve 'l-Ákkâr (Library Assad Efendi in
Constantinople, N. 2331). Also Thurayia Efendi,
*Sidilli-i Sultani*, in. 44; von Hammer, *G. O. R.,* 
vi. 499—560; Zinkein, *Geschichte des Osmanis-
chen Reiches in Europa*, v. 145—150, 243; 
255—254. 

**SULAIMAN, MAWLâY ARU'L-RÂBI b. MUHAM-
MAD, 'Alawîd Sultân of Morocco, reigned from
Radjab 1306 (March 1792) to 13th Rabi' I
1338 (Nov. 28, 1822). The son of Sulaiman Muhammad IV b. 'Abd Allah b. Ismaiîl and a free woman of the
Arab tribe of Ablâfî, he spent his youth in Sidjilmass where he devoted himself to study without
taking part in politics. When on the death of his father in Radjab 1306 (March—April 1792) the
power passed to his brother Yânis, Sulaiman came
from al-Tafihlibi escorted by the Arab and Berber tribes of the Sahara to bring him the submission of the people of Sijilmasa. After the death of Mawlyy Vazid, killed near Marrakesh (end of Djamnana II 1306 = Feb 1792) fighting against Mawlyy Hisham, one of his brothers who had rebelled against him, Morocco fell into anarchy. The people of al-Haws of Marrakesh remained faithful to Mawlyy Hisham but those of al-Hilu and al-Djbal proclaimed Mawlyy Mausuma, another brother of Mawlyy Vazid.

The people of Fes, the tribes around the capital and the 'Abid, Watafay and Berbers proclaimed Mawlyy Sulaiman whose learning and piety particularly distinguished him. Soon afterwards the 'Abid of Mikanas and the Berbers of the region joined them and the new Sultan received their oath of allegiance in the sanctuary of Mawlyy Idris, on Monday 17th Rajab 1306 (March 12, 1792). Later he was also recognised by the Banu Hasan and the other tribes of al-Gharb, as well as by the people of Sale and Rabat.

He had hardly been proclaimed, when M. Sulaiman had to fight his brother and rival, M. Muslama, who was soon defeated and went to live in the south. At the end of 1306 (1792) M. Sulaiman made an unsuccessful expedition with the object of chastising the Angul, an Arab tribe around Ugda, which plundered caravans and convoys of pilgrims. In al-Haw of Marrakesh however M. Hisham was still supreme. At the end of 1307 (1793) M. Sulaiman sent his brother M. al-Tayyib against the Shawaiba but he was defeated. In 1308 (1793—1794) the Djabala, the tribes inhabiting the mountainous massif of the northwest (Akhnas, Banu Yadar, Banu Gurufi, Gharawi etc.) rebelled on the invitation of a faqih, Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Salam Zaizan al-Khamst. After his defeat in the first encounter, the troops of M. Sulaiman ultimately crushed the rebels and Zaizan, captured and pardoned, was appointed governor of the tribe and became one of the strongest supporters of the government.

M. Hisham was always powerful in al-Haw of Marrakesh, where the tribes of Dukkalla, 'Abda, Akmara, Shyadhima, Hatha and Rahaima followed him; but discord was not long in breaking out among them and M. Sulaiman seized his opportunity. He began by attacking a section of the Shawaiba whom he defeated. In 1320 (1795—1796) the Rahaima sent him a deputation inviting him to march on Marrakesh and he took the field against the Shawaiba whom he routed, then invaded the territory of the Dukkalla and took Azzemir in 1321 (1796—1797).

He then turned his attention to Marrakesh; on his approach, M. Hisham fled from the town to the Atlas. M. Sulaiman occupied the capital of the south and extended his authority over the tribes of al-Hawa, al-Dair, al-Sitt, the Hatha and the town of Mogadore. A little later, the 'Abda, 'Abd al-Rahman b. Nasir who had been one of the most faithful auxiliaries of M. Hisham submitted to the Sultan and M. Hisham now alone, soon followed his example. M. Sulaiman was now undisputed sovereign of all Morocco.

His authority once well established, M. Sulaiman undertook several secondary expeditions to assure the security of the frontiers of his empire. The Turks and the Algers had seized Ugda and extended their authority over the tribes in the neighbourhood of this town. In 1321 (1796—1797) M. Sulaiman sent troops who reconquered the territory without difficulty. In 1323 (1798—1799) there was an expedition to al-Sis, in 1325 (1800—1801) the unfortunate campaign against the Berber tribe of Alt-Umali, in 1326 (1801—1802) an expedition against the land of Dar'a (Deira) and in 1327 (1802—1803) against the Rif to collect taxes. In 1328 (1803—1804) there was the campaign against the Alt Irhman of the Central Atlas and against the tribes of the Sahara (Tungha, Farka, Ghais and Taifillian).

The power of M. Sulaiman had now reached its zenith and Morocco enjoyed several years of peace and prosperity. This period unfortunately did not last and the Sultan had to spend the last years of his reign in almost annual expeditions. In 1322 (1807—1808) there was an expedition against the Tada and the Gurina; in 1325 (1808—1809) a new campaign against the Alt Umali, who were forced on this occasion to pay tribute; in 1324 (1809—1810) there was an expedition against the Tada and against the Alt Isri; in 1325 (1810—1811) there was an expedition against the Rif.

Very soon afterwards the situation changed. The nationalist rising of the Berbers in the Central Atlas, exasperated by the oppression of the central absolutist power impoverished the empire and brought Morocco to the verge of anarchy. In 1326 (1811—1812) the Garwan and the Alt Umali rebelled under the chief Amhass; the first expedition sent against them was routed at Asri. In 1327 (1812—1813) the Sultan sent to the Rif an expedition to punish several eastern tribes notably the Gallya, who, in spite of his prohibition, were selling wheat to the Christians. This campaign was crowned with success but had no permanent results so that the very next year in 1328 (1813—1814) the Sultan, accompanied by Arab contingents from the Banu Malik and the Sufian had to go in person to the Rif which he ravaged with fire and sword. In 1329 (1814—1815) there was an expedition to the region of Marrakesh to punish the turbulent tribes of Dukkalla, 'Abda and Shyadhima. In 1331 (1815—1816) the Sultan sent his son M. Ibrahim to punish various Arab and Berber tribes of the Sahara, the Shaha and the Alt ‘Aqiq who had seized fortresses (kasbah) built in their land by M. Ismail; the expedition was a failure and the Sultan had to undertake a second one in person which was quite successful.

But the enemy who caused the greatest trouble to Sulaiman was the Berber bloc of the Central Atlas, which rebelled on several occasions against the Arab yoke, frequently threatening the town of Mikanas. The Sultan never succeeded in taming them and their stubborn resistance was the cause of the internal dissensions which troubled the close of his reign. The Sanadhja of the Central Atlas and especially the confederation of the Alt Umali of Fasko refused to submit to the central power. In 1334 (1818—1819) the Sultan decided to subordinate them, with Arab and Berber contingents (Zanmait, Garuwa and Alt Irhman), but as a result of the defection of the Zanmait, the Sultan's son M. Ibrahim was mortally wounded and the Sultan himself was captured by a Berber who however ultimately released him. This success inflamed the national ardour of the Berbers who rose under a local mursit Muhammed U-Nasir Amhass, to fight against the whole Arabic speaking element in Morocco. The checks suffered by M.
Suilamân had destroyed his prestige and the end of his reign was simply a series of risings which he had great difficulty in putting down. While the Sulîman was at Mîrân defending it against the Berbers, the people of Fâr rose against his governor, al-Êsîfâr. He therefore returned to Fâr and on the way his army was attacked by the Berbers. In 2335/36 (1859-60) he went to pacify al-Hilâl and then to Marrakesh. During his absence the Wâdâyda plundered Fâr, disorder broke out among the people of the town who ultimately asked the help of the Berbers against the Wâdâyda. Soon the people of Fâr by arrangement with the Berbers abandoned M. Suleïman and chose as ruler M. Ilâmî b. Yastîl, who was also recognised by a part of the people of N. W. Morocco, notably the inhabitants of Tétouan; returning to the town, M. Ilâmî died and his brother M. Sûdî was proclaimed in his stead. The Sulîman M. Suleïman then left Marrakesh and laid siege to Fâr. The siege lasted till Raglîl 2337 (March—April 1852). During this period the Sulîman sent an expedition to attack Tétouan.

Having retaken Fâr and settled the situation in the north M. Suleïman set out for the south where he had to fight against the Arab tribe of the Shahrazîd, who lived near Marrakesh. Wearing with ruling M. Suleïman was thinking of abdicating in favour of his nephew M. Abû al-Rahîm b. Hâshim, when he died on 12th Rabi‘ 1, 1238 (Nov. 28, 1822) at Marrakesh, where he was buried.

In spite of his unfortunate reign, M. Suleïman left a great reputation for piety, justice and benevolence; for example he abolished the non-Islamic taxes (mûdhrûq). He was also a great builder.

Bibliography: Abu l-Kalâm al-Zayînî, al-Tarîkh al-ma‘rûzî, ed. Hôndas, text, p. 92; transl., p. 109; Muhammed Akânî, al-Qutbî al-tarîkhî, lihî, Fâr 1336, l. 181; Aymad M. el-Ma‘rîzî, al-hiṣâb, ll. 129—172; transl. in Arch. Maghreb., iii. 384—399, s. 1—105. — Suleïman al-Harîrî wrote poems in praise of Mawlay Suleïman, but the collection, of no historical value, is still in manuscript.

(Sonnino S. Cony.)

Suilamân, al-Ma‘rîzî, a sailing-master (mûsîâm al-Êa‘bîy) and author of "Sailing Instructions" in the first half of the xvíth century.

MS. No. 2559 of the Arabic collection of the Bibliothèque Nationale contains several nautical treatises in prose and verse on the Indian Ocean, the seas of Western China and the seas of the great Asiatic Archipelago. The treatises in verse are by the mûsîâm Ibn Ma‘zîdî (see Suilamân al-Êatîn). The five treatises in prose have been prepared by another sailing-master called Suilamân b. Aymad al-Ma‘rîzî al-Muhâmîn (fol. 593) or Suleïman b. Aymad b. Suleïman al-Ma‘rîzî (fol. 1554, here wrongly written al-Ma‘rîzî). In either case he would be son or grandson of Mabîrî, i.e. a member of the tribe of the Malafrân of South Arabia. Suilamân is otherwise unknown. The "Sailing Instructions", of which he is the author contain no biographical information. His Turkish translator, the admiral Sîbu‘î Ali who wrote the Mabîrî in 1554, mentions that he was dead by then (cf. T. A. E. N., Nov. 1844, p. 548). One of the nautical treatises is dated 1511; it is therefore probable that the texts in question were prepared in the first half of the xvíth century.

MS. 2559 is a small 4° of 215 × 150, 187 folios with 15 lines to a page. The five treatises by Suilamân contained in it are as follows:

1. Kitab tarîkhû al-ma‘rûzî wa-‘îsârîy fî al-ma‘rûzî, folio 16 to 50. At the beginning of the text we: "The object of this epistle is to make known the different kinds of known years and their use for all the world; these years are the lunar, solar, Byzantine (famûsîa), Coptic and Persian. The epistle contains a short introduction of 10 lines and 6 fâzûl or sections. The first deals with the lunar year, the second with the basin of the solar years; the third with the solar year; the fourth with the Byzantine years; the fifth with the Coptic year and the sixth with the Persian year."

Not dated. On folio 10, where the titles of the treatises contained in the manuscript are given in another hand, this text is entitled: "Epistle dealing with the science of eras, i. e. with the knowledge of the principle of years, the use of which is found throughout the world."

2. Kitab fâzîlât al-ma‘rûzî, from folio 51a to 100b inclusive. Onto this this the "Epistle of the gift to men of energy to facilitate the knowledge of the principles of astronomical-naval science." This treatise is divided into 4 lines of introduction, 7 chapters and a conclusion. Chapter 1 deals with the description of the spheres and the stars which they contain; chapter ii, treats of the division of the circle which those learned in nautical astronomy are agreed to divide into 36 parts called âshâms ("celestial" rumûb), by analogy with the rumûb of navigation. Chapter iii, deals with zâmî = 3 hours sailing at sea; chapter iv, with the two kinds of sailing at sea, i.e. following the coast line or crossing the high seas; chapter v, with the altitudes of the stars to determine the latitude of a port; chapter vi. with the distances between two ports estimated in zâmî; chapter viii. with the winds. The conclusion of this treatise is as follows: the art of navigation is based on a double foundation, good sense and perseverance.

This text is not dated but it is later than iv. which is quoted on folio 79, line i and than iii. which is mentioned in folio 58, line 11 which puts its date after 1512.

Folios 103 and 110 are blank in the MS.

3. Al-Êa‘bîy al-ma‘rûzîy fî fâzîlât al-ma‘rûzî al-Êa‘bîy, from folio 111 to 599 inclusive. It is divided into 7 chapters which are subdivided into sections.

Chapter i. deals with the principles of nautical astronomy. It contains the following sections: (a) To know the rumûb; (b) to know the distance of the stars at the equator; (c) to know the parallels (madârîs) of the stars expressed in degrees; (d) to know the stars which are in horizontality (fâzîlât) (observed on a single planchette); (e) to know the zâmî; (f) to know the guide to the next number of zâmî between the rumûb; (g) to know the exact number of fâzîlât (co-efficient indicating the length of the voyage to be covered to a given cape to get the same displacement in latitude sailing straight north); (h) to know the basis (for calculation) of the altitude of a star; (â) to know the distances.

Chapter ii. deals with the names of the stars and allied matters. It has two sections (a) to know the number of fâzîlât = 1° 37' that are one between the North Pole and the gûl or Pole Star, the great fâzîlât or Ê of Ursa Major, the small...
The monsoons of the second class of the first category are the monsoons from Mecca (i.e. from Jeddah), Sawakh, Zaila, Aden, Shahr, Madhâs, Zaila and Kalâhât to the west coast of India. The monsoon blowing towards the land "under the wind" (i.e. to the east of Cape Comorin) are the monsoons from 'Aden, Shahr, Madhâs, Gujarat, the Konkan, Sumatra, Tenasserim, Malabar and Bengal; the monsoon from Bengal to the west coast of the Malay Peninsula; the monsoon from the east coast of Africa to the Maldives; the monsoon of the Sawâhîl to the south Arabian coast.

The second category of monsoons includes the monsoons from Gujarat, the Konkan and Hormuz to the coast of Arabia; from Gujarat to the east coast of Africa, from Bengal, Malacca and Tenasserim, Martaban and Sumatra to Mecca (i.e. Jeddah), 'Aden and Hormuz; from Sumatra to Bengal; from the Maldives to 'Aden and the whole Arabian coast; from Dyiyl in Sind to the Arabian coast; from Malâh in East Africa to Madagascar; from Kiwâ to Sufálah and from Sufálah to Kiwâ.

Chapter vii. deals with the monsoons of the Indian Ocean, the dates of which are expressed in the Persian reckoning. The monsoons are divided into two categories. The first is divided into two classes. The first of these is called "head of the wind" and includes the following monsoons: monsoon of Aden which takes one to the west coast of India, the monsoon of Shahr [q.v.] for the same destination; monsoon of Zaila, monsoon of the Sawâhîl or of the eastern equatorial coast of Africa for the same destination; monsoon of the Sawâhîl to the south coast of Arabia; monsoons of Gujarat, of the Konkan, of Malabar, of Malâh in Shahr, of Zaila, from Masâk to Malacca, Sumatra, Tenasserim and Bengal. Monsoon from Zaila and Berbera to the south Arabian coast; monsoon from 'Aden to Hormuz.

This treatise is dated in figures, 238th Râbi' II, 961 = March 27, 1554; from according to the Mabîr of Sufi. All, it was compiled in 917 (1511-1512) (cf. F. S. S., No. 1834, p. 548), and this is the date which should be adopted as correct. The Turkish admiral actually collected the Arabic documents which he translated during his sojourn on the Persian Gulf in 1553. The date given in MS. No. 2559 is no doubt that when the copy was made as Sulaimân was already dead in 1554.

IV. Khâlit al-minhâj al-sikhtî fî 'ilm al-hâj al-shâhîr, from fol. 52a to 93b, l. 3. It is divided into an introduction, 7 chapters and a conclusion. The introduction deals with the sea routes on the coast of Arabia, Makrân, Sind, Gujarat, the Konkan, Tulun, Malâh; on the Somali coast and the east coast of Africa; the east coast of India, Bengal and Sumatra (= west coast of Malay Peninsula); and of Malacca; on the west coast of the Malay
Punamula, Indu-China, Western Chias, and some routes on the high seas.

Chapter ii. dealing with the latitudes (रेखा, lit. "measure") of the ports on known and inhabited coasts: "Know", says the author, "that as regards the observation of the Polar Star, there is a difference between the people under the wind and those of the islands in the wind of Cape Comorin, as far as certain capes are concerned. The result is differences between the people of Western India (किल्ले, this is how we must take it in nautical terminology) and the Arabs as regards the fundamental measure (i.e. the measure of the height of the Pole Star)."

In my book entitled al-ʿUmāda (cf. above col. 2) [the latitudes given] are in conformity with those of the Colas; in the present book, I have reproduced the opinion of the older masters of navigation for all the coasts because [as to these latitudes] I have verified them from certain capes which I supposed to have been situated above their true latitude ... Then come the sections where they are indicated: (a) a great number of latitudes furnished by observation of the Pole Star, (b) of the farṣbadin (ʿγυ of Uras Minor), (c) of the nāzār ʿayyāl of Uras Major, (d) the altitudes of the known stars.

Chapter iii. contains the description of the coasts of the large known inhabited islands: Madagascar, the Seychelles, Sokotra, the Laccadives, the Maldives, Ceylon, the Andaman and Nicobar Islands, the Takwa Islands on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula, Sumatra, Java and the northeastern islands (Timor, the Sandalwood Islands, Banda, the Moluccas, the island of Līkīkī [Arabic transcription of the Chinese Lifu-Kien also called ḇākū — north of Formosa], Giolo, Fariyli, [?] Borneo and Macassar = Celebes).

Chapter iv. deals with the distances between Arabistan and Western India, the ports of the Bay of Bengal, the east coast of Africa and certain ports of Sumatra, Java and Bali.

Chapter v. deals with the winds, cyclones and the dangers to which ships are exposed. Chapter vi. treats of the landings and landmarks of Western India, the Arabian coast and the east coast of Africa. Chapter vii. deals with the entrance of the sun and moon into the signs of the Zodiac. The conclusion contains the following detailed itineraries: from Dīn to Malacca, from Malacca to the Maldives, from Dīn to the west coast of Sumatra and back to Maritime and Teessimir and to Bengal.

This text is not dated but it mentions al-ʿUmāda (ill.) in folio 64a, l. 13; it is therefore later than 1514. It also mentions ill. which is quoted on folio 608, l. 6.

Folios 93b to 151a contain nautical treatises in verse by Ibn Majīd, which have already been discussed (cf. above, p. 356 ff.). Folios 1518 to 1544 are blank.

V. Kitāb ʿarbaʿ sukūt afṣanah fi tābiʿt al-ṣuʿāʾ: from folios 1552 to 1578 and last. At the end of several lines of introductory matter the author says: "I have extracted [the substance] of this book from different scholios and collected the contents [by borrowing] from my own works and those of my brethren [of the brotherhood of sailing masters] (folio 1552, l. 3 infr.)"

Chapter i. deals with the description of the celestial spheres and the stars which they contain (spheres of the moon, of Mercury, Venus, the sun, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn and the fixed stars), the loadstone and the compass. Chapter ii. deals with the division of the circle. *I say*, says the author (l. 1614, l. 3) "that this chapter ii. of this book contains the description of the circle. The word ʿarbaʿ here means the circle of the horizon divided into 360 parts, each part of which is considered a degree by observers i.e. astronomers. I say that those learned in nautical science are agreed to divide the circle (of the horizon) into 32 parts. I say that the masters of navigation of the ocean of Western India agree. There are the Arabs, the people of Hormuz, the people of Western India, the Colas and the Zenge (or Zendjānī). It is the same for masters of navigation of the west, like the Maghābbīs, the Franks, the Byzantines (Iṭṭīya); also the Franks also divide the circle into 32 parts. As to the Chinese and Javaneses — these are the people of the islands of the south — they divide the circle into 24 parts. It is the same with the people of the non-Arab countries like Khūrāsān and the non-Arab lands adjoining it and the masters of navigation have called each of these parts ʿāṣān by analogy with the ʿāṣān (or rumb) of navigation."

The same chapter then deals with the ḫibā (lit. finger = 1° 37') (Chapter iii. is devoted to the same; chapter iv. to the routes along the coasts and on the high seas; chapter v. to the altitudes of the stars; chapter vi. to the distances between two points; chapter vii. to the winds. The book ends with a general concluding chapter.

This last nautical treatise which is not dated is later than the Kitāb al-ṣināḥliḥ (ll.) quoted in l. 1759, l. 8 and 1858 l. 14; and than the al-ʿUmāda (ill.) mentioned in folio 1565a, l. 5; 1565b, l. 5; 1565, l. 13—l. 14. The Catalogue des Manuscrits Arabes de Paris wrongly says that the text of this treatise is written in red ink; the titles of the chapter, sections, and paragraphs alone are written in red ink; the text itself is written in black ink like the rest of the manuscript.

Without going into details we may here mention the main rules used by Arab seafarers in the xivth—xvith centuries. According to the nautical texts of Ibn Majīd and Sulaimān al-Māhrī the latitudes of the parts of the Indian Ocean are given in the wide sense, i.e. the ports of all the coasts between the Southern Africa and the Chinese province of Pau-Kien (coasts of the mainland and islands of the Indian Ocean in the strict sense, of the Red Sea, the Persian Gulf, the sea of ʿOman, the Bay of Bengal, the Sea of Western China, and the Sea of the Great Asiatic Archipelago), are determined by observation of three stars or groups of northern stars: ʿāṣān = Pole Star; the Guards, in Arabic al-farṣbadin, *the two calves* = ʿγ of Uras Minor; the tomb, in Arabic al-ʿayyāl ʿayyāl = ʿγ of Uras Major. The latitude of the harbours between the parallels of 32° 48′ N. = 17° ḫibā and 6° north = about 1 ḫibā from the ʿāṣān is determined by the observation of the Pole Star; that of the ports situated between the parallels of 5° 21′ south = about 1 ḫibā from the farṣbadin by observation of the Guards of Uras Minor; and that of the ports between the parallels of 6° N. = 1 ḫibā from the ʿāṣān or 8 ḫibā from the farṣbadin and of 5° 21′ south = 1 ḫibā from the farṣbadin or 13 ḫibā from the ʿayyāl and about 25° 16′ south = 2 ḫibā from the ʿayyāl, by observation of al-ʿayyāl of Uras Major. The result of these observations has been laid down in the Sailing Instructions in the following from Ibn Majīd and Sulaimān al-Māhrī give first
of all the parallel in question and then mention all the points which are found on this latitude, the one from east to west and the other from west to east. For example, in [fol. 649, L. 8 of MS. 2559] we are told:

"[There where] the $pâh$ is 11 $i$ $pâh$ [above the horizon = about 21° 14' N. are]: the harbour of Kawsh (arabish form of the Chinese 昆脚) as modern Hanouf in Tonkin which is in China (sic), this is the port of the Sui-fu (of the country). Then Shaitam = Chittagong in Eastern Bengal (= west coast of Burmah); then Râs al-Kandar on the west coast of the Bay of Bengal (= east coast of India); then Kântâma (in the bay of this name, on the west coast of India); then Râs Djaj (the west point of the peninsula of the Kathiawar); then Râs al-Hadd (south-east point of Arabia); then al-Kânjân (a cape) on the west coast of the Hijaz (to this cape is a reef [called] al-Bîn; then [cape] Dawârî on the African coast [of the Red Sea] ...]."
The list goes on by 4 $i$ $pâh$'s from north to south to 1 $i$ $pâh$ from the Pole Star which section ends in the parallel of 6° N. Lat.

The next section is entitled "Section dealing with the altitude of the farãbadain of the place where the Pole Star is at 1 $i$ $pâh$ to the end of the observations made with the two stars". Practically a $i$ $pâh$ from the Pole Star = 8 $i$ $pâh$ from the Guardians (of the Urs Minor); these two expressions are interchangeable. It is at this parallel of 8 $i$ $pâh$ = 6° N. that the section begins:

"[There where] the farãbadain are at 8 $i$ $pâh$ [above the horizon are]: Këlânâna in China (read: on the east coast of the Malay Peninsula); then Kâdâsh on the east coast (of the Bay of Bengal) = west coast of the Malay Peninsula); then the island of Persq (off the preceding harbour); then the islands of开关 and Cûmî-fûala and the north-west cape of Sumatra; then Afâm on the east coast (lit. on the back) of Ceylon; then Taqalân on the west coast of Ceylon; then the island of Kandikal on the Maldives; then the beginning of Saiî-âl-Tâwil (lit. the long bank) on the east coast of Africa. ..."
The enumeration continues by 4 $i$ $pâh$'s to 5 $i$ $pâh$; then following the parallels of 4 5 3 2 1 $i$ $pâh$, the section ends at 1 $i$ $pâh$ = 21° 14' N. Lat.

The next section is entitled: "Section dealing with the altitude of the naâbê in the Southern Isles [of Indenmena], Madagascar and on the coast of Zeng (or Zandj)". 13 $i$ $pâh$'s from Urs Major = 1 $i$ $pâh$ from the Guards. The text of this section does not begin till the following parallel:

"[There where] the naâbê are at 12 $i$ $pâh$ [above the horizon = 7° South are]: the port of Sunabaya which is on the west coast. (this is an error for north) of the island of Java; then [the island of] Sumabaya [which produces] sandalwood and is situated west (read: east) of Java; then Monâka (the Mafi of the cart maps) on the coast of the Zeng ..."

The enumeration goes on by $i$ $pâh$ (Java being always inaccurately orientated N.E. instead of E.W.); to 4 $i$ $pâh$ and alternately 4 $i$ $pâh$ = about 25° 10' south. On the parallel of 4 $i$ $pâh$ the text says:

"[There where] the naâbê are 1 $i$ $pâh$ [above the horizon are]: the harbour of Kitâ (lit. the harbour) on the east coast of Madagascar; then the bay of Kûf (lit. the coast of the same island; then the port of al-Shadjara (or part of the tree) on the east coast of Africa); and the author adds: "According to the early (i.e. writers on navigation) [this port is the last of the islands (sic) of the coast of Zeng; but the Franks say that the [west] coast [of Africa] runs to the north and] continues to the place where the naâbê are 7 $i$ $pâh$ in the water (21° 15' south). But Allah knows best!" The Madjid expresses himself more clearly in this connection in section 9 of the Hârnâna, a poem on navigation dated September 15, 1462 (MSS. 2292, fol. 1182), where he says: "... the harbour of al-Shadjara which is well known lies 7 $i$ $pâh$ from the naâbê. The learned give this as the position of this port. There are no others having a name. ... And there is nothing south of these lands, for it is there the land of Zeng ends (on the east coast of Africa) and there is the strand (that leads) to the land of the west and of the Franks. There is nothing to the south [of Africa] except reefs and darkness which the Creator [alone] knows. Some say that there are islands and that the extreme end of the coast is 5 $i$ $pâh$ (21° 30' S.). — O thou, the best informed! But the stories of the authorities do not agree. We ask Allah to pardon our errors."

This passage in the 7. A. for Oct.—Nov. 1927 (p. 307—309) and came to the conclusion that the harbour of al-Shadjara must be identified with Lorenzo Marques.

We have seen that several sections aim at making known the distances between two fixed points. The following on fol. 834, L. 8 sqq. is particularly important: because it deals with ports situated at the two ends of the Indian Ocean and with the navigation of the high seas from end to end without altering one's course:

"Section dealing with the distances [between the ports whose altitude is known] by observation of the farãbadain (ports which are situated) on the coast of Zeng (on the one hand) and in the island of Java and Sumatra (on the other):

"By 7 $i$ $pâh$ from the farãbadain = 4° 27' N. of the atoll (fughe) of Muñîl (on the African coast) to Makûfiong (the Musôfa of the early Portuguese travellers; cf. Barros, Dec. iii., Bk. vi., Ch. 11 on the west coast of Sumatra), it is 234 ñm = 39 days 6 hours.

"By 6 $i$ $pâh$ from the farãbadain = 2° 47' N. from Murtî (on the African coast) to Pânûrî (lit. Fençur or Baros on the west coast of Sumatra), it is 248 ñm = 31 days.

"By 5 $i$ $pâh$ from the farãbadain = 1° 10' N. from Dâwâra (or Dâwâra) of the African coast to the harbour of Pîranôm (on Sumatra), it is 264 ñm = 33 days.

"By 4 $i$ $pâh$ from the farãbadain = 0° 30' south from Malânî (on the coast of Africa) to Indrapura (on Sumatra), it is 278 ñm = 34 days 24 hours.

"By 3 $i$ $pâh$ from the farãbadain = 2° 07' south from Kîtîkwa (on the African coast = Qitñas in Barros, Dec. ii., Bk. 1., Ch. ii.) to Sunda-hêt (lit. the straits of Sunda or of Soend), it is 292 ñm = 36 days 12 hours.

"By 2 $i$ $pâh$ from the farãbadain = 3° 44' south from Mambása (on the African coast) to Sunda (west coast of Java), it is 308 ñm = 38 days 6 hours.

"By 1 $i$ $pâh$ from the farãbadain = 5° 21' south from the Green Island (Arabic name for Pemba on the coast of Africa) to the island of Bîi (east of Java), it is 317 ñm = 39 days 15 hours."

The "Sailing Instructions" of Sulaimân al-Majâli contain a certain number of detailed itineraries which are remarkably accurate. We give as an
example the itinerary from Dhu to Malacca (fol. 88a, l. 15 to fol. 89a, l. 3) translating the Arabic nautical terms in the text by their English equivalents; *Voyage from Dhu to Malacca. When you leave Dhu steer on the pole of Canopus, i.e. to the south for 2 alms (= 6 hours sailing); then to sunrise (al-farha = to the east), keeping 8 alms (= 24 hours sailing) from the west coast of India. Keep your course towards Canopus (= south) until you reach 9 (sic) alms from the farhadain (= 27° 37' N. lat.). Then steer for the rising of the Scorpion (S.E.,) until you reach a point a little less than 74° 15' from the farhadain (= 35° 19' N.). Then steer to the fundamental rising (nutila at-alfi = due east) for 12 alms (= 36 hours), then to the rising of al-qishkhat (= E.N.E.) until you arrive at 8 4 alms (= 24 hours) from the island of Singal (lit. the archipelago of the Nicobars). When you arrive land, have the island on the left (i.e. on the north) and when you have passed it, steer for the rising of al-tir (= E.S.E.) for 4 alms (= 12 hours); then steer for the rising of al-shubaa (= S.E.,) until you reach 7 am (= 21 hours) from the island of Polo Singal. When you arrive steer a course due eastward until you are in sight of the island of Polo Pintang. If the tide is not running north and if you see the flood tide, steer from there to the rising of al-tir (= E.S.E.) and you will reach Pintang which is an elongated island of which the two coasts are identical; it is black and is seen from afar. When you are near it steer for the rising of Canopus (= S.E.) up to the island (read: islands) [called] Polo Sembilan which in Malay means the *nine islands*. You will [then] distinguish on the coast two mountains which resemble the island of Pintang and which might be taken for two islands. They lie between the island of Pintang and the islands of Dingding and the two mountains are called Fanz-krem. After those two mountains you reach Dingding. They are the great elongated islands of the same size. After those the island of Tumbakar which is a little round island.

*Know that the island of Pintang and [those] of Dingding lie near the mainland and there is a reef there. After Dingding you come to the islands of Sembilan which are islands with high mountains; some of these islands are small. When you arrive there, when you have taken water in the vessel and resumed the voyage, steer for the pole of Canopus (= south) for 5 alms (= 15 hours) and you will arrive at the island [called] Polo Djumar. Between the islands of Sembilan and Djumar the sounding indicates 35 fathoms until you come to the island of Djumar where there are great depths. The depth is near to 40 or 50 fathoms. When you are near Djumar you see the part of the land on the coast of the river which you do not see the [adjacent] coast of Sumatra. In other weather you see the outline of the coast of Sumatra (= west coast of the Malay Peninsula) and the mountains [from which] tin is obtained. When you approach Djumar, coasting along the island steer for the rising of al-shubaa (= E.N.E.) for 7 alms (= 21 hours); then towards the rising of al-tir (= E.S.E.), know that at the rising of the Scorpion (= S.E.) from the island of Djumar lies a reef on which the waves break. Keep your course E.S.E. the depth diminishes to 18 fathoms roughly. Continue to steer E.S.E. When you are far from the island of Djumar and it appears to you level with the surface of the sea, you have before you [lit. in front of the ship] the mountains of the island of Malacca (= Galeh): E.S.E. The sounding then gives 16 to 17 fathoms. When the sounding is less than 15 fathoms turn to the right (i.e. to the west). If it becomes more than 18 fathoms turn to the left (i.e. to the east). Such is the route that you must follow. Take care of the tide if you have the flood against you with a greash wind (.= whirlwind); otherwise the flood tide will carry you on the reef. When you are near the island of Pasiar and land appears to the south turn towards the reef for 9, 7, 6 fathoms of depth. The sounding sometimes gives about 9 fathoms. The point for which you are making is in this place. There is the bank of Kafaq (= Capitollari of the Commercial House of Albian-Querque, Vol. III., Ch. xvi. and xlii.; Barrow, D. II., Book VI., Ch. ii.) and [there are] rocks. When you are on this route continue in the same direction keeping the zambak (here *small boat*) in front of you [to show the way], from the time you leave Djumar; and keep on taking soundings. I mean that when you reach the place where the reef lies — where the sounding gives about 7 to 8 fathoms — and when you follow the route already indicated, then after having doubled the reef, sounding increases to 15, 20, 25 fathoms. Know that [all] danger has now disappeared and that you are near the land. Then follow the route along the coast and steer towards the rising of the Scorpion (= S.E.) in 33 fathoms. Sometimes the sounding gives 30 fathoms, sometimes 35, 40. It diminishes or increases at each sounding from 5 to 6 fathoms. I think that the bottom varies in level on this route. When the tide turns against you with a greash wind, slacken sail. [When you resume the voyage] follow the route [already indicated] until you reach Malacca; opposite this point lie the islands of Polo Sint and the island of Polo Ani; [the name is written without dialectical points — it is perhaps the Polo Amol of our maps 84 miles from Malacca]. The zambakk will come to meet you. Make your arrangements for entering.

Chapter III. of the same Kith al-Minahidi (iii.) contains the description of the principal islands of the Indian Ocean. The island of Sumatra for example is thus described (fol. 78a, l. 10 to 79b, l. 6): *Section to make known the island of Sumatra. Sumatra begins in the north where the farbadain are a little less than 8° 15' in altitude (= a little less than 6° north). The island of Gãnsu is west of this cape. Near this cape lies the north cape of Sumatra, the island of Msã-fula. These are and small islands. As to the southern latitude of the island of Sumatra there are several opinions which I have given in [the work entitled] al-Dimma (iii., l. 27b, l. 6—399). The most popular belief is that the island ends at the place where the farbadain are 30° 15' in altitude (= 1° 17' south, which is inaccurate, the south part is about 6° south). This is the route to follow on the west coast, from Gãnsu-fula to Makãfil; towards the rising of Canopus (= S.E.,) from Makãfil to Panãr (or Baros) towards the rising of al-ahmiyati (= S. E., 45 S.; from Paniar to the...
south end of the island, towards the rising of the Scorpion (≈ S. E.). This is the route to be followed on the east coast: from våmufala to Måfala, due east; from Måfala to the port of Sumatra (also called port of Pask; cf. Carlos de Alfonso de Albuquerque, Vol. i, p. 45); the rising of al-
ghamal (≈ E. 1 S. E.); from the port of Sumatra to Pulo Barufala, towards the rising of al-ibkil (≈ E. 1 3/4 S. E.) — the farbakdön are there 7 ibps in latitude (≈ 4° 24' N.) — from Pulo Barufala to the island of Djamur also towards the rising of al-ibkil (≈ S. E. 1 3/4 E.). This route is called the route across: the route along the east coast to this island is as follows: from the port of Sumatra to 4' Artif (sic) where the farbakdön are 0' 6' in latitude (≈ 3° 34' N.) towards the rising of the Scorpion (≈ S. E.); from Artif to the neighbourhood of Rikam to the rising of alghamal (≈ E. 1 3/4 S. E.) — the farbakdön here are 2 3/4 ibps in latitude (≈ 3° 0' N.). From Rikam the land runs in the direction of the [south] pole, from there to the end of the island. This is said, but other statements are also made.

The known harbours of the west coast of the island are: The harbour of Pançar (or Baros); this is the port for camphor (al-bajw) (sic), gold and other products; the harbour of Friman, famous among men, which lies in the land of Munkasws (≈ Munkanglaw); 2' is the port for gold-dust and aloes; the harbour of Indrapus which is now no longer known (i.e. at the beginning of the xvii century) but which was at one time famous.

The harbours of the east coast are: the harbour of Feidr under Munuf Lammrit; it is the port for pepper; the port of Sumatra (≈ Pask); it is the most famous of the harbours of the island. It is a large town. It is the port for pepper, silk and gold; it is a busy harbour; the harbour of 4' Artif, it is a little port; the harbour of Rikam, also small. The port of Palamhang is also small. Among these small harbours are those for benzoin, and other products of these regions. As to the latitudes of these ports, I have given them in the chapter on latitudes and there is no need to return to the subject here.

Nota bene! (this is written in red ink to call special attention to the passage, just as it is printed in heavy type for the same reason in our modern Sailing Instructions). Know that on the coast of Sumatra which faces the high seas, the west coast, there is a series of islands. [This is] the route along them: from våmufala to the islands of Indrapus which are the first and beginning at the north [the route is] towards the setting of Canopus (≈ S. S. E.); these islands are opposite Minkafing; the distance between these two points is 8 ibps (≈ 24 hours). Then to the south a large island with large (read: numerous) creeks and harbours called Minkafing are the farbakdön are 6' 6' in latitude (≈ 4° N.) in altitude. This is the land to which belong the cannibal Batak. We seek pardon and safety from Allah! — Between this island and the west coast of Sumatra is also 8 ibps (≈ 24 hours). If from this island you sail towards the rising of al-qamal (≈ E. 1 3/4 S. E.) you arrive at a group of islands which include: Pulo Bani (read: Banyak), Pulo Lumbul, Pulo Lhid, the island of Talifghi and the desert islands close to the coast. On the coast is found the harbour of Shikat (sic) where the farbakdön are 6' 6' in latitude (≈ 3° 34' N.) in altitude. This is a place with reefs of rock. After these islands sailing towards the south lies an island opposite Pançar (or Baros) — between these two points there are about 8 ibps (≈ 24 hours); sailing this island is called Mankafirg (sic). Know that the route from Mankafirg (sic) to Pançar is towards the rising of al-fird (≈ E. S. E.); but take good care of the unhealthy parts of these regions.

*Among the known islands [of the region of Sumatra are the following]: the island of Nias which lies to the south of the [lit. below] the harbour of Pançar (or Baros); the island of Paksaw which is to the south of the [of] island of Pançar (same name as the preceding harbour on the east coast). In this island there are streams of water which never dries up. But how many other islands and reefs exist besides those we have mentioned?"*

We see from certain latitudes that the coast of Sumatra and especially the south side of the island was not well known by Arab sailors. Sulaiman refers to the direction which he has given in al-2' Umida (iii.) on the subject of the south point. It is evident that he did not himself visit this region and that he is content to reproduce information from other sources contrary and inaccurate. *The island of Sumatra, he says (fol. 37b, l. 7 sqq.), ends in the south at Taks-surw (tuk-surw?). Opinions differ regarding the latitude of this place; some say that it is 4' 6' from the farbakdön (≈ 3° 50' S.) — this is the opinion of the majority of the people of Western India — others say a little less than 4' 6' — this is the view of the Arabs and Colas — and others again who have verified this latitude say 3' 1/2 1/bps (≈ 1° 16' S.). Some say that the south end of Sumatra is 3' 1/bps (≈ 2° 4' 30' S.).*

On several occasions the author mentions the opinion of the Colas about the latitudes of certain harbours. He had in mind the Sailing Instructions of Coromandel, more or less identical with his own. None of the Indians or Hindus whom I have consulted in this respect knew of any such document in existence or having existed. It would be extremely useful if a search could be made in India to try to find these documents the existence of which is proved for the xvii century (cf. particularly 64p, l. 13 sqq.).

In fol. 58a, l. 1, the author says that the circle of 360° is divided into 244 1/bps, which gives 1' 37' for the 1/bps, 3' 1/4' for a 1/bps and so on. In the last treatise (fol. 162a, l. 1), we are told on the contrary that the circle is divided into 210 1/bps or 1' 42' for the 1/bps. Sulaiman also says that the first division into 224 1/bps is that of the ancients but that in his time, i.e. at the beginning of the xvii century, this division was reduced to 210 1/bps. The first division is thus justified by Shihab al-Din b. Madij: "there are", says this musallam, 47 1/bps from one rumb to the other and 8 1/bps from one lunar mansion to the other", which gives the figure 224 for the circumference: 7 × 32 rumb = 8 × 28 lunar mansions = 224 1/bps = 360°. This conversion is thus perfectly coherent but we do not see on what basis the division of the circle was latterly reduced to 210 1/bps. All the latitudes in 1/bps mentioned in the present article have been converted into degrees at the rate of 1° 57' = 1 1/bps.

Bibliography: Hammer, Extracts from the Mokht, that is the Ocean, a Turkish work on Navigation in the Indian Sea, in J. A. S. B., 1834, p. 545—553; 1836, p. 441—468; 1837,
SULAIMÂN — SULAIMÂN ČELEBI

SULAIMÂN ČELEBI (Emir), son of YI-DIRimin BAYAZÎD I, was ruler of Sarukhan and Karaf; after the defeat at Angora he came to Adrianople. He was ruler of Turkey in Europe and in 1403 concluded treaties with the Emperor of Byzantium and with Venice. From 1406 he was engaged in Anatolia fighting his brother Mêlêm-Čelebi and in Turkey in Europe fighting his brother Miṣâl Čelebi. Abandoned by his followers he was killed on Feb. 17, 1411 in the village of Dogançilar. His brother Miṣâl had brought him to Bursa, where he was honourably buried beside his father. Although he ruled for seven years in the European part of the empire, he is not reckoned among the Ottoman Sultans.


(SYDOR KOSS)

SULAIMÂN ČELEBI also called SULAIMÂN DÎRÎM is the earliest Ottoman poet of whom an original poem written in Turkish has survived and who is still known and popular at the present day. Turkish poems of earlier date are either translations like the Şoheîl u-Newhâhirî of Mevlâna Ahmed b. Ahmed (viii-th century a. d.) published by Morfiman in 1925, or they seem to have been completely lost, like those of Mevlâna Nizârî and those of the grandfather of our poet Shahîq Mahâmd Efendi, who wrote a lutçüyan (congregatory poem) for the Shekhzade Sulaimân Paşa b. Orkhan on the conquest of Rumelia.

Little is known of the life of Sulaimân Čelebi. He flourished in the time of Sultan Bayazit Yildîrîm (d. 805 = 1403); he was born in Brusa, as son of Ahmed Paşa, Murât's vizier and was Khélîa to the celebrated Khašwî Shahîr Amir Sulmn (d. 833 = 1429). Later he was instau to the imperial Ælînî under Bayazîd and after his death became İmâm at the great Bayazîd mosque in Brusa. He died in the year 825 (chronogram rûhây-i Ermîlî) and was buried outside the town on the road to Çeşme.

His only known work is the Mevîbî-iti Nehî or Mevîbî-Esiçehbî, called Wâsilî al-Nâfi. It is the oldest Ottoman example of this kind of panegyric in Muhammed, and in the course of the next five centuries had almost countless (over a hundred are mentioned) imitations according to the unanimous opinion of the Turks all fall a long way behind this, the oldest, Mevîbî. It is therefore almost exclusively recited at all wâsîîîl festivals on 12th Rabi' 1 (cf. MAWLI). The sources tell a story about the origin of this poem which, while not without legendary features, is interesting for the difference between Arabs and Turks in those days. A khâtib in Brusa expounded Sûra III. 385, to mean that God did not prefer one prophet to another, not for example Muhammed to Jesus. This was fiercely refuted, namely by an Arab from Syria who did not rest till he got a fênaî against it from hâne and finally killed the Brusa khâtib. This conflict is said to have been the cause of first a verse, then of a whole poem, the leading idea of which is the unique position of Muhammed.

The poem written in muallûm verse, contains about 600 couplets and is divided into 18 sections. It describes not only the birth of the Prophet but in a prologue, after the usual esorodion, develops the theory of light of the migration of the divine light from Adam through the whole series of prophets to Muhammed. The main part deals with the marvels which foretold the birth of Muhammed, the joy of the angels, the birth itself, Muhammed's parents, etc., the popular miracles wrought by him, such as the clearing of the moon, the fact that his body threw no shadow, that roses grew where his breath fell. The ascent to heaven (sîrâyî) is then fully dealt with and finally his last illness and death.

The style is very simple and for this reason attractive and very effective; the language is pure Ottoman in the Brusa dialect. There exist numerous manuscripts, in European libraries also, but unfortunately there seems to be none very old, which might form a sound basis for linguistic study. There are also translations of the poem, which are listed by Tâhir (see below) in a Munich, a Greek, two different Albanian and one Circassian.


(WALTHER BJÖRKHOLM)
SULAI\MN PASHA (1316-1359), the eldest son of the second Ottoman Sultan, Orkhan (1282-1359), and of Nilfler (Dénilfer), daughter of the Greek lord of Yur Hisar. His younger brother was Murad Khan afterwards Sultan. Only Greek sources record a third brother Kishur and his romantic abduction by a Greek denier (cf. J. J. Hadji Efendi, "Nikânîlê Kislâmîn Sagnîkîski, Revue Historique," L. N. 7, p. 339; L. N. 7, p. 318; Constantinople 1328-1339). The title Pasha which he bore, according to ancient custom, marks him as the elder brother, as the case also with 'Ali al-Din Pasha (in old chronicles often called simply 'Ali Pasha) who has the title Pasha in contrast to his younger brother Orghân (Nâmîlê Kenâl, "Orghânî Türkîî, Constantinople 1326, L. 370; Ahmed Dâwâd, Tâbilîşî 'Ashkiîlî 'Orâmîî, Constantinople 1399, p. 5).

According to the usual tradition Sulaimân Pasha was the second grand vizier of the rising Ottoman kingdom, succeeding on the death of the first grand vizier his uncle, the above mentioned 'Ali al-Din Pasha, who had resigned his claim to the title Sultan, and as a result was exiled by the latter to the island of Lesbos. He obtained his title of vizier from his father's Orders on account of his unrivalled temperance and inclination for the contemplative life of a dervish, and of his express refusal of the vizierate which was then offered to him. The reforms recorded by the chroniclers as suggested by him in the army, dress and coinage, may readily be attributed to proposals of the older brother.

In any case the alleged grand vizierate of Sulaimân Pasha is not at all in keeping with the later conception of this office. From the very first his father gave him a share in the development and expansion of the kingdom in keeping with his military inclinations and abilities, especially as a leader in the field in military operations, as they became necessary — there was yet no past the latter traditional objection to the Sultan's sons filling important offices — from the taking of Irnik and Imli (Nicaea) in 1332 to the inclusion of the European coast of the Dardanelles in the Ottoman sphere of influence. Sulaimân is said to have been the first to hold the title 'Askar. He led the Ottoman forces independently, especially as Orghân latter never took the field at all.

As to be derived from the absence of any reference to military operations, after the voluntary alliance of Orghân by treaties and matrimonial links with the Greek ruling house, there seems to have been a pause for about 10 or 15 years in the policy of conquest, which was used for consolidation in internal affairs until Sulaimân Pasha put an end to this stagnation and by a bold coup resumed the expansion of Ottoman power, skilfully taking advantage of the discord in the Greek empire in which three claimants were fighting for the throne, and giving as an excuse the combination of the Byzantines with the Genoese and Venetians.

At his father's suggestion in 1358 (1359), Sulaimân with only 50 followers (including Ewremios Bag, Hajiçhlije Iliche, Adje Bag, Caire Fâzîl Bag), crossed for want of boats, on rafts from the peninsula of Cyzicus (Kapu dağlı) to the European shore of the Dardanelles and took by surprise the fortress of Cemrhi (Taymûr), the modern Wiranje Hâşî. After some fierce Turkish raids in the Balkans, this was the first campaign with permanent results. Sulaimân at once sent for troops and Muslim settlers from Asia Minor and occupied his success by taking further strongholds, notably that of Gallipoli, the key to the Dardanelles, and the whole of Rumelia, which was surrendered to him after a battle with the Greeks, Magnaura, Ipala, (Kypaçe), Bulair, Tezkir daglı (Redostî), etc. The Byzantine story of an earthquake destroying the walls and rendering the fortresses defenceless is obviously an attempt to conceal the disastrous results of Greek policy.

Sulaimân took up his residence in Bulair where he built a mosque and a palace (he had also erected mosques in Brussels and Inalîk). But before he could set in motion his further extensive plans for the conquest of Rumelia, he was suddenly carried off by death in 1359 (1360); while he was out hunting near Bulair his horse fell and he was mortally injured (Nezirolu, "Nezîrolu"
, and Kâdir Celebi, Tâbilîşî al-Tawarihî, Constantinople 1516, p. 94 gives the year 760, while the anonymous chronicler ed. by Giese and Leunclavius 759 and Osmanîî Tâbil Ahmed, Hüdâkat al-Wazarîî, Constantinople 1271, p. 5 gives the year 761).

In keeping with a wish he is said to have expressed in his lifetime, Sulaimân was buried in Bulair, being the first Ottoman prince to be interred on European soil. This was a symbol of the firm resolve never again to abandon the new won ground. The existence of his tomb made impossible the idea of going back to Asia Minor which arose in the minds of several of his comrades-in-arms immediately after his death. They successfully drove off the attacks of the combined Christian forces.

Sulaimân's tomb has penetrated to the very soul of the Turkish people; it was and still is one of the holiest places of national pilgrimage that found particular expression, when the national hero of the Turkish liberation movement, Nâmîlê Kenâl [q.v.], was interred here.

The tomb of a daughter of Sulaimân is in Ağshirî (Ahmad Tewfîk in the Revue Historique, Constantinople 1907, N. 44, p. 106).

SULAIMAN PASHA, known as Kâzım, the ‘cunning’, a Turkish general and statesman of the time of Sulaiman the Great. He began his career in the Imperial Harem, which he left with the rank of muhid to take over the government of Syria. As Mir-i-Hasan, he was then summoned to the important office of governor of Egypt, which he held for ten years (931-941 = 1524-1534) with vigour and comprehension. He was the first to send to the Porte the yearly revenue from Egypt, the so-called Egyptian tribute, later so important for Turkey.

In reply to the appeal of the Sultan of Gurgur, he was ordered by Sulaimán to equip a considerable fleet at Suez and to strengthen Turkish power in the Red Sea and to drive the Portuguese out of India. This was the period when Khair al-Din Barabarea [q. v.] was extending Turkish power in the Mediterranean. Sulaimán Pasha succeeded in adding ‘Aden and the whole of Yemen to the Ottoman Empire. He appointed Mustafa Beg, son of Bıyıklı Mehmed Pasha, first governor of Yemen. But his efforts in India proved fruitless as he was not properly supported by the Indian rulers.

Returning to Constantinople, he became a member of the Council of Viziers which consisted of four viziers and governed the country (Luft Pasha, Sulaimán Pasha, Mehmed Pasha and Rustam Pasha). After the fall of Luft Pasha he became grand vizier. He filled this office in an important period (Hungarian campaign), for four years (948-951 = 1541-1544) until he came into conflict with the vizier Khozov Pasha over a faultless page. The mutual reproaches about various derivations of duty ended in both being deposed and an investigation ordered. Sulaimán Pasha was banished to Malatya where he died in 955 (1548).

He was able, vigorous and just, which contradicts the low opinion usually held of a eunuch.


SULAIMAN PASHA, MALATIÁLí ERKEMÎ, a Turkish general and statesman under Mehmed IV (1648—1683). A native of Malatía, of Armenian origin, he rose from page to admirir al-Malatiá became governor of Erzurum and Siwâl with the rank of muhid. He married Ḑâvûlî Şâhâl Sulaimân. In 1665 (1638) he was appointed grand vizier in succession to Murad Pasha but he only held office for ten months on account of the confusion in the empire as a result of the mutinies in the army and the complete financial ruin. He was several times banished and again recalled to high office. In 1668 (1667) he died in Scutari at the age of 80 and was buried there.


SULAIMÂNIYA (SULÂMÜN), a town and district in southern Kurdistan. A distinction must be made between the ‘Ammâr of Sulaimâniya proper (the canton of Sar-ṣînâr) and the territory formerly ruled first by hereditary pahlâbs and later by the Ottoman mutasâbin of Sulaimâniya.

The historical region of Sulaimâniya lies between the Persian frontier, the Dîyâla [q. v.], the lands that go with Kîrîkîk [q. v.] and the little Zah and occupies the group of mountains from which flow rivers to the east (Strîwân; cf. SLÂMîn), the south (‘Aḏâm, q. v.) and the north and northwest (left bank tributaries of the Little Zah; cf. SLÂMÜN-SULÂK).

Orography. The mountains chains which separate these three basins of the left bank tributaries of the Tigâr, rise gradually from the Mesopotamian plain and have the general direction N.W. to S.E. like all the ranges of western Iran. Different summits in the southern basin are called Nâsîn, ‘Aṣārîn, Segirîn, Kervan-ṣâr and Pîr-Kâlîn. To the S.W. of this line on the upper waters of the ‘Aḏâm lie the districts of ‘Abūnî (this is also the name of the district in Persia which includes Bâlūšîn, Ribâṭ, etc. The second range of mountains includes peaks like Torkman, Tâshlûţ, Darâmûnlî [Gilhâr] etc. Between the first and second chains lie to the west the upper waters of the Ta‘būr-ζâl and to the east the plateau of Naw-kopt, the canton of Kervan-ṣâr, etc. which are watered by the Awwi-dîwân, which flows into the Dîyâla (Strîwân). The third chain includes Amûr, Gwânî etc. It forks towards the west (along the little Zâb); on the southern arm of the latter is the summit Pir-Omâr-Gûdûn (two feet) which is visible from a long way off and seems to form the centre of all this mountainous region. The area between the second and third barrier is drained towards the west by the Tîhûn (Sula-ârîl), which runs into the little Zâb and to the east by the Tândjâr-ζâl (Tahj-Rûl) which flows into the Strûwân. On the upper waters of the Tîhûn which rises behind Pir-Omâr-Gûdûn lies the canton of Sûrûdâsh; the Tandjâr-ζâl waters the canton of Sar-ṣînâr in which lies the town of Sulaimâniya. The chain of Amûr sends out spurs to the east, the Kuri-Ṣârîân, Kûl-Ṣârîân etc. which join the Awwi-ζâr chain (cf. SÂNE). To the south of this spur lies Shûhrâz [q. v.] in the strict sense of the word. To the north of Amûr lie the cantons of ‘Ardîkî and Shûhrâz [Kervan-ζâl (Kervan-sulân)]. The river of the latter (Gâwâszîr) rises in the depths of Awwi-ζâr (in the valley of Purān) and receives on its left bank the waters of Sérêjîk and on the right the waters of ‘Arûdzîjî. This latter river rises north of the mountain (Sar-Sîr) which rises from the right bank of the Kervan-ζâl. Its administrative centre is Péndjavî from which one can reach Persian territory. Before reaching the Kervan-ζâl, the river of Kervan-ζâl receives on the right bank the river Tâznâ, which drains the cantons of Sâbe(528,793),(647,890) [Tarâmî] which lies inside the curve here made by the Persian frontier, and the waters of the canton of Stîwel, the administrative centre
of which is Shiwa-kul. Contrary to the indications of the maps, the combined waters of the Karasu-kul and the Khanilja flow into the little Zab in the canton of Mawat (a short distance below Teyet; cf. Čirikov, p. 556; Khurshid Esfand, p. 308; cf. )), the part of the territory of Sulaimaniya lying between the left bank of the Karasu-kul and the chain of Aasir (the district of Saragu, Marga) is not yet well known. The little Zab forms the natural frontier between Sulaimaniya and Kol-sandjak but the canton of Pashar (Kaf-i-Djar) lying on the right bank of the little Zab (between Kauliya and the Kandil range) regularly formed part of Sulaimaniya. The Baha'i Persias also often seized the adjoining canton (Khurshid Esfand, p. 246) the canton of Abdi-djar, Asir, etc. went with Kol-sandjak) and sent governors to Kol-sandjak etc. (Rich, l. 157, 315, 384).

History. The district of Sulaimaniya is known from the earliest times. Mount Nisir (in Lulla; Khilab), where according to the Babylonic epic the ship of Gilgamesh rested during the Deluge, can only be Pār-Omar-Gurdi. The region of Sulaimaniya corresponds to the land of Shuma occupied by the Lulli people, the southern frontier of which was on the side of Babila (the modern Karkheh). In 880 a. c. Assur-gašip, king of all the kings of Assyria, a stele found at Darband-i Gauw, north of Kawa-djar, seems to belong to a Lulla king. Between, mentions another ancient bilingual at the entrance to the desert of Deribah through which the little Zab forces a passage, to the extreme northwest of the territory of Sulaimaniya. Herfeld (fifth, x. 127) mentions ruins at Sitak in the canton of Surči. In 745 B.C. Tišulti Pileser III transplanted to Maxama (Māš-Zamāra) Forrer, p. 43) Ammonians who had lived in northern Mesopotamia. In the Sasanian period we have in the extreme S.W. of the territory of Sulaimaniya the famous monument of Pal-kši (cf. iin). In the history of the Syrian church the district of Sulaimaniya formed part of the diocese of Babi Garmah (Hoffmann, 224, p. 253).

In the Muslim period the history of the region was at first involved with that of Shahristan. Sulaimaniya had a more or less autonomous existence from the end of the 6th (sixth) century to 1287 (1850). The local dynasty was called Babi. According to the Šāshau-nāma (i. 280-288) the first chief and the eponym of this family was Pār Babel. Babel (probably about 1500). The house of this tribe seems to have been to the west of Kandil (cf. ). The direct descendants of Babel were soon supplanted by their subordinates but the second line disappeared also and about 1505 (1900) a new tribe had no recognised chief. A new line (of the clan Saği) of the tribe of Babet; Rich, l. 272) came from the village of Derishmarsha to the canton of Pashar; it had a continuous genealogy claiming descent from a young "Frank" woman called Kaghşan, whom her ancestor had taken prisoner in a battle. The two founders of this third dynasty, Baba Sulaiman, came to the front 1588 (1677) and in 1611 (1690) took service at the Ottoman court. Rich (i. 381-386) gives a list of his descendants, who include 17 Babi Pashas. The representatives of this local dynasty seem to have maintained their position between the two rival powers, Turkey and Persia, but they were really under the Pashas of Baghdad, who themselves held a very subordinate position with respect to the Sublime Porte. Mahâmad Pâsha who received Rich on his memorable journey through Kurdistan and in whom Rich (i. 343) tried to place the Kur national pride finally submitted to the Persians. The latter invaded Sulaimaniya in 1842 to re-establish Mahâmad Pâsha but by the treaty of 1847 Persia withdrew all claim on the town and sandjak of Sulaimaniya in favour of the Turks (cf. Čirikov, p. 631). The last ruler of the family of Bab, Abd Allâh Pâsha, was deposed by the Turks in 1867 (1850) (Khurshid Esfand, p. 209).

It may be mentioned that the Babi family was simply a conquering and warrior caste. Alongside of the Babi and under their suzerainty lived several other warrior tribes (agārat) of which lists are given by Rich, l. 280 and Khurshid Esfand, p. 217. The principal of these tribes was 1545 (cf. 224, 280). Later on we may mention the turbulent tribe of Ham wand of Hasandil which claimed to have come from Persian Kurdistan (its name resembles those of the Lur tribes). The Ham wand in the course of their razzias used to come down as far as the banks of the Tigre (Cholet, Arabian, Kurdî, and Mesopotamian, Paris 1852, p. 205-211). Beside the clans which had kept their tribal organisation there were in Sulaimaniya as elsewhere in Kurdistan, the peasants (sûr, behruz-e "white caps"). according to Rich, l. 380).

At first the capital of the Babi was at Shahr Bâbâ (Shahr-i Bâbâ) in the first valley conquered by Pār Babel. But Ishâq Pâsha moved his residence to the canton of Sar-e-Čins, where he founded about 1899 (1784). (Rich, l. 387) the town of Sulaimaniya on the site of the village of Malik-Hindi (Malik-Kendi) built around an ancient mound which had to be cleared away on the occasion. The town was called after Bayîk Sulaiman Pâsha (the family of Georgian Marlik), governor of Baghdad in 1780-1802 (Humm, Histoire de Bagdad, Paris 1901, p. 159). Towards 1820 the town had 2,000 households of Meshkis, 150 of Jews, 9 of Chaldean Catholics (who had a little church) and 5 of Armenians in all 10,000 souls. There were 5 mosques in Sulaimaniya. In 1868 Lycklama estimated the population at 6,000 Kurds, 30 families of Chaldeans and 15 of Jews.

Under Ottoman rule Sulaimaniya remained the nursery of an indefinite Kurdish movement. The local Kurds supplied Turkey with a large number of officials and particularly army officers. Several Babas became distinguished in Constantinople, like Isma'îl Haşî Pâsha, ambassador minister and diplomat in 1905-1914. After the deposition of the Bab, a great part in politics was played by the family of religious Vedak of the family of Barandja, whose ancestor Hadji Ali Kaka Ahmad enjoyed a great reputation for sanctity and is buried at Sulaimaniya.

Although the conquerors in 1819 had only talked of independence for Arabs and Armenians at first, the idea of Kurd emancipation made wide progress between 1917 and 1920. Sulaimaniya was eventually to be included in "Southern Kurdistan" the autonomy of which was provided for in Articles 62-64 of the treaty of Sevres (Aug. 10, 1920). However, as a result of long negotiations with the "Council of Mâjilis, this latter territory including the sandjak of Sulaimaniya was
SULAIIMÂNĪYA — SULDÜZ

definitely included in the new state of Iraq. By the same decision of the Council of the League of Nations of Dec. 26, 1925 a certain local autonomy was granted to the Kurds (administrative officers of Kurdish origin, official use of the Kurdish language and Kurdish schools). The official negotiations were accompanied by considerable local complications. Not only did Sulaimanāsī in Jan. 1921 refrain from taking part in the plebiscite for the election of King Faisal but numerous disturbances broke out in the district. The principal instigator of the insurrectionsary movement was Muslim in character and obviously aiming at the creation of a Kurdish state. He was Sheikh Mahmūd. He rebelled on May 21, 1919 and was supported by the chief of his band (cf. n. 218). By June 13, Sulaimanāsī was reoccupied by British troops and Sheikh Mahmūd departed for India. However when under the threat of rising in Cambīzān and Kānīsā, Sulaimanāsī had to be abandoned on Sept. 2, 1922, Sheikh Mahmūd was permitted to return. In October he proclaimed himself "Hakimāsī" of all the Kurds of the Iraq. His suspicious attitude caused Sulaimanāsī to be bombarded from the air on March 3, 1923 and Sheikh Mahmūd then retired to Suldūz. Re-occupied on May 26, 1923, Sulaimanāsī was again evacuated and on July 11, Sheikh Mahmūd returned for the third time and was recognised by the authorities at Baghdad. An attempt on his part to occupy a detached position of Sulaimanāsī provoked new air raids (Aug. 16, Oct. 25, 1923 and March 25, 1924). Sheikh Mahmūd was then destroyed and he himself driven back on the Persian frontier. As a result of these events the rural population of Sulaimanāsī in July 1924 had been reduced to 700 persons but by November it had risen again to 20,000. The towns of Sulaimanāsī consisting of 6 kūlas viz.: Sulaimanāsī, Cambīzān, Ĥalābūdja, Kāfī-Dīkā (Pūkhū), Karā-dagh and Shūrakak — which are again divided into 17 mālās — had in 1924 a total population of 189,900 Kurds, 1,550 Jews and 75 Arabs.


V. MINORSEY

SULDÜZ (Sulduz). n. A tribe in Mongolia. According to Bérend, the Mongol form of the name would be Sudos (plural of suudo, "good fortune"). L. Ligeri (Die Herbume des Persia nom.) Kergis, Kūrd-Soum Archiv, Budapest 1925, l. sees in the ending of Suldūz, as in that of Kērkū the remains of an ancient Turanian plural suffix (cf. hēs, *we*, sin, "you"); etc.) and as a hypothetical singular quotes the name of a Kūrfišt clan: Sull, Sult, Kargišt etc. claims the Suldūz among the dūrūk Mongols, i.e. of "common" origin, in contrast to the "pure" (adīna), who however were descended from the dūrūk through Alān-Geō, the miraculous grandmother of Čingis-Ḵān.

Sīrghān-Shirā Sulduz is one day saved the life of Čingis-Ḵān while the latter was fighting with the Tūdār. This exploit gained the Sulduz great prestige with Čingis-Ḵān and his successors.

Sīrghān-Shirā

Dījīaghān

Sodū-Noyon (Sodūn)

Tūdār

Malik

Čobān

The children of Sodū came to Persia with Hūlaqū-Ḵān whose wife Yūsūnīn (mother of Abāghū) was a Sulduz. Malik is said to have conquered the Persian Kūrdistan. In 688 (1289), under the Hūlaqū Arghūlu, an act of bravery brought to the front Čobān, son of Malik (cf. l., p. 104?) and he afterwards distinguished himself in the reigns of Čhārān and Uldūš. The history of the latter written by Kāshānī (Bibl. Nat., Suppl. Pers. 1419, fol. 6) in a list of the Amir mentions Čobān (Amir-i bāzargān-i Thāqīh wa-Ṭūrūk) in the second place next to Khālah-qāh Ṭāqī but adds that in ability he is superior to all. There is a letter from Pope John XIX, dated Avignon, November, 12, 1321 addressed to "Zogān Begsūn" (Čobān). In spite of the Šia šeleviyya of Uldūš, Čobān remained Sunni. When the young Abī Saʿd (716 = 1316) (cf. l., p. 105?) ascended the throne Čobān became regent and in 719 (1319) married Sarībēg, daughter of Uldūš-Ḵān. The increasing influence of the family of Čobān and the evil conduct of some of its members aroused the monarch against
them. A series of persecutions began. Čobán took refuge in Herát and was killed there in 728 (1327) by Ghiyath al-Din Kari.

A dynasty with a short but stirring life descended from Čobán (the Čobáni) arose in the period of troubles that marked the end of the line of Čagatî in Persia. Among the 18 children of Čobán the following are the best known: (1) Āmīr Ḥassân; (2) Dimishk-Khwāja, executed by Ābū Sa‘īd in 727 (1327); (3) Tūmūr-Tash, from 718 governor in Asia Minor, rebelled in 722, struck a coin in his own name and even claimed to be the Mahdí; his father brought him back to obedience but after the death of Čobán, Tūmūr-Tash, went to Egypt where the Mamluk Nâṣr, fearing his popularity and to please Ābū Sa‘īd had him executed in 728; (4) the beautiful Baghdaḍ-Khâṭûn, wife first of Ḥasan Barûr Djâlîr [q. v.] and next of Ābû Sa‘īd; suspected of having poisoned the latter she was executed after the accession of the Ikłâdîr Arap. Ābû Ḥasan Kâlek, son of Tūmūr-Tash, who ruled between 739 and 744 at Tabrîz, Ṣulṭâna, Ḥamadân, Kûr, Kābûn, Ṣulṭânit, Wâzârân, Farârân and Karâ, cf. II, p. 280, His brother Malik Ashraf succeeded him. His oppressions provoked the migration of the Khádî Muḥyî ‘l-Dîn from Kirda’s to Dâjân-Beg, Kháf of the Western Kipčâk. Dâjân-Beg without delay attacked Malik Ḥasan who was defeated, captured and executed in Tabrîz in 756.

The Sulûdûs (Ṣulûdû) after this are only occasionally mentioned by the historians. Under 697 (1040) Murghâbâd mentions the instructions given by Tūmūr to the Khâlajû of Sâwâ to reinforce the troops under Pâr ‘Āli Sulûdû in Rayâ. At the present day there is still a body of Sulûdûs in this region among the Shâh-šervân [q. v.] of Sâwâ.

Several women of the Čobáni have had remarkable careers. Besides Baghdaḍ-Khâṭûn we may mention: (1) Sâdî-beg widow of Čobán, who was first the wife of the Ikłâdîr Arap and in 739 was herself placed on the throne by the grandson of her first husband, Ḥasan Kâlek. Finally the latter married her to the new pretender Sulîhânum who reigned from 740 to 744. (2) Dilshad-Khâṭûn, daughter of Dimishk-Khwâja first of all married Ābû Sa‘īd (at the same time as her aunt Baghdaḍ-Khâṭûn) and then Hasan Barûr Djâlîr. (3) Malîk ‘Izzât, wife of Ḥasan Kâlek, whom she killed in an indescribable and atrociously cruel fashion. She was executed by her husband’s relatives. They cut her into pieces which they ate.

In Ṣulûdû through the cing of the encampments and even the Sulûdû seem to have been left off from the river Onon. But in the time of Rashîd al-Dîn the yort of the Sulûdû was near the forests inhabited by the forest-dwelling Ūrâlîk. The Chinese list of Ṣulûdû encampments published in 1867 (Mong-gi-yam-ti, Russ. transl. by F. Popov, St. Petersburg 1895) no longer mentions the Sulûdû. In Turkestan the Sulûdû with their subdivisions (Nukur and Tama’dur, are mentioned among the troops of Shâlûn [q. v.] at the beginning of the 18th century. Later the Sulûdû rejoined Bîhûr (Shâlûn-Nâmâ, ed. Melianaki, St. Petersburg 1908, p. 137, 176; cf. the Schrcchendie of N. Vambéry, Vienna 1885, p. 273, 356). According to information given me personally by Zekî Wahîd ‘Orbî genealogies (Zâdîgra) mention the Sulûdû among the 92 ‘Orbî clans; the people of the canton of Alfu-kul in Fergânâ [q. v.] are Sulûdû and there must be some in Khiwâ (Khiwarî) along side of the Nukur.


Other references to the article ḤARûn-BAZûRûG, i. 297 and E. G. Browne, A History of Persian Literature under Târât Dîn, 1920, p. 34, 170. Later eastern writers recall the Sulûdû origin of the Čobâni: Türk. transl. of Mamad-Jamîr-Bîshîl (Constantinople 1855), ii. 6: Askâriyû ‘Abû ‘I-Ghâzi (ed. Grammàns, St. Petersburg 1871), i. 166; Sulûdû. — According to Vladimirskî, Na’ân Namûn in Mongol: “le génie-protecteur habitant le drapayn”.

2. A district in Ḥâdîr-Bîshîl, to the south-west of Lake Urma, on the lower course of the Gâdir-Cay, which here receives on its right bank the Bâlûs and Mamad-gûh and flows into the Lake. To the west it is bordered by Ushân which lies on the upper course of the Gâdir from which it is separated by the Darbân gorge through which the river runs; to the north it is bounded by the little district of Dâîl (cf. Dâîl Bârêk in the Shârâf-nâmê, i. 283) belonging to Urma; to the south and the east by the cantons of Paswa and Shâhîr-ârin which go with Sâwâ-Bulâh [q. v.].

Sulûdû is a fertile plain producing much wheat. It is often flooded by the waters of the Gâdir, which near its mouth forms marshes and salt beds (yîf). On the south side Sulûdû is bordered by the heights of Fârîst at the foot of which are numerous springs impregnated with lime. The crest Bahramûl separating Sulûdû from Shâhîr-ârin is also of limestone formation.

We know that in 703 (1303) Ḥâsân distributed the land in fêns. It is possible that it was at this time that the name of the tribe (Sulûdû, in Kurdish: Sundûa) replaced the old name of the district now lost.

According to the Shârâf-nâmê in the time of the Turkman dynasties (about the xvth century), e. long after the Čobâni had disappeared, the Mûrî Kûrîs occupied the district the old inhabitants of which were probably reduced to servitude. The same authority (i. 280) in a sentence now mutilated in the MS., and undated, says that Pîr Bâdûk of the Kûrî tribe of Bâbân (babû) took Sulûdû from the Kirîshbî which may refer to one of these sudden outbursts of fighting on the frontier in the time of the Shâfawîs.

In 1828 ‘Abbûs-Mirāf gave Sulûdû as fês to 800 families of Kârâ-papâk [q. v.]. The newcomers were allowed to levy and collect the taxes (12,000 tomãns a year) and in return had to maintain 400 horsemen at the disposal of the government. At this period there were in Sulûdû 4-5,000 families of Kûrds and Mûkâddâm Turks by then gradually the lands passed into the hands of new Shaft masters.

The divisions of the Kârâ-papâk are as follows: Tarkawûn, ‘Arîb, ‘Abûpl, Dîn-Ahmadî, Câkkhîlî and Ublîlî. Each has retained its hereditary chief. The principal division is the Tarkawûn to which the Khuin belong. Mahdi-Khân, son of Nâkîkhân, had brought the Kârâ-papâk to Sulûdû. His grandson Nadjaf-Khân was the chief
of the tribe before 1914 but another Khan actually exercised the functions of government. The division of Tarkawin also included a family of Agha, inferior to that of the Khans but quite important; Aras-Agha was lord of a banded horsemanship.

There are at present 312 villages and small towns in Sulduz with 8,000 families. The chief is the Khan (Nahhas; Rawlinson writes: Nakhoda) with a thousand households. This little town lies on the bank of the Baskiya around an ancient artificial mound. Another important centre is Baskiya (Baskiya) where there is a great bridge over the Gaidir which provides communication between Urusi and Sawal-Buluk.

The village of Khaliflu is inhabited by Sunnis Kazaks who also came there in 1828 from the neighbourhood of Tiflis.

The south-east corner of the district is occupied by the canton of Mamad-Shaikh the name of which is mentioned in the Shahr-Nameh (i. 290). The present inhabitants are Shamsuddin Turk. With their chief Murtaza Bey they came into Persia at the same time as the Kazaks and received from the Abbasi Mira 3 villages with 100 families of Kurd peasants (ruyats).

The Sunni Kurds of the tribes of Mamash, Zarrs, and Akhter number 2,000 families, or a quarter of the present total of the population. They entirely occupy 10 villages (Ghulwan, Wazan, etc., and 11 others (Ghura, Naghda, Mammoud, etc.) they share with the Kara-papakh.

Sulduz like Ushun is mentioned among the Nestorian bishops (Assemann, iv. 423; Hoffmann, Abergel der syrischen Aktion, 1850, p. 204; Saldus, Sulduz) but in 1914 there were only 80 Christian families left in Naghda. The Jews are more numerous (120 families in Naghda) and are probably the oldest element in the present population of the district.

Under the Turkish occupation of 1908-1912, the Shafii Kara-papakh suffered considerably as the Turks regarded them as Persian agents. The Turks, without success however, tried to destroy the tribal organisation and to emancipate the ruysers. During the Great War the village of Haidar-khan (on lake Urmia) became a Russian naval base and a light railroad was built through the district. Sulduz changed hands several times but since the departure of the Russians and Turks it has been able since 1919 to regain its status quo ante.


SULH, composition, settlement, which is recommended as early as Kura, iv. 127, is a contract of sale (kas) with the object of averting a dispute (cf. the Roman-Byzantine transactio, balkure: Cod., 2, 4, 21; also Dig., 2, 15, 1). The rules of tari had held for it, especially tari and tari. There are three kinds of settlements: the defendant either acknowledges the disputed point to be justified (jibr) or he disputes it (inzhr) or he says nothing (inkh). The older jurists differ on the admissibility of these three kinds: al-Hariri and Ibn Abi Laila demand definite acknowledgment, while Abu Hanifa denies the possibility of a sulh in the case of jibr (al-Shafii, K. al-Qada', iii. 203) and addsuce the principal of Roman law: conquerors are pro indigente habitem (Dig., 42, 2, 3; cf. Cod., 2, 4, 32). As to the competence to negotiate of the two parties (milah) the usual rules hold but it is essential that they should have attained their majority (milah) or be freemen. The thing which gives rise to the settlement (milah) must be a mal, i.e. something about which an agreement of sale can be concluded, whether it is a thing, a claim or a usufruct. The disputed legal point (milah) is raised by the settlement may concern a thing (milah) or a legal claim arising out of killing or wounding (saya and shegar), but a law Ali is, e.g. the hada punishment for theft or incontinence, can never be settled in this way (cf. Cod., 2, 4, 18).—The settlement is reached 1) by the will of the parties; 2) by giving back the thing given for the settlement on account of defects (hayyr al-min), and 3) if circumstances unknown at the time of the settlement afterwards show that the legal position could not be disputed (e.g. discovery of a bond).—The Shafii divide the settlement into tari al-tari, which is considered as a donation (huda) (cf. Dig., 2, 15, 1) and tari al-mawla, which in place of the object claimed another one.

The Code Civil Ottoman, art. 1531-1571 is practically the Hanafi teaching on the subject.
van der Linde, Das erste Jahrtausend der Schachliteratur, 948). From the time he defeated Ma-wang-wu he was a courtier (mudrun) of the caliphs. He was a special intimate with his former pupil Al-Rādi (322–330 = 934–940) (al-Masudi, Murādī, viii. 311, 339; al-Tanukhi, Niḥāwār, p. 145; cf. Mec, Die Renaissance des Islam, p. 152). But in the last year of his life he had to take refuge in Baghda when he was prosecuted for a remark about 'Alt (al-Fihrist, p. 150, 12)'; there he died in hiding.

As a historian al-Suli is best known for his 'Abbadī history, Kitāb al-Albāb fī Abhāb Al-'Abbas wa-Anantasīrīn; the first part was arranged chronologically and the second gave a selection of the poetical works of members of the house of caliphs and of several others. The work which filled at least five or six volumes was never completed (al-Fihrist, p. 150, 121, 6) and is so far only known in a few fragments. There are manuscripts of the first part in Leningrad (Pahl. Libr., years 227–246, Zapiiski, xxi. 101–102), Cairo (Arsh. Turīkā, N. 443, years 295–318, Zapiiski, ibid., p. 99–100), Constantinople (part iii., Rescher in M. F. O. R., 1912, vīf., p. 532) and Paris (Rihāl. Nat., Fonds Arabes 4856, years 322–329); of the second in Cairo (Royal Libr., Turīkā, N. 594; Barthold in Zapiiski, xv. 0148–0153 = Arsh., Adda, N. 487, Zapiiski, xxi. 98–99) and Leningrad (Zapiiski, xxi. 102–110). Only a few parts of the Kitāb al-Awārī have been published: e.g. Abhāb al-Hallājī (Zapiiski, xxi. 0137–0141; fully analysed in L. Manisgnun, La passion d'al-Hallaj, passim); some of the Abhāb Ābān al-Dābāqī (A. Krimskij, Abān al-Ludūrī, etc., Moscow 1913, p. 1–43) and Abhāb Ībān al-Musīrā (Zapiiski, xxi. 104–112). No less famous was the Kitāb al-Wusūrī of al-Suli, so far only known from quotations (several times mentioned by himself in al-Awārī; cf. also Yaqlūb, Iṣbādī, ili. 131–132; v. 320; cf. Amur, al-Fihrist, Archives Marcocci, xvi. p. xx. 237). Of his other works the Adda al-Kutubī was recently published in Cairo by Muhammad Bahdjar from a Baghda manuscript (1351 = 1922). The book was written in the reign of al-Rādi (p. 163) and is a handbook for the guidance of clerks in the chancelleries, a kind of literature which later became very popular and attained its apotheosis in the monumental Šahāb al-'Abed of Kaşghāndi (it is noteworthy that Kaşghāndi, although he knows al-Suli well, never quotes this book).

In pure literature al-Suli made a name by his edition of the dīwān of 'Abbadī poets. Like al-Sukkari with the old poets, al-Suli dealt with the Muḥāsinīn. His Abhāb al-Maftūm exists in manuscript in Constantinople (Rescher in M. F. O. R., vīf. 501–502). Among his editions of the dīwān may be mentioned those of Abāb Nāwūs (E. M. Wechow, Die literarische Tätigkeit Hama al-Iṣbādī, Berlin 1909, 425); Muslim b. al-Walīd (De Goeje's edition, p. viii.), Ibn al-Maftūr (Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 81), al-Bahri (q. v.), Ibn al-Rūmi (extr. publ. in Cairo, 1924), al-'Abbāb b. al-Aṣfār (Aghānī, viii. 15–25; xv. 141–144), al-Sanwari (Mec, Die Renaissance des Islam, p. 250). Among many others (al-Fihrist, p. 151, 121, 136), his Abhāb 'Abdārī Marīn is quoted by Yaqlūb (Iṣbādī, ili. 5, 415–416; v. 454). He also wrote a dozen other works of which as is often the case we only know the names (al-Fihrist, p. 151, 121, 136). Ibn Khallīkān, ed. Müstenfeld, 659, p. 51; Ḥādījī Khallīkān, ili. 598, 6095; ili. 144; al-Suli, Adda al-Kutubī, p. 155; Abu l-'Alīa, Nihāl al-Dawrānī, p. 147, 6; Āl-Suli was not particularly renowned as a poet, but his verses are often quoted (specimens are given by M. Bahdjar, ed. cit., p. 14–15).

Not a very favourable verdict is given on al-Suli's honesty. The ironic verses on his literary work are well known (Ibn Khallīkān, ed. cit., p. 54); they show that all his learning was regarded by some of his contemporaries as merely a knowledge of other people's books. The Fihrist (p. 129, vīf., 151, 6–7) and Yaqlūb (Iṣbādī, ili. 58) regarded his al-Awārī as a plagiarism from the Abhāb al-'Aṣfār of al-Marqūsī (so he too leads in Fihrist, p. 151, 6 instead of al-Maqādi; but cf. the more favourable verdict in al-Maṣūdī, Murādī, i. 16–17). Yaqlūb calls him a liar (Iṣbādī, ili. 10) and the Fihrist thinks his Abhāb k. Hārma a failure (152, 6). His vanity and his bad taste are several times pilloried (e.g. al-Lajmi, al-Wusūrī, p. 260; Ibn al-Athīr, al-Maghil al-wāsīr, p. 289). His boasting is also known to Persian literature of the 10th century (Abu l-'Adlī Bahdjar in Barhīl, Zapiiski, xviii. 0131). A large number of verdicts upon him have recently been analysed by L. Manisgnun (La passion d'al-Hallaj, ili. 92 and passim). This all goes to show that al-Suli cannot be considered an historian of outstanding merit. He was only an industrious compiler, not always able to distinguish his own work from that of others. But this did not affect his influence on literature; among his immediate pupils are mentioned al-Daraqqūtī, Ibn Khallīkān, al-Marrāshīdī, etc.; he is still more important as a source used by many Arabic historians and literary critics. Even his younger contemporary al-'Arūf (q.v.) several times copies him word for word. All al-Iṣbādī quotes him over 240 times as a particularly valuable source for the history of the 'Abbadī poets (not noted in Guidī's Tables alphabeticæ, as all ināmad).


On al-Suli as a chess-player, see especially the works of Antonius van der Linde, Geschichte und Literatur des Schachspiels, Berlin 1874, i. 97–98, 166–107; Quellenstudien zur Geschichte des Schachspiels, Berlin 1881, p. 21–24, 333–337, 354–381; Das erste Jahrtausend der Schachliteratur, p. 83 and 948; H. J. K. Murray,
SULTÁN (A.), a. a title which first appears in the fourth (ixth) century in the sense of a powerful ruler, an independent sovereign of a certain territory.

The word is of frequent occurrence in the Korán, most often with the meaning of a moral or magical authority supported by proofs or miracles which afford the right to make a statement of religious import. The prophets received this sultán from Alláh (cf. e.g. Sura xiv. 12, 13) and the idolators are often invited to produce a sultán in support of their beliefs. Thus the dictionaries (like the Táj al-'Arúṣ, v. 159) explain the word as synonymous with khulūya and burkān. There are also six passages in the Korán where sultán has the meaning of "power"; but it is always the spiritual power which IDbs exercises over men (Sura xii. 65; xvi. 103, 104; xvi. 67; xxix. 20). Now it is this meaning of power or rather of governmental power which is attached to the word sultán in the early centuries of Islam. The word and its meaning were undoubtedly borrowed from the Sýríc shulīn, which has the meaning of power, and, although rarely, also of that of the wielder of power (Payne-Smith, Thesaurus Syriacus, col. 4170; Noldeke, Beiträge zur syrischen Sprachwissenschaft, Strassburg 1910, p. 39). The Koránic sense of the word may probably also to be derived from the meaning of power (some lexicographers try to explain it as the plural of sult, olive oil). Later an attempt was made to connect the title sultán with the meaning of argument, and it was paraphrased as sūlāt ḫulūya (Táj al-'Arúṣ, loc. cit.).

In the literature of Ḥadîth, sultán has exclusively the sense of power, usually governmental power ("the sultán is the wali for him who has no other wali"/al-Tirmídhí, i. 204) but the word also means sometimes the power of Alláh. The best known tradition however is that which begins with the words al-sultán ill Alláh ʿāʾrý, "Governmental power is the shadow of Alláh upon earth" (cf. Goldscheider, Muhammadanische Studien, ii. 61 and Le sens des expressions abbas de Dios, i. 153. See also, in K. H. K., xxx. 331 999.). Al-Utbi quotes this tradition at the beginning of the Kifl al-Yamiit and his commentator al-Mantúni says that it was transmitted by al-Tirmídhí and others as going back to Ibn ʿUmar (Sharh al-Yamiit, Cairo 1286, p. 21). This tradition later played a part in the theories of the Sultánate because an allusion to the title was wrongly seen in it. Apart from Ḥadîth, Arabic literature to the end of the fourth century only knows the word sultán in the sense of governmental power (among the many examples, cf. e.g. Yaḥṣáh, Kitáb al-Bulūn, p. 346, 349; Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakám, Fírīč al-Múṣir, ed. Torrey, p. 185, where it is said that at some times the residence of the Sultán of Ifríjíya was Carthage and Ibn Hawkáj, p. 145 where al-Mawûl is called the residence of the sultán and of the diwâna of al-Djaddár, or of the person who at a particular time is the personification of the personal governmental power, as opposed to amir which is rather in the nature of a title. This last meaning, which is sometimes more completely rendered by Dār ʿal-Sultán (e.g. in Ḥadîth), and is totally different from the first is found as early as the Egyptian papyri of the first century (for the governor of Egypt, cf. Becker, Anleitung zur Geschichte Aegyptens, p. 90, note 6) and in the following centuries sometimes also for the Caliphs (the Caliph al-Manṣúr is called Sultán Alláh in a hikhy, Tabari, iii. 426); the Caliph al-Mawâfiq is called Sultán (Tabari, iii. 1894; and again in 907 the Caliph al-Kádir, al-Utbi, op. cit., p. 265). This practice of designating a person by the word which indicates his dignity has parallels in all languages (cf. e.g. for the Turkish official language: H. Ritter, in Diccionario, ii. 473); it even appears that the Assyrian form šilhun was applied to foreign sovereigns (according to Ravaïse in E. D. M. G., iv. 330). The meaning of power, of government, has been maintained in Arabic literature to the present day.

The transition in meaning from an impersonal representative of political power to a personal title is a development, the stages of which are difficult to follow. Authorities writing later than this development make statements which can only be accepted with reserve. Thus Ibn Khaldún (Prolegomena, ii. 8 in N. E. xvii) says that the Barmécide Qâfar was called sultán, because he held the most powerful position in the state and that later, the great usurpers of the power of the Caliph obtained ḥakâb like Amr al-sànaa and sultán. The same thing is recorded of the Byûids (A. Müller, Der Islam in Morgen- und Abendland, i. 568) and of the Ghaznavids. Ibn al-Athír (ix. 92) says that Mahmúd al-Ghazna obtained the title of sultán from the Caliph al-Kâdir. This statement is not confirmed by al-Utbi who, in giving the various alâhī conferred on Mahmúd by the Caliph (op. cit., p. 317), makes no mention of this title. It is however true that al-Utbi himself always calls Mahmúd al-Sultán, giving in explanation the fact that Mahmúd had become an independent sovereign (op. cit., p. 311); but al-ʿUtbi sultán cannot yet have been an official title since he gives the same epithet to the Caliph (cf. above). The first Ghaznavid on whose coins the title appears is Ibráhím (1053-1099). We find the Fâtimids using the epithet Sultán al-İslám, Ibn Yûnis, Leyden MS.) and in the same period we find the ḥakâb of Sulân al-Dawla among the Byûids of Fârs (Sultan al-Dawla Abû Shujâ`, 1012-1024). The same ḥakâb was borne by the last Byûid al-Malik al-Râhim at Baghdir at the time when the usurping Sultân Tughril-Beg received from the Caliph in 1054 the ḥakâb al-Sultán Rûkhn al-Dawla (al-Râwand, Râba al-Ṣâdîr, G. M. S., i. 105; cf. also Ibn Taghribirdi, ed. Popper, p. 235).

Tughril-Beg was also the first Muslim ruler whose coins bear the epithet or rather title Sultán and in that the combination al-Sultán al-Mu`azzam" (S. Lane- Poole, Cat. of Oriental Coins in the Brit. Mus., ii. 25 sp.). This fact makes it very probable that the Sultán was the first for whom Sultán had become a regular title for a ruler; the qualification by al-Mu`âazzam was necessary to lift the word definitely out of its use as a more or less impersonal common noun; this development would at the same time explain why the word Sultán immediately became the highest title that a Muslim prince could obtain, while in the centuries preceding any representative of authority could be so designated. The adjective al-Mu`âazzam, essential for the title, was soon omitted.
SULTAN

in unofficial language. Thus, with the Saljûqîs, Suljân became a regular sovereign title. Neither the provincial dynasties of the Saljûqs (among whom however we find the proper name Sulân-Salîh) nor the Asîhs after them bore the title suljân; they were content with titles like malik and qudd. It was only after the end of the Great Saljûq in the middle of the xiiith century that the Khwârimshâhs assumed it. The Caliph al-Nâhir was however able to take advantage of the weakness of Djalâl al-Dîn Khwârimshâh to refuse to recognize his claim to this title (Nawaw, Vie de Djalâl ed-dîn Manbîkhî, ed. Houdas, p. 417). Soon the Saljûqs of Rûm also called themselves Suljân (on coins from Khâlid Arslân II). Almost at the same time the title is applied in literature to the first Ayûbîd Sulân al-Dîn (Ibn Djâbir, Rûbûl, ed. Weigl and de Goër, p. 40), although Suljân never appears on the coins of the Ayûbîds, whose official titles were all combined with al-Malîh. By the literature of the xiiith century Suljân had become a title indicating the most absolute political independence. Ibn al-Ahîr (xi. 169) speaks of Baghdad and its environs as the territory where the Caliph reigned without a Suljân. It is not certain if in the last period of the Abbâsids in Baghdad, the Caliph was already regarded as the only authority who could confer the title suljân. We see however that after the fall of the Caliphate an increasing number of Muslim potentates arrogated the title to themselves. In official use, the title was very often followed by an adjective like al-Abâm, al-Abîl etc. (a complete list is given in O. Codrington, A Manual of Musulman Numismatics, London 1904, p. 81-83). During the xiiith-xvith centuries the Suljân of Egypt added the greatest lustre to the title of Suljân; after them came the Ottoman Suljân.

Sultans, having thus become potentates whose absolute independence was generally recognised, jurists and historians set themselves to construct theories to find a justification in law for the existence of such potentates, for whom there had been no place in the old conception of the Muslim caliphate (cf. Khâyînâ). We find these theories as early as al-Mâwardî (who wrote in the time of the Hûyûs) for whom suljân had not yet any other meaning than governmental power, as is evident from the title of his book al-Akhnâm al-suljânîya. Al-Mâwardî says (ed. Enger, Bonn 1853, p. 30-51) that the Caliph may remain in office even if he is dominated by one of his subordinates provided that the latter's actions are in conformity with the principles of religion. Al-Üthârî, who quotes the tradition that the suljân is the shadow of Allâh on earth (cf. above), does so very probably to justify the independent position of Mujâhid of Ghazna to whom he always gives the epithet al-suljân; but this allusion to the well-known tradition is perhaps rather a play upon words than the theory of a jurist. To al-Ghazânî the "Sultans of his age" of whom he has a very low opinion (Geschichte, Streitgeschicht der Gains gegen die Itâfis, Leipzig 1870, p. 93) are in general the representatives of temporal power. It is only under the Manûlik Suljans of Egypt that a definite theory is laid down by Khâlid al-Zâhirî (Zadât al-khâs al-mâmainî, ed. Ravaiss, p. 89-90) who says that it is only the Caliph who has the right to grant the title of suljân and that in consequence this title only belongs in reality to the Suljân of Egypt. The Manûlik called themselves in their inscriptions Suljân al-Islâm wa'l-Mulsâmân (van Berchem, Inschriften aus Syrien, Mesopotamien und Kleinasien). About the same time Ibn 'Arâshâhî in the biography of Suljân Djalâmî (T.R.A.S., 1897, p. 295 sqq.) calls the Suljân the Khalifâ of Allâh on earth in affairs of government while the 'ulâmâ' are the heirs of the Prophet in matters of religion; this statement contains, like that of al-Üthârî, an apt allusion to the tradition (in another form). Lastly al-Sâ'idî (Fusûn al-Muâlîkî, ii. 91 sqq.) gives a definition of the titles of suljân (he in whose possessions there are malikâ) of al-Suljân al-Abâm and of Suljân al-Suljân, which is the highest title. In the time of the Manîlik there were actually quite a number of Muslim potentates who called themselves Suljân; some of these, in keeping with al-Zâhirî's theory, had even asked the permission of the Caliph in Cairo to bear the title.

From the beginning of the era of the title we may say that all the great rulers who have borne it have been Sunnis, except the Khwârimshâhs. It is therefore not a mere coincidence that this development went parallel with the religious revival in Islam in the period of the Crusades; the great Suljân became at the same time the defenders of Sunni Islam and the Mongol rulers, after having embraced this form of Islam, assumed this very title. This Sunni significance of the title is specially noticeable in the Ottoman suljânîte. It appears that some coins of Crîshân already bear the title suljân (S. Lane-Poole, Cat. Of Coins, viii. 41) although the first Ottoman princes were generally regarded as sunnî (Ibn Battûtâ, ii. 321). Beyârâî is said to have been the first to obtain from the Caliph in Cairo the right to call himself Suljân (von Humann, G.O.R., i. 233). After the taking of Constantinople, Muhammâd II assumed the title of Suljân al-khârîzân wa'l-abûzân (G.O.R., i. 88) but even in the Ottoman empire this title as the title of the sovereign it has never been as popular as those of Khânâbâd and of Fâdîshân. In official protocol on the other hand, it occupies an important place, e.g. in the formula al-Suljân ibn al-Suljân, etc. before the names of the rulers. After the extinction of the Manûlik Suljânite by the conquest of Selim I, Ottoman rulers had become indisputably the greatest Suljân in Islam. The Safawîs of Persia were called Shâh and the opposition Suljân-Shâh henceforth corresponded to that between Sunnis and Shiîs. It is true that officially the Safawîs also called themselves Suljân, e.g. on their coins (R. S. Poole, Catalogue of the Coins of the Shâhs of Persia in the British Museum, London 1887, Index, p. 313), but they were only known by the title of Shâh.

In Turkey Suljân has always been an elevated title. In addition to rulers, it was borne by princes and one of the causes, why the grand vizier and favourite of Sulaimân I Ibrahim Pasha, was disgraced is said to have been that he had taken the title of Serî'asker Suljân (G.O.R., ii. 160). In the time of 'Abd al-Hamîd II the petty chiefs who were appointed suljân in their own country (e.g. in Hâşînawî) were not allowed to use the title when they visited Constantinople (information given me by Mr. Smock Hurgronje). In Turkish the title suljân is always placed before the name of the sovereign or of the prince, which shows its foreign origin. The real popular use of the word.
in Turkish is with the meaning of princess (cf. e.g. the story, Soltun Sultan in Jacobi, Hillefisch, ii., p. 59 and the use of the word in erotic poetry and in it is impossible to study the history of the title Sultan completely without using the wealth of material in the inscriptions, it is to be hoped that the systematic publication of this material will not be long delayed.

J. H. Krämer

SULTAN AL-DAWLA ALI SHUfaq BABA AL-DAWLA, a BAYID. After the death of Bahá' al-Dawla on 7 Junnd 1252 (= Dec. 22, 1012) in Arradjad, his son Sultan al-Dawla succeeded him as amir of Fars and al-Irak. He at once left Arradjad for Shiráz and appointed his brother Djalal al-Dawla (q.v.) governor of Bagdad and his other brother Abu 'I'Fawrís governor of Kirmán. The latter was persuaded by the Dailami troops to rebel against Sultan al-Dawla; he went to Fars and entered Shiráz but was immediately driven out of the town and had to retire to Kirmán. He then went to Khurásan and asked help from Sultan Mahmad b. Sabuktegin, who was then in Bahr. The latter placed an amir Abd al-Táhir at his disposal. Abu 'I'Fawrís occupied Kirmán, then turned his attention to Fars and entered Shiráz while Sultan al-Dawla was in Baghgad. On the latter's return a battle was fought in which Abu 'I'Fawrís was defeated; he fled to Kirmán (408 = 1017/18) pursued by Sultan al-Dawla's troops, who soon conquered the province, while Abu 'I'Fawrís sought refuge first with Shah al-Dawla b. Fakhr al-Dawla (q.v.) and then with Mahmad-díb al-Dawla, lord of al-Batfa. After long negotiations an agreement was reached in 409 (1018/1019), by which Abu 'I'Fawrís was to retain the governorship of Kirmán while he bound himself to obedience to his brother. In the same year Ibn Sahlan was appointed governor of al-Irak. As he made himself much hated by the Turks, the latter complained to Sultan al-Dawla, who endeavoured to appease them and summoned Ibn Sahlan to him. Instead of appearing before his overlord he fled to al-Batfa and when Sultan al-Dawla demanded that he should be handed over, the lord of al-Batfa, al-Husain b. Bakr al-Sharih refused to do so. Sultan al-Dawla then sent an army against him; al-Sharih was defeated and Ibn Sahlan fled to Bagdad to Djalal al-Dawla. As the troops were discontented with Sultan al-Dawla and showed themselves inclined to recognise his brother Muhsarrif al-Dawla as their lord, the two brothers agreed that the latter should receive the governorship of al-Irak and neither should take Ibn Sahlan into his service. But after Sultan al-Dawla had gone to Tustar, in spite of the agreement he appointed Ibn Sahlan his vizier, which roused the wrath of Muhsarrif al-Dawla. Sultan al-Dawla then equipped an army and commissioned Ibn Sahlan to drive Muhsarrif al-Dawla out of al-Irak. But the latter took the field to meet him; Ibn Sahlan was defeated and fled to Wasiq where after a long siege he had to surrender in 411 (1021). After this victory Muhsarrif al-Dawla took the honorary title of Kház'ángah "king of kings" and in Muhsarrif 412 (May 1021) he dropped his brother's name from the Jánba and replaced it by his own. In the same year Ibn Sahlan was seized and blinded by order of Djalal al-Dawla.
and Mugharif al-Daula. In spite of Sultan al-Daula's defeat in the war involving al-Ahwāz declared for him, so he sent his son Abū Kuliqār [q.v.] thither to take possession of this province. In 413 (1022/1023) peace was made, the terms being that Fars and Kirman should be ruled by Sultan al-Daula and all 'Iraq by Mugharif al-Daula. Sultan al-Daula, according to the usual statement, died in Shiraz in Shawwal 415 (Dec. 1024/Jun. 1025) but according to one source he did not die till Shawwal 416 (Sept./Oct. 1025).


(K. V. ZETTERSTEN)

SULTAN ISHAK (more frequently S. Sahk, S. Sahk) was the last and most important personage in the history of the Al-‘Ali Ḥājjī sect, which had disappeared by the end of the 14th century. The Al-‘Ali Ḥājjī was a historical personage. The Al-‘Ali Ḥājjī put him in the 16th century. He is said to have been a son of a certain Shishk Iskandar Khatun Duyira (Dayaraq), daughter of Hasan Beg Ḥājjī. By his wife Khurshid-waṣir he had seven sons whom he called ḥaqīq (to distinguish him from another nephew called ḥaqīq tawānī). Like each of the seven fundamental avatars Sultan Sahk has a retina of four (five) angels: Ben-yānoun, Dowlad, Mafṣī, Dawdān, Pir Ṣādiq (and Khānun Duyira) each of whom has his special duties.

An analysis of the proper and geographical names in the religious work known as the Sīrat al-Daud shows that the area of Sultan Sahk's activity was the part of Kurdistan between the Zagros (Dilah) and the river Sirwan (Diyala). According to the Turkish hymn called șehīb-i-nāmeh, Sultan Ḥājjī spoke the Greek language which is still that of the inhabitants of this region, who, although Iranian by race, are not true Kurds from the linguistic nor probably from the ethnological point of view. The tomb of Sultan Sahk and his companions is at Pardwar on the right bank of the Sirwan in the Awarma-Lutuin (cf. SENNA).

The polemical M.S. in the O. Mann collection (Preussische Staatsbibliothek, Acc. M.S. 1904, No. 50, fol. 8) calls Sultan Sahk șīyoma-yi Ḥājjī “incarnation (dress) of God” and Ṣahāni-pān-I Ṣahāni-pān (“legislator of the law of the ḥājjī”). In fact it is to him that the majority of the rites of the sect are traced as for example the “recommendation of the head” to a pir (sur ‘aṣfar dān) which symbolizes the contract which the divinity (the “King of the World”) had made with Benyānoun before appearing on earth in the form of Sultan Ḥājjī. Benyānoun was to assume the role of pir and the “King of the World” that of fāhib, for he declared that the fāhib must obey the orders of his pir, one may execute the orders but, if I become the pir and thou the fāhib, thou wouldst not be able to execute what I tell thee”. This seems to be an echo of Ismaili beliefs, according to which God is without attributes and creation retains to “universal intelligence” (al-Muḥak al-Ṭalāb, 3 al-Ṭalāb); cf. Cuyard. Fragments relatifs à la doctrine des Ismaïlis, Paris 1874, p. 43, 162.

Sultan Sahk is occasionally recognized as one of the leaders of his sect, who do not agree regarding later manifestations.


(V. MINORSKY)

SULTAN ÖNU, the ancient name of the part of Phrygia in Asia Minor, situated to the north in the Dardanelles, for it was mentioned in the Chronicle of Ibn Butn (Houtman, Recueil de textes relatifs à l'histoire des Seljoukides, iii. 217) as a frontier district of the Seljuk Empire, the protection of which was entrusted to the sultans of the Seljuk Empire, the protection of which was entrusted to the sultans of the Seljuq princes of Bey (sultān) such as Ertogru. Among the early ottoman historians Neghri (ed. Nöelleke, Z.D.M.G., xiii. 190) mentions Sultan Önu as the place where Ertogru and his little tribe went, after their stay in the Karadas Dag near Amorga.

Bur Negri as well as Ibn Butn writes: Sultan Önu (dative case). Hence the name is probably to be explained at the Sultan's tumulus (ṣūr or ʿaṣif) and not as the Sultan's front, as was suggested by the later spelling ʿāṣif (comp. Lenzl, Historiae Musulminum Turcorum, col. 107); moreover Ibn Butn (ii. 324, 342) mentions two persons with the title Sultan Önu and J. H. Mordtmann takes it that the place name in Önu, which occurs in the same region was originally in Oyu; the local name Boğa-Öynük is formed in the same way (Taschner, Der osmanische Weggeweiss, i. 122, note 1). The story told by von Hammer (G. O. K., i. 45) about the reason why Sultan 'Ali al-Din called the region Sultan Önu does not seem to occur in any early historical work. In Ertogru's time, the towns of this part of the country were still held by Christian lords, but after these towns had been brought under the immediate rule of his successor Ötheman, the region was made a sanjak under the name of Irin Önu and with Karadag Hisar as capital. This sanjak was given to Örkhan and, afterwards, by Örkhan to his son Murad (ʿAshik Pasha Zade, ed. Constantiopolis, p. 20, 38; Turwurğâ-ı Ali Ötkmên, ed. Gieson, p. 7, 73; Ordul Beg, ed. Babinger, p. 15, 57, 189; Neghri, ed. Nöelleke, Z. D. M. G., xiii. 211). It seems that already in these chronicles, even as in later times, the place name in Önu was often used instead of the regional name Sultan Önu (the latter name only twice in the Turwurğâ, but both times in a poem; comp. also Taschner, loc. cit.). In later centuries the sanjak of Sultan Önu bordered according to Hadiji Khüta, Dilbhumuna, p. 631, to the S.E., upon the sanjak of Kara Hisar Sabhi, and, to the N.W., upon that of Kühdwanidjâr; it contained, besides, the capital Eski Shehir [q.v.].
show an attempt at writing Turkish in the roman metre in which the *Mathnavi* of Mawlana was written. The language is archaic and represents an old form of the dialect of the Oghuz.

The 13 Greek tales of the Rabîb-nâma have been published from the MSS. in St. Petersburg, Budapest and Oxford (those in Munich and in Gotha do not contain them) by G. Meyer, *Die griechischen Verse im Erkbi-nâme, in Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 1895, iv., p. 401 sqq.

**SULTAN WALAD, eldest son of Djâlal al-Din Rûmî** and his second successor as head of the Mawlawi order, was born in Lâranda (cf. *qašâ*) in 623 (1226) before Djâlal al-Din’s family had settled in Konya. He was called after Djâlal al-Din’s father, Bahâ’ al-Din Walad, known as Sultan al-Ulumâ. He was brought up among the Sûfîs who surrounded his father and seems to have been particularly intimate with Shams al-Dîn Tabrîzî, while his younger brother Cîlebi ‘Ali al-Dîn was rather hostile to the latter’s influence. Sultan Walad married the daughter of another of his father’s disciples, the goldsmith Şâhî al-Dîn Ferîdûn of Konya. After the death of Djâlal al-Dîn, Sultan Walad did not at once succeed him but insisted on Cîlebi Hasan al-Dîn, hitherto the waklât of the master, assuming control. Eleven years later Hasan al-Dîn died and Sultan Walad succeeded and held office till his death on 10th Rabi‘ II, 712 (Nov. 11, 1312). He was followed by his son Djâlal al-Dîn Amir ‘Arîf.

Sultan Walad does not seem to have been a dominating personality like his father. Pious traditions about his life reveal him to us as a contemplative mystic; a certain manner of performing the whirling dance has been called after him, Sultan Walad Devînî (Brown, *The Dervishes*, ed. Rose, Oxford 1927, p. 252 sq.). He was also the author of a large *Mathnawi* called *Walad-nâma* and dedicated to the Mongol Sultan Ulujiît Kühân in three parts *khišâ-nâma, hastâ-nâma* and *Rabîb-nâma*, a voluminous *Divâmâna* and a work in prose called *Mârîfî*. The *Mathnawi* contains many data of importance for the biography of Djâlal al-Dîn Rûmî and may be regarded as a kind of commentary on the *Mathnawi*-e *Ma’dâni*. The works of Sultan Walad, none of which have been printed, are written in Persian. They have a special interest because they include verses written in Turkish and Greek. The Turkish verses are in the *Totikh-nâma*, the *Rabîb-nâma* and the *Devâmâna*; their importance lies in the fact that they are the first literary documents in Turkish written in Asia Minor and for this reason the language has been called the language of the *Sâlîfî* Turks. The 156 harî’s in Turkish from the *Rabîb-nâma* are all that have been published and studied so far (from the Vienna MSS., written in 767 [1366] and the St. Petersburg one, later in date) by von Hammer, Wickerbauer, Behrens, Radloff, Salemann, Kühn, Smirnoff, Behrens, *et al.* (cf. Bibliography). According to Köprüli Zâde Faîl Bey’s *Bylîl Müsabihel-i Mevhib* (p. 266 sqq.), the influence of Mawlânâ Djâlal al-Dîn Rûmî on western Turkish literature begins with Sultan Walad. The latter is said to have been at the same time the first representative of the school of Turkish poetry under Persian influence, while the other category, that of popular mystic poets (*tâbûkh* as opposed to *tâbûr*), is represented about the same time by Yûsuf Emre. The Turkish verses of the *Rabîb-nâma* already
The cantons of al-‘Irāq are as follows: 1. Fārāhān (Zulfābdād and Mughbābdād) with 144 villages forms the central plain, the scanty waters of which (Karāsh-rūd) flow into the salt lake without outlet which in the Mongol period was called Tashgamma-ur = the white lake'. The old capital of Fārāhān is Sādūf, situated 25 miles N.W. of Sultānābād. Fārāhān is an old Shīa centre: 2. Shāhrān (Carrshah); 3. Hūzātu and 4. Wāfā with 42, 52 and 12 villages respectively lie W. and N.W. of Fārāhān; 5. Tafrīsh and 6. Aghtyān with 16 and 3 villages respectively lie to the north of Fārāhān. Tafrīsh is a hollow surrounded by mountains on all sides. Aghtyān and Garaḵān are noted as the birthplaces of many Persian holy men and statesmen; 7. Rūdābār with 47 villages lies N.W. of Fārāhān; 8. Khālaḏī̄stān with 90 villages lies in the direction of Ḥumān and Sāwā; 9. Kūzást with 150 villages lies south of Sultānābād on the fan-shaped upper waters of the Kārṣu and on those of the Karāsh-rūd (Kara-Kahirt). The important canton encroaching on the environs of Sultānābād seems to be identical with the Kārāsh al-Dīl of the Arab geographers (Le Strange, Tār Ḭaṃdi, etc., p. 103 and Manṣūr al-Ḵᵛādāb, p. 69); the mountain Rāmsand is the modern Rāshmūn (Rashmān) (although Mustawfīt seems to give this name to the Kūh-i Shāh-Zinda which continues the Rāshband range northwards); the stronghold of Fartūn of Dīyaḏuḏ-gūr in M. M. S., xvi/2, p. 116: Fartūn must be on the mountain of Fartūn (north of Tūla); finally the name of the "spring of Kāh-Khurān" which rises on Rāmsand is explained by the local legend which tells how Kāh-Khurān disappeared on the mountain of Shāh-Zinda (Cittik, p. 186; cf. Shāhūn-ḵan, ed. Mohi, iv, p. 266); 10. Sarābānd, with 130 villages to the S.W. of Kūzāst on the Bāzdīr road; the canton is watered by the upper waters of the Karḵāt (Ab-i Kūlān, etc.). In addition to the cantons above enumerated, the following have at times formed part of al-‘Irāq: Darājā (Daraḵšt) on the left bank of the Kārṣu to the north of Wāfs and south of the Hamadān-Kārṣu road; Aḥshā Ḵhor, a dependency of Bāzdīr; Kāmārā and Nīm waṣt (on the Anār-rūd) both now merged in the district of Māhālāt. The total number of inhabited villages, etc. in al-‘Irāq is 686. Before 1914 it paid to the treasury a māhrāt of 80,000 tumans and 16,000 ḡarrāwārs of corn. Five regiments in the province.

The province, agriculturally rich, is especially noted for its famous carpets (Sārḵāh, Sultānābād) exported by the European and Persian houses established in Sultānābād. The importance of al-‘Irāq will increase if the Mohammān-Bāzdīr-Tehrān railway (still only a proposal) is completed through the province. The population for the most part is pure Persian. In K̄hālaḏī̄stān are K̄hâl al-Turk speaking a very curious dialect (cf. the article Šāḵa; this region also has a K̄hâlaḏī̄stān [near K̄hâḵk in the Tebriz-Hamadān road] where however a central Irānian dialect is also spoken; cf. Brugsch, Reise d. k. preuss. Ge- sandt., 1, 337–338 and Justi, Kurdische Grammatik, p. xxv). In K̄uzaţ there are 13 Armenian villages the inhabitants of which (564 houses, 2,050 souls in 1916) were settled here by the Šafawāds. At K̄amārā there are Armenians and Georgians and also Turks repatriated from Syria by Tirmaghir language is said to be connected with Cargaghān (?).


For particulars of Karaj Aḥi Imlaš, see P. Schwartz, Persien in Mittelalter, 1925, v. p. 574–82. The position of Fartūn (Fartūn) settles the site of Karaj on the Karṣa and according to Yāḵūḏ, Fartūn was at the gate (in the defile) of Karaj. The hypothesis of Hourm-Schindler (Zeitschr. d. Gesellschaft f. Erdk., 1879, xv, p. 60) that Karaj was to be located on the river Karṣa which waters Gulpoyān (= Diar-Baḵdān, 1) cannot therefore be accepted. Burdū also (io faraḵšā east of Karaj) is to be sought west of Gulpoyān (at Diar-Baḵdān or Bubbūrūd).


3. Name of several villages in Persia for example, the capital of the canton of Turghān (q.v.) in K̄hālaḏī̄stān. (M. Vosoukāy)

SULTĀNĪYA, a town in Persian ʿIrāq, about ten miles west of the watershed between the Zendān (q.v.), which runs to the Klīz-ʿAbār and the Abhar, which loses itself in the direction of Tebriz. The old Persian name of the canton of Sultānābād was Shāhīrāz. It was originally a dependency of ʿUḏḏulī. The Mongols called this district ʿAsgūn-ʿOlīgūr (="the prairie of the Ałçasus"); there is still a village called "ʿOlgūr" S.E. of Sultānīya. Sultānīya is about 5,000–5,500 feet above sea-level. The coolness of its climate in summer and the richness of the high plateau in pastoral and game must have had a special attraction for the Mongols. Asghūn began the construction of a town, the wall of which (sūrā) was 12,000 paces in circumference. His successor ʿUḏḏulī, to celebrate the birth of his son Aḥi Sādī, began in 705 to enlarge the new town (up to 30,000 paces in circumference) and made it the capital of his kingdom. The sovereign and his ministers vied with one another in embellishing Sultānīya. The vizier ʿAbī al-Dīn alone built a quarter of 4,000 houses (d’Ossieu, iv, 486; Hammer, Geschichts d. Ichane, ii. 184–186). The building of the town was finished in 713 (1313) and was solemnly celebrated. After his conversion to the Shīa, ʿUḏḏulī thought of bringing to Sultānīya the remains of the Caliph ʿAlī and of the Imam ʿAbū. Hamd Allāh Mustawfī says that nowhere except Tahrīb could so many splendid buildings be seen as in Sultānīya and he makes the great roads (al-ʿIrāq) radiate from Sultānīya as the centre of Iran (Taḵt-e Iran-Zamīn). The exaggeration in the last statement is apparent; the site "so inconvenient" (P. della Valle) of the town was the main cause of its decline. ʿUḏḏulī died in
SULTANIYA — SULUK

Sultaniya was and was buried in the famous mausoleum there. The ka'bah of Ali was held in Sultaniya, but the fact that ‘Ali-Shah, the ruler’s minister, began to build a magnificent mosque in Tabriz seems to indicate that pride of place was returning to the old capital.

After the fall of the Mongols, Sultaniya often changed hands, and its possession was disputed between the Sultus [q.v.], the Djilallir [q.v.], and the Muqaffarids. A former captain of Shahr Uwaiz Djilallir called Sard Tv' Adil fortified himself in Sultaniya in 751. He inflicted a defeat upon the Muqaffarid Shah Shudja but finally submitted to him and kept his position. A little later Sard Tv' Adil proclaimed Sultun Bayzard Djilallir at Sultaniya; his brother Sultan Ahmad complained of this to Shah Shudja', who removed Sard Tv' Adil from Sultaniya. Timur’s troops took Sultaniya from the sons of Sultan Ahmad in 786. At the same time Timur re-established Sard Tv' Adil as governor there and seems to have respected the tomb of Uldjait (cf. Olearius). Among the villages built by Timur around Samarkand with the names of celebrated towns, there was one called Sultaniya (Barthold, Ulez-beg, p. 32). In 795 Sultaniya formed part of “the field of Illigaul” confirmed by Timur on his son Miran-Shah, Zafar-nama, i. 388, 399, 425. Clavijo, who visited Sultaniya in 1405, saw that Miran-Shah (from 785-9) afflicted with madness which showed itself in the destruction of monuments, Zafar-nama, ii. 221), had plundered the town and citadel (aivan) and had smashed the tomb of Uldjait (‘the Caballero that yest ererrado mandou echar fuera’). In this, the ambassador of Henry III of Castile adds that the town had many inhabitants and that its trade was greater than that of Tabriz. Under Tahmash I the mausoleum was restored and P. della Valle and Olearius found it in good preservation. Trade however gradually went back to Tabriz and the removal of the political centre to Ishkhan completed the ruin of the old capital of Uldjait and caused it to become forgotten. It only experienced a brief revival of favour when, in the reign of Fath ‘Ali Shah, when the court followed the old custom of moving to a summer residence, a hunting-palace was built near Sultaniya with materials taken from the old city. This new Sultaniyâbad was also abandoned after the Russo-Persian war of 1826. The splendid mausoleum now rises from the centre of a wretched little village. In 1880 Houtum-Schindler counted 400–500 houses there.

Dienlaf argued the mausoleum as “the largest and most remarkable of all the buildings erected in Persia since the Muslim conquest” and this opinion is corroborated by Sarre’s study. The mausoleum is in the form of an octagonal prism 85 feet broad and 175 feet high (including 25 feet for the cupola). It is built of brick covered with superb blue faience. The inscriptions on the mausoleum do not appear to have been studied. Uldjait’s tomb was in the interior of the mausoleum. P. della Valle speaks of a chapel the entrance of which was closed by a beautiful grill of damascened iron. According to Olearius this grill was forged in India and formed a single piece. The mosque seems to have been fortified. According to Mustawfi, the jami’ (Clavijo, aivan), Uldjait’s burial-place (marvdawg), was of carved stone. Olearius saw at Sultaniya about 30 cannon which had been used to defend the old fortress in the Safawi period. Tavernier saw in Sultaniya the remains of other mosques, but now all that exists is one ruined mosque or mudwâr near which is situated the tomb of Celebi-oghlan (sixteenth century) in the form of an octagonal tower of brick with the ornamentation arranged to form a Kufic design. The tomb of the theologian Mullâ Hamza Shadiv (adorned with faience) dates from the sixteenth century and was built by Isma'il I. Nothing remains of the walls on which Morier saw an inscription in the name of Uldjait.


SULUK (A., “journeying”) is a term used by Sufis to describe the mystic’s progress in the Way to God, beginning with his entrance into the farâ’î (Way) under the influence of a Shâkih and ending with his attainment of the highest spiritual degree within his capacity. Suluk implies a quest deliberately undertaken, methodically pursued, who he prosecutes it (suluk) must pass through, and make himself perfect in, each of the stages or “stations” (ma’âÎmâr) — shir — trust in God, poverty, love, knowledge and so on —
before he can become united with God (nafs). Hence suülük is contrasted with sâdabah (see art. MAHDIYAH).


(R. A. Nicholson)

AL-SUMAIL b. HESIM ABU DJAWAHAN AL-KILÀ (a famous Arab chief in Spain. (The vocalization of the name al-Sumail is confirmed by the transcription Zamael used by pseudo-Isidorus of Beja). He was the grandson of Sh'mir b. Abi Djawahan of Kifân who killed al-Malik at Khebbel (cf. above, il., p. 539). The family of Sh'mir had left Kifân, because of reprisals made on them by the Sh'itsu, and settled in the district of Kinnasrin (cf. above, il., p. 1021) and this is how it came about that al-Sumail came to be one of the dûnd of Kinnasrin in the Syrian army sent to North Africa by the Umayyad Caliph Hishâm b. 'Abd al-Malik in 123 (741). He shared the fortunes of his chief Bâlî b. Bishr al-Khāshî (cf. above, il., p. 617) and when he had settled in Spain he soon became chief of the Ħaṣî of the country and lived in Cordova.

As a result of a quarrel with the governor of Cordova, Abu l-Khaṭṭâr al-Ḥusain b. Dirâr al-Kabîr, who insulted him, al-Sumail whose Arab amour propre was too high, decided to rebel against him and to get the Lakhmids and Dju-djâkhîs in Spain to join him. He offered the command of the rebels to Thāwâb b. Sâlama al-Djâlahî, who after the victory he gained over Abu l-Khaṭṭâr on the banks of the Guadalquivir became governor of Muslim Spain at Cordova.

On the death of Thâwâb, al-Sumail intervened to choose a successor to this governor and chose an individual on whom he knew he could exercise great influence: Yânsî b. 'Abd al-Ḥamân al-Fihri. His choice was at first disputed but after the victory of Seccâna (Shâkûnda, q.v.) in 130 (747) won by the Ma'addî clan under Yûsuf and al-Sumail over the Yamanî clan commanded by Abu l-Khaṭṭâr, the authority of the new governor was consolidated and the latter offered al-Sumail the command of the district of Saragossa [q.v.] in 132 (749). He distinguished himself for his great generosity during a severe famine there, but two rebel chiefs finally besieged him in his capital. Al-Sumail appealed for assistance to his kâhid fellow-travellers in Spain and his enemies raised the siege of Saragossa.

The later history of al-Sumail is closely and regularly connected with that of Yûsuf al-Fihri and that of the founder of the Umayyad caliphate of Spain, 'Abd al-Ḥamân al-Mahallî. He at first promised his support to the latter, then changed his mind, in circumstances of which a picturesque account is preserved in the anonymous chronicle entitled Abhûr al-majâla', and these show the inconsistency and complexity of the character of al-Sumail. 'Abd al-Ḥamân however after the return of his emissaries from the peninsula landed at Almûncar on Rabh' II, 138 (Sep. 755). Al-Sumail, after forcing his master Yûsuf al-Fihri to get rid of two important kâhid chiefs Sulãmah b. Shîhâb and al-Ḥusain b. l-Dâdîn, persuaded him to return to the new Umayyad government the government of the two districts occupied by the dûnd of Damascus and Jordan and gave him in marriage his daughter Umm Mihây. But the negotiations broke down through the insecurity of the envoy, hostilities began between Yûsuf and 'Abd al-Ḥamân and the former was defeated near Cordova. Al-Sumail had a son killed in the battle and his palace at Seccâna was looted. He tried with Yûsuf to regain the upper hand but both had soon to submit to the new caliph and al-Sumail installed himself in Cordova again. Yûsuf having taken to flight, al-Sumail was accused of being his accomplice and imprisoned; when Yûsuf after being defeated was killed near Toledo and his head brought to Cordova, 'Abd al-Ḥamân, wishing to be rid of his other enemy, whose submission he suspected was only nominal, had al-Sumail strangled in 142 (759).


(E. Levi-Provençal)

SUMAISât, the ancient Samaït on the right bank of the Euphrates, now Samaït (in Cuinet: Simas). The Muslims under 'Iyâd conquered it in 18 (639). From its position on the frontier between Arab and Byzantine territory, it was often the scene of both. The Byzantines raised it in 245 and 259 and this contributed to the destruction of the old Greek and Roman town. It was again the scene of fighting in the Crusades. Saladin took it in 584 (1189).

It is now an unimportant village; but Yâkîî called it wadan and mentions among its noted inhabitants a certain Abu l-Ka'sî. 'Ali b. Muhammad al-Salami who died in Damascus on Rabî' I 453. Under the Ottomans, Samaït was capital of a nahiya in the ka'da of Hsîn-İ Mânsî, a sandjak in Mañîya in the vilayet of Mauntet al-Azîl; now it forms part of the vilayet of Mañîya. Cuinet gives it 300 inhabitants; at one time it contained many Armenians but now its population is entirely Kurdish.

Bibliography: Caetani, Annali dell'Islam, iv. 43, Šahri, ed. de Goeje, ill. 1447, 1580; Historien des Croisades (Oriental), ill. 194, Yâhî, Ma'djun al-Baldîn, ill. 131—2; Cuinet, II. 379; Sâmi, 'Abûl-ul-Ilâm, p. 2635; Le Strange, The lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 108.

SUMANAT, or rather Sama Nâth (now most infreq.) is an ancient town situated in 20° 55' and 70° 28' E. at the eastern extremity of a bay on the south coast of Kâlibîwûrî. On the western headland of the bay stands the port of Verâfûl, and on the sea-shore, half way between the two towns, is an ancient temple dedicated to Shiva.
The town was the object of the most famous of the raids of Maḥmūd of Ghazni [q.v.] into India, in 1024. The invaders reached Sumānāt early in 1025, captured the town, desecrated the temple, and destroyed the idol, a linga, two pieces of which were sent to Ghazni, one to Makka and one to Madina, to be trodden underfoot by the faithful. Of the history of Sumānāt before its capture by Maḥmūd little is known. In the eight century it was in the hands of the Čawada Rājputs, vassals of the Čalukyas or Solankis of Kalyani, but Maḥmūd, on leaving the town in 1025, placed a Muhammadan governor in the district. Muslim rule did not endure, and Kāthiāwā fell into the hands of the Wadiji Rājputs, who preserved the glories of the ancient sage, but in 1298 it was captured, and again desecrated, by Ulugh Khān, in the reign of ‘Alī al-Din Khālidji. It was included in the dominions of the Rājā of Gīmnā, and when that kingdom was overthrown, in 1470, by Maḥmūd Begārja of Gudjarat it passed into the possession of the Muslim kings of that country. It was afterwards ruled, at different times, by the Shāhīk of Mangrol and the Rāvā of Porbandar, but was finally conquered by the Nawwals of Dūnīgarh, in whose hands it still remains.

**Bibliography:** Muhammad Khaṣim Fīrūz, Guiliation: Devātān, Bombay lithographed edition of 1834; Kavard Naṣīm al-Dīn Aḥmad, Tabāširi, Bibliotheca Indica series of the Asiatic Society of Bengal; *Imperial Gazetteer of India*, Oxford 1908, xiii. 74; also Maḥmūd of Ghazni, and Guījarat. (T. W. Hahn)

**SUMĀRA.** Sumārā, with an area of 440,000 square K.M., is the fifth largest island in the world. The distance between its Northern and Southern extremities is ± 1,750 K.M. and its greatest width is ± 400 K.M. The ascendant passades through the middle of the island, which lies between lat. 5° 39' N. and lat. 5° 57' S. For the geology, hydrography and orography, geography and ethnology, political and economic condition, statistics, administration etc., reference may be made to the great encyclopaedias and to special works, a summary of which is given in the Dutch Encyclopaedie van Nederlandse Indië, s. v. Sumāra. The present article, therefore, will be confined to an account of Islām in Sumārā, viz.: the history of the coming of this religion into Sumārā, its conversion of its heathen inhabitants, their special religious characteristics etc.

The name Sumārā appears to have originally indicated only a small locality and afterwards to have come to denote the whole island. Later names will be mentioned in the short historical sketch that follows. The first mention of Islām in Sumārā was made in 1292 by the Venetian traveller Marco Polo, who mentions the spread of Islām in Ferlo (i.e. Porloc, Agh. Prerovīa), a name well known from Malay chronicles. Since the old Muhammadan tombstones in Acheh have been deciphered, it has been ascertained that the founder of the Muslim kingdom of Sumārā-Passā, on the N.W. coast of Acheh died in 1297. So it is unlikely that the conversion of this country took place between 1270 and 1275, as has been assumed. Northern Sumārā is called by Arabic authors, in the 15th and 16th century: Rami, al-Rami, al-Romi, Lamari; al-Idrisī also calls it: al-Rami (11th century); al-Karwinit: Rami (13th century). Marco Polo mentions, besides Ferlo, the countries of Bozna, Samara, Lumbri, Fanzor, etc. In the sixteenth century “Sumoltra” is mentioned as a state at war with Lamor. The son of Sultan Muhammad of Samudra (died in 1526) was Sulṭān Aḥmad, who probably was still reigning when Ibn Batṭuta arrived there in 1345. In 1363 the Javanese poetical chronicle Narakaragama mentions: Aru, Taliang, Peruak, Samudra, Lumbi, Batur and Barus, as being all subordinate states to the empire of Madjapahit. In 1416 and 1436 the secretaries of the Chinese ambassador Cheng Ho described Aru, Samudra, Lampol etc., as being Muhammadan countries; according to their records there must have been a Sulṭān Husain at Aru. It may be surmised that the name Sumārā was generalized, and so became the name of the whole island. In 1432 Nicolo de' Conti calls it Taprobane “or in the native tongue Sumatera”. In later periods the Arabic denomination of both Java and Sumatra was Ḥasma; hence the term Java Major and Java Minor in European sources. The more modern native names are: pula pereka (= mervsa, from Sanskrit mārīyā, mortals, mankind), or pula andalās (a well known tree); this name has occasionally been interchanged with the Arabic term Andals. After the Portuguese took Malacca (1511), Sumatra ceased to be a country of commercial importance and its place was taken by Acheh, and that country soon became the most important in North-Sumatra. As regards the conversion of Acheh the following might be noted; the Malay chronicles may on the whole be regarded as historically trustworthy. The most reliable of them mentions as the first king who embraced Islam: Anu Tugghāyat Shāh (1193–1232), the conqueror of Pedro, Samudra etc. During the reign of Sulṭān ‘Alī Rūṣayt Shāh a learned man came from Mecca to Acheh, and taught metaphysics there. But the introduction of Islām into Acheh was certainly not carried out by Arab preachers. It is most probable that Arab traders carried Islām to Sumārā in the early centuries of the Hijrī. In the 2nd century B.C. the trade with Ceylon seems to have been wholly in their hands; in the 7th century Arab traders were to be found in great numbers in China. So it is quite possible that they also established commercial settlements on some of the islands on the W-coast of Sumārā. Learned men, however, must also have come to the Archipelago from the South of India, as may be assumed from certain peculiarities of dogma and the Šiftām now prevailing in Muhammadan parts of Sumārā. The South-Indian origin of the Indonesian form of Islām reveals itself in many ways, and theological, literary and linguistic evidence is abundantly available; as examples of the latter class may be added the name for “theologist” (zahīr), which is the South-Indian term labagam, merchant, and hīyarī = Sanskrit yugadar = merchant. There cannot possibly have been any introduction of Islām by compulsion, and the gradual spread of Islām through the eastern islands must have been the result of the settlement of Muhammadan traders, especially Gujaratis, their intermarriage with native Malay women, the improvement of the status of the natives by their adoption of the religion of the influential strangers, in short a process of peaceful penetration. But from the very beginning of its influence, Islām adapted itself to the native creed, i.e. to the indigenous animism, and made large concessions to Hinduism as is clearly shown.
by the remarkable fact that the Sanskrit words for religion (agama), Muhammadan fasts (jumada = wajadu), teacher (guru), disciple (sishya = sitya) are still in use. In the period of its greatest power (xvith and xvith century) Acheh was the most important Muhammadan state in Sumatra, and made its influence felt by the heathen inhabitants of the south; so it is probable that proselytising by means of warfare was sometimes carried on among the Batakas and other heathen peoples, but without any permanent success. It is a curious fact that the Batakas, who for centuries had offered obdurate resistance to the entrance of Islam into their midst, have in the xixth and xxth century responded with enthusiasm to the efforts made for their conversion. Especially the Karo, and still more the Mandeling-Batakas are fervent Muhammadans. The efforts of the Malay subordinate officials of the Dutch Government, the desire to attain the same social level as the educated clerks and tax-collectors, and further the impulse given to Muslim propaganda by the establishment of Christian missions among the Batakas, have all paved the way for Islam. On the island of Nias the same process is to be observed; there, just as in the Batak-land, heathendom is breaking down before the two higher religions, Islam and Christianity. Of the introduction of Islam in the Minangkabau country (W. Sumatra), in early times a Hindu kingdom, there are no historical records. It may be supposed that the new religion made its way along the commercial routes from Padri (Pidie) to Priaman and other harbours, and came up from the coast to the uplands in the interior. It is probable, judging from some scantly data, that Islam did not come into the Minangkabau country before the middle of the xvith century. No reliance can be placed upon the current tradition that Shahil Ibrahim, a man of Minangkabau, who had learnt the tenets of Islam in Java, introduced them into his own country on his return via Priaman and Tiku, but this may be regarded as an indication of the route along which Islam made its way into this part of the island. In the Minangkabau country, with its strong matrilineal form of society and its primitive Malay law of inheritance the success of Islam for a long time hung in the balance, and open conflicts inevitably broke out in the struggle against these unorthodox survivals. The most serious of these was the long, bloody warfare of the Padris', so called after the name Padari or Pidari, i.e. men from Pedir in Acheh (not from Port. padre, as was formerly supposed), who tried, in the middle of the xixth century to introduce, by violent means, the orthodoxy of Islam into their native country. But their efforts were resisted by the greater part of the population and further the Padri-sect involved the Dutch government in a fierce and long war, which ended by their being defeated after the fall of their last stronghold Bondjo in 1839. A great many Minangkabau men migrated to the Straits-Settlements, their old place of refuge. At the present time, the people of Acheh and Minangkabau are the most zealous followers of the Prophet, the former being rigidly orthodox, having discarded the numerous Shi' and mystical elements that were formerly mixed up with their creed; the latter clinging persistently to their old national social laws, and only slowly accepting the orthodox dogmas. In Palembang, once the classical Malay country under Hindu rule, Islam spread at a comparatively late period, but now it is completely Islamised, like the adjacent country and sultanate Siak on the East coast. The southern part of Sumatra, the Lampong-districts, seem to have been Islamised by preachers and influential persons from Banten (W. Java), which country is now the most zealous province in the almost entirely Islamised island of Java. The conversion of the less-civilised tribes, the Luhu and Kubu, is only a question of time; the process of peaceable penetration has been begun, and is slowly but inevitably going on.


**SUMBAWA**, an island in the Malay archipelago, belonging to the Little Sunda group and lying east of Timor. The coast line, especially on the north, is very irregular; the largest bay is that of Saleh which runs deep into the country and almost divides the island into two halves. This division is of more than purely geographical significance. The inhabitants of the two parts differ in many respects in manners and customs and the physical type is not exactly the same in both. The population of the western part is distinguished by its lighter complexion and higher stature. As regards administration, the island belongs to the residency of "Timor en Onderhorigheden" and politically it consists of four districts, ruled by native princes under the suzerainty of the government of the Dutch East Indies; the western half of the island forms the sultanate of Sumbawa, on the eastern side are the two very small kingdoms of Domo and Sanggar, and in the extreme east the sultanate of Bima. The island is very mountainous and there are no rivers large enough to be navigable at all seasons. The soil is not infertile and the population lives mainly by agriculture and cattle-rearing; the collection of wheat products is also of some importance. The exports include rice, horses, buffaloes and wax. The greater part of the native population (many foreigners have settled on the coast; Macassars, Buginese, Salierese and Aralis) belongs to the so-called Young Malayas and is considerably mixed with Buginese and Macassars. At the same time an older stratum is clearly discernible to which the people of the interior of W. Sumbawa and some tribes in the east belong and from the anthropological point of view shows a great similarity to the Sasakans of Lombok. The Don Donggo (i.e. "hill-men") on the west coast of Bima Bay may be considered the purest representatives of this group; they live severely isolated from their neighbours and are on a much lower level of civilisation. The Don Donggo and the Bimeans do not intermarry. While almost all the rest of the population of Sumbawa has adopted Islam and even observes the prescription of the religion with comparative piousness, the Don Donggo are still pagan and in their paganism as well as in
their social institutions traces of an original totemism have with great probability been recognised. Bimanese society is remarkable for a sharp division of the people into 26 or (including the nobility) 27 classes (durs), which may roughly be described as gilds. These durs are under the control of two state officials (bumi) and their functions and other obligations to the state are definitely laid down. Very little is certainly known about the earlier history. Some antiquities found on the island suggest Hindu influence at some time; in the later Hindu period Sumbawa belonged to the Javanese kingdom of Majapathis; in 1357 Dempo was conquered by Majapathis. At the beginning of the eighteenth century when the first intercourse of the Dutch with Bima began, the various Sumbawan kingdoms were under Gowa (Macassar); in the second half of the same century they were forced to recognise the suzerainty of the Dutch East India Co. According to a Bimanese court chronicle (the older parts of which are only of mythological interest) there have so far been 50 rulers of Bima and the 38th of these, Aid Abd al-Kahit, who lived about 1640, was the first Muslim sultan.


SUNAN. [See SUNNA.]

SUNBULA, the ear (of corn), the usual name for the constellation of the Virgin al-'Adiyy from its most brilliant star, the ear of corn in the hand of the Virgin which is still called Spica. According to al-Karwain, the constellation consists of 26 stars with a further six lying outside the figure. The head of the Virgin lies south of al-Sarf (beta Leonis); the feet are pointed towards the two pans of the Scales. The brightest star is also called either Sunbula or al-Simük al-'asel, the unmarked Simuk, in contrast to al-Simük al-rumah, Simuk with the lance (Amuch on the star-maps).


SUNBULIYA, a branch of the Khalilat Order, named after Sunbul Sinan al-Din Yusauf, whose birth-place is variously given as Boulou and Marsuan. His death-date is given in the Kamaal al-Alâ' as 936 (1529/1530); according however to al-Shâfî'î al-Nu'mâniya (transl. Rescher, 1927, p. 224, 225) he died before 929 (1525/1523); and this author, who was a contemporary, mentions him among the Shaikhis of the reign of Bayârî II (died 918 = 1512), wherein he is followed by the author of the Talâm al-Tawârikh (Constantinople 1279, ii, 955), who is half a century later. On the other hand 'Hâdîddi Khâlîfah, who passed Sunbul Sinan b. Yusauf, who died 898 (1581), in a treatise in defence of Sufi Dancing, and a Chain of Khalilat Shaikhis; the former work was dedicated to Sulaimân I (whose reign began 926 = 1520), and stated that Salim I had asked for a fatwa on this subject, merely for the purpose of confirming his prejudice against the practice. It is probable that 'Hâdîddi Khalîfa is mistaken in the date. From the brief biography of him which is almost identical in the Shâfî'î and the Talâm, it appears that after being attached to the Mulla 'Adilzâde (died 908 = 1502/1503) he entered the service of Celebi Khalîfa (Rescher, p. 175; wrongly given as Sunbul's successor in Mîvat al-Ma'âzî, quoted by A. J. Rose, Brown's Derwishes, 1927, p. 455), whose discipline involved severe exercises; after submitting to these he received permission to enrol as a disciple. He spent some time in Egypt, where he instructed aspirants, and presently came to Constantinople, where he was lodged in the sâhiya of Mufti Pasha, and occupied himself with training disciples. The Talâm adds that his tomb is in that sâhiya.

His successor there was Muzhli al-Din Marks al-Lâdîkî (Rescher, p. 332), who died 959 (1552). Another disciple, Ya'qûb al-Kimrzyînî, who had some doubts about the successor's qualifications, was convinced by a dream, wherein the Prophet with the Companions etc. appeared attending one of Markas's sermons. The Prophet's turban was green and black; the former indicating the completion of the Law, the latter that of the Path (Pechew's History, Constantinople 1283, i, 465).

Reference has already been made to the severity of the exercises practised and enjoined by Sunbul Sinan; Pechew (loc. cit.) mentions that Ya'qûb al-Kimrzyînî had to break his fast once only in three days, and drink water once in six months (!). He appears, as has been seen, to have favoured dancing or whirling as a religious exercise. Deport and Coppolani (Confrérie, p. 375) state that the Sunbulya, while maintaining Khalilawan principles, have adopted practices belonging to the Rifa'iya and Sa'diya. Their work contains a list of Sunbulyiyya in or about Constantinople, fifteen in number; a similar list is given by J. P. Brown, The Derwishes, 1868, p. 316, with their respective days of service; it is rearranged in H. A. Rose's edition of the work (1927, p. 480). The order would seem to be confined to that city.

(S. D. MARGOLIOUTH)

SUNBULZADE WEHBI, a Turkish poet and scholar of the latter half of the eighteenth century.

Meşmed b. Râhîb b. Meşmed Efendi Wehbi was born in Marash in the province of Antioch; he belonged to the prominent local family of Sunbulzade, which had already produced several
mufit; including the grandfather of our poet, Mehmed, mufit in Ma'arit and author of several works including the Şerif al-Abhid al-mu'mannah bi-Tawfiq il-tahle, Naml al-full and Khatib al-Tanzihâ. His father Râshid also was a learned man and collaborated in Aleppo with the poet Sâyiîl Wehbi. As one of the latter's sons died at the same time as a son, our poet, was born to Râshid, the infant received the poetical name of the father of the dead child; Wehbi. In his native town Sunbulûzâde was mûrûd of Ghalaîlî Tîfî (? Efenđi) and received the ijtâhîd from him. He then went to Stambûl and lived there by writing chronograms and other verses d'occasion, but later became kâfiî through the influence of distinguished patrons. He then entered upon the career of a Hejîjî and was particularly entrusted with the drawing up of the more important state documents, in which he so distinguished himself that Sulîmân Ma'âfîî III had his attention called to him and bestowed honours upon him. In 1190 (1776) at the beginning of the reign of the next Sulîmân 'Abîl-Hâmîd I he was sent as ambassador to Işfâhân to Karâm Khân. In the course of his mission a dispute broke out between him and 'Omar Pâsha, governor of Bagdad; Sunbulûzâde complained in Stambûl of the difficulties the governor had put in his way; 'Omar Pâsha on the other hand accused him of high treason and of incurring contempt in Persia. Sunbulûzâde was condemned to death in Stambûl and a courier with the order for his execution sent to meet him, but he was warned in time and kept in concealment in Scutari. 'Omar Pâsha soon fell into disgrace and Sunbulûzâde's innocence was established. Sunbulûzâde then won complete forgiveness from the Sultan by the "Resonant" (fântûnî) kashådî. In it he describes, after an extravagant eulogy of the Sulîmân, his Persian journey and continually emphasises the superiority of the Turkish court and of all things Turkish over those Persian.

On his return Sunbulûzâde again became a kâfiî and went in this capacity to Eski Zagra in Eastern Rumelia. Here his kâfiîdâh was the poet Şirîrî [q.v.]. The two poets became close friends and remained always intimate but they continually used to attack one another in good-humoured but ribâhî lampoons, which with their grotesque reproaches and their continued efforts to outdo one another are very amusing. The Arabic poems of Dûarîj and Farazâd have been suggested for comparison. Their joint activity in Eski Zagra came to a sudden end, however, when they were both imprisoned because they had aroused the indignation of the populace by their dissolute conduct.

Later we find Sunbulûzâde again as a kâfiî on the island of Rhodes. In his period of office there took place in Rhodes the execution of the unhappy Krim Khân Shâhîn Girîî who had been betrayed by Russia to Turkey. Sunbulûzâde felt he had to celebrate this event in a kashådî (called Tûyûrî, the "Volunt", because there is much talk of birds in it); the glorious Stambul Sulîmân is again extravagantly praised in it, the unfortunate victim abused; the whole is little suited to place our poet in an enviable light.

Sulîmân Sulîm III was keenly interested in literature and helped poets in every way. Sunbulûzâde dedicated his Divân to him and received rich rewards and honours. The Divân contains, besides ghazals and quatrains, a large number of short occasional poems, especially riddles and chronograms. Sunbulûzâde spent the rest of his life in Stambûl, versifying and merrymaking. He suffered much from illness in his last years, gout, failing sight, perhaps mental derangement, and he is said to have been bedridden for seven years. He died on 14th Rabi' I, 1224 (April 28, 1809) aged over 90. His tomb is in Topçulûdar before the Adrianople Gate.

Sunbulûzâde wrote several works in addition to those already mentioned: the Lüftîsî, an imitation of Şâmî's Khârişi, a rhymed Abhidî book for his son Lutfûlâh, of advice, about his studies in particular. The poem is of interest for social history but its literary value is slight. Sunbulûzâde himself boasts that he wrote it within a week and in a fever besides. It was written in 1205 (1790) and could not have long outlived the son as he died of the plague five years later.

A Hikayet-nâme, entitled Şerif-i Esgols, was probably the most congenial to the poet of all his poems. It is a kind of sumûntûpa between a debaucher of women and pederast who then ask the Şâhi, of Love for his judgment. The latter shows how little either knew of pure absolute love, and the whole concludes with the praises of the love of God.

The next two poems are primarily an educational effort and as they are still used in Turkey as schoolbooks, they give the modern Turks an acquaintance with Sunbulûzâde. The Thebraî is a rhymed Turkish vocabulary, written in 1107 (1735) for his son, in imitation of the similar work of Şâhidî (xvîth century). It is excellent for the time and a fruit of Sunbulûzâde's Persian journey. It contains 38 fi'âsî in different metres, the last of which is a double rhymed manmanûn on the îsâîsî durchûm. The Turkish counterpart to it is the Nishââ written in 1214 (1799). There are commentaries on both, notably that of Hayātî Efenджi, which also gives valuable details of Sunbulûzâde's life.

There are other educational works by Sunbulûzâde which are now more or less forgotten; thus in 1184 (1770) he made a translation of a part of the îsâî of Dhûnîn of Aîm which exists in MS. in the Evîd Efenджi Library in Stambul.

The Ottoman critics agree that while Sunbulûzâde was a master of the language with few rivals, he is not really to be called a great poet. He was primarily a lover of life, then a man of learning and next a writer of occasional verse and a very clever one. His choice of material is as characteristic as his technique. The latter is based on a thorough knowledge of prosody and not on poetical feeling. Sunbulûzâde can treat poetically the most banal subject and a sentimental and graceful phrase seems to pour forth from him. He is therefore always pleasing in spite of a lack of real poetic talent. He never has become really popular; Ziyâ Pâsha compares his poems to wild roses without scent. For the history of culture his exact knowledge of Persia acquired in the country itself, is of importance, and it is very interesting to see his impression made by Persia of that day on a highly cultivated Turk. References to Persia are exceedingly frequent in all his works.

Bibliography: Şîmîn, Kâmîn al-Afâm, p. 4707; Mu'allîm Nâfîlî, Eâmî, p. 336; Peqîn, Târîh, p. 444; Ziyâ Pâsha, Khâribî, Introduction, p. 17; Mehmed Abûîlîsî, Nâmîlî, iv. 618; Brunâlî Tâhir, Onâmîlî Mûlî, Âgî, ii. 236 49; Shâhlî Dîn Salâmî,
SUNBULZADE WEHBI — SUNNA

eighth generation from Sa'di-Khan who lived in the time of the latter Safawids. In 1213 (1798) Ali Himmat Khan and his brother Hâdî Khan (of the Nâzâkî tribe) supported the pretender Sulaimân Khan and were executed by Fath 'Ali Shah (H. J. Bridges, History of the Kajars, London 1833, p. 58—59, 67). The Kulyû'î speak a Kurd dialect resembling Kirmandâhi and are suspected of Akhâ Hašî (= 'Ali-ûlâhi, q. v.) tendencies.

(S. MÖSKÝ)

SUNNA (n.), custom, us and wont, statute. The word is used in many connections. Here only the following will be dealt with. In the Kur'ân 'sunna usually occurs in two connections: sunnat 'al-a'ammanāt, "the sunna of those of old" (vii. 39; xv. 13; xviii. 53; xxxv. 41) and sunnat Allâh, "the sunna of Allâh" (xvii. 79; xxxii. 62; xxxv. 42; xviii. 23). The two expressions are synonymous in so far as they refer to Allâh's punishment of earlier generations, who met the preaching of prophets sent to them with unbelief or scorn. The expressions are therefore found mainly in the Meccan sūras of which the main subjects are stories of the Prophets. In Sûra, iii. 131, the plural sunn occurs meaning judgments. Sunnat Allâh is found in Sûra, xxxiii. 38, where it means the privileges which Allâh granted to earlier prophets.

In Hadîth by sunna is usually understood Muhammad's sunna; Allâh is connected with the community by his Book and Muhammad by his sunna (cf. Muslim, Inâm, trad. 246: "Allâh's book and your Prophet's sunna").

According to the usual explanation Muhammad's sunna comprises his deeds, utterances and his unspoken approval (kâmû, kâmû, tabûr). Observance of the sunna might in a way be called: "Imitatio Muhammadis".

In itself however the word is colourless. One speaks of good and bad sunnâ's, e. g. of the bad sunnâ of the Kûfîn (Bukhârî, Dîwâl, bâth 9). Muhammad prophesies: "Verily ye shall imitate the sunna of those who were before you, inch for inch, ell for ell, span for span; if they were to crawl into a lizard's hole, you should follow after them" (Ahmad b. Hanbal, Munâm, ii. 347).

The contrast between good and bad sunnas finds its classical expression in the following hadîth: "He who institutes a fair sunna in Islam, so that it is practised after his death, to him a reward shall be given equal to that of all who have practised it, without anything being deducted from their rewarid. But he who institutes a bad sunna in Islam, so that it is practised after his death, against him a sin shall be debited, like that of all who have practised it without anything being subtracted from their sins" (Muslim, 'Imâm, trad. 15).

Al-Sunnâ has however become the characteristic term for the theory and practice of the catholic Muhammadan community, Abl Al-Sunnâ wa'l-Dîmâr, the Sunna. "The people of the sunna and of the community", are those who refrain from deviating from dogma and practice. The expression is particularly used in this sense in opposition to Shî'a (q. v.); the division of Islam into Sunna and Shî'a is generally known in the west. Great stress is therefore put upon following Muhammad's sunna.

"He who tires of my sunna, does not belong to me!" (Bukhârî, Nikâh, bâth 1). The prescribed jâ'lat, Friday and Ramaḍân are an atonement for the period till the next jâ'lat, the next Friday and
the next Ramadan, except in the case of polytheism, breach of agreement and neglect of the sunna, ... and neglect of the sunna is secession from the community" (Djama'a; Ahmad b. Hanbal, ii. 229). Among the six categories of those who are cursed by Allah, Muhammad and all the prophets are those who have abandoned Muhammad’s sunna (Tirmidhi, ḥadîth, bāb 17). Knowledge of the sunna is one of the criteria in deciding who will act as imam at the gālib (Tirmidhi, ḥadîth, bāb 60; Nasā’i, ḥadîth, bāb 3).

The companions are the propagators of the sunna (Muslim, ḥadîth, trad. 80); the word is occasionally referred to the example of the companions and the oldest generations of Islam; in Bukhārī, Alkānī, bāb 43, the sunna of Allah, his prophet and the two khallūf is mentioned; in Tirmidhi, ḥadîth, bāb 16, there is a reference to the sunna of Muhammad and the rightly guided caliphs.

The word thus acquires the meaning of standard; it is recorded that Muhammad said when drawing up such prescriptions: “at discretion lest any sunna (burdened to the community) arise” (Bukhārī, Tafsīr, bāb 35).

The opposite of sunna in the sense of the theory or practice consecrated by Muhammad’s example or the tradition of the community is bāw’ (q.v.) (cf. e.g. Tirmidhi, ḥadîth, bāb 16).

Muhammad’s sunna in the sense of his words, actions and silent approval is fixed orally and in writing in the ḥadīth (q.v.). In theory the conceptions of sunna and ḥadīth are separate but in practice they often coincide, which may be due to the fact that some of the collections of ḥadīth have the title Sunan (e.g. the collections of Abī Ḍa’ūd, Ibn Māja and al-Nasā’ī).

If we are to understand the theoretical and practical significance of the sunna in Islam we must remember that while the Kur’an was a source from which a considerable part of the practice was deduced, on the other hand Muhammad had answered many questions, not by revelation but by decision from cases of a case and that the words and deeds of the Prophet even in his lifetime were recognised as a “fine example” and as a result of this recognition the sunna of the Prophet was drawn up and fixed in writing, although not in a form equally canonical with the Kur’an. The ḥadīth itself illuminates this side of Muhammad’s sunna in traditions: People came to the Prophet and asked him: “Send us men to teach us the Kur’an and Sunna” (Muslim, ḥadîth, trad. 147). “The faith has settled in the depths of the hearts of men. They have thus learned Kur’an and Sunna” (Bukhārī, ḥadīth, bāb 35). Omar b. al-Khaṭṭāb said: “People will come to dispute with you over doubtful points in the Kur’an. And them with the sunna, for the people of the Sunna are best able to decide about the Kur’an” (Darʾim, Introductio, bāb 16).

In the Kur’an itself references to the importance of Muhammad’s sunna are found, like the command to believe in Allah and Muhammad (Ṣāra vii. 158; ivxiv. 8) and Ibrāhīm’s prayer, when he founded the temple at Mecca: “O Lord send to them a prophet from midst, to read out to them thy verses and to teach them the book and wisdom and to purify them” (Ṣāra ii. 123 and similar passages).

It is clear then that in the system of Islam the Sunna became a standard of conduct along-
about your innovations" (Dürri, Introductio, b. 16). Balḫārī has significantly given a chapter of his Šāhā'ī the title: "On the observance of Kur'ān and Sunna." This attitude is however abandoned by the four muḥaddithīn: Ismā'īl and Ḥāfiz have obtained their place among the muqta'īna. The four roots were never recognised by the Kātibīs and Waḥhabīs, in addition to the Shī'īs. With the term Sunna in the theory of the Uṣūl must not be confused the second of the five categories, under which actions are considered from the legal point of view and which is also called Sunna. On this see the article Sunnā'.


(A. J. Wensinck)

SUNNITES. [See Sunna.]

ṢŪR (Tyre), the island city of Phoenicia. From the Amarna period it was one of the richest commercial centres of the Syrian coast and gradually developed into a powerful rival of the adjoining Sidon [q. v.] for dominion over the Phoenician colonies in the west. Its conquest and destruction by Alexander the Great only deprived the flourishing metropolis of its importance for a brief period; but it had one permanent important result; namely, that the island city was henceforth connected with the mainland by the Alexander dam, which was gradually widened into an isthmus by the material swept up by the southwestern coast currents; from very early times Palaityros (Assyr. Uqān) had lain opposite the island town on the mainland. Under the Roman empire Tyre was the secular and ecclesiastical capital of the eparchy Panayia Pafīdēs.

After the occupation of Damascus, Shuraḥbīl b. Ḥusayn captured Ṣūr and Ṣafīāriyā among other towns of the region (al-Baladhūrī, ed. de Goeje, i. 116; Caezari, Annotati dell' Istoria, tifi, § 3, ii. 141; 107). According to Psamites-Waḥrid (Faḥīš al-Šuṣhīx, Caire, 1278, ii. 56 sqq.), ʿĀkka was taken through the treachery of the former commander of Ḥabbāl, ʿAbdallāh b. Ṭūnṭūn. Al-Waḥrid and the Tyrian Ḥishām b. al-Lāith say that Muʿtawiya restored ʿĀkka and Ṣūr at the time of his expedition against Cyprus (27) and in 42 transplanted Persian colonists from Ba nastāk, Šīms and Anān to the cities of al-Uṣūl, namely ʿĀkka, etc. (al-Baladhūrī, op. cit., p. 117). The authorities of the above mentioned Tyrian said: "When we settled in Ṣūr and the cities of the coast there were Arab troops there and still many Greeks; later, people came from other regions and settled alongside of us just as happened in all the other cities of the coast of Syria." In 49 the Greek fleet raided the Syrian coast-towns which had not yet arsenals (Baladhūrī, op. cit.; Mahbub of Manbijī, Kitāb al-Uṣūl, ed. A. Yassī, in PatroL Orient., xii. 492). Muʿtawiya thereupon built dockyards in ʿĀkka for the district of al-Uṣūl. ʿAbd al-Malik b. Marwān restored ʿĀkka, Kaṣāḥ, and the suburbs of ʿĀkka, which had again fallen into ruins (al-Baladhūrī, op. cit., p. 117, 113). When at a later date ʿAbd al-Malik wished to purchase mills and store-houses from one of the descendants of Abī Muʿāṣa, and the latter refused to sell them, he had the arsenal removed to ʿĀkka and built magazines and docks there (al-Baladhūrī, p. 117). According to al-Waṣīkī also, ʿĀkka was under the Marsūmīs as a naval station and remained one henceforth (al-Baladhūrī, p. 118; Ibn Dījāfīr, ed. Wright, p. 305). The Caliph al-Muʿawwakīl later (247/248 A.H.) distributed the fleet and naval forces among all the Syrian coast-towns.

The Arab geographers describe ʿĀkka as a city on the sea-coast (al-sumāqīl) of al-Uṣūl (the Jordan province) which was strongly fortified and thickly populated and had fertile country round it. The island city was only accessible from the mainland through a gate to which a bridge led, and was fortified by walls which rose straight out of the sea, almost all the way round it; as in ancient times, a second part of the city, opposite it on the mainland, the bridge which is mentioned by al-Muqaddasī is also, described by al-Khwārizmī (ed. Wüstefeld, ii. 366, l. 5 from below, under Tūlāṭīla) as the largest arch in the world (confusion with the Sandāq bridge?). The ancient aqueduct which led from ʿSūnī (now Kās al-Aʿīn or al-Rāḏīyīs) via Telt al-Muṣālīk to the city still provided it with water in the middle ages (al-Muqaddasī, E.G.A., ii. 163; Nāṣīrī Khurāwar, ed. Schefer, p. 11). Nāṣīrī Khurāwar, who visited ʿĀkka in 1047 mentions the five to six storied houses there and a richly decorated Masjīd at the city-gate; the inhabitants were then for the most part ʿShīʿa; only the kāzī was Sunni. In the Crusading period al-Idrīsī (1154 A. d.) records the flourishing glass industry, the pottery and the weaving of valuable stuffs in ʿĀkka. Kūdāma mentions the harves of the town.

From the Tūlāṭīla period, Syria was almost continuously under Egyptian suzerainty, which became still more firmly established under the Ṭūmīmīs. The Tyrians rose against the Caliph al-Hākim in 388 (998) under a peasant named ʿAlīkā (ʿUṣgī) at the same time as al-Ramīs rebelled and the caliph of Fāmīsīs was besieged by the Byzantine General Ducas. The governor of Syria, Djašir b. Muḥammad b. Sāmīn, sent the Hamdīnī Husain b. ʿAbd Allī Ṣaḥir al-Dawla and the enuch Fātik (var. Fāţīk) al-Barrās against the city. When they attacked ʿĀkka by land and water, ʿAlīkā appealed for help to the Byzantine emperor. The latter sent several ships but these were completely defeated in a naval battle. The town, the inhabitants of which thereupon lost all heart for a stubborn resistance, was taken and sacked, its inhabitants massacred and ʿAlīkā tortured and executed in Egypt. But the rising continued; the vizier Badr al-Djīmāfī in 1089 A. D. was forced to take ʿĀkka, ʿAlīkā and Djašir from the Sandāq Sulṭān Tutūs and his successor al-Aṣfāl Shishānīs in 490 (1097/1098) punished a new rising with a terrible massacre, in which even the governor of the city
was executed. This took place in the same year as the Crusaders left Constantinople. Coins were struck in Şūr in the name of the Caliph al-Musta‘īl (1094—1101).

Although the city at first (1100—1101) sought to win Baldwin’s good graces by gifts, it soon (1103) joined in the defence of Akkā and Taḥrūbulus. By arrangement with Tughtakin the amir ‘Izz al-Mulk of Şūr in 500 (1106—1107) attacked the Crusader’s stronghold at Tibnin (Toron), plundered a suburb and massacred the inhabitants, but fled quickly away when Baldwin advanced on Şūr from Taḥbīrya. The king appeared next year before its walls, built a fort on Tell al-Ma‘ṣaḥṭa and besieged the city for a month; its walls had to purchase his withdrawal by a payment of 7,000 dinars.

A week after the fall of Taḥrūbulus, the Egyptian fleet with soldiers, money and supplies for a year appeared before this city, but on hearing that the fortress had been taken by the Franks, they returned to Şūr and the supplies and soldiers were distributed between Şūr, Sa‘īdā (Sidon) and Ba‘rīṭā.

Baldwin laid siege to Şūr once more on the 25th or 27th Djamā‘ā (November 27 or 29, 1111); he built two wooden towers to ells high, put 1,000 soldiers in each and had them pushed up to the walls of the city. On the appeal of the Tyrants, Tughtakin came from Damascus to Bā‘rīṭā and sent reinforcements from there, who cut off the Franks’ supplies while he himself marched on Sa‘īdā. Baldwin had already stormed two walls when the governor of Şūr, ‘Izz al-Mulk al-A‘ūzī held a council of war in which a shi‘ī, who had taken part in the defence of Taḥrūbulus offered to destroy the towers of the Franks. He actually succeeded in setting both on fire. The Franks gained no success worth mentioning up to the spring of 1112. In the meanwhile Tughtakin, after taking the fortress of al-Djihāth in the Damascene came up with 20,000 men and cut supplies from the Franks. When they received their supplies by sea, he laid waste the country round Sa‘īdā. On the 10th Shawwāl (April 21) Baldwin raised the siege and retired to Akkā. The people of Şūr welcomed Tughtakin with rich gifts and restored the injured walls and ditches of their town. On his departure Tughtakin handed over Şūr to the Caliph again; but in the very next year the people and their governor ‘Izz al-Mulk Anushkin al-Adjlî, fearing another attack from the Franks, decided to hand over the city to him again. Tughtakin at their request sent them the amir Mas‘ūd with forces for its defence; but the caliph continued to be prayed for in the mosques and coins were still struck in his name.

The vizier al-Ma‘ṣūm, al-Adjlî’s successor, in 516 (1122/1123) sent a well equipped fleet of 40 galleys under Mas‘ūd b. Sallār to Şūr; when the commander Mas‘ūd came on board to greet them he was put in chains and brought to Egypt. There however he was shown great honour and sent to Damascus, where diplomatic apologies were offered and the incident explained away; Tughtakin replied courteously and promised his further assistance in the defence against the common enemy.

The Franks however saw in the removal of the valiant Mas‘ūd a good omen and prepared for a further siege with renewed vigour. The Egyptian commander recognised the futility of the garrison and the insufficiency of the city’s supplies and appealed for help to the Caliph. Al-Amīr replied that he would put the defence in the hands of Zahir al-Din (Tughtakin). The latter thereupon occupied the city again and put it in a satisfactory condition for defence. In the month of Kā‘bā’ (April 1124) the second siege of Şūr began. Venetian ships blockaded the harbour, while on land the armed troops attacked the walls with a siege-tower. Damascus troops distinguished themselves by particularly bravery in the defence. The besiegers sent a portion of their army against Tughtakin while the Venetians were to ward off the Egyptian fleet. After various vicissitudes the Tyrants decided, after famine had broken out in the city, to surrender under favourable conditions. After Tughtakin had conducted negotiations for surrender with the Frank commanders, they were allowed to leave the city with their possessions or to remain there on paying ransom. On 23th (or 25th) Djamā‘ā (July 9 or 14, 1124), the inhabitants marched out of the city between the troops of Tughtakin and the Frankish army; they were divided partly in Damascus and partly in Ghaza. After this surrender, which marked the zenith of the power of the Crusaders in Syria, Tyre remained till 1127 in the hands of the Franks. Ibn al-Adjlî laments its fall as a great misfortune for the Muslim world, as it was one of the finest and strongest of cities, and adds: “Let us hope that God the Almighty will restore it to the rule of Islam”.

Shams al-Mulk (Blīr) of Damascus in 528 (1133/1134) after a raid of the Franks into the Hawrān laid waste the region of Taḥbīrya, Şūr and the rest of the coast-lands and returned via al-Sha‘rā with a great booty. An Egyptian fleet appeared in 550 (1155/1156) in the harbour of Şūr, sank ships which belonged to Christian pilgrims and others, and returned with numerous prisoners and rich plunder. In 552 (1157) Şūr, Sa‘īdā, Ba‘rīṭā, Taḥrūbulus and other towns suffered from an earthquake.

From the Crusading period we have the descriptions of the city by Idrīsī and Ibn Djubair. The former admires the glassworks and potteries and the manufacture of an extraordinarily finely woven cloth. Ibn Djubair, who spent 11 days in Şūr gives a full description of the town and of a ceremonial procession that took place during his visit. On the land side the city had 3—4 successive gates. The entrance from the sea was through two high towers, between which one entered a harbour (the old “Sidonian”), the finest of all the harbours of the coast-cities. On three sides the walls surrounded the harbour, on the fourth a wall with an entrance through an arch below which the ships anchored. This inner harbour could be shut off by a huge chain which was stretched between the two towers.

Sha‘lār al-Dīn after the capture of Jerusalem and most of the coast-lands proceeded to besiege Şūr and pitched his camp before the city (on 5th; according to others, on the 9th) Ramaḍān 535 = Nov. 3 or 12, 1187). He had at first to wait for the impediments of the army and summoned his son Malik al-Zāhir from Hijāz and his brother Malik al-Adīl from Jerusalem to his side; his second son al-Adjlī and his nephew Taṣṭ al-Dīn were with him. As soon as the siege artillery arrived, they began to bombard the town from movable towers with catapults etc. Ten ships
brought from 'Akka blackedad the harbour; but they were surprised by the Frankish fleet and some destroyed, some sunk. An attack on the walls was repulsed. A council of war summoned by Salâh al-Dîn decided, on account of the approach of winter, to raise the siege till next year. On the 26th Dhu'l-Ka'da 584 (= Jan. 3, 1188), according to Muhammad b. Na'dîr, Ibîn al-'Atrî gives the last day of Shawâl as Jan. 10, 1188, Salâh al-Dîn began to withdraw his army. Hardly was the city freed from its besiegers than a fight for its possession broke out between king Guy de Lusignan who had just returned from captivity and its valiant defender Conrad of Montferrat.

The failure of the siege of this strong seaport marked a reverse in Salâh al-Dîn's fortunes. With Shâfiî Arkûn (Belfort) it was the only fortress of Syria to remain in the hands of the Franks. In the harbour of Tyre assembled the powerful forces for the Third Crusade; into it poured the garrisons of the towns taken by Salâh al-Dîn whom he always chivalrously released; from it the siege of 'Akka was opened, which completely distorted the Salâtîn's attention from Shir. On the 13th Rabi'll-awwal 588 (April 29, 1192) the Marquis Conrad who lived in Tyre as titular king of Jerusalem was murdered by Isma'il. His successor Henri de Champagne concluded the peace of Ramla with Salâh al-Dîn (Sept. 1192) by which the coast from Jaffa to Tyre was left to the Franks.

When the garrison of Tibnîn undertook a campaign against Shir and laid waste the surrounding country, the Crusaders began to besiege this fortress on 1 Safar 594 (= Dec. 13, 1197). On the news of the approach of a large army under al-Malik al-Adîl they retired without achieving anything. In Shi'bân 597 (May-June, 1201) Shir was visited by an earthquake, and in 603 (1203/1204) by another in which the walls of the fortress collapsed. By the peace between Frederick II and al-Kâmil of Egypt (1229) Shir, 'Akka, and several coast-towns of Syria were left in the hands of the Christians, in addition to Jerusalem. In the next few decades the power of the Franks was further weakened by the ceaseless fighting between the coast-towns, and the Venetian and Genoese fleets.

The powerful Ballbars in May 1256 and in 1259 attacked Shir, on the second occasion, it is said, in anger at the murder in Shir of a merchant, whose mother had laid her complaint before him in Khabir al-Lusîq. But he agreed to a treaty in 669 (1270/1271) with the prince of the city by which ten districts of Tyrian land were allotted to the latter, 5 to the Caliph to be chosen by him while the rest were to be jointly administered. In August 1285, Margaret of Tyre purchased from Salâh al-Dîn a ten years' peace by paying him half her revenues and promising not to restore the defences of the city. But after the fall of 'Akka (1291), Shir and the few remaining Frankish towns could no longer hold out. After the taking of Shir, Khalîl had the inhabitants killed or sold into slavery and the city itself was destroyed.

It was still completely in ruins in the time of Abu l-Bâkî (1321), al-Kâmilî (1400) and Khalîl al-Zâhirî (c. 1450). Ibn Ba'îshîsî (1555) could only find a few traces of the old walls and harbour. Henceforth Shir was an unimportant place.

The Druze chief Farîh al-Dîn (1595—1634) did not succeed in improving the situation of the town; nor did the Shaikh Zâhir al-Umar of 'Akka and his successor Djezîrî Pâshâ in the second half of the 17th century. An earthquake in 1857 brought further misfortune to Shir. The town has now 6,500 inhabitants (1840: 3,000; 1880: 5000; 1900: 6000) of these about half are Muslims and rather less Roman and Greek Catholics, the remainder Jews.

Sūrā division is divided into two clans, Parangi and Isma'īl, the latter having three subdivisions, Sūr, Lohānī and Mahṣūl. The accession of Buhālī Lodī to the throne of Delhi attracted many Afghāns to India, among them a community of the Sūr subdivision of his own tribe, headed by Ibrahim Khān Sūr, who was first employed in the Ḥūṣūr Fīrtīs and Nārmaul districts. He had four sons, Hasān, Ahmed, Muḥammad, and Ghāzī. Hasan and Muhammad accompanied Djamal Khān to Dzuwānd, where Muhammad remained, while Hasan received the fiefs of Sahaṣārān and Kha- wāṣṣārān Tānda in Bihār. He had four sons, Farīd and Nīṣām by his wife, an Afghan lady, and Sulaymān and Ahmed by a slave girl. Farīd eventually became emperor of India under the title of Shīr Shāh (q.v.). His strength of character and commanding ability suppressed that tendency to internecine strife which he recognized as the besetting sin of the Afghāns and the chief source of their weakness, but after his death there was none to restrain them, and the empire which his valour and ability had won was speedily lost by the dissensions of his successors. He was succeeded by his son Djalāl Khān, who took the title of Isākīn or Salīm Shāh and reigned for nine years (1545—1554), but whose energies were dissipatet in a contest with his elder brother, Adīl Khān, Salīm Shāh’s young son, Fīrtīs, was put to death by his maternal uncle, Mubāriz Khān, son of Shīr Shāh’s younger brother, Nīṣām, and Muḥammad ascended the throne under the title of Muḥammad Shāh ‘Adīl, but was contemptuously nicknamed Adīlī by his own people, and Ḍahādīl (“blind”) by the Hindus. During his feeble reign (1554—1566) his cousins Ibrāhīm, son of Ghāzī Khān Sūr of Hindawān, brother of Hasan Khān and Ahmed, son of Ahmed Khān Sūr, another brother of Hasan, assumed the royal title, and at one time there were three emirs pretending to reign in India: (1) Ibrahim Shāh, who seized Dīhlī and Ḍāgra; (2) Muḥammad Shāh ‘Adīl, who retired to Ḍaṅsīr, and (3) Ahmad Sūr, who assumed the title of Sikandar Shāh in the Pandībāt, drove Ibrahim from Dīhlī and Ḍāgra, and was occupying those districts when Humayūn returned in 1555 and expelled him. He fled into the Siwalīk hills and avowed his adherence to Bengal, where he died. Ibrāhīm Shāh, who had driven from Ḍāgra by Sikandar Shāh, fled to Sambhāl and thence to Kālpī, where he was defeated by Humayūn, the minister of Adīlī, Ibrahim next fled to his father, Ghāzī Khān, then in Bijnīya, and Humayūn besieged him there, but was recalled by ‘Adīlī to repulse Muḥammad Khān Sūr, governor of Bengal, who was marching on Ḍaṅsīr. Ibrāhīm followed him, but was defeated, and again retired to Bijnīya, and thence to Patna, where he attacked Rājā Rāmaṇḍāna, who defeated and captured him, but treated him with great honour, enthroned him, and acknowledged him as his sovereign. ‘Adīlī meanwhile attacked and slew Muḥammad Sūr near Kālpī. The news of Humayūn’s return and of Sikandar’s defeat and flight had now reached Ḍaṅsīr, and was followed by that of Humayūn’s death, on receipt of which ‘Adīlī sent Humayūn with 50,000 horses and 500 elephants to recover Ḍāgra and Dīhlī. He took both cities, for himself, not for his master, but was defeated and slain at Fārsītīs by the army of Akbar, for whom both Dīhlī and Ḍāgra were recovered. ‘Adīlī was defeated and slain by Khān

Khan, son of Muhammad Sūr, who had assumed the title of Bahādur Shāh, Ibrahim Sūr was for some time in Mālwā, and fled thence to Utra, where Sulaymān Kanzāmī treacherously put him to death in 1567.


(T. W. Haig)

Sūra, the name given to the chapters of the Kurān. In the Kurān itself, the word means, in the Meccan as well as the Medine parts, the separate revelations which were revealed to Muhammad from time to time. Thus he challenges his opponents to produce a sûra like his own (li. 21; x. 39) or to bring ten sûras like his of their own devising (xi. 16). As a supercession we have in xxiv. 1: *(this is) a sûra which we have sent down and sanctioned and in it we have revealed clear signs (ayāt)*. The Muḥāfīṣīn, we are told (ix. 65), fear that a sûra may be sent down that will tell them what is in their hearts; cf. ix. 87: *(when a sûra was sent down which commanded them to believe and to fight etc.)*. In ix. 135, 138; xlvi. 22, mention is made of the different effects of a sûra upon believers and unbelievers. As far as contents are concerned the word thus coincided with the word "Kurān" in its original meaning, but in later usage they became separated; Kurān became the name of the collected revelations in book form while sûra was used of the chapters of the revealed book, which consisted originally each of a single revelation but later were formed of the combination of several revelations or fragments.

Where Muhammad got the word is still uncertain in spite of the attempts made to trace its origin. Nieβdeke thinks it is the modern Hebrew ṣīrāh "order, series" but even if this could be explained as "line" it would not take us to the original meaning of the word, and against it is the fact that one sûra, according to xxiv. 1, contained several ayāt. Perhaps the word is in some way connected with Muhammad’s conception of a book in heaven (al-Kutab), the contents of which were revealed to him piecemeal. "Piece, section" or a similar meaning would make good enough sense and would also explain the later usage, but linguistically it cannot be proved, for W. H. Hirschfeld’s support that it is a correction of the Hebrew sefer is not at all probable. Sāra, to mean a thing that falls upon, overcome (e.g. with wine) might possibly yield a meaning like impetus, sudden overwhelming inspiration etc., but sāra and not sûra is the derivative found from it.

The authorised Kurān contains 114 sûras of which the first (al-Fatīhā, q.v.) and the two last are conjurations loosely connected as introduction and conclusion to the rest. This agrees with the fact that these three sûras are said to have been lacking in the Kurān as edited by Ibn Masʿūd. There was a certain amount of freedom at first
in this respect so that Ubarsiy for example had two silents in addition to those usually accepted. The order of the utras also was not definitely fixed, although the same principle of arrangement may be recognised in the different editions. The reader may be referred to the article Kuran on this point, as well as to the names of the uras, their separation in the manuscripts and the letters which are found in the superscriptions to some of them.

Bibliography: Noldeke, Geschichte des Korans, p. 34 sq., 227 sq., 320 sq.; second edition by Schwally, i. 30 sq., ii. 1, 30 sq.; H. Hirschfeld, New Researches into the Composition and Exegesis of the Quran, 1902, p. 2. (F. Buhl)

Sura (a), image, form, shape, e.g. purut al-ard, "the shape of the earth", purut hawwad, "the form of an ass" (Muslim, Sunna, trad. 115)
or face, countenance (see below). Tappatwa are rather pictures. Sura and taqawwara are therefore in the same relation to one another as the Hebrew demet and semim. The Biblical idea according to which man is formed in the image of God in the beginning (Gen. i. 27) has most probably passed into Hadith. It occurs, so far as I am aware, in three passages in classical Hadith; the exegesis is uncertain and in general unwilling to adopt interpretations such as Christian theology has always readily associated with this Biblical passage. In Bukhari, liiti dawâm, bâb 1 (cf. Muslim, Dima, trad. 28) it is said: "Allah created man after (ilâ) his surâ: his length was 60 ells". On this Kaftânân (I. 144) says: the suffix with this refers to Adam; the meaning therefore is: — Allah created Adam according to his i.e. Adam's form, that is perfect and well-proportioned" (cf. also, Lütik al-Abû, vi 143 sq.). But there are also other explanations. Another tradition says: "One should not say: may Allah make thy face hateful and the faces of those who are like thee, for Allah created Adam after his surà." In this tradition the suffix obvious refers to the person addressed. Others say: The suffix refers to Allah, for in one version the tradition runs: Allah created Adam in the shape of al-Rahmah i.e. as regards his qualifications knowledge, life, hearing, sight, etc. although Allah's qualities are incomparable. — The theologians are divided into two groups on the exposition of this tradition; the one refrains from any interpretation through dread of anthropomorphism; the other explains the expression as an indication of Adam's beauty and perfection, an alây hatim o-Ilaâhî (like as beautiful Allah, Bait Allah, says al-Nawawi, see below). — So far Kaftânân.

The second passage in which the tradition occurs is Muslim, Bîr, trad. 115: "If a man fights with his brother, he ought to spare his face, for Allah created man after his surâ." Al-Nawawi's commentary on this tradition coincides in part with the already quoted section in Kaftânân; he need only quote the following here: al-Mazari says: "Ibn Kutaba has interpreted this tradition wrongly by taking it literally". He says: "Allah has a surâ, but not like other amans". This interpretation is obviously wrong for the conception surâ involves imposition and what is put together is created (nafa'ah); but Allah is not created therefore is not composed, therefore he is not muqawwama. Ibn Kutaba's interpretation is like that of the anthropomorphists, who say: Allah has a body, but not like other bodies". They quote in support the orthodox pronunciation "The Creator is thing (mahfâh) but not like other things". This is however reasoning by false analogy for mahfâh does not involve the conception of coming into existence (mahdî), and what is associated with it. Body and surâ on the other hand involve joining together and composition and therefore also mahdî, etc.

We have further to deal with the conception surâ in connection with the prohibition of images, which, in so far as it is known in the west, is traced to the Ukbân like most Muslim institutions. Although this idea is one of the numerous popular errors about Islam, we cannot deny that the prohibition of images is based on a view which finds expression in the Ukbân. In Ukbân linguistic usage samawara "to fashion" or "form" is synonymous with barâ'a "to create": Sura, vii. 10, "and we have created you, then we have fashioned you, then we have said to the angels, etc." Sura, iii. 4: "It is he who forms you in the mother's womb as he will", Sura, xi. 66: "It is Allah who has fashioned the earth for you, and shaped the heavens for a vault above you, shaped you and formed you beautiful" (cf. Sura, Isra, 3). Sura, lix. 24 Allâh is called al-khâli, al-khâr, al-samawwir, i.e. according to Buṣân: "He who takes the resolution to create things according to His wisdom, who creates them without error, who calls their forms and qualities into existence, according to His will".

This linguistic usage shows complete synonymy between the concepts to fashion, to shape", and "to make, to create". In the older Hebrew literature also Yahwe as creator is called yisqer, i.e. the potter. The roots q-ger and q-ser are also unmistakably connected.

If then Allah according to the Ukbân is the great fashioner, it follows in Hadith that all human fashioners are imitators of Allah and as such deserving of punishment: "Whosoever makes an image him will Allah give as a punishment the breath of life into it; but he is not able to do this" (Bukhari, Bîr, bâb 104; Muslim, Bîr, trad. 100). "Those who make these pictures will be punished on the Day of Judgment by being told: Make alive what you have created" (Bukhari, Taqwâd, bâb 56). "These whom Allah will punish most severely on the Day of Judgment are those who imitate Allah's work of creation" (Ahmad b. Hanbal, vi. 36). Such are called the worst of creatures (nasâ', Maṣâ'î), bâb 13, cursed by Muhammad (Bukhari, Bîr, bâb 25), compared to polytheists (Tirmidhi, Dhadhîm, bâb 1). Houses which contain images, dogs and ritually impure people are avoided by the angels of mercy (Bukhari, Bad: al-Kâlîf, bâb 17, etc.). The latter statement is illuminated by the story of how Aîsha once purchased a cushion (nawrâh) on which were pictures; when Muhammad saw it from outside the house, he stood at the door without coming into the house. When Aîsha saw repugnance expressed on his countenance, she said: "O Apostle of Allah, I turn full of penitence to Allah and his Apostle, but what law have I broken?" He replied: "What is the meaning of this cushion?" She said: "I purchased it for thee to sit upon and use as a cushion". Then the Apostle of Allah answered: "The makers of these images will be punished and they will be told: Make
alive what you have created". And further he said: "A house which contains images is not entered by the angels". (Muslim. Lit. 50. ābd b. Ḥasan, vi. 172.) Muhammad is said to have removed the images and statues out of the Ka'ba (Bukhārī, Mughāṣṣel, bāb 48). There are also references to this in the Sūra. Here we need only quote one more remarkable tradition, which has some resemblance to the Christological legend.

"All relates: "I and the Prophet walked till we came to the Ka'ba. Then the Prophet of Allah said to me: 'Sit down'. Then he stood on my shoulders and I arose. But when he saw that I could not support him, he came down, sat down and said: 'Stand on my shoulders'. Then I climbed on his shoulders and he stood up and it seemed to me as if I could have touched the sky, had I wished. Then I climbed on the roof of the Ka'ba on which there was an image of copper and iron. Then I began to loosen it at its right and left side, in front and behind until it was in my power. Then the Prophet of Allah called to me: 'Throw it down'. Then I threw it down so that it broke into pieces like a bottle. I then climbed down from the Ka'ba and hurried away with the Prophet, till we hid ourselves in the houses for fear some one might meet us" (Ahmad b. Ḫasan, i. 84; cf. 154).

According to the law it is forbidden to copy living beings, those that have a rūḥ. Nawawī in his commentary on Muslim's Sahih to Livād, trad. St (Cairo 1283, v. 445) gives the following summary: "The learned men of our school and other 'ulama say: The copying of living beings is strictly forbidden and is one of the great sins because it is threatened with the severe punishment mentioned in the traditions. It does not matter whether the maker has made the copies from things used in little esteem or from other things, for the making of them is in itself ṣārūm, because it is an imitation of Allah's creative activity. From this point of view it makes no difference whether the image is put upon a cloth, carpet, coin, vessel or wall, etc.

The copying of trees, camel-saddles, and other things apart from living creatures is not forbidden. - So far the legal prescriptions affecting the copying itself.

As regards the use of articles which have on them images of living creatures, if these are hung on a wall or are on a garment which is worn or on a turban or other article which is not treated lightly, they are ṣārūm. If the reproductions however are on carpets which are walked upon, on cushions and pillows etc., which are in use, they are not ṣārūm. Whether the angels of mercy avoid houses which contain such articles will be discussed immediately, as God will.

In all these cases it makes no difference whether the reproductions have a shadow or not. Some of the older jurists say: Only what has a shadow is forbidden; there are no objections to other reproductions. But this is an erroneous view. For the reproduction on the curtain was condemned by the Prophet and it certainly had no shadow. The other traditions should be remembered which forbid all images of whatever nature.

Al-Zuhri says: Images are without exception forbidden as well as the use of articles on which there are images, whether embroidered on a cloth or not embroidered whether they are put on a wall, on a cloth or carpet, to be trodden upon or not; on the authority of the literal interpretation of the tradition about the muqawma (pillow) which Muslim records (cf. above). This is a very strict point of view. Others say: What is embroidered on a cloth whether for humble use or not, whether hung on a wall or not is permitted. They regard as muqrab images which have shadows, or reproductions on walls, whether embroidered or not. They rely for this view on Muhammad's words in several traditions in the Bāb concerning: "except what is embroidered on cloth". This is the attitude of Kāsim b. Muhammad.

The 'udmān forbids all representations which have shadows and declares their defacement māliḳ. The Kāfîr (Iyād) says: "Apart from little girls playing with dolls and the permission for this", Mālik however declares it muqrab for a man to buy his daughter a doll. And some say that the permission to play with dolls was abolished by the traditions (p. 447 sqq.). These traditions lay it down without any ambiguity that the representation of living creatures is strictly forbidden. As regards representations of trees and such without rūḥ neither their making nor purchase is thereby forbidden. Fruit-trees in this respect are the same as other trees. This is the view of all the 'ulama' except Mālik, who considers the representation of fruit-trees muqrab. The Kāfîr (Iyād) says: Mālikīh is alone in this view. He relies on the tradition: "Who is more unmighty, than he who imitates my creation?" (Muslim, Livād, trad. 101; Bukhārī, Turāfād, bāb 56); while all the others quote the tradition: "Then it shall be said to them, put life (ayyāh) into that which ye have made, for ayyāh means: make living creatures (bayyāmūn) with a right hand, just as for al-īyād"

In spite of the opinions of the theologians and jurists, breaches are not rare as in the case of the prohibition of wine; as for example, the frescoes in the bath-house of 'Amra [q.v.], the miniatures in Persian and Turkish manuscripts, Turkish and Egyptian stamps. There have even been pictures of Muhammad in recent times. But this does not affect the fact that among Muslim peoples there has been neither painting nor sculpture to any considerable extent. Arabesques and calligraphy may be regarded as a substitute for it. Strzygowski has tried to explain the absence of human figures from Muslim art by the latter's being influenced by a school of art in which there were no human figures for some other reasons.

Objections were for long made to photography (see Saneck Harrgunde, Vergegenständliches Geschäft, ii. 432 sqq.); now these seem, in certain circles at least, no longer to be so strong or even to have been quite overcome. In Cairo there is an illustrated weekly al-Muṣawwar, which is produced entirely on western lines. This does not however mean that the old opinions have entirely disappeared. Chauvin gives examples of the horror of being copied, examples which still have their counterparts in the modern western world. Here also we find people objecting to being photographed because they feel as if something were being stolen from their persons.

We find the second commandment quoted literally in the west against pictures although the usual interpretation regards it only as prohibiting
the worship of idols. It may be asked whether the Muslim interdiction of images was influenced by the Jewish interdiction of the second commandment. From the literature (Flavius Josephus) on the one hand and the coin on the other, it is evident that the Jewish prohibition of the exhibition of images was exactly the same as the Muslim: no living creatures, only plants and other objects. On the one hand we may assume Jewish influence on the Muslim prohibition of images, on the other hand recognize that the foundations for this transference can already be found in the Kur'an. The Biblical idea of the creation of man by the making of an image and breathing the breath of life into it as found in the story of the creation is also found in the Kur'an (Sûra, xvi. 29, xxxviii. 72) and it is this very idea which has had great influence on traditions and legal literature. — For the philosophical meaning of the conception Sûra see MAIDUA.


(A. J. Wensinck)

SURAKARTA, or SURAKET, name of a kingdom on the island of Java, and of its capital, ruled by two Javanese princes, the Suhuhunan, and Mangku-Negara, under Dutch suzerainty. It arose along with the kingdom of (Ayogakarta (kerta), likewise ruled by two chiefs, out of the older kingdom of Mataram, which on the decline of the kingdom of Dëmak and Pajang appeared as a third Muhammedan state in Java proper. The Muslim character of Mataram, although rather superficial and only nominal, was the result of the official recognition by the Suhuhunan as Muslim ruler by the authorities in Mecca and found expression in the title Pa-nâs-punâ, “Arranger of the religion (of Islam)”. Although the population was quite consciously Muhammedan, the kingdom nevertheless remained in many ways, e.g. in political organisation, Hindu-Javanese. The same holds of the states, which succeeded it, and particularly perhaps of Surakarta, where especially of recent years an active interest in the older culture has arisen in educated circles under the influence of studies by Europeans. The kingdom of Mataram founded by Senapati about 1575 reached its greatest prosperity under Agung (1613–1645). Under his successors the influence of the suzerain Dutch Trading Company (Veereenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie) rapidly increased, which, founded at the beginning of the 17th century was the de facto ruler of Java by 1745. Disputes about the succession brought about (1755) the already mentioned partition of the kingdom into the states of Surakarta and Yogyakarta. The Suhuhunan, who still ranks higher than the Sultân, had already founded a little state by 1744 in the village of Sala (often written Solo); the name of which, Surakarta, as usual in Java, took the place of that of the previous state, Karinura (from Sanskrit bhūta = flourishing etc. and pura = hero, heroic, brave). The state and the village of Sala were officially called Surakarta after the state, although the present town is still also called Sala (pronounced Solo by Europeans). Very soon after the partition, one of the rival princes received an important fief from the Suhuhunan; this gradually developed into an independent principality the ruler of which the Mangku-Negara is still however formally subordinate to the Suhuhunan. The history of the kingdom is, like that of Yogyakarta, rather confusing on account of the continual alternations in its boundaries. It passed more and more under Dutch influence and is of no special importance for the world of Islam. On account of the impossibility of giving a brief sketch of it here, the reader must be referred to the fuller studies by Dutch scholars quoted below.

The present town which has now about 130,000 inhabitants, of whom only a few thousands are Europeans, has retained the aspect of a Javanese culture. Native arts and crafts were always cultivated in the capital but on account of the keen European competition have lost a good deal of importance for Java itself. The Javanese fine arts, especially music and dancing, are however still flourishing and Javanese learning was officially encouraged and this is partly true of the present day. Literature, which seems almost to have disappeared with the death of the last pañjangga, Kangea-Warsi (pañjiangga was originally a priest, later court-scholar; Sanskrit bhūta = snake, snake-demon, and it is not quite clear how the present meaning has developed from this), appears to be reviving again to some extent and may still have a future in a more modern form under the influence of the expansion of European education. Quite recently (1926) the Dutch authorities have founded a school in Surakarta, on account of its central situation for Javanese culture, the special object of which is to give native scholars a classical oriental training.

The buildings of the capital with its old customs and usages, its bēlaja dances and wayang plays, with its many remarkable features, its reflection of former Javanese splendour, form the greater attraction of the town. The princes have their own officials for various services, who live with their families in the palaces and are estimated to number 15,000. But actually the power is exercised by the Dutch resident who is equal in authority to the prince, an arrangement which has repeatedly caused friction.

Bibliography: Exceedingly valuable for our knowledge of the two native states is G. P. Rouffaer’s article Vorstenlanden in den Encyclopaedie van Nederland Leeuw, 1876–1878, with a valuable bibliography. P. J. Veth, Java, ii. 165 sqq., is more general.

(C. C. Bero)

SURAT, a city situated in 21° 12’ N. and 72° 50’ E. on the south bank of the Tapti and ten miles from its mouth. The geographer Ptolemy (A.D. 150), speaks of the trade
of Pulipula, perhaps Phulpâda, the sacred part of Surat city. Early references to Surat by Muslim historians must be scrutinized, owing to the confusion of the name with Sorath (Saurashtra), but in 1373 Firdawsi built a fort to protect the place against the Bihls. The foundation of the modern city is traditionally assigned to the beginning of the sixteenth century, when its prosperity was restored by Gopi, a rich Hindu merchant, and in 1514 it was already an important seaport. The Portuguese burnt the town in 1512, 1530, and 1531, and the present fort was founded in 1540 by Khudawand Khan, a Turkish officer in the service of Mahmûd III of Gujrat. In 1572 it fell into the hands of the Mirzâ, then in rebellion against Akbar, who besieged and took the place in the following year. For 160 years the city, known as "the Gate of Makka" and "the Blessed Fort" from its being the port of departure for pilgrims, enjoyed peace and prosperity under the Timürids. An English ship first arrived at "Swally Hole" (Sawall) the anchorage near the mouth of the Tapti, in 1608, but the English encountered great difficulty in founding a factory, owing to the hostility of the Portuguese. They succeeded, and their position was secured by the treaty brought back from Agra by Sir Thomas Roe in 1618. In 1664 Shihâjât plundered the town for three days, but could not touch the English and Dutch factories, which were bravely defended by their inmates. From 1669 an annual Marâtha raid was almost a matter of course, but the foreigners defended themselves. In 1687 Bombay superseded Surat as the principal English settlement on the western coast, and in 1733 the Muslim governor proclaimed his independence, but in 1759 the English, with the approval of the Marathas, charged themselves with the administration of the town, which became a British possession in 1800. The English and Dutch graveyards contain interesting memorials of European trade and adventure in India.

**Bibliography:** Sheikh Abu 'l-Fadl, Ṭāhâ Annâ Akbari, translated by Blochmann and Jarrett; Akbarnamâ; Khâdija Nişân al-Din Ahmad, Ṭâhâ Annâ Akbari, all in the Bibliotheca Indica series of the Asiatic Society of Bengal; Muhammad Kâsim Firâgh, Gulshan-i Ibrâhîmî, Bombay lithographed edition of 1832; The Imperial Gazetteer of India, Oxford 1908, xxii. 153, 164. (T. W. Haig)

**SURAJDÏVA (Maśâla).** This is one of the classical "questions" in the theory of law (miṣâl), one of the few that have a special name (cf. akbarîya) derived from one of the first to propose it. It refers to the legal fiction (daw' bâhâli) invented by some Shâhidî (Masani, I.ha Suraî, and Ghasâli, who later abandoned) to cancel, by bringing it into a vicious circle (yamîn âhâmâ), the solemn declaration (tâlîf) pledging the contracting party to divorce his favourite wife if he breaks his oath (tâlîf ma'sâlaṭâ, employed in the Karâjân initiation; cf. karâjâtans). Snouck Hurgronje has shown the use made by the Shâhidî of the tâlîf to stabilise marriages in Java.

**Bibliography:** Shaīrâni, Miṣânî, Cairo, ii. 115; I.ha Hadjâr, Ṭâhâšt al-mišâlîh (with gloss by S. Shaîrâni), Cairo, vi. 112–113; Goldringer, Streitschrift des Gesandten gegen die Batiniyya-Schîrî, 1916, p. 78–79; Massignon, Passion d'al-Hâfîz, in P. 586, 716, 787.

**SURÛRÎ, the name of several Ottoman poets of whom the most notable are the two following: 1. Müsûlî al-Dîn Mûstâfâ Efendi, called Suraî, a distinguished philologist and expositor born in Gallipoli where his father Shâhîn was a merchant or a teacher. After the conclusion of his studies he became an assistant yâği in Stambul, in 944 (1537). When the medrese founded by Kâsim Pasha [q. v.] was finished, he was appointed its first müdderbis, but resigned a year later and by the desire of his patron Kâsim Pasha began to lecture on Dîjât al-Dîn Khâtîn's Mutâhâr as a Nakâşbandi derawîsh. In 950 (1543) he became tutor to prince Muṣṭafâ [q. v.], the ill-starred son of Sultanânum [q. v.] the Magnificent. After the prince's execution in 960 (1553) he retired into private life and died on 7th Dijâmâd I 960 (Jan. 13, 1562) in Stambul at the age of 72. His tomb was at the little mosque which has now disappeared built by him in the Kâsim Pasha quarter (cf. Hâšî, Hüsâïn, Ṣâdûtât al-Dîjâtîn, ii. 4 sq.; J. v. Hammer, G. O. K., i. 106, No. 593). In this manuscript at one time were preserved the manuscripts of all his works. On his tomb cf. also Ewliyya Ĉelebi, Suyûtbname, i. 426; Sûrûrî was one of the greatest philologists of the time and probably the greatest authority on Persian language and literature that Turkey has ever produced. In his capacity as tutor to the prince he prepared several of his famous commentaries e.g. those on the Bûstân and Gûstân. Towards the end of his life (968) he published the commentary on 'Hâšî which is probably the best of its kind; his text book of prosody and rhyme Bâhâ al-ma'ârif prepared for prince Muṣṭafâ in 956 (1549) and his 'Aṭâ 'râ al-Mâhîbûr a synopsis of the Cosmography of Kaşâni are also famous. Less well known is his commentary on the very popular introduction (Isâfārâ, Gr. ieropoiâ) of Shaïkh Aṭîr al-Dîn Muṣfüdî. His other works are almost all expositions of Arabic or Persian works, or translations. He had a command of Turkish, Persian and Arabic as is rarely found.


II. Sayîdî ‘Othmânîn, called Sûrûrî, the greatest Ottoman writer of chronograms, usually called Sûrûrî Muṣürîk, i.e. Sûrûrî the writer of tâlîfik. Sayîdî ‘Othmânîn was born in Adana in 1165 (1751) in Southern Anatolia, the son of Hâshî Muḥâmî. As a youth he came to the capital through his fellow townsmen, the kâdi Tewfîk Efendi of Adana, where he mixed with distinguished men of letters and finally became a kâdi through the influence of Tewfîk Efendi, afterwards Shaïkh al-Islâm. He was for many years on intimate terms with the poet Sâbûnî-şâde and Wehbi Efendi [q. v.] whom he voluntarily accompanied into exile at Old Zagrâ. He later settled in Stambul again where he built a house and died on 11th Safar 1229 (Feb. 2, 1814). ‘Othmânîn Sûrûrî was considered the greatest Ottoman writer of chronograms. His chronological rhymes (tawârîkh), which he wrote on every occasion with remarkable readiness are innumerable. He was also distinguished
as a poet but his poems seem to be of less merit and it is only his skill in making chronograms that it is really admirable. He was imitated by Ḵᵛ Consort [q.v.], his pupil, and Ḵᵛ Consort, the imperial historian, in this style of composition. There is no complete edition of his works and not all his chronograms are contained in his Divān. A selection of the latter is given in Ahmad Djewdet Pasha's Sarūrī Madje'ī, Stambul 1399, 109 pp, 8° and by Abu Ṭ-Dīya Tewfik, Sarūrī Muṭtawrī, Stambul 1305, 54 pp, small 8°.


(Franz Babinger)

AL-SŪS, a ruined site in the Persian district of Khūjistān or 'Arabistān. At a very early period (from at least the second millennium b.c.) it was the capital of the kingdom of Elam. Its name in the Bible and in cuneiform inscriptions is Śūši; Greek Zēs; Late Egyptian Súṣ (see M. V. G., iii. 141; O, 6); Syrian and Armenian Sûš (not to be confused with the town of the same name, the see of a bishop, in the region of Mēšū; cf. e.g. G. Hoffmann, Auswärtige orientalische Akten pers. Mittheilungen, Leipzig 1880, p. 203; Sachau, Akh. Pr. Ab. W., 1905, p. 531; modern Pers. Šūš. When between 642-639 B.C. Assurbānilap put an end to the kingdom of Elam, its capital Sūš was sacked and completely destroyed (cf. Streck, Akkumerz, Leipzig 1916, p. 600). Cyrus raised the town from its ruins again and made it his winter residence. In this capacity it experienced a new period of glory under the splendid-loving great kings of the Achaemenid house. To the great riches which were again accumulated in Susa in this period, we have eloquent testimony in the vast booty which Alexander the Great carried off from it in 333.

In the Sassanian period, as we know from Syrian, Byzantine and Arab sources (cf. Nöldeke, Gesch. d. Pers. und Arab. zur Zeit der Sāsāniden, Leyden 1879, p. 38), the vigorous Sapor II (309—379) had the town of Sūš stamped into the ground by 300 elephants as a punishment for a rising there and built a new city beside it, to which he gave — after the fashion of Oriental potentates — a new name alluding to himself, Trāmshāh-Sūš (== probably the abbreviation TRW on Sasanian coins of Susiana) but this however ultimately disappeared before the older name. Sapor settled Roman prisoners in his new city. The latter no doubt strengthened the already not inconsiderable Christian element in the population. Sūš was the see of a bishop from 410—605 as we know from Syrian literature; see Guidi, in Z. D. M. G., xliii. 414: Sachau, ep. crit., p. 40.

Sūš fell into the hands of the Arabs in 17 (638) (or not till 639) when Abū Mūsa al-Ḵᵛāriz (q.v.) carried through the conquest of Khūjistān. The forces there, commanded by the Persian governor Ḥarmūrān, apparently offered little resistance to the Muslim troops (cf. the Syriac Chronicon, ed. by Guidi, Act. du 2e Congrès Intern. des Orient., J.A., 1891, p. 32 and history of the Armenian Sebōs of the 11th century; see Hübschmann, in Z. D. M. G., xliii. 625). The older historians Balḥirī and Šabart (cf. Schwarz, op. cit., p. 364) know nothing of severe fighting with the natives and a destruction of the city by Arab troops, mentioned by al-Muḳaddasī (and cf. Loftus, op. cit., p. 344). Under Isām, Sūš remained for several centuries more a populous flourishing city — we have coins struck in it (cf. Loftus, op. cit., p. 400) — but it was no longer the capital of the whole region of Khūjistān or Āhwāz. That the capital now fell to the city of Āhwāz (more precisely Sīykāl-Āhwāz; cf. above, i, p. 208; ii, p. 728). Sīykāl was now merely the capital of one of the seven (and at times more) divisions of this district. To the district of Sīykāl belonged several smaller towns, notably Karkha (Syriac Karkhā dēr ʿādīnā) which is well known from Syriac literature. Sīykāl was surpassed in importance not only by the capital Sīykāl-Āhwāz but soon also by other places in Khūjistān, e.g. Tustar and ʿAskara眔 (Askaran)-Makram (cf. i, p. 4883; ii, p. 778). All these three places lay on the river Kārūn (q.v.) towards which during the caliphate the political and economic centre of gravity of the region moved.

The Arab geographers emphasize the busy industries of Sūš, notably weaving which was highly developed. Its silk was famous (cf. the Divān of Kašī al-Ruṣayyīrī, ed. Rhodokanakis, No. 63, 6 in S. B. A. W. Wien, 1909). The lemons grown here were held in particular esteem; so much a good deal of sugar was grown around the town and still more was refined in the town. According to al-Muḳaddasī, in his time (end of the tenth century), the town proper had already fallen into ruins; the population lived in a suburb. Idristi (transl. Taubert, Paris 1836, i. 381, 384) makes Sīykāl still thickly populated at the middle of the 13th century, and Beniamin of Tudela who travelled through Asia a few years later says that there were no less than 7,000 Jews here with 14 synagogues. The two banks of the river "Ulā" — the Shāwār (see below) must be meant — were united by a bridge; on the west bank was the quarter of the poor (cf. Ritter, op. cit., i. 305 sq.; Loftus, ep. crit., p. 320). The Persian geographer Mustawfī, writing in the xivth century, describes Sūš as still a flourishing town. But we are justified in doubting whether this is really accurate at this late period and was not simply taken from earlier writings. It is certain that Sīykāl became more and more completely deserted from the xivth century, and this agrees with the results of the French excavations, according to which most of the remains of the Arab period discovered in Sīykāl belong to the xivth and xvth century (see de Morgan, Mém. de la Délég. en Perse, viii. 32). Dāmīl, 33 hours N. E. of Sīykāl, which only appears to have come into prominence since the Mongol period, and is now an important town in Khūjistān (ʿArabistān), may be in a way considered the successor of the mediaeval Sūš.

Sūš has a very favourable strategic and commercial situation; for it is at the point where the two principal rivers of the country of Khūjistān, the Kārūn (q.v.) and the Karkhā (also written Kerka), approach nearest to one another. They were at one time connected by canals. The ancient Sīykāl lay between two arms of the Karkha, the western, i.e. the modern Kerka (Chosaps of classical writers) and an eastern branch which has now disappeared but is still recognizable (cuneiform: Ulā) which was connected with the Kātān
(Pasiligris, the Ulai proper, Σανάς). The mounds of ruins of Sima begin about 12 miles S.W. of Dīsafīl. A short hour's journey east of them, the Dīsafīl-Rūb or Ab-i Dīa, a tributary of the Kūrīn, runs through the plain. The western side of the area of the town 100—300 yards from the two western main mounds is washed by the narrow but deep Shāwūr (Shaur) which rises about 2½—3 hours above the ruins of Sima, and does not flow out of the Kerkha itself as has been assumed (contrary to Schwartz, op. cit., p. 30; cf. Rawlinson, op. cit., i., p. 70 and Layard, xvi. 56.). A canal, now dried up, leaves the Kerkha a little above the source of the Shaur, runs round the side of the town on the north and east and finally disappears in the S.W. in the swamps which stretch to the Shaur. This watercourse is the above-mentioned eastern branch of the Kerkha. The Kerkha proper is about 2 miles from Sima, while its earlier bed (the old western main arm) now a ditch thickly overgrown with bushes is only 500 yards west of the Shaur (cf. thereon Loftus, op. cit., p. 346).

The Arab geographers not infrequently call the Kerkha, like the Shaur, the "river of Sima"; see G. Le Strange, op. cit., p. 233; Schwartz, op. cit., p. 304—305 and cf. above, ii., p. 778, 857.

The system of ruins at Sima is quite considerable (3—5 miles in circumference). It is only since the beginning of the sixteenth century that we have reliable accounts from European travellers, namely: König and Montetith (1809), Gordon (1814), H. Rawlinson (1836), A. H. Layard (1840) and notably Loftus (1851—1852). The English excavations conducted by the latter in 1851—1852, and those of the French, first (1885) under M. and Mme Dieulafoy, then 1897—1899 and later by de Morgan and others, have settled the main topographical and archaeological problems. Four large artificial platforms stand clearly out from the ruins, separated from one another by more or less broad ravines. At a short distance from the Shaur (100—300 yards, increasing towards the south) stand two hills, the larger to the north, roughly a rectangle, about 60 feet above the bed of the river, which conceals the palace of the Achaemenid kings and a smaller one irregular in shape, but higher (up to 120 feet above the Shaur) which formerly bore the Citadel mentioned by Greek writers, still called Kal-i Shāh = the citadel of Shāh by the people. On the east these two mounds are joined by a roughly rectangular area, larger than these in area, which Loftus calls the great or central platform, attaining a height of 65 feet and covering an area of over 60 English acres. Next comes on the east an extensive fourth platform, the eastern and northern edges of which are not easy to define as the slope by terraces to the plain. Besides these four mounds of ruins, there are a series of smaller ones mainly in the east and northeast. When Benjamin of Tudela speaks of a quarter of the town on the west bank of the Shaur (cf. above), it should be noted that no distinct traces can be found of this suburb where the poorer people dwelt, at least in the form of well marked mounds of rubble. In the south or southwest the ruined area is bounded by marshes with a luxuriant growth of reeds and trees.

In the northeast mound Loftus found a pillared hall like that in Persepolis, apparently the throne room, the walls of which were adorned by the relief of the immortals now in the Louvre. This splendid room formed part of the royal palace built by Darius I and restored, after suffering in a fire in the reign of Artaxerxes I, by the latter's grandson, Artaxerxes II Memnon, who was particularly fond of Susa. The western pair of mounds near the river, must have been the residence of the court and of the government, while in the third "the central platform", we have probably to locate the town proper. Remains of a great wall surrounding the town dating from the Elamite period (before Assurbanipal) have been found during the excavations; the sides not protected by watercourses could easily have been defended by fortifications. The town destroyed by Assurbanipal is buried 12—16 feet below the surface, covered by ruins of the later settlements of the Achaemenid, Seleucid and Sassanian period. The English and French excavations recovered a vast quantity of inscriptions and other relics from all periods of Susian history down to the Arab. These are now partly in the British Museum and partly in the Louvre. For London, cf. the Guide to the Babylonian and Assyrian Antiquities in the British Museum 2, 1921, esp. p. 175 sq.

About 150 yards from the N.W. corner of the S.W. hill just on the bank of the Shaur is the tomb-mosque of the Prophet Daniel (called by the Persians Pār (= Arabic Shāh) or Paighambar (= Prophet Dānēpillot) still visited by numerous pilgrims, Muslims, Jews and Mandaeans (Subbe). The present building is only a few centuries old, but in it were used several fragments from the ruins (bricks with cuneiform inscriptions, capitals etc.) as wāqāf pieces (cf. Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 69). The sanctuary has a round rectangular court surrounded by a wall, entered by a low doorway from the river side. Within, on both sides are arched ways leading into the sanctuary which runs in the west of the court yard. The actual tomb is dark and consists of a sarcophagus of smooth cement behind perforated wood lattice. Above the mosque, rises out of the centre of the roof terrace, on which the pilgrims sleep in hot weather, a sugar-cane like tower ending in a pointed pyramidal cupola crowned by a crescent. This remarkable type of tower found especially in tombs is not rare elsewhere in Iraq, in Khûzistān (cf. e. g. i. 1026a and Herdner in Petermann's Mitteil., 1907, p. 628, 759), Irānstan and the Persian Gulf. Cf. thereon F. Langenegger, Die Baukunst des Irān, Dresden 1914, p. 115—116 and Herrfeld in Sarre-Herrick, Archäolog. Reise im Perser- und Türken-gebiet, Berlin 1911, 1, p. 231, 239, 246; 1919, ii., p. 177—178, 321.

According to the statements of various Arab writers, with whom the above mentioned Syriac chronicles also agrees, the sarcophagus with the bones of Daniel was found after the capture of the town by the Arālab, and, as some say (Bašāri, ed. de Goeje, p. 378; Tabari, op. cit., see below), in a chamber in the citadel. By orders of the Caliph 'Omar the river Shaur was turned from its course, the sarcophagus placed in its dry bed and the water then led back into its old course (cf. the Arab legend of the original tomb of the prophet Joseph in the Nile in Schwarz, op. cit., p. 561, note 5, and the burial of Alaric in the Rucento). The place of the burial in the river is, as Mu'addad (p. 407) and cf. p. 417)
Near the tomb of Daniel stands another ruined tomb of a saint (sw̃āma ẖād); see Rawlinson, op. cit., ix. 70 and J. D. Dusauloy, A Sur., p. 83. East of the ruins of Susa towards Dīfīl, are two other similar sanctuaries, one of which is considered to be the tomb of 'Abdās and the other that of Ibrāhim al-Ḳahilī; see Loftus, op. cit., p. 345—346; Jéquier in de Mecqan, Mém. de la Dilig. sur Perse, vii. 31, 32 (speaks of two towers and of one of a Shaikh). Bricks and capitals from the Achaemenid period are also built into these saints' tombs. One Muslim tradition (Tabari, i. 252, 27) says that Abraham (Ibrāhim; q.v.) was born in Susa. In keeping with this tradition the site of the oven into which Muslim legend says Nimrūd threw Ibrāhim is also moved to Khūzistan (Mandjanik, south of Māl-Amir); see Rawlinson, op. cit., ix. 81. But these associations with Abraham are usually localised in al-Ṭīlāq (in Khūţā, Aḵārift, Bīs Nimrūd, etc.). It may be further mentioned that the Arabic sources consider Susa, like Babil, one of the oldest cities in the world and make them both foundations of one of the mythical Iranian kings (Oshāng or Tammūras; see Tabari, i. 171, and above, i., p. 548 sq.). The country round Susa suffers for nine months of the year from the glowing heat of the Iranian sky. In January however a luxurious, almost tropical, vegetation springs up after the winter rains. The rich pastures that then cover the land attract the nomads thither. In the spring it is mainly Arabian Beduins that camp here and indeed they are in the majority in Khūzistan generally, so that this district is actually officially called 'Arabīastān by the Persians (q.v.). The region of Susa is particularly visited by the tribes of 'Allī Kāḫîr and Bāti Lām (q.v.). On the 'Allī Kāḫîr, who migrated lither over three centuries ago from Naḷīd in Central Arabia, cf. Layard, op. cit., xvi. 33, 56, 90; Loftus, op. cit., p. 347, 351, 356, 358, 381 sq. and Schwart, op. cit., p. 417. Of the great tribe of 'Allī Kāḫîr we are here mainly concerned with two of its subdivisions, the Ka'b and Zāblā (cf. Layard, op. cit., p. 33). The Ka'b were originally members of the powerful Ka'b tribe leading a nomadic life on the lower Kūrā; on the latter, cf. ii., p. 775; also Layard, op. cit., xvi. 6, 37—39, 41—55 and Loftus, op. cit., p. 285 sq. 381, 390. Lur nomad tribes are often found in the plain of Susa. At the beginning of May all is again as quiet as the grave. Even the guardian of the tomb of Daniel leaves the district, which is filled with miasma from the grave and the heat now becomes unendurable.

On the banks of the Šawwār covered by luxurious woods (notably acacias, poplars and willows), in the desert that was once the left arm of the Kerkhā and in the undergrowth of the swamps are many beasts of prey, wolves, hyenas and even lions, also wild pigs.

He charges them with a lack of urbanity, coarseness and insolence. The dress of the men consisted of a kitāb of wool which enveloped them entirely, with a māṣūr of wool around the waist which they called āyāb. They were armed with short spears with steel heads. They drank a liquor made from the mast of sweet grapes which they called omtis and considered it a permitted beverage as it did not bring about drunkenness. These notes show clearly that the term al-Sūs al-adānā was then applied to a much wider area that at the present day; it included not only the valley of the Wādi Sūs but also the mountainous country towards the Ḥawā of Mīrakkeš, the Dāʿa (Darā) and the Tāfdāl.

Farther Sūs, as a province of the Maghrib, has always been closely connected with the history of the whole country and with the histories of the different dynasties which have successively established themselves there. In 117 (735) it was conquered and converted to Islam by Ḥālūb b. Aḥbāb, a grandson of 'Uqba b. Nāfi'. Under the Ifṣids it passed on the death of ʿĪrīdī II in 213 (828) to his son ʿAbdallāh, at the same time as the massif of the Great Atlas with the towns of Aḥmādīy and Nafisī. It was next one of the main objectives of the Almoravids [q.v.] when they thrust their way northwards. In 451 (1059) the general Aḥbāb Bakr b. ʿUmar seized the towns of Māṣūṭ and Tāfdāl but the authority of the Almoravids was never very secure in Sūs, in spite of the submission of the province to Ṭūṣuf b. Tāsīfīn in 478 (1085).

Sūs played a prominent part in the early days of the Almohad movement in the Maghrib. It was, along with the plain of Mīrakkeš, the centre of Almoravid resistance against the attempts at expansion by the companions of the Mahdī Ibn Tūmār beyond the massif of the Great Atlas where the movement began. A son of the Almoravid ruler ʿAbī l-Ṭūṣuf, Baggā, organized the resistance there and was only in 533 (1140–1141) that the Caliph ʿAbd al-Muẓafīn definitely conquered the whole of Sūs. During the whole period of the Almohad dynasty it was one of the most important provinces of the empire. On its demise in the reign of al-Murtāfā (660–665 = 1268–1266) it was the scene of a rebellion on a great scale fomented by the agitator ʿAbbās b. Yādās. This individual, a former dignitary of the Almohad court, wishing to found a little independent kingdom in Sūs, appealed to the Arab tribes settled between Tlemcān and the Rif, the Ṭawī Ḥassān and the Shabbānāt of the Maʾkī group. He was able to hold out against the Almohad governor of Tāfdāl but his success was not of long duration. In 1266 the Almohad prince ʿAbbās Dabbūs with the help of the Marinid contingents regained the province from him and seized Tīnākhtī and Ṭīnytānīn. Nevertheless the independent kingdom of Sūs after the fall of the Almohads was able to maintain some sort of independence in the period of the early Marinid Saṭāns until the reign of Ṭūṣuf b. Iʿḥāsan ʿAbbās who broke it up for ever.

In 1504 the Portuguese gained a footing on the coast of Sūs in the bay of Aqṣādir [q.v.] and founded the fortress of Santa Cruz; it was a strategic point of great importance, the gateway to a rich hinterland and at the same time an excellent harbour, one of the best on the Atlantic coast of Morocco. The people of the country tried
in vain to dislodge the garrison; in order to harass it incessantly and to blockade it by land they established quite close to the Portuguese station, a rifle or concentration-camp of the "volunteers of the faith" who used to come there in relays to deliver open attacks on the Christian foes or prepare murderous am biscuits for them. Between the sea and Tārūdānt, a small town was soon formed to take charge of the local qādis, the Zāwiyā of Tedalet, the cradle of the Sa'dian [q.v.] dynasty. It was founded by some ḥassāni Shūfrū; whose ancestor Āḥmad b. Mūḥammad b. Āḥmad Kāsim, had come in the 9th century from the Ǧūdāf and settled in the valley of the Wādī Ǧara', at Tāguñadah. His descendants then migrated to Sīs near Tedalet, settled there and took up a position in the country which daily increased in importance. At the beginning of the 9th century, the head of the Zāwiyā, Mūḥammad b. Āḥmad al-Ṭaḥrīn, became the real leader in the holy war in al-Sās; assisted by his two sons, Āḥmad al-Ṭaḥrīn and Mūḥammad al-Shālikh, he displayed great activity and denounced the impotence of the ruling dynasty to the people. He was not long in achieving his object; the tribes of al-Sās proclaimed him their Sīlān in 630. He died soon afterwards, leaving his son to continue his work. The eldest, al-Ṭaḥrīn, who had assumed the title of king of Sīs in the lifetime of his father, established himself as sovereign in Tārūdānt and in 641 succeeded in driving the Portuguese finally out of Ǧādīrī.

We see from the above what a large part Sīs plays in the history of the first of the two Ḡurritian dynasties of Morocco. The Sa'dian Sīlān also always kept a watchful eye on this vital part of their empire. Mūḥammad al-Shālikh al-Mahdī was the first to extend the cultivation of sugar in al-Sīs and thus created an important source of revenue for the treasury. It was in the reign of the great prince Āḥmad al-Manṣūrī that this province saw its greatest revival of prosperity. A regular army, formed of citizens recruited in Sīs, at this time formed the garrison of Marrakesh and relations between the capital and the province were never closer. But after the death of al-Manṣūrī, when anarchy once more reigned throughout the empire, al-Sīs did not escape the various rebellions which broke out on all sides. Prince Ǧālidīn, a claimant to the throne, made his headquarters there. A few years later al-Sīs fell into the hands of a powerful rebel Abū Ǧārid al-Manṣūrī called Abū Ḥālib, who made an alliance with the Ǧīlāf Shīrīf of Sidjilmasa. But this alliance was only ephemeral and the early days of the second Ḡurritian dynasty of Morocco were marked by the struggle between the Abū Ḥālib and the Ǧārid pretenders of Tārlīn. He was succeeded on his death by his son Abū Ǧārid, who was only soon brought to terms by the Abū al-Sīlān al-Raṣīlī. In 670 the latter led an expedition to the very heart of al-Sīs and captured the stronghold of Ǧujjīn. Next year the people of al-Sīs sent a deputation to him at Marrakesh to offer their submission. The latter was not of long duration for in 677 the Sīlān MawĪlī Ismā'il had to send an expedition to al-Sīs and another in 682. The country was finally pacified and at the end of his reign when MawĪlī al-Hāsan divided his empire among several of his sons, al-Sīs fell to Mūḥammad al-Ǧalīn, with Tārūdānt as his capital. But this prince only went to his domain to set up as a pretender to the throne and from this time on we find each successive Abū al-Sīlān forced to suppress one or more rebellions in al-Sīs during his reign. We may just mention the expeditions to put down rebellions sent by MawĪlī Abū Allāh (1533), MawĪlī al-Ǧalīn (1582) and particularly those of MawĪlī al-Hāsan in 683, 685 and 686. Al-Sīs has been definitely at peace since the establishment of the protectorate of the French Republic in Morocco after the expedition of 1917.

These continual rebellions have resulted in the gradual impoverishment of al-Sīs since the 9th century. The enthusiastic descriptions of the geographers and travellers of the middle ages no longer apply to the second period of the history of this reign. At the present day, while modern methods may be expected to raise the value of this country, the only part of al-Sīs that is really rich is the narrow strip of irrigated land which lies along the banks of the Wādī Sīs which is hardly susceptible of extension except to the north of this river. The products of al-Sīs are cereals, oil of Ǧīlān and fruits. Cattle-raising is very limited. Al-Sīs on the other hand seems certain of an great economic future as a result of the exploitation of its abundant mineral deposits: copper (already worked in a rudimentary fashion by the natives), lead, rock-salt, and lime.

The principal town of al-Sīs at the present day is Tārūdānt, the residence of a qādis appointed by the Sīlān. It has about 7,000 inhabitants of whom 1,000 are Jews who live in a ghetto or μελιθ. This town seems to have been founded at a very early period and we already find it playing a part in history in the Almoravid period. In the middle ages al-Sīs had as its capital sometimes Tārūdānt and sometimes Iglī. After the death of MawĪlī al-Hāsan, at the end of the 9th century, Tārūdānt was the centre of the rebellion of al-Hībī who held out there till the town was taken in 1013 by the Mahālas of the Mahīzīn. It is surrounded by a great wall of clay which dates from the end of the 9th century.

Besides Tārūdānt, there is the little town of Temīt, 52 miles south of Ǧādīrī, and 12 miles east of the Atlantic coast, at the foot of the Anti-Atlas. It has a population of about 1,000. Sīlān MawĪlī al-Hāsan founded it in his expedition to al-Sīs in 683. Finally we may mention about 60 miles S. E. of Temīt the famous Ǧūrīyā of Sīdī Ǧāḥīr-al-Mūsī, in al-Tāsīrīn. It is the mother-Ǧūrīyā of the Ǧūrīyā of the Ǧūrīyā of the Ǧūrīyā of the Ǧūrīyā of the Ǧūrīyā of the Ǧūrīyā of the Ǧūrīyā of the Ǧūrīyā of the Ǧūrīyā of the Ǧūrīyā, who are all acrobats and follow their profession throughout North Africa and also in Europe.

On the coast besides Ǧādīrī [for which see the separate article] we may mention the villages of Ǧādīrī and Ǧīlidī, which in the middle ages were comparatively important centres of maritime trade, frequented especially by Genevois sailors, and the terminus for several caravans from the affidavit.

The people of al-Sīs still speak a Berber dialect belonging to the Tāsīrīnī group but the speakers of Arabic are becoming more and more numerous as a result of the emigration of large numbers of natives who go to exercise various trades in the towns of the rest of Morocco.

AL-SUSAN, the common name for the white and yellow-eyed lily used for the blue iris which is more precisely described by the addition of armāngīfī and is also called ārīdī by the physicians. The name is a general Semitic one, but whether from ārīdī (ārīdī) as L鈥檚 suggests, seems to me doubtful on account of the ārī or ārī found in it. The root of ārī dententiātī is still used in medicine.


SUSAN, a ruined site on the Upper Kārin in Khūṣīṭa in the territory of the Lūr tribe of the Bakhšīyārīs, 5 hours journey from Dītorf; cf. above, ii., p. 779.[*] The place is also called ārīdī (or ārīdī) and Dīhaftī by the Persian geographers. H. Rawlinson discovered these ruins in 1836; Layard then visited them twice (1840, 1847) and made several important corrections in his predecessor's description, which was in part based only on the information of natives. No later European traveller seems to have made a thorough examination of the locality.

According to Layard the ruins seem to belong to two different epochs, the old Persian and the Sassanian. On the right bank of the Kārin at a point where the river makes a turn westwards and forms a semicircle can still be seen for a stretch of nearly two miles the ruins of a mass of unknown stones called by the Lūr Māl-i Wīrān "possession in ruins". They are said to come from an old, probably Sassanian, town. On both banks of the river very old paved roads can still be traced. At a short distance from Māl-i Wīrān, N.E. at the foot of the hill stands the tomb of Daniel, reverenced by the Lūr of the Ali Ilāh sect [q.v.] as the burial place of the Old Testament prophet. It is called the tomb of the "Great Daniel" (Dānīyāl-i Akbar) to distinguish it from that of "Little Daniel" (Dānīyāl-i Aghar) in Sūs. Musulmans, Jews and Mandaeans in agreement with the older Christian tradition, believe firmly in the authenticity of the latter as the real tomb of the Biblical prophet (cf. further the article Al-Mālīs). Rawlinson describes the tomb of Daniel at Sūsān as being of huge white marble blocks with a large artificial pool in front. The latter is fed by a little river which runs down from the hills. The many fish in the pool are held sacred by the superstition of the people. Layard on the other hand says the building is of earth and denies the existence of any pool or of a general belief in the sacredness of the fish in this stream. Even in the middle ages, however as we know from the stories of the Jewish traveller, Benjamin of Tudela, and the Persian traveller al-Mustawfi (cf. Layard, op. cit., xvi. 61) at the tomb of Daniel in Sīs the fish in this stretch of the Sīwar stream near this sacred site were considered sacred, probably a relic of the ancient fish cult of Neaer Asia.

According to Rawlinson, there were near the tomb of Daniel a large block of marble with a completely preserved caniform inscription and many similarly inscribed tablets. Layard saw nothing of these nor could he see anything to indicate the survival of such monuments.

The Kārin is enclosed by fearful ravines a little below the ruins of the Māl-i Wīrān. Where the
the southwest of this province in lower French Guinea; the Sūsā are in part Muslims.

Sūsā is also the Mandingo pronunciation of the name of the Sudanese town of Soso [q.v.].

(Maurice Delaporte)

SUTRA, covering, protection, shelter, especially at the gālāt, where sutra means the object, which the worshipper places in front of him or lays in the direction of the śiṣṭā whereby he shuts himself off in an imaginary cincture in which he is not disturbed by human or demonic influences. "The fictitious fencing off of an open place of prayer, the sutra, seems to have had among other objects that of warding off demons" (Wellhausen, Reste, p. 158). In one tradition the man who deliberately penetrates into this imaginary area is actually called a śaṅgitā (Bukhārī, Śatāt, bāb 100; cf. Ahmad b. Hanbal, Muṣannāt, iv. 22; Taylīṣī, Muṣannāt, Haidarbād 1521, No. 1542).

The word is not found in the Korān. In Hadith it often occurs in the expression sutra rasa (tastātā, tistātā) bi-ṣawāw in traditions which describe the ritual ablution, in which one conceals one's nakedness or causes it to be concealed by a cloak or curtain (e.g. Bukhārī, Śatāt, bāb 14; Ghāzin, bāb 21; Muslim, Ḥaifī, trad. 70, 79; Abū Dā'ūd, Tukhrā, bāb 123; Manṣūrī, bāb 37). Similarly sutrī is the name given to the curtain by which Muhammad concealed his women from the gaze of the world (Bukhārī, Mağbūrī, bāb 56; Niknāz, bāb 67). We are further told that one performs the gālāt in the direction of an object which isolates him from the multitude (jāma'ah min al-nāzī) so that he is not disturbed by them (e.g. Bukhārī, Ḥaifī, bāb 53; Muslim, Śatāt, trad. 259; Abū Dā'ūd, Muṣannāt, bāb 53).

Muhammad is said to have been quite unrestricted in his choice of a sutra: baggage-camels, horses, trees, saddles (Bukhārī, Śatāt, bāb 98), a couch (ṣibū, bāb 99), lance (jāba, bāb 92), stick (jumma, bāb 93), the pillars of the mosque (bāb 95) are mentioned. Hadith has preserved the memory of two opinions regarding the sutra; one gives minute rules and the other opposes this.

The former endeavours to lay down accurately what distance should be preserved between the sutra and him who performs the gālāt (mawarr al-gālāt, "space to allow a sheep to pass"); Bukhārī, Śatāt, bāb 91; Muslim, Śatāt, trad. 265, 264 etc.); it makes Muḥammad explain that no one is to be allowed to pass between anyone and his sutra (Bukhārī, Śatāt, bāb 100; 101; Muslim, Śatāt, trad. 258-262 etc.), that passers-by, especially dogs, asses and women, intercept the gālāt: the Apostle of God said: "If one performs the gālāt without having in front of him something, such as the end or central part of a saddle, his gālāt is intercepted by a passing dog, ass or woman" (Tirmidhī, Maṣwāḥ, bāb 136; Ahmad b. Hanbal, vi. 80).

The other view holds that the gālāt is never intercepted by passers-by (this is also Shāfi'i's view according to Tirmidhī's note on Maṣwāḥ, bāb 135). Aḥṣāa explains indignantly: "you place us on the same level as asses and dogs; by Allah, the Prophet used to perform the gālāt while I lay on the couch between him and the śiṣṭā" (Bukhārī, Śatāt, bāb 103). The same tenacity is seen in an anecdote by Ibn 'Abbās: "I was riding behind al-Faḍl on a she-ass; we came up
to the Prophet just as he was performing the qalāt and with his companions in Mina. We dismounted and took our places in the row, while the animal ran among the crowd without intercepting the qalāt" (Tirmidhi, Muwādhah, bāb 135; cf. Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, ii. 196).

The Shāfiʿīs call the suṭra suṣma. The various views of the jurists are given in al-Nawawī in his commentary on Muslim’s Al-Ṣaḥḥah, Cairo 1283, ii. 76 ʿay.; cf. also Tirmidhi’s remarks on bāb 133—136 in his chapter Muwādhah al-Suṭra.

Abū ʿAbdullāh al-Shāfiʿī, ed. Juynboll, p. 29, writes as follows: "If anyone passes a man who is performing the qalāt and there is a suṭra or stick between them of about an arm’s length in size, it is not makrūh; nor is it makrūh if there is no stick but a line which the worshipper has drawn at a distance of 3 ells; if on the contrary there should be nothing of the kind at all then it (passing by) would be makrūh. The qalāt would however remain valid".

It may be mentioned in conclusion that the suṭra of the imām at the qalāt serves for those with whom he performs the qalāt (Buḫṣāṭ, Ṣaḥāḥ, bāb 90).


AL-SUṬUDĪ, Sain al-Dīn 'Abd al-Latīf b. 'Abd Allāh, a theologian who died in 736 (1335/1336). Biographical data do not seem to be known historically. He contested the tenets of Ibn 'Arabi (q.v.) in some ḥadīth occurring in al-Sakhawī’s work al-Kawāl ik al-maṣāḥīḥ waṭ-Tarjīmat: Ibn Ṭabarī (MS, in Berlin, Ahlwardt, Verschelde, No. 2849, cf. No. 7846, 4) and is mentioned (ep. cit., No. 8379, cf. No. 3658) as the author of a prayer (duʿa).

Bibliography: C. Brockelmann, G. A. L., ii. 9. (C. Van Arendonck)

AL-SUṬUDĪ, Abu l-‘Aṣrāf al-Mālikī, a theologian of the xth (xviith) century. He wrote a controversial work finished in Shawwal 942 = April 1356 against the Christians (and the Jews), which has been edited from manuscripts of Leyden and Oxford by F. J. van den Ham (Disputatio pro religione Mohammedanorum adversus Christianam, Leyden 1877—1890) and is in substance an extract from a book by Abu l-Bakr Ṣalih b. Ḥasan al-Djaʿfari (written in 618 = 1221) entitled Tabḥīj al-man harraf al-İndir. He is probably to be identified with Abu l-‘Aṣrāf al-Mālikī, the servant of the Saʿīd Shāhāb Abu l-‘Aṣrāf al-Djaʿfari (died some years after 930 = 1523/1524), cf. al-Shārāni, Lamāqah al-Anwār fi Tabḥīj al-İndir, Cairo 1347, iii. 113 ʿay.), who wrote, according to Ḥadīth Khālifa (iv. 557, No. 9521) a commentary on the Hadiths of al-Ḥusayn (q.v.). For al-Suṭudī refers to his polemics (p. 146, 147, 4) to Abu l-‘Aṣrāf as his master (muḥaddith) and al-Shārāni (ep. cit., ii. 113, s. a.) mentions Abu l-‘Aṣrāf al-Mālikī as a devoted adept of Abu l-‘Aṣrāf, from whom he probably derives his nisba al-Suṭudī. According to van den Ham (Præfatio of his edition, p. 6) his book contains many passages occurring word for word in a manuscript commentary on the Hadiths preserved in Gotha (Persich, Die Arab. Handschriften ... zu Gotha, iv. 294, No. 2395), in which the author’s name is ʿAbd Allāh al-Mālikī.

Bibliography: in addition to the works mentioned above: Ḥājjī Khālifa, Rauš al-Żamīn, ed. Flügel, ii. 249, No. 2736; Steinschneider, Ptolemische u. apologetische Literature in arabischer Sprache (Weimar 1897, s. f. d.). Leipzig 1877, p. 36 (No. 17); id. (No. 121), 149; F. Treibs, Liber deorum sacrorum contra Christianos ancitore Salis ibn al-Ḥusayn, Thesis Bonn 1807, p. v. vi.; C. Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 430, ii. 339. (C. Van Arendonck)

SUṬUDĪ (or Abu l-‘Aṣrāf) b. YAHYĀ b. MUḤYĪ l-DIN al-MUṬANABĪ al-AḤRĀF al-ShAḤAB al-DIMĀHIG, a man of letters, who died in Damascus in Jāfār 1127 (Fulur 1715). He studied several branches of Muslim knowledge and one of his preceptors was ʿAbd al-Ghanī al-Nabulusī. Al-Murādī mentions his Divān entitled Muḥājir al-Ḥadāsār bi-Līlān al-İhārāt and gives specimens of his poetry. According to the same author, Al-Mushībī gives an article on him in his Naṣīḥat al-ḥikāth wa-Raḥbat Ẓāī al-aḥzān (cf. Brockelmann, G. A. L., ii. 294). A manuscript in praise of Damascus from his pen is extant in a manuscript of the Preussische Staatsbibliothek (Ahlwardt, Verzeichnis, No. 6090, We 1120, l. 758, cf. No. 8172).


SUWĀK. [See Sūk.]

AL-SUWĀDIYĀ, the harbour of Aṣṣūkī, which lay 12 mil from the Mediterranean. The town owed its rise owing to the gradual siting up of the harbour of Selecina Pieria which lay a little farther north. Even in the time of Vespasian an attempt had been made, by making a great tunnel through the rock (which still exists and is called al-Ǧarīs, i.e. the Pers. Čehrūšt or Čārtū) to avert the danger of setting up its port from the great trading centre but without permanent success. In the early Muslim period Suwādiyya is still occasionally mentioned (al-Baladhuri, ed. de Goeje, p. 148, 18, Ḥaṣan Suwādiyya; al-Maṣʿūdī, Muḥāsib al-Djahās, ed. Barbier de Meynard, ii. 199; Yaḥyā, Muḥāsib, i. 126; Saʿīd al-Din, Manṣūrī al-İlğāl, ed. Juynboll, ii. 47). In the histories of the conquest also for Kalābūša or Malakūya, Suwādiyya (in 21 H.) should probably be read (Custani, Annali dell' Islam, iv. 506, § 81), and perhaps also later the unknown al-Malakūya, since Busaid (Dardoulo) and al-Ḳaṣār (now Ƙaṣār al-Zaw) are mentioned in its neighbourhood, to which the people of Darğūsh migrated (Quatremère, Hist. d. Sult. Mont., i, 4, p. 266; van Berchem, Voyages en Syrie, i. 250, 6). But gradually the importance of the ancient seaport passed to its southern neighbour al-Suwaidiyya, which took its name from the "Black Stones" (the 36 Māṣūrāq, still called Būyūk and Kūfāk Kāra) and the "Black Mountains" (Maṭṣā or Makhīrūm, a town of Montaç, Nigra, Syl. 1. Ūṯā Ḫāṭʾ, i.e. Amanos). In the older Arab geographers (e.g. al-Khwārizmi, Ibn Khurdadhbih al-Battani), the town is not yet mentioned. It only seems to have because of some note shortly before the Crusades, if its name is to be recognised in the Development
Suyūṭī was born on 1st Rajab 849 (Oct. 3, 1445) in Cairo where his father was a teacher of fiqh in the Madrasa al-Shāhānūnīyya. After the early death of his father in Ṣafar 855 = March 1451 (see his Bughyat al-Walā'ī, p. 206) a Sufi friend of his adopted the boy. He began his studies in 864 (1460) and concluded them on a journey through the cities of Egypt and a pilgrimage to Mecca in 869 (1465). Returning to Cairo, he first set up as a consultant on legal problems, and in 872 (1467) on the recommendation of his teacher al-Buḫārī he received the professorship at the Shāhānūnīyya formerly held by his father. In 891 (1486) he was moved to the more important al-Baḥrānīyya but in Rajab 906 (Feb. 1501) he lost this office, as he was accused of a breach of trust in the management of the institution’s property.

He then retired to al-Rāwa on the Nile island and, when his successor died three years later, would not be induced to take up the office again. He died on 18th Dūrād 1, 911 (Oct. 17, 1505).

Suyūṭī’s literary activity, which he had already begun at the age of 17, was distinguished by an unusual versatility. The very long list of his writings compiled by Flügel in the Winzer Jahrb, 1832, vols. 58–60, gives 561 works but it includes numerous quite short treatises in addition to substantial works. Suyūṭī’s ambition was to try his skill in all branches of Muslim learning, and he did make a number of compilations, which are now of great value to us as compensating for lost works of classical literature as well as collections of material. From the catalogue of his extant works given in G. A. L., ii. 145 only the best known will be dealt with here, in so far as they have been printed.

He collected all traditions referring to the exposition of the Kūrān in his (apparently lost) Tadhqīmīn al-Kūrān fī l-Tafsīr al-muṣūm. He abbreviated this work by giving only the literary sources instead of the idāsāt in his Kitāb al-Durr al-manṣūrī fī l-Tafsīr al-muṣūm. Cairo, 1314, 6 vols. A number of obscure passages, he discussed in his Mashāhīrat al-Ābān fī Mushāhāt al-Kūrān, Būlāḏ 1784, Cairo 1309, 1310. He dealt at length with the occasions of the separate sūras in his Luhāb al-Nuṣḥ fī Aṣbāb al-Nuṣḥ, which is based on Wāḥid’s work but supplements this material from tradition and exegesis and lays special stress on making his sources clear (printed a.l. [Stambl], 1290 and several times on the margin of its most popular commentary). This was begun by his teacher al-Maḥṣūlī Dālī al-Dīn (d. 864 = 1459) and finished by Suyūṭī in 40 days in 870 (1465) it is therefore usually called Tafsīr al-Dālīsīn, pr. Bombay 1869, Lacknow 1869, Calcutta 1257, Delhi 1854, Cairo 1300, 1301, 1305, 1313, 1328; among the glosses the best known is that of Sulaimān al-Djamāl (d. 1204 = 1790), pr. Būlāḏ 1828, Cairo 1302, 1308. Suyūṭī later placed a large commentary entitled Tadhqīmīn al-Bahrān wa-Muṣūm al-Baḥrān, but it is not clear whether this is lost or was never completed. Only the introduction to it has survived, a survey of all the branches of study relating to the Kūrān, which he published separately in 872 (1367) under the title al-Tadhqīr fī ʿUllām al-Tafsīr. He afterwards expanded this work, by using the K. al-Burūḵī fī ʿUllām al-Kūrān of al-Zarkashi (d. 794 = 1392) into its Iṣbaḥ which is the most exhaustive examination of the whole subject (ed.
by Mowlawies Baheeroodeen and Nour -ool Haq with an analysis by A. Sprenger, Calcutta 1852/1854, pr. Cairo 1278, 1307, 1317.

Suyūtī aimed at collecting from Tradition all the sayings of the Prophecy in his 遐jumlah al-
Marāyi fa, which is also called 遐jumlah al-Qaṣīm or al-遐jumlah al-ḥakīm. He himself prepared a synopsis of this, the 遐jumlah al-ṣaghir min Ḥadīth al-
Baṣīr al-nagāfī added a supplementary al-
Ziyāda; a commentary on this by ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Jivālān (d. 1012 = 1602) was printed at Bū probably in 1286. The work which had an alphabetical arrangement was re-arranged by al-Muttaqī al-
Hindi (d. 975 = 1567, or 977 = 1569) according to the rubrics of Fīh with the title Manāqib al-
Ummāl fi Sunna al-
Aṣwāl wa ʿl-
Aṣwāl; he next worked the two books into his K. Ḥayāt al-
Ummāl fi Sunna al-
Aṣwāl. He finally collected together the traditions about the sayings and doings of the Prophet once more and thus arose the Kaws al-
Ummāl fi Thūbūt Sunna al-
Aṣwāl wa ʿl-
Aṣwāl (printed Bābār 1312/1313, 3 vols., folio). Of Suyūtī's numerous works dealing with special points of Tradition we may mention his book on the Qualities of the Prophet, Kifayat al-
Talib al-
fī Ḥaqq al-
Aṣwāl fi Ḥaqq al-
Aṣwāl, Bābār 1319/1320, 2 vols. He deals with questions of criticism of Tradition on the lines of Ibn al-
Dawwrat [q. v.]; on the latter's K. al-
Marāyi fa he wrote a first notes entitled al-
Nubṭ al-
badāi (see Fikhrī Kitāb al-
Arabiyā hāl-
kūfīyāh ḥāl-
kūfīyāh, 1. 445) which is probably identical with the al-
Taṣābih al-
Marāyi fa, printed in a Maḥrūmā, Lucknow 1303. He then edited the whole himself again in the al-
Laṭīf al-
maṣāfah ʿl-
al-
Nāṭiq ʿl-
Marāyi fa, Cairo 1317. Of Suyūtī's smaller works, very many very many dealt with eschatological questions. Al-
Kurtabi's (d. 672 = 1273) al-
Taṣābih bi-
Aṣwāl al-
Maṣāhif al-
Aṣwāl is edited under the title Sharh al-
Subtūr fi Sharh Ḥal al-
Maṣāhif ʿl-
Kurtabi, also often simply K. al-
Bābār [pr. Cairo 1309, 1320, in a Persian translation, Lahore 1871]. A synopsis of it Baṣīr al-
qātib bi-
al-
Haft al-
Maṣāhif is printed on the margin of the Cairo edition. As a supplement he wrote in 884 (1479) al-
Dudīr al-
qātib fi Umūm al-
Aṣwāl, lith. in India 1311. On the examination of the dead in the grave he wrote 176 radjās verses entitled al-
Tāhīta fi Lailat al-
Maḥṣūl, pr. with a commentary by M. ʿArīfī, Fīs 1314, by M. al-
Thāqāt Dja-
nīn, ibid. 1321. His K. al-
Dawr al-
qātib fi ʿl-
Bāšr ʿal-
Naṣm al-
Qātib has also been also several times printed. Several of his shorter works, e.g. six on the question whether the parents of the Prophet are in Paradise, are printed in the Maṣīmāt al-
Maṣāhif al-
Rās, Bābār 1316/1317 and 1334.

Suyūtī discussed the whole field of philology in an extremely full and valuable encyclopaedia entitled al-
Makārib fi ʿl-
Ummār al-
Qaṣīm, Būlāk 1283, Cairo 1323, verified by M. b. Al-
Ainain under the title Taṣābih al-
Maṣāhif, Fīs 1334. Following the example of Ibn al-
Ahnār [q. v.] he endeavored to apply the ṣumul, or principles of the science of Fīh to grammar in his al-
Taṣābih fi ʿl-
Ummāl fi Naṣm al-
Makārib, Bābār 1310, cf. Sprenger in Z. D. M. G., xxvii. 7; A. Schmidt in al-
Muqaddimāt, Sbornik Statei, St. Petersburg 1897, p. 309 sqq. He also dealt with separate gram-
matical points on the lines of the discussion of legal points in a work which he called al-
Oṣrāh ʿal-
Naṣm, a title he had already used for a compendium of Fīh, with the supplement al-
Nāṣmāt, printed Bābār 1317, 4 vols. From 868 (1463) he had originally been collecting the material for this, along with particulars of the lives and works of the philologists; but after Sog 1493 he separated the Nāṣm from his material and on the advice of Maṣūf al-
Din b. Faḥd collected the historical matter under the title Baṣīr al-
Wāṣi, pr. Cairo 1326. He collected traditions regarding the beginnings of grammar in the al-
Kurtabi al-
Maṣāhif, fī Sabab Wāṣf al-
Aṣwāl, pr. in the al-
Tāhīta al-
Maṣāhif, Siāmāb 1320/1322, p. 49–53. He wrote a commentary on the Kaws al-
Ummāl fi Naṣm (q. v.) al-
Maṣāhif he wrote a Sharh Shāmī, Cairo 1332. He wrote an original grammatical study entitled al-
Kaws al-
Maṣāhif ʿl-
Tāhīta wa ʿl-
Kurtabi, on which a commentary by Muḥ-
mad b. ʿAbd al-
Rahmān b. Ṣūrī al-
Fāṣ was printed at Fāṣ 1319, and another in the al-
Qātib fi ʿl-
Maṣāhif which was printed with notes by al-
Shāhāni in Cairo 1318 and 1327/1328 in two two, and a commentary on the verses quoted as examples by the same entitled al-
Dawr al-
Maṣāhif, Cairo 1328.

In the field of history Suyūtī has given us three main works: one on general world history entitled Baṣīr al-
Zahār fī Wāṣf al-
Dhālī, Cairo 1282, etc., a history of the Caliphs, Tāhīta al-
Dhālī, ed. by S. Lee and Maulawi Abū al-
Haqq, Calcutta 1857, Cairo 1305, 1913, Lahore 1870, 1875, Delhi 1906, transl. by H. S. Jarrett (Bibli. Ind.), Calcutta 1881, and a history of Egypt entitled al-
Maṣāhif fī Ḥaft al-
Dhālī, Cairo 1306 (?), pr. ibid. 1299, 1321. In biography in addition to the already mentioned history of the grammatical school he also wrote a biographical collection on Kūfīn expositors, entitled Tabāhāt al-
Maṭfāsirīn, ed. A. Meuinge, Leyden 1839, and a synopsis of al-
Dhāfābī's (d. 748 = 1348) Tabāhāt al-
Mashūfī, ed. F. Wüstenfeld, Göttingen 1833/1834.

The gift of poetry was denied to Suyūtī. But he experimented in belles-lettres with the composition of Maṭfūnā, which only have the title and the form (rhymed prose) in common with the perfect examples of this genre and collect all kinds of interesting notes about plants etc. out of Hadīth and Adab. Twelve of them were lithographed in Cairo in 1275 and again in the collection issued at Būlāk 1297 and printed at Stamul in 1298; 6 of them were translated by O. Reicher in Beiträge zur Moglen-Literatur, part 8, Kirchhain N. L. 1918. Some of these are also quite original, for example Rasa fī ad-Dhālī min al-
Ṣūr al-
Kurtabi, in which he makes no representatives of different branches of learning describe their wedding-night in the technical terms of their particular subject, lith. Cairo, n. d. pr. Fīs 1319. Other works also show that he did not hesitate to treat of sexual and pornographical subjects (cf. those detailed in G. A. L. ii. 153, N. 207–213). A synopsis al-
Dawr al-
Haft al-
Aṣwāl wa ʿl-
Taṣābih fi ʿl-
Maṣāhif wa ʿl-
Maṭfāsirīn, which was made from his Adab-book Adī al-
Dhālī, by ʿAbd al-
Kāyīm b. Mollā ʿAbd al-
Naṣr al-
Shīrāzī in Tatar (7th ed., Kasan 1905). He was not ashamed to
Tā', third letter of the Arabic alphabet, with the numerical value of 400. For palaeographical details see ʿAqrāla, i, 382b, 383b and plate I.

Tā', sixteenth letter of the Arabic alphabet, with the numerical value of 9. For palaeographical details see ʿAqrāla, i, plate I.

Tāʾabella Sharran, a nickname of the old Arab poet and Bedouin hero, famed in legend, Thabî: ʿAbdul Rāḥîm b. Sufayn of the tribe of Fāhīm. Various explanations of it are given by the sources: "he carried missive under his arm", namely a sword, a knife (ṣamâna), a rope which proved to be a gîlî, or a skin full of poisonous snakes (Aghibî). His mother was according to one statement (in Frenzel) a negress, according to the Aghibî a woman of the Fāhīm tribe called Anima, who afterwards married the Hudhali Abî Kābir, who sought to take his step-son's life. Taʾabella Sharran was throughout his life an enemy of the Banî Hudhail and Banî Bâitila. He perished in a fight with the latter on Mount Najmar in their territory (Vâkili, Musafirîh, p. 421). According to a statement of Ibn Kutalba quoted by Bau (cf. Bibliography) he was a contemporary of Nawfâl b. Muʿawiyâ, who is said to have lived for sixty years before and after Ilām. But all that is recorded of the life of Taʾabella Sharran and the poems ascribed to him breathe throughout the spirit of the old Arab Djâliyya. He is pictured as having all the traditional features of the wandering robber knight of the early Arab period. He wrote a lament for Shanfara, who was his companion in battle, along with ʿAmr b. Barâṣ (Aghibî). The longest and finest of his four longer poems on a fallen relative inspired Goethe to write a poem in the same style.


(H. H. Brâô)

TABÂLA, a place in the west of northern Yaman, in the interior of ʿAsir, about seven days' journey S. E. of Mecca. Its fertility was
proverbial among the Arabs. The basin of Tabbala and Tarata is often called ṣāḥfar ("green"; cf. al-Handānī, Ḥadhran, ed. D. H. Müller, Leiden 1884, p. 165; Yākūṯ Muḥammad, ed. Wustenfeld, l. 164). The itinerary of the pilgrim caravans from Mecca through the frontier lands of the Ḥijāz and Yaman to Šaʿrān given in Burckhardt, *Travels in Arabia*, London 1829, i. 445 was marked on the map as early as Berghaus, *Arabien und das Nilland* (Gotha 1835, esp. p. 69; and see also Ritter's map [1852, ed. by H. Kiepert]), for the stretch from Mecca to Tabbala. The latter was the 10th station on the territory inhabited by the Shumarān. Al-Idrīṣī (see Jaubert, *Geographie d'Édris*, Paris 1836, l. 148) describes in detail a fortified place belonging to Mecca, with perennial water, cisterns and palm trees (similarly Ibn Khordadbeh, *B. G. A.*, vi. 135, 188, 191) on the irrigation cf al-Handānī, p. 258, 116 (180); on its wealth in palm-trees, cf. al-Handānī, p. 258; al-Azraqī (ed. Wustenfeld), p. 262; its fertility may also be deduced from Bakrī, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 191 and damage done to it later by Berbers from al-Handānī, p. 258. Al-Idrīṣī further (cf. op. cit.) says that Tabbala was occupied for the Caliph Abīd al-Malik b. Marwān but was considered too insignificant. Al-Ḥajjādīḏ, appointed governor of it, did not think it worth while taking it up the pass, whence the proverb: "More despicable than Tabbala to al-Ḥajjādīḏ" (cf. thereon with further information Yākūṯ, op. cit., i. 816; Freytag, *Provenienz* ii. 981 also Liša, viii. 80 sqq.; Tūfī, vii. 239 sqq.). According to al-Idrīṣī, Tabbala lay 5 days' journey from Mecca and 3 from the market of Uqqūn. In the itinerary given by him from Mecca to Šaʿrān (see Jaubert, op. cit., p. 143, N. vi.; cf. thereon Ritter, *Zentral-Kaifer*, ii. 166 sqq., 197), Tabbala is the 9th station from Mecca and is described as a town lying in a depression in a valley. This broad depression begins at the foot of the hills of Taʾif and Yaman is well watered at its beginning and also contains the towns of Tarata and Bihā (Yākūṯ; cf. Sprenger, *Das Leben und die Lehre des Mohammed*, iii. 297). Of the nine stations mentioned between Tabbala and Šaʿrān on this itinerary, the next to Tabbala is said to be Bihā (Yākūṯ). Sprenger proposes the connection B. Bāfnūn (also al-Handānī, *op. cit.,* p. 118, 127 and in his itinery from Mecca to Šaʿrān* p. 178 and 165; Ibn Khordadbeh, *op. cit.,* p. 134) in contrast to his earlier spelling (*Z. D. M. G.*; 1888, xii., 321). According to the same authority Tabbala itself lies 8 stations north of the (14th) station Mahḍjara, in which stands the tree (Tabak al-Maḥḏ) which is regarded as marking the boundary between the lands of Mecca and Yaman (see Ibn Khordadbeh, *op. cit.,* vi. 153). Modern writers mention another route from Mecca via Taʾif and Tarata to Raniya (instead of the latter al-Rawāihan in al-Idrīṣī, al-Roheynya in Burckhardt, Rohe(y)n in later writers) and Tabbala as a main road (cf. Burckhardt, *op. cit.,* p. 451; Ritter, *op. cit.,* p. 200). Its topographical position may be clearly seen from the map of the coast of S.W. Arabia, sheet 7, *Wadi Bihā* (compiled for the *Geographical Section General Staff*, from *Amer. Survey* made in 1917) on which the place (*Tebala*) is marked at 19° 33' 55" N. Lat. 42° 31' E. Long. Greenwich. It lies on the Wadī of the same name which seems the northern boundary of the land of the Beni Ruʾl-Karn on the main road from Taʾif to S.E. via Bār-al-Ghaḍāt, with the road from the S.W. from al-Sīmā and Halb which also starts from Taʾif in a southerly direction. Sprenger's assertion, deduced from a comparison of several mentions of (Wādī) Bihā and Bihās in al-Handānī in *Détrits de l'Arabie*, Bern 1875, p. 47, that al-Handānī thought that the Wādī Bihā which is often confused with Bihā also waters Tarād and Tabbala cannot therefore be accepted nor the assumption of more recent writers that Tabbala lies in the Wādī Bihā. The Wādī Tabbala (mentioned in a quotation from Taṣrā in al-Handānī p. 173 [not in the *Dīrām*; see D. H. Müller's edition of Handānī, ii. 183]) flows into the Wādī Bihā. Al-Handānī often mentions Tabbala in topographical statements in connection with Bihā and Tabrā (p. 27, 49, 84, 127 [on mentions in poetry of the occurrence of the lion at Tabbala, cf. Sprenger, *op. cit.,* p. 165, 257; and Yākūṯ, *op. cit.,* i. 835, 791; iv. 1006; Ibn Ḥawāq, *B. G. A.*, ii. 35; Bakrī] in distances (p. 187, 189) and in quotations from the poets (p. 173, 207, 215, 235). To the land of Tabbala he includes *'Arram* (Yākūṯ, *Muḥammad* ii. 918) Zaba, for which see Raniya; cf. Sprenger, *op. cit.,* p. 240 and (p. 239) his map of this region constructed from al-Handānī's data. The latter (p. 165) mentions Tabbala along with Raniya (the vocalisation Raniya in D. H. Müller's edition is not certain; the manuscripts do not give the vowel signs in the passage; Yākūṯ, *op. cit.,* ii. 826; al-Muḥammad, *B. G. A.*, ii. 112 and Bakrī have Ranya, as has al-Handānī *op. cit.,* p. 215 and 259, see D. H. Müller, ii. 32 and Sprenger, *op. cit.,* p. 240 and *Z. D. M. G.*, *op. cit.* and modern geographers). Sprenger's supposition (*op. cit.,* p. 156, 253) that Ṣuqāra in Ptolemy, vi. 7, 389, was an error for Ṣuqāra and identical with Ṣuqāra in Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, vi. 154 and the assertion he bases on it that 'Tomala is only a dialectical variant from Tabala or as highly educated men say, Taballa, Tabala are both incorrect. This identification adopted also by M. Hartmann, *Die antiken Arber* von Leipzig 1909, p. 420 is not supported by Sprenger's interpretation of al-Handānī's statement, p. 188 about the old pilgrim routes from Ḥajramot, which according to his construction (*op. cit.,* p. 156, 161) meet in Tablā. Pliny describes Thomala as a city of the Sabaeans (see further Pauly-Wissowa, a.v. Saba, col. 1328). Sprenger's assumption (p. 253) that Taballa lay in what had originally been Minān territory is also erroneous; his localisation of the Minān was completely wrong (see *Reaenycly*, col. 1316 sqq.). The traditional derivation of the name of the town (Tebalat, in the *Qāhūn-numū* of Ḥabīlī Khalīfī, p. 520) from that of an Amalekite woman Tabalīth, is of no value, but one may nevertheless assume that the town is a very old foundation (Yākūṯ; *op. cit.,* l. 846). — In the pre-Muḥammadan period a white stone in Tabbala was worshipped as an idol, called Dhu 'l-khalasa (Khilasa); Muḥammad had it destroyed (Yākūṯ, *op. cit.,* l. 55 sq.; the Khilāsh, who are mentioned among the followers of this cult, are also mentioned alone by al-Handānī, p. 119, and by Yākūṯ, *op. cit.,* ii. 461 sq.; ii. 608, 850 in connection with Tabbala). The verses given there, in which this oracle of Tabbala, which was consulted by casting lots with arrows, is mentioned are wrongly ascribed to Imru 'l-Kais, according to Ibn Ḥāghim (cf. on the idol the information collected in *Liša*, viii.)
295: Tâbîḏ, iv. 389; on Tâbâla as the site of a pagan cult, cf. Wellhausen, Reste arabischen Heidentums, p. 45 sqq.). The Khâṣîm, whom Ibn Ruṣûm, B. G. A. M., viii. 2, 75, thought to be the inhabitants of Tâbâla, are more accurately the people of Târûba and Bîgha and the land behind Tâbâla while the inhabitants of Tâbâla proper are the Banû Mâzin (Wüstenfeld, Die Wohnplätze und Wanderungen der arabischen Stämme, xiv. of the Abkhâlid, d. h. sein Geschlecht. d. Wüstenfeld, Göttingen 1868, p. 84 and 58, following Bakr). According to Khâṣîm (n. Bibl.) there were camping places of the Araba to Tâbâla (cf. Ibn Khâṣîm, op. cit., p. 188). According to Ibn Khâṣîm (ed. Kay, Yaman), p. 129 sq, Tâbâla is the land of the Banû Nâhid. Dhu l-Khâṣîm, about whom we see Bakr, p. 316, Ibn al-Kalbî, Kiṣâb al-Aqîm, Cairo 1332 [1914] (from whom Yâkût borrowed; cf. Wellhausen, op. cit., p. 390 sqq.) and Yâkût, op. cit., i. 461 sqq. is boldly explained by D. Nielsen, Handbuch der altarabischen Altertumskunde, Copenhagen–Paris–Leipzig 1927, p. 251, 254, as an Arabian Venus-deity. As the cause of the conflict Tâbâla was also a market: al-Hamâdâni mentions the traditions. In (p. 103) the history of Islam Tâbâla is known as one of the towns which were among the first to adopt the new religion and thus preserved their independence (Goluis, in Alpharabius, Elementa Astronomicae, Amsterdam 1669, p. 85).

**Bibliography:** The works of Burckhardt, Spenger, Wellhausen, Ritter and the Arabic geographers and lexicographers (al-Hamâdâni, Yâkût, Bakr, al-Îrāfî) mentioned in the article; also J. v. Hammer-Purgstall, Jahrbücher der Literatur, Vienna 1840, vol. 92, p. 55 (on the itinerary from Sâmîn to Mecca in Ṭâbâla-numa), and vol. 94, p. 94; Spenger, Die Post- und Reisereisen des Orients, Abhandl. d. d. Kunde des Morgenl., Leipzig 1864, iii/ii. 125 sq., 138 sq. (on the itinerary from al-Hamâdâni), 128 sqg. (on the itineraries of Khâṣîm, Ibn Khâṣîm, and Ibn al-Mudâjir). (J. Tatsch) al-Tabari, nisba from Tabaristan; most of the bearers of the nisba have come from Amul, the capital of this province. This nisba is also wrongly referred to Tabaristan (Tabariyas) in place of the correct al-Tabaristân (cf. Samânî, Amûdî, fol. 366b; Tâbîḏ al-îrâs, ill. 355).

1. Abu l-Tâbi'î al-Tabari, AHIKHIR B. ABD ALLAH B. TABARI, a Shâfi'î jurist, teacher of Abu Ishâq al-Shirazi and of al-Kâfî al-Baghdâdi; al-Shirazi who attended his classes for over ten years, praises him as his best teacher. Al-Tabari was born in Amul in the year 348 (959/960). At the age of 14 he began his studies in fiqh in his native city and in 371 (981/982) went to Dâr al-fiqh to study under Abu Bakr al-Ismâ'îlî but the latter died the day after his arrival there. For four years he studied with Abu l-Hasan al-âsâî (d. 383 = 993) and continued his studies in Baghdad with Abu Muhammad al-Bâî (d. 389 = 1007/1008), Abu l-Hasan al-Dârâḏî (d. 385 = 993), the famous Shâfi'i Abu Hamîd al-İsfârînî (d. 406 = 1015/1016) and with Abu l-Faraaîd al-Maţhâf b. Zakariya al-Nahrâwînî (d. 390 = 1000), a follower of the school of law of the historian Tabari. He then remained in Baghdad engaged in private study. He was victorious in different disputations with Hâfizîs, e.g. with al-Khaddîrî (Subkt., ill. 182 sqq.). In 422 (1034) he was admitted a notary
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Ali, No. 8202, 11850); 7. Sifa 'Adidjat al-Nabi (Hadjji Khalifa, No. 7758; if not identical with Brockmeier, No. 4); 8. Wadjnat al-Mawdhi (f) Kemah; Man ra'anî f. l-Muslim fa'a z-ranî (Hadjji Khalifa, No. 14176); 9. Manhâj il-l-Masih al-Manfûr (Hadjji Khalifa, No. 13142); 10. al-Sinâ al-Thâtan f. Manhâb Ubûn al-Mawdhi (Hadjji Khalifa, No. 7250, 13035); 11. Ta'aizî bi-Mawdhi (f) âdât (so read for 'Adâtî) al-Kashâ'î l-Sulâm (d. 223 = 837), alphabetically arranged selection (Hadjji Khalifa, No. 3465 and iv. 325); 12. on the rare words in the Qûsîn al-U'rajî of Ibn al-Ashîr (Hadjji Khalifa, ill. 506); 13. Extract from the Anwârî al-Mawdhi (f) il-l-Tauwaanî of Shahb al-Dîn al-Suhrawardi, (d. 562 = 1234); Brockmeier, G. A. L., i. 440; Hajjaji Khalifa, iv. 275); 14. a ten volume commentary on the Ta'biîn of Shari'at (Sukhî; Yâ'fî; Hajjaji Khalifa, ii. 435); 15. Extract from the same Tashâh (Yâ'fî); 16. Târikh al-Mudabîb fi Ta'âla al-Mudâkhab, two volume synopsis of the Muhadabâb of Shari'at (Hadjji Khalifa, vi. 275).


(HEFFENING)

Al-TABARI, Abu 'Ubayd Allah Muhammad b. Dârâ, the Arab historian, was born probably in 839 (end of 224 or beg. 225 A. H.) at Amul in the province of Tabaristan. He began to devote himself to study at a precociously early age, and is said to have known the Kûran by heart by the time he was seven. After receiving his early education in his native town, he received from his father who was quite well off the necessary means of visiting the centres of the Muslim learned world. He thus visited Rayy and its vicinity, then Baghdad, where 'Abd al-Hafl under whom he had intended to study had died shortly before his arrival there. After a brief stay in Bašra and Kûfî he again returned to Baghdad where he remained for some time. He then set out for Egypt but stopped in the Syrian towns to study Kûran. When he was in Egypt (according to Ibn 'Askâr in 867—877; according to Yâ'fî however for the first time in 867 and after a stay in Syria again in 867—870; in 871—872 according to Anwaar, ill. 1562 he was in Baghdad) he must already have been regarded as a celebrated scholar. From there he returned to Baghdad where except for two journeys to Tabaristan (the second in 902—903) he lived till his death in 923.

Tabari seems to have been of a quiet scholarly disposition but full of character. In his earlier years he devoted his whole energy to acquiring the material of Arab and Muslim tradition; later he spent his time mainly in teaching and writing. Although he had only a modest competence, he rejected all financial advantages and even refused lucrative official positions which were offered him. In this way he was able to devote himself to an extremely prolific and versatile literary activity. Apart from his main subsctra, history, Kûran, the recitation and exegesis of the Kûran, he devoted himself also to poetry, lexico graphy, grammar and ethics and even mathematics and medicine. Ten years after his return from Egypt he followed the Shâ'î Mudâkhab and then founded a school of his own, whose followers called themselves Qurtûsyâ after his father's name. But it seems to have differed less in principle than in practice from the Shâ'î school and fell comparatively quickly into oblivion. His break with 'Abîn b. Hanbal however was more fundamental. He recognised the latter only as an authority on Kûran but not on Kûran. He thus brought upon himself the hostility of the Hanbalis. He is said to have attracted the particular hostility of the latter by attacking their interpretation of Sûra xvii. 81. He had to shut himself up in his house to protect himself from the anger of the enraged mob and was only left in peace when a strict order by the police was issued for his protection. His enemies also sought to injure him through the law by laying an accusation against him in which he was accused of heretical tendencies, certainly unjustly.

Tabari's works have not come down to us by any means completely. For example, those writings have been completely lost in which he laid down the principles of his new school of law. On the other hand his commentary on the Kûrân (Qûsîn al-U'rajî of Ibn al-Ashîr) has survived. In this work Tabari collected for the first time the ample material of traditional exegesis and thus created a standard work upon which later Kûrânic commentators drew; it is still a mine of information for historical and critical research by western scholars. Tabari's own position with regard to the traditions collected by him is mainly defined by linguistic (lexicographical and grammatical) criteria. But he also deals with dogmatic and legal deductions which can be obtained from the Kûrân and sometimes permits himself to express a rather candid opinion without however in any way basing it on historical criticism.

Tabari's most important work is his history of the world (Tabrizî al-Rusul wa 'l-Mawdhi). The well known Leyden edition gives only an abbreviated text of the huge work which is said to have been ten times as long but even it fills 324 volumes. Even this synopsis is not complete but had to be supplemented in various passages from later writers who had used Tabari's history of the world.

The work begins after an introduction with the history of the patriarchs, prophets and rulers of the earliest period (i. 1). Then comes the history of the Sassanian period (i. 2) and of the period of Muhammad and the first four caliphs (i. 3—6); the history of the Umayyads (ii. 1—3); lastly the history of the 'Abbasids (iii. 1—4, middle). From the beginning of the Babylonia period the material is arranged annalistically under the years of the Hijra. The work stops in July 915. It was afterwards continued by other historians. Among such supplements may be mentioned (1) the lost al-Mudabîb al-Sis al-Tâhir of Tabari's pupil Abî Muhammad al-Parghanî, (2) the work of Abî 'l-Hasan Muhammad al-Hamâhani (ii. 1127), which came down to the year 1094 but only the first volume exists from the year 977—978. Later historians like Ibn Misâkah and Ibn al-Asîr used Tabari's material for their histories but came down beyond his period so that in a sense they continued his history (down to 979—980 or 1225). Ibn al-Asîr made large use of Tabari's work and sought to harmonise different accounts and to supply gaps from other sources. The fragment of the Spanish Arab 'Arbî (covering
903–932) edited by de Goeje also comes from an independent version and continuation of the annals. In 1296, Tabari’s history was translated into Persian by order of the Sâmânid vizier Abu’l-Muhammad al-Balâ’ami. It was much abbreviated and supplemented from other sources, especially in the older period. This version was also translated into Turkish and Arabic.

Tabari’s Ta’rikh al-Khulâsâ gives the most necessary facts about the persons whom he has used as authorities in his Ta’rikh. The work was originally current as an appendix (šâmil) to Tabari’s Annals. A synopsis, not however complete, was published at the end of the Leyden edition of Tabari (iii., p. 2295–2501).

Tabari procured the material for his history of the world from oral tradition, for the collection of which he had ample opportunity on his wide travels which were mainly devoted to the jâlab al-lûm, and in studies under celebrated scholars. He also used literary sources, namely a book by Abû Mâlikârma; ‘Umar b. Shabbâba al-Kharbî Akhî al-Baghrî, a work on tradition out of which Zâ declaring that he had read to him; Nâsir b. Muzâhhim’s history (Z. S. liv., p. 367); and the Ta’rikh of Muhammad b. Judâjûb and the works on the subject by al-Wâkidî, Ibn Sa’d, Muhammad and Hishâm al-Kabîr, al- Mudânî, Sa’îd b. ‘Umar, Ibn Ta’fîr etc.; for his account of Sâmânian history, he used an Arabic version of the Persian Book of Kings, which seems to be based in part on a translation of this work prepared by al-Muqaffa’. Tabari did not work up the material into a connected account of historical events. He was rather content to collect the available material and to record the different, often contradictory, accounts as they were handed down to him. He therefore declined any responsibility for the reliability of the traditions collected by him. But it is just in the conscientious unharmonised repetition of the collected material of tradition that the value of Tabari’s work for modern historical research lies, especially when it is a question of reconstructing the events of the early period of Islam.


TABARISTÂN (in Fahlavi inscriptions on coins: Ta’furstan, land of the Tarzak), the name applied by the Arabs to Mazedarân, a province of Persia, north of mount Alborz; the name is explained by a popular etymology to mean “land of the tabār” (Abu l-Fâdî, Geography, text p. 432; Mehren, Cosmography, p. 314) on account of the thick forests which cover the country and the principal industry of the inhabitants (wood-cutting). It is bordered on the north by the Caspian Sea, on the south by the chain of the Alborz, on the east by Dajarjân and on the west by Gîlah. The soil is fertile and well watered, rich in fruits but unhealthy on account of the stagnant waters; the little rivers, Herâh, Tâîrî and Tejjen run through it. The principal towns are: Amol, Sari, Shahsavan, Rain and Barfurûsh. The tribes are warlike, disciplined and inclined to murder and plunder. The industries are fishing, catching aquatic birds, cultivating of rice, flax and hemp (Mukaddas, p. 354).

History. At the time of the Muslim conquest this district was ruled by hereditary chiefs who held the title of ispahbâd (Persian: “head of an army”). In 90 (650) in the reign of the Caliph Othman, Sa’d b. Al-‘Aqi, governor of Khif, undertook an expedition against Tabaristân. In the reign of Mu‘awiyah I, Mas’ûla b. Hâiba entered it at the head of 10 or 20,000 men but he perished with the greater part of his army in the passes, crushed by rocks hurled down upon them by the enemy. Another unsuccessful attempt was made by Muhammad b. Al-Aslî in the time of Sulaimân b. Abd al-Malik, Yazid b. Muhammad invaded it; the ispahbâd made a peace and promised to pay an annual tribute of 4,700,000 dirhems, 400 ass-loads of miffon, and the sending of 400 men each bearing a shield, a silver cup and a silk saddle cushion. The inhabitants rebelled in the time of Marsûn b. Muhammad. They were subdued but for a short time only by the governor sent by Abu l-’Abbas al-Saffâ. The Caliph al-Mansûr sent against them Khâzin b. Khuzaima al-Tamimî and Rawb b. Hâim al-Muhallabi, ‘Umar b. al-‘Alî invaded the mountainous country of Dalaim. His great-grandson Muhammad b. Mûsâ b. Hûsh and Mâyazdiyâr b. Kârin conquered the wild mountain country of Shurîn. The latter was given the title of ispahbâd by al-Ma’mûn. When he rebelled in the sixth year of the reign of al-Mu’tasim, he was defeated by Hûsain b. Hasan sent by his nephew Abdallâh b. Tâhir, governor of Khorasan, captured and sent to Samarra, where he died under the lash (245 = 840). His body was hung beside that of Bâbah al-Khurrami. Tabaristân thus passed to ‘Abdallâh b. Tâhir.

He was killed by an emissary of Muhammad b. 'Abdallah b. 'Abd al-Malik. One of his brothers, Hasan b. Zaid, rebelled in 250 (864); on his death in 270 (884) he was succeeded by his brother Muhammad who took the title of al-Dawla al-Malik the "great missionary" and was killed fighting with Muhammad b. Hārūn, a general of the Sāmānid Ismā'īl b. 'Abd al-Malik (287 = 900); the latter annexed the country. In 297/298 (910/911) the Russians, coming by water, laid waste Abasgān and Sāri but were finally driven back by the inhabitants; on their way back what remained of their fleet was intercepted and destroyed by the king of the Khazars. Another 'Allī, al-Hassan b. 'Ali, surnamed al-Nāṣir al-Kabīr, rebelled in 311 (920) and on his death (324 = 937) left his power to his son Sharaf al-Hassan b. al-Kāsim, surnamed al-Dawla 'Irshād b. al-Nāṣir and with the condottiere Mustak b. Kākit; he was killed by Marādīdī, then in the service of Asfār b. Shūfī, (cf. zīyārāt) with a blow from a mace at 'Allābād. Thus Asfār became lord of Tabaristan until he perished by the hand of Marādīdī in 319 (931). It was the brother of the latter, Wushangīr, who next ruled, down to the battle of Iṣhāk-Shāhīd in 320 (940) where Mustak b. Kākit was killed and the army of Wushangīr destroyed; the latter having made up his mind to become a vassal of the Sāmānids, settled in Čuğdūn and Tabaristan at intervals like his successors Khūlūd I and Miṃārīh; the latter accepted the suzerainty of the Ghaznavids. The province next passed to the Seldūqs; but ʿIṣḥāq b. Kātin belonging to the house of Bāwandī, lasting for 118 years, practically independent, especially in the mountains; ʿAli al-Dawla ʿAlī b. Shāhryār b. Khārīj, contemporary of the Ghaznavids Maḥmūd III; Nūr al-Din Rūstam; Taḏj al-Mulūk ʿAlī b. Mardwīj; contemporary of the Seldūq Sandjar; ʿAlī al-Dawla Hasan b. Rūstam b. ʿAlī; Ḥusayn al-Dawla wa-l-Din Ar-ḍāshīr b. Hasan, contemporary of ʿOṯmān the Fatimid. Bibliography: Balāḥchī, Ṣafī al-Khulūdī, ed. de Goeje, p. 335–340; F. C. Margotten, The Origins of the Islamic State, New York 1924, ii. 39–48; Muḥammad, D.G.A., iii. 354; Zakḥī al-Din, Tarīḵ Tabaristān, ed. Dorn, St. Petersburg 1850, index; Muhammad b. al-Ḥasan b. Isfandīyar (abridged transl. by E. G. Browne, G. M. S., London 1903), p. 14; ʿAbbāsī, Ṣafī al-Khulūdī, ed. Wustenfeld, iii. 501; Barbier de Meynard, Dict. de la Perse, p. 380; Fr. Spiegel, Erōn. Alterthumskunde, i. 66; Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, Cambridge 1903, p. 358, 376; British Museum Catalogue of Oriental Coins, vol. ix., p. 257; H. Porte, in Numismatique Chronicque, 1901, p. 327 sqq.

(Ch. Huart)

TABARIYA, Tiberias, a town on the western side of the lake of Tiberias (sea of Galilee) (sībār wazar Tabariya) through which the Jordan flows to the south; the lake is rich in fish, 13 miles long, 6 broad and lies 700 feet below the level of the Mediterranean; the town is long and narrow as it is shut in by the steep hills on the west which come right down to the water, north and south of the town. S.S.W. of the town is the Mount of Herod, Tabariya had probably a predecessor in a little town in this region mentioned in the Old Testament (on account of the hot springs some identify it with Hammat, Joshua xix. 35) but nothing certain has been established on this point. The town only became of importance when Herod Antipas about 26 A.D. founded a city to which he gave the name of Tiberias in honour of the emperor Tiberius. It was built with great splendour on the model of Hellenistic towns with temples, theatres, and other public buildings. The splendid palace of the king, described by Josephus, lay on the Mount of Herod (Kašā bint al-Malik) surrounded by the old city wall, the course of which has been traced by G. Schumacher. The stricter Jews avoided it and the population was therefore very mixed, some forced by Herod to settle there and others tempted thither by various privileges. At a later date a remarkable change took place as Tiberias became one of the main centres of purely Jewish life and a centre of Talmudic studies. Here about 200 A.D. was edited the collection of laws known as the Mishnah and later at the beginning of the fourth century the Palestinian Gemara (the so-called Jerusalem Talmud) composed and in the fifth-sixth centuries the Tiberian system of Gemara in general use established. The Hebrew teacher of Jerome was a Jew in Tiberias. The Jewish scholars who worked here are recalled by a series of tombs among them those of Ḳ. Ḥiẓ_EXPI, and R. Akiba. Another old Jewish cemetery with several sarcophagi has been discovered close to the western gate of the city in laying out a new road.

After Constantine the Great, Christianity penetrated, although slowly, into Galilee and in the lists of synods several bishops of Tiberias are mentioned. A temple begun by the Emperor Hadrian in this town was turned into a temple.

The destroyed walls of the town were rebuilt by Justinian. At the Persian invasion in 614 the Jews there, as was the case elsewhere also, are said to have sided with them. In 635 Tiberias passed over to the Muslims. While a number of towns in the province of Urūncl had to be taken by force, Tabariya surrendered to the Arab general Shurahbil who guaranteed the safety of his families and the safety of their lives and the half of their houses and churches. For each qarin of ground they had to pay annually a dirham of wheat or barley, and a dinar for each head of cattle; he also reserved for himself a site on which a mosque was to be built. In the caliphate of Ṣafīrūn the people of Tiberias broke the agreement but were conquered by Ṣafīrūn (according to others by Shurahbil) and yielded on the old terms. With the Crusaders began a new chapter in the history of Tabariya. The town was granted as a fief to Tancred and ultimately came into the possession of Raymond of Tripoli. On Thursday July 2, 1187 (583 A.H.) Saladin surrounded the town and conquered it in a few hours, although it was strongly fortified, and then set it on fire. The Christian army encamped at Ṣaffīrīn in spite of the urgent warnings of Raymond was persuaded by the overwhelming force of Templar Gerard to set out to the help of the town, which resulted in the disastrous battle of Ḥattīn (7 v. 1.) which again in turn led to the capture of Jerusalem and the collapse of Frankish power. Later, in 1240 the town again came into the hands of the Christians when Odo of Montbéliard took it, but in 1247 it was lost to
the Khwarizmians and henceforth Tiberias was Muslim right down to the end of Turkish rule in Palestine. In the middle of the xvi century the town belonged to the Shaikh Zahir al-Amir who had it fortified. In 1759 it suffered from an earthquake, but that of 1827 was much worse, as it destroyed most of the town (but not the baths). In 1790 it was occupied for a short time by Napoleon's troops.

There are more or less brief descriptions of Tiberias, the capital of the province of Urudm, in the Arab geographers. Ya'qubi (275 = 891-892) mentions the position of the town at the foot of a mountain and on a large lake through which the Jordan flows. Iṣṭikhlīr (340 = 951) gives the lake a length of 12 and a breadth of 2-3 miles (its real dimensions are 13 miles long and 6 broad). Muqaddas (375 = 985) says: "The houses stand between the mountain and the lake, the town is narrow and in summer hot and unhealthy. It is about 1 mile long but no breadth. The market place stretches from one gate to the other and the cemeteries are on a hill. The chief mosque on the market place is large and beautiful. Around the lake are villages and palm-trees and ships go up and down. The lake is full of fish and the water is very pleasing." The Persian traveller Nāṣir Khān Kāpārī who visited Tiberias in 438 (1047) puts the length of the lake at 6 and the breadth at 3 miles. "The town is surrounded by walls but not on the lake side; many houses have their foundation on the rocky bottom below the water; besides the chief mosque in the centre of the town there is another on the west side, the Masjid al-Yāsmin. Here is the tomb of Joshua son of Nun and of the 70 prophets slain by the Israelites and also the grave of Abī Huraira. The inhabitants make mats of rushes; on the hill west of the town is a castle built of hewn stones, with a Hebrew inscription". Idrisi (1154, during the period of Crusader rule) describes Tiberias as an imposing town on a high hill on a lake with fresh water, 12 miles long and the same in breadth (!). The boats on it bring supplies to the town. He also mentions the making of rush-mats which was a very important industry. Yākūt (625 = 1125) produced what is said by several of his predecessors; like the other Arab geographers he makes Tiberias be built by Tiberius. Almūnād (v. 372 = 1331) records that the town was destroyed by Saladin, which shows that it was still in ruins and from Ibn Battūta (745 = 1325) it is evident that this case the later.

As long as they existed, the hot medicinal baths (al-Hammam) played an important part in the life of the town. They lay about 40 minutes south of it and perhaps influenced Herod in choosing this town for his capital. Josephus correctly tells us that they were not far from Tiberias at a village called 'Amāhās (i.e. the native Hāmmāt) which agrees with the fact that the old city was discovered by Schumacher on the Mount of Herod to the shore of the lake without enclosing them ("in Tiberias"), as Josephus, Vita, 85, Bell. ii. 1614 says therefore means "in the territory of Tiberias"). They are mentioned as early as Pliny (Nat. Hist., i. 15) and frequently in the Talmud and the Arab geographers are never tired of telling that they are warm without fire being kindled there. Ya'qubi says that the hot water is brought into the town in pipes and Isṭikhlīr adds that the water, although the springs are about 2 parasangs from the town (quite an absurd exaggeration), is still so hot on entering the baths that skins thrown into it have the hair taken off by it, so that the baths cannot be used till cold water is added. Muqaddas speaks of a boiling spring, which supplies most of the baths jointly and from which the steam warms the building. Nāṣir-i Khusraw mentions a spring at the door of the mosque in the centre of the town over which a bath was built, ascribed to King Solomon. Idrisi makes special mention of a large bath called Damākīr, in the saltish water of which small goats and fowls could be stewed and eggs boiled; one bath called al-Lūḥ had hot water which was not salt, while the so-called "little bath" was the only one that was heated by fire; a Muslim prince had built a bath for his family over the latter but later it was presented to the public. There were also many hot springs to the south of it; to these baths there came from all parts paralysed and injured people, or those with diseases of the chest who remained three days in the water and with God's will became healed. These descriptions leave something to be desired in accuracy and clearness, especially as some of them mention in connection with the baths springs at a considerable distance away. In 1703 the springs dried up for a period (Roeid, Palæstina, p. 703). When the old bathing establishment fell into ruins, a new one was built at the beginning of the xvi century which is described by Burckhardt; it was however very simple so that Ibrahim Pasha in 1853 had a more handsomely equipped one built. In 1890 a third was built somewhat more to the South. According to Robinson the water comes out of four springs, one of which is under the old bath house. According to his measurements the water has a temperature of 60° C. Frei read the temperature of the new bath where the water enters the basin at 59.5° behind the old one 58°, in a smaller spring near it 63°. Frei also gives the result of a chemical analysis of the water.

The new political conditions will no doubt bring a revival of prosperity to Tiberias, wise before the war its condition formed a striking contrast to its brilliant past (cf. the enthusiastic description in Jos., Bell., i. 516 sqq.). Ships and boats were only rarely seen on the lake and the once so intensively cultivated gardens were a wilderness. There is an almost complete lack of ancient remains.

TABARKA, a town on the Tunisian coast, 75 miles W.N.W. of Tunis and 10 miles E. of the Algerian frontier. It is built on a sandy bay surrounded by hills at the mouth of a rather narrow fertile valley watered by the Wâd al-Kabîr, which descends from the mountains of Ain-Draham (Khamîria). Three quarters of a mile from the shore lies a rocky islet, 2,000 yards long and 500 broad. A roadstead lies between this island and the mainland accessible on the east side to ships of medium tonnage but only possible on the west side, the better sheltered, to small boats. The trade is insignificant, but the anchovy and sardine fishery attracts from March to September, 200-300 Italian fishermen. The village itself, the capital of a 'contrôlle civil', has a thousand inhabitants, half French and half Italian. A few European works have been built on the adjoining plain.

The site of Tabarka corresponds to that of Tharucsa, a flourishing town in the Roman period and Byzantine period. It was the port for the export of 'Numidian marble' from the quarries of Simitha (Chemtou) on the left bank of the Mejdîra. Ancient ruins were still standing in the time of al-Bakîr (Description, transl. de Saxe, p. 121); they have now almost completely disappeared except for a few traces of cisterns and buildings of the Christian period; on the other hand Christian burial-places have been unearthed in the neighbourhood. In the time of Bakîr Tabarka had still considerable trade; the ancient harbour however no longer existed and ships moored in the mouth of the Wâd al-Kabîr itself. The wealth of the coral deposits there later attracted Provençal and Italian sailors thither. In 1540 the Lamellina of Genoa obtained for an annual payment the monopoly of the exploitation of the coral and the right to keep a garrison on the island. It is without-proof however that this has been said to be the ransom paid for Dragut made prisoner by the Genoese Admiral Doris. In any case for two centuries (1540—1741), the island belonged to the Lamellina; they built a strong castle there and established a colony of their compatriots who sometimes numbered as many as a thousand. The Turks in their turn becoming lords of Tunis installed a garrison of Janissaries on the mainland. As a result of the presence of the Christians, the island became a market where European merchandise was exchanged for the products of the country (wax, hides, corn) purchased very cheaply (cf. Savary de Bréves, Relation, p. 254). It was at the same time a kind of depot where the Christian slaves were interned while awaiting the arrival of the sums arranged for their ransoms, a transaction in which the Genoese apparently acted as intermediaries. The profits made by the Lamellina no less than the strategic value of the island could not fail to excite the cupidty of the French companies established on the Algerian coast. In 1653, Sansou Napolion, governor of "Bastion de France", tried to take the island but was killed as soon as he had made a landing on the island. During the second half of the 17th century and the first half of the 18th century, several negotiations were several times conducted between the French government and the Lamellina to obtain the cession of the island by the latter. They were just reaching a settlement when the Bey 'Ali learning what was going on sent troops to occupy the island (June 1741). The Genoese establishments were destroyed, section of the inhabitants managed to escape and take refuge on the island of San Pietro, off the coast of Sardinia. The others were taken to Tunis where their descendants were long known as Tabarkas. War as a result broke out between France and the Regency and a French naval officer M. de Sauvres attempted an unsuccessful attack on Tabarka on July 2, 1742; a hundred men were killed and 224, including the leader of the expedition, captured by the Turks. Henceforth the Tunisians remained in possession of the island and refused to yield to the demand for concessions made by France and other foreign powers. But although the coral continued to be exploited, Tabarka lost all commercial importance. At the beginning of the Tunisian expedition, the French bombarded the Turkish fort and landed at Tabarka on 26th April 1851. Since then a European centre has been created here and a road made to connect the coast with the valley of the Medjerda through the massif of Khamîria. But as a result of its ousting position, the town has only developed slowly. The making of a road and a railway to Matmata and Beja and the exploitation of the mineral deposits discovered in the region will undoubtedly however bring it some element of prosperity.


TABAS, a town in Persia, in the province of Khorasan, in reality two towns whence the dual form used by the Arab geographers: Tabasîn. The first is called Tabas al-'Unnâb, "T. of the jujube-trees" (in Persian Tabas-Masînûn), and the second Tabas al-Turc, "T. of the date-palms" (al-suṣûd, Mulukaddas). In the Persian Tabas-Gilâh (Kuri, Kuri). The first has walls and garrisons and no citadel. The second is commanded by a fortress; it has a small market and a graceful mosque; it gets its water-supply from reservoirs fed by open canals (qâhirâ). These two towns are under Kân, the capital of the district of Kūhîastân; they form the southern frontier of Khorasan. In the reign of the Caliph 'Othâmân, they were the first Muslim conquests in this province, in 637. These two towns are, as it were, the gates of this country. They were taken by 'Abd-alâh b. Budall b. Warâja. After the occupation of Alamût by Hasan Sabbâh, they became centres of the Īmârat. In the Šâdîk conquests, they were allotted to Kâwâr, son of Câshî. They were laid waste by the Ubeza during the reign of Şâh 'Abbâs I before 1006 (1597).

Bibliography: Vâlkül, Mufâdam, iii. 513; Barbir de Meynard, Dict. de la Perse, p. 288; Iskhâr, B.G.A., i. 229, 273, 286; Ibn Hawâkî, B.G.A., ii. 273, 286, 291, 324, 325; Mulukaddas, iii. 24, 324; Abu 'l-Fida', Géographie, ed. Reinhard and de Saxe, p. 448—449; Mehran, Cartographie, p. 315; Samâlâ, Ansâb, G. M. S.
TABRIZ, a town highly esteemed in the east, consisting of pebble-like accretions, which are formed in the modes of *Bambusa auriculata* Wild. The substance is obtained, according to Kázwini (ii. 82) or Ibn Muhallib, by burning the reed and from ancient times it has always been a valuable article of commerce which the Greeks called *rýzárta*.


(J. RUSKA)

TÂBÝ (A.), pl. tâbý, follower, follower of a prince, disciple of a teacher, adherent of a doctrine; the verbal form is tâbý, e.g. tâbý Dâlúd, he followed Galen (in medicine).

The word is of special significance in Tradition where the name tâbý is given to those who came after the Companions of the Prophet, the Ašûr. The Ašûr are the people who saw and were directly acquainted with the Prophet; the tâbý are those of the next generation or contemporaries of the Prophet, who did not know him personally but who knew one of his Companions. The followers of the second generation (tâbý tâbý) are those who knew one of the first tâbý and so on. Traditions are of more or less value according as they go back to a "follower" of a more or less early generation and according as the tâbý who is the first transmitter of it is more or less esteemed and famous. Thus the more tâbý or dispersed tradition is that which goes back to a tâbý of the first generation and which has been disseminated and handed down by several tâbý of the second generation and their successors (cf. FADIL). There are in the same way generations of transmitters for traditions regarding the reading of the Qur'ân and for those of Shám. One of the most celebrated "followers" of the first generation is Hasan al-Bajri.


(B. Carra de Vaux)

TABRIZ, [See Ruß.]

TABRIZ, capital of the Persian province of Ādâbarbâıdjn [q.v.].

**Geographical position.** The town lies in the eastern corner of the alluvial plain (measuring about 30° 30' N, 50° 40' E) sloping slightly towards the north-east bank of Lake Urmia. The plain is watered by several streams, the chief of which is the Adjî-čâi ("bitter river") which, rising in the south-west face of Mount Sawâlân runs along the Karađja-dagh, which forms a barrier on the south and entering the plain runs around on the north-west suburbs of the town. The left bank tributary of the Adjî-čâi, Miθâñ-râd (now the Meidân-čâi), runs through the town. The altitude of the different quarters of Tabrîz, according to the Russian map may be put at 4,000—5,000 feet. Immediately to the north-east of the town rise the heights of Aínâlî-Zanjâl (the syýar of 'Awn b. 'Ali and Zâid b. 'Ali) which (6,000 feet) forms a link between the mountain system of the Karađja-dagh (in the north and north-east) and the outer spur of the Sahand whose peaks (about 30 miles south of the town) reach a height of 11,500 feet. As the Karađja-dagh is a very wild and mountainous region and the great massif of Sahand fills the whole area between Tabriz and Maragha, the site of Tabrîz is the only suitable place for the establishment of a pass between east (Asârî on the Caspian—Arrâvî - Tabrîz and Teherân—Karvan—Miθâñ—Taðrîs) west (Tâbâzand—Erzerûm—Khâθo—Tabrîz and north (Tîfîs—Erûmûn—Djûñûs—Marand—Tabrîz). Lastly as the outer spur of the Sahand leave a rather narrow cooI along the east bank of the Lake of Urmia, communication between north (Transcaucasia, Karađja-dagh) and the south (Maragha, Kurdîsân) must also take place via Tabrîz.

This fortunate position had predetermined Tabrîz to become the centre of the vast and rich province lying between Turkey and Russian (or Soviet) Transcaucasia and in general one of the most important cities between Constantinople and India (only Tîfîs, Teherân, Isfâhân and Baghdâd fall into the same category). Tabrîz has now about 200,000 inhabitants.

The climate of Tabriz is very severe in winter with heavy snowfalls. In summer the heat is tempered by the proximity of the Sahand and by the presence of numerous gardens about the town. The climate is on the whole healthy except for epidemics of cholera and typhus which are due rather to the unsanitary state of the town.

One feature of Tabriz is the frequent earthquakes. The most formidable took place in 1858 (858), in 1854 (1042) mentioned by Nâṣîr-i Khusraw in his *Safar-nâmâ* (and predicted by the astronaut Añîl Tabrîz Shârî), in 1864 (Arâkel of Tabrîz, p. 486), in 1727, in 1780 (Ouseley, iii. 436; Ritter, ix. 854) etc. The earthquakes of Sept. 22—23, 1854 and of Oct. 30, 1856 have been described from personal observation by Khanykow in the *Bull. Hist. Phil. de l'Acad. de St. Pétersburg*, 1855, p. 251; 1858, p. 337—354. Seismic shocks are of everyday occurrence at Tabrîz; they may be due to the volcanic activity of the Sahand but Khanykow thought they were due rather to a mechanical displacement of the earth's strata.

The fortifications of the town were razed to the ground in the reign of Nâṣîr al-Dîn Shâh (*Mizd al-Buldân*, i. 343). The part of the town called the Kâ'ba (the districts of Čar-mînâr, Surkhbâh, Dâvâdây, Wâlcâya [vulgo: Wâl'dî], Miθâñ-mînâr [vulgo: Miθâñ-mînâr], Nâbwâr, Bâbkûdisîa etc.) is therefore no longer separated from the former part extra murus (the districts of Añârâh, Lâl-lââd [vulgo: Lâl-lââd], Čarándîn, Nâbkûdisîâ, Bûgh-mêshâ etc.). The town has also incorporated the former suburbs to the west of the town (Añârâh, Čust-dûzân, Hûkûmâbâd [vulgo: Hûkûmâbâd], Kâra-malkî, Kâra-sağhâd, Akûtûn, Kûcâ-bûgh, Kâthîb) and the south-east (Marâlûn). The tendency of the city is to extend to the west and south-west.

Tabrîz is the administrative and economic centre of the vast province of Ādâbarbâıdjn, the present
sub-divisions of which are: Ardabil (with Astarkh, Mughān etc.), Kanakja-Dagh (capital Ahar), Marand (with Dailuj and Gargar), Khoi, Māzand, Salmas, Urmia (with Ushn), the region of Mukri (capital Sefid-Bulak), Sa'im-dāna, Maragha, Haftarah and Garmār (capital Miyān), Sarāb and the central district of Tabriz.

In the xvi century, Ḧamdūllah (cf. Ewliya, ii. 257) gave the divisions of this last district (İman) as: Mihdān-rūd, to the east of the town; Sarāb, to the south-west of the town; Sefid-Bulak, to the south of the preceding (with the villages of Khuwarāshāh, Ushn, Mīyān); Arvandāq, to the north-east of the Lake of Urmia with the villages of Shabistan, Sofyān etc.; Rūdālah (the实用); Khūshām-Rūdālah (the practical) and Badānūn (the professional), all three to the north of the town. The boundaries of the old central İman were unchanged down to the xvii century.

The name. According to Yaḏsī, i. 822, the name of the town is pronounced Tibrīz. Yaḏsī gives as his authority Abū Zakariyā al-Ṭabarīzī (a pupil of Abū 'l-ʿAlī Abū Maʿarrī, 363–449) of whom we know that he spoke the local Iranian dialect (cf. al-Samānī, Kitāb al-Anwiš, G. M. S., s.v. Tanūḵt, and Sayyid Ahmad Kirsawī Tabrizī, Aḥfīrī yā mādūn-i Ḵāreṣ-i ʿAḏabāvāryān, Tehran 1304, p. 41). The pronunciation Tibrīz must be one of the peculiarities of this dialect which is related to that called ʿAskī. The modern pronunciation is exclusively Tibrīz (or with a metathesis typical of the Turkish dialect, now predominant throughout ʿAḏhārdābādī: Tabriz). The Armenians confirm the pronunciation with a. Faustus of Byzantium (fourth century) has Thavrevē and Thavrevē, Asōlīk (fifteenth century) Thavrevē. Vardan (xvi century) has Thavrevē and Derrevē, this last form evidently adopted to a popular Armenian etymology: do i vreb, "that is for vengeance"; cf. Camtān, History of Armenia, Venice 1784, i. 365; Hübchmann, Armen. Gramm., i. 42; do., Pers. Stud., p. 179. For the fifth (fourth) century of the Christian era the form of the name attested in Armenian is therefore Thavrevē < Pers. Tabriz (Hübchmann). The Armenian etymology gives Tabriz as "making fever run" (= disappear). (Ewliya ʿCebei: ʿitma dōvččūr, but it is possible that the name rather means "that which makes the heat disappear"; in some connection with the volcanic activity of the Sahand (cf. also the name of the pass between Bayzād and Vān: Tārzdā). The Armenian orthography reflects the peculiarities of Northern Pehlevi (tan < ṭāṣ and especially ṭē for ṭē) and this suggests the origin of the name may go back to a very early period, pre-Ṣasānian and perhaps pre-Āravak (on the linguistic changes that have taken place in ʿAḏhārdābādī as a result of the Turkish invasion cf. the article ʿAṯā).

History. The identification of Tabriz with some ancient city of Media has given rise to much discussion (cf. the resolute in Ritter, ix. 770–779). The possibility that Tabriz = ʿAḏhār in Ptolemy vi, Ch. 2 (from ʿAḏhār) is made less probable by the analysis of the Armenian form quoted above. Rawlinson, Memoir on the Site of the Astāfaran, J.R.G.S., 1840, x., p. 107–111, has definitely cleared up the confusion between Tabriz and Gams = al-Sīsa (in Armenian Gandrak Shahasat distinguished from Thavrevē by Faustus of Byzantium).

According to the Armenian historian Vardan (xvi century), Tabriz was founded on Persian territory by the Arshakid Armenian Khosrow (217–233) as an act of revenge against the first ʿAḏhārdābādī king Ardabīr (224–241), who had killed the last Parthian king Ardashīr (cf. St. Mašāʿ, Memôres sur l'Armenie, i. 423). This story is not found in any ancient source and is probably explained by the popular etymology given above. In Faustus of Byzantium, transl. Lauer, i., Ch. 25. and 39 and v., Ch. 2, we only find that in the reign of Arshak II of Armenia (351–367) the Armenian general Wazak attacked the ʿAḏhārdābādī Shahār II (309–379) who was encamped at Thavrevē. Wazak later slew the Persian general Boyekez there, burned the royal palace and gave an arrow into the statue of the king there. Later Murgâb, son of Wazak, defeated the Persian troops at Tabriz.

It remains to be seen whether the name Thavrevē, where in 614 the emperor Heraclius after laying waste Ganzak, burnt the town and fire-temple (Thaphsana, p. 474: ʾ-addons ʿadd ʾaḏhārā bārīn, "the Thavrevē of the fire") does not show some confusion with Thawrevē.

Arab rule. During the conquest of ʿAḏhārdābādī by the Arabs (c. 22 = 642) the principal efforts of the latter were directed against Ardabil. Tabriz is not mentioned among the towns from which the Persian Marzbān had levied his troops (Balāḏūrī, p. 326). After the devastation mentioned by Faustus, Tabriz must have become a mere village (cf. Yeḵūṭ). The later legend (Nukhat-e-Khōlā, 730 = 1340) of the "building" of Tabriz in 1475 (791) by Zaynab, wife of Hārūn al-Raḍī, is perhaps based on the fact that after the sequestration of the Umayyad estates Zaynab had received Warthān (in ʿAḏhārdābādī on the Araxes). According to Balāḏūrī, p. 331 and Ibn al-Fakhūrī, p. 285 (cf. also Yaḵūṭ, i. 822) the rebuilding of Tabriz was the work of the family of al-Raḍāwī al-Azdī and particularly of the latter's sons, al-ʿAskī and others who built the walls round the town. Tabātih (iii. 1173) describes Alī al-Khātīr, vi. 315, speaking of the rebellion of Bahāb, son of ʿAsārī who mentions among his conquerors a certain Muḥammad b. Bahīth, owner of two castles: Shāhī which he had taken from al-ʿAsārī and Tabīz (no details given). Shāhī which was ʿaz farsakha? (?) in extent was stronger than Tabīz (cf. the name of the peninsula of Shāhī or Shāhī on Lake Urmia to the south-west of Tabīz; but according to Balāḏūrī, p. 330 the site of Bahīth was Marzdān.)

When Ibn Khurdābdīshī, p. 119 wrote (352 = 840), Tabīz belonged to Muḥammad b. al-Raḍāwī. In 244 the town was destroyed by an earthquake but rebuilt before the end of the reign of al-Mutawakkil (242–247). Tabīz seems then to have changed hands several times, for, according to al-ʾIṣkāḥī (c. 340), p. 181, the strip of territory which included Tabīz, Dāshēma (or Dīb-ʾKhārānī?) and Ushnā (s.v.) bore the name of the ruling tribe Banū ʿRudānī, which had already disappeared by the time of Ibn Ḥawkāl (c. 367), p. 289. These owners seem to have ruled in practical independence for the history of the ʿAṯās (lords of ʿAḏhārdābādī from 276–317) mentions no reference to their intervention in the affairs of Tabīz: cf. Defrémyer, Mémoires sur la famille des ʿAṯās, f., 2347 (the capital of this dynasty was first Marzdān and later Ardabil; ibid., reprint p. 25, 41, 47, 57, 77).
After the disappearance of the Shajids, Akhar-bida was one of the first to make the road leading to Tabriz. A former governor for the Ziyarid Marzward, Lashkar-i Bar, had seized the province in 350. He was driven out by the Kurd Daiman (cf. Kord) who came into conflict with the Daiman Musafirs (q.v.). The people of Tabriz invited Daiman into their town, which was at once besieged by the Daiman Musafirs (q.v.). The end of the Musafirs was soon to be clear. Huart, Les Musafirs de l’Ahdar-bidjan in Fables, presented to E. G. Browne, Cambridge 1923, gives 436 as the last mention of their rule at Tabriz, but Sir E. D. Ross, Les Musafirs, Dynasties, Asia Major, 1925, ii, p. 212-215, connects with the Musafirs the family of the Rawwidi which can be traced at Tabriz down to 446. It is however possible that these Rawwidi were descendants of Al-Rawwidi Al-Adzi, father of the rebuilder of Tabriz, and had nothing to do with the Daiman Musafirs (apart from inter-marriage). The following events are connected with these Rawwidi: in 430, Wahshidân b. Mahlân (Mamlân?); a large number of Ghuzz chiefs massacred at Tabriz (Ibn b. Al-Adzi, ii, 279); in 434 an earthquake destroyed Tabriz and the amir (probably the same one) went to other strongholds with fear of al-Ghuzz al-Saljukiyâ (ibid., p. 351); in 438 Nâṣir-i Khwarazm found in Tabriz a king Salaf Al-din, b. Shâhârâ Al-Milla Abî Manjûr Wahshidân b. Muhammad (Mamlân?) Mawli Atâî i Ma'mûn; in 446 Tughrîl received the submission of the lord of Tabriz Al-Adzi Abî Manjûr b. Muhammad Al-Rawwidi (ibid., i, 410).

Tabriz in the early centuries of the Hijira. While Ibn Khurdâbîhîb, p. 119, Balâdhur, p. 531, Tabari, ill. 1171, Ibn b. Fakhr, p. 285 and even al-Isjâkhîrî, p. 181 simply mention Tabriz among the little towns of Ahdar-bidjan, Al-Mal-kedast already sings the praises of Tabriz and his contemporary Ibn Hawkal (c. 367 = 978) considers it the most prosperous town in Ahdar-bidjan with a busy trade and manufactures of armament. Ibn Miskawaih (d. 431 = 1030) calls Tabriz a “noble city with a strong wall, surrounded by woods and gardens”, and calls its inhabitants “brave, martial and rich”. According to Nâṣir-i Khwarazm the area occupied by the town in 436 was 1,400 4,100,000 acres which is only about a third of a square mile.

Saljuk period. Tabriz is very rarely mentioned in the history of the Great Saljuks. In the vicinity of the town Tughrîl celebrated his marriage with the caliph’s daughter (Râhat Al-Salzûr, p. 111). During his struggle with his brother Muhammand, Sultân Barkiyaruk retired in 494 to the mountainous region to the south of Tabriz but at the reconciliation of the brothers, Tabriz fell to Muhammand who appointed Sa’d Al-Mulk as wazir there (498). In 505 we find Al-Adzi Sukmân Al-Khihtî mentioned as lord of Tabriz, i.e. the founder of the dynasty of Shâhâ of Armenia (ibid.; armament) who ruled at Atsil at 493 to 604.

Under the branch of the Saljuks of the Shirvân whose capital was at Hamadân, Ahdar-bidjan played a more important part. In 534 Sultan Mahmûd spent some time at Tabriz to calm the inhabitants who were alarmed at the intrusions of the Georgians. The name of the atâbâg of Ahdar-bidjan is mentioned at this period was Kun-toghidî. After his death (515), the Amir of Marâgha al-Sunqur Al-Mamûdî endeavoured to get Tabriz out of the hands of Tughrîl (brother of the Sultan) but these intrigues came to naught. Mahmûd appointed to Ahdar-bidjan the Amir Dguyûs of Mawzî who was killed at the gate of Tabriz in 516. After the death of Mahmûd (525), his brother Mamûd occupied Tabriz and was besieged there by Dâwût, son of Mahmûd. Finally Dâwût established himself in Tabriz and from this town ruled (526-533) the Ahdar-bidjan, Arrin and Armenia. Ahdar-bidjan and Arrin were later entrusted to Tughrîl’s old slave, the Atâbâg Kâra-Sunqur, whose capital seems to have been at Arrin (Ibn b. Al-Adzi, xi, 52). After his death in 535 the Amir Dguyûs (Cawlî) al-Tughrîl succeeded him but we soon find Ilidigtî, the founder of the dynasty of Atdâb which ruled the province till 622, established in Ahdar-bidjan. The centre of 111 idigizid power was at first to the north-west of Ahdar-bidjan while Tabriz became part of the possessions of the Almâdîl Amir of Marâgha for it was not till 570 that the Atâbâg Pahlâwân b. Ilidigtî took Tabriz from Fulak Al-din, grandson of Al-Sunqur b. Almâdîl, and gave it to his brother Kâlîr Arrânî. It was during the period that Kâlîr Arrânî was atâbâg (582-587) that Tabriz definitely took its place as the capital of Ahdar-bidjan.

In 620 the Amir Kâra-Sunqur ‘Ali’ Al-din Almâdîl in alliance with the Atâbâg of Arrin made an attempt to retake Tabriz from Kâlîr Arrânî’s successor, the bon-vivant Abû Bakr. The attempt failed and Kâra-Sunqur lost Marâgha.

The Ilidigtîs lived in great style as we may judge from the orders addressed to them by poets like Nâṣîmî and Kâhâînî but of their buildings we only know the remains at Nakhchivan [q.v.]. The political weakness of their epigram is confirmed by the episode mentioned in the Georgian chronicle which took place between 1208 and 1210 (605-607 L. H.). Iwane and Zakvare, generals of queen Tsmar, in the course of a hazardous marauding expedition traversed the whole of northern Persia to Dguyrjîn. The Georgian troops coming from Marand levied a ransom from the people of Tabriz (Tsmar) but otherwise did not disturb the peace of the country. A little garrison left in the town awaited the return of the troops. The episode is not mentioned in the Muslim sources but by its detail the story inspires a certain confidence. Cf. Broset, Histoire de la Géorgie, i, 470.

The Mongols. The Mongols made their appearance before the walls of Tabriz in the winter of 617. The incapable Atâbâg Zrbeg b. Pahlâwân obtained their departure by paying a heavy ransom. Next year the Mongols came back again. The Atâbâg fled to Nakhchivân but a resistance was organised by the valiant Shams Al-din Al-Tughrîl and the Mongols departed with a new ransom after which Orzbec returned to Tabriz. In 621 a new horde arrived from Mongolia and demanded from Orzbec the surrender of all the Khâvârimzîans in Tabriz. Orzbec hastened to yield to this demand.

Djalâl Al-din. The Khâvârim-zêhs soon arrived from Marâgha and on 27th Rajab 622 gained admittance to the town which Örbeck had again abandoned. The inhabitants were glad to find a valiant defender especially as Djalâl Al-din
was soon to show his energy by an expedition against Tiflis and by the punishment of the marauding Turkomans of the tribe of Aiwâ (al-Aiwîyya). Djalal el-Din having married the mulkâ, the former wife of Özbek, held Tabriz for six years but towards the end of this period, his position was seriously compromised by his failures as well as by his personal conduct (Ibn al-Athîr, xii. 323). As early as 627 a Turkoman chief of the tribe of Kusâr-vâlwa (?), a chief of Rûyân-diz (near Marâqgha), dared to plunder the environs of Tabriz. In 628 Djalal el-Din left Aðharbâjîyân and the Mongols conquered the whole province, including the town of Añ Tabriz which is the very heart (aqâ) of the country for every one is dependent on it and on those who live there" (Ibn al-Athîr, xii. 324). The "mulkî" of the Mongols (Qur-\textit{mughrûn-noin) sent for the nobles (Shams el-Din al-Tughrâ'î alone did not stir), levied a heavy indemnity, ordered the weavers to make \textit{khâthif} stuffs for the use of the great king (\textit{Ugedei}) and fixed the amount of the annual tribute. From the time of Ghiyât the effective rule of Arûnû and Aðharbâjîyân was in the hands of Malik Sadr el-Din, a Persian ally of the Mongols. Cf. \textit{Djalâl-\textit{Gusûq}}, ed. M. Karstut, G. M. S., ii, 255.

The Mongol \textit{Ilêhîn}. After the taking of Bagh-\textit{dâd} in 654 (1256) Hilûgât went to Aðharbâjîyân and settled at Marâqgha [q. v.]. In 661 (1263) after the defeat inflicted on him in the northern Caucasus by Berjâl's troops, Hilûgât returned to Tabriz and massacred the merchants there of Kîlipân origin. In 662 (1264) at the re-distribution of the fiefs Hilûgât confirmed Malik Sadr el-Din in the governorship of the province of Tabriz.

Tabriz became the official capital under Abâl el-Din (663-680) and kept this position under his successors till the coming of Uldjâiî. In 688 (1289) under Arûnû the Jewish vizier Sa'd al-Dawla appointed his cousin Abî Manûrî to Tabriz. Under Kâl-\textit{Dschâhu} the revenues of the province of Tabriz were estimated at 80,000 tamarîn. In 693 (1294) Tabriz was the scene of a rebellion as a result of the introduction of a paper currency (\textit{qa'af}). It was in the reign of Ghaçân-Khân that Tabriz attained its greatest splendour. This monarch entered Tabriz in 694 (1295) and took up his abode in the palace built by Arûnû in the village of Sâmâm to the west of the town, on the left bank of the Adjud (the old form of this Persian name is \textit{zanbî}, "cupola") (\textit{Quattromestre, N. E., xiv, p. 31: "building surmounted by a cupola"}), but the name was already pronounced \textit{shâm} in the sixteenth century, cf. \textit{Nushat el-Khûlûkh}). Orders were at once given to destroy the temples of idols, churches and synagogues, and fire-altars. These orders are said to have been revoked in the next year on the appeal of the Armenian king Hethum. In 699 (1299) on his return from the Syrian campaign, Ghaçân began a whole series of buildings. He intended \textit{shâm}, already mentioned, as the site of his eternal rest. A building was erected there higher than the \textit{gumhûd} of the Sâmâm Sandjar at Marv, which was then considered the highest building in the Muslim world. Besides this mausoleum, which was crowned by a dome, there was a mosque, two madrasas (one \textit{shâtî} and the other \textit{Hâmî}), a hostel for Saiyids (\textit{dûr al-saîyêdah}), a hospital, an observatory like that at Marâqgha, a library, archives, a building for the officers of these establishments, a cistern for drinking-water and baths with hot water. \textit{Walîs}, the revenues from which amounted to 100 tamarîns of gold (\textit{wâshqâ}), were set aside for the maintenance of these foundations. At each of the gates of the new town was built a caravanserai, a market and the baths. Fruit-trees were brought from distant lands.

In the town of Tabriz itself great improvements were also made. Hîhterto its wall (\textit{khûra}) was only 6,000 mûnsî ("pace"); \textit{Qâhir al-nawâq} (\textit{mêrêd} "fathom") Ghaçân gave it a new wall 25,000 mûnsî in length (44 farsâbah). All the gardens and the Kâl-\textit{Wâliyân} and Sandjarîyân quarters were incorporated in the town. Within the wall on the slopes of the Kâl-\textit{Wâliyân} (now \textit{Kûh-i Sûrkhshân} or \textit{Aiminâl-Zamání}) a series of fine buildings was erected by the famous vizier Rashîd el-Din and the quarter was therefore known as \textit{Nasûl-\textit{Râghûd} (\textit{Nâshat el-Khûlûkh), p. 76). We have a letter from Rashîd el-Din in which he asks his son to send him from Kûm 40 young men and women to people one of the villages in the new quarter; cf. Browne, \textit{A Hist. of Pers. Liter.,} iii. 82.

As if to emphasize the fact that Tabriz was the real centre of the empire which stretched from the Caspian to Egypt, the gold and silver coins and the mosaics (\textit{âlêb, geys}) were standardized according to the standards of Tabriz (D'Olsoun, iv, 144: 271-277, 350, 466-469).

In 703 (1304) Ghaçân-Khân was buried with great ceremony in the mausoleum of Sâmâm. In 705 (1307) his successor Uldjâiî conceived the idea of creating a new capital at Sulshâti (\textit{q. v.}). It was however not easy to move the inhabitants, as in 715 (1315) we still find the ambassador from the Ózbek of Kîlipân following the route by Tabriz instead of the shorter Mujghân–Arâbil–Sulshâti. It is also noteworthy that Tâj al-Din \textit{Alt-Sâhî} (vizier from 711 = 1312) had begun the construction of a magnificent mosque at Tabriz (outside the Mîhâd-mîhûn quarter).

In 717 (1317) under Abî Sa'id the retiring vizier Rashîd el-Din went to Tabriz and only left it the following year to meet his fate. His property was confiscated and Rabî-â Rashîd sacked (Browne, iii. 717). His son Ghiyât el-Din who was invited to power by Abî Sa'id himself continued to enlarge Rabî-â Rashîd. The capital continued to be Sulshâti judging from the fact that Abî Sa'id was buried there in a mausoleum which he himself had ordered to be built (D'Olsoun, iv, 720).

When in 736 (1336) his successor Arpa lost the battle of Taghtatî (this to be read for Baghâtî) his vizier Ghiyât el-Din was killed by the conqueror \textit{Alt Pâdshât Îbrâîî. The property of the family of Rashîd el-Din was plundered by the people of Tabriz and valuable collections and precious books disappeared on this occasion.}
Arran, Mughān and Georgia. The successor of Hasan Kūtik, his brother Ahrāf, in 744 (1344) proclaimed a new puppet Aḥmadrādūn whom he relegated to Sultānṣāla while he himself remained in Tabrīz as the real ruler and extended his authority as far as Fārs. His cruelty and executions provoked an “intervention in the cause of humanity” by Djiḏe-beg Khiṣn of the Blue Horde (Eastern Kipta). Ahrāf was defeated at Khaoi and Marand and his head suspended over the door of a mosque in Tabrīz (756 = 1356). The vizier Aḥmaid whom Djiḏe-beg had left in Aḥdarbājān found his authority disputed on several sides. Tabrīz was temporarily occupied by the Djiḏal-i Uwais b. Hasân Buzurg who came from Baghdād. Hardly had he been driven out by Akhīdjālū than the Mūsafārīd of Fārs, Mubārzī al-Dīn Muhammad, quarrelling with Djiḏe-beg who had called upon him to recognise his successorship arrived from Shirāz, defeated Akhīdjālū at Mīyān which seized Tabrīz in 758 (1357). After two years he retired before Uwais (cf. Tarīkh-i Gūstār, G.M.S., p. 677–679, 715–717) who soon afterwards reoccupied Tabrīz and slew Akhīdjālū.

When the news of the death of Sultan Uwais (776 = 1377) reached Fārs, Shah Shudja’ who had succeeded Mubārzī al-Dīn set out from Shirāz to take Tabrīz. Hisān, son of Uwais, was defeated and Tabrīz occupied but after a few months a revolution having broken out at Uḍjīn forced Shudja’ to evacuate the town which Hisān reoccupied without striking his banner. Sultānṣāla seems to have marked the limits of the lands of the Mūsafārīds in the north-west (Tarīkh-i Gūstār, p. 723–725).

In 784 (1382), Hisān Djiḏal-i Uwais was slain at Tabrīz and his brother Sultan Aḥmad succeeded him in Aḥdarbājān but his rule was to be brief for Timūr soon after appeared on the scene. In spite of all the vicissitudes of their intermittent rule the Djiḏalar were able to gain the sympathy of the people of Tabrīz. Their rights were implicitly recognised by the lords of Shirāz, and the Ḵara-Ḵoyūnlu. Among their buildings in Tabrīz are recorded their mausoleum Dimashqīya and a large building by Sultan Uwais, which, according to Clavigio, ed. Semsavchi, p. 169, contained 20,000 chambers (“caminas apartadas e apartamentos”) and was called Dawlat-i Khāna (“Talabgana . . . la casa de la ventura”); cf. Markow, Catalog Dijalair. monest. St. Petersburg 1897, p. 1–21; history of the Djiḏalar. Coins of the following years struck by the Djiḏalar at Tabrīz are known: Hasan Buzurg – 757; Uwais – 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 769, 770, Hisān – 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, Aḥmad – 785, 810.

Period of Timūr. During his first invasion of Persia (786) Timūr returned to Samarkand after taking Sultānṣāla. His great rival Toḵtamis-Khiṣn of the Golden Horde at once sent an expedition against Aḥdarbājān by Darband in 787 (1385).

The invaders took Tabrīz which was badly defended by Amir Wali (the former lord of Djuṯulān [cf. Toḵta-Timūr] driven out by Timūr) and the Khān of Khālīḏan, plundered the inhabitants, carried off prisoners (including the poet Kamāl Khudjand) and returned to Darband (Zafar-nāma, l. 392; Clavigio, Hist. Pers. Lit., iii. 347).

Hardly had Sultan Aḥmad Djiḏal recovered Tabrīz than he was driven out again by Timūr (788) who came on the pretext of protecting the Muslims. Timūr encamped at Ṣāhl-i Ḡavāzī and levied an indemnity (māl-i amūn) on the people of Tabrīz; cf. Zafar-nāma, l. 326; al-Ḡāmi‘ is much severer on Timūr, cf. Markow, Catalogue, p. xxvii).

In 795 (1392) the “feit of Hilāḥgū” (tabbāh-i Hilāḥgū), consisting of Aḥdarbājān, al-Ka‘ūn, Gūstār, Darband and the lands of Asia Minor, was granted to Mīrān-i Ḡavāzī (ibid., ii. 623) and Tabrīz became the capital of this territory. Three years later Timūr’s prince became insane and Timūr committed a series of insensate actions (execution of innocent people, destruction of buildings, ibid., ii. 703, 213, and Browne, op. cit., iii. 71). Timūr immediately on his return from India set out for Aḥdarbājān in 802 and executed those who shared in Mīrān-i Ḡavāzī’s debauches.

In 806, Mīrān i Ḡavāzī, son of Mīrān-i Ḡavāzī, was placed at the head of the “feit of Hilāḥgū” and the lands conquered by Timūr in the west. His father Mīrān-i Ḡavāzī (in Arrān) and his brother Abū Bakr (in Mesopotamia) were placed under the authority of Mīrān-i Ḡavāzī. After the death of Timūr a long struggle began between ‘Omar and Abū Bakr. In 808, Abū Bakr succeeded in levying on Tabrīz a tribute of 200 Ḳirāt tumānū. Omar returned to Tabrīz but his Turkmans harassed the people and Abū Bakr regained the town. Hardly had he left Tabrīz than the Turkmans rebelled. Bistān Djiḏe entered it but hurriedly retreated on the approach of Shulīt Ibrāhīm of Shirwān (q.v.). In 809 the latter handed over Tabrīz to Sultan Aḥmad Djiḏal-i as to its true sovereign and the inhabitants showed great joy on this occasion; cf. Mafṣū al-Sa’dain, transl. Quatremére, N. E., xiv., p. 109. On Rabī‘ 1, 8, Abū Bakr was again at Ṣāhl-i Ḡavāzī but did not dare go into the city where the plague was raging.

A short time before these latter happenings, the Ambassador of Henry III of Castile, Clavigio, spent some time in Tabrīz (June 11–20, 1404 and with intervals Feb. 28–Aug. 22, 1405, i.e. from the end of 806 to the beginning of 808). In spite of the trials it had undergone, the town was very busy and conducted considerable trade. Clavigio talks highly of the streets, markets and buildings of Tabrīz.

The Ḵar-Ḵoyūnlu. On the 1st Djuṯāide 1, 809, Kara Yūsuf, the Ḵara-Ḵoyūnlu Turkoman on the Araxes, inflicted a defeat on Abū Bakr who in his retreat handed Tabrīz over to plunder, and nothing escaped the rapacity of his army* (Mafṣū al-Sa’dain, p. 110). Kara Yūsuf advanced as far as Sultānṣāla and carried off the population of this town to Tabrīz, Ardabīl and Maragha. Abū Bakr soon returned to Aḥdarbājān but Kara Yūsuf assisted by Bistān defeated him at Sardarūd (5 miles south of Tabrīz). Mīrān-i Ḡavāzī fell in this battle and was buried at Tabrīz in the cemetery of Surkhāb. Kara Yūsuf, remembering the agreements on the redistribution of the territory made with Sultan Aḥmad at the time when both were in exile in Egypt had recourse to a stratagem. With great ceremony he set out on the throne of Tabrīz his son Pir-Budaghā who was regarded as the adopted son of Sultan Aḥmad (according to the Mafṣū al-Sa’dain, Kara Yūsuf did not give the title of Khān to Pir-Budaghā till 814). Aḥmad to outward appearance resigned himself to this arrangement but, when Kara Yūsuf was absent in Armenia, he occupied Tabrīz. In the battle of Asad (f) two farakhs from Tabrīz, Sultan Aḥmad was finally defeated (28th
Rah! II, 873 = 1410). He was executed by Kara Yusuf and buried in the Dimiğjıya beside his father and mother. Once more the sympathies of the people of Tabriz were with the last Daš'ir king: cf. Huart, Le fin de la dynastie des Ikhkani- nides, Jour. As., Oct. 1876, p. 310—326.

Tabriz is regularly mentioned as the centre from which Kara Yusuf sent out his expeditions. The Timurid Shahrūkh fearing the influence of Kara-Yusuf in 877 undertook his first expedition against him but did not advance beyond al-Ra'i (Maş'a al-Su'da'an, p. 238, 250). When in 823 (1420) he was renewing his attempt, news reached him of the death of Kara Yusuf (on İhter'ı-Kad'a 7, 823 = November 12, 1420). Anarchy broke out in the Turkoman camp and a week later Mīrza Baisungūr occupied Tabriz; cf. Price, Chronological Retrospect of the Events of Mawm. History, London 1821, iii. 541, following the Rauwaf al-Su'af and the Khuṣṣat al-Abār. Shahrūkh arrived there in the summer of 824 (1421) after defeating in Armenia the sons of Kara Yusuf. In 824 Iskan捺r, son of Kara Yusuf, seized Sulůjān. Shahrūkh marched to Shām-Ghasān at the head of an army and inflicted a defeat on the Kara-Koyunlu at Salmās. In the winter of 825 Khurābādžīn was given to Ablu Sa'īd b. Kara Yusuf who had come to pay homage to Shahrūkh. In the following year he was slain by his brother Iskandar. In the winter of 828 (1434) Shahrūkh came to Ablur-bādžīn for the third time. Iskandar thought it wise to retire before him but his brother Dījahānshāh hastened to join Shahrūkh. The latter spent the summer of 829 (1436) in Tabriz and on the approach of winter gave investiture to Dījahān-shāh. Thus began the career of the prince who made Tabriz the capital of a kingdom stretching from Asia Minor to the Persian Gulf and to Herāt.

The most remarkable building in Tabriz *the Blue Mosque* (Gök-maşjd) is the work of Dījahān-shāh (according to Berzin, of his wife Begum-Khatīm). It is possible that the presence in Tabriz in the Surkhab and Carandah quarters of members of the Ahī Hakk sect (cf. Sulūk-i-sūr) dates from the time of Dījahān-shāh on whose heretical views cf. Münu'ddijir-Isbālī, ii. 154.

The Aḵ-Koyunlu. On the 12th Rah! II, 873 (10th November 1467) Dījahān-shāh was surprised in Armenia and slain by Umm Hāsān Bāyandari, chief of the Aḵ-Koyunlu Turkomans. The two daughters of Iskandar proclaimed at Tabriz their dervish brother Husain 'Ali but Begum Khātīm, widow of Dījahān-shāh, put a stop to this plan. Tabriz was however occupied by Husain 'Ali, the mad son of Dījahān-shāh (by another wife) who put to death Begum Khātīm and her relatives (Mūnû'ddijir-Isbālī).

In spite of the assistance which he had received from the Timurid Abū Sa'id, Hāsan 'Ali was defeated at Marand. Subsequent events led up to death of Abū Sa'id himself. In 873 (1468) Umm Hāsān seized Tabriz which he made his capital (he announced this decision in a letter to the Ottoman Sultan, Fārūd-eq, Mūnû'ddijir-Isbālī).

The Venetian sources are of considerable value for the period of Umm Hāsān. (The first Venetian consul at Tabriz was Marco da Molino in 1324). Giosefa Barbaro, sent by the republic in 1474, describes the animated life of Tabriz to which embassies came from all parts. Barbaro was received in a pavilion of the magnificent palace which he calls "Aptist" (Haft + i). The infamous Venetian merchant who visited Tabriz as late as 1514 (?) still speaks of the splendour of the reign of Umm Hāsān *who has so far not yet had an equal in Persia,* Umm Hāsān died in 875 (1477) and was buried in the Naşīrīa Madrasa which he had built and which was later to be used for the burial of his son Yaqūb. During the twelve years of comparatively peaceful reign (893— 898) he became attracted to his court many men of letters (the Kurdish historian İdrīs was his secretary) and in 888 built in the garden of Şahib-ābād the Hašt-bihāt palace (cf. the history of Yaqūb by Fādż Allah b. Rūhābīn, a unique MS. of the Bibl. Nat. de Paris, ancien fonda pers. 101, fol. 100v.). This palace (Ašt-bihāt) has also been described by the Venetian merchant; on the ceiling of the great hall were represented all the great battles of Persia, embassies, etc. Beside the Hašt-bihāt there was a harem in which 1,000 women could be housed, a vast makhir, a mosque and a hospital to hold 1,000 patients (cf. also Ewlvī, ii. 249).

The Şafawī and the Turco-Persian wars. Isma'īl I occupied Tabriz in 906 (1500) after his victory at Șahrūr over Mirzā Alawd Ak-Koyunlu. Of the 200—300,000 inhabitants of the town two-thirds were reported to be Shi'ī but the new ruler was not long in imposing the Shi'ī's upon them and took rigorous measures against those who objected (*Alam-sāli, p. 31*). In his hatred of the Ak-Koyunlu Isma'īl had the remnants of his predecessors exhumed and burned (the history of Yaqūb, fol. 206v.; G. M. Anjouelot). The Venetian merchant speaks of the despair into which the debauches of the young prince had plunged several noble families. When Isma'īl set out for Arzindān after Alawd the latter succeeded in returning to Tabriz and during his brief stay there "oppressed the rich" (*Alam-sāli, p. 31*).

The battle of Radjañ (2nd Radjañ 920 = 23rd August 1514) opened to the Ottomans the road to Tabriz. Nine days later the city was occupied by the vizier Dukagin-oghlu and the defterdar Fīrūz and on the 4th September Sulūk Selim made his triumphal entry into it. In the town the Turks conducted themselves with moderation (Browne, Pers. Lit. in Mod. Times, p. 77) but the friends of the treasures amassed by the Persian sovereigns and carried off to Constantinople, 1,000 skilled artisans. The Sulītan only stayed a week in Tabriz as he had to return to his own lands in consequence of the refusal of the Janisaries to continue the campaign (v. Hammer, G. O. R. T., i. 720).

The events of 1514 were a grave warning to the Persians and under Tahmāsp I, the capital was transferred much farther east to Kazvīn. According to the Venetian Ambassador Alessandri, Tahmāsp, as a result of his aversion, was not popular in the old capital of the Ak-Koyunlu.

At the suggestion of the regenerative Ulūm (of the Turkomans tribe of Tekke) the troops of Salāmān I under the command of the grand vizier Ibrahim Pasha, occupied Tabriz on 941 (July 13, 1514) and went to the summer camp at Aqadat (Şahib-ābād?). Ibrahim Pasha began to build a fortress at Shām-Ghaṣān. The government of Ašt-bihāt was entrusted to Ulūm who had held the same post under Tahmāsp. On September 27, Sulītan Sulaimān himself arrived in Tabriz. A little later he made a thrust as far as Sulūjān and occupied
Taghbad. On his return to Tabriz he spent 14 days engaged in administrative business. The cold forced the Turkish army to retreat and the Persian troops at once advanced as far as Wân. Again in 955 (July 26, 1548) at the instigation of Alikhâr Mirzâ, brother of Shah Tahmâsp, Sulaimân occupied Tabriz but only stayed five days there. The Persian tactics were to destroy all means of subsistence for the invader and famine thus forced the Turks to retreat once more. According to the Hâfiz-i-Shâh Sulaimân had bought back from his soldiers their right of plundering the conquered city for 3 days but in spite of this the citizens continued to stay Turks in secret. Sulaimân refused Alikhâr Mirzâ’s proposal that the inhabitants should all be massacred or carried off into captivity. M. d’Aramont, ambassador of Francis I, was an eye-witness of the occupation of Tabriz and testifies to the Sulaimân’s efforts to protect the town (Voyage, p. 83). In 962 (May 29, 1555) there was signed at Amasia the first treaty of peace between Turkey and Persia which lasted about 30 years (v. Hammer, ii, 112, 120, 269; Alam-ard, p. 49—59).

In 993 (1585) the grand vizier of Murâd III had 40,000 men under the recapture of Tabriz. The governor of Wân, Cighalsa-nâdeh, sent him with 6,000 men. Going via Califrân and Sulaimân in the Turks arrived before Shah-Ghâzân. The Persian governor ‘Ali Kuli-Khan after a bold sortie which cost Cighalsa-nâdeh 5,000 men, retired during the night. In September the Turks occupied the town. As a punishment for the murder of several soldiers, the Turks sacked the town and massacred its inhabitants for three days. The Persian prime minister Hamza Mirzâ operating around the city on several occasions inflicted heavy losses on the Ottoman troops. To defend Tabriz, ‘Othmân Pâshâ built a square citadel the walls of which were 12,000 ells long (Ewillya, mûsâ-mirzâ mishkî arzâb). This citadel which was erected in 36 days was inside the town (‘Alam-ard “only the site of the old dâwât-khana”; Ewillya “around the Khiyâhân of the Shâh”). It was held by a garrison of 45,000 men. The envoys Dîsâr Pâshâ was appointed governor of Tabriz. On October 29, 1585, ‘Othmân Pâshâ died. Cighalsa-nâdeh he had appointed on his deathbed to command the Ottoman troops succeeded in defeating the Persians but soon the latter were able to besiege the Turks within the town. Forty-eight encounters took place between Farhad Pâshâ definitely relieved the garrison (v. Hammer, ii, 354). By the disastrous peace of 998 (1590) Shah ‘Abbâs had to cede to the Ottomans their conquests in Transcaucasia and the west of Persia. Henceforth the Turks took their occupation of Tabriz seriously. Their many buildings, especially those of Dîsâr Pâshâ, are mentioned by Ewillya in Tabriz and its vicinity. But the Persians were keeping a watchful eye on their old capital. The troubles with the ‘ajÂli at the beginning of 1001 showed the weakness of Sulaimân Muhàmed III. In the autumn Shah ‘Abbâs left Isfâhân unexpectedly and entered Tabriz 12 days later. ‘Ali Pâshâ was defeated at Hâjûdji Harâmî (2 farsakhk from the town) after which the citadel surrendered. Shah ‘Abbâs treated the defeated foe with generosity (cf. the evidence of Tectander who was in Tabriz) but in a revival of Shah’s fanaticism the inhabitants killed a large number of Turks in the town and neighbourhood without heed for any bonds of kinship or friendship that had been formed during the 20 years of Ottoman occupation. ‘Abbâs I invited the people to do away with all traces of Turkish role and “in a few days they had left no vestige of the citadel nor of any of their houses, buildings, dwellings, caravanserais, shops, baths etc.” (‘Alam-ard, p. 441, 451).

In 1019 (1610) in the reign of the weak Sulaimân Ahamad III the Turks again tried to resume the offensive. The grand vizier Murâd Pâshâ with an army unexpectedly appeared in front of Tabriz but ‘Abbâs I had had time to make his preparations. The town was defended by the governor Pir-Budak-Khan while the Shah took up his position to the north of the Surkhâh. No fighting took place but the Turks suffered greatly from want of provisions in the country which the Persians had laid waste. Five days later the Turkish army was retracting its steps while Shah ‘Abbâs and Murâd Pâshâ continued to exchange embassies. This Turkish invasion hastened the building of a new fortress at Tabriz. The site of the old Turkish citadel was thought to be unsuitable as liable to inundation by the Mishrin-rûd. The new fortress was built under the shadow of Surkhâh in the Ra’l-i Raqâsh quarter. The materials were taken from old ruins particularly at Shâm-Ghâzân (‘Alam-ard, p. 584, 601). On the other hand the unsuccessful invasion by Murâd Pâshâ led to the conclusion of a new treaty in 1022 (1612) by which the Persians succeeded in restoring the status quo as it had existed in the time of Shah Tahmâsp and Sulaimân Sulaimân (‘Alam-ard, p. 600, 611; v. Hammer, ii, 756, 745). The actual demarcation however met with obstacles.

In 1027 (1618) at the instigation of some Tatar Khâns of the Crimea the Ottoman troops (60,000 men) of Wân suddenly invaded ‘Adjarhabad. The Persians evacuated Tabriz and Ardabil. The Turks who were short of supplies retraced their way to Tabriz and advanced to Sarâb where Karâkai Khân, sipahsâlar of Tabriz, was a brilliant success against them. A new treaty was made confirming the conditions of that of 1022 (‘Alam-ard, p. 656—661; v. Hammer, ii, 773).

After the death of ‘Abbâs I the struggle between Turk and Persian was resumed on a great scale. In the reign of his successor Shah Şafi, Sulaimân Murâd IV invaded ‘Adjarhabad in 1045 (1635) and entered Tabriz on September 12. The aim of this campaign was plunder rather than conquest. Murâd ordered his soldiers to destroy the town. Having in this way “knocked down Tabriz” (Ewillya, sygle surselv) Murâd in view of the advance of the season hastened to return to Wân. He only spent 3 days in Tabriz. In the following spring, the Persians reoccupied their possessions as far as Erivan and by the treaty of 1049 (1639) secured for themselves the frontier which has survived in its main lines to the present day. Hâjûdji Khâlîfî who was an eye-witness of the campaign of 1045, says that after the devastation wrought by Murâd IV the old ramparts had completely disappeared and “only here and there could traces of old buildings be seen” (Qâshân-nûst, p. 381). Even Shâm-Ghâzân was not spared; the mosque of ‘Umar Hasan alone was left intact. The soldiers also tried to cut down the fruit-trees but in view of their number only managed to destroy a tenth of them.

Such then was the state of the town when a
series of travellers who visited it a few years later say had undergone a splendid revival. The interesting story of Ewliya Celebi (in the reign of 'Abbâs II in 1057 [1647]) gives detailed statistics of Tabriz, its madrasas (47), schools (400), caravanserais (200), houses of notables (1,070), dervish tekdes (160), gardens (47,000), animated public promenades. In the same period Tavernier says that in spite of the damage done by Murad IV "the town is almost completely rebuilt". According to Chardin (II. 328) in 1673 under Shâh Sulaimân I, there were in Tabriz 550,000 inhabitants (the figure seems exaggerated), 15,000 houses and 15,000 shops. It was "really a large and important town... There is plenty of all the necessities of life and one can live very well and cheaply in it". There was a hospice of Capucins at Tabriz on which the authorities cast a kindly eye. The Begler-begi of Tabriz had under his authority the Khân of Kâr, Urmîa, Marâgha and Ardabil and 20 "subâns" (local envoys).

The end of the Safawis and Nâdir. The Afghan invasion of Persia resulted in a state of complete anarchy. The heir to the throne, Tahmâsp, who had fled from Isfahân arrived in Tabriz where he was proclaimed king in 1135 (1722). When by the treaty of September 12, 1723, Tahmâsp II ceded the Caspian provinces to Russia, Turkey announced that as a precautionary measure she would be forced to occupy the frontier districts between Tabriz and Erivan. After the fall of Erivan, Naqsh-ezdan and Marand, the Turks under the ser-asker Abdallâh Pâšâ Koprûli arrived before Tabriz in the autumn of 1137 (1724). They occupied the Dewêli and Surkhâb quarters (where Selim I had once pitched his camp). The Persians who made Shîkân-Ghâzin their base held out. The Turks had some success but the advanced season of the year forced them to retreat before the end of the month. In the following spring Koprûli returned at the head of 70,000 men. The siege only lasted four days but the fighting in the seven fortified quarters was very desperate. The Persians lost 30,000 men and the Turks 20,000. The survivors of the Persian garrison to the number of 7,000 withdrew without hindrance to Ardabil ("Ali Hâznî, ed. Bâlîrî, p. 153; Hanway, ii. p. 220).

The treaty of 1140 (1727) concluded with the Afghan Afsâf confirmed to the Ottomans the possession of N.W. Persia as far as Sulţânîya and Ahbar. Two years later Nâdir defeated Mustâfa Pâšâ's army at Shâllân (sudje Sawallîn or Shollek-kôpû) near Tabriz. He entered this city on the 5th of December 1142 (1729) and made prisoner Rustam Pâshâ, governor of Hovhârân.

Anxious to take advantage of the domestic troubles of Turkey, Shâh Tahmâsp resumed the offensive but lost the battle of Kurîdjan (near Hamadân) and the ser-asker "Ali Pâshâ returned to Tabriz in the winter of 1144 (1731) and even built a mosque and madrasa there. By the treaty concluded a little later (January 16, 1732), the Persians ceded to the Porte the lands north of the Araxes but kept Tabriz and the western provinces. As Tabriz had actually been occupied by "Ali Pâshâ, the Porte very reluctantly agreed to its restoration to Persia and the signing of the treaty resulted in the dismissal of the grand visier (v. Hammet, iv. p. 281). On the other hand the cession of the Transcaucasian provinces to Turkey gave Nâdir an excuse for deposing Tahmâsp II.

After checking Nâdir near Hâmadân the governor of Wûn Rustam Pâshâ re-occupied Tabriz. In 1734, Nâdir set out for Tabriz and as a result of his victories in Transcaucasia the treaty of 1149 (1736) re-established the status quo of 1049 (1639).

Towards the end of the reign of Nâdir, when anarchy was again beginning, the people of Tabriz declared in favour of an obscure pretender who claimed to be Shâh Mîrzâ. The death of Nâdir in 1160 (1747) might have given the Porte an opportunity to intervene in Persian affairs especially as Rûdje Khân, son of Fath 'Ali Khân, dervân-beg of Tabriz, had come to Erzerûm to beg Turkish support for one of the candidates for the throne (a. Nâdirî; v. Hammet, iv. 474) but Turkey maintained complete neutrality.

Nâdir Shâh had entrusted Adharbâijân to his valiant cousin Amir Arslân Khân who had 30,000 men under him. After Nâdir's death, this general sided Nâdir's nephew Ibrahim Khân to defeat his brother 'Adî Shâh (Sultân 'Ali Shâh) but Ibrahim at once turned on his ally, slew him and after collecting 120,000 men spent six months in Tabriz where Shâh 'Alî Khân I ('Alî 'Adî, 1164) had himself proclaimed king ("Târîkh-i 'Abdûl-Mü'minî, ed. O. Mann, p. 36-37). He was soon killed by Shâhrukh, grandson of Nâdir.

The history of Adharbâijân during the rule of the dynasty of Karim Khân Zand is still little known. The Afghan Aâdî Khân was at first lord of the province. In 1170 (1756) it was taken from him by Muhammad Husain Khân Kâdirî. Next year Karim Khân defeated Fath 'Ali Khân Aflârî of Urmîya and conquered the greater part of Adharbâijân (Malcolm, Hist. of Persia). In 1780 an earthquake did great damage in Tabriz.

The Kâdirîs. Towards the end of 1205 (1790) 'Abd Muhammad, founder of the Kâdirî dynasty, set out to occupy Adharbâijân. Among the governors who came to meet him was the hereditary lord of Khojî, Husain Khân Dumbalti (Kurûs, ii., p. 1145). 'Abd Muhammad added Tabriz to his fief. After the assassination in 1206 (1796) of the first Kâdirî shâh, troubles broke out in Adharbâijân. Shâh Shâh 'Abdul Azîz of the Shîkûkî tribe [q.v.] attempted to seize the supreme power and appointed his brother Muhammad 'Ali Sultân to Tabriz. The Dumbalti Khân took an active part in suppressing the rising and in return Fath 'Ali Shâh confirmed Djâfar Kuli Khân Dumbaltî in the governorship of Tabriz. The latter as soon as he arrived in Tabriz in 1213 (1798) formed a coalition with Shîdk Khân who had re-established himself in Sarab and the Aflârî Khân of Urmîya and shaking off *the dependence which was so slight that it really was absolute independence" ascribed to the Shâh's representatives. Troops were sent against Djâfar Khân who with the help of the Kurds held out for some time in Khojî; cf. H. J. Brydges, The Dynasts of the Kajar, London 1853, p. 50, 84 etc. In 1217 (1799) the hand of the throne of Persia 'Abbâs Mirzâ established himself in Tabriz with Ahmad Khân Muhammadd (Marâgha) as his beglerbegi. Djâfar Khân sought refuge in Russia (cf. Shirku) but for some time other members of the Dumbaltî family continued to rule in Tabriz. In 1224 (1809) Nadîf Kâlit Khân Dumbaltî rebuilt the citadel of Tabriz (Mir 'Alî, p. 343; S. Wilson, p. 345) around which 'Abbâs Mirzâ dug ditches in 1241 (1825).
After the incorporation of Georgia into Russia (1801) complications between Russia and Persia gradually increased and Tabriz became the principal centre of Persian activities. 'Abbâs Mirzâ set himself the task of europeanising the Persian army. An important English mission including a number of very notable explorers of Persia (Ouseley, ill. 399; Ritter, ix. 876–880) made its headquarters in Tabriz. The English and Russian diplomatic missions (the secretary and later head of the latter was the famous writer Gribyedov) also came to the court of 'Abbâs Mirzâ. The energetic heir to the throne built arsenals, cannon foundries, depots and workshops. After the trials it had undergone the town was however but a shadow of the splendid city of the time of Chardin, Tan-cogne (1807) estimated its population at 50–60,000 including several Armenian families; Dupré (1809) at 40,000 with 50 Armenian families. Kinnir gives Tabriz ("one of the most wretched cities") only 30,000 inhabitants. Morier, who in the account of his first journey (1809) had given the exaggerated figure of 50,000 houses with 250,000 inhabitants, in his second journey confines himself to saying that Tabriz has only a tenth of its pristine magnificence and that it has no public buildings of note.

The Russo-Persian wars filled the period to 1828. During the operations of 1827 the General Prince Erístow with the help of certain discontented Khâns entered Tabriz with 3,000 soldiers on 3rd Râhè II, 1243. 'Abbâs Mirzâ was away and opinions in the town were divided. Allah-âr Khan 'Asaf al-Dawla was for continuing the struggle but an important ecclesiastic the Imam Mirzâ Fattâh insisted on surrender and opened the gates of the town to the Russians. After the peace Mirzâ Fattâh had to leave Persia and take refuge in Transcaucasia. The commander-in-chief Count Paâskewi then came to Tabriz and met 'Abbâs Mirzâ at Dib-Khârâšân. An armistice was signed but the court of Teherân did not approve of the terms. The Russians resumed the offensive and occupied Urmia, Marâgha and Ardashîl. The peace of Turkman-châl (5th Sha'bân, 1243 = Feb. 22, 1828) which fixed the frontier on the Araxes finally put an end to the Russian occupation (murâshla). On the events of the Mirzâ al-Balûdîn, l. 404–410; Miasmarov, Bibliographia caucasica, St. Petersburg 1874–1876, p. 745–747: Détails sur ce qui s'est passé à Tabrız le 29 octobre au 5 novembre 1827, in Nouv. Annales de Voyage, Paris 1828, i. 38, p. 325; P. Zoubow, Kertâl voyagé a Persièe 1828–1827, St. Petersburg 1831; do., Forsvikskaya veïna, St. Petersburg 1837; Osten-Saken, Administration de l’Aghâr-bâydisân pendant la guerre personne de 1827–1828 (in Russian), in Russkiy Inamîldî, 1861, No. 79.

Since the time of 'Abbâs Mirzâ, Tabriz has been the official residence of the heir to the Persian throne. Down to the accession of Muhammad Shah in 1250 (1834) the British and Russian diplomatic missions spent most of their time in Tabriz (Fraser, Travels in Koordistan, ii. 247). Their transit to Teherân marked the definite transference by the Kurds of the political capital to that city. Down to the end of the sixth century little of general importance marked the life of Tabriz. On Sha'bân 27 1286 (July 8, 1850) the Bûb [q. v.] was executed in Tabriz at the entrance to the arsenal (ajâb-e khârā); cf. this correction in Wilson, Persian Life, p. 62. In 1880, the approach of the Kurds under Shâh Khâyur (cf. Shâh Khâyur) greatly disturbed the people of Tabriz. Gates were put up between the quarters to isolate them better if necessary but the Kurds did not go beyond the Bûbān.

The consolidation of Kûstâr power secured peace for Aghâr-bâydisân and Tabriz gradually recovered. In spite of the terrible ravages of cholera and plague in 1830–1831 the census made in Tabriz in 1842 recorded 9,000 families or 100–120,000 people (Berezin). In 1895 the number of inhabitants was estimated at 150–200,000, of whom 3,000 were Armenians (Wilson, op. cit., p. 53). Twenty years later the population was certainly over 200,000 and in spite of the rudimentary nature of the municipal organisation the town showed every sign of prosperity. The trade of Tabriz after a period of stagnation developed, especially between 1853 and 1856, but the too great extent of imports produced a great crisis in 1837. The opening of the route by Transcaucasia (Potti-Bakun) meant considerable competition for the parallel route Trebizond—Tabriz. In 1885 the Russian government closed the route through Transcaucasia and Russian trade was thereby encouraged. Russian and Northern Persian markets but the movement of goods via Trebizond—Tabriz (the only route to the west) also increased.

Twentieth century. The history of Tabriz since 1904 has been very stirring. The Turks of Tabriz (who are the result of intermarriage of Persians with Ghurcz, Mongols, Turkomans etc.) with their energetic and passionate character played a very important part in the Persian nationalist and revolutionary movement. Open rebellion broke out in Tabriz on June 23, 1908, the day of the bombardment of the Parliament in Teherân. The names of Şâdâr Khan, a former horse-dealer who became chief of the Amir Khêt quarter and his companion Bûr Khan are closely associated with the brave defence of Tabriz but darker sides of their activity have not escaped even E. G. Browne, The Pers. Revolution, p. 491–492. The government troops under Prince 'Ain al-Dawla, surrounded the town and at the beginning of February 1909, blocked it completely. On April 20 the Cabinets of London and St. Petersburg agreed to send to Tabriz a Russian force to facilitate the entrance into the town of the necessary provisions, to protect the consulates and foreign subjects, and to help those who so desired to leave the town. The Russian troops led by General Snarski entered Tabriz on April 30, 1909 (Browne, op. cit., p. 274). The negotiations for their withdrawal lasted till 1913 when the Russian ultimatum presented at Teherân on November 29 provoked a new agitation in the country. On December 21 the 'Ard of Tabriz attacked the weak Russian detachment, distributed about the town, and inflicted considerable losses on them. This had the immediate result of the despatch to Tabriz of a Russian brigade under Voropanov, which arrived on the eve of the new year. The Russian military tribunal pronounced several death sentences (including one on the Thikat el-Islâm, an important member of the Shâhkhit sect). In October 1912 the Turkish detachments who occupied the "disputed" districts west of Aghâr-bâydisân were recalled but the question of the Russo-Turkish frontier (cf. kurîj) remained still undecided. The Russian troops therefore re-
mained in Ašharbādjan till 1914 when the world war broke out.

At the beginning of December, the Kurdish irregulars commanded by Ottoman officers began a movement from Sardj-bulak towards Marāỉqā and Tābriż. At the same time Enver Pascha's raid on Saff-kamāl (south of Kārs) threatened the whole Russian army in the Caucasus. Orders were given to evacuate Ašharbādjan. Between December 17, 1914 and January 6, 1915, the Russian troops and following them the bulk of the local Christian population had left Tābriż. On January 8 Ahmad Muḥtār Bēy Shamskhālī at a head of a body of Kurds entered the town. The situation changed suddenly and on January 31 the Russians returning in force occupied Tābriż (cf., the details in the book by the former German consul in Tābriż: W. Litten, Persische Flüchtlings, Berlin 1925, P. 8-127).

Since 1906 a paved road connecting Tābriż with the Russian frontier (Djulfā, terminus of the Russian railway) had been constructed by the Russian government company which had obtained the concession from the Persian government. The work of changing this road into a railway was now actively hurried on and it was opened to traffic at the beginning of May 1916. The railway (80 miles long, with a branch line from Sofīyān to Lake Urmīyā 25 miles long) was the first to be built on Persian territory.

The Russian army on the Persian frontier had become disorganised on the outbreak of the revolution of 1917. Ašharbādjan was evacuated at the beginning of 1918. The representatives of the Persian central government and even the Crown Prince had remained all this time at their places but when the last Russian detachment left Tābriż on February 28, 1918, the actual power passed into the hands of the local committee of the democratic party and its head Ismā‘īl Nawbār.

Meanwhile the Turks emerging from their inactivity quickly occupied the frontiers abandoned by the Russians. On June 18, 1918, the Ottoman advance guard entered Tābriż. On July 8 General ‘Ali Ḥasan Pāšā arrived and on August 25 Kāsīn Kūrā-bekīr Pāšā who commanded the army corps. The Ottoman authorities banished Nawbār and supported the appointment of Ma‘ṣūd al-Sulṭānī as governor of Ašharbādjan. This troubled situation lasted for a year and only with the arrival in Tābriż of the new governor-general Sīhār-salīr (June 1919) did affairs begin to resume their normal course. Complete order was only established under Rūdā Khānī, who became first of all minister of war and later ruler of Persia.

By the treaty of February 26, 1921, the Soviet government rescinded all the old concessions in Persia and the railway from Tābriż to Djalufa built at the expense of the Russian government thus became the property of the Persian state.

Antiquities. The oldest monuments in Tābriż date from the Mongol epoch (beginning of the sixteenth century) but no systematic study has yet been made of this field. The earthquakes and the indifference of the Siyānī to the buildings of their Sunnī predecessors or rivals are the two main causes of the disappearance of the monuments, interesting traces of which still remain.

The magnificent buildings of Ghāzān Khān in the village of Shahbāzān (now the suburb of Kūrā-mallāk) have completely disappeared. As early as 1611 we find Shāh ‘Abbās using the material of the ruins of Shahbāzān to build a fortress. The earthquake of Feb 5, 1641 caused further destruction (A rzāk of Tābriż, p. 375). Ewliyā Celebi (II. 265) still found the ruins of the stepped tower standing which reminded him of the tower of Galata (the same remark is made in the Iqlīṣmānī). Mme. Desloulay and Sarre also visited the mound which is all that remains of Shāh Shīrāz and remains were still found there.

A detailed description of this marvellous building is given in the ‘Iqlīṣmānī of Badr al-Dīn ‘Alī (d. 835 = 1431) who made use of the account of the embassy from the Mamlūk Sulṭān al-Nāṣir in the time of the İbn Shābīl Sa‘dī (the text was translated by Baron Tiesenhausen, Zeitschr. f. pers. Spr. x., 1886, p. 114-118). The mosque was said to rival the vault of the palace of Chosroes at Ctesiphon. According to Hamdullāh (1340) the mosque was built too rapidly, which caused it to collapse (farīd ʿunūd). The Venetian merchant (in 1514) speaks with enthusiasm of its ruins but Chardin (II. 323) only found the lower part (restored) and the "tower." The name Tābriż al-Shāh ("vault of A.") is still preserved in the name given to the enormous dilapidated brick building which stands in the centre of the town at the entrance to the old Mīnār Mīnār quarter (vulgo: Miṭar-mīrār; cf. Beresin). It is probable that there is some confusion between the old mosque which has now disappeared and the neighbouring citadel which in no way agrees with the description which we have of the mosque. Nothing is definitely known of the date of the ark. It may be the vast davwāt-khānā ("Toltbatgana") of which Clavijo speaks and which is mentioned in the ʿAṣār-i dawr (cf. above). The ark was turned into an arsenal by ʿAbbās Mīrzā and is still the most imposing building in Tābriż.

The beautiful mosque of Dūhān Shīr (the Blue Mosque) described by Tavernier and Chardin has been exhaustively studied by Texier, Mme. Desloulay, and Prof. Sarre. It is in a state of collapse. It is possible that its abandonment was the result of the heretical views on the part of its builder was accused by the Ašk-Koyunlu. Ewliyā Celebi is enthusiastic about "the mosque of Sulṭān Hasan" adorned with stones from Nadīf and inscriptions traced by the hand of the calligrapher Yāḥyā-i Mustaʿṣımī. On either side of the mihrāb were two pillars of a rare stone, like amber. This mosque known as Ustād-shāhīd ("master apprentices") was the work of Hasan Kūčkī Cobi (d. 741 = 1340) (Zīnāt al-Muṣaffāri, in the Mir‘āt al-Buldān, p. 341, Chardin). According to S. Wilson, that new mosque of this name (built on the site of the old one) is situated near the wool-market. This mosque seems to be different from the mosque of Ustād Shīr, of which very little is known.

Ewliyā says that the mosque of Shāh ‘Abbās was opposite the Ustād-shāhīd. To the Safawī period also belongs the "ala‘ī (Kadh-i Kadhāwī) of Shāh Sa‘īd (cf. Ewliyā). To the Kādīr period belong the residence of the governor-general Alā-Kapī ("the red gate"), the beautiful gardens of Bāgh-i Shīmāl ("north garden") which lie however on the south of the town), the pavilion of Shāh-gūl ("the Lake of the Shīh"), 5 miles S. of the town (Beresin, p. 80) etc.

A detailed list of the monuments of Tābriż will be found in the Jāmāt of Ewliyā Celebi. The view of Tābriż by Chardin (Atlas, Pl. XI) which
shows the public buildings is valuable for the study of the topography. The Mir‘izz al-Bulūk, i. 346—348 and the book by the American-missionary Wilson also contain useful details. A plan of the town prepared in 1830 by the students of the military school of Tabriz on a scale of 1:8,820 was published in 1894; cf. Houtum-Schindler, Geogr. Journ., 1895, p. 104. Berezin, p. 52 gives a sketch of the quarters of the town. There is a little Persian plan reproduced in Browsen, The Perif. Revolution, p. 254. A very detailed plan of Tabriz was also published in Tiffens in 1912.

The most important building is the pilgrim's fort built according to the inscription in 1004 (1654), the oldest parts of which can easily be distinguished from the later restorations. Beside it is a modern mosque built of beautifully hewn stones. Ecuring found the place empty except for a garrison of five men. Jaussen and Savigmee speak of about 40 houses with walls of sun-dried bricks and roofs of branches covered with rubble. The fruit-trees were in a very neglected condition.

In the time of the Prophet, Tabuk was on the northern frontier of Arabia beyond which Byzantine territory began. The place became historic when Muhammad's great campaign against the north began in the year 9. The population, Greeks, Amila, Lahm and Djuđlām, fled on his approach. He had however to abandon his objective which was evidently the lands farther north inhabited by Arabs, as the great heat caused his followers to become dispirited. He therefore only stayed ten days before beginning his retreat but made use of this time for negotiations with the people of Aila, Ađhrūj and Makna, which led to their submission.


**TABULA SMARAGDINA,** the revelation of secret alchemical teachings ascribed to Hermes Trismegistos. Known in a later version in the west since the middle of the 12th century, the origin of the text was until recently an unsolved problem in the history of chemistry. Since R. Steele in his edition of Bacon (1930) showed that the text of the *Tabula* existed in Arabic and Latin in the Sīr al-Arār of Pseudo-Aristotle, and E. F. J. Holmyard in 1923 discovered a more primitive form of the text in the Kitāb al-Uṣūṣūs al-kabīrī of Djibrīr b. Haiyīn, J. Ruska has been able to show that the original source of the text in many passages puzzling to the must be found at the end of the Sīr al-Sabkha, composed by Hermes, said to have been found by Bālamīs (Apollonius of Tyana) in the tomb of Hermes and to throw light on many points of the history of the Tabula from the time of Hugo St. Lullius to the present day. He was finally able to show that Djibrīr b. Haiyīn already was acquainted with the book of Apollonius, so that it is fairly certain that the work originated in gnostic circles.


**TABUR** (τ.) (Eastern Turk: ṭabūr, a palmate-formed of wagons arranged in a circle or square; a body of men sent out to reconnoitre), a battalion, a corps of about a thousand men, commanded by a ṭabūrī (chief of a thousand).


**TADALLIS, TEDELLES (Dellys), a town on the Algerian coast, 70 miles east of Algiers and 4 miles E. of the mouth of the Sebă, the prarivaries of the river of Kabyla, from which it is separated by the mountainous mass which is Cape Benguét. It lies in 35° 30' N. Lat. and 3° 55' E. Long (Greenwich). The town consists of two distinct quarters: the native quarter with its narrow streets and the European quarter regularly built on a plateau about 175 feet above sea-level. Below, the harbour, sheltered against the winds from the west and northwest, offers a fairly secure anchorage but is frequented only by a few small trading vessels. The country is covered with tall trees and well-tilled gardens and offers a pleasing picture. The total population is 3,854 of whom 2,508 are natives. The latter are of Kabylian origin but like the majority of the tribes of the district speak only Arabic.

The site of Dellys was occupied in the Roman period by the town of Rassacurru a few traces of which have been discovered (remains of walls, cisterns, etc.). This town must have been destroyed after the Arab conquest and for long the site remained uninhabited. Al-Ḫārī (Descriptio de l’Afrique, transl. de Senebier, p. 135) describes the town as a port situated to the east of Māṣa ʿl-Šāṭlajādī which he calls the town of the Beni Djemna but this place seems to correspond to Cape Djinet rather than to Dellys.

The name itself under the form Thadellis, Thadellissi ("the cottages") does not appear till the period when the Hammāḍid sovereigns (cf. HAMMĀDIDS) established their capital in Bougie. Owing to its position which enabled relations to be easily established with the people of the valley of the Sebă, this little town acquired a certain commercial and military importance; it even had a Hammāḍid governor. (In 496 [1102–3] the Sulṭān al-Maṣūr gave this office to a prince of Almohads who had taken refuge in Africa). Idrist (p. 104) describes Tadallah as a town on an eminence and surrounded by a strong wall. He mentions the fertility of the country round, the low cost of living, and the abundance of cattle which were exported to the adjacent regions. After the fall of the Hammāḍid kingdom, Dellys passed under the rule of the Almohads, was taken by Yāḥyā b. Ghistiya (622 = 1226–1227), then its possession was disputed among the Almohads, Zayyanids, Hafsids and the Marinids who took it in 1394. In the 16th century according to Leo Africanus (bk. iv, transl. Schefer ill., 66), Dellys shared the fate of Algiers. Like all the towns on the coast, it received a number of refugees from Spain, who must have contributed to the economic and intellectual life of the town. Leo (loc. cit.) says that the inhabitants engaged in dyeing, traded successfully and were noted for their skill in playing the lute. As to their fashion of dress, he says it is like that of the people of Djériss. When the Algerians had submitted to Spain (1490), the people of Dellys followed their example but in 1517 it was retaken by Arrūd [q.v.]. The Turks
put a garrison there and made the town a base of operations against the tribes of the valley of Sebou. Although the inhabitants kept up a constant intercourse by sea with Algiers, Dellys only vegetated under Turkish rule. It was a wretched village when the French occupied it on May 7, 1844. A European quarter was established there two years later. The conquest of Kabylie, which was followed by the transfer of the military establishment to Tizi Uzun and Fort National, arrested its development. In the course of the insurrection of 1871, Dellys was blockaded on the land side by the Kabylies (April-May) but maintained its own communication by sea so that it could not be taken by the rebels. Since then its peace has not been disturbed but owing to its outlying position and the difficulties of its communications the town has remained stationary and colonization by Europeans has not developed around it.

**Bibliography:** S. A. Boullia, La Djurjura à travers Ph locator, Algiers 1925; Roby, Notes sur l’organisation militaire des Turcs dans la Grande Kabylie (R. Afr., 1873). Cf. also the Bibliography to the articles ALGERIA, KABYLIA.

(G. YERK)

**TADBIR (A.), Ma‘ṣūr of the second stem of the root ṣ-l-b.**

1. With the meaning of "direction, administration." The Arabic lexicographers explain ṣabbara as a verb from the noun ṣabbur "the hindmost, the end" (opposite: ṣabli); thus we read in the Liṣān, v. 358: wa tamtura li-mu ṭalula ṣabli ṣabli hahu, "to heed what one attains at the end of a matter," or yamurra fī anwaqqah, "to heed the end of a matter." This verb has now a double application: a. in the sense of government, administration (e.g. in the title of a work by Ibn Abī ‘l-Rabi‘i, Suluk al-Mulūk fi Tadbir ‘l-Mawālib [cf. sīvaṣā]) and b. which concerns us here, in the sense of guidance, management of a household, tadbir al-munāwiṣ = al-munāwiṣ. Thus for example, Ibn Khaldūn says in his Muqaddima (ed. Quatremère in N. E., xvi. 62; transl. by de Slane in N. E., xix. 78): al-sīvaṣat al-madāniyya hiyya tadbir al-āwāli ṣaw wa al-mudāni ... "The Sīvaṣat al-madāniyya is the management of a household or of a state in keeping with the demands of ethics (ṣabīḥah) and wisdom, so that the whole may be led on a path on which regularity ( nast) is maintained."

The Tadbir al-Mansūr is one of the three subdivisions of practical philosophy, which was taken over by the Muslims from Hellenism with these divisions; the latter are ethics (ilm al-ṣabīḥah), economics (ilm tadbir al-munawwir) and politics with ethics (ilm al-sīvaṣat) (e.g. Ibn Sīnā, Akhīr al-‘Ulim al-ṣabīḥa, in Maqāṣid al-ṣabīḥa, Cairo 1328, p. 239 sqq.; al-Ḳīf, Tadbir al-Ḥusnā, ed. Liptay p. 53, and many others). As Ritter was the first to show, the whole economic literature of Islam can be traced to the Economics (of which the Greek original is now lost) of the Neopythagorean Bryson, which survives in an Arabic translation (ed. Cheikho in Machri, xix. [1921], 161—181; mentioned as early as ‘Fikrist, p. 315), from which again came a Hebrew (Munich, Cod. Hebr. 263, Ritter in JBL, viii. [1917], 12 sq.) and a Latin (Dresden MS. of Galen to which Plessner has called attention) translation. The latter has edited and studied all the material. According to his results the main lines of development of economics in Islam are as follows: apart from copyists and imitators (al-Dināshī, Ishārāt illa Ma‘ṣūr al-Tīfārī, ed. Ritter in JBL, vii. 1 sqq.; Ibn Abī ‘l-Rabi‘i, Suluk al-Mulūk; the Encyclopædia of Fakhr al-Dīn al-Ra‘ī‘; Ibn al-Fā‘ānī) the Economics of Bryson was independently edited by Nāṣir al-Dīn in his ‘Abdallāh and extended by the incorporation of Muslim and Persian ideas. Tūsī’s Economics was regarded for all time in Islam as the final model. On it were based the ʿAbdallāh in Dīla‘ī and for the most part the later authors also who deal with economics, like al-Ghaṣṣī, al-Shahrārī, al-ʿArūfī (inserts a chapter on attitude to relations) and al-Ṭifārī. The contents of these economic writings deal with the following subjects: acquisition, preservation and utilization of property (muḥāfāzah), attitude to slaves, women and children; everything is regarded from the point of view of acquiring and retaining the greatest possible good fortune.

The ‘Fikrist, p. 265, further mentions a second work on Economics apparently dating from the Hellenistic period and translated into Arabic: The Kitāb Rūḥā fi Tadbir al-Mansūr by I. W. SWS (for 'i one should probably read ʿi, f. or ʿi): "The book of Rūḥā on the Economics of... (?)." The name of this ancient author cannot be ascertained with certainty, especially as the names of very few ancient economists have come down to us. One might imagine it to be some name like Philodemus. There is also an Arabic translation (or synopsis) of the first book of the Economics wrongly attributed to Aristotle (now usually attributed to Theophrastus) in a manuscript of varied contents in the Escorial (Casiri, 90, 383) entitled Kitāb Rūḥā fi Tadbir al-Mansūr and in a manuscript containing several different works in a private collection in Cairo entitled Tadhkir Maḥbūla Avvāṣa fi Tadbir al-Mansūr (cf. Ma‘ṣūr in Machri, xix. [1921], p. 250—262). These two manuscripts have however not yet been closely studied. In the ‘Fikrist, in Abī ‘l-Rabi‘i’s and al-Ḳīf, this Economics is not mentioned (cf. the more recent Syriac translation of the Aristotelian works, Leipzig 1900, p. 53 sqq.), while Abu ‘l-Ḳāsim ʿAbd al-ʿArūfī (d. 452 = 1069—1070), Tadbir al-Umm, Cairo, n.d. p. 39, or his authority seems to have been acquainted with an Economics (Sīvaṣat al-Mansūr) of Aristotle. The way in which this translation has been handed down in MS. seems to indicate that it originated in Christian Arab circles: Ma‘ṣūr suggests without any authority that the translator was Abu ‘l-Farsad ‘Abd Allah b. al-Ẓayfīb (d. 435 = 1043—1044). The writer is preparing an edition and study of this book of Economics.

**Bibliography:** G. Ritter, Adīb al-Lungat al-rubāḥ, Cairo 1912, ii. 332 sqq.; ‘Fikrist, Ein arabi, Handbuch der Handelswissenschaft, in JBL, vii. [1917], 4—14; Plessner, Der Ursprung der Neupythagoräischen Bryson und sein Einfluss auf die islamische Wissenschaft, Breslau, phil. Diss. 1925 (synopsis only; the complete work will appear shortly).

2. With the meaning "Manumission of a slave, which however only becomes operative after the death of the master." Dabbarā is in this case a verb formed from the noun ṣabūr, "life’s end," i.e. death. Cf. Liṣān, v. 355 sqq.; al-Ḳīf, Tadbir al-Ḥusnā, ed. Liptay p. 53 and many others. For particulars cf. the article ‘Arūfī.

The fullest treatment of the subject in Santillana, Introduzione di diritto musulmano malichita, Rome 1926, l. 122.

(HERPERING)
TADHDIRA (a), memorial, memorandum, from dhahara "to record". The word appears in the titles of many famous works: the *Memorandum of Astronomy of Nasir al-Din Tusi*, the *Tadkhira al-Awilayy* "Memorial of the Saints" of Farid al-Din 'Ajmar, the *Tadkhira al-Sharawi* "memorial of the poets", a biography of the poets, popular in Persia.

In administrative language it means: ticket, memorandum, permit. It is the name given to travellers' passports, yul tadhkirati, to the custom house office's exact: murur tadhkirati. It is also more especially applied to the diplomas of investiture given to ḥāfiz on taking up their office, the general name for these diplomas for ministers of religion being ḥāfiz. Under the old Turkish government system there were two tadhkirāt, a minor and a major, entrusted with the delivery of tadhkhira's; they were important officials directly under the orders of the šāhīzāker [q.v.] and admitted to the table of the grand vizier.

**Bibliography:** The dictionaries and M. d'Ossian, *Tableau général de l'Empire Otoman*, Paris 1791, iv. 539, 597.

(B. CARRA DE VAUX)

TADJ (a), Crown. A Persian loanword in Arabic going back to the Old Persian *tag*; cf. Armenian *tag*, Aramaic *tage*. From it are formed in Arabic the broken plural *tagjan* and the corresponding verb *tan-uj II* "to crown", *vat* "to be crowned", and *tagii*, "crowned" (Horn, *Grundrisse der mesopotamischen Erzaehnisse*, Strasburg 1862, p. 81; Siddiqi, *Studien über die persischen Freundswörter im klassischen Arabischen*, Göttingen 1919, p. 74, 84; Frenkel, *Die aramäischen Freundswörter im Arabischen*, Leyden 1856, p. 62). Like the name, the thing itself comes from old Persia. The form of the crowns of the old Persian kings, which we now know best from their coins, was not known in Arabic literature. Masudi, for example, tells us how he had seen an old book with coloured pictures of Persian kings wearing their crowns, which was translated into Arabic for the Omajyad Highämi b. 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwân (B.G.A., vii., p. 106). A whole series of books now lost with titles like Kitāb Siyar al-Muluk, Kitāb al-Tadj seem to have been of similar content. On the other hand, the Zekii *Paša* in the introduction to his edition of Kitāb al-Tadj of Dāshli (Cairo 1532 [1914]) it is presumably on such sources that are based the statements of the Persian crown in Harun al-Ishfahani, Kitāb Tərəq Sibt Mālīk al-ʿArūs wa-l-ʿAynī (Berlin, Kaviani Press, p. 17, 24 sq., 32, 35 sg.), and the Persian Mudjdī al-Tawārakh which utilises him and the statements in Tahar's also (on the relation of their sources cf. Ndèfèke, Geschichte der Perser und Araber, Leyden 1879, Introduction; on the crown among the Persians cf. especially p. 95, 221, 304, 385, 453; A. Christensen, *L'Empire des Sassanides*, Copenhagen 1907, p. 14, 89 sq., 106; do., *Le Règne du Roi Kawaoud I et le Communisme musulman*, Copenhagen 1925, p. 22 sqg.). In the Arabic *Amuli* literature we are told that the first to wear a crown was Dāhshā (see Kalkashandi, *Ṣabū al-ʿAψ*, Cairo 1331 [1913], 1. 415).

On Muhammadan miniatures which depict the old Persian kings, the latter wear regular crowns but their form is of course in no way authentic. On the miniatures, crowns are also worn by the angels, and notably by the Prophet Muhammad and Būsik in the Mīrūf (see the miniature in the edition of the Uigur Mūridīnam, ed. by Payet de Courtelie, Paris 1882).

The Arabs made their first acquaintance with crowns before Islam, for the Persian kings occasionally gave their Arab vassal kings crowns as a token of their rank, e.g. to the Lakhrid Imas al-Ḳais (d. 438 A.H.; cf. Clermont-Ganneau, *Recueil d'Archéol. Or.,* vii. 307: Le roi de "jeus les Arabus" and vii. 376 sqq.: Le Ṭadj al- físūr "l'Elie e la royauté générale des Arabes"; Lidszbarski, *Ephemeris*, ii. 35, 375, so also on the difference between ṭālī and ṭāji; the latter seems to mean a simple chaplet only), and to the Lakhrîd Nūmān III (s. Rothstein, *Die Dynastie der Lakhdîm in al-Hira*, Berlin 1899, p. 128) and to the Dāči Tadj Hawdha b. `Alî, the Christian ruler of the Yezidis in the time of Muḥammad, to whom the Prophet is said also to have sent a demand to become converted to Islam (Ibn Ḥamdân, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 971; Kalkashandi, vii. 379; Frenkel, p. 62; Tahari, i. 985; Ndèfèke, Geschichte der Perser und Araber, p. 258). Crowns and bearers of crowns were often celebrated by the poets (see Siddiqi, p. 84; Mubarrad, Khânî, p. 289 sq., where the crown is said to be a peculiarity of the Yezidis, possibly a reminiscence of the old relations between the Yezidis and the Abyssinians; on the crown of the latter cf. Ndèfèke, Geschichte, p. 225 and 233).

The celebrated crown of Khusenaw II was among the booty which the Arabs took at Ctesiphon (Christensen, *L'Empire*, p. 106). But the crown continued to be something foreign and rare among the Arabs. There is a ṭālī which says al-mulūk ṭāj al-ʿArab, "the turbans are the crowns of the Arabs", i.e. according to the usual explanation in the Līyān al-ʿArab and elsewhere: turbans are not amongst them as crowns, for most Bedouns do not wear turbans but only ṭālīsī (case cf. the article ʿKalāmawīa) or no headdress at all.

Islam knows no regular royal crown or coronation in our sense as a symbol of regal power. When we find mention of crowns, the reference is to foreign rulers like those of the old Persian Great Kings, of Christian rulers etc. The ṭālī al-ʿBâlî is the tiara of the Pope, ṭāj al-ʿArnî the mitre of a bishop. Only in the case of the so-called ṭāj al-ḥāfiz we do see at first sight to have a Muslim ruler's crown. This crown of the caliph, which is included among the insignia (al-ʿahwālī) of sovereignty, is not found till the "Abbasid period and it has been suggested that this dynasty imitated the Persian tradition in deliberate contrast to the early caliphs and Omajyads (Ndèfèke, Geschichte, p. 453). The Caliph wore the ṭāj on ceremonial occasions (mewādī) on the great feast-days. Kalkashandi (ii. 472 and 484 = Wüstenfeld, *Calçashandi*, ii. 172 and 182) describes the ṭāj of the Fāṭimid Caliph of Egypt. It is evident from him that it was not a proper crown but a turban richly studded with gems, including a particularly large one called al-ṣalīma, weighing seven dirhams, of the colour of the Fāṭimids, namely white, for the elaborate winding of which (ṣalūd al-ṭāj al-ḥāfiz) a special official (the ṭājīdī, later called ṭājī) was appointed (cf. Inoceramo, *The ceremonial procession of the Fāṭimid Caliphs*, St. Petersburg 1905, p. 645; Ibn al-Shāri`a, *Khâmîn Dinār al-ʿArnî*, ed. Bahgat, p. 37):—The Hafṣid Sultan too wore a ṭāj on his mawwâlī (cf. Ibn Ḥajj Allah, *Masūlī al-ʿArbâr*, extract: Wâsīf Iftikhrī wa-l-ʿAmalûsî, ed. Ḥasan
The name ṭādh was also given to the headdress of the Ottoman sultāns. Even 'Othmān I is said to have worn a ṭādh-i Khwānsād (d'Olissos, iii. 46). We know exactly the kind of head-dress worn by the conqueror of Constantinople from the pictures by Bellini. He wears a large turban, and the ṭādh; the inner cap of this turban is in the shape of a truncated cone, is usually red and tipped (t stitched). Round this is wound the turban proper (pārk) of thin cloth. The form of the turban of the Fāṭih found on his pictures is also shown on the medals. When we find on the reverse of a medal a three regular crowns, which are believed to represent the three kingdoms of Asia, Greece and Trebizond united under Ottoman rule, the explanation probably is simply that the medal was designed and executed by a European artist (cf. G. F. Hill, in Numismatic Chronicls, 1926, p. 287—298 and Pl. xiv.). Karabacek has dealt fully with the ṭādh of the Ottoman sultāns. According to him the Perso-Turkish ṭādh corresponds to the ṭarz of the Arabic-speaking lands, a rather high cap which is found represented as early as a papyrus of the viith century A.D. and appears in many varying forms in the course of time. In remarkable agreement with these forms are the headdresses (nīn, nīn) of the viith—sixth centuries of ladies in France and Spain, which according to Karabacek came direct from the east (the name: Arabic bādān as well as the thing itself). Particular forms of this headdress have survived on women to the present day e.g. among the Druses of the Lebanon and in Algeria and Tunisia. In modern Egypt there has developed from this the ṭarz as a woman's headdress. This is a plate-like ornament of gold and gems, which is sewn on the crown of a rather high cap and is sometimes of considerable weight. This ṭarz is put on the top of (ṣāhās) of the head of dead women, as is done with the turban in the case of men (cf. Lane, Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians, Appendix A; Lane, Arabian Society in the Middle Ages, p. 218, 224). The use of a special crown for bridges, which is found all over the world, is also sometimes found in the Muslim world (Lane, The Thousand and One Nights, i. 424; Lagarde, Araba mitrati, Nachrichten, Göttinjen, i. 190, p. 160 sqq. and the title of the well-known ṭādh ul-Arūz; cf. for Eastern Turkistan: Brockelmann, in Asia Major, i. 122).

The ṭādh has been given a special religious significance as a headdress among the dervishes. The assumption of the ṭādh is an essential part of the ṣhāhdh [q.v.]. The different dervish orders have their ṭādh of distinct form and colour, frequently with 12 seams (tork) from the number of the Imāms, or with 9, 7 etc., and there are numerous names and symbolic interpretations associated with them (see Ahmad Rif'at, Mir'at al-
fourteen children, and died in June, 1631, at Bırhänspir, after giving birth to a daughter. She was buried temporarily at Zaımbād, a suburb of Bırhänspir, but her husband, who mourned her deeply, resolved to commemorate her love by a tomb worthy of it, and her body was removed to Agra, and again temporarily buried on a site which he acquired from Tādjiūs Ila, in Burj, and on which the Tādji was erected. The structure, with its subsidiary buildings was not completed for twelve two years, during which period 20,000 workmen was continuously employed on it. A council of the best architects in the empire was held, and designs were submitted, that finally chosen being the work of Ustādūs Tādji, a native either of Tūk or of Shibār. The tradition that the architect was the Tanjoric, Geronimo Verzone, based on a statement made by the Italian Augustinian Friar, Father Monrique, finds no corroboration either in native annals or in the writings of the travellers Tavernier, Bernier, and Thévenot, who regarded the building as a purely Oriental work. It is, moreover, improbable. The tomb, of white marble from Djiāmbar, stands on a raised plinth, also faced with white marble, 18 feet high and 31 feet square. At each corner of this stands a beautifully proportioned minaret, 133 feet high, girt with three stories and finished with an open, domed lattāb. In the centre of this platform stands the mausoleum, a square of 186 feet with the corners cut off to the extent of 33 feet 1 inches, the façade rising 92 feet 3 inches from the platform. The centre of this is occupied by the principal dome, 55 feet in diameter, and rising 74 feet above the roof, or 191 from the platform. In each face of the building is a high arched porch, and in each a small domical apartment of two stories in height. Each is surmounted by a domed lattāb, and each has, in its three outer faces, six arched recesses, arranged in two stories and admitting light to lattice windows. These recesses, and the great porches, are vaulted. Beneath the dome, in the centre, is the cenotaph of Mumtāz Maḥall, and beside it that of her husband, both adorned with inscriptions. Immediately beneath these, in the crypt, which is on the ground level, are the true tombs, less ornamented than the cenotaphus. The cenotaphs are enclosed by a screen of trellis-work of white marble, *a chef d’œuvre* of elegance in Indian art. The porches are framed in ornamental inscriptions in the Arabic character, and the beauty of the whole is enhanced by copious and graceful ornamentation in *pietra dura*, all the spandrels, angles, and important architectural details, being inlaid with precious stones, agates, jaspers, bloodstones, cornelians, and the like, combined in wreaths, scrolls, and frets, as exquisite in design as beautiful in colour. Light is admitted only through double screens of white marble trellis work of the most exquisite design, one on the other, and on the inner face of the walls. Beyond the mausoleum and its platform are the two wings, one of which is a beautiful mosque. This group of buildings forms one side of a garden court, 880 feet square; and beyond this again is an outer court, of the same width, but only half the depth. Pedants in art have endeavoured to judge the Tādji by the canons of Greek and Gothic architecture, but such comparisons are merely impertinent. As Fergusson truly says *the combination of so many beauties, and the perfect manner in which each is subordinated to the other make up a whole which the world cannot match*.


Tādjiūs Dāwūlā [See Tūrughū]

Tādjiūs al-Dīn [See al-Surekī]

Tādjiūs al-Mulūk [See Būrkī]

Tādjiūs, older form of Tādjiūs or Tādjiū (in Maḥmūd Kāshgāri, i, 324: Tekīk), the name of a people originally used with the meaning *Arab* (later this meaning became confined to the form Tārīj), afterwards "Iranian" in contrast to *Turk". The word is derived from the Arab tribal name of Tāji. The nearest Arab tribe to the Iranians was the Tāji, hence the name of this tribe came to be applied to the whole Arab people. The Tājī are mentioned as early as the beginning of the third century by an Edessene along with the Saracens as representatives of all the Bedawīn" (Cureton, *Spicil. Syr.* p. 16 ult. in Nöldeke, *Z. D. M. G.* , Ixx., 1713). The corresponding word with the meaning "Arab" is *Pahlavi Tadzīk", in Armenian Tadzīk (cf. *Gverur, d. bram. Phil. i.*, 2, 1877) in Chinese Tadzhi. The Muslim conquerors seem to have known by the same name the Iranian population of Central Asia, as, in the view then prevailing, an Iranian convert to Islam became an Arab (cf. Tabari ii, 1508, 13), the word reached the *Turkic*, with the meaning *Muhammadan, a man from the land of Islam*; as the majority of the Muslims known to the Turks were Iranians, the word *Tadzīk* came to mean Iranian in Turkī. Maḥmūd Kāshgāri (cf. *cit.*) explains the word *Tekīk* as "Persian" (al-Farābī) in the contemporary Kūstābqāl Bīlik (esp. 8, 1) the *Tadzīk* are distinguished from the Arabs as Persians (cf. Radloff, *Versuch eines Worterbuches der Türk-Dialekte*, iii., 1906). The Iranians themselves even at this date already called themselves *Tārīk* in contrast to their Turkish rulers; e.g. Bā’ilakt, ed. Morley, p. 746 at the top. The difference between Turk and Tadzík is frequently emphasised; it was asserted that relations between a Turk and a Tadzík always ended badly and that a Tadzík could never rely on a Turk (Zahir al-Dīn Marzašī, ed. Dorn, p. 248 and 253 sqq.). On the relation of the word Tadzík to the word *Sart* cf. the article *Sart*. In the use of the two words the importance of the Iranians as a race of traders is apparent. The word *Sart* is first found in Turkī as a noun meaning "merchant" and later became the ethnic of the Iranians who were principally regarded as a race of traders; *sür gora*, the name Tadzík (Tekīk) later, at least among the Tatars on the Volga, came to be used as a broad meaning "merchant". According to one of the original sources for the conquest of Kazan by the Russians in 1552 (Prince Kurbsky’s account) the citadel of Kazan was surrounded by the *ditch of the Tekīk* (*tezīk* or *ezīk*) and the work Tekīk is explained as *merchant* (cf. Karamzin, *Ist. ges. Russ.*, VIII, 1772; P. Zarskiy, *Oberh. devomer Kasan*, 1877, p. 8).

At the present day the name Tadzík is sometimes
given to the Eastern Iranians in contrast to the Persians proper; the strip between Astarâbâd [q.v.] and Yezd is said to be the western limit of the dwellings of the Tadjik. In Turkistan the Tadjik, especially under Ozbek rule have been gradually driven from the plains into the mountains. The Russians include under the name "Tadjik" all the Iranian peoples in Turkistan, both the Tadjik proper, i.e. the people who speak "Tadjik" and the highlanders on the Pasuji (cf. XMU-DARNAK) and the upper Zarafshan, who occupy a special linguistic position. In keeping with the use of the name, the autonomous republic of Tadjikistan was founded in 1924 with its capital Dushanbe (on the upper Kafir-Nihân). According to a census of the same year, the number of Tadjik was 871,552. The people themselves use Tadjik in different ways. The inhabitants of several mountainous districts like Shughãn and Roshan call themselves Tadjik while they describe their Tadjik-speaking neighbours in Darwáz as "Persian-speaking" (farsi gûy); in contrast to this, the people of the upper Zarafshan, who speak a Persian dialect, apply the name Tadjik to themselves and call the people on the river Yagnob, who speak a peculiar dialect (Gallâ), the latter people seem also to distinguish their "Yagnobî" from the language of the Tadjik.

The old derivation (still given in Gründl ii., 402) of the ethnic Tadzhik from the head-dress tadjî may be absolutely rejected on both linguistic and historical grounds.

Bibliography: N. de Khanikof, Mémorial sur l'Étymologie de la Perse, Paris 1866 (Renseil de voyages et de mémoriaux, viii.); A. Shâhîv, Tadjîkî, Étymologie et interprétation des termes populaires, Tashkent 1913; Svetozar Asya, God ii.; W. Barthold, Tadjikî, Istoričskički Nerb (Tadjikistan, Tashkent 1925, p. 93-112); M. Andryeyev, Po ethnografii tadjikov. Nizhny Novgorod 1871, (ibid., p. 151-78); (W. Barthold) TADJIKI, the language of the Tadjik [q.v.]. As a literary language Tadjikii seems to be more or less remote from modern Persian according to the degree of education of the person writing or speaking it. In this sense (aiming at the elegance of the "Persian" but without denying a dialectical colouring), the Tadjik was the official and business language under the rule of the Ozbek of Bukhara [q.v.] and remained so after the revolution of 1920; since 1924 however Tadjik has been limited to the area of the new autonomous republic of Tadjikistan founded in that year. As a spoken language Tadjik has lost a portion of its area to Turkish in the last few years; on the other hand in the mountains it has extended its territory at the expense of other dialects (like the Yagnobî). On the linguistic position and peculiarities of Tadjik cf. Grundr. d. ir. Phil., i. ii. 407 ff., and the observations thereon by A. Freiman on M. Andryeyev in Tadjikistan, Tashkent 1925, p. 162. (W. Barthold)

TADJNIS or Djinj (A.), paronomasia, play upon words, is a figure of rhetoric (badâi) which consists in using in the same phrase two words of a similar or almost similar sound but of different meanings, e.g. amanatu sunt amenet.

1. The Tadjnits is complete (Jamu) when the two words resemble one another in kind, number, vocalisation (or form) and in the order of the consonants.

2. If the two words are of the same kind (e.g. two substantives, two verbs or two particles), it is called identical (numadîh), e.g. "The day and the Hour (al-âda) will dawn, the guilty will swear that they have only been an hour (îda) in their graves" (Sûra xxx. 54, 55).

3. If the two words are of different kinds (e.g. a noun and a verb, a noun and a particle, a verb and a particle), it is called "sufficient" or "imperfect" (mustafrî), e.g. man mâta min haddihî "men may humble (âdina) to Yahyâ b. Abdal-lâh," he who dies of the sudden changes of fate, lives (âdina) with Yahyâ b. Abdal-lâh, for he is generous and will revive the name of generosity" (Abû Tammâm, Divân, Bairût 1905, p. 341).

4. If one of the two words is a compound and the other simple, it is called a compound paronomasia (Ju’dâl al-tâkhûl). If the two words, simple and the compound, are similar in writing, it is called "resembling" (mustafrîh) on account of the resemblance or conformity of the two words in writing: e.g. idhâ ma’likum lam yakhmû dâbi kibû - fa-ala’din fa-dawlatuhû dâbi kibû, "when a king is not generous (dâbi kibû), leave him, for his kingdom — power — will not be long in disappearing" (dâbi kibû) (Abû’l-Fath al-Bustî).

5. If there is no conformity in writing between the two words, it is called separated, divided, cut (mufrî), e.g. kulluhum hal a-hâddihîhî dâbi long mulla’î dâba long ma’likum luw dâbi long; you have all taken the cup and we have no cup (wa-la dâbi long); what would have harmed him who made the cup circulate if he had been kind to us" (lew dâbi long) (Abû l-Fath al-Bustî).

II. 1. If the two words are not similar in form or even vocalisation, it is called "transposed" (munafarik) on account of the transposition found in one compared with the other (inshârî); e.g. hard and hard, in jâmâbât al-hard, jummat al-hard, "a cloak of striped material (hard) is a cuirass against cold" (hard); mufrî and mufrî in al-jâmâbât imam mufrî wa mufrî, "the ignorant man either goes beyond the limits (mufrî) or remains far below them" (mufrî) (one may note that in this example no notice is taken of the tashdîh); al-khâb at-sharîk al-tâkhûl; "innovation in the sense (sharîk) of polytheism" (tâkhûl).

2. If the two words do not agree in the number of consonants so that one has one or more consonants more than the other, it is called "imperfect" (nâfrî):

   a. Either the extra consonant is at the beginning of the word: e.g. ma ‘tâqaddîr ‘l-âda bi l-âda’ il-il rebbika yamu’l-âda al-masîkî, "when one leg (al-âda) shall be twisted over the other (‘l-âda)" (on account of the terror which will seize man on the approach of the last judgment), it is to thy Lord that the driving (al-masîkî) of men shall take place on that day" (Sûra lxxv. 39); or it may be

   b. in the centre as in Ju’dâl al-tâkhûl, "my fortune (Ju’dâl) depends on my efforts" (Ju’dâl); or

   c. or it may be at the end as in the verse of Abû Tammâm (Divân, p. 47): yamu’dinuk min wâni wâni wâni wâni, taqâla bi-nayfûn banâfûn banâfûn; they stretch out their hands, strong as rods (wâni) and protecting (wâni); they attack with their swords which deal death (wâni) and which are cutting (wâni) (they stretch out
hands which strike their enemies, defend their followers, attack their adversaries with swords which deal death and which cut)\(^1\). Sometimes this last variety is called *mu'arruf, rhymed*;

\(^1\) or the addition is more than one consonant as in this verse of al-Khaṣṣāṣ (\textit{Dīwān}, ed. Beysouth, 1896, p. 25): \textit{insert the words 'l-ṭafsīr al-kamīn min al-ṭafsīr bihān l-ṭafsīr}, "ears are the cure of the fire (al-ṭafsīr) which is in my loins" (al-ṭafsīr). This variety is sometimes called *muṣābīlā* (prolonged).

3. If the two words do not agree in the nature of the consonants, it is necessary that they do not differ in more than one consonant:

A. If the two different consonants are of pronunciations adjacent to one another, the dīnāt is called *muṣāfāt* (similar) and comprises three varieties:

a. The different consonant is at the beginning of the words: e.g. \textit{boint was-bintīn kumī laḥbūn dāniūn wa parḥūn ānānī}, "between the place where I am and my dwelling there is a dark night (dāniūn) and an obliterated path (ānānī)" (Harriri, ed. de Sacy, \textit{Sānūr}, xvi, p. 185).

b. It is in the middle: e.g. \textit{wa-kum wa-kumum anẖu wa-yanẖumum anẖu}, "they forbid it to them and (themselves) avoid it" (Sūra vi. 26).

c. It is at the end: e.g. \textit{al-khalīt ma-kaddūn fi ma-nawqištā l-khairūr}, "good fortune (l-khairūr) is associated with the forelocks of horses (l-khalīt)" (a dīnāt quoted by Bakhārī, Muslim, Tirmādī, Nāṣī', Ibn Mādi̇j).

B. If the two consonants have no analogy in pronunciation, it is called *ihāb* (approximate) and is of three kinds:

a. The different consonant is at the beginning of the words: e.g. \textit{ma-nabūb l-kulliHummatumHummatum}, "curses on each detractor and defamer" (Sūra iv. 1).

b. It is in the middle: e.g. \textit{lattān 'an thawmīn balāghu madāḥā - gha'ma annī 'ma'ru'ka kafān kafātīn}, "it is not by good fortune that I have attained my end, but that I am a man: what is sufficient for me to live (kafātīn) is sufficient for me (kafān)

\cite{Buḥūrī, \textit{Dīwān}, Cairo 1329 (1911), ii. 108}.

c. It is at the end: e.g. \textit{wa-lātha dīẖāh ummān min al-amīn wīlī l-khānū, when news (umma) inspiring confidence (āmm) or fear arrives for them} (Sūra iv. 85).

c. The two words do not agree in the order of the consonants, it is called *tafādāl al-kāf* ("palindrome" or "inversion"), e.g. \textit{khuṣūnumu fuṭūmu bi-nawīqītī nafta na]'īīnahtī, "his sword is victory (na]'īīnahtī) for his friends and death (nafta) to his enemies".

a. It is called "complete inversion" (kāf l-kāf) when the order of all the consonants is inverted: e.g. \textit{al-khuṣu'umum na]'īīnahtī na]'īīnahtī}, "God, conceal one faults (na]'īīnahtī) and assure one fears (nafta)!

d. It is called "partial inversion" (kāf l-kāf) when inversion only takes places with respect to some of the consonants. And in this case, if one of the two words in this variety is at the beginning of a line and the second at the end of a line, it is called "winged inversion" (manāfiḥ al-khuṣu'umum) e.g. \textit{lā<h} awūlūn l-khānū bi-nawīqītī ni kāfālākī fī kullī kāfālī, "the lights of the good path shines (lā<h) from his hand in every circumstance (kāfālī)".

III. When one of the two similar words follows the other, it is called, *misawafid, wummaddūn*.
TADJWĪD (Arabic) is the art of reciting the Qur'an, giving each consonant its full value, as much as it requires to be well pronounced without difficulty or exaggeration: strength, weakness, tonality, softness, emphasis, simplicity (farāk). There are three kinds of tadhād: 1. tamād, slow recitation; 2. ṭāhid, rapid recitation; 3. tadhād, medium recitation. — Tadżwīd, "the adornment of recitation", has for its object to prevent the tongue making any mistake in the recitation of the divine words. Besides the study of the articulation of consonants it deals with the knowledge of the laws which regulate the pause, the ṣalmāla or inclination of the vowel ū to the sound ū and contraction. The consonants fall into two groups:

1. Musta'luya "elevated" so called because in pronouncing them, the tongue is raised in the palate. These are  

They are all emphatic and more so than the others.

2. Musta'la "depressed", so called because the tongue is below the palate when they are pronounced. They are called simple; i.e. they are not emphatic, except wād and ūdām in the following cases: wād is emphatic when it is vocalised with a damma or a fathā. The wād is not emphatic if it is vocalised with an original or accidental kārā, if it is quiescent and preceded by an original kārā, and lastly if the wād and the kārā belong to the same word, provided the rā' is not followed by an elevated consonant. Ūdām is only emphatic in ʿall and ʿalim when they are the only preceded by a consonant modified by a fathā or a damma:  

At the end of a word the ūdām and tawwād retain their natural pronunciation when they are followed by one of the six guttural letters  

The quiescent ūdām and tawwād are assimilated to the letter which precedes them if the latter is  

The assimilation takes place with nasalisation except for the ū. When the word that they affect ends in another consonant the ūdām and tawwād have not their natural pronunciation; they are assimilated but not completely. It is the same with the quiescent ūdām which is contracted with the ūdām which follows it. It is modified when it is followed by a vocalised ūdām. In other cases it retains its ordinary pronunciation.

There are two kinds of contractions:

1. Great, when the consonants are both vocalised like  (Sūra lxiv. 43) to be pronounced  

2. Little, when the first of the consonants is quiescent and the second vocalised. It should also not be forgotten that the ūdām of the article is only assimilated if the consonant following is solar; the sound should be prolonged when the word contains an alif, a waw or a ūdām preceded by a vowel of the same nature. If the ūdām or ūdām are preceded by a fathā they become softened letters. The ūdām may be retained or suppressed; in the latter case, its vowel is carried back to the preceding quiescent consonant. If the ūdām is quiescent, not by apocope, it may be changed into a letter of prolongation of the same nature as its support. The pronunciation of ūdām is incompletely softened when it is not preceded by a vocalised and non-quiescent ūdām; the vowel of the second ūdām then resembles a sukūn, a ūdām when ūdām is preceded by a damma  .

The second ūdām "falls" when the two ūdāms are affected by the same vowel and belong to two words  which follow them.

The verses of the Qur'an, although separated by a sign, are not to be recited with a stop at the end of each of them. The pause is only to be made if the sense of the verse or verses is complete and forms a homogeneous whole. As a rule in good copies of the Qur'an, the places where the pause is not allowed are indicated by an  (no pause). If a pause is made after words like  a quiescent ūdām should be added (called silent ūdām). Some readers restore the suppressed final ūdām in the middle of the discourse like , etc.; other drop the sukūn and its vowel and say , etc. When a word ends in a ūdām preceded by a ūdām or a ūdām, the ūdām is assimilated to the letter which precedes one says for , especially after ūdām. The ūdām of the accusative is changed to alif. The final ūdām of feminine singular nouns is changed to quiescent ūdām. A vocalised final consonant loses its vowel; this vowel is sometimes only weakened (by ra[im]) or rather it is pronounced like a final French e (ihmāna). However this last method of pronunciation is not allowed in words ending in kārā; some even say that ra[im] and ihmāma only affect damma.


(Moh. Ben Cheneb)

TADLĀ (or TADILĀ), the Todle of Leo Africanus, a district of Morocco comprising the plateaus which stretch to the west of the high valley of
the Wādī Umm al-Rabī', as well as the western slopes of the Central Atlas, from Wādī 'I-Abū to the sources of the Molaya. The classical ethnic Tādilī is no longer used except for the Sharfī of the district; the popular ethnic is Tādilī.

The region of the plateau is occupied by six semi-nomad tribes of Arab origin: Urdīgha, Bni Khrān, Bni Zemmūr, Smā'la, Bni 'Amer, Bni Mūsă, whose centres are Wādī Zem, Bajād (Bnī Biljādrīd) for the classical Abu 'I-Dajād) and Bni Zadīlī.

In the central region of the high valley of the Umm al-Rabī' (the old Wādī Wānsataf) is settled the group known as Bnī Rabī', made up of tribes almost entirely sedentary and of mixed Arab and Berber origin. These are the Gījāya, the Semget, the Bni Ma'dīs and Bni Mellās. The two principal centres are Kašba Tādīlī and the ḫaṣba of the Bni Mellās.

The western slopes of the Central Atlas we have from north to south the following Berber tribes: Ait Sir, Ait Ṣāfī, Ait Bnī-Zid, Ait ʿAṣīyā and Ait ʿAntāb.

The Berber peoples of the mountains belong to the Zenāga group (Ẓanḥādā). In the plains there were at first Zanāta, Berbers who led a nomadic life between Meknās and the Umm al-Rabī' and the Lawāya (Zanāra). The earliest Arab tribes here were the Luḥṣām (B. Diẓār, Zīrār), then the Khulī. It was the Zenāga who introduced tribes of the Maṣwarī group.

At a remote period, Tādīlī seems to have been inhabited by people more or less professing Christianity or Judaism. When Idrīs II conquered it in 722 (789), he found — according to the author of the Rawṣafat al-Kūfīfī — very few Muslims, in fact many Christians and Jews. Leo Africanus who was in Tādīlī at the beginning of the xviith century mentions the large Jewish colonies there; at Tafra, the capital of the country in his time, there were about 200 houses of Jews, all merchants and rich artisans. At the present day there are still many Jews at Bajād and in the ḫaṣba of the Bnī Mellās. This last place corresponds to old Madīnat Uḏdā, an Arabic-Berber name which seems to mean "town of the Jews". Tādīlī was one of the provinces which the sons of Idrīs II divided among themselves. According to the author of the Rawṣafat al-Kūfīfī, it went to Aḥmād, but al-Bakrī says that Dāī, the capital of the region, belonged to Yaḥyā.

In time Tādīlī became incorporated in the empire of the Bnī Yafaran of Shāhla (q.v.) (xv-xx centuries). In 449 (1057-1058) the Almoravids having taken Aghmār, the Maghrāwīd Lajjūb b. Yūsuf, who reigned there, managed to escape and took refuge with the Bnī Yafaran of Tādīlī; 'Abd Allāh b. Ṣāfa, leader of the Almoravids, followed him there and conquered the province. A local legend says that the town of Dāī was destroyed by the Almoravid Sultan Yusuf b. Tāhbīn, who built Tāhbīt to replace it, the ruins of which can still be seen in the immediate vicinity. This incident, which does not seem to be recorded in history, may perhaps be located in the period of Yūsuf b. Tāhbīn’s war on the fortresses of Fāṣa, a region adjoining Tādīlī on the north.

In 526 (1131-1132) the Almohad Sultan ‘Abd al-Mu’min seized Tādīlī and henceforth the province lying halfway between Fāṣa and Marrākēs on the direct road between them, became the battleground of the rival dynasties. Its history is that of these struggles and of the constant rivalries of the Arab or Berber tribes who live in it.

In 690 (1261-1262), the Marinid chief Yaḥyā b. ‘Abd al-Ḥāḳ having come to attack Marrākēs, the Almohad Sultan al-Murtādā sent his cousin Abū Dabbūs against him. The Marinid troops drawn up on the Umm al-Rabī’ were defeated at the place called Umm al-Rajdīlīn, which perhaps corresponds to the ford now called Umm al-Rajdīlī.

In 666 (1267-1268), the Marinid Sultan Yaḥyā invaded and laid waste Tādīlī; having raided the Khulī, an Arab tribe of Luḥṣām stock, allies of the Almohads, the latter came to their assistance but were defeated as they were deserted in the course of the battle by their Arab allies, the Bani Ḥāfar. In 761 (1359-1360), the Sultan al-Husayn b. ʿUmar, governor of Marrākēs for the Marinid Sultan Sālim Ibnrāfīm, rebelled against his master and sought refuge in Tādīlī, where he was welcomed by the Bani Ḥāfar; but, when hard pressed by the Marinid troops, he had to flee to the Zenāga of the mountains finally handed him over to his pursuers.

On the coming of the Saʿdīans, it was once more in Tādīlī at the ford of Abū ‘Aḥkām on the Wādī ‘I-Abū, that was sought the decisive battle in which the Marinids were routed in Ṣafar 943 (July 1536). In the reign of al-Manṣūr, in the xviith century, Tādīlī was governed by Zalān, son of this Sultan. In the middle of the same century, Tādīlī threw off the authority of the Saʿdīans and became part of the principality of Zenāga. Berbers of the Moukātā of Dīlā and, one of them, Muhammad b. al-Haḍāfi, defeated the Saʿdīan Sultan Muhammad al-Shāhī at the ford of Abū ‘Aḥkām in 1050 (1600-1601). The former regency of the Dīlā was exercised over this region until the ʿAlawi Sultan al-Kashīd destroyed their sīwiq in 1079 (1668-1669). In 1084 (1673-1674), the ʿAlawi Sultan Ismāʿīl defeated at Abū ‘Aḥkām his nephew Aḥmād b. Muḥrīz, who had rebelled against him.

In 1088 (1677-1678), Mawlay Ismāʿīl had to put down a serious rising of the Zanāga of Tādīlī, who had rebelled at the instigation of a Dīlā, ‘Aḥmād b. ‘Abd Allāh. In 1099 (1687-1688), he had to make another expedition, which resulted in the building of the sīwiq of Atadākhān (near Khenfīra), Tādīlī and Dīlā. At the division of the provinces of Morocco in 1111 (1699-1700), Tādīlī fell to the son of Mawlay Ismāʿīl, Mawlay Aḥmad who, living in the ḫaṣba built by his father and called Kašba Tādīlī on the Umm al-Rabī'.

In 1142 (1729-1730), Sultan Mawlay ‘Abd Allāh had to take the field once again in the Tādīlī against the ʿAṭr Yemmūrī who were routed. In 1179 (1765-1766), Sultan S. Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allāh was forced to deport them for a time to the Diẓār of the Bnī Zem nowadays Retāṣ. They were replaced provisionally by the Gījāya, the Semget and the Mehjīrī who later sent back to the ʿAṭr. In 1199 (1784-1785), the same ruler had to destroy the sīwiq of Bajād and imprisoned its head, Muhammad al-Arāb b. al-Shāhī. In 1222 (1807-1808), Sultan Mawlay Sulaimān sent a punitive expedition against the Bnī Zem, the ʿAṭr Asīfī, the Rīṭās and the Bnī Aḥyā. In 1224 (1809-1810), there was a
new expedition against the Berbers of Taddé (Aït Sdr) and one against the Urdigha Arabs. It was Mawlay Salâma who built the mosque of Bajad and the bridge over the Umm el-Kabîr.

In 1269 (1852-1853), Sulîm Âbd-al-Rahmân b. Hîgâm punished the Bîb Mûsa who had slain their governor Aymad b. Zadâm. In 1280 (1872-1873), Sulîm Mûsamâd b. Âbd-al-Rahmân sent an expedition against the Arab tribes of Taddé and Bîb Mûsa, who had rebelled against their governor (Sanka, Bîb Zemmûr, Bîb ‘Ummâr).

In 1295 (1878-1879), Sulîm Mawlay al-Hassan to pacify the region had to raid the Bîb ‘Ummâr and Bîb Mûsa. Next year he returned to punish the Aït ‘Attab. It was at Taddé, on the Umm el-Kabîr, that he died in 1311 (June 1894).

The great religious centre of the district is the âjwa of Bajad founded in the 17th century among the Bîb Zemmûr by Muhammad al-Sharkî. His descendants form the important Marinid group of the Sharâkîa [q. v.].


**Tadmur** [See Palmyra.]

**Tafdîl** is the *vurnished artium* of the second formation of *jafala*, it *exceeded*; or *was*, or *became redundant*, or *superfluous*. In grammar it is applied to the comparison of adjectives. *In al-tafdîl*, the "noun of the attribution of excess, or excellence," is the noun adjective in the comparative and superlativc, or, as it is now usually called, the elative degree. This is also called *al if al-tafdîl* because it is regularly of the measure *al if al.*

**Bibliography:** The standard Arabic lexic; Wright-de Goeje, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*, Cambridge 1866-1868, i. 140-141; de Sarvay, *Grammaire arabe*, Paris 1851. (T. W. HATO)

**Al-Taff,** the desert region that lies west of Kûfâ along the whole plain of the Euphrates. It is higher than the low-lying ground by the river and forms the transition to the central Arabic plateau. According to the authorities quoted by Yâkût (iii. 359), al-taff means an area raised above the surrounding country; the name is not found after the sixteenth century. The district contains a number of springs, the waters of which run southwest (cf. Ibn al-Fâkîth, p. 187). The best known of these wells was al-Udghar. From its geographical position al-Taff was the scene of the first encounter between the Arabs and Persians (Tabbari i. 2240, 2247; Ibn al-Ahdrî, iii. 345-351). The Sâharî tribes had stationed there feudal guardians of the frontier which was defended by forts (*maqâla*) and a great ditch (*manadik*) which began at Hît (Ibn Rosta, p. 107). On al-Taff lay al-Kâdisiyâ [q. v.] and also Karbala famous as the scene of the death of al-Hussain (Yâkût, loc. cit. and Bakrî, *Muqâmî*, ii. 456). The latter is also referred to as al-Mukhtâr, *al-taff* (cf. al-Mukhtârî, Ibn al-Ahdrî, iv. 149; or also the poem quoted by Yâkût, loc. cit. and Ibn al-Ahdrî, iv. 267). In later centuries al-Taff is rarely mentioned (e.g. Ibn al-Ahdrî, vii. 379 in connection with the Karismatic troubles); and the majority of the Arab geographers make no mention of it. (J. H. KRAMER)

**Tafilalt,** ethnic Fitlîlî, the name of a district in S.E. Morocco, formed by the broadening of the valley of the Wâdi Zin. It consists of an alluvial plain 12 miles long and 10 broad, over which are scattered 200 *jâfâr* (or fortified dwellings of clay) surrounded by gardens and cultivated fields. Where irrigation from wells is possible, the soil is wonderfully fertile. The chief product of Tafilalt is the palm-tree and the most developed industry is the preparation of goat-skins by the use of the bark of the mimosa which yields a tanning gall. Fitlîl leather is famous and sought after throughout all north Africa. The population is dense, in the *jâfâr* of Tafilalt it was estimated in 1920 at 150,000. The historical capital of Tafilalt was al-Shîjimâs (q.v. for the political history of Tafilalt). Here we may simply state that the district was the cradle of the dynasty of the 'Alîd Sharifs of Morocco, also called Fitlîlî Sharifs and still the ruling family. Many of these Sharifs after the accession of their family to the throne remained in or returned to settle in Tafilalt where they may be counted by thousands. A khâtila of the Moroccan Sultan represents the authority of the *malik* among them and in the valley of the Zin. In addition to Shîjimâs of which only the ruins remain we may mention as small towns in Tafilalt the *jâfâr* of Rûb’îm, the business centre of the district, and that of Tîghmar with defences built at the end of the sixteenth century by order of Sulîm Mawlay al-Hassan.

**Bibliography:** cf. the article *Shîjimâsa.*

A general description with a map will be found in F. Ricard, *Les Guides Bleus*, Maroc, Paris 1919, p. 255-258. (E. LÉVY-PROVENÇAL)

**Tafsîr** (âz), pl. tafsîrîr, explanation, commentary, verbal form: *jussâra* to explain. The name is applied to commentaries on scientific and philosophical works and is an alternative to *sharîh*; it is regularly applied to the Greek and Arabic commentaries on Aristotle: the following are examples taken from Ibn al-Kîthî’s *History of Scholars*: Banas al-Rûmî wrote a *tafsîr* on the *Almagest* and another on the tenth book of Euclid; Abu ‘l-Wâfî al-Bûrûjî, the famous astronomer, wrote a *tafsîr* on the works of Diophantus and of Khâwrîmî on Algebra; Muhammad b. Zakariyyâ al-Rûzî, the famous physician, wrote a commentary on the *tafsîr al-tafsîr* of Pintarch on the *Timaeus* of Plato. The Christian scholar Hunain b. Ikhâlî excelled in translations and *tafsîr.* The majority of the famous works of Greek science and some of Arabic science have had commentaries made on them, translated into or written in Arabic.

In Idrîs the word *tafsîr* means particularly the commentaries on the *Qur’an* and the science of interpreting the sacred book. This branch of learning entitled “Knowledge of *Qur’an* and of the commentary” is a special and important branch of Hadîth; it is taught in the madrasas and the universities. There are in Tafsîr a few general works on the *Qur’an* not written in the regular style; but the majority are continuous commentaries, in which the text of the sacred book is explained in regular order, phrase by phrase and sometimes even word by word. These commentaries are numerous: the most famous are those of Tabarî, Zamakhshari and Beidîwî.

Tabbarî (d. 310) is the great historian; his com-
mentary, a very extensive work, contains a large number of traditions handed down by authoritative transmitters (jinâdi). Zamakhshâri (d. 538) is a very keen brain, a moralist of delicate sensibility and a philologist of consummate skill. His commentary (al-Kashshâf) is much valued and has in turn been commented upon by important theologians like Taftâzânî (d. 792) and Saiyid Shâfir Dînjânî (d. 816). The commentary of al-Bâdîwâlî (d. 685) is the most popular and is the one taught in the schools: it has fixed the beliefs of the pious Muslim as regards the interpretation of the sacred book and has been several times annotated. Among the other commentaries we may mention that of Fakhr al-Dîn al-Râzî (d. 666) which is called the great Taftîr and that of Ismâ'îl b. Šâhîj b. Braun, an author much esteemed by the Turks (d. 1127). It is worth noting that the majority of these learned men belong to the Persian region.

The science of Taftîr is old and seems to date from the beginnings of Islam, Ibn 'Abbas for example (d. 68 A.H.) is said to have been an authority on the subject and a Taftîr is attributed to him (Hamûdiyya Library in Stamhul). Recent criticism (Goldzaher, Lammens etc.) has raised the question of the real value of the traditions contained in these enormous compilations. The answer so far has not been very favourable; the majority of the traditions seem to have been invented, either to settle a point of law or with some theological object or with a simple desire to explain or even merely as an amusement. There is, these critics say, no hope of finding much exact information in these commentaries about the circumstances under which the Kur'ân was composed and made public; they are nevertheless important for the minute study of Muslim law and theology as well as for the legends and philology. In our own day a learned Egyptian Shi'ît Taftâzâni has sought to rejuvenate the study of Taftîr; he is publishing a commentary into which he introduces many ideas borrowed from philosophy and modern science [cf. also Ta'wil].


Tafta (p. "twisted"), a kind of silk, tafta. Clavijo, ambassador of Henry III of Castile, found in the markets of Tabriz, of Sulhânum and of Samarkand, taftes were woven in the country itself. This material spread more and more in the East towards the end of the Middle Ages.

Bibliography: M. Devic, Dict. des mots français d'origine orientale, p. 214; Clavijo, Narrative, p. 109, 114, 190; W. Heyd, Hist. du commerce du Levant, French ed. by Raynand, Leipzig 1886, Index. (CL. Huarte)

Al-Taftâzânî (Sa'd al-Dîn Ma'dûb b. 'Umar), a celebrated authority on rhetoric, logic, metaphysics, theology, law and other subjects and the author of several text-books used to this day in the madrasas of the East, was born in Safr. 722 (Feb.–March 1322) at Taftâzân, a large village near Nast in Khurâsân. He is said to have been a pupil of 'Abîl ad-Dîn al-Mîdîjî (see above, p. 447 and Brockelmann, G. A. L., ii. 308) and of Ku'b al-Dîn [al-Râzî al-Taftâzânî presumably], see Brockelmann, ib. 209]. Lists of his chief works, giving, with variations, the dates and places of composition, are extant (Muhammadî Fâshî under the year 787; Rawûtat al-Dînjânî, p. 309 [considerable variations in the dates]; al-Fâshî al-Idhâhiyya, p. 137; Ahlwardt, Berlin Catalogue, No. 195]), and provide some information concerning his migrations. His earliest work, the Shâhî al-Taftîr al-İstâ'ât, was written by him at the age of sixteen, it is said, in Shâbân 738 (1338) at Fârûyân. The Mu'jamwa'al, the Mughîsîyar al-Ma'dînî and the Taftâhî were completed in 748, 756 and 758 at Harîl, Guhdjûwân and Guhsîân. According to Ibn 'Arâbîsh al-Taftâzânî, like Ku'b al-Dîn al-Râzî, was one of the scholars attracted to the court of the Monguls of Western Kpeâk, and the Mughîsîyar al-Ma'dînî, completed at Guhdjûwân in 756, is in fact dedicated to Muhammûd Dînjânî Bâg. Khâdîjdâmîr's statement that he settled at Khâdîjdâmîr is borne out by the fact that works completed by him in 768, 770 and 787 are said to have been written there. Khâdîjdâmîr tells us that in 779 (1377–1378) he was present at [see above, i. 166 and Brockelmann, G. A. L., ii. 210] to the Muqâṣṣid ruler of Fârs, Shâh Shâhir. The same author states that when Timur invaded Khâdîjdâmîr [in 780–781 (1379) presumably] Malik Muhammûd Sarajîsh, son of Malik Mu'âd al-Dîn Huseîn Kûrt, asked his nephew, Pir Muhammûd b. Ghiyâsh al-Dîn Pir 'Ali, who was then in the suite of Timur, to obtain Timur's consent and send al-Taftâzânî to Sarakhs. Timur agreed, but subsequently on learning how eminent a scholar al-Taftâzânî was, he sent to Sarakhs a request that he should come to Samarqand. Al-Taftâzânî at first declined on the plea that he was about to visit the Hûdâs, but on receiving a second summons he transferred himself to Samarqand, where Timur treated him with great honour. The conquest of Shâhir by Timur in 789 (1387) was followed by the arrival in Samarqand of his old acquaintance al-Sâyîd al-Shâhir al-Dînjânî. The rivalry between them led to controversies and to an estrangement, which is reflected in the criticisms of al-Taftâzânî's views to be found in some of al-Dînjânî's works. Al-Taftâzânî died at Samarqand in 791 (1389) (Buqhayât al-Wâlî) or on the 22nd of al-Muharram 792 (Jan. 10, 1390) (al-Faw'ûdî al-habîyya, p. 135) or on the 22nd of al-Muharram 793 (Dec. 30, 1390) (according to a chronogram ascribed to al-Dînjânî, see the Khedivial Library Catalogue, ii. 242), or in 797 (1394–1395) (Hâshîh al-Sîyar). The date 787 given by Fâshî is inconsistent with the alleged dates of some of his works and with the statement that he and al-Dînjânî forgered after the capture of Shâhir in 789. He was buried at Sarakhs.

Al-Taftâzânî seems to have had no pupils of great distinction. The two mentioned in the Rawûtat al-Dînjânî are Husân al-Dîn al-Hasan b. 'Alî al-Abrwîd, the author of a work entitled Râbî'l-Dînjânî fi 'l-Masâ'în wa-l-'Bayân, and Burhân al-Dîn Haidar (see Taşkîpîrîzade, al-Shâhiq al-Nâmîusâ'î, transl. Rescher, p. 33 and 'Ilî, xi. 61).

Al-Taftâzânî's merits impressed Ibn Kâlidân, who came across some of his works in Egypt and mentions him in his Muhûddim (transl. de Slane, iii. 120). He wrote both on Shâ'î and on Hanâfi law and has been described as a Shâ'î by some authors (e.g. al-Kûfîwî and Hasan Cebî).
and as a Jaina by others (e.g. Husein Nadim and 'Ali b. Sulaym Muhammad al-Kati').

Among his works are the following (the dates assigned to these works in the Kitab ad-Durr al-Durrani, which in many cases differ considerably from those given elsewhere, are not always mentioned. For fuller information concerning the manuscripts, supercommentaries etc., Brockelmann, G. A. L., should be consulted):

I. Grammar

1. Sharh al-Tafsir al-Fatih (in India often called the Se'ediya), a commentary on the Arabic exegesis of al-Zanjandi ('Iza al-Din 'Abd al-Wahhab b. Ibrahim, see Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 285) completed at Faryād in Shaban 738 (1338) when the author was sixteen years of age. MSS. at Berlin (Ahlwardt, No. 6617–6618), Turin (Naldino, No. 39) and elsewhere. Editions: Constantinople 1255, Thirān 1270, 1884 (in a manuscript), Delhi 1289, 1295 (with the Miftah al-Siddiya of Ahmad b. Sahib Gul), 1886 (with the Miftah al-Siddiya), Bombey 1292, Lucknow 1306, Cairo 1307. Of the supercommentaries, in addition to the Miftah al-Siddiya mentioned above, that of Dede Khaliťa has been printed (Bulāk 1255).

2. al-Ikhtiyār, or [al-L]Irshād al-Kuti, as Hādīyat Khaliťa calls it, an Arabic syntax written for his son and completed at Khwarizm in 724 or 728 or 727. A manuscript exists at Vienna (Filgel, No. 206). Several commentaries are mentioned by Hādīyat Khaliťa, including those of Muhammad b. 'Abb al-Djurjūnī (a son of al-Sayyid al-Shariqī) and Shams al-Din Muhammad b. Muhammad al-Bukhari, which are preserved at Munich (Ahlwardt, No. 6754–6755) and the Escorial (Derenbourg, No. 181) respectively.

II. Rhetoric

Al-Tafsīzandī's three works on rhetoric are all connected directly or indirectly with the classical exposition of the subject contained in the third part (al-zim) of the Miftah al-Ulum of al-Sakkāki (see below under al-Sakkāki and Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 294). Two of them are interwoven commentaries on the abridgment, Tahtīf al-Miftah, written by al-Kazwīnī (Muhammad b. 'Abb al-Rāyjanī called the Khāṭtī Dimashq; see Brockelmann, ii. 22).

1. al-Mu'assalāt, as it is usually called, orSharh al-Mu'assalāt, or Sharh al-Takhir al-Mu'tamid, completed in Safar 748 (1347) at Aṣīrāt. Editions: Constantinople 1250, 1289 (with al-Djurjūnī's glosses), Lucknow 1255 (first part only), 1289 (first part only), 1288, 1306, 1309 (with 'Abb al-Rāyjanī's al-'Uqāfī, a commentary on the verses passed on), Thirān [?]. 1270, Delhi 1326 (with al-Mu'assalāt, a commentary by Muhammad b. 'Abb al-Rāyjanī). A Persian edition of 1274 (with commentaries by al-Fanārī, al-Djurjūnī, al-Samarqandī, and Muhammad Rījā Gulpiyagānī) is mentioned in the catalogue of the Khevdīl Library, iv. 153.

The glosses of al-Djurjūnī have moreover been published at Lucknow in 1312 and those of 'Abb al-Hakim Siyāsī at Constantinople in 1266.

2. Mukhtār al-Ma'ānī, as it is now commonly called, or Mukhtār Sharh Tahtīf al-Miftah, or 'Abb al-Sharh al-Takhir, or Sharh al-Mukhtār, or simply al-Mukhtār (the author having given it no formal title), a shorter interwoven commentary, completed in 756 (1355–1356) at Ghuzīdawān and dedicated to Mahmūd Dijān Bēg. Like the Miftah al-Ulum this work is still studied in Eastern madrasa. Manuscripts are common and there are several supercommentaries. Editions: Calcutta 1813, Lucknow 1261, 1312 (with al-Bunātī's supercommentary), Bulāk 1271 (with al-Dassīlī's supercommentary) (1860?), 1285 (with al-Bunātī's supercommentary), Calcutta 1285–1286 (with al-Khatīb's [al-Khatīb's!] supercommentary), 1296 (with the same supercommentary), Meerut 1285, Constantinople 1301, 1301 (with al-Dassīlī's supercommentary), Lahore 1306–1307, Delhi 1286, 1324.

Extracts from this work have been published by Mehren in Die Rheotorik der Araber (Copenhagen and Vienna 1853).

3. Al-Tafsīzandī's third rhetorical work, Sharh al-Qīm al-Khuli'ī min al-Miftah, is a commentary on the third part of the Miftah al-Ulum itself. It is one of his latest works, having been completed at Samarkand in Shawwāl 787 (1385) or 789 (1387), and it has not enjoyed the same popularity as the Muhkma al-Ma'ānī and the Miftah al-Ulum. Manuscripts are preserved at the Escorial (Derenbourg, No. 26), the India Office (Loth, No. 847–848), Leyden (de Goeje and Houtsma, No. 298), Trinity College, Cambridge (Palmer, No. 18) and elsewhere.

III. Logic

1. Sharh al-Fisalāt al-Samā'iyā, or Sharh al-Samā'iyā (in India this work, like the Sharh al-Tafsīr al-Fatīh, is often called Se'ediya), a commentary on the logical manual of al-Kāthīrī (Nadjīm al-Din 'Abb b. Umar al-Kāthīrī; see Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 466) completed at Dīān in Djamā'ī II 752 (1351) (Mujaddālā) or 757 (1356) (al-Fawā'id al-bukārā) or 762 (1361) (Ahlwardt, No. 1959) or 775 (1370–1371) (Rasūl ad-Durrani). MSS. are preserved at Berlin (Ahlwardt, No. 5266–5268) and elsewhere. Editions: Lucknow 1905 (1326).

2. Tahtīf al-Manafīs wa 'l-Kalām, at it is usually called, or Ghayāt Tahtīf al-Manafīs fi Tahtīf al-Manafīs wa 'l-Kalām, as the author calls it in his preface, a manual of logic and scholastic theology completed in Radjāb 789 (1387). Whereas the second part of this work, described by Hādīyat Khaliťa as an abridgment of the Muqādīd, is evidently copied (and rarely, for some copies seem to be distinctly recorded in the existing catalogues of manuscripts) the first part, on logic, became a favourite text-book and has often been published.

Editions: Calcutta 1243 (with al-Yāsī's commentary), 1328 (with an Urdu translation), 1333 (with the same Urdu translation), [Lucknow?] 1250 (preceded by the Tahtīfīdī). Lucknow 1859 (in a Madīna'i-Ma'ani), 1288 (the introductory portion only with the commentary of al-Durwānī and glosses by Mis Zakhīd and 'Abb al-Hājī Lakhnawī), 1292 (with the same), 1321 (with the same), 1290 (with al-Yāsī's commentary and glosses thereon by 'Abb al-Hājī Lakhnawī), 1292 (with the same commentary and glosses), 1311 (with the same), 1787 (with Mahmūd b. Māhāmūd al-Shabristānī's Persian commentary), 1854 (with the same Persian commentary), 1322 (in a Madīna'i-Ma'ani Madīna'i Mantif), Delhi 1264, 1276, 1283–1284, 1869], 1286 (all these Delhi editions with
al-Yaṣaḍi’s commentary), Cawnpore 1278–1279 (in a Mağfof-1-a Muntası), 1291 (with al-Yaṣaḍi’s commentary and glosses entitled Tawfik-i Zāhik Lajdānī by Ḥāfiẓ Bahākh Faddābādī), 1296 (with the same commentary and glosses), 1851 (in a Mağfof-1-a Muntası), 1915 (with al-Shahrastāni’s Persian commentary), Benares (1899), and with an Urdu translation).

IV. Metaphysics and Theology

1. al-Maḥṣūf, a compendium of metaphysics and theology, completed with the author’s own commentary at Samarqand in Dhu ’l-Ka’dā 784 (1338) (in 774 according to the Rawḍāt al-Dīnānāt). A Constantinople edition of 1277 is mentioned in the catalogue of the Kedivial Library (li. 26) and there are manuscripts in the British Museum (Ellis-Edwards, p. 9), the India Office (Loth, No. 461–464) and elsewhere. As has been said above, the second part (kām) of the Taḥbīh al-Mustafī wa l-Kalām is described by Ḥāfizī Khaṭīf as an abridgment of this work.

2. Taḥbīh al-Mustafī wa l-Kalām. See above under Logic.

3. Sharḥ al-Afḍal al-Nasfīya, completed in Shāhābūn 768 (1367) at Khirbat al-Tannur, a commentary on the extremely brief statement of Muhammadan belief written by ʿUmar b. Muhammad al-Nasfī (d. 537 = 1142–1143; see Brockelmann, i. 437). This work also is a favourite text-book and several supercommentaries have been written on it. Editions: Calcutta 1244, Delhi (1870), 1904, Lucknow 1876, 1888, 1890, 1894, Constantinople 1297 (with the supercommentaries of al-Kastali and al-Khayālī and the glosses of Bihlī, al-Khayālī and the latter), Cairo 1297 (with al-Khayālī’s supercommentary and Ḥāfizī Khaṭīf’s glosses thereon), Cawnpore 1905, 1930. Extracts are translated into French in L’Observateur’s Tableau général de l’Empire Ottoman, vol. i. and there is a German translation in J. T. Plant’s Biblische Rituale [sic], oder Elementarbuch der Mohammedanischen Glaubenslehren (İstanbul and Geneva 1790).

Of the supercommentaries that of al-Khayālī has been published at Delhi in 1870 (11) and 1329 (with ʿAbd al-Ḥākim Siyyālī’s glosses), at Lucknow in 1876, 1313 (with ʿAbd al-Ḥākim Siyyālī’s glosses), 1326 (with the same glosses), at Constantinople in 1297 (with al-Kastali and Bihlī) and at Cairo in 1297 (with Ḥāfizī Khaṭīf’s glosses): that of Ḥasan Shahid (Abu l-Ḥasan b. al-Afḍal) at Bihār in 1328, and that of Ṣaʿīd b. Ahmad Efendi at Delhi in 1237.

4. An attack on the heresies of Ibn ‘Arabī’s Futūḥat al-Balīhām preserved in a Berlin manuscript (Ahlwardt, No. 2691), which bears on fol. 1b the doubtful title Futūḥat al-Muṭanabbī.

V. Principles of Jurisprudence

1. al-Taṣkīh illā Kawkab Ḥāfiz al-Taṣkīh completed 29th Dhu ’l-Ka’dā 758 (1357) at Gūzān, a commentary on the Taṣkīh al-Uṣūl of Ṣaḥīḥ al-Sharīʿ’s the Younger (ʿUḥdāb Allāh b. Masʿūd al-Maḥbūbī, d. 747 [1346–1347]; see Brockelmann, ii. 214).

Editions have been published at Delhi in 1267 (1851), 1273 (with Ṣaḥīḥ al-Sharīʿ’s other commentary al-Taṣkīh) 1281 (1864) (with the Taṣkīh), 1287 (with the Taṣkīh) and 1292 (1870) (with the Taṣkīh), and supercommentaries on the Taṣkīh by Ḥasan Ṣalebī, Mullā Ḥusayn al-Tawfīqī, and al-Anṣārī, and at Kāzīm in 1301 (1854) (with the Taṣkīh).


VI. Law

1. al-Muṣafā, on Ṣaḥīḥ ʿAbū Daʿūd. A manuscript is preserved at Berlin (Ahlwardt, No. 4664).

In addition to this work a collection of Ḥanafī Fatwasī is mentioned by his biographers, but no copies seem to be recorded.

2. Taḥṣīl Sharḥ Taḥṣīl al-Dīnī Ṣaḥīḥ al-Ḥācir, an unfinished abridgment of the commentary of Maṣʿūd b. Muhammad al-Ghajdūrī on al-Khāṣṣ’s abridgment of al-Shafiʿī’s treatise on Ḥanafī Faraḥī entitled al-Dīnī Ṣaḥīḥ al-Ḥācir (see Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 172 and H. Kh., lii. 401). According to the Rawḍāt al-Dīnānāt this work was begun at Sarhāb in 785. A manuscript is preserved in the Veṣri Ṣaḥīḥ (No. 436 bi).

At Delhi in 1870 (15) was published an edition of the Muḥākkat al-Uṣūl fī Ḥanafīa, a treatise on the ritual prayers ascribed by some to al-Khāṣṣ’s (see Ḥāfizī Khaṭīf) Khaṭīf, vi. p. 83), with commentaries alleged to be by al-Djurjūnī and al-Taḥfizī, but it is uncertain that the Khaṭīfī existed in al-Taḥfizī’s time.

VII. Kurʿānic Exegesis

1. KāTim al-Aṣrūr wa l-Uṣūl at-ʾArbrār, a Persian commentary on the Ḫurāsān (cf. H. Kh., v. No. 10674). A manuscript appears to be preserved in the Veṣri Ṣaḥīḥ (see the catalogue, p. 8a, No. 43).

2. Sharḥ (or Ḥāfiẓf fī) al-Kifāḥ, a Commentary on al-Zamakhshari’s treatise on al-Kifāh (see Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 290), said to have been begun at Samarqand in Rabiʿ 1, 789 and left unfinished. These annotations embrace Suras L. x. 58 and xxxvii.–liv. Manuscripts are preserved at Berlin (Ahlwardt, No. 793), the British Museum (Ellis-Edwards, p. 3), the India Office and elsewhere.

VIII. Philology

1. al-Nīmī ash-Sharḥ fī Sharḥ al-Kālim al-nīmī, a commentary on al-Zamakhshari’s collection of sententiae entitled al-Kālim al-nīmī. Selections from this commentary were published by H. A. Schultens in his Anthologia sententiārum arabicarum (Leiden 1772) and it was printed at Cairo in 1287.


Biographies: Ibn ʿArabī’s, Abu al-Maḥfūz, Abū al-Maḥfūz, al-Golmi, i. 422; Fuṣḥī, Muḥāfīz (under the year 787; see E. G. Browne, in Le Musée, series iii., vol. i., p. 57); Ṣaʿīdī, Ḥaqqīya al-Waṣāʾil, p. 23; Sulaymān b. Maḥmūd, Maṭṭīfī al-ʿAnnual, p. 287; al-Kafrawī, fī al-ʿīrāb al-Khāṣṣ fī ʿAlī b. ʿAbī Ṣayyār, iii. 3, 87; Muhammad Bīkṣī Ḥusaynī,
vaded India in 1398, but before he reached Dihili Nusrat Shāh had been driven from the capital, and Mahmūd and Mullī were left to face the conqueror. They were defeated and fled, Mahmūd to Gudjarat and Mullī to Baran, but returned after Timur's departure. Mahmūd retained the royal title, but was for the rest of his life a state prisoner, at first in the hands of Mullī, and, after Mullī's death in 1405, in those of Daulat Khān Lollī, who succeeded Mullī as virtual ruler of the kingdom. Mahmūd died at Kāthī in February, 1413, and with him ended the Taghūk dynasty. Within sixteen months of his death Daulat Khān was overthrown by Khādīr Khān [q.v.]; who on May 28, 1414, entered Dihili and founded the Safiyy dynasty.

Bibliography: Barani, Tarikh-i Firās Shāhī, Calcutta 1862; Shams-i Sirāj 'Affī, Tarikh-i Firās Shāhī, Calcutta 1891; Bādānī, Munṣūkhab al-Tāwārikhī, text, and translation by G. S. A. Rānkīng, Calcutta 1899; Mūsāmān Kāmīn Firāstā, Gaḥ hỏ m-i Ibrāhīmī, Bombay 1832.

Taghūk [See Wādī.]

Tagus, Arabic Wādī Tādīj, Latin Tagus, Spanish Tajo, Portuguese Tâo, the longest river in the Iberian Peninsula, rises in the Serranías de Cuenca at about 6,550 ft. Its length to its estuary at Lisbon is 550 miles (of which 190 are in Portuguese territory). Among the numerous places on its banks one may mention going down stream: Aranjuez, Algodon, Toledo and Talavera de la Reina, in Spain; Abrantes, Santarem and Lisbon, in Portugal. The Arab geographers describe the Tagus as an important river and mention it especially in their descriptions of Toledo and Lisbon. They also mention the famous Roman bridge built of granite in 105 a.d. by order of the Emperor Trajan on the Tagus at Alcantara, the ancient "Kantarat al-Safi" of the Arabs. Cf. above, i., p. 251. See also the articles on LISBON and TOLEDO.

Bibliography: al-Idrīsī, Sīfat al-Andalus, p. 187 of the text and 228 of the transl.; E. Fagnan, Extraits inédits relatifs au Maghreb, Algiers 1924, Index. (E. LEVY-POVONCZAL)

Tahadjdud (A.), infinitive V from the root ṭ-ḥ-d-d which is one of the roots with opposed meanings (ṭāḥdūd), as it signifies "sleep" and also "to be awake," "to keep a vigil," "to perform the night ṣalāt or the nightly recreation of the Qur'ān." The latter two meanings have become the usual ones in Islam. The word occurs only once in the Qur'ān, Sūra xxvii. 81: "And in a part of the night, perform a ṣalāt as a voluntary effort, etc.," and the thing itself is often referred to. We are told of the pious (li. 17) that they sleep little by night and pray to Allah for forgiveness at dawn. In Sūra xxv. 65, there is a reference to those who spend the night prostrating themselves and standing before their Lord.

From the Qur'ān it may be deduced that the old practice in Mecca was to observe two ṣalāts, by day and one by night (Sūra, xvii. 80 a.v.); Sūra, lxxvi. 25: "And mention the name of thy Lord in the morning and in the evening [26] and in the night prostrate thyself before Him and praise Him the livelong night"; Sūra, xi. 10: "And perform the ṣalāt at both ends of the day and in the last part of the night." Tradition is able to tell us — and there is no real reason for scepticism — that
for a shorter or longer period (mention is actually made of a "period of ten years"), Tahari, Tafseer, axis. 65, vigil were so ardently observed that Muhammad and his companions began to suffer from swollen feet. The old practice is said to be based on Sura Ixxlii, 1: *S* thou enfolded one, 2. stand up during the night, except a small portion of it, 3. the half or rather less, 4. or rather more and recite the Kur'an with accuracy; but its origin cannot be dissociated from the example of Christian ascetics. In the end however, this form of asceticism became too much for Muhammad's companions. The revelation of verses 20 ff. of Sura Ixxlii brought an alleviation: *See, thy Lord knoweth that thou standest praying about two thirds, or the half or a third of the night, thou and a part of thy companions. But Allâh measureth the night and the day; he knoweth that ye are not able for this; therefore he turneth mercifully to you with permission to recite as much of the Kur'an as is convenient for you*. By the institution of the five daily salaahs the obligatory character of the tahajjud was then abolished (cf. Abu Dâwûd, Tâhuwun, B. 17 and Baihaqi, Sunan, Sura Ixxlii. 20).

Nevertheless, Muhammad is said not to have abandoned the vigil (Abû Dâwûd, Tâhuwun, B. 18); in Hadiths and Fiqh this is considered blameworthy for those who were wont to perform these salaahs (Muslim, Sunan, trad. 185; Naasî, Kiyâm al-Lail, B. 59; Baihaqi, Haqiqat, i. 165). The performance is in general regarded as useless. David is said to have spent a third of the night in these exercises (Muslim, Sunan, B. 68; Naasî, Kiyâm al-Lail, B. 147): another reason given in justification of it is that the tahajjud loosens one of the knots which Satan ties in the hair of a sleeper (Abû Dâwûd, Tâhuwun, B. 18). The tahajjud is particularly meritorious in Ramdân and in the night before each of the two feasts (Ibn Maджsâ, Sunan, B. 68; Naasî, Kiyâm al-Lail, B. 147): when the term idb'$ al-lail is used (see also Tâhuwun).

Even at the present day the ma'râshûm in some lands summons to a night salaah (consisting of an even number of rakâs and therefore called shaf'; cf. witr) shortly after midnight by an adâwâh to which special formulae are added (Lane, Manners and Customs, chapter iii. "Religion and Laws"; cf. Snouck Hurgronje, Mecca; Juyubill, Handelings, p. 74).


For the views of the different law schools cf. also I. Guff, *Il Muwakjohn* ad Hulil ibn Ishaq, Milan 1919, i. 97; Abu Ikhlaq al-Sharî`ah, al-Tenibî, ed. A. W. T. Juyubill, p. 27; al-Ramî, Nikâyah al-Muhaddid, i. 488 sqq.; Ibn Haflar al-Hattamî, Tafseer, i. 201 sqq.; Abu T.-Kâsim al-Hilli, Kibîth Sharî`ah: al-Islâm, Calcutta 1850, i. 27; A. Querry, Droit Musulman, Paris 1874, i. 52 sq.; Nîqâm, al-Fatwah, i. Alomgirî, Calcutta 1245, i. 157. (A. J. Wensinck)

**Tâhuwun (A.);** grammatically tâhuwun is a mawâdh and means purity; it also has the technical sense of ceremonial, levitical purity and purification. It holds an important place in Islam, for "purity is half the faith", a saying attributed to Muhammad. Theologians divide defilements into material and mental; lawyers divide them into actual (bâhîf) and religious (bâhîf). Fiqh deals with bodily, material impurity only. Sexual intercourse, menstruation, and childbirth are religious impurities. Actual impurities (mâdîq, q. v.) have a perceptible body. They are wine, pigs and dogs and what is begotten of them, dead bodies (except those of men, animals used for food, and creatures that have no blood, i.e. insects), and certain discharges from the body. There are five things that are not unclean: any dirt left after defecation, dust or mud on the roads, the soles of shoes, the blood: squashed out of a full-fed flesh, and the blood or pus from a boil or pimple or from coughing. Tears, sweat, spittle and mucus are clean. The laws of purity are not meant to be burdensome. The usual means of purification is cold water but after defecation stones are also used. Water is pure if running, if from a pool above 100 sq. inches (dhâr' r.), in a river, or from smaller quantities so long as the colour, taste and smell are not changed. Elaborate rules are laid down for the various cases. After micturition or defecation there is a preliminary cleansing with stones or earth (istidâm) and one with water (istindâm). On ablutions and baths, see wudû', abdu. When no water is to be had or, by reason of illness or some other cause, the use of it is feared, sand or dust may be employed [see yawmûm]. The rules of the Shâ'î differ in detail from those of the Sunnîs. After helping to carry a corpse to the grave an ablution is necessary, but not merely approved; and according to them a quantity of water amounting to two quâlî (the meaning is uncertain, but it is generally taken to be a large jar) is clean.

Popular practices do not always agree with canonical rules; it is said that round Aden the defilement of micturition can be removed by helping to carry a bier on its way to the cemetery.

These processes must not be just mechanical; purpose (nia'a) must come first, and they must be accompanied by the thought of God and special prayers, which vary at different times and places. The theologians develop this side of the idea and say that purification consists of four stages: purification of the body from physical dirt; of the members from offences; of the heart from evil desires; of the spirit (siyâr) from all that is not God. Tahâ' is become the common name for circumcision and the ceremonies that accompany it [see KHIYÂN].


**Tâhuwun** (A.); Abu Dâ'ar Ahmad b. Muhammad b. Salâm b. 'Abî al-Makî al-Azîd al-Tâhuwun al-Harazi. His name Tahâ' is derived from the name of a village in Upper Egypt named Tahâ'. He is considered the greatest Hanafi lawyer which Egypt has produced. His ancestors had settled in Upper Egypt and his grandfather Salâm when the news of the rebellion
Tahawi

was in this capacity that he served also under Abū ʿUbayd b. Abī Hassan b. Ḥbar, who was chief judge from 293 to 311. He had the habit of saying to Abū ʿUbayd in cases of differences, that Ibn Abī Ṭimān used to say so and so. The judge finally got tired of it and said that he had known Ibn Abī Ṭimān well, but sparsows become eagles in Taḥawi’s country. This stopped Taḥawi, and made the saying proverbial. In his later years he devoted himself, besides the composition of his numerous works, to the giving of legal decisions (fatwa), but he had always the courtesy, if the questions were brought forward in the presence of the judge, to state that it was the opinion of the judge, unless he was given special licence by the judge to give the decision upon his own Authority. He died according to the historian Ibn Yimnus on the 6th of Dhu ’l-Qu‘adar 321 a. h. (Oct. 21, 933). Ibn Khallīkān says, in the night of Thursday the 11th of the same month, and that he was buried in the garden of the Taḥawi family. The Fihrist wrongly states that he died 322.

Taḥawi was in the first place a lawyer, and is unanimously praised for his skill in the art of drawing up valid contracts, but he also is counted among the traditionists and as such transmitted the Maṣnad of Abī Ṣaḥḥāf, but more than one authority states that ḥadīth was really not his business. However his larger works abound in citations of traditions, but these are always cited with a legal aim in view. His works are many and several have been preserved in manuscript and printed. Those mentioned by his biographers are: 1) Maṣnū’i ʿAlī Ḥabīb, his first work; printed with glosses in Lucknow in a large 4° volume; 2) Ṣaḥḥāf b. Ummām (MS. at Cairo); 3) Abū Ḥabīb b. Ḥabīb in 20 kūraṣ; 4) Muḥātār fi ʿl-Fiḥḥ, a work which gave the author much pleasure and has been the subject of many commentaries the earliest of which is by Abū Ḥabīb b. ʿAll is-Djassān (MS. at Cairo); 5) Sharḥ al-Daḥīb al-Saghrī; 6) al-Ṣaḥīḥ al-Kabīr, which is preserved in an incomplete MS. at Cairo from which Schaech has published a portion (Heidelberg 1926); 7) al-Ṣaḥīḥ al-ʿĀṣim; 8) al-Ṣaḥīḥ al-Saghir; 9) Muḥājir, Ṣaḥīḥ, Wajīb and Qiṣṣa, and these are perhaps several works of the Wajīb are mentioned by some biographers separately: 10) Sharḥ al-Šaḥīḥ al-Kabīr; 11) Nihāya al-Qāṭīfī al-Madīsin against al-Karābī; 12) al-Ṭūlith al-Kabīr, probably a kind of biographical dictionary of lawyers; 13) Manāḥīb Abī Ḥanīfa in one volume; 14) a book on the Purāna mentioned by the Kādī Iyād in his work al-Ibnī; it contained about a thousand leaves and is perhaps identical with the Muḥājir al-Ṣaḥīḥ; 15) al-Nawwāṣīr al-Fihām in over 20 kūraṣ; 16) Hukm Arāfī Mokkā wa-Qim al-ʿĀṣim wa-ʿl-Qaḥīm; 17) al-Radd ala ʿl-Iṣāṣ b. ʿAlīn against the latter’s book called Ḥaqqat al-Kabīr; 18) al-Radd ala ʿAlī ʿUtbā fi-mi ʿābd al-Kabīr; 19) al-Radd ala ʿAlī ʿUtbā fi-mi ʿābd al-Kabīr; 20) Muḥājir al-Ṣaḥīḥ, his last work; it is the final deposit of his studies and has been printed in Haiderabad in four large 4° volumes, 1333 a. h.; this book has been abbreviated by the Mâlik lawyer Ibn Rushd; 21) Khāla fa Qāṣī al-Dīn (also called Ṣaḥīḥ Abī al-Summa wa ʿl-Dīnār or Bayān al-Summa wa ʿl-Dīnār) printed in Kâzim 1893 and in India; it is a short pamphlet of about ten leaves, setting out the Sunni con-

The Encyclopaedia of Islam, IV.
session of faith in clear legal language. This little book has also found a number of commentators (cf. Brockelmann); 22) al-Nawādir wa l-Ḥikmat in 20 Jawādir’s; 23) some biographers attribute to them two books with the title of Muḥājir in al-Kāmil and al-Saghir, but it appears that it is the smaller one which is the one generally commented; 24) in the Diwanādir al-Maṣūfa it is mentioned also a book, the basis of which are the books on dismissal from office (Kutub al-Adli), but I am not clear if I understand this correctly.

In books on Ḥanafi law Ṣahwī is cited continuously and the number of his pupils or such who came to Egypt to gain information from him is very great, and many are enumerated in the biographies, especially in the Diwanādir and the Liṣān al-Masūm; among them are mentioned: ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Muhammad al-Tanwīrī, who became later Kādī of Egypt and superior to Ṣahwī; Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Ḡūfūr; Ḥabīb b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, who was considered the head of the Zāhirī in his time; the celebrated Kādī Ibn ʿAbī ʿAwwām; Sulaymān b. Ahmad al-Tabarānī, the author of the Maṣūfā and many others.


TAHER (We also have Tāher) was a Mediterranean town of Algeria, on the eastern border of the present department of Oran. According to Idrīsī there was used to be two large towns of this name: the one, Old Tāher, an old Roman site, perhaps the capital of a native dynasty, vassals or allies of the Byzantines (Gebl), rose from its ruins in the modern period and became the capital of Tāher; the other, New Tāher, lies 6 miles to the NW of Tāher, not far from Tag吕布empt which was one of the strongholds of the amir ʿAbd al-Kādir [q.v.]. It no longer has more than a few almost obliterated traces of its past grandeur.

New Tāher was the capital of the Ābūdī Imāms (or Bilād, q.v.) of the Rustamid family for 147 years. ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Rustam fled from Kairauān after the return of the Arab armies commanded by Ibn al-Āṣīth and sought refuge in this part of the central Maghrib where the Khārijīs were numerous. He founded Tāher in 144 (751). The site was wisely chosen. The climate is severe (al-Bakrī tells us stories of the cold that prevails in Tāher) but the land around could be irrigated and produced excellent fruit. Tāher owed its wealth mainly to its trade. Placed at the foot of the Qāba of Geznī, at the end of the Tell on the northern border of the stepspe in touch with the country of the nomads and settled lands, it was destined to become a great market like modern Tīaret. The nomads flocked to it; the hope of making a fortune as well as attachment to Khārijī doctrines brought many foreigners there, especially Persians. They had fine dwellings and siqās and Tāher was known as "Little Iṣāq". We also know how intense was the religious life of this capital of a democratic kingdom and are told of the intellectual life of the Imāms and their entourage. It is no longer possible to know what the town and its buildings looked like; probably the latter were quite simple. Al-Bakrī speaks of four wide gates and its citadel commanding the marketplace.

Tāher taken in 206 (920) by the Shiʿī propagandist Abī ʿAbd al-Malik was utterly ruined. Henceforth it only plays a very minor role in the history of the Berbers. Tāher inherited part of the economic prosperity of Tāher. This prosperity, which the Algerian centre, like the 15th century town, owes to its situation as the port of the steppes has increased again, since the plateau of Serral, which adjoins it, has become an important centre of colonisation.


GEORGES MARCAND

TAHIR b. AL-HUSAIN, founder of the Taḥrid dynasty [q.v.], in Khorāsān [q.v.], born in 159 (775—776), died in Diqmādī I (Ṭahārī, III. 1065, 92) or Diqmādī II (Ibn Ḥalikān) 207 (822). Tāher belonged to a family of Persian descent and also to the Arab tribe of Khurāsān [q.v.]. His ancestor ʿIṣāq was a client of the governor of Sīstān, Abī Muhammad Taḥā b. Abī Ṣaḥib al-Ḵurāsānī; ʿIṣāq’s son Maṣʿūd took part in the fighting against the Umayyads under Abū Muslim as secretary (bāḥīsī) to the general Sulaymān b. ʿAlī al-Khurāsānī. The town of Bīshānbādī [q.v.], in the district of Herāt [q.v.], was held by Maṣʿūd and afterwards by his son al-Husain (d. 109 = 814—815), Tāhir himself took part in the fighting against the rebel ʿAlī b. Ḍatlī in Samarqand in the last years of the reign of Ḥārūn al-Rashīd (d. 157 = 808—809). In 194 (810), Maʿmūn’s minister Fadl ibn Salih [q.v.] gave him command of the army sent against al-Āmil [q.v.]. In Shaʿbān 195 (May 811) the enemy under ʿAlī b. Iṣā was defeated; Tāhir is said to have used his sword with both hands during the battle and for this to have been given the name Dhu l-Yamīnī (amhīdītrus) by Maʿmūn. After the taking of Baḥdād (198 = 813) Tāhir was appointed governor of al-Disrā (q.v.) with the supreme command over Syria and the west. When Maʿmūn went in 211 (203—204) from Khorāsān to the ʿIrāq, Tāhir was ordered to leave Raḵja and come to meet the Caliph at Nahrawān. In 215 (208)—216 (209). Tāhir was given the governorship of all the lands east of Baḥdād, especially of Khurāsān. There he died suddenly in his capital Merv, shortly after he had omitted the mention of the Caliph in prayer one Friday, and thus committed an act of open rebellion. The details are variously recorded.
TĀHIR b. AL-HUSAIN — BĀBĀ TĀHIR


Although his mother-tongue was Persian (cf. the utterances in Persian ascribed to him in Ibn al-Tāhir, ed. Keller, p. 130 and Tabarsi, ii. 1063 infra), Tāhir is said, like his descendants, to have been well versed in the Arabic language and culture. His letter written in 306 (821–822) to his son Abū Allāh on his appointment as governor of Dīyah Ḳabṭa (q. v.) is well preserved among his contemporaries; cf. Kitāb Buhārī, ed. Keller, p. 36 sqq. (German transl., p. 17 sqq.), Tabarsi, ii. 1046 sqq.; Ibn al-Ḩārīṣī, vi. 285 sqq., Russian transl. by A. Schmidt, *Bulletin de l’Univ. de l’Afrique Centrale*, viii., 1925, p. 129 sqq.


(W. Barthold)

TĀHIR ʿOMAR [See ZAHIR ʿOMAR.]

TĀHIR WAḤĪD, MUSAMMAM, ʿIMĀD-DĀWĪ, a Persian poet of KĀZIM, who was the secretary of the two Prime Ministers Mirzā Taḥā al-Dīn Muhammad and Ḳalīf al-Sulṭān; in 1055 (1645–6) appointed historiographer to Shāh ʿAbāt II, he became minister in 1101 (1680–90) in the reign of Sulṭān; afterwards he retired into private life and died most probably in 1108–90 aged 90. The British Museum has five MSS. of his historical works. The *Aṣḥāb al-Balāt* (Bombay 1277, not paginated) says that his poems were mainly admired because of the rank of the author.


(C. Huart)

BĀBĀ TĀHIR, a mystic and poet who wrote in a Persian dialect. According to Ḳaṭā Kālī Kháūn (sixth century), who does not give his source, Bābā Tāhir lived in the period of Dālam’s rule and died in 401 (1010). Among his quatrains there is an enigmatic one: “I am that (alw) which entered into a vase; in that vase which entered into the letter. In each alw (‘thousand’, i.e. of years?) arises an alw-lād (a man upright in stature like the letter alw). I am the alw-lād who has come in this alw.” Mahdī Kháūn in the *J. A. S. Bengali* has given an extremely curious interpretation of this quatrain: the letters alw-lād have the value 215, the same as the letters of the word dāryā (Persian equivalent of the Arabic bahr ‘sea’) and those of the name of the poet Tāhir. If we add alw-lād (215) to alw (111) we get 326 (the same value by the way as the Persian word hāżā, ‘thousand’, if we spell it ḥā, ḥā, alw, ʿrā). In this way the phrase ‘an alw-lād coming into the alw’ would give the date (326) of the birth of Bābā Tāhir who may well have lived till...

In spite of the ingenuity of this explanation, it is nevertheless true that the only historical evidence that we possess about Bābā Tāhir is that of the *Rāḥīḥ al-Sūṭī‘ī* (c. 601 [1204], G. M. S., p. 98–99), the author of which ‘had heard’ that when the Sāljiḏ b. Ṣulṭān Tughrīl entered Hamdān (in 447 = 1055), Bābā Tāhir addressed an ad-

monition to him (“O Turk, how you going to act towards the Muslims”?) which much impressed the conqueror. The anecdote suggests for the death of Bābā Tāhir a date later than 447 but is in no way contradictory to the statement that Bābā Tāhir flourished under the Dālamīs, i.e. under the Ḳaṭāys and their relatives, the Ḳākūyds, whose rule in Hamdān lasted till the expedition of Ibrahim Vanā in 435. Bābā Tāhir may well have been the contemporary of Arvencus (Aḥū Sīn), who died at Hamdān, in 428 (1037), but the legends which make him a witness of the execution of the mystic ʿAlī al-Ṭuṣī of Hamdān in 533 and the contemporary of Nūṣī al-Dīn Tūsī (d. 674) are pure inventions.

The sources sometimes call Bābā Tāhir Hamdānī (cf. the Arabic MS. 1903 of the Bibl. Nat. Paris, the *Sarrajdān*, etc.), sometimes Lurī (Lūrī). This last form — in place of Lur [q. v.] — is somewhat puzzling: does it mean some other connection than of origin between Bābā Tāhir and Lurīstān? It is certainly well to remember that in the seventh century there were very close links between Hamdānī and Lurīstān and the poet may have spent his life between the two places. In Khurramshāh there is a quarter bearing the name of Bābā Tāhir (cf. Edmonds, *Geogr. ‘Iranien*, June 1922, p. 445). The association of Bābā Tāhir with Lurīstān in the beliefs of the Aḥḥa ʿaţīq [see below] is also significant. In the quatrains of Bābā Tāhir (cf. nos. 101, 200, 274 of the *Dīnawār*), Mount Alwand [q. v.] overshadowing Hamdān is frequently mentioned. The tomb of Bābā Tāhir lies on a little hill to the northwest of the town in the Ban-i bāzār quarter; beside the tomb of Bābā Tāhir are those of his faithful Fāţima [see below] and Mirzā Ali Naḵš Fardari (sixth century); the building is a humble one and of no interest. The tomb is mentioned in the *Nuzhat al-Ḳulūb* (740 = 1340), *Gīhāb. Mem. Ser.*, p. 751; cf. the photograph in Minorsky, *Matières*, Moscow 1911, p. xii, and Williams Jackson, *A visit to the Tomb of Bābā Tāhir at Hamdān*, in *A Volume presented to E. G. Browne*, Cambridge 1922, p. 357–360.

The stories one hears in Mīzāndarān about B. Tāhir’s connection with that province have no foundation and may have been brought by immigrants from Lurīstān (the Lāk). Besides, all the sounds of Persia like to claim B. Tāhir as a compatriot.

The language of Bābā Tāhir. Since all the facts and traditions connect the poet with Hamdānī and Lurīstān, it is reasonable to expect to find in his dialect traces of a dialect of this region of Persia. But as this dialect was very close to Persian and as so many different mouths have been trying to render more comprehensible the verses transmitted orally, there is little hope of reestablishing the value of the text in its dialectic purity. It is not an improbable suggestion that B. Tāhir simply wanted to imitate the dialects of these adepts. In our own day a Kurdish-Christian claims to have made verses in the Gūrān dialect, quite distinct from his own in order to “transmit the message” to the Aḥḥa ʿaţīq (Dr. Sa’d Kháūn, in the *Modern World*, Jan. 1927, p. 40).

The country between Hamdān and Khurramshāh still has many dialects, but that of Bābā Tāhir is not connected with any definite one and seems to borrow from all. The closeness of the present
text of B. Tahir to literary Persian is undeniable; on the other hand changes like nun > nun "name", zan "my hand") > zastun ("my hand") > rafian ("I have gone"), dix > dir (cf. Haert, xiv = Dīvān, No. 82) are typical of the Lur dialects; the stems sādād "to speak," hār "to win" are common to the Kurdish and central dialects; the forms mukhar-rā "he does" and ġ-yā "he comes" recall particularly the Gūrānt spoken much farther to the west. For certain peculiarities (dārīm > dārem) we only find analogies at Kārūn (near Shīrţā). Hadan's detailed analysis has plainly proved this mixture of dialects (Dialektgeschichte) in the quatrains, at least as we know them now. The term "Muhammadan Pahlavi" proposed by Haert (1885) for the language of Bābā Tahir has not been accepted by scholars.

The metre of the quatrains of Bābā Tahir and of his ghazals is almost exclusively kasajy munaddas makāra (— — — —) which has made the new edition of the quatrains du-bētit (disticha) instead of rukāt, the last term being too closely associated with the metre kasajy makāra makāra (— — — —) — — — — — — — —. The authenticity of some regular rukāt attributed to B. Tahir seems doubtful. The metre of B. Tahir is also found in popular songs (Mirzā Dā'far [Korsh], Grammat. Pers. Yekhā, Moscow 1901, p. 308).

Bābā Tahir—poet. Down to 1827, all that was known of his poems was a rather small number found for the most part in anthologies of the xviiith and xixth centuries. Haert's researches produced in 1885, 59 quatrains and in 1908, another 28 and one ghazal. E. Hero Allen only found 3 new quatrains (they are moreover very doubtful). Lessczynski (who used the Berlin manuscripts) has translated 50 quatrains and one ghazal (a different one from Haert's). Finally Hainaki Wāhid Dastgirdī Iṣfahānt, editor of the Persian review Armağān, published in 1306 (1927) at Tīrān a Dīvān of B. Tahir containing 296 du-bētit and 4 ghazals of this poet; as an appendix the editor gives 62 du-bētit found in the "different collections" and the 3 rukāt added by Hero Allen. The quatrains of the Dīvān are arranged in the alphabetical order of the rhymes. The editor unfortunately gives no details of the manuscript of the Dīvān reproduced in his edition. The new quatrains several of which mention Tahir's name, the mountains of Alwand and Meymand (?) etc., confirm the characteristics already known of Bābā Tahir, while making them a little more banal by the inevitable repetitions. The dialectic flavor of most of the quatrains is in favour of their authenticity, although the imitation of the peculiarities of the language of B. Tahir would really not be a very difficult matter. The question of the authenticity of the quatrains of B. Tahir certainly arises, as it did in the case of those of 'Omar Khayyām. Žukowski says that the quatrains of B. Tahir are found in the Dīvān of Muḥammad Sūfī Māzandarānī (xixth cent.) a. M. A certain Şāfiī Beg Muḥammad, a modern poet of Hamādan, claimed to be the author of several "Kurdi (Pahlavi)" quatrains attributed to B. Tahir; cf. Dīvān, p. 21.

The choice of subjects in Bābā Tahir is very restricted, but the poet's work bears the stamp of a distinct personality. We give an analysis of the 59 quatrains published by Haert to enable the reader to judge. As usual it is difficult to draw a rigid distinction between the expression of mystical and that of profane love; 34 quatrains are almost equally divided between two categories of lyric poetry. Two quatrains are simple hymns to God. The rest is more individual and characteristic. B. Tahir often refers to his life as a wandering dervishāndar, without a roof above his head, sleeping with a stone for a pillow, continually harassed by spiritual anxieties (Nos. 6, 7, 14, 28). Caves and melancholy torment him; he is "flower of grief" alone toils in his heart; even the charms of spring leave him still unhappy (34, 35, 37, 54). B. Tahir professes the philosophy of the true Sūfī, confesses his sins, implores pardon for them, preaches humility, invokes nūrān (nūrān) as the only remedy for his misfortunes (1, 13, 45, 50, 58). One human failing is especially characteristic of Bābā Tahir: his eyes and his heart do not readily detach themselves from the things of this world; his rebellious heart burns within him, leaves him no rest for a moment and the poet cries in anguish: "Art thou a lion, a panther, O my heart, thou who art continually struggling with me. If thou fallest into my hands, I shall spill thy blood to see what colour thou art, O my heart." (3, 8, 9, 26, 36, 42).

Bābā Tahir's psychology shows striking contrast to that of 'Omar Khayyām. Bābā Tahir shows no trace of the hedonism of the latter (d. 517 [1127?] f.or his serenity in face of the changes brought about by death, while 'Omar Khayyām lacks the mystic fire of Bābā Tahir (cf. Christensen, Critical Studies in the Rubāyāt of 'Omar Khayyām, Copenhagen 1917, p. 44).

What pleases in Bābā Tahir is the freshness of his sentiments which Sūfī routine had not yet stereotyped, the spontaneity of his images, the naiveté of his language, when expressing terror. A new Fitzgerald might make of Bābā Tahir a worthy rival to 'Omar Khayyām.

Bābā Tahir—mystic. The Persian derives with whom Žukowski talked about Bābā Tahir knew that he was the author of 22 metaphysical treatises (cf. also Rīdī̄ Kūţī Khān) but it is only from Ethé and Blochet that we have learned in Europe of the existence in Oxford and Paris of commentaries on the maxims of B. Tahir. The complete treatise (al-Kalīmāt [al-țīğār ("The brief sayings") has now been published in the edition of the Armağān. This treatise consists of 368 Arabic maxims divided into 23 ̄āb dealing with the following subjects: knowledge (tāḥīm); gnosis (muğaffa); inspiration and penetration (tāhām, āfāzā); reason and the soul (šāb, waṣīft); this world and the beyond (dunyā, ṭālā); the musical performance (tawāt) and the āfār; sincerity and spiritual retreat (tāhām, āfāzā) etc.

Here are a few specimens of these maxims: No. 86: "Real knowledge is the intuition after which the knowledge of certainty has been acquired" (al-faṣīḥātun muğaffāatun baṭa išāmi yarāīya).[19, 96] "Exstacy (waṣīft) is the loss (of the knowledge) of existing things and is the existence of lost things"; No. 365: "he who has been the witness of predestination (coming) from God remains without movement and without volition"; No. 360: "he whom ignorance has slain, he who never lived, he whom the āfār has killed will never die.

The "Brief Sayings" seem to have enjoyed considerable popularity among the Sūfī. The Persian editor mentions the following commentaries
on this treatise; the Arabic commentary attributed to 'Alî al-Kūfî al-Hamadānî (d. in 533 but often associated in legends with Bâbâ Tahir); another Arabic commentary by an unknown author; the Arabic and Persian commentaries by Mullâ Sulṭân 'Ali Gunâbbâlî; the Persian commentary was printed in 1326 (1906) but is very rare. The editor of the Amâraghân expresses the hope of being one day able to publish the “Brief Sayings” accompanied by one of the commentaries.

The Arabic manuscript 1909 of the Bibî, Nat. contains the first 8 chapters of the maxims of Bâbâ Tahir in an abridged form (fol. 100a—105b), as well as a commentary on them (fol. 74a—100a) entitled al-Futûhât al-râkîniyya fi lâ‘îrât al-Hamadâniyya.

The manuscript seems to be the hand of the author of the commentary, Dînjî Beg 'Arîzî, who began his work in Shawwâl 889 and ended it on 20th Shawwâl 890 (1485). The commentary was written at the request of a certain Shâhîîg Abu 'l-Bâkî, who had possessed the lâ‘îrât of Bâbâ Tahir since 853. He had let them fall into the well of Zamsam at Mecca but the manuscript was miraculously recovered. The “ulama’ had dissuaded Abu ‘l-Bâkî from writing a commentary on the text on account of its profusity and obscurity, finally Abu ‘l-Bâkî engaged Dînjî Beg to accomplish this task. The commentary deals with the text of the maxims of Bâbâ Tahir word by word.

Bâbâ Tahir — a saint. As is the case with the majority of the mystical poets (‘Aṭîr, Dînjîlî al-Dîn Rûmî, Hâfîz), there are numerous legends of the life and miracles of Bâbâ Tahir. It is related that when Bâbâ Tahir had asked the students of the madrasa of Hamadân to show him the way to acquire knowledge, the students as a joke told him to spend a winter night in the frozen water of a tank. Bâbâ Tahir carried out the advice and next morning found himself enlightened and exclaimed: Amsârul Kurîyân wa-za’âkîhun ‘Arâhîyan (‘last night I was a Kurd and this morning I have become an Arab’). This story was heard by Žukowskî in Teherân and by Heron Allen’s informant at Bâdîî; it is widely current in Hamadân (cf. the preface to the Dînjîlm, p. 17 and the manuscripts from Hamadân). This Arabic utterance is found in the preface to the Ma’tâmî of Dînjîlî al-Dîn Rûmî, where however it is referred to an unknown (mystîc?) ancestor of Ibn Aakhir, a Turk of Urmîya. In the Nafâyîn al-Uns of Îlîmin, ed. Nâzzîn Lës, p. 362—363, the phrase is attributed to Aâbî ‘Abd Allah Bâbîmlî.

Other pious legends represent Bâbâ Tahir as such making the snow on Mount Alwan melt by the ardour of his spiritual fire, tracing with the point of his great toe the solution of an astronomical problem which had been put him, etc. (Žukowskî, Heron Allen, Leszczynski, preface to the Dînjîlm, manuscripts from Hamadân). Gobineau, Žièsr esr ar Arîs, Paris 1859, p. 344, also knew that the adherents of the Ahl-‘Âkî sect were in the habit of “praising exceedingly and giving pride of place to the names of famous Sûfîs, notably of Bâbâ Tahir whose poems in the Lur dialect are highly esteemed, and of his sister Bibî Fatima” etc. The discovery of the religious work Sarûnî’âm has enabled us to locate Bâbâ Tahir in the theogony of the sect. The Ahl-‘Âkî believed in 7 manifestations of the divinity (the first, that of Khândîgâr was in pre-eternity, the second is that of ‘Ali, the third that of Bâbâ Khoshîn, the fourth that of Sulîmîn Is’hâm [q.v.]). Each of these manifestations was accompanied by a retinue of 4 angels, each of whom had special duties. Bâbâ Tahir is regarded as one of the angels of Bâbâ Khoshîn and the incarnation of Arrîl and Nusrâl. The mystic period of Bâbâ Khoshîn generally corresponds to the marîfâ. The events of this cycle take place in Luristân and Hamadân. The manuscript of the Sarûnî’âm recounts the visit of the “King of the World” to Bâbâ Tahir in Hamadân, Bâbâ Khoshîn is meant by the “King of the World” but the legend seems to be inspired by memories of the episode of Tughrîl, related in the Rûgat al-Sâdîr, Bâbâ Tahir and Fatima Lârî (“the thin”) of the tribe of Bâb Bâhî (living in the Gürîn country), who, in his service, fed the whole army of the King with a sâr-yak of rice. The latter tempts Bâbâ Tahir with all the treasures of the world but he only desires the “beauty of the King”. Fatima wants to follow the king of the world; she lays her head on her knees and gives up the ghost. The King consoles Bâbâ Tahir for his loss and promises that on the day of the Last Judgement he will reunite him to Fatima so that they shall be like Lâlî and Majdînî. 13 poetical fragments (muttilated but in the style of Bâbâ Tahir) are so scattered through the text (cf. Minerskî, p. 29—35, 99—103; these facts have been utilized by Leszczynski, op. cit., p. 18—25). Fatima Lârî, who is mentioned in the text is buried beside Bâbâ Tahir. According to the custodians of the tomb of Bâbâ Tahir, she is not to be confused with another Fatima also buried in the same Bûlgh (?). Gobineau and A. V. W. Jackson mention the sister of Bâbâ Tahir, Bibî Fatîma or Fatîma Lârî. Azâd-i Hamadân (Dowân, p. 16—21) speaks of the tomb of the Sâyâ “nurse” of Bâbâ Tahir: everyone seems to endeavour to translate into the language of everyday life the mystic relations of Bâbâ Tahir to Fimâ.

The quatrains already quoted at the beginning of this article (alîf, alif-kad) may reflect some high aspiration of Bâbâ Tahir.

TĀHIRIDS, a dynasty in Khorāsān, founded by Tāhir b. al-Husayn [q.v.]. The foundation of the rule of the Tāhirids was later considered to date from the appointment of Tāhir as commander of the army of the Caliph Mu'āwīya in 194 (810) and therefore the duration of their rule was put at 61 years (till the deposition of Muḥammad b. Tāhir in 259 [875]; cf. the biography of Fadl b. Sahl [q.v.] in Ibn Khallikān N. 540, ed. de Slane, p. 577; transl., ii. 473 [where we have wrongly "six and fifty"])). Tāhir was succeeded in Khorāsān by his son Ťaḥṣa, d. 215 (828); after he reigned "Abd Allāh b. Tāhir [q.v.] till 230 (844) and Tāhir b. "Abd Allāh till Rudjāb 248 (863), both of whom are described as able rulers. The capital of the dynasty was Naḥīfāt (Arabic: Naṣīfāt); from the time of "Abd Allāh their territory comprised Rāy and Kiṃrān in addition to Khorāsān proper and the lands east of it as far as the Indian frontier and northward to the boundary of the Caliph's empire. Although the Tāhirids were nominally only governors for the caliphs, their authority was so firmly established in Khorāsān that the province could not be given to any other. After the death of "Abd Allāh the Caliph al-Wāthīk appointed Isfahān b. Ibrahim al-Mu'āth governor of Khorāsān, but this appointment was cancelled before the departure of the new governor and Tāhir b. "Abd Allāh confirmed in office in succession to his father (Sītī, MS. in the Pahl. Libr. in St. Petersburg, f. 18v eqq.). At the same time, from 237 to 253 (851–867) another of "Abd Allāh's sons, Muḥammad, held the office of military commandant (ṣāḥib āḥrat) and deputy of the Caliph in Baghdad. He declined an offer to go to Khorāsān on the death of his brother Tāhir, as he knew that the latter had intended his son Muhammad to succeed him; Muhammad b. Tāhir was therefore appointed governor of Khorāsān by the Caliph Mustāin (Yaḥyā, ed. Houtsm., ii. 604). Muḥammad b. Tāhir, in contrast to his predecessors, is described as a frivolous and pleasure-loving prince; his lands gradually passed to the Ṣaffīrids [q.v.]. Yaḥyā b. Laiṭh, to whom Muḥammad himself had to surrender his capital in 259 (873). Muḥammad b. Tāhir, who lived till 266 (978–99) (Ibn al-Athir, viii. 42), does not seem to have returned to Khorāsān, although he was liberated after the defeat of Yaḥyā at Dahr al-Akīl in 262 (876) and thereupon and once again in 271 (885) appointed governor of Khorāsān. His brother Huṣayn b. Tāhir continued the struggle with the Ṣaffīrids without much success. The last military commandant of Baghdad of the Tāhirid family was "Ubad Allāh b. "Abd Allāh, who died in Shawwāl 300 (May 913); according to "Arīṣ, p. 49, he was 81 years of age but Ibn al-Athir says he was only 70 in 232 (838); until his death he was regarded as Shaikh of the Khuṭa tribe (the Khuṭilān, transl. of Slane, ii. 80, not in the text p. 382, 2nd in Wustenfeld's edition N. 366). His son Muḥammad b. "Ubad Allāh was for a period commandant of the eastern half of Baghdad and was dismissed from office in 301 (913–914); cf. "Arīṣ, p. 45.

The Tāhirids seem to have occupied a unique position among the rulers of their time on account of their high education and literary activities (in Arabic). In the Fīḥris (p. 117) a special chapter (Fāṭr Tāhir) is devoted to the Tāhirids: many of them, from Tāhir b. al-Husayn to "Ubad Allāh b. "Abd Allāh are celebrated as poets and authors. According to "Abd Allāh b. Tāhir the "wisdom" (Ukūh) of the Tāhirids was particularly manifested in his nephew Mansūr b. Tāhir, the governor of Miṣr, Amul and Khwārizm, and author of several works. According to a statement of little credibility in Dawlatshah (ed. Brown, p. 30), "Abdallah is said to have disapproved of Persian literature and to have ordered Persian books to be burned and destroyed.
Tahmās P I, second ruler of Persia of the Šafawī dynasty, eldest son of Shah Ismā'īl I born in 919 (1514); he acceded to the throne at the age of ten years (930 = 1524) and was of course the plaster of the Khīlkhānah chief. He defeated the Uzbek in 934 (1527) near Turbet-i Shāhīkh Dijān. Summoned to Baghdad by the rebellion of Dhu 'l-Faqār of the Kurd tribe of the Māḏūf, who was supported by the Kalbur Kānds and claimed to be under Turkish suzerainty (936 = 1530), he found him murdered by his brothers. He next went to Herāt where the Uzbek had been besieging for 18 months, but the latter withdrew on his approach. In 940 (1534) the Ottomans occupied Mesopotamia and Tabrīz. Sulṭān Sulāmān went to Sulṭānīya, then crossed the mountains to the south to occupy Baghādād; four years later he occupied Wān. The Persians had all the time been on the offensive. In 941 the great Moghul Humâyūn, son of Būbur, driven from his throne by a rebellion, took refuge with Tahmās. The magnificent festivities held on this occasion are commemorated in a wall-painting in the pavilion of Chīlī-Sūrā in Ḫisāfān, but Humâyūn was worried by the Shī ḥ’s insisting on his adoption of the Shī ḥ’a.

A rebellion of his brother Ḫīlāḥ-Mīrzā in 954 (1547) who was supported by the Turks gave Tahmās no rest; an Ottoman army occupied Aḥvardābīlān and Ḫisāfān; Ḫīlāḥ however quarreled with his allies, the campaign led to nothing and the pretender was later captured and put to death. In 961 (1554) an armistice was concluded with the Turks and the peace signed the following year. Bīyāzdī, son of Sulṭān Sulāmān, took refuge in Persia after his rebellion (965 = 1559) but he was handed over after two years’ negotiations and Tahmās ordered or allowed him to be put to death for a sum of 400,000 pieces of gold.

The last years of his reign were marked by Uzbek invasions of Khorāsān and a famine followed by a plague (919 = 1511). Tahmās died in 984 (1576), poisoned by the mother of a certain Ḥādīr, chief of the Ustāḏīn tribe. His reign had lasted 52 and a half years. He wrote his autobiography, published by P. Horn, Denkwürdigkeiten, Z. D. M. G., xlv., 1890, p. 563–649, transl. Strassburg 1891; it stops at the year 969 (1561) when Bīyāzdī was handed over to the Turks. Copies of official letters addressed by him to contemporary sovereigns are found in various MSS. of the British Museum (Rieu, Catalogue, N°. 390, 330, 309, 984). In his reign Persia was invaded by Anthony Jenkinson, English Ambassador (1562) and Vincenzo d’Alessandri, Venetian Ambassador (1574).

Bibliography: Rūdūš-kull-khnān, Rawdat al-Ṣafā‘-i Nā ’trī, Teherān 1274, viii., not paginated; E. G. Browne, Persian Literature in Modern Times, Cambridge 1924, p. 81, 84–98; P. M. Sykes, History of Persia, 1, ii. 246–253; Curzon,
Persia, ii. 35; Cl. Huart, Histoire de Bagdad dans les temps modernes, Paris 1901, p. 34-36; P. Hum, Geschichte Trams in islamischer Zeit, in Grundriss d. islam. Philologie, ii. 585; L. Teufel, Z. D. M. G., 1883, xxviii, p. 113-125; Malcolm, History of Persia, London 1815, i. 505-511.

Tahmasp II, third son of Shah Husain, proclaimed heir-presumptive during the siege of Isfahan by the Afghans (1135 = 1722), escaped at the head of 600 men and tried without success to raise troops in Kerman. He made a treaty with Peter the Great who had just occupied Kast and Nikola (the treaty led to nothing), held out at Farahabad in Mazarabad, with the support of Fath 'Ali Khan, chief of the Kadjars, and was joined there by the future Nadir Shah, who then took the name Tahmasp Kuli Khan (the Khan, servant of Tahmasp) and brought him 5,000 men, Afghans and Kurds. After the assassination of Fath 'Ali Khan near Mleshed by Nadir, the latter was appointed commander-in-chief of the Persian troops, took Mleshed and Herat, won a signal victory over the Afghans at Mihman-Dust, near Darmghan in 1141 (1729). Leaving Tahmasp at Daghmeh, Nadir won a further success at Murche-Khurt, entered Isfahan where Tahmasp, whose father had been massacred by the Afghans before their departure, followed him and found his mother there, where she had lived seven years disguised as a slave without being recognised. Tahmasp rewarded his general for his services by giving him the governorship of Khorasan, Sultani, Kirmanshah, and Mazarabad with the title Sulthan. Nadir struck coins in his own name and paid his troops with them. Fired by the victories of his lieutenant, Tahmasp wished to take command of the army, undertook unsuccessfully the siege of Erivan, and was defeated by the Turks at Koroghan, near Hamadan in 1144 (1731); in the following year he concluded peace by ceding Transcaucasia, but retained Tabriz and the country S. E. of it. Nadir protested against the conclusion of the treaty, marched on Isfahan, seized Tahmasp and sent him to be imprisoned in Khorasan putting on the throne a son of the Shah, aged eight months, under the name of Shah Abbâs III; this son dying, Nadir [p. v.] had himself proclaimed ruler of Persia in 1145 (1736). In the course of the campaign in India, the son of Nadir, Rûd Kuli, put Tahmasp to death along with the greater part of his family at Sebawar (1151 = 1739).


TAPHRÂTH, the second king of the Pahlavi dynasty in the Persian epic epos.

The name Takhmûsrupas (Avesta), Takhmûropas (Bundahish) is compounded of takhma ("strong, courageous") (cf. Rustam = Rustamum = urupa or urupas) (cf. Christensen, p. 140), a certain animal of the dog family", cf. Bartholomaeus, Altir. Wirt., p. 1532, who, however, expresses doubt as to the real meaning of the name (Darmesteter, Avesta, ii., p. 583, interprets it "of sturdy shape"); cf. Sanxari vâraps). Later forms are Tahmâhir, Tahmûras. The transcription into Arabic character Tahmûrat (sometimes Tahmûrat) reflects an intermediate stage in the evolution of the final > > > > such that the emphatic Arabic t seems to show retroactive influence of the >; cf. the forms Tahmâris, and Thiân. In the Sîra Arabic the Mandaeans Tahmûrat appears under the name Zardanûra Tahmûrat.

As Windischmann points out, Tahmûrat is one of the most puzzling characters in the Persian epic. Syneretic imagination has been very much at work on the person of this king and each period has added some new features to his character. According to the majority of the sources, Tahmûrat is the son of Wîwângîshân (Avestan Vohuvarait, Frâh). Vohuvarait, who is the grandson of the great god Hûshang. The brothers of Tahmûrat are his successors Yim = Djamîshîh, Spîrî (Spîtyura) and Nars. The Shâh-nâmây alone makes the order of reigns the same as the order of generations, by making Tahmûrat the son of Hûshang and the father of Djamîshîh. The Muslim sources mention a son of Tahmûrat, according to Inân al-Fâthî, was called Fâris (epoyny of the Persians), according to the Nâmây al-kalitât (ed. Le Strange, p. 121), Lāshkâr; according to Herbelot's sources: Kahramân.

In the Avesta Tahmûrat has the epithet azânârâvânt (azânârâvanâ), usually explained (cf. Haima and the Monšûlî, p. 166) as "armid" but according to Bartholomaeus, Altir. Wirt., p. 228 and 1654, having the sense of "watchful", "wise awake". Firdawsi does not mention this epithet unless he alludes to it when he says that Tahmûrat adorned (sîn) Ahriman to serve as a steed for him.

According to the Avesta, Yâghî, 19, 28, Takhmûsrupas "subdued all the demons and rode Arûra-Mânuwh whom he transformed into a horse, for 30 years, from one end of the earth to the other" (transl. Darmesteter). The victory of Tahmûrat over Ahriman was won on the day Khorshed of the month of Farravand and this event is celebrated each year by the faithful who should make a special cake for the occasion (according to a Pahlavi treatise in West, Pahlavi Texts, i, p. 314). The Persian Rîdânâyât (Spîgel, Einleitung) which gives Modadî Dîhlaw as its authority is full of curious details (absent in Firdawsi and elsewhere). Every day Tahmûrat, mounted on Ahriman, went three times round the world and three times covered the road from Mt. Allura to the bridge Cînav. Ahriman felled by mace blows from Tahmûrat lived only on the sins of men. By promises of honey and silk garments (on these impure things, cf. Spîgel, Einleitung, ii. 153, 158) Ahriman persuaded the wife of Tahmûrat to ask her husband if in the course of his rounds he was ever afraid. Tahmûrat confessed that he was always afraid that Ahriman might throw himself from the summit of Allura to the foot. Learning Tahmûrat's weak spot, Ahriman threw him and swallowed him. The augean Sûrîân announced the disappearance of Tahmûrat to Djamâshîh and tells him what two things delight Ahriman, praises (or song) and sodomy (cf. Marquart in Hâfez Amârya, Vienna 1916, p. 100). Djamîsh played on these passions and when Ahriman prepared to ascend to his proposals, Djamîsh slipped his hand into his entrails and pulled out his brother's body. Ahriman pursues Djamîsh but the latter on the advice
of Sarūt abstains from looking him in the face and Ahriman thus impotent returns to hell. Dżam purifies Tāhmūrāt and builds an [aššāq] for him. The hand of Dżam which had touched Ahriman became covered with leprosy. During a dream he learns that his malady can be cured. Hence the institution of the aššāq and the use of the ghāfūr and the abāh. In the Rūmāyāt the death of Tāhmūrāt. The Muṣnymi‘i expressly says that Tāhmūrāt died a natural death.

The exploits of Tāhmūrāt also earned him the epithet of dżābab, cf. the Shāh-nāma, the Muṣnymi‘i and the Persian Rūmāyāt. According to the Aogemäide (Avestaz, tr. Darmesteter, i. 165), Tāhmūrāt made a steed of Ganūš-Mainyū, the demon of demons, and exorted from him the 7 kinds of writing. The Mānīkūhāz (tr. West, Ch. xxi. 32) explains that it was the seven alphabets hidden by Ahriman that were brought to light. Firdawsi does not seem to be aware of the ambiguity of his language, which here suggests the demoniacal origin of the alphabets, while, according to him, they were taught to Tāhmūrāt by the dżor whom he had subdued after their rebellion. Firdawsi speaks of "about 30 alphabets" (mazīd-kā n) but once mentions six by name, the rajā, the māzīd, the jāydu, the gafūn and the pahārī.

On this tradition there was in time superimposed the legend of the measures taken by Tāhmūrāt to save the books at the Deluge. As Windischmann has already pointed out, this act of Tāhmūrāt’s connects him with the Babylonian Kings. According to the story of the astronomer Absû Maššîk (1272-95), according to which a similar system of manuscripts written on the skin of the white poplar (Arbāz) had previously been made at Sūrūyā. On this occasion one of the manuscripts written "in old Persian script" could be deciphered. One of the old kings of Persia in it related that 231 years and 300 days before the Deluge, Tāhmūrāt had known the date of its happening. As a true friend of knowledge and of scholars, he ordered his engineers to find the safest place to erect a building which was called Sūrūyā. Scientific works of different kinds including astronomical tables were put in it (but the Deluge, cf. al-Birūnī, did not come beyond the frontier of Huwān). There are several other traditions connected with Tāhmūrāt. The reference is very old in the Rūmāyāt, ch. xviii. 4, according to which the time of Tāhmūrāt *the people regularly passed on the fire, are the bull Sarsaōko from (Kāshāvarz) (m. Pers.; Kashāvarz central) Kyvantras to the other regions*. One night in the middle of the sea, the wind blew into the water the sacred fire which had also been placed on the back of Sarsaōko, but the fire broke into three parts which shone so brightly that the people were able to cross the sea. This myth is symbolic of the peopling of the 6 kāshāvarz of the periphery and of the origin of the three great pyres.

To Tāhmūrāt (Hamza, p. 29–30) is attributed the building of Babylon, of the citadel (Khartīnī) of Mawz, of Kardānād (one of the 7 cities of Mawz; another reading has: Kortābī; in the Muṣnymi‘i al-Tawārīkh Girdārī: i. 129d, 124b), of the two suburbs of Isfāhān: Mihrīn (Marbīn, cf. Ibl al-Fākīh, p. 265) and Sūrūyā (formerly Kūkh). According to Tābarī, Tāhmūrāt founded the town of Sūrūyā and Mašīlī placed there the residence of Tāhmūrāt. To this list Herbelot’s sources add Niniveh and Amid.

In the Shāh-nāma, Tāhmūrāt is represented as the great initiator in the exploitation of the animal kingdom: from him dates the weaving of wool, the domestication of wild animals, of birds of prey, the rearing of horses and other animals for riding, of watch-dogs and of cocks and hens (cf. the Muṣnymi‘i and Tābrīzī).

Along with Tāhmūrāt the Shāh-nāma mentions his wise and pious minister (dastūr) Shīdāb, whose name looks like a wrong reading for Būddāb (Buddhisatva, Būdha, Būdha). Ericeur (Eunides sur le Gnosticisme, p. 28) has endeavoured to show from the system of writing Pahlavi the possibility of the substitution of shēh, in place of šēš in the sense of demon. Tābarī, i. 175 says that in the first year of the reign of Tāhmūrāt, Būdāsāf appeared who preached the doctrine of the Sārīs (q.v.) and almost all the Muslim historians repeat this (cf. Windischmann and Christiansen). Some writers (Mašīlī, Tābrīzī, B. G. A., viii. 90) even suggest that before Zardūst the Persians professed the Saean religion preached by Būdāsāf. According to Hamza, Yūdāsāf (read Būdūsāf) instituted fasting on the occasion of a famine in the time of Tāhmūrāt. The same writer says that Tāhmūrāt was tolerant in religious matters and in his reign idolatry had increased. This legend is exactly contrary to what the Dīnārī (vii. 1, 16) says, that Tāhmūrāt put down idolatry and caused the worship and adoration of the Creator to increase.

Tāhmūrāt has no equivalent in Indian mythology. Windischmann and Spiegel: have sought to unravel the Indo-European (Iranian) from the Semitic elements in this complex character. To the former belong the genealogy of Tāhmūrāt, his struggle with Ahriman etc. Are the elements dealing with the deluge, the saving of the books etc. Semitic? Windischmann, relying on the second element of the name Tāhmūrāt (ternpa), even suspected an animal origin for him (Tergentall) connecting him with certain Babylonian mythological figures.

An original theory has been advanced by Christiansen, e.g. cit., p. 136, 142: he says that it was after the separation of the Iranians from the Indians that Hūshang and Tāhmūrāt, both keeping traces of the type of the “first man” and the “first king”, were inserted in the mythological framework where they took a place before Yim, the Indo-Iranian type of the first man, and after Gayōmard, the pre-anthropomorphic giant, who became the prototype of the human race. Christiansen then proposes to assimilate Hūshang and Tāhmūrāt to the personages of Scythian legend (Herodotus, iv. 5–7); Targitaos, the first man and his son Arpoxanis, “eponym of the Scythian tribe Rpa” (*Arpua > Urupa; Christiansen thinks he recognises this element in the toponymy of many places in near Asia which were the scene of Scythian migrations*). Hence the genealogy, Tāhmūrāt, son of Hūshang,
given by Firdawsi is perhaps in keeping with the tradition, while the three generations introduced between Tahmûrath and Hâshang would only be missreadings of the name Viranghân.

Later sources rationalised the legend; according to a Fârsi priest (Darmesteter, Et. iran., ii. 74), the victory of Tahmûrath over Ahriman simply means his victory "over the impure desires of the flesh". Mirkhân seems to wish to substitute for the revolt of the Râb, one of the nobles of the kingdom.

The later evolution of the story of Tahmûrath in Muslim lands is very curious. According to E. Blochet the mare with a woman's head, al-Burâk, [q. v.], on whom at the mûâjil Muhammad traversed the world, is derived from Ahriman in the legend of Tahmûrath. The name of Burâk is, he says, connected with the Persian word barâk barâdī, which are also used in the Rûmâyât and Firdawsi. On a Sâzânî vase in Vienna (cf. Arzouk, Monuments d. K. R. Mûsâ- und Anûth- Cahunette à Wien, 1850, Die antiken Gold- und Silbermonumente, pl. vi.-vii.) are figures of a man mounted on a monster with a bearded human head having some resemblance to the winged Assyrian bulls. Blochet thinks he recognises in these figures different phases in the exploit of Tahmûrath. On the other hand, the same scholar has shown how Tahmûrath, having passed through the avatar of the Muslim Samsûrâs or Shamûrâs (metathesis of h and w) has come to be confused with the complex figure of St. George. The figure of Samûrâs is found in an old manuscript Dâdî al-Šâhî (Bibli. Nat. Paris, Pers. fonda, No. 174); in the accompanying text we are told that this spirit is the "great spirit of the atmosphere" and that his residence (mûdân) is in the island (sic.) of Ba'îlak. He is represented as a warrior fully equipped (mûhâirâ) killing a dragon with a blow from a sword in such a way that the dragon (al-âdâsh) is cut in two while seizing with his teeth the chest of the horse. Wherever two armies meet ready for battle, God orders this spirit to go to the place between them and it is he who gives his aid to the side which God desires to assist 1.

The name Tahmûrath, frequent in the modern period among Pârsis, seems to be unknown in Muhammadan Persia. Since the 16th century it has been very popular among the Christian princes of Georgia (in the form Taimouraz). This curious fate of the name may be explained by the influence of the Shirwâshkhâ [q. v.] who were related to the Georgians and often bear names from the Iranian epics.


(V. Minorek)
narrower, "to exchange", "to put in the place of something" (ii. 56; vii. 16). How he pictured this alteration to himself is not clear from his words and perhaps he had no very definite idea of it. He was more concerned with the fact itself than with how it was done. There is a direct charge of having falsified the text in Sūra ii. 73: "Woe to them, who write the Scripture with their hands and say: this comes from Allāh." On the other hand in iii. 72 there seems to be a reference to an alteration in the text while it is being read: "A part of them twist their tongue in the scripture so that you think that it is out of the scripture, but it is not out of the scripture; they say: it comes from Allāh, but it does not come from Allāh"; cf. iv. 48: "they twist with their tongue".

In other passages he is content with the accusation that the Jews conceal and suppress all sorts of things in their scripture (Sūra ii. 154, 169). This is expressed in a peculiar fashion in vi. 91 where it is said "you make the scripture of Moses into leaves which you read out and suppress much of it"; which can only mean that in his opinion they removed the passages attesting the truth of his mission from the copies which they used in the disputations. He gives in ii. 156; vii. 16 a specimen of their alterations which is unfortunately not clear; he says that they used another word instead of the word fīṭrāt which brought a heavy punishment upon them. The examples quoted in ii. 95; iv. 48 are hardly meant as quotations from scripture. Among the suppressed passages, the scriptures make special mention of the law which punishes insubinence with stoning (Ibn Hāshim, p. 394 sqq.) and the descriptions of Muhammad as the expected Prophet (ibid., p. 355). Muhammad naturally extended this charge of tahfīz to the Christians, of whom he also asserted that they likewise concealed the passages in their holy scriptures which contained evidence of the truth of his mission; cf. the appeal to the "possessors of a scripture" in Sūra ii. 141; iii. 64 and with reference to the prophecy of Muhammad's coming, Ibn Hāshim, p. 388, although he probably meant that Jesus's refusal of the name God and the doctrine of the Trinity (e.g. xvi. 110) were based on falsifications of the scriptures. His whole attitude was so peculiar that his opponents were able with justice to direct a charge of tabdīl against the Prophet's revelations. It is true that in Sūra x. 16 he vigorously defends himself against the charge brought by his opponents that he had substituted another revelation in place of the one given him, but the not rare abrogations of earlier legal prescriptions [cf. kisāʾāt] ceased him no misgiving and in xvi. 103, Allāh clearly refers to his having occasionally substituted one verse for another, a thing with which his enemies did not forget to reproach the Prophet.

The vague way in which Muhammad in the Kurān speaks of falsifications of scriptures by the "possessors of a scripture" resulted in the Muhammadan scholars who gradually became better acquainted with the "Old and New Testaments" and were fond of dealing in their polemical works with the charge of tahfīz, tabdīl and tāḥkīr, coming to hold very divergent views in their opinions of the facts lying at the basis of the charge. Some continued to hold the opinion usual in the early centuries after Muhammad that the Jews had actually altered the text. A vigorous champion of this view was the Spanish Arab Abū Muhammad ʿAlī b. ʿIshāq (d. 456 = 1064). Diametrically opposed to this was the view held by others that the texts of the "possessors of a scripture" were intact and that the divergent opinions of Jews and Christians were simply due to erroneous interpretations of the passages concerned. One of the earliest representatives of this view was the Zaidi of the Yemen, al-Kāsim b. Būṣlīhī (d. 246 = 860), in his polemical treatise directed against the Christians; among his later followers, special mention may be made of the great historian Ibn Khaldūn. As is usual in such controversies there was also a middle school, for some conceded the actual falsifications of the text by the "people of a scripture" but limited them to a minimum. Of these different opinions, the first was decidedly the simplest and most logical, for it was based on the first impression which the words of the Qurān naturally made and had made in the early days of Islam, but it led to rather serious consequences which gradually came to be appreciated. When one had always to deal with the possibility that the texts of the earlier books of revelation had been falsified, they lost considerably in value and indeed the holders of this theory frequently spoke slightingly of it and warn against its use. But in this way one came up against a question of apologetics, to which the theologians were devoting themselves with ardour, namely the prophecy of Muhammad's coming as the Prophet to be expected from the Bible (e.g. Deut., xviii. 15) for this naturally presupposed the authenticity of the passage in question. This factor had such an influence that only a minority took seriously the charge of tahfīz in its strictest form. But in its milder form it continued to play a principal part in Muslim polemics against Jews and Christians, as may be seen for example from Doughty's statement that in his conversations with Arabs he frequently heard this accusation made (Travel in Arabia, i. 208; Snouck Hurgronje, Medde. ii. 204).

In the disputations between the different Muslim sects the charge of tahfīz is also made, as the Shi'is have often insisted that in the orthodox Kurān all sorts of things have been omitted or inserted with the object of disposing of or refuting evidence of the truth of their doctrine. The orthodox also naturally reply by making the same charge against the Shi'is.


(Fr. BIHL)

TAHSIL is the nomen actionis of the second formation of the verb taqāla, and signifies originally, "collection", "obtaining" or "acquiring". In India the use of the word is restricted to the collection of the revenue, and it is applied, in the United Provinces and Madras to a subdivision of a district (called ta'alluq, or, cor-
TASHIN, Mir Muhammad Husain 'Ata' Khan, with the title Tashin, also known by the name Malang Khan, was an Indian author, as it seems, from Lahore, son of Mir Edair Khan, whose nephew was Shawk. The son of Tashin, named Kasim Ali Khan, was not only an author, but also a musician. The exact dates of Tashin's birth and death cannot be fixed; the date of the completion of his most important work, the Newafr-i muraqqa, is ± 1195 (1780). The author was in the service of General Smith, whom he accompanied from Lahore to Calcutta. Later on, Tashin lived at Patna, then, after his father's death, at Faizabad. His patron, the last named place, was successively the Nawab Shuja'ul Daula († 1189 = 1775) — in whose service he continued the composition of his Newafr, which he seems to have begun at Patna — and the following Nawab, Asaf al-Daula (1189—1212 = 1775—1797), under whose reign the work was completed. The author has added, to the preface of the Newafr, a pujido in honour of Asaf al-Daula. It is said, that the reading of the works of the famous Hindustani poet Mirza Muhammad Raff Sawai († 1195 (1780) at Lucknow), induced Tashin to devote himself to Hindustani literature also.

Works. (1) Newafr-i muraqqa: a Hindustani translation, in verse and prose, of a Persian original (named Kizig-i lokhr Darwish). This original is ascribed to Amir Khusraw, but sometimes also to Andijab or to Muhammad Ali Mas'ud. The Newafr exhibits an elaborate literary style. This was the reason, why, for didactic purposes, another translation of the Kizig-i lokhr Darwish was begun in 1215 (1801) by Mr Amman of Dhlit and completed in 1237 (1853); this translation is the well-known Bagh-i-ub-Bahar. Editions of Tashin's Newafr appeared at Bombay (1849), Lucknow (1859) and Cawnpore (1874). The Newafr itself has had a literary influence upon another Hindustani author, 'Azamat Allah, who, in his work Kizig-i rangin Gufira, has imitated that book the style of Tashin's composition. On the other hand, we find in a manuscript of the India Office (No. 132 of Blumhardt's Catalogue), the Introduction and the tale of the first darwish in Tashin's translation combined with a Hindustani rendering of the stories resp. of the third darwish and the third Asadkhait by another literate, Muhammad hladi.

(2) Besides the Newafr, Tashin wrote in Persian an English grammar, called Dawabshi Angrist, and a work, which seems to be historical, named Tawarihi-ki Kaziim.

It may be added, that, according to the Tadhkir of Yusuf Ali Khan, Tashin was also renowned as a calligrapher. Besides this Tashin, there is also another author of that name, likewise called Muhammad Husain Khan, of whom a cycle of poems in praise of the prophet, partly in Persian and partly in Hindustani, was lithographed at Dhlit, under the name Gouder-dari 368 (1753). There is also a collection of stanzas on Muhammad compiled from various sources by one Muhammad Husain Khan Tashin (the same), named Camaoni Madhobi Nabi, edited at Dhlit 1854.


AL-TAFI: El-Amr Allah (or 'I kli') 363 al-Karim R. al-Fadil, Ababbis Calip b, born in 317 (929—930). His father was the caliph al-Muttair after whose deposition in 1368 Ibn al-Kadhi 363 (Aug. 5, 974) he was proclaimed Commander of the Faithful. His mother, who survived him, was 'Utb. As Ibn al-Athir justly observes (ix. 56), al-Tafi during his reign had not sufficient authority to be able to associate himself with any enterprises worthy of mention. He is only mentioned in history, one may safely say, in connection with certificates of appointment to office, letters of condolence and such like formalities, and his most remarkable feature seems to have been his extraordinary physical strength. The real rulers were at first the Bu'ayda [q. v.] but after the most important of them, 'Ajud al-Daula [q. v.] who was the caliph's father-in-law, had died in Shawwal 372 (March 983) his sons began to quarrel among themselves. In Sha'ban 381 (Oct./Nov. 991) Bahar al-Daula [q. v.], who was in financial difficulties and could not pay his troops was persuaded by his influential adviser Abu'l-Husain b. al-Ma'allim to overthrow the caliph and seize his treasure. At an audience at which the Bu'ayda appeared with a large retinue the unsuspecting Tafi was torn from his throne by Bahar al-Daula's orders and taken to the latter's house where he was kept a prisoner. He was succeeded as caliph by his cousin Abu'l-Abbas Ahmad, who took the name al-Kadir [q. v.]. In Radjab 382 (Sept. 992) the ex-caliph was allowed to come to al-Kadir's palace. Here he was well treated. He died on 1st Shawwal 392 (Aug. 3, 993).

Bibliography: Muhammad b. Shikir al-Kuttabi, Fawaid, ii. 3; Ibn al-Ashir, al-Kulti, ed. Torabegi, vii.—ix., see Index; Ibn Khaldun, al-Tabar, iii. 428, 436; Ibn al-Tukabbi, al-Fa'ahri, ed. Dietrichson, p. 391; Weil, Geschichte der Chalifen, iii. 211—244; Muir, The caliphate, its rise, decline, and fall, p. 582; Le Strange, Baghdad during the Abbasid caliphate, p. 102, 270, 271.

TAIBA [See al-Madina.]
TAIIF, a town in Arabia. It lies 75 miles S.E. of Mecca about 5,000 feet above sea level in the mountains of Sarat. Of the country round with its walled gardens Burchkardi says that it is "the most attractive that he had seen since his departure for Lebanon in Syria". The Beduins also describe it as a corner of Syria transported and placed under theincline sky of the Hijaz and say this marvell is due to the all-powerful intercession of Abraham, the friend of Allah. This healthy and windy site at the same time freezes there was not without attraction for the rich merchants of Mecca. They all aimed at possessing an estate or at least a pied-à-terre there in which to recuperate from the strain of the relaxing climate of Mecca, as their successors do to this day.

TAIIF was the capital of the tribe of Thaqif [q.v.]. The Qur'ânic (xiii. 30) phrase al-buraydân classes Mecca with TAIIF and suggests a link of importance between them. TAIIF is nowhere else mentioned in the Qur'ân. But it may be said that on the eve of the Hijaz, it was regarded as the second city of Western Arabia and ranked next to Mecca. It had an advantage over the latter in the possession of fertile lands. The surrounding valleys supplied its export trade with ample materials, particularly easy to market in a region so much favoured by nature as the Hijaz: wine, wheat and wood. The special industry of TAIIF was the manufacture of leather in its tanneries, which were so numerous, we are told, as to render the air around foul. It had a girdle of walls built to take machines of war. At the entrance and exit to the sea port TAIIF offered the ships of the desert provinsions in the varied produce of its soil and loads in the products of its industry. TAIIF seems to have had particularly close relations with the Yemen, for which it was able to save 3 or 4 stages as compared with its redoubtable rival Mecca. The people of the town were divided into two main groups, in reality, two adverse factions. Their efforts for supremacy paralysed the eco-nomic development of the town. The "Ahlâf" were the younger, less aristocratic section. They nevertheless succeeded in securing control of the national sanctuary of al-Lat. Inferior to their rivals, the Banû Mulik in wealth and in territorial possessions, they made up for their disadvantages by a very skilful diplomacy and by a more serious military organization. The best poets, the most respected leaders in TAIIF came from the Ahlâf.

To their habit of living on wheat, the Beduins attributed the cunning and finesse of the TAIIF which were proverbial. There was a kind of entente cordiale between Mecca and TAIIF, an entente cemented by matrimonial alliances between Kurisâh and Ablâf. Many Meccans lived, as we have seen, in TAIIF and had estates there. Hardly less numerous were the TAIIFs in Mecca, half of the great families notably of the Umayyads, the latter almost all landlords in the region of TAIIF. This explains the preponderating part taken by the Thaqif in the Syrian caliphate.

On the eve of the Hijaz, TAIIF was therefore unique among the towns of the Hijaz. Its bracing climate, its fruits, its grapes, the famous seaâ of TAIIF and other products of the soil suggested Syria rather than the bare landscapes of western Arabia. As to intellectual development, the people of TAIIF seem "to have been notoriously above the average of Beduins and settled tribes". This is how the acute encyclopaedist al-Jâhîz speaking of Hâdîjâlî summed up the fellow-citizens of the great Thaqif. It is no wonder then that Mu'âhammad after the check to his mission in Mecca thought of "winning" over the intelligent citizens of TAIIF, unpulsed again here, the only course left him was to turn to the Amârâs. In their wars with Mu'âhammad the Kurisâh had the military support of the Ablâf of TAIIF. After the fatâh of Mecca in 8 A.H. immediatly after the defeat of the Hawâzin at Hurrain, Mu'âhammad laid siege to TAIIF, but without success. It was not till a year later that a delegation of TAIIFs came to discuss at great length in Medina the adhesion of their compatriots to the new religion, which they adopted without enthusiasm.

The expansion of Islam beyond the bounds of Arabia no more benefited their town than it did Mecca. The latter declined while Mecca prospered; the latter was at first the residence of the caliph and later under the Umayyads that of the governor general of the Hijaz, under whom TAIIF usually was now reduced to the rank of a sub-prefecture. This decline was at first checked by the initiative of the inhabitants. They succeeded in keeping in their blazing mountains the country resorts not only of the Meccans but also of the new Muslim aristocracy in Medina. Under the Umayyads they gave a further proof of their ability to adapt themselves to new circumstances. The economic decline of TAIIF and the loss of its autonomy coincided with the zenith of the political influence of the Thaqif. They succeeded in pushing themselves into the highest offices and displayed the most varied talents in them. From the time of Mu'âwiya we regularly find Thaqif lieutenants beside the Caliph. For a brief period with Ziyâd b. Abihi, they were almost expected to get the throne. Under Walid I., when the Arab empire attained its apogee, the greatest man of the reign was not the Kurisâh ruler but the Thaqif Hâdîjâlî. They were all able to exploit the historical relations, the intimacy between TAIIF and Mecca, their old connections with the principal Kurisâh families, especially with the Umayyads. They discovered in the past an indication of the proper orientation of their political activity.

The 'Abhâsâds and 'Alîds took care not to forget this. Tradition records their hatred of them and associates the Thaqif with the disfavour that surrounds the Umayyads. From Kerkbali and the failure of the attempted restoration of the 'Alida they are represented as having been cursed by the Prophet. Combining hatred of the Shi'is with the political feuds of the 'Irāq, the 'Abhâsâd action veiled itself with particular bitterness on the memory of the great Thaqif officers of the Umayyad period. It endeavoured to put the town of TAIIF and its doubtful citizens under a ban in history. The plot succeeded marvellously and to this day among the Beduins, the name of the Thaqif is treated with scorn.

'Abhâsid rule showed itself frankly hostile to the Hijâz, where continued 'Alîd risings were fomented (Kutâb al-Ahâlan, iii. 94). TAIIF was encircled by the tomb of 'Abdallah b. 'Abbas, the ancestor of the dynasty who became the patron saint of the town. The possession of this sanctuary, a much frequented object of pilgrimage, did not disarm the hostility of the 'Abhâsâds who never forgave the population its former Umayyad sympathies and
TÄIF — TÄIMA

left the town to decline gradually. It was the exception when we find Abd al-Salām princes taking an interest in Tāif. The mother of the Caliph Muḥammad b. Abī Bakr and before her the celebrated Zanbiyāt, wife of ‘Abdāl,l-rād, acquired estates there; the latter no doubt in connection with the waterworks which she built at Mecca. Along with the adjoining districts of the Ṣarāṭ, Tāif has remained to the present day the fruit and corn market of Mecca.

From the fourth (tenth) century all the geographers who mention Tāif describe it as baldādūd, "little town," and even add the epithet "little." Its environs became depopulated and the encyclopaedists like Yāqūt and Bakri could not find there the sites of the estates and villages mentioned in the time of the Umayyads. Since the establishment of the Ḥasanid amirates in Mecca, Tāif has as a rule been under the Grand Sharifs. With its walls and its modest citadel, it was intended to defend Mecca against invaders from Najd. It only imperfectly played this role, especially in the war between the Grand Sharifs and the Wahhābīs under Ibn Sa’ūd. These sectarians captured and sacked it in 1802. It was taken from them in 1813 by Egyptian troops under Tāmim-Pāghā, Bureckhardt, who visited it in the following year, found it half in ruins. In it he ate "very large grapes of most delicious flavour, figs, pomegranates and quinces." The bulk of the inhabitants consisted of Arabs of Ṭaʾīf. "The majority of the rich Meccans had houses there, but most of the foreigners who have chosen it as a place of residence are of Indian origin." Such still is the composition of its population. According to Phīlībī, who was there at the end of 1918, its population is not over 5,000 but rises to 20,000 during the summer season. In April 1924, Tāif fell again into the hands of the Wahhābīs in the course of their campaign against Ḥusayn b. ‘Abī, ex-king of the Ḥijāz.


(H. Lammens)

TAIM B. MURRA, a clan of the Meccan tribe of Ḫaṭrif. Its name, which is born by several other Arab tribes, means "servant" and must therefore be an abbreviation of an ancient theophoric, and such as we find in Taimalṭāf, Taimalṭāt [q.v.], and in the inscriptions, Taim Manāt, Taim Rūtā, Qāṣeṣ etc. (cf. Wellhausen, Reste, p. 7; Līdābarski, Īṣāṣ d. nordīm. Epiqārat, p. 385). The Taim b. Mura belonged to the Ḫaṭrif al-Blāfībī, i.e. to the clan which were dominant in Mecca: but in spite of that they do not seem to have possessed any political influence, while their real relatives, the Makhṣūm [q.v.], b. Ya‘qub b. Mura, rivalled in influence those of Ḫaṭrif. The pre-Islamic history of Mecca makes almost no reference to them (cf. the scarce references in Caestner, Annali dell'Istit., Indice vol. i—ii, p. 1906). The only person of note that they appear to have numbered among them on the eve of Islam is ‘Abdallâh b. Ḳâlan, celebrated for his generosity; it was in his house which was still pointed out in the days of Islam that the Ḫaṭrif clans formed their alliance (Ali al-mukhabī; cf. Caestner, Annali, Introduction, § 147), and he was the patron of the poet Umayya b. Ābl-Salīm (Aḥkām, viii. 2—5 e Schulten, Orientalische Studien, Th. Niecke, . . . gewidmet, i, 73—79; Goldsche, al-Ḍiḥaḥa, Z. D. M. G., xiv. 7).

The name of the Taim b. Murra rests entirely on the fact that two of the most celebrated heroes of Islam came from them: — Ābl Bakr and Tālam b. Uṣayyālāh.

A brief description of the quarter inhabited by the Taim b. Murra in Mecca is given by al-Arraqā (Chron. d. Staat Micka, ed. Wüstenfeld, i. 468).

TAIMA', an old settlement in a well-watered oasis in northern Arabia, four days' journey south of Dumat al-Jandal; according to Muḥammad b. Ḫasūn, three from Ḥijāz and four from Wādī l-Kūrā. It lies in a depression the length of which Jausen and Savignac put at 2 miles with a breadth of 500 yards. The subterranean waters collect and burst forth into a well 40—45 feet deep and about 60 feet in diameter, according to the two travellers just named. Taima' is mentioned in the cuneiform inscriptions and in the Old Testament as an important caravan station (Isaiah, xxl. 141; Jeremiah, xxv. 23; Job, vi. 10). To the Persian period belongs the old Aramaic inscription found by Euting, which throws a light on the important culture of the place. It is mentioned by the old Arabian poets e.g. Īnara 'I-rās, Mūtakalbi, verse 76: "it (the rain storm) does not leave a palm-tree leaf nor a house unless it is buried in stone." Like other oases in North Arabia, it was settled by immigrant Jews or Jewish proselytes. Among them was Sawmawal [q.v.], the lord of the citadel of Abīlāk al-Fard, mentioned by Aḥṣā and other poets. The Jewish inhabitants were not inclined to be friendly to Muḥammad, but when they learned how their co-religionists in Wādī l-Kūrā had been treated, they voluntarily submitted and were thus allowed to retain their lands on payment of a yearly tribute; but they were expelled from the land, like the other Jews in Arabia, by ‘Omar. In the tenth century, Ibn Hawāk describes it as more thickly populated than Tāmūk. Muḥammad gives a more detailed picture of its situation in a well-watered wide depression with a spring, many wells, some of which have fallen in, fine gardens, and many palm trees with excellent dates; on the other hand he censures the avarice of the inhabitants and laments the lack of distinguished scholars from this town. In the next century al-Bakri refers to its wealth in dates, figs and grapes. The densely populated town had a wall, a parapet in length running along a brook. Of modern travellers
Eating gives a good description of the town with its narrow streets and houses surrounded by orchards. Of antiquities he found the ruins of temples and a quadrangular building with hills at the corners. Of the citadel of Ablâk, the ruins of which, according to Yâkil, were still visible in his time [see Ablâk], he could find no traces; Janssen and Savignac describe the same peculiar round tumuli, the sides of which in the form of stairs led up to a small square building. Taimâlah at the present day shows signs of decay everywhere.


TAIMALLAH b. THAILAB, an Arab tribe belonging to the branch of the Rabba b. Kâmir (tribe of the Adnan) and forming part of the great ethnical group of the Bakr b. Wail. Genealogy: Taimallâh b. Thâlab b. Ublâb b. Sa'b b. 'Alî b. Bakr b. Wail. There was also found in the form Taimallâh, which may be the correct name, for a Muslim (or Christian) alteration of the name Alât to that of Allah is not at all unlikely while the opposite is hardly conceivable. This tribe as usual with so many other tribes of Arabia formed an alliance (bif), with the sister tribe of the Banû Kaḥfa b. Thâlab, and each of them was closely associated with the Banû 'Idî and the Banû 'Anazâ. This confederation bore the name 'Alâtulâim (the word ulâim, according to the lexicographers signifies the mastoid bone and similar expressions are not unusual to indicate the solidity of an alliance); it was afterwards extended to the Banû Mâzîn b. Sa'b and even, it appears, to the two great Bakr subdivisions, the Banû Dhu'llah and the Banû Shâhîn. After Islam the Banû Hanîfâ, another Bakr tribe, also entered the alliance (al-Mubârrat, Kâmîl, ed. Wright, p. 276, sq.; Najât, ed. Bevan, p. 47, 19, 305, pp. 764, 9 and especially 725, 35; Wüstenfeld, misspelled probably by the statement in Ibn Kutaiba, K. al-Mu'târîf, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 48, thought that the name Alâtulâim referred only to the Taimallâh; cf. also Reiske, Primas Linear, p. 253 note 6, 255 note 4). The Taimallâh took part with their allies in the wars of the Bakr b. Wail against the Tamâmâ and we find them specially concerned with the battles of Zubâhâ, Nishâdî, Taßâhîl, Džâdînî, and al-Wâbkî (the last two falling within the Muslim period). It does not appear, however, that they distinguished themselves by any particular exploits or that they numbered among their leaders any person of note. In the latter expeditions the command was held by al-Hawâmî b. Sharîk and by Abdjâr b. Džîhrî, both of the Banû 'Idî. At a more remote period, the Taimallâh had fought with the rest of the Bakrîs against the Lakhmî tribes of al-'Izâ: they are mentioned in the stories of the Yâsin Ummâr.

The Taimallâh were Christians, like almost all the Bakr b. Wail (cf. Tabari, Ananeis, i. 2032 ult.) but they were early converted to Islam and we find them fighting in the wars of conquest and the civil wars; one of them for example, 'Umar b. Sa'b 'Ablâb, took part in the murder of the Caliph 'Uthmân (Nahâf, ed. Bevan, p. 918 sqq.). But it was mainly in the history of the eastern provinces that the Taimallâh played a part in the first two centuries of the Hijra: among the members of this tribe who have made a mark in history the best known is 'Abdallâh b. Zulfâr b. Wadî'â, who is also known as a poet (notice in Ibn Hâfiz, Zâba, Cairo, 1335, l. 82, quoted from the Tahtâbat al-Shâdi'î of Dâhîl and the Mu'jam al-Shâdi'î of al-Muqaddam; verses in Yâkil, Muqaddam, ed. Wüstenfeld, i. 850, with reference to two ancient statues at Palmyra) and was governor of Khorasan during the civil war of 65 A.H. He valiantly defended Herât against the troops of Mu'âsh b. al-Zubair, commanded by Abdallâh b. Kâlin and held out for a whole year, with the support of all the Bakr b. Wail of Khorasan, until he fell (Tabari, Annals, ii. 484–490; Balâdchuri, Fatâh, ed. de Goeje, p. 414–415). Another poet of the Taimallâh, 'Abdallâh b. Tawâsî' (who was the best poet of the Bakr in Khorasan) took part in the campaign of Kütâba b. Muslim, whom he had once satirized but finally joined. (Cf. Ibn Kutaiba, K. al-Shâdi'î, ed. de Goeje, p. 342 sqq.; Hamânî, ed. Freytag, p. 431 sqq.; Najât, ed. Bevan, p. 359 sqq., 364 sqq., 368; Tabari, Annals, ii. pârâsâ, ii. 201 sqq., ibid. etc.). There were several other tribes, especially in the south, called Taimallâh or Taimalâh: Ibn al-Kalbî mentions the following: T. b. Asad b. Wâharî; T. b. Za'hâb (b. murî b. al-Ghawthî b. Ta'îy); T. b. Hâzîl; . . . Mâdir b. al-Azîz; T. b. Râfît b. Thâawr b. Kâli; T. b. 'Amîr al-Adîdâr . . . Kâli; T. b. al-Nâmîr b. Kâsîr; T. b. Wadîm b. Wahbalâh . . . Kâli.


(G. LEVI DELLA VIDA)

TA'IZ, a tribe in early Arabia of Yamanite origin. According to the genealogists its ancestor, Dîjhumâ b. 'Udb, with the surname of Ta'îy, was a descendant of Ka'bîn and a brother of Maqadîbî and Murra, the ancestor of the large tribe of Kinda. Originally they were at home in that part of the South-Arabian Dîjî in which Huna'ka was situated, on the way between Sam'â and Mecca. Ta'îy, as well as Azd and other South-arabian tribes, joined the migration which tradition connects with the break of the dam of Ma'rib. They settled in the Northern part of the Peninsula, near the Shammar-mountain [q.v.] to the South of the desert Nefûd, Mounts Adâr and Salmûs, S. and S. E. of Hârî, were even called "the mountains of Ta'îy", which proves that for centuries the tribe had a claim on that territory. The Dîjîb b. 'Awîlî, about half way between Hârî and Ta'îy as well as Ta'îmî [q.v.] itself, belonged to Ta'îy.

Through the immigration of Ta'îy the Mę̇jar-tribe of the Banû Asad lost a part of its territory; nevertheless the two tribes fraternised in later times; it is related that they joined their forces and defeated the Banû 'Adîlî, who belonged to Tamîn at Râjîla al-Ta'î.

Sub-tribes or clans of Ta'îy were: Thâ'âl, Dju'djina, Dîzmar, 'Abd al-Ghawth, Ma'n, Nâbîn, as well as the three "Ta'îlîh Ta'îy", which by this denomi-
nation were distinguished from the Bakrite Tha'laba, viz. Tha'labah b. Dhuhl, b. Ramun, and b. Djelah.

In the time of the Dajihilla, Ta'iyy worshiped a God called Fili, who possessed a sanctuary on Mount Adja', which was destroyed, on Majammad's order, by 'Ali b. Abi Talib aided by 150 Am'ar; the expedition captured one of Hārim al-Ta'iyy's daughters. Another deity of Ta'iyy was Ruqā.

At least for some time Ta'iyy was on friendly terms with their relatives the Lakhmids of al-Hira, as may be concluded from the fact that the last Phylarch, al-No'man IV, had two wives belonging to Ta'iyy, viz. Fat'a bint Sa'd and Zainab bint Awa, both of them from the family Hāritah b. Lām. When, however, al-No'man fled before the Persian king and sought refuge with the Ta'iyyites, they refused him hospitality, probably, with a view to their friendly relations with the Persians, which apparently were not of an altogether ephemeral nature. For after al-No'man's death the Ta'iyyite Iyās b. Kābiyā was appointed as Regent in al-Hira (602-611); he commanded the Persian and Arab army against the Banū Bakr in the battle of Dhu Kār. Tabar and other authors call Iyās one of the 'Abd, because he was a Christian.

In 9 A.H. the Ta'iyyites sent an embassy to Mu'ammad, to which belonged Kābi b. Djal'al who, it is said, was the first to embrace Islam and is remembered as one of the Ṣā'ibah (cf. Uṣūl al-Ḳhāja, iv. 210).

The mihra of Ta'iyy is Tarīqah. It is especially the poet Ḥārim who became famous under the mihra al-Ta'iyy (his ḫīna was edited by Schultheiss); his proverbial liberality is the subject of numerous anecdotes and tales. Other Ta'iyyite poets were: 'Ariq al-Ta'iyy, Zakī al-Khail, Abū Aḥmad, a Christian, 'Amr b. Mīlīkāt, 'Amr b. Sā'īy b. Kūrwākh, and, after the rise of Islam, the Khāridh al-'Irīmīwār, whose ḫīna was edited by Krenkow (G. M. S., xxv., 1928). Lexicon and ḫīna have specimens of the dialect of Ta'iyy: Ḫaṣ and Ḫam for 'ādiyya and fāsiyya; Ṣā'īda for Ṣā'īda; Ṣā'īd for Ṣā'īd; Ṣājīt for Ṣājēt; 'Ṣā'īm for Ṣājēt.

In Syriac "Ta'iyīta" became a name for "Arabs" and Musulmānīn.


(H. H. Brā'u)

TA'IYY, an important town in South Arabia, formerly the capital of the emirate which was called Ta'ayziyya, according to the provincial law regarding the general administration of wilayets 'Ṭa'ayzīyya (March 15, 1913) included the Ḫudayj of 'Udah, Ibh, Maḳīla, Kama'īra, Ḫaṣ, Ḫadhoura, and, according to R. Manzoni, also Makhādir, Dhib Sufal, Mawīlah, i.e. the whole country between al-Hudayda and the independent lands northeast of 'Aden. The town, which lies in 44° 6′ 45″ East. Long. ('Greenw.) and 13° 36′ 55″ North Lat., at 4,500 feet above sea-level, is built on the northern slope of the Djebeel Sabr (in al-Hamāly: Sabir) and has 2,000 inhabitants. The Portuguese called the town Taiz, the Italians (Ladovec di Barthema and Andrea Corsatti) Taesa. It is surrounded by a wall 25-30 feet broad and 9-12 feet high which, like that of Sa'ā, is flanked by towers in which stand a farther 3-4 feet above the wall and is built of large sundried bricks and covered with an outer layer of baked tiles. The town wall forms an irregular quadrangle, which stretches from east to west. On the western side of this quadrangle is a polygonal spur of the hill in the south-eastern corner which rises a steep rock 450 feet high, on the top of which is the citadel al-Khāira, which is however now in a very ruinous state but was at one time regarded as a strong fortress. Corresponding to this in the north east angle of the wall is a sharp spur, the top of which is a steep mound. There are five gateways in the town wall; in the east the Bour al-Kabir leads out to the Maqāy—'Aden and Khāitsa—'Umar—Sa'ā'. Roads in the west the Bahr Shāhīh Mūsā opens up to the road to Makkah and Ḫaṣa. The Bour al-Emādāgher on the southwest is the gateway to the Ḫadjariyya and Bent 'Alwān, in the south the Bour 'Alī Dummā leads to the Djebeel Sabr and connects the hill with the fort of al-Khāira, and lastly in the south east we have the Bour al-Khulair, which is still surrounded by a wall, also leading to the Djebeel Sabr. These gates, which are not far from one another, are built in the Arabizm style and flanked by two towers which rise above the town-wall and are surmounted by a third which defends the entrance. The town is provided with excellent drinking-water by subterranean pipes from the Djebeel Sabr and has a large market. Since the troubles of the xth century it has had a very neglected appearance. The once beautiful houses of stone which, as a rule, have only one storey above ground are for the most part in ruins. Barely 20 are still standing and others have been replaced by wretched huts. The southern quarter of the city has suffered particularly and ruins are scattered all over it. A number of beautiful mosques still testify to the past glory of the capital of the Rasūls. One of these is the Ashrafiyya founded by the Rasūlīd al-Malik al-Aṣ̄īrī Tāmūl b. al-'Abbās (1377-1400 A.D.), a quadrilateral in plan with two minarets and two rows of pillars with 3 domes richly decorated with coloured or ornamentation; in the south of the mosque are the tombs of its founder and of his son 'Ali and of two slaves. Behind a grill of fireproofed wood lie the three marble sarcophagi which contain the remains of the seven wives of the founder of the mosque; opposite them is a sarcophagus of limestone and brick surrounded by carved woodwork in which lies another of his slaves. The large and splendid mosque of the al-Masafiyya lies on the slope of the Djebeel Sabr and is also a quadrilateral in shape with three rows of pillars and three great domes and two minarets. Its whitewashed walls make it stand out in striking fashion against the dark volcanic rocks of the hill. The front is pierced by a series of windows with grilles in the north and adorned with vaultings which are supported by slender pillars. The surface is decorated with scrolls and interlaces. The well-preserved building, which is still the principal mosque, was not unjustly compared with the St. Maria Rotunda in Rome by the Bolognese traveller Ludovico di Barthema, who visited the town in 1506. Other mosques are the well-preserved mosque of 'Abd al-Hāki and in the west overlooking the town wall the mosque of Shāhīh Mūsā, in the east the well-preserved and splendid mosque of Shāhīh Aṣ̄īrī and his family of the first period of the Turkish conquest, from which period also dates the Makkabiyya mosque in the south, the high
lying part of Ta'izz, which was built by an Abyssinian slave of Husain Pasha. It is a quadrangular building without a minaret, with a large court in the centre, in a peculiar mixture of Byzantine and Arabic style, richly ornamented with inscriptions, which are written on the doves of inlaid wood and on the walls and pillars. On the left side are large water-basins which were made for the ritual ablutions, but are now used for the hospital laundry. The mosque of Sharaf al-Din is destroyed except for the minaret; it was founded by the Imam Sharaf al-Din b. Imam Mu'tasim and like the Ashafa'ya stands in the high-laying southern part of Ta'izz.

The town is richly provided with gardens, fields and meadows. The most beautiful, in the centre of the town, belongs to Sulaiman Pasha and is called Birkat Husseinayn. In its midst stands a kiosk which contains a fine large room; before it is a large oval basin with a spring. In the garden also is the high zuhba (mausoleum) of Husain Pasha, who is buried there. The gardens are amply supplied with water by aqueducts from the Djabal Sahir. The same plants and trees are grown here as in San'a and Rawda except the nut-tree: the date-palm does not do very well. Bananas flourish exceedingly. The plain around Ta'izz is well tilled; the slopes of the Djabal Sahir north-east of Ta'izz are covered with little groves of tamarisk and carob trees, with many little hamlets near them. The Djabal Sahir itself is like a botanical garden, on the lower slopes of which grow almost all kinds of fruits, tamarinds, quinces, citrus, vines and on the higher slopes all kinds of aromatic plants in addition to the usual trees and shrubs. Cultivation is carried up to the highest points of the hill and barley and qhardal flourish especially. The true wealth of the country however lies in the extensive plantations of bat [q.v.] (cocos nucifera Forsk.), the aphrodisiac of which the people of Yemen are so fond. Glaser says the site of Ta'izz is exceedingly unhealthy and the climate malarial. Ta'izz has good caravan connections with Zabid, Yarim, Ibsh and San'a, as well as with Aden and under Turkish rule used to have a weekly postal connection with al-Hudaida. The railway planned in 1913 to connect al-Hudaida with San'a and the interior was intended to include a line al-Hudaida-Zabid-Ta'izz-Ibsh-Yarim-San'a but has never been constructed as a result of the Italo-Turkish war and the Great War.

Local tradition says that Ta'izz was founded in the pre-Muhammadan period. It connects the Djabal Darbat 'Ali N.E. of Ta'izz with the son-in-law of the Prophet, afterwards Caliph. The mountains which now has two peaks is said to have once been a solid mass. When 'Ali, engaged in the conquest and conversion of the Yemen, came to Ta'izz, its inhabitants showed themselves extremely hostile to him and the teaching of the Kur'an. 'Ali laid siege to the town and took up his quarters on the summit of the hill which bears his name. The siege dragged on on account of the stubborn resistance of the inhabitants; 'Ali's envoys to the heads of the town talked to deaf ears and only received abuse, indeed, one embassy was ill treated and beaten by the inhabitants. 'Ali was so enraged at this that he took his celebrated sword and struck the summit of the hill such a blow that he made the long deep cleft which is still to be seen. Although not a text was shaken in 'Ali's camp and no man was injured, the houses in Ta'izz were all overthrown and even the most solid collapsed. Ambassadors therefore came to 'Ali from Ta'izz who declared 'Ali a prophet and adopted Islam.

This story is of course quite unhistorical. The peculiar form of the hill has given rise to the legend. Several other places are also connected with 'Ali; for whom the people of Yemen have a particular fondness. For example, according to Glaser, on the Djabal al-Dinz (near Kubet on the road to Dhamar) on the roadside (probably at the highest point) 'Ali's footprint (rida? 'All) is shown on a rock and close beside it, but to the left of the road, is a rock which seems to have been perforated, called garhat 'All. Another legend is connected with the vicinity of Ta'izz, namely that of the Seven Sleepers, the scene of whose sleep Ibn al-Mudjätwar puts in a grotto of the Djabal Sahir. The South Arabian version of this legend says that the seven sons of a king were taken to king Dokiyan al-Juddar as hostages. When the king went to war, the hostages escaped and went into Mis' Hmaid (near Tha'bad) and did not disappear till they came out on the top of the Karyat al-Majši on the Djabal Sahir where they lived. Dokiyan sought them without being able to discover them. They lived there for 316 years and slept the whole time. They then awakened and it seemed to them as if only a single day had passed. They found some of the money that they had had with them and sent one of their number into the town to buy food. Wicked men seized him and found the money in his possession. They thought that he had found a hidden treasure and took him before the authorities; no one knew him in the place and as he had no home in the town he was thought to be mad and released. He returned to the cave and remains there still. Winds are now said to blow out of the cave.

Glaser visited the spot on November 20, 1887. The Mosque of the Seven Sleepers (Aṣbah al-Kaff) is a very fine one, has wonderful wooden columns and a very good roof. The sanctuary proper is in the north-west corner of the mosque and is a simple walled space in the shape of a prism, on the right side of which there is a hole which the Arabs call Maghara (cave). Glaser investigated it very closely without tracing a current of air or any considerable orifice. He thought it probable however that the rocks were not close together so that a slight current of air blows through them. Saiyida live near the Masjid. The place which Botta erroneously calls All al-Kaff was visited by him in 1837. At the foot of the Djabal Sahir near Ta'izz there was pointed out to him the entrance to the cave, from which the Seven Sleepers had made their way through the whole hill, it is not probable that Ta'izz was in existence in the pre-Muhammadan period. The capital of this area was Sawwā and later Djabal, neither of which is far from Ta'izz. According to the Arabic work of Hājjī Khalifa, Ta'izz was founded by the Ayyubid al-Malik al-Ahsha' Saif al-Islám Zahtar al-Abu T-Fawāris Tughtekt, who came to the Yemen in 578 (1182-1183). According to Glaser, Ta'izz was built for the most part out of the material of the adjoining little town of Tha'bad on the left bank of the Wadi Shla. Ta'izz, according to his investigations, was called 'Udaya 5-600 years ago, but only the foundations of the walls of this
date survive; the walls themselves are of recent erection. The village of 'Udaima lies 3–4 miles almost due east of Ta'izz on the slopes of the Djibal 'Sabr like Ta'izz itself. It is said to have been originally the residence of the kings until Isma'il Malik, a celebrated Samni saint, to whom many miracles are attributed, was patron of Ta'izz, built a mosque and his tomb on the mound of al-Kâhirah, where the citadel later arose and the town grew up, so that the latter also like Mukhâ, Bêt al-Fâqih, Lubiya etc. owes its origin to a saint.

On the other hand as a result of enquires made in 1887 by Kâtib Yahya in Ta'izz, Glaser says that Ta'izz is older than Ta'izz, which was only founded under the Rashidids or even later in the seventh century A.H. Ta'izz, he was told, existed under the name 'Udaima as early as 133 (750–751 A.D.) and the town used to be much larger. How far this is true cannot be definitely ascertained. Yahya (d. 1229) already describes Ta'izz as a large and famous Yemeni fortress and 'Udaima as a suburb of Ta'izz. Ibn al-Mujâwar (wrote about 670–1342) calls Ta'izz a strong fortress and residence of the kings of the country. Ibn Batuta, who visited Ta'izz in 1332 A.D., describes this residence of the Yemeni rulers as one of the finest and largest towns in the country and its inhabitants as arrogant, proud and uncultured. Of its three quarters one was inhabited by the ruler and his servants and Mamlik and nobles; the second called 'Udaima was occupied by the military and officers, the third by private citizens; in the last was the great bazaar called al-Muhallib. The town prospered exceedingly as the capital of the Rashidids. Five educational buildings were founded by them in Ta'izz; viz. two by al-Malik al-Manṣûr 'Umar (1239–1250 A.D.), a third by his successor al-Malik al-Fadl Muẓhikîd (called the Muẓhikhâliyya), a fourth by al-Malik al-Asghar Isamîl (1377–1400 A.D. the Ashgrafid) and a fifth by al-Malik al-Muṣayyad Dâwûd (1296–1321 A.D.) who left a library of 100,000 volumes and is buried in the madrasa. The fortress does not seem to have been very strongly built, for in 1529 A.D. a part of the castle collapsed and killed two people. In 1516 Ta'izz was taken by Husain al-Kurdi, the admiral and general of the Egyptian Manusik Sultan Kânsîn al-Ghûrî, in 1545 by the Turks and in 1557 it passed to the Imâms of Şan'â'. The French physician De la Grêlandière, who passed through Ta'izz in 1712 describes it as a famous old town with fine walls built by the Turks. The citadel had 30 cannons and was used as a state prison. Under the rule of the Imâms of Şan'â', who succeeded the Turks in 1635 the town had therefore recovered from all the blows it had suffered.

Later Ta'izz passed to the powerful tribe of Dhib Muhammad who held it till Ibrahim Pasha took it from them and it was under Egyptian rule from 1835 to 1840. When the Turks began to reconquer the Yemen in 1871 Ta'izz fell to them on October 28 and they were able to hold it till the great general rising of the Yemenis under the Imâm Aḥmad al-Din in 1892. The fortress was only temporarily rising: the Turks reconquered it in 1893 and held it till the conclusion of peace in 1918. With the withdrawal of the Turks from the Yemen, Ta'izz has again passed under the rule of the Imâms of Şan'â'.


TAKASH (Turkish pronunciation: Tekşâ) b. li-ARSLĀN, king of Khârizm [q.v.], 567–590 (1172–1200), of the fourth and most glorious dynasty of Khârizmshâhs [q.v.], was, before his accession, governor of Dârân on the lower course of the Sîr-Darya' [q.v.]; he had to fight for his throne with his younger brother Sultan Shah, and in the struggle at first Takash and then his brother received the support of the Kara Khatīb [q.v.].

When the fight was finally decided in favour of Takash, Sultan Shah succeeded with the help of the Kara Khatib in establishing himself in Mev, Sarakhs and Tabi and held this territory till his death in 589 (1193), being sometimes at peace and sometimes at war with his brother. The capital of Khorasân, Nischâpur, had already been taken by Takash in Rabî' I or Rabî' II 583 (1187), Takash's eldest son Malik Shah was governor there. After the death of Sultan Shah, Malik Shah was transferred to Mev and his brother Kuth al-Din Muhammad appointed his successor in Nishapur. Of greater importance was the destruction of Saljuk rule in Persia. 'Irak (Irâq, Adjâmî) the victory over Sultan Tughluq II in 590 (1194). This victory raised Takash from the status of a local dynast to a ruler of a great power and henceforth he called himself on his coins no longer Khârizmshah but Sultan-šâh, son of the Khârizmshah, Persian 'Irâq with al-Râfî and
Hamadhân passed into the possession of Takâsh, who appointed his son Yûnus governor of Hamadhân; later he handed over Hamadhân to the ruler of A-hashšîbân, Abî Bakr, as his vassal, who sent his brother and ultimate successor O sângh thinker. In 592 (1196) an army of the Caliph Nâṣir was defeated at Hamadhân; the Caliph had demanded that Takâsh should evacuate the conquered territory and retire to the east but Takâsh wanted not only to retain his conquests but to get Khâisticân also from the Caliph. Takâsh, like the Saljuqâs before him, including Taghhrî II, is said to have demanded that the Caliph should hand over to him the secular power in Bâghdâd itself and he content with a nominal sovereignty over the Muslim world. This dispute was not decided on this occasion, but was continued under Takâsh's successor, Muhammed.

We know still less about the fighting between Takâsh and the Kara Khitai. The most important event in these wars, the capture of Bûkhârâ by Takâsh, is placed by Ibn al-Athir (ed. Tornberg, ii. 362 sqq.) in the events of the year 594 (1198); there is however a document relating to it in the collection of state-papers made by Muhammed b. Mu'ayyad al-bâghdâdi of the years 576–579. In any case the access was not a transitory; and in spite of his possession of great power in the Muslim-world Takâsh remained a vassal of the Kara Khitai till his death.


**TAKBIR (a),** infinitive II. from the root k-b-r in the denominative sense; to pronounce the formula Allâh akbar. It is already used in this sense in the Qur'în (e. g. Sûra lixv. 3; xliii. 11) with Allâh (the object). On the different expositions of the elative akbar in this formula cf. Liânâm, s.v. and the Kur'ânic elative akrâm also applied to Allâh (Sûra xlviii. 3) and akrâ ('Sûra xii. 20; lixvii. 1).

The formula, as the briefest expression of the absolute superiority of the One God, is used in Muslim life in different circumstances, in which the idea of Allâh, his greatness and goodness is suggested. When Muhammed had learned by supernatural means of the death of Nâdîjî in Abyssinia, he proclaimed the news to those around him, arranged them in rows on the Musalla and had a takbir pronounced four times (Bûkhârî, Djâm'a, bâh. 4, 55, 61). On other occasions also Muhammed is said to have called the takbir four or five times over a funeral bier (Muslim, Dînâîa, trn. 72). The fourfold takbir remained or became usual at the salât for the dead (Shàkit, Khâb al-Tabaâ, ed. A. W. T. Juybûlî, p. 47 sqq.). The Addâsān (q.v.) is also opened with a fourfold takbir.

The Prophet is said to have uttered very frequently the takbir during the Idrâdî, at the beginning of (Aûmân b. Hâbal, Mu'mân, li. 144), during (Bûkhârî, Dînâîa, bâh. 132, 133; but not too loudly, op. cit., bâh. 131) and at the end of the journey (Ibn Hâbal, ii. 5), at the sight of the Ka'âba (Ibn Hâbal, ill. 320), at the Black Stone (Ibn Hâbal, i. 264), between Mina and 'Arafa (Bûkhârî, Hadîjî, bâh. 80), on Safâ and Marwa (Ibn Hâbal, ill. 320) etc.

The takbir is prescribed by the law at the beginning of the salât (the so-called takbirat al-âdâbî); during the salât it is five times repeated.

**Bibliography:** The Dictionaries, s. v. k-b-r; Th. W. Juybûlî, Handlising, p. 61, 65; A. J. Wensinck, A Handbook of Early Muslim Tradition, s. v. (A. J. Wensinck)

**TAKDRÎJ: **[See KADAR].

**TAKDRÎJ, **lit. "woodcutter", the name of an Anatolian sect with Shî'a tendencies. The Tâkdrîj, like the Čepni or Četni (cf. F. Babinger in Z. D. M. G., lxxvii (1922), 141 and F. Taeschner, ibid., p. 282 sqq.) are who are mentioned as early as the end of the xivth century, the Zeibeks (q.v.) and all the sub-sects comprised under the name Kızılbaş, form a separate element in the population of Anatolia, as regards ethnography and religious history, the origin of which has not yet been satisfactorily explained. As to the Tâkdrîj they are mainly found in Western Asia Minor; they settle in villages and engage in cattle-rearing, agriculture, wood-cutting etc. They seem to have got their name takdrîj from their activities as woodmen. The origin of the Tâkdrîj is obscure. While F. von Luschan in his Reisen in Lykien, Milyas und Köyvaris, Vienna 1889, ch. xii, thinks, mainly as a result of cranial measurements, that they are remnants of the original inhabitants of the country, G. Jacob has suggested (cf. Islam, ii. 232 sqq.) that the Tâkdrîj are the remnants of the brotherhood of the dâbûsî (cf. F. Cumont in Pauly-Wissowa s.v. Dâbûrî, also H. C. Maul, Die Vereine der Türki, Centenarii und Dâbûrî und des Römischen Reich, Frankfurt a.M. 1896, Program). These two views have little in their favour; the Tâkdrîj are rather Persian settlers from Persia at the end of the xivth century to western Anatolia, who were adherents of the Şafawî sect (q.v.). Of them we know that they were widely dispersed over Asia Minor even before the rise of Şâh Ismâ'îl (cf. F. Babinger, Scheich Bedr ed-Dîn, Leipzig and Berlin 1921, p. 91 sqq.). In favour of this view is the striking similarity in customs and practices of the Tâkdrîj and of the Şafawî in the time of Şâh Ismâ'îl. They are said to drink wine, eat pork and have ceremonies which recall baptism and communion. The women go, and have always gone unveiled, among them. Persians and Christians, but not Turks, are welcome guests among them and the Shî'a names 'Ałî and Ismâ'îl are especially popular among them; cf. W. Heffening, in Der Neu Orient, iv., Berlin 1919, p. 264 sqq. It is also noteworthy that the Tâkdrîj, according to the report of the Austro-Hungarian Consul of Adalia, Tibor v. Pöd (cf. Österr. Monatschrift für den Orient, xii., Vienna 1915, p. 506 and F. Babinger in Ist., xii. (1921), 103), lived outside the authority of the Turkish government, and "until quite lately were regarded as Persian subjects according to old tradition." All these indications suggest a former very close connection with the Şafawî kingdom. According to the same authority, the Tâkdrîj are specially numerous in the sandjak of Teke (around Adalia), spend the winter on the coast and in summer go with their
herds back to the mountains, where they dwell in tents and wretched huts and live by cattle-rearing.


FRANZ BARINGER

TAKI KASHI, TAKI AL-DIN MOHAMMAD B. SHARAF AL-DIN HUSAINI KASHI, a Persian biographer, a native of the town of Kashan, died in 1016 (1607). He wrote in 985 (1577-78) the Khüfus al-Asfar wa-Zadat al-Ashar, and wrote the preface to the Divan of Mahmudshah, who was a poet of the time of Shah Ismail I and of Tahmasp I.


TAKI AL-DIN. See al-Muzaffar.

TAKIYA (al), caution, fear (see Glossarium to Tahari, s.v. 64-4) or hilmun, disguise, is the technical term for dispensation from the requirements of religion under compulsion or threat of injury.

Muhammad himself avoided suffering in the cause of religion in dogmaticism by docetism (Sura iv. 156) and in everyday life by the khidra and by allowing in case of need the denial of the faith (Sura xvi. 108), friendship with unbelievers (iii. 27) and the eating of forbidden foods (vi. 119; v. 5). This point of view is general in Islam. But, as he at the same time asserted the proclamation of his mission to be a duty, and held up the heroic example of the old saints and prophets as a model (xxix. 7; v. 71; iii. 40 etc.), no definite general rule came to be laid down, not even with the separate sects. Minor questions, which are very fully discussed, are whether takiya is a simple permitted alleviation (makka) or a duty, whether it is valid in private interest or in that of the community.

The takiya was not rejected even by the extreme wing of the strict Kharijites [q.v.] although among the Azaqis in the related question of divine worship when danger threatens (zalit akhris), it is often given as an example that one should not be sterile even if his horse or his money be stolen from him during it. The advice is quite old: “God gave the believers freedom of movement (maasa’a) by the takiya; therefore conceal thyself!”

The principle adopted by the Ibadjud however was that “the takiya is a cloak for the believer: he has no religion who has no takiya” (Djamiayi; see Bibl., xiii. 127 sqq.).

Among the Sunnis authorities the question was not such a burning one. Nevertheless Tahari says on Sura vii. 108 (Tafsir, Badik 1323 sqq., xxv. 123): “If any one is compelled and professes unbelief with his tongue, while his heart contradicts him, to escape his enemies, no blame falls on him, because God takes his servants as their hearts believe”. The reason for this verse is unanimously said to have been the case of Ambarr b. Vais, whose conscience was set at rest by this revelation when he was worried about his forced worshipping of idols and obligation of the Prophet. It is more in the nature of theological speculation, when in this connection the question of khidra is minutely investigated, that in certain circumstances e.g. threat of death, a Muslim who cannot live openly professing his faith may have to migrate “as God’s earth is wide” Women, children, invalids and one who is tied by considerations for them, are permitted wamikaya (“consimulation”); but an independent individual is not justified in takiya nor bound to khidra, if the compulsion remains within endurable limits, as in the case of temporary imprisonment or flogging which does not result in death. The endeavour, however, to represent the takiya as only at most: permitted and not under all circumstances obligatory, as even some Sunnis endeavour to hold on the basis of Sura ii. 191, has resulted in the invention of adulatory traditions, e.g. ru’u’ul al-mudawwar “to be good friends with unbelievers is the beginning of actual unbelief”. To prove that such a fast is tawriyya, is a noble thing, the regally of the two Muslim prisoners of Musailim, one of whom allowed himself to be forced to acknowledge the anti-prophet, while the other died for the Prophet. The latter is reported to have said: “The dead man has departed in his righteousness and certainty of belief and has attained his glory, peace be with him! But God has given the other an alleviation, no punishment shall fall upon him”.

The takiya is of special significance for the Shi’ a. Indeed it is considered their distinguishing feature, not however always with justice, as Nāṣir al-Din Tusi in the Tafsir al-Muhaqiq against Kazi (see at the foot of his Muhaqiq Afshar al-Muqaddadin wa l-Mutla’ahhah, Cairo 1305, p. 182, on 1). The peculiar fate of the Shi’a, that of a suppressed minority with occasional open not always unheroic rebellions, gave them even more than the Kharijites occasions and examples for extreme takiya and its very opposite; every Shi’ a, usually masters in the art of disguising their creed, made the challenge to their leaders: “He who has 40 men at his disposal and does not seek his rights: is no Imam”. The Zaidis give for the number of helpers which removes the necessity of takiya from the Imam, that of: those who fought at Badr. It is a common polemical charge of the Sa’dis, quoted from the writings of the Shi’a themselves, that the latter, as followers of fighting martyrs, are not justified in takiya, while the Twelvers in particular, while representing the Imam as examples compelling one to resoluteness, appeal on the other hand to the conduct of Ali during the reign of the three first Caliphs and to the qablawiyah of the Mahdis as the typical takiya.

Belief is expressed by heart, tongue and hand; a theory of probabilities developed with considerable dialectic skill calculates under what real or expected injuries, “the permitting of what is pleasing to God and the forbearing of what is displeasing to God” is permitted. Observance with the heart is absolutely necessary. But if it is probable to any one (fawz ghaibah ‘ala sanihi) or if he is certain that an injury will befall him, his property or one of his co-religionists, then he is released from the obligation to intercede for the faith with hand or tongue.

In Shi’i biographies concealment is a regular feature; we are told that the hero broke the laws
of religion like the prohibition of wine under compulsion and not at all in an excusable way. Not since for them also Muhammad is the Prophet, and since at among the Semites a Prophet may not practice takiya in matters of his office, because otherwise one would not be certain of the revelation, we have, in view of the double exame of the Imams, in the code of mulsams for the ordinary pious men of faith, the following sayings of Allah in juxtaposition: "It is the mark of belief to prefer justice if it injures you, and injustice if it is of use to you"—and as an explanation of Surâ xix. 13: "He among you who is most honoured before God is the most fearful (of God)," that is to say, he who uses the takiya most (attakhmam = at-thurukam takiyam); and it is also said: "The ikhlas is our æthanal", but at the same time the æthanal chapters are to be read with the implied understanding that the fighting is primarily against other Muslims. It is also to be noted that the takiya of the Shâfi is not a voluntary ideal (cf. Khânâi, Rowûtul al-Djamâât, Teherân 1306, iv. 66 sq.), but one should avoid a martyrdom that seems unnecessary and useless and preserve oneself for the faith and one's co-religionists.

Latterly the takiya is based on the intention and so we continually find the appended name to the takiya in this connection. The validity of the profession of faith as an act of worship is not only settled by the correct formulation of the intention to do it, but this is the essence of it, so that it alone counts, if under compulsion a profession of unbelief is made with the lips or worship performed along with unbelievers, God's rights alone can be injured by the takiya. He has the power to punish the constrainer, and only in certain circumstances will a slight portion of the punishment fall upon the constrainer. The phrases used in this connection especially in oaths with mental reservations give however ample opportunities to injure one's fellow-creatures.

The moral dangers of takiya are considerable, but it may be compared with similar phenomena in other religions and even among mystics. The ethical question whether such forced lies are not still lies with a forced denial of the faith not still a denial, is put partly by the one "who conceals himself", and he is not in a state of confidence which would be broken by lies or denial.

this connection, and 'Abd Allah b. 'Umar who is also quoted in support of the opposite view, this opinion is only ascribed to 'Ali b. Sa'd b. 'Ubada, Ibrahim al-Nakah, 'Abd and Muhammad b. Sirin; the brief reference to "others" does not mean much. In Said b. al-Musayyib we have the essential alienation but still retains a main feature of the ishram, that one thing only, sexual intercourse, is forbidden on the Friday night. A further proof of the close connection between ishram and taqlid is the view reported of Sa' id al-Thawri, Ahmad b. Hanbal, Ishak, and others, that the pilgrim to Mecca becomes muhrim by putting on the taqlid alone, and the allied view that the taqlid put on by a pilgrim binds him to adopt the ishram; Malik b. Anas says that it is at least undesirable for the Mecca pilgrim to separate the taqlid from the assumption of the ishram. The Fikh regards the hanging on of a fitrada (two sandals, one sandal or a piece of leather) as desirable (mustahabb) in the case of camels or cattle or according to the Shafi'i, Hanbalis and Ahmad b. Thawri and Dawr, in the case of smaller beasts also; of the Hanafis and Malikis who do not allow it, the Malikis entirely refuse to allow small animals to be used for sacrifices (hady). After the animal is slaughtered the fitrada is dipped in its blood. When the pilgrims no longer brought the sacrificial animals with them from home and the market for them was instituted in Minah, the taqlid fell with oblivion.

In conclusion, we may note that a leather neck band, also called fitrada, on the camel to avert the evil eye, especially if a bell hang from it, is suggested in one tradition.

**Bibliography:** Lane, Arab.-Engl. Lexicon, s.v.; for the traditions: Wensinck, Handbucb, s.v. Victims; Malik b. Anas, al-Muwatta' in both recensions; al-Zuhali, Kommentar zum al-Muwatta' and al-Tahawi, Sharh Ma'ani al-Attar, lithogr. 1300, l. 439; the Fikh works; Guénon, Le Pilier Inverse de la Meccé, p. 279–285 (a very thorough treatment of the custom in paganism and Islam, although differing in minor points from the sketch given above).

2. **Taqlid** also means installation in a military office, which was done by girding on a sword; it then comes to mean investiture with any administrative office, including that of kaffi.

**Bibliography:** Lane, Arab.-Engl. Lexicon, s.v.; Sprenger, Dictionary of the Technical Terms (bibliotheca indica), p. 1178.

3. **Taqlid** lastly means "clothing with authority" in all matters of religion; the adoption of the utterances or actions of another as authoritative with faith in their correctness without investigating reasons (the derivation of the technical use from fitrada is wrong). In this sense taqlid is the opposite of ishrab ['q.v.]. The historical beginnings of the taqlid coincide with the formation of the juristic Ma'dhab (cf. Ma'dhab), which in part at least arose through adhesion to particularly notable jurists. Al-Shafi'i in his Rihala, 8, 18, uses the word in a sense very close to the later technical use, but al-Tahawi still uses it of the recognition of traditions or their use for the deduction of precepts of Fikh. When definite conceptions had been formed for recognising the ma'dhab i.e. the person qualified for independent derivation of Fikh rules from the sources, and at the same time the conviction of the cessation of unlimited ma'dhab from the third century on, and of the other kinds of ma'dhab correspondingly later, all later scholars or laymen were at once bound to acknowledge taqlid as regards earlier authorities. According to the general orthodox Muslim view, everyone is now and has been for centuries bound to what has been authoritatively laid down by the preceding, no one may any longer consider himself qualified to give a verdict of his own in the field of Fikh, independent of that of the earlier ma'dhab. All later persons are called ma'dhadil i.e. those who have to exercise taqlid. This obligation to taqlid is defended by saying that the ma'dhad only in the early centuries of Islam had possessed the real perspicacity and sufficient learning to deduce Fikh from sources and to form an opinion of their own about it, while this was quite beyond the powers of later generations, a view which is only a part of certain aspects of the history of the philosophy in orthodox Islam.

The taqlid has contributed to maintain the differences between the separate ma'dhab but is not to be held responsible for the deadening of the stimulus to the development of Fikh in later times.

While it is the unanimous view that the layman as well as the scholar is bound to taqlid, it is occasionally demanded of the scholar that he should be aware of the correctness of the ishrab of his ma'dhab. If there are several ma'dhad, as is actually the case, the ma'dhad may follow any one of these he pleases (presuming of course that he remains within the bounds of the 113oth i.e. does not choose a ma'dhad whose teachings are no longer recognised by the 113oth; the obligation to taqlid is also based on the 113oth); according to Ahmad b. Hanbal and Ibn Shuraidh, it has to decide to whom the preference is to be given and to follow him (this divergence of opinion is really confined to terminology). In theory the ma'dhad can make a new choice of a ma'dhad with each question that arises for him, but in practice he usually joins once and for all the ma'dhab of one of the three recognised ma'dhad. There are a fair number of cases of tradition from one ma'dhab to another (cf. Goldscheider, Verlesungen über den Islam, p. 235; 2nd ed., p. 48–50; opinions are divided as to whether such a transfer is admissible in theory (cf. Jouyeb, Handwörterb. 3rd ed., p. 22). It very often happens that on a particular question the more convenient rules of another ma'dhab are followed; the Fikh books themselves occasionally hint at the possibility of taqlid, but in such a case it is demanded that the business should be carried through to its conclusion, in keeping with the laws of the particular ma'dhab once it has been chosen.

This all holds of taqlid in questions of Fikh; with regard to the taqlid, the fundamental questions of dogma, e.g. the existence of Allah, besides the opinion that taqlid is obligatory or that it is admissible, we also have the view that it is inadmissible, as on these questions knowledge is demanded which cannot be obtained by taqlid alone. It was the school of the Ash'ari which gave this originally Mu'tazili view wide dissemination in Islam (cf. Goldscheider, Verlesungen, p. 123 and 136, note 10; 2nd edition, p. 121 sq. and 327, note 72).

The principle of taqlid in law has not been enforced in orthodox Islam without opposition; even
in later generations there have been scholars who held that there must always be a muhāfīṣ, like Ibn Ṭabīb al-Id (d. 702 = 1302) or al-Suyūṭī (d. 911 = 1505) or some who were inclined to claim for themselves unlimited qaḍāʾiḥ, like al-Dhahawi (d. 478 = 1085) and the already mentioned al-Suyūṭī, and even some who held that taḥlīf was obligatory for later scholars and condemned the system of taḥlīf, like Dāwūd b. ʿAlī, Ibn Ḥanbal and other authorities of the Ṣŷriṭ, and some Ḥanbalis like Ibn Ṭanūmah and Ibn ʿAbī al-Dawār mentioned taḥlīf of the Ḥanbalis, bring with their followers Ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb rejected taḥlīf (cf. the Ḥanbalis-Wahhābī works and propagandist pamphlets printed at the Masār press in Cairo and al-Shawkānī’s brochure entitled al-ṣawād al-muṣūd fī ʿAllāh ʿal-ṣawādīḥ wa ḍalīl al-ṣawādīḥ wa ʿAllāh ʿal-ṣawādīḥ, which deals particularly with the Ḥanbalīs-Ḥanbalīs question). Like the Ḥanbalis, their extreme opposites, the modernists in Islam, for whom the Ḥanbalis, it is true, paved the way, reject taḥlīf and demand and exercise a new qaḍāʾiḥ which in its lack of restrictions far surpasses even the most liberal of the later period of legal development (cf. Hartmann, Die Kritik des Islam, and the writings of the different modernist schools, some of the most important of which are quoted in the article ʿal-Ṭalib). For reasons similar to those of the Ḥanbalī-Wahhābī the Ḥabīb also rejected taḥlīf. Lastly the Shīʿīs reject the orthodox doctrine of taḥlīf, according to the Twelver, during the period when the Ḥanbalīs and ʿal-Ṭalibīs, when the Ḥanbalīs and ʿal-Ṭalibīs have to guide the faithful as his agents; as these have thus living teachers always in view in religious matters, taḥlīf towards a dead man is forbidden (cf. C. Frank, in Ḥanbalīs, ii. 177 sqq.).

Bibliography: in addition to the works quoted above: Lane, Arab.-Eng. Lexicon, s. v. and Spranger, Dictionary of the Technical Terms (Bibliotheca Indica), p. 1178 (not wholly reliable); on the terminology, the Uṣūl-works; Juynholl, Handtiriding, 3rd ed., p. 33 sgg. and note 13; Snouck Hurgronje, Verspreide Geschriften, ii., passim.

(T. SCHACHT

TAKILIF is imposing a requisition or constraint upon any one; it requires an action in which there is difficulty and trouble (Lane, Suppl., p. 3002 sqq.; Lizān, s. 218: amur bi-ni-yaḥfaṣal-ʿalābiḥā). The verb is used in several forms seven times in the Korān (ii. 235, 286; iv. 86; vi. 153; vii. 40; xxiii. 64; lv. 7) to express that Allah does not require of any one what is beyond his capacity (umūr). Technically it means the necessity which lies of the creatures of Allah and act as He has revealed to them. It is therefore defined legally by the majority of canonists as the requiring (ṣāliḥ) of an action in which is difficulty and trouble. On this definition, it applies only to things necessarily required and to things forbidden (al-muḥallaf, al-ṣāḥibīm). Some canonists define it as an assertion of a belief that the action is one of the legal rulings (al-ṣāḥib al-ṣāḥibīa). On this definition, takilif applies only to the recommended (al-muṣūd), the disliked (al-makrūḥ) and the permitted (muḥallaf). Further, there is dispute as to who is muḥallaf, i.e. under this divine requirement. It is accepted that every sane, human adult (ṭabīt, inst., hāṣṣ) is thus muḥallaf (Juynholl, Hanbalīs, p. 69). But the qiyas are also under this taḥlīf so far as

the prophetship of Muhammad is concerned; he was sent to the qiyas and the other prophets were not. Similarly of the angels, although this applies only to their acts of obedience, as faith (imān) exists of necessity (ṣarūrī) in them. Yet some assert that as their created nature is obedience, the prophetic mission of Muhammad to them was only to glorify them (la-hamātibīm; cf. al-Baidūrī on the Ḥayyān of al-Ṭaḥāwī, ed. Cairo 1315, p. 73). Some further extend this taḥlīf of the prophetically mission of Muhammad even to inanimate things (al-qāmūdūḥ), on the ground that in some of the miracles (muḥāfīs) of Muhammad reason was created in some inanimate things to the point that these believed in him. Another matter of controversy as to taḥlīf is the allowability of Allah’s requiring of a creature that which the creature has no power to do (taḥlīf wa lā nīṣāʿ). The Muʿazzārites asserted, in the language of the Korān as above, that the creature is not required to do what is not in his capacity (bāʾīd fi manākib; ʿAqīd of al-Nasafi, ed. Cairo 1321 with commentary of al-Tar PORTA, p. 103). Al-Idāja in his Mawād (ed. Baltīsh 1366, p. 535 (middle, 537 middle), as an Aṣḥarite, brings the question back under the general ruling that Allah’s will and action cannot be limited in any way; nothing is incumbent upon him and nothing is evil that proceeds from him. It is a general agreement of the Muslim people (al-Ummma) that Allah does not do an evil thing (ḥabīb) and does not leave undone a necessary thing (nūḥīb). He adds that the Aṣḥarites put it that the ḥabīb and the nūḥīb have no relationship to Allah at all, while the Muʿazzārites hold that what would be ḥabīb from Him does not do and what is incumbent on Him does. See, further, in the passages cited above, long scholastic discussions of these points by al-Tar PORTA and al-Idāja.

Bibliography: Add to passages cited above the general discussion in Dictionary of technical terms, under “Taḥlīf”, p. 1295.

(T. B. MACDONALD)

TAKORONNA, a name given in Muslim Spain to the mountain massif of the south of Andalusia, now called Sierra de Ronda. This is undoubtedly a double of the Berber word which is frequently found in North African names, tākrūna. Different writers have given different vocalisations of Tākoronna: they may be found collected with references in a valuable note by W. Marçais and Abderrahmān Guiga, Textes arabes de Tākoronna (in Tunisia), i., Paris 1925, p. viii, note 2. Cf. also Yākūt, Muḥammad, s. v. Sīlaṣ; Ibn Bashkuwīl, al-Ṣūla, ed. Cordova, B. A. H., p. 185 and 302; Ibn Ṭabīb al-Munšī, al-Ḥayyān al-maṣūf, s. v. — Dooy after thinking of explaining this name by a combination of the Berber prefix tā- and the Latin corona, wisely abandoned this etymology, which could hardly be defended (Hist. des Mus. d’Esp., i., p. 343; note 2, and iv., p. 339; cf. also Rochehurt, ii. 43, note 1). In any case, according to the same authorities none of the proposed etymologies is satisfactory.

The capital of the district of Tākoronna, later the capital of the little independent kingdom of the Banū Ṣarūf till its annexation to the kingdom of Seville, was Rondā; cf. the article RONDO for a resume of the history of the region during the Muslim occupation.

(É. LEVI-PROVENÇAL)
TAKRIT (popular pronunciation: TAKRÜT; cf. Yabıktı), a town on the right bank of the Tigris to the north of Sámara (according to Streek the distance is a day's journey) and at the foot of the range of the Dašal Hamra. Geographically this is the northern frontier district of the Frāk. The land is still somewhat undulating; the old town was built on a group of hills, on one of which beside the river, stands the modern town. To the north is a sandstone cliff 200 feet above the level of the river, on which still stand the ruins of the old citadel. The traces of the old town stretch to the west of these two hills in a large circle, which shows that Takrit was once of considerable extent.

It has been suggested that the name may be recognised in a tablet of the time of Nebuchadnezzar (Strassmeyer, quoted by Streek, ii., p. 87), but the first certain name is that of Ptolemy (v. 18, 19) who calls it Birtha (Yabıktı, l. 361, in giving the latitude and longitude also refers to Ptolemy). Ammianus Marcellinus calls it Virtha. Indeed the hill of the citadel is still known as Barī Şa. In Syriac literature the town is called Teghrith. From the fourth century it was a see of a Jacobite bishop until, in 1553, the diocese was combined with that of al-Mawṣil (Assemanii, Bibliotheca Orientalis, i. 174, 465). The Arab writers attribute its foundation to the Sasanian king Sibtı, son of Ardašir; the town is said to have been called after a Christian woman named Takritt bint Wāli; several legends are connected with its foundation (Yabıktı, loc. cit.; Abu 'l-Fida', Taṣawwur al-Bulāḏūn, ii. 288). Before Islam the town was temporarily occupied by the Arab Christian tribe of the Iyād (al-Bakri, Māḏīma, i. 46); they were driven from it, but the Iyād remained for a long time afterwards in the neighbourhood (Hamdānī, Qāṣīrat al-'Arab, p. 180) and in the period of the conquest the soldiers of the Iyād in the garrison of Takrit secretly assisted the Arabs [cf. Yânā]. The first Muslim capture of the town seems to have been affected in the year 16 by 'Abd Allāh b. al-Mā'tam who was sent out by Sa'd b. Abī Waqqās. Then in 20 AH, the town again surrendered by agreement; tradition ascribes this second occupation to 'Abd al-Nasir b. Dāisam or to his deputy 'Ukbā b. Furqād or to Mas'ūd b. Hūraith b. al-Abdljar. The last named was the first governor and built the dūm9 mosque there (Yabıktı, loc. cit.; al-Baladhuri, p. 248—249).

Down to the middle of the tenth century, the Arab geographers reckoned Takrit as belonging administratively to al-Dżasira (Ibn Khordāḏbeh, p. 93; Ibn Rastu, p. 105; Ibn al-Faqīh, p. 129; Kudāsim, p. 245, 250; 'Abd Allāh, p. 72, 77; Ibn Hāwkal, p. 157; Mā'addī, Kītāb al-Tūḥāt, p. 36), but from the time of al-Makātib (p. 54, 115) the town is more often regarded as belonging to the Istālī (excepting by Idrīsī and Dimashq). In the early centuries of Islam the town was almost exclusively Christian. Ibn Hāwkal and Mas'ūdī (ep. cit., p. 155) mention the al-Khāḍra church there, and there is still a ruin of this name in the south of the town. There were also other Christian buildings (like the monastery of Sa'āba on the opposite bank [Yabıktı, ii. 673] and the Dair Mār Yahanū, Yabıktı, l. 701). The name of the great Muslim sanctuary al-Arba'ın, a quarter of an hour west of the old town, seems to indicate that it was formerly the site of a Christian building. Two vaulted chambers decorated with stucco are still standing; the building goes back to the ninth century. Takrit was celebrated for its manufactures of wooden goods (Makdīs). In the xilth and xiiith centuries it is described as a large town ( Ibn Dżasira, p. 253; Ibn Bağtūs, ii. 133); Ḥamīd Allāh Mustawārī says it is a town of average size. İdrīsī (trans. Jaubert, ii. 147) mentions the al-Daḥlī canal which ran from the Tigris near Takrit and was supposed to go to Baghdaḍ; this is probably identical with the Ḥamīd Allāh Mustawārī, Dāhli, 1, 265 (1945). Traces of this canal, which according to 'Abbāsīd Čeblī was cleaned out by Murtadā Pasha in 1554 (quoted by von Hammer, Wiener Jahrbiicher, 1821, viii. 335), are still visible.

Takrit never played an important part in history. In the eleventh century it belonged to almost independent lords until the Sa'dlād Thaqftāl Beg took advantage of the death of its lord to seize it (Ibn al-Aḥṣī, 148). From 1149 the town was part of the territory of the Bagdadīs and in 1190 it passed to 'Abbasīd Caliphate. It was the birth-place of Sa'dān, whose father Nāṣīn al-Dīn Ayābī had been appointed commander of the town under the Sa'dlād. When the conqueror Tūmī took it, it was in the possession of Arab feudals (Šārāf al-Dīn, transl. Petit de la Croix, lii. 141—154). In the following centuries it remained a small place; Christians are mentioned in it for the last time by Tavernier (Voyages, ii. 87). Under Turkish rule, Takrit was a wāqf in the ayāt of Kāfka (Dāhli, 148), but after the reforms of the twentieth century it was reduced to a nāḥiya of the bāb of Sámara in the wāqf of Bagdadā. In the xiiiith century the population was probably never more than 4,000—5,000 souls. All travellers have been poorly impressed by it; the majority of the inhabitants of the present day make their living by navigating kelseks, which change crews there. From the archaeological point of view Takrit seems to be promising. Herzel found there pottery of an interesting type belonging to the Sasanian period and to the early centuries of Islam.


(J. H. Kramer)

TAKRŪR, Tacnōl (French Toucolone), is the name given to the population of negro stock which inhabits the greater part of the lowlands of Senegalese Futa and the larger part of Bundo. The inhabitants of these countries lying on either side of the river Senegal but more on the left bank, includes from west to east the provinces of Dimbār, Tōrō, Lōn, Virāble or Irīsile, Bōsēya, Ngânē or Pōna, and Damgā. Bundo lies west of the lower Famene. Tacnōl colonies are also found in different parts of West Africa, especially at Kayes (on the upper Senegal), at Nyōro (in Sudanese Sahel), at Sēgū (on
the Niger), at Pandjagara (eastern M-us Lam), at Dingirai (east of Futa Djallon); these colonies were founded in the middle of the xixth century by natives of Senegalese Futa who had followed the fortunes of the conqueror al-Hādzī j Umar. They are also found between the Niger and Chad, particularly at Sokoto (q.v.); these last are descended from other natives of Senegalese Futa who had accompanied Uthman Fodjo on the conquest of the Hausa country at the beginning of the xixth century.

The word "Tuculor" is a slight corruption of the pronunciation among the Wolof of the Lower Congo of the name of the people in question. Among them the word assumes the form Tokoror or Tokoler. We find it in the narratives of the early travellers and on old maps with the spelling " Toucourol" or "Toucourogne." The Arabs wrote it Takur and have made the ethnic Takurif plural. Takur, which is applied by the Moors of the right bank of the Senegal to the Tuculors. It seems that at one time Tokoror or Takur was the name of a town near the river Senegal, as well as the name of the kingdom of which it was capital, which corresponded practically to Senegalese Futa and lastly it was the name of the people of this kingdom. There is still a place called by this name (Tokoror) not far from Gede in the Turo or district of Podor near the arm of the Senegal which is called the "marjot de Don"; this corresponds to the position assigned by al-Bakri, Idrisid and other Arab geographers of the middle ages to the town of Takur. In time Arab writers and following them the Sudanese chroniclers who wrote in Arabic extended the application of the word Takur to the whole of the Muslim Sudan, from the Atlantic up to (but not including) the valley of the Nile and have made Takur a synonym of Sudanese. This is why the European allies have for long borne south of the Sahara, the inscription "Tekur or Sudan." But this extension of the name is not in keeping with the facts, and Takur or Tokoror strictly means the true home of the Tuculors, i.e. Senegalese Futa.

There is not absolute certainty about the origin of the present Tuculors, who seem to form a very mixed population. They are probably in part the descendants of the old autochthons of Senegalese Futa, who are probably of the same stock as the Wolof and the Serer; in part the descendants of the old negro autochthons of modern Mauritania and the Hodh (Hawd) who must have been of the same stock and migrated southwards when the southern Sahara began to dry up; partly the descendants of the Sarakkol (or Soninke) and of the Mandingo (or Malinke) who came at a remote epoch and settled round the commercial centres of the Senegal, Tukur, and partly, descendants of negro serfs called Rammel, belonging to the Fula of Ternes (in the N.E. of Nyoor) who came with their masters to Senegalese Futa before the xith century; these Fula remained shepherds and settled in the highlands, while their negro serfs devoted themselves to agriculture in the valley of the river.

Whatever may be the origin of the Tuculor, they cannot, as has been said, be regarded as Fula half-breeds. Of course such half-breeds are found among them but as a whole the Tuculors are Negroes of pure stock. The only thing they have in common with the Fula is the language which is clearly a negro idiom related to the Wolof and very closely to the Sereer, probably borrowed by the Fula from the old negro autochthons of Ternes and the adjoining districts. The Tuculors give to the Fula dialect which they speak the name of Fular, and sometimes describe themselves as Hinfuleri, i.e. those who speak Fular. The Fula has certainly been the mother-tongue of the Tuculors for a long time, although we cannot tell whether they already spoke it before the arrival of the Fula in Senegalese Futa. In any case we know from a reference in al-Bakri that in the xith century the hippopotamus was known by its Fula name (nyala) to the people on the banks of the Senegal in the country of Futa.

The Tuculors are in general agriculturists, but they have a natural fondness for fighting. In the xviith century, they successfully resisted the domination of the Fula in Senegalese Futa, who from 1559 to 1775 exercised supremacy there under the leadership of the satagi or saligi or siliagi (the "Siratiques" of the early travellers) belonging to the Fula dynasty of Demianke. At the later period they for long resisted the French conquest. They played a considerable part in Uthman Fodjo's conquests in the Hausa country in 1500 and in those of al-Hādzī j Umar in the Mandingo country, the Bambara lands and the Mâsina, from 1845 to 1864, furnishing these conquerors, both natives of Tero, with their best officers and finest troops. Since then they have enlisted in large numbers in the Senegal tirailleurs and have contributed to the black army of France a very large number of soldiers of great bravery and N. C. O.'s of a high order.

They include within their ranks professional castes which are perhaps of a different origin from the rest of the population, but are now at any rate completely incorporated with the rest and speak the same language. Such are for example the S Oral (sg. Tyuballe) fishermen and sailors, the Lawhe (sg. Labbe) joiners and basket-makers, the Bürnëhe (sg. Burnaye) potters, the Wulabbe (sg. Walebe) smiths, the Wulabbe (sg. Gollbe) shoemakers, the Mâbhe (sg. Mabbe) weavers, the Wasmâbe (sg. Bambady) musicians, the Wulabbe (sg. Gwele) herdsmen or troubadours, the Wulabbe (sg. Gore) and the Dûwâwâne (sg. Dywâwâne) curriers etc.

The Tuculors are all Mahommedans and are among the earliest peoples of the Sudan to be converted to Islam. This religion penetrated to Senegalese Futa towards the end of the first half of the xixth century, at the beginning of the Almoravid movement and under its influence. Al-Bakri says that the first ruler of this region to embrace Islam and spread it around him was a certain Wîr-Dyîbî or Wîr-Dyîbî or a third form Wîr-Ndyî (the variants in the manuscripts give these different forms), who died in 1041-1042 A. D.; his son Lebbi in 1056 supplied a contingent to the Almoravid leader Vahyâb. Umar, of the Berber tribe of Lamtuna, in his war with the Berber tribe of the Godda. Local tradition on the other hand gives the name of the first to spread Islam in Senegalese Futa as Âbî Dardî, who is sometimes confused with Nyozyam-Ndyî, the missionary of Djolof. In any case the Tuculors have never ceased to profess Islam since their conversion. In the period of domination of the pagan Fula, religious was added to nationalist
sentiment to stimulate the Tuclors to cast off the yoke of the Denunke kings. Tuclor was synonymous with Muslim as Fula was with pagan.

It was the Tördë section (sg. Tördë) among the Tuclors that always showed itself the most devoted and ardent Muslims. Sulimán Bili, who succeeded in casting off the suzerainty of the Fula kings, and in establishing in Senegalese Futa in 1775–1776 shortly before his death, a Tuclor theocratic monarchy, belonged to this section. 'Ujman Fọdjo and al-Hājjī Umar were also Tördëbe.

Politically Takrur or Senegalese Futa has successively consisted of: 1, a series of provinces more or less independent of one another (before the ninth century of our era); 2, a kind of kingdom ruled by princes who came from Fodh (Hawd), via Tagant and were known as Dyåxingo (15th century); 3, a more or less direct dependency of the Sarakolle kingdom of Dyån (Sëbel) under the government of Tucular princes or Sarakolle governors (8th–11th centuries; this is the period of the Fula immigrations from Termes and the conversion of the Tuclors to Islam); 4, a dependency of the same Sarakolle kingdom, which was now in turn a vassal of the Mali or Mandingo empire (12th–17th centuries); 5, still a dependency of this same kingdom, but the latter was now under the suzerainty of the empire of Gao or of the Songoi (beginning of the 18th century to 1558); 6, an independent kingdom ruled by the Fula dynasty of Denenke who were pagans, i.e. Koli Tengella and his successors (1559–1775); 7, an independent theocratic Muslim federation, the power being in the hands of Tuclors (1776–1858); 8, a series of Tuclor principalities characterized from one another and gradually coming under French protectorate (1858–1890); 9, a series of provinces annexed to the colony of Senegal (1890 onwards).

The theocratic Tuclor state of Senegalese Futa, founded in 1776, was ruled by a chief of a religious character, called almámi (from the Arabic al-imām), elected by the notables and frequently destined by them to a very brief reign. The first almámi of Futa was Abd al-Kādir (1776–1805). He had 33 successors, some of whom had several reigns, like Yüşufu who had nine. The almámi Muhammad Bīrën, elected for the first time in July 1841 signed a treaty of friendship with France on Oct. 7 of the same year. In the reign of Sibawalhi (1844–1856) a fort was built at Podor in Töro by the governor of Senegal, Faidherbe, who now set himself the task of leading the separate provinces of Tuca to leave the confederation and acknowledge French suzerainty. Under the almámi Maqţafi (1858–1859), the French protectorate was accepted by the Dimár, who became independent of Futa. In 1859 the almámi Muhammad Bīrën, who was then reigning for the fifth time, abandoned his rights over Töro and Damga, which were next year placed under French protectorate and the confederation of Futa now comprised only the Lào, Virllabh, Bösey and Ngéné. On Oct. 24 1877, the almámi Muhammad Abجام ceded to France the provinces of Lào and Virllabh and finally in 1884, the governor Brèìre de l'Ise obtained from the almámi Sïre Bàbu Lîh, the recognition of French suzerainty over what remained of the Futa federation: the Bösey, and Ngéné. This was the last almámi. He died in 1890 and on his death the seven provinces which had composed the Tuclor state of Senegalese Futa were annexed to the French colony of Senegal.

The Tuclors of Bundu had formed in their country a similar state, which made an alliance with France in the middle of the sixteenth century. The almámi Bùhaksar Sa'àda who was then reigning in Bundu vigorously supported the governor Faidherbe in his struggle against al-Hājjī Umar especially in 1857 and 1859.

It was in 1861 that a Tuclor, a native of Töro, 'Ujman, son of a certain Muhammad called Fodjjo, i.e. the "learned", having raised an army among his contemporaries of Senegalese Futa and strengthening it with soldiers recruited in Mâxîna, Liptiko and Songoi, taking as an excuse the exactions of the king of the province of which the shepherds of Gōber had complained, preached a holy war against the Hausa, seized Tesêwa, capital of Gōber, then Sokoto, Katsêma, Zinder, Kânsa, Zaria and other Hausa towns and founded between the Niger and Chad an empire the capital of which he made at Warra, near Sokoto, and whose boundaries he extended to Nupè in the northwest and Adamawa in the southeast. He even invaded Bornu but was driven out again by the celebrated Kânsa, in 1810. He died in 1815 as a result of a kind of fit of mystic mania. His brother 'Abbûllâh assumed the government of the western part of the empire with Gando as capital, and his son Muhammad Bello, that of the central part, called the kingdom of Sokoto; as to Adamawa, it became practically independent. Muhammad Bello, who reigned from 1815 to 1837, had to fight against the greater part of his subjects who rebelled against Tuclor domination and returned to paganism; he had also to fight against Bornu. He was a notable scholar and wrote in Arabic a number of historical and religious works. In 1828 he received with consideration the explorer Clapperton. He was succeeded by his brother 'Abjîko (1837–1843) who distinguished himself by his rigid puritanism and forbade dancing and music in his kingdom. 'Alt (1843–1852) who received Barth was the son of Muhammad Bello; he allowed the royal power to slip from his hands into those of the governors of the various provinces, and the five last Tuclor kings of Sokoto never succeeded in recovering it: Abjam (1852–1866); 'Alîyyun Karami (1866–1867), Abjam, second of the name (1867–1872), Abülakari (1872–1877) and Moyûs (1877–1904). The last named offered no resistance to the British troops under Sir Frederick Lugard who occupied Sokoto in 1904 and put an end to Tuclor rule in the Hausa country by re-establishing the authority of the native princes.

The al-Hājjī Umar empire of the sixteenth century founded by al-Hājjī Umar had a short duration. Born at Alwâr in Töro about 1777, 'Umar Tal in 1820 went to Mecca where he performed the rites of the pilgrimage and acquired the title of al-Hājjî (the pilgrim) and received investiture as Khalifa for the Sîûnah of the Tidjâniya brotherhood. On his return he spent a considerable time in Sokoto with his compatriot Muhammad Bello, who gave him a daughter in marriage. In 1838 he established himself in Futa Djallon, then in view of the hostility of the chiefs of this region took up his residence in the south of the Mandingo country at Dingirai where he built a fortress and raised an army, the principal con-
tigents of which he brought from Senegalese Futa. Preaching the holy war against the infidels, he conquered Mandingo and Bambuk, marched against the Bambara and Kaarta, destroyed their kingdom and victoriously entered Nyiro in 1854. Then turning against Kâoso, which had placed itself under French protection and had a French post established at Medina, the capital, by the governor Faidherbe, he laid siege in 1857 to the capital and the French garrison. Paul Holle who commanded the fort of Medina with a handful of men held out for three months. Just when, having neither food nor ammunition left, Paul Holle was going to blow up the fort with its defenders, Faidherbe, who had been waiting for the waters of the Senegal to fall, appeared with his troops before Medina, and routed the army of Abûdîl Umar. The latter went to Bundu where he had to fight the almami Bûbakar Sa'ada, then went to Senegalese Futa, a part of whose population he forced to follow him to Nyiro. Having thus reconstituted his army, he marched against the Bambara of Ségou and took this town in 1861. He then turned his attention to the Fula of Mâsina, who although Muslims had assisted the pagan Bambara, took their capital Hamdallahi and seized them under Ahmadu-Ahmadu, whom he beheaded in 1862. He then proceeded to sack Timbuktu, after which besieged by the rebel Fula he was brought to bay in a cave, where he was smoked to death in 1864.

One of his sons, Ahmadu, whom he had left in Ségou wished to succeed him, but he found rivals in his brothers and other relations installed at Dingirai, Nyoro and Bandyagara (Mâsina). The empire founded by his father was divided into four kingdoms, all at variance with one another. Ahmadu tried to get rid of his brothers and of several of his brother's lieutenants by having them assassinated but he did not succeed either in gaining absolute power or in putting down the continual rebellions which his cruelty and capricious ways provoked among the Bambara and Fula. After profiting a desire to negotiate with France, he omitted acts of deliberate hostility and the French authorities decided to put an end to a tyranny which all the natives hated. Abûdîl, brother of Ahmadu and king of Dingirai, had joined the French. Colonel (later General) Archinard took Ségou on 6th April 1890, Nyoro on Jan. 1, 1891 and Bandyagara on April 26, 1893, thus destroying the Tucreul empire of the Western Sudan and putting to flight Ahmadu; he sought refuge with Motus, king of Sokoto and died in Hausaland in 1898.


(M. Delafosse)

TALât b. RIZEK AL-MALIK AL-SÂLÎHI, Fâţîmid waṣṣar (495—556 = 1101—1161). He died immediately attendant on the treacherous murder of the 12th Fâţîmid caliph al-Zâhir (1154) called him forth, at the request of the ladies of the royal household, from his governship at Ushmân in to play the role of strong man essential in the circumstances. Success crowned his march on Cairo with his followers from Upper Egypt. Then, following the deposition of Abûbâs, he was appointed waṣṣar to the child caliph al-Fâ'âl in 549 (1154) with the title of al-Sâlîhi mî tâlât. His traitorous predecessor in office, Abûbâs, had fled with his wealth to Palestine and had there fallen into the hands of the Crusaders. Talât treated with the latter for the surrender of their prisoners, paying it is said about 10,000 dinars for each (ibn Lût, i. 66). The exchange was effected and Abûbâs and his son Nasr were cruelly tortured and crucified in Cairo. Talât, as might be expected of such a general, maintained a rigorous control of affairs. In his leisure hours he manifested a penchant for verification, which even obstructed itself in the style of his military despatches. Specimens of his poetry are quoted by Ibn Khallîkân (i. 658). He seems to have been a liberal patron of Art and Letters, although he was not above granting the penury with his taxes. The ruins of the mosque which he built may still be seen near the Bûbah al-Zawfâa in Cairo, bearing witness to his zeal for the faith. He was even a strong supporter of the Isma'ilis. On the death of the little caliph in his eleventh year (1160), and the accession of another child, his cousin Abû 'Ajîl, the last of the Fâtitids, Talât continued as waṣṣar and married his daughter to the caliph. Although virtually ruler of the country, it was only a question of time before his political enemies undermined his power. The restrictions he put on the royal harem, for one thing, earned for him the hatred of the caliph's aunt, whose intrigues led to the waṣṣar's assassination. Even as he lay dying his dominating spirit manifested itself in his ordering the lady to be put to death before his eyes. His death took place on the 19th Ramadân 556 (Sept. 1161). He was ultimately buried in the cemetery of the Karâfà. There was a story in Abû Şâlih's Chronicles (fol. 480b) that an aged Christian monk in Upper Egypt had foretold to Talât, when he was still a provincial governor, that he would attain the highest rank in the state. When the prophecy was fulfilled the waṣṣar is said to have made a grant of land to the monastery. Whatever else he may have been, he was certainly a valiant warrior. He did his utmost by diplomacy, bribery and attack to drive the Crusaders from Palestine, but without success, chiefly due to the collapse of his negotiations with the orthodox Muslim ruler of Damascus. With his dying breath he is said to have regretted his failure to re-capture Jerusalem from the Franks. Amari is said to have invaded Egypt during his waṣṣarate.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Khallîkân, Wafayât, transl. de Sarazin, i. 567—568; Ibn Dašmâk, Kitâb al-Istî'âr, iv. 356; v. 45; Abû Şâlih, Chârîches et Monasteries of Egypt, transl. Evetts.
index; ibn Iyās, Tārīkh Mīr, i. 66—67; Maṭrūz, Khūtīf, ii. 294; H. Dernbourg, Osman du Vénec, index; do., Viṣe d'Onušina, p. 177; Kay, Omrāh's Hist. of Yemen, vi. 78; al- Suyūṭī, Ḥasan al-Majdūdah, Cairo 1327, ii. 17; S. Lane-Poole, Egypt in the Middle Ages, index; Wüstenfeld, Geschichte der Fatimidischen Chilifien, index; W. B. Stevenson, The Crusaders in the East, p. 186.

(J. Walker)

Tālāk (a.), repudiation of a wife by a husband, a form of divorce, effected by his pronouncing the words anna ṣallāh. The root idea of the verb ṣallāh is: to be freed from a tether etc. (of a camel), to be repudiated by a man (of a wife; in this sense also ṣallāḥ), hence ṣallāḥa, to release (a camel) from a tether, to repudiate (a wife); ṣallā is a camel un tethered or a woman repudiated by a man (cf. Lane, Arab. Eyl. Lex. s. v.).

I. The right to a one-sided dissolution of a marriage belonged to the man exclusively, among the pre-Muḥammadan Arabs. Long before Muḥammad this ṣallāḥ was in general use among the Arabs and meant the immediate definite abandonment of the man of all rights over his wife, which he could insist upon as a result of his marriage. Cf. Th. W. Jasnolli, Die mohammedanische Eheordnung (Diss. Leyden), p. 42—64, who corrects the view held by W. Robertson Smith, Kinship and marriage in early Arabia, 2nd ed., p. 112 sqq. and J. Wellhausen, Die Ehe bei den Arabern (Nachrichten v. d. Königl. Ges. d. Wiss., Göttingen 1893), p. 452 sqq.

II. The Qur'ān lays down regulations which go into the ṣallāḥ with comparative thoroughness. From their fullness, and still more from the many admonitions to observe them exactly, it is evident that Muḥammad was here introducing new rules which had been previously quite unknown to his contemporaries. Muḥammad found particularly repulsive the apparently not uncommon exploitation in his milieu of the wife by the wulāt as well as by the husband, which took place especially in connection with the ṣallāḥ. The first Muslim regulation about the ṣallāḥ seems to be the prohibition to use it for extortions from the woman: Sūra vi. 24. (of the years 3—5, on the whole chronology, which is here given in further detail, cf. Nöldeke-Schwally, Geschichte des Korans; the preceding verse 23 is directed against encroachments by the relatives of the deceased and by the wulāt): "If ye be desirous of exchanging one wife for another and have given one of them a certain sum (as mahr, or brid. gift) make no deduction from it; would ye take it by manifest slander and sin? (25) How could ye take it when ye have had intercourse together and they (the wives) have received a binding promise from you?" (Here Muḥammad recognises the ṣallāḥ as such as legitimate.) The next passage which deals with the ṣallāḥ introduces an important intention to the Prophet, namely the period of waiting (iddā), which is on the one hand intended to leave no doubt about the real paternity of a child born from the divorced woman and on the other to give the man an opportunity of atoning for a too hurried pronouncement of the ṣallāḥ by withdrawing it; thus it is laid down in Sūra ii. 228: "The women who have been given the ṣallāḥ shall wait three wulāt (this expression, which is variously explained means in any case phenomena connected with menstruation); it is not permitted to them to conceal what Allah creates in their bodies, if they believe in Allah and the last day; their husbands have the full right to take them back during this period, if they desire to make atonement; they have to demand the same good treatment to which they were bound but the men are a step above them; and Allah is powerful and wise" (the man is here given the right to take back the wife during the period of waiting even against her will). But this right now given to the man for the first time was very soon abused; the wife was taken back near the end of the period of waiting and a new ṣallāḥ at once pronounced over her so that she was permanently in a state of waiting, in order to induce her to purchase her freedom by giving back the mahr or making some other financial sacrifice; verse 229 was therefore revealed. "If the man has twice pronounced the ṣallāḥ, he may still keep his wife if he treat her kindly or let her go in a seemly fashion; it is not permitted to you to take away anything of what ye have given them. . . . (In an interpretation the kifā, the amicable purchase of her freedom by the woman in contrast to the extortions condemned above, is declared permitted). 229. If he pronounces the ṣallāḥ over her for the third time, it is not permitted for him to take her again unless she has married another husband; if the latter pronounce the ṣallāḥ over her, it is no sin for the two to return to one another if they think they can observe Allah's commands; these are the commands of Allah which make clear to those who have knowledge (it is probable that the second part of verse 229 was induced by a concrete case in which a thrice divorced woman who had married another husband and received the ṣallāḥ from him also, desired to marry her first husband again). A further extension made necessary by the practice, which was intended to prevent abuses of the right of taking back the wife during the period of waiting, is given in verse 231: "If ye give women the ṣallāḥ and they reach their time, retain them with you kindly or let them go kindly; but do not keep them to harm them with hostile intent; who does so only injures himself: make not a jest of Allah's words!" (Here it is forbidden to take back a former wife under a show of reconciliation, and to keep her simply with the object of making her life uncomfortable and forcing her to purchase her release by the payment of a sum of money; the perhaps contemporary verse 232 contains warning admonitions to the wulāt's of divorced women). Later than Sūra ii. 228, which is presupposed, but still before the year 5 are the regulations of Sūra lxv. 1: "O Prophet, when ye pronounce the ṣallāḥ over women, do it with regard to their period of waiting (the meaning, not quite clear, of the Arabic expression seems to be that the ṣallāḥ is to be pronounced in such a way that the period of waiting can be easily calculated i.e. not during menstruation), and calculate the time exactly and fear Allah your Lord; put them not out of your houses and they are not to depart of their own accord, unless they have manifestly done something shameful (i.e. committed adultery); these are the commands of Allah and whose transgresseth them injures himself alone; thou knowest not whether Allah after this may not bring about a change (in the attitude of the man to the woman so that he may take her back). 2. When they have reached their time, then either help them
punishes the woman who seeks the talaq from her husband without sufficient reason. Sura ix. 1. is unanimously interpreted to mean that it is forbidden to pronounce the talaq during the woman's period of menstruation; such a talaq is regarded as a sin and error (khulfa, contrary gurda) but its validity is not disputed; the man who has pronounced it should however withdraw it and if he insists on a divorce should pronounce a talaq in keeping with the rules. A question not yet conceived in the Koran is that of the effect of a talaq pronounced three successive times; the traditions are divided regarding this; alongside of the approval of such a thing, there is the strongest disapproval, sometimes it is even held to be invalid; in the same direction points the hadith that down to the caliphate of 'Omar such a talaq was considered to be a single one and that 'Omar was the first to introduce into jurisprudence his view that it was a threefold one, in order to restrain people by the fear of the undesirable consequences of this abuse. The traditions further mention as a third requirement for the talaq which is to be butuna i.e. in keeping with the prescriptions of the Koran and of the Prophet, that the man in the period of purity in which he pronounces it, must have had no intercourse with the woman. The so-called talaq in which consists in marrying a thrice divorced woman and at once pronouncing the talaq over her, simply with the object of enabling her to remarry her first husband (cf. Sura ii. 230) is strongly disapproved of and even cursed. In general the woman is only considered "permitted" (hazil) for the first husband when the second marriage is actually completed. To check frivolous pronouncement of the talaq, a talaq pronounced in jest is considered legal and binding. As, on the other hand, the talaq means the dissolution of the marriage, a talaq pronounced before the conclusion of the marriage is of no importance. Whether a woman who has thrice received the talaq has a claim during the period of waiting on her husband for lodging and maintenance is not evident from the Koran; the earliest differences of opinion are enshrined in a group of traditions, some of which completely deny any such claim, some of which recognise it only for lodging and some for maintenance also.

Talaq between slaves is not regulated in the Koran; the hadith gives the slave also the right to the talaq but (in analogy with other legal enactments) only twice and similarly puts the period of waiting of a slave-woman at two years' periods. Anyone who becomes a convert to Islam and has more than four wives is bound to keep four and pronounce the talaq on the others. If he has married two sisters, he must pronounce the talaq on one of them. Finally it should be mentioned that according to tradition, Muhammad at once gave the talaq to women who took their refuge with Allah before him and is said to have induced 'Abd Allah b. 'Omar to separate from his wife by a talaq out of consideration for his father's dislike of her.

IV. The oldest jurists (down to the beginning of the formation of the madhhab's), some of whom go back to the time of the origin of the traditions, develop the doctrine of talaq on the lines indicated above; the most important views to be mentioned here are the following. The doctrine of talaq al-
sunna and its three requirements is further developed; it is ascribed among others to 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abbās, 'Abd Allāh b. Ma'sūd, 'Abd Allāh b. Othām, al-Dāhīkhā, Hammād, Ibrāhīm al-Nakha'ī, Ikrima, Muqāshīd and Muḥammad b. Shīrīn (such attributions to the oldest authorities must be regarded as unheistorical; they only become certainly historic with Ibrāhīm al-Nakha'ī; this is also true of what follows); it is even applied to the case when a woman is pregnant; for this 'Abd Allāh b. Ma'sūd, Dājīh b. 'Abd Allāh, Hammād, al-Hassan al-Baqṣī and Ibrāhīm al-Nakha'ī are given as authorities. The ʿtalāq pronounced three times in immediate succession is considered a sin but as thrice valid, by the overwhelming majority, including 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abbās, 'Abd Allāh b. Ma'sūd, 'Abd Allāh b. Othām, Hammād, al-Hassan al-Baqṣī and Ibrāhīm al-Nakha'ī; sometimes the view is even described as the only prevailing one, against which no contradictory opinion exists; but at a somewhat later date there were nevertheless champions of the view that the ʿtalāq of this kind is to be considered as only once valid. While according to the view of the majority, among whom are mentioned 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abbās and al-Dāhīkhā, the wife becomes ḫarām for the man after a threefold ʿtalāq and can only marry him again after completing and dissolving a marriage with another man, these consequences, according to the view recorded of Muqāshīd (among others), who follows Tabāris, and which goes back to a divergent interpretation of Sūra II, 229 f.), come into force after a twofold ʿtalāq; if the man does not withdraw it, but "allows the woman to go". That the second marriage must be actually consummated if the woman is to be ʿtalāqān again to the first man, is unanimously demanded e.g. by 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abbās, 'Abd Allāh b. al-Mubārak, 'Abd Allāh b. Othām, Ibrāhīm al-Nakha'ī, Sa'd b. al-Musayyib, al-Zuhrī. The validity of the ʿtalāq pronounced in jest, is expressly affirmed by 'Abd Allāh b. Ma'sūd, Hammād, Ibrāhīm al-Nakha'ī and is regarded as generally recognised. The principle is unanimitously affirmed that in ambiguous expressions the opinion of the speaker decides, but there is much difference of opinion as to whether certain expressions are to be considered ambiguous or not, and also whether the ʿtalāq pronounced under pressure or under the influence of intoxication is valid or not. Here it is a question of the application of principles, important in other cases also, in a field, which on account of its practical importance had a great influence on its development. The validity of the ʿtalāq pronounced before the consummation of the marriage is denied in agreement with the tradition of 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abbās, 'Ali, Ikrima, Muqāshīd, Sa'd b. al-Musayyib etc. The ʿtalāq pronounced on condition the marriage is consummated (if I marry thee, thou art divorced) is on the other hand recognised as valid by 'Abd Allāh b. Ma'sūd, 'Abd Allāh b. 'Umār, Ibrāhīm al-Nakha'ī, al-Zuhrī while others deny it. Any ʿtalāq pronounced before the consummation of the marriage is irrevocable (cf. Sūra ii. 238; xxxiii. 48); authorities for this are 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abbās, Hammād, Ibrāhīm al-Nakha'ī, al-Zuhrī etc. (this rule is undoubtedly in the spirit of the Kur'ān; cf. Sūra xxxii. 48). The different views found in the Ḫadīth regarding the claims of the divorced woman to lodging and maintenance are also found here: according to 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abbās, al-Hassan al-Baqṣī and Ikrima she has no claim at all, according to al-Zuhrī (who however also appears among the advocates of the first view but probably wrongly) only to lodging. According to 'Abd Allāh b. Ma'sūd, Hammād, 'Umār and 'Umar to lodging and maintenance. 'Abd Allāh b. 'Umār, Sa'd b. al-Musayyib and al-Zuhrī allow the slave only the possibility of the twofold ʿtalāq, whether in respect of a female slave or a free woman.

According to 'Abd Allāh b. Ma'sūd and Ibrāhīm al-Nakha'ī the other hand the deciding factor is the status of the woman as a slave, so that every husband of a slave, whether slave or free man, has only the possibility of a twofold ʿtalāq. The ʿKūrānic expression ṭalīḥa (Sūra ii. 229 f.) is sometimes interpreted as menstruation and sometimes as the period of purity; among the representatives of this former view are 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abbās, 'Abd Allāh b. Ma'sūd, al-Dāhīkhā, Hammād, Ibrāhīm al-Nakha'ī, Ikrima, 'Umār and the Ḫāṣi; as adherents of the latter view 'Abd Allāh b. 'Umār, al-Zuhrī (the first view is also wrongly attributed to him) and the Mālikis are mentioned; Alī and Sa'd b. al-Musayyib appear in both groups. Less important differences of opinion are associated with the interpretation of different ʿKūrānic expressions in Sūra ii. 228 and lxv. 1, 2, 4. There is unanimity on the point that the man has the right to withdraw the ʿtalāq even against the will of the woman. This is expressly stated, for example by 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abbās, al-Dāhīkhā, al-Hassan al-Baqṣī, Ibrāhīm al-Nakha'ī, Ikrima and Muqāshīd. V. The teachings of the ʿFiṣḥ on ʿtalāq, which can be briefly summarised as follows, are based on the above. The husband has the right to pronounce the ʿtalāq on his wife even without giving the reasons, but his pronouncing it without good grounds is considered ṭalīḥa (reprehensible) and by the Ḥanafis even as ḥarām (forbidden); the ʿtalāq al-bird also, i.e. one in which the requirements of the ʿtalāq al-ʿaʾla (cf. above) are not observed is regarded as ḥarām; the validity of the ʿtalāq is not in any way affected thereby. To be able to pronounce the ʿtalāq the husband must have attained his majority and he is corpus mediis; the ʿtalāq of a minor is regarded as valid only by one tradition of 'Alī and the guardians acts of the legally disqualified husband. The ʿtalāq is a personal right which the husband must exercise in person or through a mandatory specially appointed by him; he may even entrust this mandate to his wife, who can then pronounce the ʿtalāq on herself. The ʿtalāq presupposes a valid marriage; the ʿtalāq pronounced on condition that the marriage is carried through if (above) is invalid according to the Ḥanafis, but according to the Ḥanbalis and Mālikis (according to the latter however, not if it is expressed in quite general terms, e.g. "every woman who marries, is divorced.") The ʿtalāq pronounced in delirium or by automatism is invalid. The ʿtalāq of an intoxicated man has given rise to lively discussions in all the madhābhī; in the case of culpable intoxication it is regarded as valid by the majority. The ʿtalāq pronounced under pressure is valid according to the Ḥanafis, but not according to the Mālikis, Ṣaḥīfis and Ḥanbalis.

Words referring unambiguously and directly to the ʿtalāq bring it into operation, whatever may have been the intention of the speaker who uttered
the man, if the speaker uses unambiguous circumlocutions, the Hanbalis, Hanafs, and Shafiis demand also a corresponding intention, while the Malikis pay no heed to the intention. In the case of ambiguous expressions or gestures the intention of the speaker is the only deciding factor. There is a great difference of opinion among the madhhab on all these questions, when it comes to the individual case. The question of the validity of a conditionally pronounced *fatâh* (apart from the above mentioned case) is also much disputed; the Hanafis and Shafiis make such a *fatâh* come into operation on the fulfillment of the condition; the Malikis regard it, according to the nature of the condition, as sometimes at once effective and sometimes void.

The woman's period of waiting begins at once after the *fatâh* unless it is a question of a *fatâh* before consummation of the marriage, which is always definite: in this case the woman does not need to have a period of waiting and has only a claim to half the bridical gift, if it was already fixed (if it was already paid, she has to pay back half of it) or to a gift at the discretion of the man, the so-called marra (cf. Sura, ii. 235). A distinction has further to be made between a revocable and a definite *fatâh*. In the first case the marriage is still considered legally in existence with all its consequences and the woman has a claim upon the man for lodging and maintenance for the whole period of waiting; on the other hand the man has the right to revoke the *fatâh* throughout the period of waiting. If he allows the period to pass without exercising this right, the marriage is definitely dissolved at its expiry. If the bridical gift was not yet paid, it is now due unless some later date was agreed upon for its payment. If a reconciliation then takes place between the two parties and they wish to marry again, they must draw up a new contract of marriage with a new bridical gift.

With a definite *fatâh* on the other hand, the marriage is at once finally dissolved (with the single exception that a definite *fatâh* pronounced by a man during his mental illness does not abolish the wife's rights of inheritance: so the Hanafis, Malikis, and Hanbalis with Shafiis on details, while the Shafiis consider the opposite view the better). The woman has however in this case also to pass the period of waiting, during which she cannot conclude a new marriage; during this period she has a claim on the husband for lodging, but for maintenance only if she is pregnant. The husband's payment of the bridical gift is the same as in a revocable *fatâh*. The conclusion of a new contract of marriage between the former partners is impossible, unless the woman has in the meanwhile lived with another man in a regularly completed marriage (cf. Sura, ii. 235); but even this way out is only open to them twice.

The third *fatâh* is considered definite among freemen (cf. Sura, ii. 229 et seq.) and the second among slaves; it is a matter of indifference whether the separate repudiations were announced in one marriage or in several, not separated by *zibdli*. In mixed marriages between freemen and slaves the status of the man is decisive according to the Malikis, Shafiis and Hanbalis, and of the woman according to the Hanafis.

The period of waiting for a woman is three *husnâs* (cf. Sura, ii. 228) i.e. according to the Malikis and Shafiis three periods of purity, and according to the Hanafis three menstruations; if she is pregnant, the period lasts till her confinement (cf. ibid.). For a slave woman the period of waiting is in the first case two *husnâs* and in the second a month and a half; if she is pregnant, the period of waiting again lasts till her confinement.

Sexual intercourse with a not definitely divorced woman during the period of waiting is not permitted according to the Hanafis and the better known view of the Malikis; according to the Malikis, Shafiis and the other Hanbalis, it is forbidden. In keeping with the views of the first class, it is regarded by them as revoking the *fatâh* in every case; according to the Malikis only if the man intends to do so, while the Shafiis only regard an utterance by the man as revoking the *fatâh*.

VI. The Shis rules concerning *fatâh* only differ in unimportant details from the Sunni with which we have so far dealt. In a more strict interpretation of Sura ixx. 2 the production of two legal witnesses is regarded as absolutely necessary for the validity of a *fatâh*, while the Sunnis dispense with them. All circumstances, ambiguous expressions and gestures are neglected, whatever may have been the intention of the speaker.

VII. As an institution of family law, the *fatâh* has in practice to follow lines strongly dictated by the principles of Muslim law. The very frequent pronunciation of the *fatâh*, often on the most worthless grounds and three times in succession has brought about the following usage: if the couple wish to marry one another again after the third *fatâh*, they seek a suitable individual who is ready for a certain reward to go through the ceremony of marriage with the woman and at once repudiate her; the woman is then again *fatâh* for her first husband and he who undertakes this *zibdli* is therefore called *wakhilâl*. For this purpose a minor or a slave is used by preference. Nothing can be urged against the validity of such a procedure providing that at the conclusion of the intervening marriage the word *zibdli* is not used; its permisibility is defended by the Hanafis but disputed by the Malikis and Shafiis; the Hanbali Ibn Taimiya regarded the *zibdli* in general as invalid and attacked it in a special work (cf. Brockelmann, G. A. L., ii. 155, 38) but he seems to be practically alone in this view.

The conditional pronunciation (*ta'liq*) of the *fatâh* may have different objects: a man may pronounce such a *fatâh*, for example, to drive his wife or himself to something or to refrain from something by threatened separation, or to give force to some statement made by him. In India, the Straits Settlements and a large portion of the Dutch East Indies, this *ta'liq* of the *fatâh* has become a regular custom at the conclusion of a marriage; it is hardly ever omitted and serves to impose upon the man certain obligations towards his wife, on the non-fulfillment of which the marriage is dissolved by the *fatâh*. Cf. Snoek-Hurgonje, De Aziehers, i. 356 sqq. Fortgezette Geschriften, iv. 300 sq.; ivii. 379; Jubbil, Handelding tot de kennis wan de mohammedanaeche woerd, p. 207 sqq.

On the practice of the *fatâh* as it has developed in different countries under the influence of the Sharîa and under native customary law, cf. for example, for North Africa: Ubach and Rackow, Slaves und Recht in Nordafrika, p. 37, 97, 194.

Turkey: with the introduction of the Swiss civil code in 1926 is so far the only Muslim state that has abolished the tašâ.

Bibliography: In addition to the works already mentioned and the Arabic works on Ha- 
zioni di diritto musulmano malichka, i. 201 sqq.; Hughes, Dictionary of Islam, s. v. Divorce.

(T. Schachy)

TALAŌÂN (Talā, Talaţ, Talaţ, l. 3658), name of two towns in Persia.
1. A town in Tukhrâstân, between Balkh and Merw-al-Râd, three days' march from the latter. Situated in a plain, but quite close to the mountains (an arrow-shot, şâblân), it was the largest town of the province and had a large market; it was divided into several parts by two rivers: Khuttal-âb (connexion of de Goeje) and Barâsh. It was destroyed in 617 (1220) by Cingiz- 
Khân; ruins near Čâkātkan.
2. A town in Dālam, between Karāwân and Abâr, capital of a district of the same name including several small towns. The birthplace of the famous minister, ûshâk Isma'il b. 'Abbâd. His father Abu 'l-Hasân 'Abbâd b. al-'Abbâs, had the same ethnic name of Tala̲ākan. The inhabitants were suspected of sharing in the heresies of the Isma'îlis. Near it there is one of the two sources of the river Shâh Râd, tributary of the Safid-Râd, also as the source of two of the Karâsh-Râd and the Bih-Râd.


(T. Schachy)

TALAVERA, the name of several places in Spain; the Arabic form is Talaâbrâ. They are the following: 1. Talavera de la Reina, a town of 10,000 inhabitants, the Casaróbriga of the Romans, on a fertile plain on the banks of the Tagus about 100 miles below Toledo, at the entrance to the Sierra de Gredos: Towers dating from the period of Arab occupations may still be seen there: “the Torres Albarranas”. The Arab geographers boast of the solidity of the bism of this town; 2. ca. 20 miles south of the latter: Talaver la Vieja, the ancient Augas- 
obarada; 3. Talavera la Real, a little village on the south bank of the Guadiana, 12 miles above Badajoz.


(T. Schachy)

TALâBIYA (A.), infinitive of form II of the verb labâha, which is formed from the term labâha to mean “to pronounce the formula labâha” etc. Labâhsa is connected — and probably rightly — by the Arab lexicographers with labâba which means “offering devoted service” as labâha does “at your service”. According to the native grammarians labâba is a “frequentative” dual. It is difficult to say what is the significance of the element ai in this and similar forms like ta'âlaâ. The explanation from the Hebrew proposed by Dossy (De israelitum et Mecka, Haarlem 1804, p. 60) may be said to be now generally abandoned.

The formula is used in various forms and on different occasions. The talbiya of the Prophet is said to have been: Labâha alllâhma labâha 
labâha ta'âlaâha lâkâ labâha lâkâ labâha lâkâ labâha lâkâ labâha lâkâ labâha lâkâ labâha lâkâ labâha lâkâ. But shorter forms are given like: labâha alllâhma, labâha ta'âlaâha etc. It is usually referred to Allah, in Hadith also to Muhammed, or to his helpers only its briefest form labâha (e. g. Bukhârî, Khûnâmîzât, B. 4; Muslim, Zakât, Tr. 32; Tirmidhî, Sifat al-Kiyâm, B. 36) and ya labâha (Muslim, Du'âh, Tr. 70). It is also placed in the mouths of pious men of the past like Adam and Nîh. According to a tradition in Muslim (Hadîth, Tr. 22) the hasten in Muhammed's time used it in a false form. The talbiya is especially pronounced on the hadîth (q.v.), at an early stage at the i'âmam which Muhammed and others assumed with the formula labâha hadîth wa-umâraîn (Bukhârî, Hadîth, B. 34) or ya labâha hadîth wa-umâraîn (Tirmidhî, Hadîth, B. 11) or with the exclusive mention of the hadîth (Bukhârî, Hadîth, B. 35). At the beginning of the umara A'lâhî is said to have used the formula labâha bi 'lmumâraîn (Abû Dâwûd, Musnad, B. 23).

The talbiya is continually pronounced during the hadîth up to the tidation (e. g. Abûnâ B. Hanbal, i. 114) and in a loud voice (Abûnâ B. Hanbal, v. 192).

On the question whether the talbiya is obligatory or sunna, see al-Nawawî on Muslim, Hadîth, Tr. 22.

(A. J. Wensinck)

TâLâ B. 'Uamâlallah, companion of the Prophet, one of the ten mu'âshirât, i.e. those to whom the Prophet had promised Paradise. He belonged to the Kūrah clan of the Banû Tamî b. Murra (q.v.); his genealogy was: Tašâ b. 'Uamâlallah b. 'Ughmân b. 'Amr b. Ka'b b. Sa'd b. Tamî b. Murra and his awyûn, Abû Muhammad, from his son, celebrated for his piety and one of the first readers of the Kur'an; both fathers and sons were killed in the battle of the Câned in 36 a.H. Tašâ was one of the earliest converts to Islam. According to tradition he had suffered along with Abû Bakr the threats and ill-treatment of the Kūrah. He went with Muhammad on the Hâdj and was henceforth one of his councillors and most intimate friends. At the battle of Badr, having been sent out to spy the movements of the Meccan carvan,
he was unable to return in time to take active part in the battle but was allowed to share the spoil equally with the other mushārifūn. In the unfortunate battle of Uhud, Talha particularly distinguished himself by his bravery; using his body as a shield to defend the Prophet in the retreat, he received numerous wounds and blow out the tendons of two fingers which remained paralysed. This exploit gained him a prestige during the lifetime of the Prophet and after his death and a place in the veneration of Muslims which the blots of his later career never destroyed.

Talha also took part in the other expeditions undertaken by Muhammad; on the death of the latter his relations with the first two Caliphs seem to have been rather cool; he is said to have hesitated for a long time before recognising Abu Bakr and ‘Omar. The latter in the turn were careful not to give high office to the powerful Companion whose ambition they had probably reason to fear. This did not prevent him from amassing immense wealth as a result of the Muslim conquests, in estates in Arabia and the ‘Irāq and in spiege: the tradition tells us that his generosity was in keeping with his fortune. His prestige and his financial position made him a person of the first importance in the caliphate of ‘Omar. That he along with al-Zubair and ‘Ali was one of the instigators of the murder of this Caliph, as Cæsarii has held (Annales dell’Islam, v. 47-48), cannot be proved, and it seems that the least likely as Talha was away when the murder took place in Medina (cf. R.S.O., iv. 1060-1061); in any case he was a candidate for the succession and was bitterly disappointed when it fell to Uthmān. Thrown into opposition, Talha took advantage of the discontent soon aroused by Uthmān’s rule to try once more to get the caliphate. The real character of the movement which cost Uthmān his life is difficult to understand at the present day, since the records of it are obscure and biased, but it seems certain that Talha was one of the chief actors in the drama, especially in its last days when the long discussions between Uthmān on the one hand and Talha, al-Zubair and ‘Ali on the other, were abruptly broken off and the Caliph killed in his house by the mob. Talha thought his dreams were about to be realised and it even seems that he was near being proclaimed Caliph when ‘Ali was proclaimed in his stead. Here again tradition in spite of the mass of details which encumber it is not at all clear. ‘Ali probably relied on the more turbulent elements which gained the upper hand in these troubled times while Talha (and al-Zubair who was working in accord with him, although for his own ends) seeking to take a middle course was thrust aside. In any case he found himself forced to recognise the new master; but immediately afterwards he fled from Medina with al-Zubair and reached Mecca where he joined ‘Ali, whom he being the enemy of ‘Ali as she had been of ‘Uthmān — who seems to have urged Talha’s claims to the caliphate (perhaps on account of their ties of blood; they both belonged to the Tānis b. Murra). The three allies went to Basra where they — Talha especially — relied on finding many partisans; they announced that they wished to avenge ‘Ali’s murder of ‘Uthmān for which they disclaimed any responsibility. We know the unfortunate end of their enterprise; the defeat in the battle of the Camel (ṣawm al-‘aṣimal, ʿUmaida

11, 36) in which Talha and al-Zubair lost their lives and ‘Ali won the ‘Irāq, which however he could only hold for a few years. Talha’s family however did not suffer by the fall of their head; his heirs entered into possession of his fortune and continued to enjoy a high position; many of them are known as traditionalists, but they completely abandoned politics.

Talha was a brave warrior and a noble and generous character, so far as we can judge from the statements of tradition; he was ruined most likely by the fault, which is common to parvenus, of not being able to moderate his ambition. The unexpected successes of his career made him see no bounds to its possibilities; the qualities necessary to enable him to realise them were apparently lacking to him. The judgment that should be passed on the conduct of Talha (as well as on that of al-Zubair and ‘Ali) has always been a very delicate question for Muslim orthodoxy. They decided it in the conciliating spirit that has always characterised them; Talha and his allies are sinners of good faith and their previous merits are sufficient to wipe out their faults. Many traditions even say that Talha repented before his death and that ‘Ali for his part declared himself reconciled to his adversary. It is only the extreme Shi‘is who have not renounced “cursing those lacking in faith” (la‘anat al-nāthābin).

Biblilography: Ibn Sa‘d, ii/1, 152-161, and the other sources for biblical biography of the company. The text relative to Talha are collected and translated in Cæsarii, Annales dell’Islam, i. 350-399 (cf. also in the same work the index ex tov. i. — ii., iii., and to vols. viii. and ix., the years 375 and 36 a. h.; cf. also G. Levi Della Vida, R.S.O., vi. 434-449 (for the rebellion against ‘Ali).

(T. G. LEVI DELLA VIDA)

TALIK. [See ARABIA, i. 387-8.] TALISH. A district and people in the north of the Persian province of Gilan (see map, v.), which since the peace of Gulistan (12/24th Oct. 1813) has belonged to Russia. The name according to Marquart, Ostasiatische Stiftungs, Leipzig 1903, p. 278 sq., is first found in the form Tališ in the Armenian translation of the romance of Alexander, Ch. 194 = ii. 19, p. 76 (ed. C. Müller). In the history of the Arab conquest (Bafiḏjuri, ed. de Goeje, p. 337; al-Taḫari, i. 2805) the country is called al-Talashkia; according to al-ʿAṣwa‘i in his Yūnis, iii. 571, 1, the Persian pronunciation was Tališkian (apparently a plural form). According to i. 814, 18, Tališkian (so vocalised) was a district (čamal) of the province of Gilan. According to the itinerary given by Muḥaddasi (B.G.A., iii. 373) from Sāfīn (on the frontier between Tabarištān and Gilan) to Shemāghā (cf. mifwawa‘), the last town belonging to Gilan was Kūhan-rūd, 4 days’ journey south of the Kur [q.v.]. Hamed Allāh Kārwin (G.M.Š., xxiii. 180 ult.) mentions a village Talish on the road between Sulṭānābād and Ardalū, 6 farsakh from the latter town; the corresponding district (niyêt) was called Tawalish (p. 162, 12). Before the wars between Russia and Persia, Talish seems to have been of no particular importance; under Persian rule it was governed by a special Ešān and the capital was, as it still is, the town of Lenkoran. The narrow strip of land between the hills or “alps”
of Talysh and the Caspian Sea has a very much moister climate than the plain lying to the north of it (the rainfall in Lenkoran is 52 inches, in Baku 10), belongs geographically to Gilan, is equally fertile and unhealthy and has a more varied fauna (including the tiger). The people, called the Russians “Tallah” or “Tallishch”; called themselves “Tallish”; they are found to the north as far as the Mughan steppes, where the Tallish lead a nomadic life and to the south up to about 30 miles south of the Russian frontier. The number of Tallish living in Russian territory is 75,824 according to the last census (1922). Like the people of Gilan, the Tallish are Shi‘is; their dialect differs very little from that of Gilan.


**TALISMAN.** [See Škemcč.]

TALKHĪS, an Arabic madār meaning to make a précis, means in the official language of Turkey a document in which the most important matters are summed up for presentation to the Sultan. The officials who had these papers prepared and presented them to the Sultan were the grand vizier and the Shāhīk al-‘Īslām. On account of its change of significance, ṭalkīṣ is included among the ẓahāfīṣ al-maṣūḥa, cf. Muhammad Hāfid, al-Durar al-munqahkhādī al-manṭūra fī ṭallīṣ al-Ṣāḥīḥ al-maṣūḥa (1221 A.H., p. 115).

(J. H. Kramer)

TALKHĪṢĪDĪ, or in the official style, Talkhīṣī, was the individual appointed to prepare the précis called ṭalḥīṣ [q.v.] and to take it to the palace where it was handed over to the chief of the envoys. The Talkhīṣīdī was therefore an official of the grand vizier’s department; in addition to preparing the ṭalkhīṣ, he took part in several official ceremonies. The talkhīṣīdī of the Shāhīk al-‘Īslām was not—at least in the later period—in direct communication with the palace; documents presented by him had to pass first of all through the hands of the Re’s Efendi and of the grand vizier.

Bibliography: d’Ohsson, Tableau Général de l’Empire Ottoman, ii. 260; iii. 343; von Hammer, Der osmanisch-nachevrischen Staatsverwaltung, i. 347. (J. H. Kramer)

TALIUT is the name of king Saul of the Bible in the Kur’ān (ii. 245, 250). The name is explained as early as Tha‘labh from the height (fīl) of Taliut. Taliut recites Ḏallīt (Goliath), an assonance of pairs of names, cf. Hārūn–Mūsār, Hāshil–Kābir, Yājūj–Mājūj (Goldhöher). Dzhaliut itself is explained from the Hebrew Ḏūlūt (Horovitz). In the Kur’ān (247–253) the following is told of Taliut. After the time of Moses Israel demanded a king. God appointed Taliut king but the people did not find him worthy of the throne. Taliut was distinguished for the greatness of his knowledge and for his great physique also; it was a sign of his fitness to rule that angels brought back the ark (Arkh) with the sabmam and with what remained of the people of Moses and Aaron. Taliut tested his people at a river; whoever drank from it did not follow him. Israel took the field against Dzaliut; David slew Dżaliut and became king.

The more or less confused memories of the Biblical story in this version are obvious. The first book of Samuel relates that Israel demanded a king (viii.) but no respect was shown to the new king (v. 27; vi. 12). The sacred ark which Muhammad regards as a token of Saul’s worth was recaptured in the Bible before his accession. The need for drinking water is made in the Bible, not by Saul but by Gideon (Judges, vii. 5–7).

Nöldeke sees in this Kur’ānic story an effort by Muhammad to arouse the Muslims to courage and obedience by examples from Jewish history. Later Muslim tradition (Tahtari, Talaḥāb, al-Kurū) often mentions that the number of the faithful who fought by Muhammad’s side in the battle of Badr was that of those who passed Taliut’s test by water.

Muslim legend has more to say, explains every feature of the Kur’ānic story, and adds many new details. Later writers (Tahtari, Tha‘labh, Ibn al-‘Aţhîr) also know the name Saul, son of Kish (شايع ابن فيس). In explanation of the name Tahtar, we are told that at this time the future king of Israel was to be recognised by his height (Tha‘labh); Samuel set up a measure, but no one in Israel reached its height, except Taliut. As a miracle which took place to show the rightness of their choice, we are told that when Taliut went to consult Samuel (Šhamwîl) about his lost treasures, the coronation oil began to boil. Tahtar’s Tahtar mentions inspiration as another token. In explanation of the story in the Kur’ān, that Taliut appeared unworthy to the people, it is said that Saul was descended from Benjamin, that is neither from Judah, the tribe of kings, nor from Levi, the tribe of priests (Tha‘labh). On the ark, the tokens of Taliut’s worthiness, Muslim legend has much that is marvellous to tell. This sacred ark had been handed down from the time of Adam from generation to generation through Ima‘alî to Kejdar. Kejdar gave it to Jacob. Within the ark were kept the bones, the hearts of the prophets, the tables of the law, the rod of Moses, Aaron’s turban and rod (Tha‘labh). This ark had fallen into the hands of Dżaliut, the king of the Amalekites. When plagued fell upon the Amalekites, they sent back the sacred ark on the advice of a captured Jew. Two angels led by angels brought the ark to Taliut and returned. According to another legend, the angels themselves brought it to Taliut between heaven and earth. The people were then convinced of Taliut’s worthiness.

Taliut’s relations with Da‘ūd are fully described. Taliut promised his daughter and one third of the kingdom to whoever should kill Dżaliut. Nevertheless he next demanded a nuptial gift of 200 slain giants. When the affections of the people turned to Da‘ūd, Taliut wanted to slay his son-in-law. Warned by his wife, Da‘ūd put a wine-skin in his bed and Taliut stabbed it. Da‘ūd on one occasion was saved by a spider spinning a web at the entrance to a cave. Da‘ūd showed his magnanimity by once leaving four (in Ibn al-‘Aţhîr: two) arrows besides Taliut; on another occasion he took from Taliut, his enemy, his bow, his arrows, a piece of his garment and hair from his beard.

Saul’s raising of the dead (I Sam. xxviii) is completely transformed in Muslim legend. Some-
times it is Joshua and sometimes Samuel that is called up. Ţalût learns that there is only atonement for him, he must fight with all his family and die for Allah. Ţalût abdicates and suffers with his sons the "death on the path of Allah".


On the spider's web which saved David: R. Basset, La Bordereau du Châtelet et Bouairi, Paris 1897, p. 81-86. (BREMAREN HELLER)

**TAMATTU**. [See ʾIYSRIM, MUNTA.]

**TAMGRUT, the principal town in the Wâdî Darâ (Dra [q.v.]), in the south of Morocco and the site of the mother-sâwiya of the religious brotherhood of the Naṣâriya [q.v.]. It is a fair-sized town with houses of red clay, surrounded by groves of palm and fruit trees, on the left bank of the Wâdî Darâ, which is here 120 to 250 feet broad but of no depth and runs between hills about 300 yards apart. Tamgrût is surrounded by low walls pierced by 4 gates: in the north, Fumûm (class. *fam. = mother*) al-Sâlî, in the N.E., Fumûm Tâṣirî, in the S.W., Bûb al-Raḳî, and to the east, Fumûm al-Sûr. An important market is held there on Saturdays.

The sâwiya of Tamgrût, which owes all its importance to the Şâhîkh Muḥammad b. Naṣîr, was founded in 983 (1575-1576) by a member of the Marrabout family of the Wâdî Darâ, Abû Ḥâfiz Qâsim b. Ahmâd al-Anṣârî from the sâwiya of Saṣyid al-Nâsî. It was the fame as mystics of two holy men who lived in the sâwiya of Tamgrût, Saṣyid Abû Ḥusayn b. Saṣyid Ahmâd b. Ibrâhim, that secured the Sufi novice Muḥammad b. Naṣîr, born at Iṣhmân in 1015 (1603), to settle there. On the death of Saṣyid Ahmâd b. Ibrâhim, he became head of the sâwiya, and founded his order there, directly based on the teaching of al-Shâhî [q.v.]. He died here in Şaṭar 1085 (May 1674) and his descendants from his father to son without intermission have since been heads of the sâwiya of Tamgrût. The latter contains the tombs of Muḥammad b. Naṣîr and his successors together in a mausoleum, rebuilt in 1859 after a fire and surmounted by a pyramidal cupola of green tiles, with a dûmâr with three golden balls on top. It is also said to contain a very fine library, but it is unfortunately still impossible to attempt to catalogue it.

The sâwiya of Tamgrût and the holy men who lived in it have formed the subject of a monograph by Ahmâd b. Khâlid al-Naṣîr al-Ṣâliw [q.v., author of the Kitâb al-Iṣâb, entitled Taṣâf al-mushaffar b. l-Naṣîr al-Iṣâb]. Tamgrût was the birthplace of Abu l-Ḥasan al-Tamgrûtî, a noted official of the Āṣârî court.


(E. LÉVI-PROVENCAL)

**AL-TAMGRUT, ABU L-ḤASAN 'ALI B. MUHAMMAD B. 'ALI B. MUHAMMAD, a Moroccan writer, a native of Tamgrût [q.v.], died at Marraksh in 1005 (1594-1595) and was buried in the sanctuary of Ṭâljî Ṭâlib. He held an official position at the court of the Saṭîlīn Sultan Abu l-ʾAbbâṣ Ahmâd al-Maṣûr al-Djâshâbî (986-1012 = 1578-1602). He was placed by this rule in charge of the embassy to Sultan Murād III in Constantinople along with another court dignitary Abu l-ʾAbd Allâh Muḥammad b. ʿAlî al-Fâshâštî, d. 1021 (1612-1613). Al-Tamgrût prepared an account of his journey (rīḥâ) which he called al-Naṣaḥat al-misâkiya fi l-Šiṣṣat al-turkiya: it was afterwards used as one of his sources by the author of the Nasrât al-Jadîd, al-Ifrânî (or Ufrânt, [q.v.]). It contains interesting information about the court of Marraksh at the end of the xviiith century. An edition, with a translation, of al-Tamgrût's work had been announced by H. de Castries, before his death in 1927.


(E. LÉVI-PROVENCAL)

**TAMIM b. MURR, an Arab tribe; their genealogy (Wustenfeld, Geneal. Tabellen, K. L.) Tamim b. Murr b. Dûd b. ʾAbâḥîga b. al-Yâs b. Mūḍâb, puts them among the Mûḍâb tribes where they take first place; indeed their name is often used as a synonym of the whole Mûḍâb branch in contrast to the Kâsân and the Rabîa. Of the two latter, the Rabîa are most closely related to them, which is not apparent in the systematic genealogies (where on the contrary the Kâsân are descended from the Mûḍâb while the Rabîa are not), but from expressions like the dual al-Djâffâm (Lūmûn al-Arab, x. 373) meaning the Tamim and the Bakr b. Wâl'll together (the latter being the principal group of the Rabîa). In any case, the Tamim are much nearer geographically as well as historically to the Kâsân [q.v.] with whom the traditional genealogy closely connects them.

The Greek and Latin writers, who describe the Arabian Peninsula, having left no reference to the Tamim, we are dependent on native tradition for their early history, the beginnings of which are as usual related with a number of legendary details (the tomb of the eponymous Tamim at Marrân, Ibn ʾUṣlân, al-Maṣūrî, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 37: Yâkût, Muṣâfîm, iv. 479; birth and as-
ventures of his sons Zaidmanat, 'Amr and al-Jāhri, Ibn Duraid, Kitāb al-Tūhāb, p. 5 etc.) the true character of which it is impossible to ascertain, nor to distinguish what is fantastic fiction from what might be a mythical travesty of historical events. At the period when their history becomes better known to us, i.e. from the sixth century A.D., the Tamim appear as a very large tribe, whose vast territory occupies a great part of the eastern coast of Arabia; nearly all Najd, a part of Ba'rain and a part of al-Yamama. To the south their lands stretched as far as the steppes of al-Dahna and to the northeast to the banks of the Euphrates; their neighbours in the north were the Assad, the Bābila and Qatataf (q.v.) on the southwest; within their own territory they were much mixed with parts of the tribes of the 'Abd al-Kais and the Ḥantaf (especially on the east and south coast) and with Bakr and Taghibi in the north. Essentially nomads, they never had any towns in the proper sense: Ḥadjar, al-Abšaʾ and al-Djarā (is the last the Gerā of classical authors? Cf. Sprenger, Die Altere Geographie Arabiens, p. 132) are mentioned as the sources places as which they frequented on the occasions of markets and fairs but they were not their owners (cf. Hamdān, Qaṣrār al-ʿArab, p. 136; Noldeke, Gesch. d. Perser und Araber, p. 56) although they are said to have occasionally seized and held them for a time (cf. the Ṣāḥib Ḥadjar, Munjibh b. Sāwst who negotiated with Muhammad belonged to the Tamim group of the Banī Fārānī, as the sources allege, to the 'Abd al-Kais, cf. Ibn Ḥadjar, Iṣba, Cairo, v. 19, who quotes Ibn al-Kalbī, Qaṣrār al-ʿArab, Beir. Mas. MS., p. 654); their relation with these towns was probably that of Beduins harassing and holding to ransom the settled population, alternately at peace and at feud with them. The very imperfect development of the culture of the Tamim is seen in their form of worship, about which our information is extremely meagre. We know of the general Arabian worship of al-Īṣ, Manīt, and al-ʿUzza among the Tamim only from the occurrence of the names of these deities in proper names and in oaths; that of the sun, Ṣamān (in the dialectic variant Ṣamān) from a brief note in Yaḥṣī (Muḫṣ[q]., iii. 19); the worship of Ṣamān is said to have been common to the tribes mentioned from Ḫūd: Tamim, Ḍabb, ʿUḵ, Taim ʿAdī, ʿAwhur under the leadership (ra-da) of the Tamim tribe of the Ibn Āwūb b. Mufkāshīm, the fact that they lived beside the Christian tribes of Bakr and Taghibi ought to have favoured the spread of Christianity among the Tamim (cf. Castani, Annali dell' islam A.-N. 9, § 3), but it does not actually seem to have met with much success. The only Tamim group known to have been completely converted to Christianity is a part of the Ṣahd of al-Hira, the best known member of which is the poet ʿAdī b. Zaid (q.v.), but these were a clan who had abandoned their native territory and completely altered their manner of life and their relations with the rest of the tribe.

The extent of the territory inhabited by the Tamim early accelerated their division into numerous groups and subdivisions, each of which finally attained the importance of an autonomous tribe. This is what explains how the tribe never had a very strong feeling of solidarity so that the two Tamim poets Ḍjarīr and Fardad, members of different clans, were able in their poetical duels to insult in the most atrocious manner each other's clans. Indeed we find something of one and sometimes another of the Tamim groups involved in wars and alliances in which the other groups took no part or even were on the other side. On the other hand events of special importance often induced these groups to combine their forces but always in the form of an alliance (ḥīf), in which each kept its autonomous character (e.g. Naṣṣ[a], ed. Bevan, p. 699, 752, for the alliance between the B. Ṭabībī and the B. Naḥhalī). The famous genealogist Abu 'I-ʿAbd al-Muḥsin b. ʿAbī Ḥāābī (d. 290 A.H.) seems to have devoted a special work to the alliances of the Tamim among themselves (if, as seems certain, one should read in the Fīlṣ, p. 94, 24, Kishk Ḥīf Tamīm b.Ṣamīm b. Ḥarīrī of the family instead of Ṣamīm, an absurd reading which the commentary on the text p. 44 explains in an even more absurd fashion). The principal branches of the Tamim are the Zaidīnats and 'Amrīn, the principal sub-group of the latter being the 'Abd al-Kais while the former is divided into ʿAṣā'īr and Malik; to the ʿAṣā'īr belong the Ṣinaḳ and ʿUḏārī, to the ʿAṣā'īr and Malik who are again subdivided; from the Ḥanāla are descended the Ṣabībī, one of the most important clans, including among others the Rizāḥ and the Kulaib (Ḍjarīr's clan); from the ʿAṣā'īr the Naḥhalī and the Muṣāliṯ (al-Fardad's clan). It is of course impossible here to follow out the vicissitudes of the various Tamim clans, whose doings make up the history of the tribe in the pre-Islamic period. The information which we possess on this subject is very full and surpasses in quantity all that we have about the other Arab tribes. This is due in the first place to the large number of celebrated poets among the Tamim whose verses formed, as usual, the nucleus around which historical traditions gathered as they were collected in later times by the philologists commenting on them. It is particularly the zeal and erudition of Abū Ubasīd [q.v.] and cf. also Aṣyāʾ al-ʿArabīs that we owe the preservation of the greater part of the historical references to the Tamim ʾayām. Others are due to Ibn al-Kalbī [q.v.]. We owe this historical matter mainly to the great commentary on the Naṣṣ[a] of Ḍjarīr and al-Fardad (ed. by A. A. Bevan, Leyden 1905—1912). The Kīḥāk al-Ṣaḥṣeli and to a less extent the sections relating to the Aṣyāʾ al-ʿArab in the ʾIḥā of Ibn ʿAbd Rabbihī (vol. iii.) and the Kāmil of Ibn al-ʿAlīṣīr (vol. i.) also preserved a certain amount of early Tamim history which can be supplemented from other historical and philological texts. It would be difficult and would take too much time to try to arrange the chronological and topographical sequence of the battles of the Tamim from the confused mass of details supplied by tradition (for the difficulties of the chronology of the aṣyāʾ cf. above, p. 654): an exhaustive study of this subject, which has not been made since Caussin de Perceval, might however succeed in getting some kind of order, starting from those happenings in which the kings of Persia and al-Hira take part, whose chronology is known and comparing the results thus obtained with the series of genealogies which for this period are sufficiently reliable. Two facts may be gathered from all the stories: on the one hand the continual rivalry between the Tamim and their neighbours Bakr b. Wāṣ and especially their subdivision ʿAmīr b.
by the prophetic Salāh [q.v.] whose true character is unfortunately unknown, distorted as it is by a biased tradition. In any case the vigorous campaign of Khālid b. al-Walid brought the Tamim back to the bosom of Islam and the conquests which followed immediately afforded an outlet for their warlike tendencies (cf. Caesani, Annali dell’ Islam, index to vols. i—ii.). The bulk of the Tamim warriors naturally went in the direction of Persia and, settling at first in the two great camps of Kufa and Basra, later went to Khorāsān where in the ’Abbāsid period they formed the majority of the Arab population. In spite of the fact that the historical record of the conquests goes back for the most part to Sāli b. ‘Omar [q.v.], himself a Tamim, and likely to exaggerate the exploits of the Tamim in the conquests (cf. Annali dell’ Islam, 12 A.T. §356, note 2), it cannot be denied that the latter continued to display as Muslims the same warlike spirit that had distinguished them during the Dāhilīya. It was no doubt also to their character that true Beduins, rebels against all authority by nature—that was due to their active participation in all the rebellious movements of the Omeyyad period. If they only played a small part in the struggle between Kais and Kalb, which was really quite foreign to them they distinguished themselves all the more as Khārijis [q.v.]. It is among the Tamim that we find the most fanatical of these rebels at the beginning of the movement. The chief of the Azriks, Kaṭari b. al-Faljī [q.v.] and the most of his followers were Tamim. We find them equally numerous among the followers of the ’Abbāsid dīwān in Khorāsān. Finally we may note the success at a later period of one of the tribe, İbrahim b. al-Aghlab, a descendant of the Sād b. Zaidmanāt, who founded the African dynasty of the Aghlabīds [q.v.].

The grammarians and lexicographers have preserved for us a number of peculiarities of the Tamimi dialect which will be found in the works quoted in the article Kais aś-Šarrām and also in Vollers, Volksprosche und Schriftprosche im Altertum, p. 23—23; Āḥmad b. Ḥārīm, al-Sābiḥ, Cairo, 1258, p. 24 sqq. Many of these peculiarities are also found in the dialects of other tribes, e.g., the kahkāsha which is the same as the Kaisi, the use of dī for a in the prefix of the imperfet, etc. Other peculiarities are: the pronunciation like dḥ, the letter between ḫaf and ḫaf, etc. It would be imprudent to try to found on these statements, which are due merely to casual and sporadic observations and not the result of a systematic study of the different dialects, any generalisations about the character of the Tamimi dialect. What is certain is that it formed with the dialect of the Kais and Bakr the eastern group of dialects of ancient Arabia, clearly differentiated from the dialects of the west (cf. Vollers, op. cit., p. 4 sqq.). The Tamim were further reputed in poetry and eloquence the repository of the true Arabya: we find among them, as has already been mentioned, some of the most illustrious poets of all old Arabic literature: Awb b. Hālid, Sālāma b. Dajdl, Sulaik b. Dalaka, Abba b. Ṭabbīh, Ahd b. Zaylak, Mūsā b. Matmūn b. Nūwārī, al-Mukhallab; in the Omeyyad period besides Dzirn and al-Farazdak, al-Sāriḥ, Kubayyir, Thābit Kārus, Awb b. Maḥrūr, ‘Ahdaljīdī, Rūba, etc.

Bibliography: Wšttenfeld, Register, p. 442—443; Ibn Daurād, K. al-Ḥujbaḥ, ed.
TAMIM B. AL-MU'IZZ, fifth ruler of the Shanahit family of the Banu Zir' in the 10th century. He was born in 445 AH/1053, and he was known for his military and political achievements.

His activities, otherwise, seem to have been directly related against the towns of the coast. He sent many expeditions against them, the success of which could at best be ephemeral. He was able to reestablish his control over the Banu Khuwaylid of Tunis to submit, failed before Gabes, then took it, laid waste the suburbs of Sfax and then entered it. His base al-Mahdiyya was itself much threatened. The Arabs besieged it closely in 1054.

Tambun's effort against the coast-towns is explained by the aims which sent him to the sea while the land was slipping from him. Following his father in this respect, he tried to prevent the conquest of Sicily by the Normans. Having failed, he intensified his piratical raids. On the Christian side, this produced an alliance of Genoese and Pisans who, as early as 1067, succeeded in occupying al-Mahdiyya and sacked it. In 1014 the Romans (i.e.) made another attack on the town which ended disastrously for them.

Four years later (1018), Tambun died at the age of 78 and was buried in the Ksar al-Sa'aidah at Monastir.

**Bibliography:**


**TAMIM AL-DARÎ, a companion of the Prophet. His niche al-Darî is said to be derived from the clan of the Banu 'l-Darî (for 'Abd al-Darî, according to Wellhausen, Skizzen und Vorarbeiten, l. 108, note 4), a section of the tribe of Lakhm [q.v.]. Al-Nawawi however (Tabâhid al-Amâda, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 178) gives him the niche of al-Darî, said to be derived from the devout (dâir) in which he was a monk before his conversion to Islam. His genealogy was: Tambun b. Awa b. Khudraj b. Sawad (var. Sâb) b. Dajhâmna b. Darî (var. 'Darî, 'Dârî), b. 'Abî b. al-Darî b. Hâlî b. 'Abû b. Numara b. Lakhm (Wüstenfeld, Gen. Tabellen, 5-35; transl. Tabari, ed. de Goeje, ii. 25-35, 2545; Ibn Sa'd, vii.l. 129-130 etc.).

From Palaestina, where he lived with his tribe, Tambun came to Muhammad at the head of ten of his relatives after the Khaibar campaign in 20 H. (Ibn Highânâm, Strä, end. Wüstenfeld, p. 777) or, what is more probable, after the Tabûk campaign in 9 A.H. which brought the Muslim army up to the frontiers of Syria (Ibn Sa'd, l. 75, following al-Wâkidî and Ibn al-Kalût): the first statement may be due to some confusion that has arisen from the fact that Muhammad allotted to the Banu 'l-Darî the revenue from part of the lands taken at Khaibar (Wâkidî, transl. Wellhausen, p. 287). Tambun embraced Islam and settled in Madîna. The fact that he had been a Christian, like most of the Arabs of Syria, enabled him to advise the
Prophet on details of public worship which were adopted by him from the Christians, among them the use of oil-lamps in the mosque (cf. Clermont-Ganneau, R.H.R., Ixxxi. [1920], 247 sqq. = Recueil d'Archéologie Orientale, viii. 216 sqq. : La lampe et l'olive dans le Coran). He is said to have been the first narrator of religious stories (ḥaṣa : cf. Goldzirher, Mus. Stud., i. 161 infra ; Nawawi, Taḥāfiṣ al-Aṣma‘, p. 175) and it is really to this literary genre of the ṣāfa (q.v.) that belong the stories of the Prophet and the coming of the Beast (al-Dajjāl [q.v.]) and of the Dead (al-Mu‘minūn), which Tamīm communicated to Muḥammad and the latter published on his authority. Tamīm is said to have seen the two apocalyptic monsters with his own eyes and spoken with them in an island situated at the end of the world, where the tempest had thrown him on a voyage on the Syrian seas. On this island al-Dajjāl and al-Mu‘minūn are kept to await the day when they will be set loose on the world. This legend of Tamīm must have arisen at quite a remote period for it is already found with all its details in the earliest collections of hadīth : Muḥamīd, Abū ʻAbbās, Abū Mu‘āwiya b. Abī Ṣafīr, and is signed only by ‘Ali (Ibn Sa‘d, i. 21, 97– 23, 15 ; Abū ‘Abbās, Kābīr al-Kabīrī, Tāhirī, 170, 1272, p. 132), while the other, a longer one, begins with the formula : kābhī la mā anā (ḥaṣa al-Mu‘āwīya) Muḥammad... gives the four places mentioned above and is signed by the three first Caliphs, Abū Bakr, ‘Omar and ‘Uthmān, as witnesses. It is the latter which was in the possession of the Dārūsīn, who guarded it jealously and always produced it when threatened with spoliation by the local authorities. When Ibn Fadl Allāh al-Umari saw it on the occasion of a visit which he paid to the sanctuary of Hebron in 743 (Muḥamīd al-Ishār fī Manālik al-Amīrī, Cairo 1342, li. 172– 175), it was written on an old piece of skin which had been a part of one of ‘Ali’s shoes; the letters, in old Cufic characters, which were almost entirely obliterated and only a few faint traces left, but a certificate (ṭabāka) of the Caliph al-Mu‘tasim (756– 755) confirmed its authenticity and gave a copy of the text; the document was wrapped in rich covering of silk and kept in an ebony casket. Mūḍjar al-Dīn al-Ui‘amī who saw the document about 150 years later (cf. al-Umar, al-‘Un‘ al-Sa‘īdī, Cairo 1283, p. 428– 429) : the book was written in 900– 901) gives practically the same information but the ṣa‘īdā is not to be identified with him was from the caliph al-Mu‘tasim (555– 560). Later, under Ottoman rule, the Dārī Taqī al-Dīn gave the document to Sultan Murād who put it in his library and as a reward gave the Taqī al-Dīn a post as ṣā‘īd in Cairo. The Murād in question can only be Murād III (982–1003 = 1574–1599) or Murād IV (1032– 1049 = 1623–1640) for the incident is recorded by one of the chancellors of the Kābīr al-Tāhirī of Ibn Durādī, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 226), a certain Muḥamīd b. ʻOmar who (p. 211a) says he was a descendant of the historian Muḥāja al-Dīn b. al-Shīrīn (d. 980 = 1485) (cf. the preface, p. v.; Wüstenfeld is wrong in thinking he was his grandson). The longer version is also given in Ṣa‘īdī, Mu‘ājam al-Buldun, ed. Wüstenfeld, ii. 195 ; Ibn ʻAkkīrī, Ta‘rīkh Du‘aṣī, Damascus 1331, ii. 344– 357, who also gives the shorter version in the very full and detailed biography which he devotes to Tamīm on which al-Kāshī ṣhīrīn relies entirely (Ṣa‘īdī al-‘Uṣūl, Cairo 1337, xli. 118– 122). The apocryphal character of the document scarcely needs to be proved (cf. Cæsari, Annulli
Bibliography: Besides the sources and the authors quoted in the course of the article cf. the bibliographies of the companions; Wustenfeld, Register, p. 441—442; Sprenger, Das Leben und die Lehre des Muhammad, i. 408, 460; iii. 13 note, 432; Caetani, Annali dell'Islam, x. 544—546 (40 A.H., §§ 400—404).

G. LEVI DELLA VITA

TAMMUZ, the tenth month in the Syrian calendar. Its name is derived from the Hebrew שמחה (shimah) in which it roughly coincides. It is the same as the Roman calendar and like it has 31 days. According to al-Biruni, in Tammuz the lunar stations 8 and 9 rise and 22 and 23 set; the days on which one rose and the other, 14 days apart from it, set were the 10th and 23rd. According to al-Kazwini on the other hand, stations 7 and 8 rise, 21 and 22 set, on the 4th and 17th respectively. In the year 1300 of the Seleucid era (989 A.D.) according to al-Biruni the stars of the stations mentioned by al-Kazwini rose and set on the 9th and 23rd.


M. FLEISNER

AL-TANAS, MUHAMMAD b. 'AMM AL-ALI. An important author of the 8th century, lived at the court of the Zayyânid rulers of Ithimn whose historiographer he became and died in Dzumâ-Il '899 (Feb. 1494). Besides several works now lost and formerly given by al-Wangshatî in his Mus'âr, we have from the pen of al-Tanasi a history of his patrons, Nâyq al-Dirr wa l-Ityân ft Sharaf Sana Zayyân, ed. and partly trans. by Bagaei, Histoire des Bnî Zayyân, roi de Tlemcen, Paris 1852 and Complément de l'Histoire des Bnî Zayyân, roi de Tlemcen, extraits du châtî,... al-Tanasi, Paris 1887. It is, in the fashion of the period, not only a chronicle but also an anthology of poetry, literature, moral sayings and anecdotes.


E. LEVIS—PROVINCIAL

TANASUKH, transmigration, metempsychosis; a belief widespread in India and among several sects of the Muslim world. Muhammadan authors who deal with it attribute it to the Indians rather than to the Pythagoreans.

Shahirastân in his article on the "people of metempsychosis" takes the word in a wide sense: to him it means the doctrine of the successive lives and rebirths of the world. The Indians, he says, are of all nations that which believes most in metempsychosis. They tell the story of the phoenix and then say it is the same with the universe; after a certain number of revolutions, the celestial spheres, the stars, all come back to the same point and the life of the universe is repeated. The length of this period of revolution is 30,000 years according to some and 160,000 according to others. Mas'âdi (Murâdî, i. 163) also talks of this great revolution and gives the cycle a duration of 70,000 years. This idea was known

dilî', Islâm, ii. 288—291 [9 A.H., § 69, note 1, § 70, note 2]; Krenkow, Islamische, i. (1925), 529—532; the existence of the two versions is sufficient to show that the text is a complete fabrication. But the fraud must be old; not only is the document given in Abû 'Yûsuf, al-Wâhidî, Ibn al-Kalbi (cf. above) which takes us to the end of the second century A.H. but we could take it back to the end of the first century if we can believe the anecdote recorded by al-Baladî (Fusûl, ed. Goeje, p. 129, 13—14) from Ibn al-Kalbi (it is given also in the Dzumâ-Il Ândûsh, Escurial MS., f. 70 a 8), according to which the Caliph Sulaymân b. 'Abd al-Malik, when passing by the siege of the Dârîyân was careful not to stop there "for fear of bringing God's curse upon him". This is clearly an allusion to the document, which in the shorter version threatens with the curse of God any one who in any way infringes the šâ'î'a granted by the Prophet. Besides, there is another tradition according to which Muhammad had only promised to Tamam to grant his family the šâ'î'a of Hebron and the document was only drawn up after the conquest in the name of Abû Bakr (Ibn Sa'd, jili. 75; following Ibn al-Kalbi: the story is naturally passed into later writers). Although Wellhausen (Studien u. Vorarbeiten, iv. 126, note 1) considers this tradition to be a "späterer Korrektur", it seems to me contrary, to be the older. It is easy to believe that the Muslims at their conquest of Palestine found the sanctuary of Abraham at Hebron occupied by a section of the Christian tribe of Lakham, who perhaps exploited it by making charges to pilgrims who came to visit it; the nâmâ al-Dârî would not be an ethnic especially as, except for the family of Tamam and other individuals mentioned in the story of the embassy to Muhammad, we have no knowledge of a tribe of al-Dârî; it could very well refer to the dârî the "sacred chamber" (on this meaning of the word dâr cf. the article Kûsâiyn). These Lakhmîs, conversed to Islam, were probably able to keep the guardianship of the Haram in Mecca, which became sacred to the Muslims as it had previously been for Jews and Christians, and based their claim on an alleged grant made by Muhammad to their chief Tamam whose fame was gradually extended until he was made one of the inspirers of the eschatological beliefs and liturgical institutions of the young faith of Islam. It might even be asked if the traditions associated with the figure of Tamam al-Dârî are based on any historical figure or if his personality is not completely legendary. Clermont-Ganneau in his article quoted above refers to his Archaeological Researches, ii. 463—464 (which are not accessible to me) for the analogies which the grant of Hebron made to Tamam al-Dârî presents with that of the same town made in similar conditions to the Caleb of the Bible. But the Caliphs received Hebron (Joshua, xxv. 43; cf. Judges, i. 10) on the occasion of the general distribution of southern Palestine among the families of the tribe of Judah of which they were clients; there is then no analogy with the grant made to Tamam in quite special circumstances.

 Tradition knows practically nothing of the life of Tamam after the death of Muhammad; it only narrates that he left Madina after the murder of 'Uthmân in 35 and that he returned to his native land where he died at the end of the caliphate of 'Ali (40 A.H.).
to the Greek astronomers who called it the "great year."

In another sense tanāṣūkḥ means the diffusion and distribution of the divine spirit among the beings of our world. The Ghulāt, who were extreme Shi'is admitted, says Shahrastānī, tanāṣūkḥ and the descent or incarnations (fāṣẖẖ) of all or part of the divine principle in certain men. Belief in this kind of (fāṣẖẖ) is found among many peoples, who received it from the Mazdak Magi, Behmanu of Indian, philosophers and Sabaeans. Huṭūlī is acquainted with a sect of Sūfis whom he calls Huṭūlīs; they assert that there is only a single spirit, eternal and divine, which is diffused and passes into different bodies. This view, says Huḍūrī, is that of many Christians, although they do not confess it, of the generality of Indians, Tibetans, Chinese, and it is found among the Shi'is, Karmajānīs and the Ismā'īlīs. There are four degrees of metempsychosis: nakhẖ, maṭẖẖ, faṣẖẖ and raḵẖ.

In the popular sense, of passing from one body to another, the belief in metempsychosis is held by several Shi'i sects. Among the Ma'ṣṭaḏīlis, according to Shahrastānī, the disciple of Ahmad b. Hājī taught that God first created beings in a kind of Paradise; then those who were guilty of some disobedience were sent by Him into our world in the form of men or animals according to the gravity of their sins; they then migrate from form to form until the effects of their sins have ceased.

The Ismā'īlīs did not admit the passage of the soul into the bodies of animals; but they did admit successive lives in which the souls are active in the world of birth and death until they have recognised the Inām; then they rise to the world of light.

The Naṣṣāris believe that the sinner of their religion will return to the world as a Jew, Sama'i Muslim or Christian; the infidels who have not known 'Ali become camels, mules, asses, dogs or other similar animals. There are five different degrees of metempsychosis, according to the Naṣṣāris; the faithful soul which has passed through the seven degrees rises into the stars from which in the beginning it had descended. Anz. and Durrādī have connected this theory with the doctrine of the ascension of the soul through the seven heavens which originating on the Babylonian soil spread into Persian beliefs and then into those of the Neo-Platonists and the Gnostics. The Drūses have taken some of their popular beliefs from the Naṣṣāris, although their founder Ḥamza was opposed to them; they believe that the souls of the enemies of 'Ali will enter the bodies of dogs, monkeys, and swine. The Khāris and the Yaḍīs believe in transmigration into the bodies of men and animals and in successive existences separated by an interval of 72 years. According to Sā'yīd Shārīf Dūrdūnd (Ṭāfrīfī) the tanāṣūkẖ is the passing of the soul to a new body without interval on account of the inclination of the spirit for the body.

Al-Sam'ānīnī quotes curious legends about marḏẖ (a variant of maṭẖẖ), according to which the monkey, the pig and other animals are descended from people who have been metamorphosed. The star Suḥai and the planet Zhūr (Venus) are in the same way said to have been a king and a princess punished by God for their crimes and placed — somewhat illogically — among the stars. Finally we may mention the stories of metamorphosis found in the 100 Nights and other tales.


Abū Ya'qūb Yūsuf b. Muḥammad al-Tannawī who often appears in later tradition. His son Ismā'īl but still more his grandson Abū Ya'qūb Yūsuf b. Ismā'īl had the reputation of being very devout and miraculously gifted. The most important bearer of the name is the last-named's son:

Abū 'Amār Abī d-Ḫāfī al-Tannawī, fellow-pupil and friend of Abū Ya'qūb Yūsuf b. Ḩārūn al-Sadrāt al-Wardījānī. He came of a wealthy family and had an allowance of 1,000 dinārs a year for his studies in Tunis, of which he gave half to his teachers. His interest in learning, particularly in Arabic philology, was so keen that he did not even stop to read the letters that accompanied the paternal remittances. When he opened them, as he was about to return home, he read in one of the death of his father and in another of the death of his mother. His principal teacher in theology was Abū Zakariyya Yahyā b. Abī Bakr al-Wardījānī [q.v.] who also taught Abū Ya'qūb. Abū 'Amār lived principally in Wargīla (Wardījānī). In the spring he roamed with his hards far to the south among the oases of Marīb. His co-religionists revered him as one of the revenue of their religion (munḥiyy al-dīn). On the question of the verdict on the Qalīq, al-'Amīr was a fundamental one with the Abāḏīs, he inclined to leniency. On the other hand he shared the general bitterness of the Berbers against the immigrant Arab Beduins [cf. Muḥrā]. He declared that the property they had acquired in the Maghībī was lost (ghāṣīf) and, like his friend Abū Ya'qūb, he received a painful impression of the Beduins of the Hādiṡ who, when on a pilgrimage to Mecca so that their consciences troubled them as to whether they who in the Maghībī carefully avoided any, even business, intercourse with the Arabs, could purchase from them in the Hādiṡ; they conspired themselves with the reflection that the Hādiṡ had belonged to the Arabs from the very beginning. — Among the writings of Abū 'Amār are noted al-Maḏẖī fī Tahīf al-Sawā'īl, "Refutation of all enemies of truth", i.e. one of those four books in which the Abāḏīs used carefully to show that they were distinct from all other schools; also Sharī al-Dībāḥ, but particularly the Siwa in which Masquary remarks "Je règle des clercs", a fundamental work for the spiritual organisation of the 'ṣāliḥ leaders and their ṣāliḥa disciples. A long illness prevented
Abū 'Amārī from ever answering a list of queries from 'Abd al-Wahhāb b. Muḥammad b. Qāhil b. Nu'mān al-Anṣārī regarding the details of his teaching regarding their differences from other sects. A reply was only given after his and 'Abd al-Wahhāb's deaths by Abū Ya'qūb al-Wārṣajānī and is contained in the latter's Kitāb al-Ḍallī. According to this text, Abū 'Amārī died before 570 (1174).— His teaching was continued, notably by Abū Ya'qūb Yūsūf b. Muḥammad al-Tanawwut, the younger, whose name is identical with that of the individual first named in this article.

'Adī b. al-Luṭū'ī al-Tanawwut, who lived for a time on the island of Djerba, is said to have been the first man in Wargha to be killed by the invading Arabs. His brother was the father of Unm al-Munīm, a woman revered for her miracles. As in the case above named, the brothers Yaḥyā and Abu Ṭabīr Sulaimān b. Ayyūb b. Muḥammad b. Abū 'Amr al-Tanawwut are of interest to the biographers on account of their piety and miracles upon which they love to dilate.

Bibliography: al-Baradī, al-Dājishīr al-Muṣṭafā, Cairo 1306, used by: Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Shamakhitī, Kitāb al-Siyar, Cairo and Constantinople 1301, p. 444 sqq., 498 sq. 513 sq., 569; Abū Ya'qūb Yūsūf b. 'Abd Allāh al-Wārṣajānī, al-Ḍallī, Cairo 1306, i. 54 sqq.; ii. 28; Masqueray, Chronique d'Abyen Zakaria, Algiers 1878 (or 79), ii. xlviii. and notes to p. 140, 177, 235, esp. 253 sqq.; do., Formations des cités chez les populations sédiéntaires de l'Algérie, Paris 1886, p. 316; A. de Motylinski in Recueil de Mém. IV Congr. d. Orient, 1905, p. 545. (R. Struthmann)

TANGA (or Tangua), the name of the small silver coin which formed the main currency of the Mongol world from the end of the viii/ixth to the beginning of the xth/xxth century. It varied in weight from 20 to 35 grains (1.3—1.95 grammes) and was struck by the Later Khāns, the Qāhars of the Golden Horde, the earlier Qāhars of the Crimea and the early Timurids. The Russians borrowed the denomination and the name in the form teste at the end of the xivth century from the Mongols; denga, latterly of copper, were struck in Russia down to the first half of the xvith century. The word tanga has survived in Central Asia as the name of a small silver coin of about 50 grains (3.25 grammes) which was struck till the last century by the Shaiks of Persia, the Qāhars of Khōvān and the Emirs of Bukhār. Tanga is to be connected with the Turkic word tāngā, an official mark, a die (cf. sīkka) and not with the Indian tāhā [q. v.]. (J. Allan)

TANGIER, the ancient Tingit, Arabic Tanīdja (old ethnic: Tanīdja; modern ethnic: Tanīdar), a town in Morocco, situated on the Strait of Gibraltar, 7 miles to the east of Cape Spartel [q. v.] at the point where the Atlantic coast begins. The town dominates a magnificent bay terminated on the East by Cape Malabata (Rūs al-Mannī) and on the West by the citadel (ṣafra) and it slopes, at times fairly steeply, towards the sea. The town is divided into a number of quarters within the walls and others without. The former, fourteen in number, form the town properly speaking (Masāmīn, popularly Missmīn). Amongst the principal extramural quarters are those of Sidi Bu-Knāt (Ṣāyiḍi Abū Kanātīlī), Marsīlān (a large plateau 1,300 yards long, situated to the West of the town along the sea), ed-Drādah (al-Dārādah, that is "the slopes"), Ḥamāna, Sūq al-Barrī, Sīsāf (al-Sahāfī, "the poplars"), or San Francisco, al-Muṣawī (al-Maṣṣīwh), es-Sawāna (al-Sawānī, the norias) etc. In the immediate vicinity of Tangier are the villages of Ṣafrīn and Tāndjī al-Balīya, peopled by rustics of the tribe of Ṣāfāy of Tangier. There are a comparatively small number of mosques in the town; there are several Khaṭba mosques and six of less importance. The chief one which had been transformed into a church at the time of the Portuguese occupation was the object of several restorations after being won back for the faith in 1684. The town in the strict sense is surrounded by a rampart more than 2,000 yards in length, built in stone, which dates in large measure from the time of the Portuguese occupation (1471—1661); it was later restored at different times. Several gates are pierced in it; most of them are recent. On either side of the rampart towers (bordjī) are still standing; amongst them may be mentioned the bordjī al-naḍām, Irish tower, the bordjī d'ar al-Ṣāhrū (the York Castle of the English period), the bordjī al-nilām, with 29 bronze cannons of European origin. The principal monument of the town is the Sharfiīn palace, which is situated in the East part of the citadel. It is here that the government of the town has been located for several centuries. The English during their occupation called it the Upper Castle. The present palace was built on the ruins of this Upper Castle by the Pasha Ahmad b. 'Abd Allāh al-Tanawwut al-Kif before the year 1743, in which he was killed in a battle near al-Karīf al-Kabir (Alcazar quivir, q. v.).

Tangier has now a rather mixed population amounting to about 30,000 inhabitants of whom 3,000 are Muslims, 12,000 Jews and a European colony in which the Spanish element was the dominant one until quite recently. From the nineteenth century, the town was the residence of the representatives of foreign countries at the court of the Saūrīns of Morocco. This role of diplomatic capital of the Sharīfīn Empire has given Tangier a character of its own. It is now the capital of the international zone which bears its name; the status of this zone has been recently defined.

The most varied legends are told about the origin and foundation of Tangier. There is no space to recall them here. The site was known to and first inhabited by the Phoenicians, and after that by Phoenician colonists. Tangier figures in the Periplous of Hanno (530 B.C.). It seems that the town was the capital of different petty native kings of whom the chief one was Bokkūs I (c. 105 B.C.). In the reign of Bokkūs III (in 98 B.C.) it was formed into a republic and was declared by Rome a free city until in the reign of Claudius (42 B.C.) it was raised to the rank of Colony, with the name of Julia Tractuca and became the capital of the province of Mauretania Tingitana. In the year 303 at the time of the administrative reform of Diocletian, when Mauretania Tingitana was joined to the diocese of Baetica, Tangier became the residence of a Consul, and of a Prefect for civil administration. Tangier passed thereafter under Byzantine rule, but the residence of the representative of the Emperor of Constantinople was at Ceuta.

It was at the beginning of the eighth century that Tangier became Muslim; it was captured by
the celebrated Mūsā b. Nusair, who entrusted its government to one of his lieutenants, Ṣafrīk b. Ziyād al-Laiḥi, who concentrated close to the town the forces which were to carry out from Creta the first Muslim landing in Spain in the year 711. During the period of the governors nominated by the Caliphs of the East, Tangier became the capital of Morocco as far as the Grand Atlas, whence the expression al-Sūr al-Adnī, in opposition to al-Sūr al-Asfāl [q. v.]. The first governor who thus had Tangier as his residence was 'Umar b. ʿUbaïd Allah al-Murādī in the year 732. Soon afterwards, the very suburbs of Tangier the revolt of Maïsaara broke out. Maïsaara was a Berber who, under cover of the Khatridī movement, desiring to rid Morocco of the Arab yoke, managed to win over to his cause a great number of followers and marched upon Tangier which he seized in the year 740. The troubles which he fomented lasted until 785.

It is at Tangier that the historians make the fugitive Idrīs I, who was to become master of all the country, land on his arrival from the East. Finding the position of this town not sufficiently central, he seems never to have thought of making it his capital and Tangier now lost its rank as the first town in Morocco, which it never regained. It fell at the time of the Idrīsid partition of 829 al-Kāsīm, soon displaced by his brother 'Umar, who died in 835. All the North-West of Morocco had passed into the hands of this prince, and his descendants kept it from father to son in an almost independent manner for more than a century. It was not until 949, that Tangier was annexed to the possessions of the Umayyad Caliphs of Spain who appointed a governor, charged at the same time with the administration of Morocco, which had been reduced to the state of a vassal province of Cordova. It was thus that at the beginning of the 10th century the Idrīsid 'Ali b. ʿHāmilī was appointed governor of Tangier by the Caliph Sulaimān al-Mustaʿn bi ʿllāh, before fomenting the rebellion which brought him to the throne of Cordova in 1016. All the revolts at the end of the Umayyad Caliphate thus had their repercussions on Tangier and also on the neighbouring Creta and the Berbers of the country, ever on the alert to what was taking place on the other side of the Strait, placed at their head two governors of the tribe of the Barghashīta [q. v.], ʾIrīq Allah at Tangier and ʾṢaḥḥāt at Creta; under the quite nominal suzerainty of the ʾHamālīds of Spain.

Tangier was taken by the Almoravids in the year 470 (1077). It was there that the celebrated al-Muʿtāmīd [q. v.] disembarked in the year 1090. He was the last ʿAbūbādī of Seville, and was exiled to Morocco by ʿUbayf b. ʿAbbās. On the fall of the Almoravid dynasty the town passed at once under the ʾAlmohad domination. The first Caliph, ʾAbū al-Maʿmūn b. ʿAll [q. v.], seized it in the year 542 (1147). During the whole of the period of the dynasty it remained a flourishing town, and a port which was much frequented on account of its proximity to Spain.

Tangier, like the rest of North-West Morocco, did not at once recognize the new ʾAlmohad dynasty, on the fall of the ʾAlmohad dynasty. While Creta passed under the rule of the local princes of the family of the Bānū ʿAbd al-Qasīf, Tangier took as its chief Abu ʿI-Hāfiẓ ʿUṣūf b. Muhammad Ibn al-Amir al-Ḥamdānī who was killed in the year 665 (1266—1267) after having declared himself first the vassal of the Ḥāfiẓ al-ʿArīfī, then of the ʾAlbānīs of the East. In 672 (1273) the town was taken by assault by the Marinid Sulṭān Aḥḥ ʿAbd al-Ḥāṣṣ after a three months' siege. During the following century the town passed once more through an obscure period, and became involved in different rebellions, which mark the last period of the Marinid Empire.

It was in the first half of the 14th century that Tangier attracted, for the first time since its conversion to Islam, the covetousness of the Christian states of Europe. The Portuguese, masters of Creta since 1415, attempted by land to seize Tangier in 841 (1437). But this attempt remained without result as did those of 1458 and 1464. Finally they occupied the town on the 28th August 1471, during the reign of Alphonso V.

The occupation of Tangier by the Portuguese extended from 1471 to 1661, almost two centuries. Like the other Portuguese possessions in Morocco, Tangier passed nominally to Spain in 1581 under Philip II after the union of Portugal to the crown of Spain but it kept its own administration and its Portuguese garrison. This state of affairs lasted until 1643. After a revolution, Tangier again accepted the authority of the new Portuguese sovereign, the Prince of Braganza, John IV.

In the year 1661, Tangier passed from the hands of the Portuguese into those of the English on the occasion of the marriage of Charles II to the Infanta Catherine of Braganza, the Portuguese possession being part of the dowry of the princess. An English squadron, commanded by the Lord Sandwich, came to take possession of the town and a garrison disembarked there at the end of November of the same year while the garrison and almost all the Portuguese population returned to their native land.

Before the passage of the town of Tangier to the Crown of England, the Portuguese had only been able to maintain themselves in the place with difficulties of all kinds. Numerous skirmishes with Mudjāhīds, under the stimulus of a leader of a holy war, a member of the tribe of the Bānit Gurfat, al-Khāṣīr (the Moroccan form of al-Khiṣīr) Ghalīnā b. ʿAll, had harassed them without cessation on the outskirts of the town, and they were almost forced on many occasions to abandon their possession of it. It continued to be the same under English rule. The governor, the Earl of Peterborough, tried at first to conclude a truce with the Mudjāhīds by paying a sum of money but this truce was only respected during the years 1665—1664, after a check that the Muslims had suffered under the rumparts of the town. Hereafter the pact was broken and on the 3rd of May 1664, the new governor, the Earl of Teviot, fell into an ambuscade near Tangier and was killed with more than 400 of his soldiers.

The English, however, managed later to win over to their cause the chief Ghālīnā, who had set up as a pretender against the new ʿAlawīd Sulṭān Mawākiq al-Raǧūlī [q. v.]. An alliance was signed in 1666 between him and the governor Baron Bellasaye, but after being held in check by the troops of al-Raǧūlī, Ghālīnā was forced to cease all activity in the north of Morocco. Up to the death of this chief in 1673, the English enjoyed a respite in Tangier and they made use of it to carry out a great scheme of fortification and the con-
construction of a mole. But the expense which these works necessitated along with other causes helped to make the occupation of Tangier very unpopular in England. Thus it was under very favourable conditions that the ‘Alawi Sulṭan Mawlay Ismā‘il decided to lay siege to the town. This siege lasted not less than six years. An army was gathered together to blockade Tangier and the attacks on the advanced position of the system of defences were successful from the year 1678. As the siege became more and more severe, the English decided to evacuate the town after blowing up the mole and the most important fortifications. On February 6th, 1684 the garrison and the English population embarked with the last lord, Lord Dartmouth, and Tangier became once more a Muslim town.

The Moroccan governor, who was appointed to the command of Tangier, named Ali the ‘Alawi b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Tamasmin al-Ri‘i, at once proceeded to rebuild the town which had entirely been left in ruins by the English. He, and after his son, became sufficiently powerful throughout the district to be able soon to withstand Mawlay ‘Abd Allāh, the successor of Mawlay Isma‘il, and to give an asylum to the pretenders to the dynasty. In later times also, the governors of Tangier who nearly all belonged to the same family had no hesitation in occasionally throwing off the authority of the sulṭān. The history of the relations of these governors with the mahārīs is the history of Tangier until the sixteenth century.

On August 6th, 1844 Tangier was bombarded by a French squadron under the command of the Prince de Joinville. Eight days afterwards the Moroccan forces were routed at the battle of Lily.

It is unnecessary to quote here the successive agreements come to between the European powers and Morocco which ended in the elaboration and adoption of the statute under which Tangier and its zone are at present ruled, along with the zone of Spanish influence and the zone of French influence in Morocco. A railway from Tangier to Fès and to Rabāṭ has been open since the year 1927.

Bibliography: A good monograph on Tangier with documents, statistics, illustrations and maps has been published under the title "Tanger et sa zone" being volume vii. of the collection "Villes et tribus du Maroc", Documents et renseignements publiés par la Section Sociologique de la Résidence Générale de la République Française au Maroc, Paris 1907. The "Archives Marocaines", Paris 1904–1920 also contain a number of documents on Tangier. For the Portuguese occupation the principal contemporary source is the "Historia de Tanger" of D. Fernando de Menezes, Lisbon 1737; Tangier has been the subject of many descriptions by travellers (chiefly English) in the sixteenth century. A list of them can be found in Playfair’s Bibliography of Morocco, London 1892. In conclusion, the Arabic dialect spoken by the citizens of Tangier has been the subject of a masterly study by William Marçais, "Textes arabes de Tanger", Paris 1911, based on the works of Lluchvitz, Meissner, Blanc, Marchand and Kampffmeyer. These texts besides their linguistic interest contain valuable information about society and native life in Tangier.

(E. LEVI-PROVENCAL)

TANKA, (Sanskrit pāhā, a weight of silver = 4 mānas) an Indian coin. When Muhāmad of Ghazna conquered northwestern India and struck bilingual coins for the convenience of his Hindu subjects, pāhā was used in the Nāgarī legend as the translation of dīrham in the Arabic legend. Shams al-Dīn Ilītūshī, Sulṭān of Dehlī (1210–1235 = 567–553) introduced a heavy silver coin of 175 grains (= 11.3 grammes) and gave it the name of tanka (although tola would have been more accurate); a gold tanka of the same weight was first introduced by Nūsir al-Dīn Muhāmad (1226–1265 = 646–664). These two coins were henceforth to be the standard coins of India. The gold tanka was last struck by Mu‘īz al-Dīn Mu‘ābān (1421–1433 = 824–837) except for a few rare pieces of the Sūrā. The coin itself was again struck by Akbar but was now known as the mukhrī [q.v.]. The silver tanka became gradually debased after the reign of Muhāmad b. Tughlāk, being practically copper ("black tanka") under the Lāhūrī. In the great reform of the coinage by Sher Shāh (1530–1545 = 945–952) it was restored to its original fineness and weight but was now called the rupee (tārī). As the rupee, the denomination was taken over by Akbar and has continued the monetary unit of India to the present day. Akbar transferred the name tanka to copper coinage; his tanka was a piece of 2 ṭāns (640 grains = 4.15 grammes); he also struck a copper coin called the tanki which was 1/10 of a tanka (64 grains = 4.15 grammes).

Silver and more rarely gold tankas were also the currency of the various contemporaries of the Sūlṭān of Dehlī, in Bengal, Gudjarat, Malwa and the Deccan. The word still survives in Bengali in the form pāhā and is the regular Bengali word for the rupee; in Southern India the name is still in use on the Portuguese coins of Goa where it is the equivalent of mana.


TĀRĪ ( teg), Heaven; God. In the eastern dialects the vocalisation is usually palatal: Cāgštā, tāngri (written تاری) and similar forms in the other dialects. The triliteral forms in Teleut (tāhūrd) and in the Altai dialect (tāhrī) are worthy of note; the Kasan dialect has alongside of tāngri (god) a word tārī = image of a saint, ikon (we may here mention the proper name Tārī-hīrd, where tārī of course means God). Ottoman Turkish has a non-palatal vocalisation (tāri) which has Yavuz which has also in addition a triliteral form (tāhūr). For the lexicographical material cf. Pavet de Courteille, Dictionnaire Turc-Oriental, s. v.; W. Radloff, "Versuch eines Wortregister des Türkischen", iii. 823, 1065; O. Böhlinger, "Über die Sprache der Tschuten", Türkisch-Tatarischer Sprachen, p. 168 sq.; and lastly al-Kāhchārī (Dīwān ‘Ulughī al-Turk, Constantinople 1333–1335, ill. 275 sq.), who says: tāngri means God; the infidels however call heaven tāngri and likewise everything that impresses them, e.g. a high mountain or a large tree. They worship such things
and they call a wise man tāngrāhīn. This word tāngrāhīn appears also as an old Türk title (cf. Radloff, Worterbuch, iii. 1048; F. W. K. Müller, Uigurica, p. 47: tāngrāhīn = ruler). With the meaning "God" (in the Manichaean system) we find tāngrāhīn for example in the Manichaean confession of sins (Culnulpēnif, ed. A. von le Coq, 1911, p. 10). The word tāngrīm (i.e. tāngri with the grammatical suffix of the first person) seems to be used in the Turfan texts in the titles of princesses or queens (cf. F. W. K. Müller, Uigurica, p. 48, who compares the modern usage of ḫanum and ṣiqānum). We may here give a few derivatives of tāngrī: tāngrī (in the Manichaean confession of sins, cf. T. R. A. S., 1912, p. 289, 299) = preacher, chosen one (lit. man of God); Kuman, tekhrīk = "divine"; Uigur, tengrīlīk = "pious". The Mongol tāgri (God) is a loanword from the Turkic (for this form cf. Bibl. Buddh. u. z. 51).

The etymologies proposed for the Turkish word (e.g. by Vámbéry and Barbier de Meynard, s.v.) are of no value. In most modern Central Asian dialects of Turkish tāngrī has the two meanings "God" and "Heaven"; in Ottoman Turkish on the other hand the (rather obsolete) word has apparently only the meaning "God". A few combinations of tānūrī, e.g. tānūrī devtavīzī = thousand-footed, cf. the Dictionaries of Radloff and Barbier de Meynard (s.v.).

To define the conceptions implied by the word tāngri so far as the beliefs of Turkish paganism is concerned, it will be advisable to deal first with the old Turkish inscriptions and then with the material collected in modern times from the Telet and Altab shamanism.

In the inscriptions tānūrī almost always appears as a divine power: it is by his will that the king attains to power; the king himself is "like tānūrī" and "born of tānūrī" (Tānūrī tānūrī bozmoğlu) and installed by tānūrī (tānūrī yararınmakoğlu). Tānūrī protects the Turkish people, secures their victory over their foes: in this quality of special protector of the Turks he is described as Türk tānūrīsī. Alongside of the God of Heaven we find a certain power over the fate of the people and the individual conceded to the spirits of earth and water (gir-sud); the highest deity however is Tānūrī.

There are however some passages where the term tānūrī does not imply any real personality. The "blue heaven above" (bağa kık tānūrī) is created like the "dark earth below" (aşına yagıbars yir) and mankind. Who created them is not stated. An important passage (V. Thomsen, Inscriptions de l’Orkhon, p. 112) records that a rising of the Oghuz took place "because heaven and earth were in confusion". Here we have clearly the influence of Chinese ideas of the nature of the universe, the theory which de Groot called "Universismus". This need not surprise us because the Turkish chiefs who had the Orkhon inscriptions prepared lived within the area of Chinese cultural influences.

On the conception of tānūrī in modern Turkish shamanism (i.e. mainly among the Telet and Altai Turks) cf. H. Vámbéry, Die primitive Cultur der Turke-Tatarischen Volker, 1879, p. 150 sqq.; W. Radloff, Aus Sibirien, 1884, ii. 1 sqq. and the texts collected by Radloff in the first volume of his Proben der Volksliteratur der Türkischen Stämme Süd-Sibirien. This paganism as might be expected, did not remain entirely free from foreign, e.g. Christian and Buddhist influences; when, for example, in a shaman’s conjuration we find the expressions Pyrkan Tengri and Pyrkan Kan (Radloff, Aus Sibirien, ii. 33, 44), it is natural to recognise in Pyrkan the Mongol (also old Turkish) word Burkhan = Buddha. That the pagan Turkish creation myth shows traces of Jewish, Christian and Buddhist influences was noted by Radloff himself (op. cit., ii. 5 sqq.). When it is said that the evil spirit Elik created a heaven for himself, like the god of heaven, one is tempted to think of Zoroastrian influence ("the counter-creations" of Ah riman).

According to the Turkish shamanism the most powerful god, Tengere Kaira Kan, created the heavens and also the evil spirit Elik, the good spirits, mankind and the earth. The form tengere (following the orthography in Radloff) corresponds to the Telet Tündür and Altai Tüznü. Kaira Kan must be identical with the Altai Kuriouskan (cf. Radloff, Worterbuch, ii. 22), a word used to describe gods and spirits; Tengere Kaira Kan is therefore the "god of heaven".

There are seventeen different regions in heaven arranged in succession: above the other deprived of the good spirits live. The highest of these minor deities are Başı Ulğun, Kyasag Tengere and Mergen Tengere. The gods of heaven are not directly appealed to like the spirits of earth and of water but through the intermediary of the spirits of ancestors, i.e. a shaman (kam) is required for the purpose. In a Telet shaman’s prayer (Radloff, Volksliteratur, i. 238) the heavens above are appealed to as the Creator. In an Altai myth (Radloff, ibid., i. 61 sqq.) he asks the hand of the daughter of the god of heaven, Tämnük Ökü.

When it is said of the thunderstorm in the dialect of Kasaan: "The old man of the heavens (stähri bahal) is thundering", this is a relic of old pagan ideas (cf. Radloff, Worterbuch, ii. 1425; iii. 1047; iv. 1564).

Speaking generally one may say that apart from foreign influences, so far as they can be eliminated, in the Turkish conception Täññūrī is regarded as the heavens as an element and also as the spirit ruling in heaven. This spirit was probably originally conceived as a kind of force, something which would be called mana in modern ethnology. The conception of a personal god of heaven must have developed out of this.

When Turkish tribes took over other religions the word tāngri became the name for the god or higher beings of these religions. The meaning "heaven" was naturally driven into the background. To convey the conception of heaven the word kık (Ottoman gük) was used, which is originally the name of a colour (cf. Radloff, Worterbuch, ii. 1220). In old Turkish we also find gük bull, the blue ether (Uigurica, p. 8, 18; Radloff, Worterbuch, ii. 240). In Buddhist old Turkish texts tāngri corresponds to the Sanskrit deva "god"; in Buddhist mythology, a conception which is better conveyed by the word "angel" because this being lacks several qualities which to us are necessarily associated with the idea of "god". The feminine equivalent dēt is given by tāngri bhatra; tāngri bhis is Turkish for devakanyā (divine maiden, apsaras). The king of the gods (devarājī) Indra
is Tângirîl ðikî Khorramdâdë; Brahmā is called Aruma Tângirî. The goddess Cîrî is called Kit Tângirî Khatun or (without Khatun) Kit Tângirî. The name Kit Tângirî seems also to be given to Kubera (e.g. Müller, Ugaricu, p. 45). In a collection of dhâranîs for travellers, the Tâhistovûlî (ed. by W. Radloff and A. v. Staël-Holstein, St. Petersburg 1910 = Bibl. Buddhica, xii.), we find a deva named Tângirîdâm, whom Radloff takes for Kubera so that the latter has therefore another Turkish name. But this is doubtful, for in one passage (p. 22) of this work, Kubera (Kupiri) is mentioned by name and Tângirîdâm is mentioned soon after as a different deity, but it must be allowed that in the text there are elsewhere illogicals (cf. §2 Turkish text, p. 23 sq.). For Kubera in this work cf. also p. 97, note 2; Buddha himself is often called Tângirî Tângirî. The god of heaven (Arowlîk) is called in Turkish Tângirî Yir and the Vaimânîkas gods, as a rule peculiar to Jain mythology, but also found e.g. in the Tâhistovûlî, are called Vaimânûkî-Tângirî.

The Manichaean Turkish terminology which is influenced by Buddhist (cf. Chirnystamnî, ed. A. v. Le Coq, Berlin 1911, p. 5; J. R. A. S., 1911, p. 278) shows the word in the following way: Tângirî corresponds here to the Iranian Yad (or Bagí); in the first place this means the highest principle of the Manichaean system and secondly the subordinate spirits of light or gods (yamak tângirî) in contrast to the demons (yakhrî). The first man is called bîsh tângirî, five-god (from his five component known from the Manichaean myth: ether, wind, light, water and fire). The name tângirî is also given to the five elements, e.g. oet tângirî = god of fire. Tângirî is found with the meaning "heaven" (e.g. Chirnystamnî, p. 16 = J. R. A. S., 1911, p. 291, l. 167). Paradise is called Tângirî Yir. This Manichaean terminology corresponds pretty well to the Buddhism. One or two peculiarities may still be pointed out: the occurrence of the already mentioned term, tângirîkîn (Chirnystamnî, p. 10; J. R. A. S., 1911, p. 281, l. 22), in the name of a deity (Aryâ Tângirîkîn) translated in John le Coq (J. R. A. S., loc. cit.) "Arya the Lord" and the peculiar combination Arksho Yir Tângirî, the "archon earth-god", in which perhaps the word tângirî is used for one of the powers of darkness (cf. J. R. A. S., 1911, p. 393, note 31).

In Christian Turkish usage is Tângirî = God; Tângirî-Oghîlî = "Son of God" and Mabkhûr Tângirî = the God Messiah. In the Christian fragments published by F. W. K. Müller in Ugaricu we also have the word Tângirîdâm, which we frequently find in Buddhist Turkish; it occurs twice in these Christian texts and seems here to mean simply "God". The Kuman usage gives nothing worthy of special remark.

As regards the earlier Muslim Eastern Turkish texts, the Arabic and Persian terms (Aâbhî, Kâmâdî) naturally begin to compete with the Turkish Tângirî. In the Rûmûc Bibîk, so far as I am aware the Arabic name for God is of rare occurrence (practically only in Arabic quotations). The conception of God is however not exclusively conveyed by Tângirî in this text but other Turkish words e.g. Bayât are used. The word Tângirî occurs here also with the addition of teâštâ. In the Rûmûc-

Tânţâ seems to be the usual word for the Deity, except in quotations; here also, following the Arabic usage, we sometimes find Tângirîbîdâm (e.g. p. 408, ed. Hinzinsky). That the word Tângirî is disappearing in Eastern Turkish also before Arabic and Persian terms is perhaps to be deduced from Shaw's remark (A Sketch of the Turkish Language, ii. 69).

Proper names like Tângirîrî, Tângirîbîn may be modelled on Persian names like Kâbûdî and Kâhûdûhûn.

(V. F. Rîchmann)

Tânsîn, of whom Shaikh Abu 'l-Fâdî said: "A singer like him: has not been in India for a thousand years", was a native of Gâwîlîrî, and was at first in the service of Râm Çamd the Baghî, Râdâ of Pânâ'î, who is said to have given him on one occasion ten million tankas. Ibrahim Sîrmaine endeavoured to entice him to Agra, but Akbar, in 1562, sent a mission to Râm Çamd and at Khîlindûr to induce Tânsîn to come to his court, and Râm Çamd, not daring to refuse the request, sent him with his musical instruments and many presents to the imperial court. On the first occasion of his performing there Akbar gave him 200,000 rupees. Most of his compositions are written in Akbar's name, and his melodies are still popular in Hindustân. He had two sons, Tántârâng Kâm, also a singer at Akbar's court, and Bîlûs, who was a singer of the court of Akbar the Great. Gâwîlîrî was famous for his musicians, and produced a musician of the eighteenth singers at Akbar's court.

Bibliography: Shaikh Abu 'l-Fâdî, Acker-nâmâ, text and translation by H. Beveridge; A'îl Akbarî, text and translation by Robbmann and Jarrett; 'Abd al-Hamîd Lâhawî, Phûdih-kâmâ, text; all in the Bibliotèque Indica series of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

(T. W. Hâns)

Tânţâ, an important town in the Egyptian Delta between the Rosetta and Damietta branches of the Nile, capital of the Gharbiya province, and a busy railway junction, of unpretending appearance, about 75 miles from Alexandria. Its Coptic name of Tântâaâ has assumed in Arabic the forms Tântî, Tânţû and Tânţâ. Formerly it was an episcopal city. Nowadays the place is famous for the tomb and mosque of the most celebrated of the Muslim saints in Egypt, Aymad al-Badawi [q. v.]. Throughout the year no fewer than three Memûlûh or birthdays of this Saint are made in the occasion of great fairs to which pilgrims flock from all parts. The presence of a large native population and the extreme veneration with which the spot is regarded have made it a centre of fanaticism. Tânţû is one of those places where the worship of a Muslim Saint had displaced that of an earlier Coptic one.

The present town is built on one of those numerous mounds of accumulated mud-hut débris so characteristic a feature of the Egyptian landscape. The Almadya mosque, which was rebuilt under 'Abbâs I., is the principal building of any historic importance. It is now the second largest religious establishment in the country. A library, begun in 1898, contains about 9,000 volumes including over 1,000 MSS. The number of professors attached to the Tânţî institute is over 100; the
students numbering about 2,600. Besides large Government Schools, there is a well-equipped American Mission Hospital. But the health of the people is not improved by the existence of an evil-smelling, muddy canal flowing through the town.


(J. Walker)

**AL-TANTAWI,** Muhammad ʿAli (with his full name: al-Ṣaḥib Muhammad b. Saʿd b. ʿUlamāʾ ʿAlī al-Maʾrīṣī al-Tantawī al-Ṣāḥīfī), an Arabic scholar of the 19th century, born in 1225 (1801) at Nījdīr (a small village near Ṭantā in Egypt), died Oct. 29, 1861 in St. Petersburg. His father, a travelling merchant, was born in Māḥāllat Mārīṣī, hence his nība: al-Maʾrīṣī. At the age of six he went to a maktab in Ṭantā. At 13, he moved to his uncle in Cairo and studied at al-ʿAzār. Of his teachers the celebrated Ibrahim al-Dirjātī (d. c. 1275; Brockelmann, G. A. L., ii. 487) had a particular influence on him (see the ode dedicated by Ṭantawī to him, Z. D. M. G., iv. 245–246). He also studied with the poet Ḥasan al-ʿAbbār (d. c. 1250; Brockelmann, op. cit., ii. 473, No. 1). Many of his fellow-students later became famous. His friend Rifāʿ al-Ṭantawī (Brockelmann, ii. 481, No. 6) sent to Paris as Imam of the first scientific mission (1825–1831) by Muhammad ʿAli was one of the founders of the new literary movement. Ibrahim al-Dārisī (1811–1883) was Lane’s first tutor (Brockelmann, ii. 478, No. 4). After his father’s death in 1843 (1257) al-Ṭantawī had to stay two years in Ṭantā, where he continued his studies and gave lectures. Returning to Cairo he joined the teaching staff of the ʿAzār mosque; here he was one of the first to discuss literary and poetical themes. He had been a teacher for a time in an English school. F. Fresnel was the first to make his fame known in Europe (cf. ʿA. A., 3rd Ser., v, 1828, p. 60 sqq.). Many young scholars after him studied with al-Ṭantawī (G. Weil, Dr. Pruner, A. Peerson, R. Früh, son of the founder and first director of the Asiatic Museum in St. Petersburg). The latter brought his reputation to Russia and in 1840 (1256) al-Ṭantawī was summoned to St. Petersburg as teacher of Arabic in the “Institut des Langues Orientales”. In 1845 he was appointed Extraordinary Professor in the University and in 1854 ordinary. His teaching had hardly any permanent influence in Russia; his method was not adapted to the European university system. Of his pupils (1840–1842) the most noted was the Finn G. A. Wallin (1811–1852), the noted Arabic teacher, afterwards Professor in Helsinki, who corresponded with him regularly till his death (see K. Tallqvist, Breif, och Dokhanskanstillingarn av G. A. Wallin, Helsingfors 1905). A severe illness forced al-Ṭantawī to go on leave in 1861 and in the same year he died. His tomb with inscriptions in Russian and Arabic still exists in the Tatar cemetery in Leningrad.

His literary activity before he moved to St. Petersburg was almost exclusively confined to the old fashioned scholarship. He composed many books, such as al-ʾIklīl and al-Khawāṣ, which exist in MS. in Cairo and Leningrad (University Library). Among his original productions of the same kind were his Liwaʿal faṣl ʿAṣār al-Fāṣl (in private hands in Cairo) and his Uṣūlīl wa-nabāṭ of his own commentary, Mashahhaʿ ʾal-ʾAzār wa-manāṣiṣ ʾal-Fāṣl wa-tālīl wa-nabāṭ wa-nabāṭ wa-nabāṭ (Leningrad, MS. Or., 830). To the Russian period belongs his useful Kitab al-muṣābīḥāt, Leipzig 1848, which, besides the exercises, contains many letters and verses from his own pen (cf. Fleischer’s observations, Z. D. M. G., i. 1847, p. 212–215; iii. 1849, p. 474–475).

His acquaintance with European literature and his command of French enabled him to make interesting critical observations (cf. ʿA. A., 4th Ser., ix., 1847, p. 351–354; Milièges Asiatiques, St. Petersburg, i. 1851, p. 474–495; ii. 1855, p. 466–486). Many articles in Arabic from his pen are in the manuscripts left by him (e. g. on the Egyptian festivals, MS. Or., 538, ff. 50–60; a collection of stories and anecdotes in the popular Arabic of Egypt, MS. Or., 745; Comptes-rendus de l’Académie des Sciences, 1826, p. 23–26; an Arabic translation of Sainte-Beuve’s Guide to his works by him, Comptes-rendus de l’Académie des Sciences de Russie, 1924, p. 102 sqq.; an autograph copy of his work ʿUṣūlīl wa-nabāṭ al-Fāṣl wa-nabāṭ wa-nabāṭ and of his understanding of the text of ʿUṣūlīl was found in Constantinople (see Rescher, Z. S., iii., 1924, p. 252; Comptes-rendus de l’Académie des Sciences, 1927, p. 181 sqq.)

His inestimable claim to fame is his large collection of manuscripts (c. 150) which passed after his death to the University Library (cf. C. Salemann and V. Rosen, Indices alphabetici codicum manuscriptorum persicorum turcicorum arabicorum qui in Bibliotheca Imperialis Literarum Universitatis Petropetrovana adscriptur, St. Petersburg 1888). Many manuscripts were copied or collated and corrected by him (cf. Zaptinski, vi. 384–390). The collection contains very old manuscripts; it has many unique and valuable copies, almost all from Egypt (e. g. Zaptinski, xxii. 283 sqq.; Zaptinski, 291 sqq.; Comptes-rendus de l’Académie des Sciences, 1924, p. 101 sqq.).

**Bibliography:** al-Ṭantawī’s autobiography (to his settlement in Russia) was published by Kosegarten with a German translation, W. Z. K. M., vii., 1830, p. 43–63, 197–200; important corrections to it are given by G. Gottwaldt, in Z. D. M. G., iv, 1850, p. 243–248. The European articles are too scanty and inaccurate (Brockelmann, G. A. L., ii. 479; Huerl, Litteratura arabica, 1901, p. 420; Chekhov, La litterature arabe au XIXe siècle, ii. 59); more important are the recent Arabic biographies by Ahmad Tabrīzī, in Madsjam al-ʾAlmāʾi al-ʿArabī, iv., 1924, p. 388–391 (corrections by I. Kratschowski, ibid., iv. 562–564) and Muhbīl al-Dīn al-Khatīb, in al-Zahrāʾ, l, 1343, p. 417–428 (with picture), p. 554. A description of his manuscripts in Leningrad and his biography is being prepared by I. Kratschowski.

(IGN. KRATSCHOWSKY)

**AL-TANUKHĪ,** and ʿAlī al-Muḥassim, an Arab writer, was born in 939 (according to Yaḥṣīl) in 940–941 A.D., the son of a learned kāṯī in Baṣra, and received his early education.
there, from al-Süli [q.v.] and Abu 'l-Faradj al-
Išāhān [q.v.] and others. He chose a judicial career
and rose to be kāfi, first in Baghdad and then in
Ahwāz; as a result of a change in the vizierate in
Baghdād his office was taken from him in
969-970 and his property confiscated. He was
not allowed to follow his profession for three
years. During this period he seems to have lived
mainly in Baghdad but also made a journey to
Egypt. Then he was restored to office but fell
into disfavour with the Būyid 'Abd al-Dād [q.v.]
(981-982) and is even said to have spent
some time in prison because he had penned con-
tempt on al-Shāfi‘ī and his followers. He suffered
many more hardships and much persecution before
he died in Baghdad in 994.

The following are given as Tanūkhī's works:
A Siwān which no longer survives; and three
collections of anecdotes: Kitāb Niğmān al-Mu-
ğafara wa-Abīhār al-Muddakara, al-Mustafājūd
min Fāqīlār al-Ajadiā and, by far his best known
book, al-Fāraydha al-Shidda (not composed before
984). This is a collection of proverbs, anecdotes
and sayings on the theme "joy follows sorrow".
Madārīn [q.v.] a century and a half before had
written a work similar in title and substance and
Ibn Abī 'l-Dunyā and the kāfi Abī 'l-Husayn
after him had published similar collections.
Tanūkhī used these works and other literature sources
but also drew upon oral traditions for his new compi-
lation. He owed many a story to his father and
his teachers, and was also able to draw upon his
own experiences; but the bulk of the contributions
not taken from literary sources were given him
by secretaries and judges. The work begins with
a brief introduction dealing with literary history
in which Tanūkhī discusses critically the works
of his predecessors. Then come the separate stories,
most of which are introduced by a brief reference
to their sources, divided into 14 chapters from
the point of view of matter or form. While Ibn
Abī 'l-Dunyā's work was intended to be edifying in
itself, Tanūkhī's collection was lighter and wittier.
It found a wide welcome, was much read and
copied and in later times played a part in Persian,
Turkish and Jewish literature.

Bibliography: A. Wiener, Dīr Farāḥ b'd
al-Sāda-Siddo, in Ilk., iv, 1913, p. 266;
298, 387-420, esp. 393-413 (full bibliography:
p. 393, note 2 and p. 398, note 1); also Yāqūt,
251-267; al-Farāhib b'd al-Shidda, 2 parts,
Cairo 1903-1904.

(R. Pareti)

TANZIL [See WAJH.]

TANZİMAT, or rather TANZİM-ı KUHAYRIYE
("beneficial legislation" from the expression: ışanın
tanẓim etmek = "to draft a law") is the term used
to denote the reforms introduced into
government and administration of the Ottoman
empire from the beginning of the reign of
Sultan 'Abd al-Majīd and inaugurated by the
charter generally called the khaṣṭ-ı shērīf of Gūl-
hāne. The expression tanẓīm-ı kuḥayrīye is
first found in the latter years of the reign of Mahmūd II.
The other end of the period of the tanẓīm is
put about 1880, when the absolute rule of 'Abd
al-Hamīd II began.

The tanẓīm-ı are the continuation of the work of
Sultān Selim III and Mahmūd II, undertaken to
save the Ottoman state which had become enfeebled
internally and externally. Mahmūd II had succeeded,
by getting rid of the feudal system at home and
the reactionary element of the janissaries, in
centralising and consolidating his power in home
affairs but he had been unable to avoid the loss of
Greece and Egypt. His work however was not
yet constructive. This was reserved for his suc-
cessors or rather for the great statesmen of his
successors for, since the sultāns themselves proved
incapable of directing the reforms, the task of
carrying them through became more and more
the work of a reform party among the Turkish
officials themselves. In the period from 1839 to
the end of the Crimean War, the course of the
reforms was Mustafa Kâzım Paşa (1816-1856),
who was six times grand vizier; in the second
period inaugurated by the character called khaṣṭ-ı
hümâyûnī from Feb. 1854 the activities of the
reformers were directed by 'Ali Paşa (q.v., d. 1871)
and Fu'ād Paşa (q.v., d. 1869); the great
figure in the third period (from 1871) was Midhat
Paşa (q.v., d. 1883).

The khaṣṭ-ı shērīf of Gūlkhāne was not distin-
guished by any new ideas; in it the Sultān an-
nounced that henceforth he wished the honour
and property of all his subjects to be secure, that
the farming out of the taxes (ibādāt) should be
abolished and that recruiting for the army should
be done in a more regular fashion; all criminals
were to be tried in public and it was expressly
said down that all subjects, to whatever religion
they belonged (emek-i İslam see-müslim-i vârî)
should be equal before the law, without exception.
To draw up the necessary legal enactments, the control
of reform already in existence (mejlī-i aḵkhām-i
'adiliye) was to be increased by a certain number
of members. Although, in the preamble to
the document, it was said that the former prosperity
of the Ottoman state was due to respect for
the Kur'an, at the end it is stated that the new
measures mean a complete change in ancient
principles (miṣâwil-ı 'atāğa). In fact the aim of Rashid
Paşa in drawing up the khaṣṭ had been as much
to give satisfaction to the European powers, whose
intervention in the domestic affairs of Turkey had
become more and more serious (solution of the
Greek crisis; agreement with Muhammad 'Ali),
as to re-establish confidence in the home govern-
ment. For the moment this double aim was
achieved. But as soon as the attempt was made
to carry out the reforms, numerous difficulties
were met with. This was in the nature of things.
The new institutions were based on the administra-
tive systems of European states, notably France,
and in introducing them problems and distinctions
were created in the state which, under the old
system, had never presented themselves in so
threatening a form. Four groups of interests had
to be dealt with: 1. the civilian officials and
military officers who in the old order had been the
slaves of the Sultān; 2. the free Muslim subjects
of whom the 'alamât were the most notable
section; 3. the non-Muslim subjects, the rays
(ra'yâya) and 4. the foreign interests. The con-
solidation of the first two groups offered least
difficulty; religion united them and Mahmūd II
and 'Abd al-Majīd had renounced their rights as
sovereign over the lives and property of the
officials; the ending of the feudal system by Mah-
mūd II had also been favourable to the combination
of the Muslim elements. But to give the Christian
and Jewish subjects equal rights to the Muslims
threatened to deprive the former of the considerable autonomy which they had enjoyed since the time of Mahomed the Conqueror; the attempts to deprive the Muslim ecclesiastics of their rights of jurisdiction and administration and the problems raised by the enrolment of non-Muslims in the army soon showed that the latter themselves did not regard the granting of equal rights as an unmitigated benefit and at the same time accentuated the hostilities and differences already existing between the different non-Muslim communities, differences often more serious than those between them and the Muslims. Lastly the foreign powers, although numerically weak, with the liberties and privileges granted by the capitulations occupied a position which was all the stronger because foreign powers took advantage of it, not only for their own profit but also to make themselves the protectors of non-Muslim subjects in their struggles to keep their privileges (France by virtue of the capitulations; Russia by virtue of the treaty of Kiliak Kainardji). The realisation of the reforms was bound to be in great part illusory so long as the privileged position of the foreigners, known as extra-territoriality, continued to exist in striking opposition to the centralisation of power which was the aim of the reforms. It is for this reason that the great difficulties of the tangmat centred round the problem of the rayas (insurrections in Crete, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Lebanon and Bulgaria), and the intervention of the Powers (among them the Holy See) which was always the result. It was for this reason also that the fear was formed in Turkey itself a considerable alarm which regarded the tangmat as dangerous to the empire. But the path once taken by Rashid Pasha could not be abandoned, because the old institutions themselves no longer offered guarantees. It was rare however, to hear serious objections from the religious point of view; the Shishk Al-Islam was present at the reading of the khatt-i shirfi, although it does not appear that he sanctioned by a fetvah the different laws which were promulgated as a result of it. The reforming ministers themselves always refused on the other hand to repeal definite sections of the shar'a such as that of capital punishment for apostasy from Islam or the non-validity of the evidence of a non-Muslim before a tribunal, although they were quite ready to pass any measures to which the shar'a did not refer.

The tangmat were thus carried through in a very troubled atmosphere. A grand vizier could hardly ever carry through a programme peacefully; there were sudden falls from power often followed by equal unexpected returns to office. Thus Rashid Pasha was no less than six times grand vizier between 1846 and 1858 although the Sultan Abdul Majid was rather in favour of the reforms. The same changes in office took place under 'Abdul-'Aziz, much more capricious than his predecessor; Midhat Pasha was grand vizier for three weeks in 1873, and for the second time for seven weeks (Dec. 19, 1875-Feb. 5, 1877). There were also periods when foreign intervention suddenly called for new efforts; this was notably the case during the deliberations which preceded the peace conference in Paris. Turkey's allies then wanted the Sultan to bind himself by an international agreement to carry out the reforms which were still in abeyance. The result was the khatt-i humayyin of February 1856, which was nominally a spontaneous act of the Sultan. In article 9 of the Treaty of Paris of March 30, 1856 the contracting Powers take note of the declaration by expressly stipulating that it would not give them the right of interfering in the interior administration of the empire. Now the khatt-i humayyin is simply a more detailed confirmation of the promises made in 1859 regarding the equality of treatment of non-Muslim subjects; it is in particular laid down that mixed tribunals shall be instituted for lawsuits between Muslims and non-Muslims and that the laws relating to them shall be codified as soon as possible. One further important point in this act is the right conceded to foreign powers to possess landed property in Turkey. The intervention of European powers did not cease, however, after 1856; thus in 1859 they demanded an enquiry into the European provinces. In 1867 the Ottoman government was again taken to task by the Powers; but they were not agreed among themselves as to the steps to be taken: while Russia demanded an extreme system of decentralisation, France encouraged the Porte to try a policy of fusing together the different categories of subjects. It was the latter view that prevailed for the moment: the opening of the lycée of Ghazi Seray for teaching French was one of the consequences. After 1870, foreign pressure became weaker on account of events in Europe (Franco-Prussian War); it is just this period that is marked by a strong tendency to decentralisation in Turkey, but of a kind which pleased neither the Powers nor the rayas. This policy had a certain amount of success, as for example the strengthening of Ottoman power in Triполитia and Tunisia. The reaction was not long in being felt. The insurrections of 1875 in the Slav provinces resulted in "a European conference" at Constantinople in 1876 and in the following year came the disastrous war with Russia which separated Rumelia and Serbia from the Ottoman Empire and created an almost independent Bulgaria (Treaty of Berlin, July 13, 1878). The act by which Turkey had tried to anticipate this intervention was the promulgation of the Ottoman Constitution on December 23, 1876, the day of the first meeting of the European Conference. But this remedy, already regarded very suspiciously by the new Sultan 'Abd al-Hamid, did not gain the success anticipated; the author of the constitution, Midhat Pasha, was banished two months later and soon the constitution was completely ignored by the Sultan. In the long "Hamidian" period which followed the War with Russia, the reforms were not, however, completely suspended; the laws of 1879 affecting the judiciary in particular in a way completed the legislation of the tangmat.

We now give a rapid survey of the different reforms. The grand Council of Justice, also called the council of the Tangmat, underwent several transformations in 1854, 1861 and lastly in 1868, when its activities were definitely divided into administrative and judicial functions — i.e. into a Council of State (zahra-yi-desseler) which retained its form till 1918 and a High Court of Justice (divan-i akt-i-yi-adlis). Immediately after 1839, Rashid Pasha had introduced a new system of administration in the provinces on the French model and abolished the hiles. This proved to be too much centralised and in 1852 the powers of the governors had to be again extended; the
farming out of the taxes had again to be introduced because levying them directly did not bring enough into the treasury. The law relating to the wilayets of 1864, completed in 1871 by another law, completed the system of provincial administration which lasted till 1918. This law of 1864 was further remarkable because it provided for each province new tribunals, different from the courts of the ḥāfs, although the judges were very often 'ulamā'.

Even before 1864 there had been created at Constantinople and several large provincial towns a commercial court and a mixed court (for law suits between Ottomans and strangers); these two courts were amalgamated in 1860, but it was not till the legislation of 1875 and 1879 that all the non-religious tribunals were put under the Ministry of Justice. The first common law was the Commercial Code of 1850, based for the most part on French law, as were the Penal Code of 1858, the Code of Maritime Commercial Law of 1863, and the Code of Commercial Procedure of 1861. The Civil Code or Medjelle of 1869 on the other hand is an attempt at codification of the law of property and the law of guarantees according to the Hanafi Mağābīb. This codification carried out by a council under the presidency of Ahmed Djevedt Paşa is not to be considered however as being obligatory in use; it is rather a manual for judges who have not studied Muslim law. The law regarding the execution of judgments and the Code of Civil Procedure, both of 1879, were not recognised by the foreign missions, so that they were never applied in mixed suits.

Legislation for the different non-Muslim communities was an extremely complicated task. The "organic regulations" which in 1860 were published for the large communities had the tendency to give more power to the lay element in the administration, to the detriment of ecclesiastical authority. The communities in general kept their judicial autonomy. The Porte in its turn had to deal with disputes within the communities and differences between the Roman Catholics and the Eastern sects "united" with the Holy See. Here again the European Powers had every opportunity to intervene, especially Russia in the question of the primacy of the Gregorian Armenian Church in Turkey and in that of the schism of the Orthodox Bulgars who were recognised as an autonomous community in 1870. The enrolment of non-Muslims in the army, decided upon in 1855, when the ḍarūfī was officially abolished, remained a dead letter during the tanzimat. It was replaced by an exemption tax (hedel).

In foreign relations all the attempts to obtain the abolition of the capitulations which had been begun at the Paris Congress remained fruitless. A slight change in principle was effected on the occasion of the law of 1873, which granted foreigners the right to possess real estate.

From 1845 a council had been instituted to elaborate reforms in education (rüşāde-i mevṭef). The President was Fustat Paşa and later Djevedt Paşa. In this field the tradition of religious instruction had to be combated. The creation of universities, in 1845, could not at first have any direct consequences and the creation of the secondary (rüşāde-i tıbbiye) and primary (rüşāde-i sāhib) presented considerable difficulties. Lastly the opening of the Lycees of Ghiṣaṣa Sarzā in 1868 where French was to be the language of instruction, meant the introduction of a foreign culture and was vigorously opposed. It was not till towards the end of the nineteenth century that these measures began to bear fruit.

The period of the tanzimat was comparatively poor in measures of an economic nature. The finances of the state were all the time in a deplorable condition, aggravated more and more by the foreign loans (from 1854) and by Sultan 'Abd al-‘Azīz’s extravagance. The international control of the national debt which was the result was not, however, taken in hand till after the financial catastrophe of 1879. The decree of 22nd Maḥarram 1299 (Dec. 20, 1881; cf. Young, v. 69) established the International Council of the Ottoman Debt.

The following table of the more important legislative measures of the tanzimat gives the sources as far as possible. The references to the collection of laws, Dā‘ūrī, which contains the legislation down to 1886 are taken from Young, Corps de Droit Ottoman (Oxford 1905—1906), which gives most of the texts in a French translation. Where the text is not given the reference has been put in brackets. Most of the other references have been taken from Engelhardt, La Turquie et les tanzimat, Paris 1884. Although the statements in this book are not very accurate, they may help to complete the general survey of the reforms especially in the first period.

The period of the tanzimat also saw an intellectual effort in the Turkish Muslim element, which laid the foundations for the new Turkish culture. It was in this period that Şināk, Nāmil Kamal and Ahmed Wekil worked, who created a new Turkish literary language. To it also belongs Ahmed Djevedt Paşa, famous as an historian, man of letters and legislator (cf. Fâżâl ‘Alî, Ahmed Djevedt Paşa ve-Zenâk, Constantinople 1832). Ziyâ Gök Alp, the theorist of the modern Turkish nationalism, also recognises the high importance which the period had for the development of Turkish thought (cf. Türk-tarihî Efsaneler, An- gorâ 1339, p. 61; and Halide Edib, Memoir, London 1926, p. 238 sq.).

Bibliography: The Turkish texts of the legislative measures are given in the Dā‘ūrī. French translations are given in Aristarchi Bey, Legislation Ottomane, Constantinople 1873—1874; supplement in 1878; G. Young, Corps de droit ottoman, vol. i—vii, Oxford 1905—1906; A. Heindorf, Droit public et administratif de l’Empire Ottoman, Leipzig 1908; a Greek translation, Κανόνες οικονομικού, was utilised by Young. For foreign relations cf. Gabriel Edzidi Noradunkhan, Recueil d’Actes Internationaux de l’Empire Ottoman, tome ii—iv, Paris 1900—1903.

The Turkish historical sources on the tanzimat are not abundant: Ahmed Wekil, Tavīkî (Constantinople 1920—1926), vol. vi—viii, covering the years 1255—1265; ‘Othmān Nūrī, ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd (İzmir ve-Deve-ri Sultanat), vol. i, Constantinople 1327; there is no monograph on the tanzimat. — European works: Ed. Engelhardt, La Turquie et les tanzimat, vol. i—ii, Paris 1884; Chertier, Les réformes en Turquie, Paris 1885; A. Ubicini, Letters sur la Turquie, Paris 1855; da., La constitution ottomane, Paris 1879; Millingen, La Turquie sous le règne d’Abdül Aziz, Paris 1868; Rosen, Geschichte...
Khaṭṭ-i aṣḥāb of Gūlkhāne.

Reorganisation of the Grand Council (meğlî-ı aḵbâr-i 'adlîyye).

Promulgation of a code of penal laws.

Institution of a tribunal of commerce (tibâyî-ı meğlî-ı aḵbârî). in the Ministry of Commerce.

Law relating to the formation of the contingents of the army.

Assembly of provincial delegates in the capital.

Creation of a university and of establishments for secondary education.

Publication of an administrative code.

Creation of civil and criminal mixed tribunals.

Creation of a Ministry of Public Education (meğlî-ı meğlî-ı 'umûmîyye).

Firman in favour of non-Muslims.

Firman on the administration of the provinces.

Division of the Grand Council into a Council for Reforms and a High Council of Justice.

Abolition of khrâqîyye for the rayas and decision to enroll them in the army.

khâṣṣ-ı hâkimîyye.
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Foundation of an Ottoman Bank.

Promulgation of a Code of Lands.

Promulgation of a Penal Code.

Appendix to the Code of Commerce, regulating the Tribunals of Commerce, which are amalgamated with the mixed tribunals.

Regulations regarding the Armenian Gregorian Community (ratified in 1863).

The two High Councils joined into one with three sections (administrative, legislative and financial).

New regulations for Lebanon.

Code of commercial procedure.

Organic regulation of the Oecumenical Patriarchate.

Concession of the Imperial Ottoman Bank.

Code of maritime commerce.

Regulations for the Jewish Community.

Organic regulation for Lebanon.

Law of the wilâyets.

Law granting foreigners the right to own property.

Creation of a Council of State (khrâq-ı devlet) and of a High Court of Justice (dûvâ-ı aḵbârî-ı 'adlîyye).

Opening of the Lycée of Ghalaṭa Serîûy.

Law on the Ottoman nationality.

Law on the competence of the meğlîyye tribunals.

Elaboration of the Civil Code (meğlî-ı aḵbâr-ı 'adlîyye); the 16 books of the code were promulgated between 1869 and 1876.

Law on the creation of the Bulgarian Exarchate.

Law on the secularisation of the Ewâzîf (never put into execution).

Firman reorganising justice; the commercial tribunals transferred to the Ministry of Justice. Promulgation of the Ottoman Constitution (fârû-ı erâstî).

Organic Regulation of the Ministry of Justice and Public Worship.

Regulation of the meğlîyye tribunals.

Law on the execution of judgments.

Code of civil procedure.
but the capital itself had still to be taken from the Muslims. Raymond began the siege in 493 (1101) and to isolate the town more effectively built a fort on a hill on the ravine of Kesilah, called Mons Peregrinus (by the Arabs Sandjil i.e. St. Giles), at the foot of which in course of time a little town arose. He died in 499 (1105) in this fortress without having attained his goal and it was not till July 12, 503 (1109) that the beleaguered town capitulated. Idrist, who wrote in 1154, says the fortress "built by the Frank Ibn Sindji" and gives a list of towns and villages belonging to Tarabulus and of the rocky islets off the harbour. In 1170 the town suffered severely from a terrible earthquake. After the fall of Jerusalem in 1187 Tarabulus held out for another century as an important base for the Christians until in 688 (1289) the army of the Mamlûk Sul-tan al-Mansur Qal'ûn appeared before it and it had to surrender on April 26. This proved a turning point in its history for the Sultan, learning a lesson from the past, built a new Tripoli on the Pilgrims' Hill while the old town was destroyed and sank to be an insignificant little harbour known as al-Minâ (from the Greek Minas). Dimigliò who wrote about it c. 1300 A.D. describes the plentiful supply of water in the town—in addition to the running water on all sides, an aqueduct 200 ells long, 70 ells high was built—and the gardens with excellent fruit in plenty. He also mentions the various localities belonging to Tarabulus, including Botrys, Buq'ân and the Nasridian hills. Among the kingdoms (mamalik) divided among the descendants of Saladin was a kingdom of Tarabulus but this division was soon replaced by a division into five provinces, and Tarabulus was put under Damascus as its port. The town is now in a comparatively prosperous condition owing to the remarkable fertility of the surrounding country, the not inconsiderable shipping and the silk industry. Of non-Muslim inhabitants the orthodox Greeks are the most numerous. A series of towers along the seashore recalls the warlike past of the town.


(TABULUS)

TAARBUNZ, the Turkish form of the name of the town of Trebizond, in Greek Torbç, situated at the southeastern corner of the Black Sea on a very hilly coast which is separated from the rest of Asia Minor and Armenia by a high range of mountains, this town, like the population of the country immediately around it, has always led a more or less isolated existence, from which it only emerged in those periods when
In 1240, the Mongols put an end to the hegemony of the Seljuqs. Trebizond was spared their invasion but the emperor Manuel had to declare himself a vassal of the Mongol empire (cf. e.g. William of Rubruck, ed. de Bacher, Paris 1877, p. 6; Hakluyt Society edition, London 1905). In this period the Abbasid sources change the orthography of the town to Tārābhūn or Āṭalāsūn (cf. especially Dimaghki, ed. Mchen, p. 106, 145, 228 and Abu ‘l-Farādī, Mushahhar who writes Tārībāt: Abu ‘l-Firdaws, Ta'āsim al-Bulūdān, p. 392–393; Vāyāt, i. 306 keeps the old orthography). After the Mongol conquest the city experienced a new commercial revival; the centre of political power having shifted to Tabriz, Trebizond became the corridor to Asia Minor, through which ran the great trade-route to the Far East which the Mongols had opened. The people of the town did not themselves take part directly in this traffic which was in the hands of Genoese and Venetians but they profited greatly by it, because it, for example, gave them an opportunity to export the products of the city itself (especially linen, silk and woolen goods and the minerals of the adjoining mountains). The Genoese colony in particular, with their own consul at the head, from the second half of the 13th century occupied a premier place among the foreigners and, supported by its mother city, was sufficiently powerful to obtain extraordinary concessions from the emperors. The centre of their activities was the quarter called Leontocastrum. In proportion as the Mongol power declined (after 1320) the territory of the emperor of Trebizond suffered more and more from the attacks of the Turkomans of Asia Minor, who took possession of the strongholds in the mountains; at the same time civil wars were weakening the empire, while the trade-routes became impracticable. Its neighbours were now the little Turkish states which had replaced the empire of the Seljuqs, Kastamonu in the west [q.v.] with Smyrna, to the south, the dynasty of the Oghuz and the south-east the Aq-Koyunlu. The emperors of Trebizond in this period endeavoured to strengthen their position by marrying princesses of their house to Turkomans. This state of affairs lasted until the Ottoman Sultan Bayezid I after the capture of Samsun in 1396 and his victory over the Aq-Koyunlu became a redoubtable neighbour. Timur’s advance saved Trebizond for the moment; in 1392 the emperor Manuel came to submit to the conqueror and a few years later had to assist him in his preparations against Bayezid; the fleet demanded by Timur was not however required, as, before it was equipped, the battle of Angora took place (1402); a body of soldiers from the city seems however to have taken part in the battle against Bayezid (Fallmerayer, p. 229). Timur’s armies withdrew, going to the south of the mountains of Trebizond; this territory with the towns of Armenia and the Caucasus now passed to Khusraw Sultan, nephew of Timur. It was during the period of Timur’s invasion of Asia Minor that the Spanish envoy Clavijo passed through Trebizond. The revival of Ottoman power once more became dangerous and resulted in the decline of Genoese influence and the rise of that of Venice. Under Murad II, Turkish ships in turn tried to seize Trebizond but after the fall of Constantinople the town was doomed. The emperor Kalo-Johannes then concluded
an alliance with Üzün Hasan to whom he gave his daughter in marriage. David, the successor of Kale-Johannes endeavoured to extend this alliance to the Christian rulers of the Caucasus and the Muhammadan lords of Kaştanı and Karaman [q.v.]. But all these efforts were in vain. In 1644 (1460) the Ottoman Sultan Muhammad II set out on his great campaign in Asia Minor which gained him Kaştanı and Sinope without a blow being struck. He then turned against Üzün Hasan, took him from the frontier fort of Koilia Hisar or Koyunlu Hisar and concluded a peace with him. He then marched on Trebizond and in spite of the attempts of Sera Khatun [Sera Khatun of 'Askhi Pasha Zade], mother of Üzün Hasan, to persuade him to abandon his designs on the town. The Turkish fleet commanded by the grand vizier Mahmut Pasha had already gone to Sinope. The emperor David was quite resolute to capitulate when Mahmut Pasha [q.v.] appeared with the vanguard of the Turkish army. The Sultan with some difficulty was persuaded to approve of the capitulation, by the terms of which David and all his family were to be taken to Adrianople; a few years later he was put to death by order of the Sultan. The Turks immediately installed themselves in the town and citadel and only allowed a third of the population to remain in the suburbs. The majority of the rest were carried off to Constantinople. The church of the citadel was converted into a mosque (Orta Džami') and also the church of St. Eugenius which was henceforth known as the Yeni Džami'; all the country conquered was granted as fiefs to Muslims. Trebizond never again became a town of great importance under the Ottoman empire; it became the capital of an eyalet to which also belonged the town of Bitum (Hadsji Khalifa, Džihan-nâmesi, p. 429 sq.). For some time it was the residence of Selim I as crown prince; the mother of the Sultan is buried in the Kührünie Džami'. Trade was conducted mainly by sea; Ewliya Celebi, for example, only visited it from the sea; the road to the interior, to Erzerum, continued to exist but it had no longer the commercial importance it once had. In 1534 this road was improved by Rashid Pasha, after the route through the Caucasus had been closed by the Russians (Rosen, Gesch. der Türkei, i. 214). After the introduction of the wilayets in the sixteenth century the wilayet of Tarabzun included the sandjaks of Tarabzun, Şamsun, Lazistan and Gümüşhâne (Cuinet, L. 41); the present wilayet, as reorganised since the war, is much smaller in area, with 6,922 and 356,250 inhabitants (cf. Turchy Sâl-nâmesi, 1926, p. 624). In the Great War, Trebizond was occupied by the Russians in April 1916, but as a result of the Russian revolution and the negotiations at Brest-Litowsk the Turks had no difficulty in reoccupying the town on Feb. 24, 1918.

The centre of the town of Trebizond has been built on a plateau in the form of a table (hence the name) which runs down to the sea on the north side and terminates on the south in an elevation on which stands an acropolis (Orta Hisar). Above the acropolis again rises the citadel (Sel). The latter, called by the Turks Boz Tepe, is bounded on the east and on the west by ditches which have to be crossed by bridges to reach the suburbs. The country all round is mountainous and covered with vegetation. The suburbs, lying along the coast to the west and east of the old town, have a mainly Christian population while since the Turkish conquest the centre has been Muslim. The eastern suburb is the centre of trade and navigation; the ships moor in the roads and one can hardly speak of a harbour. The population put at 35,000 by Cuinet, has always been very mixed. The Latins (cf. Lazi), as the principal inhabitants of all the surrounding coast, form a considerable section of it and are mainly boatmen and fishermen. Ewliya Celebi found other aboriginal inhabitants there with whom he declares to be the least agreeable section of the populace. The Turkish spoken there shows in its sounds considerable influence of local dialects. The Greeks (8,000 according to Cuinet) and Armenians (6,000) form the Christian element. After the Turkish defeat in 1918 and in spite of the recent reoccupation, there arose in all the lands of the Pontus with Trebizond as centre, quite a strong movement, which aimed at reviving the old empire, but the victory of the Angora government put an end to these attempts at independence (cf. in particular, the government publication, Pontos Meclisi, Angora, 1938 (1922). A section of the converted Greek population has preserved to the present day certain customs and rites of Christianity (cf. F. W. Hasluck, The Crypto-Christians of Trebizond, Journal of Hellenic Studies, All. 19th century).


**TARABA**

E 'Abd al-Bakr is unanimously considered by Arab critics one of the foremost poets of the period before Islam and is the author of the longest of the poems known by the name of Musallâqa. He is at the same time one of the earliest poets of that period of whom poems are preserved. The editors of the Musallâqa and of his collected poems generally give a full genealogy from which however we can gain with certainty only that he belonged to the section of Bakr of the Wall tribe. His father's name is given as al-'Abd h. Sulaym, the name 'Abd being probably only an Islamic abbreviation of some thorophoric name like 'Abd Manât. The
biographies given in Arabic authors are exceedingly unsatisfactory, and generally attempts are made to draw conclusions from his verses. This much seems certain, that he had relations with the court of the kings of al-Hira, especially with king 'Amr b. Hind, who reigned approximately from 554 to 568 of the Christian era. The lands of the poet's tribe lay in South-eastern Arabia, in Bahrayn and the Yanamma, which appears also to have been the home of the earliest Arab poets of whom we have any reliable knowledge and it is possible that Arabic poetry, as we know it, spread from this part of the country.

'Tarafa is, in a legendary account, brought into contact with the still earlier poet al-Musniyyah b. 'Alac, whom he is said to have corrected when he made a mistake in one of his poems. Generally Arab antiquarians describe 'Tarafa as extraordinarily precocious and argue from a poem (Ahlwardt, No. 1) that he was a mere boy, when he composed verses after the death of his father, when his uncle acted unjustly towards his mother Warda. He is also stated to have died very young. The latter is a conclusion arrived at from some verses of al-Kharnik, who is claimed to have been a sister and in the verses in question mentions the age of 25 years. As she is said to have been a daughter of a man named Hiffan it is more probable that her elegy, composed upon another unknown person, was assumed to refer to 'Tarafa, who may have died at a comparatively early age.

We obtain some light by comparing contemporary history. When 'Amr succeeded his father in 554 A.D. he gave to his brothers certain commands, but slightly his half-brother 'Amr b. Umama. The latter went to South Arabia and accompanied by 'Tarafa to obtain help from the Yanamite princes. 'Tarafa had left some camels belonging to (or inherited from) his father in the district where 'Abd, a brother of the king, and 'Amr b. Kals al-Shalibasi were in command. 'Amr b. Umama received the support of the Yanamite tribe Murad, the troops being under the command of Hubaira b. 'Abd Yaghluh. When they reached the Yamama, Hubaira fell ill through drinking from a well and 'Amr b. Umama sent to him a doctor who applied hot irons clumsily to his stomach in the effort to cure him and almost killed him. Believing that the doctor had acted under instructions of 'Amr, Hubaira had him murdered at a place called Ka'dib and he and his clansmen returned to the Yanam. The man who had slain 'Amr went with his family to al-Hira expecting a suitable reward from king 'Amr, but instead of this he and his family were burned alive. This event is mentioned by 'Tarafa in the first line of his Divan in the recension of Ibn al-Sikkit (not found in Aihwardi's edition except for a few verses). The poet also claims in the same poem the return of the camels confiscated as being the property of his father who is here called Ma'bad. They were pastured near Tabala (Ibn al-Sikkit, No. 2). In this poem which must be considerably later, he gives full vent to his feelings because the property is not restored and accuses also a man named 'Abd 'Amr b. Bishri, who was not a relation of the king as is generally assumed by the biographers. The latter seems not to have benefited from the confiscation. This poem had the desired effect and 'Tarafa composed a violent attack upon the king in which he says that it would be preferable to have a sheep to rule than king 'Amr (this poem has 17 verses in the recension of Ibn al-Sikkit; only 9 verses are found in Aihwardi, No. 7 and App. 17). This appears to have been the climax and from a poem by a sister of 'Tarafa, whose name Ibn al-Sikkit does not give, it appears that 'Abd 'Amr was to a great extent responsible for 'Tarafa falling into the hands of the governor of Bahrayn (this poem is not in Aihwardi nor Seligsohn). Ibn al-Sikkit tells us further that the governor was not willing to kill him and the king sent an official who killed the unwilling governor as well as 'Tarafa.

Against this we must set the tale of the letter. King 'Amr in a celebrated legend is stated to have given to 'Tarafa and his kinsman al-Mutamimms, after a visit to his court where he treated them with honour, a letter each containing a recommendation for suitable reward by the governor of Bahrayn upon their arrival. Such a course of bestowing favours, though unusual, was plausible as the reward might consist of cattle, but al-Mutamimms, becoming suspicious, broke the seal and asked a youth at al-Hira to read the contents. Reading that the letter contained a command for their execution and afraid of his life, he decided to go to Syria and advised 'Tarafa to open his letter also, but the latter refused to do so, thinking it impossible that the king would dare to have him murdered among his own people. While al-Mutamimms fled to Syria and from there sent his Hijjari poems to the king, 'Tarafa went to Bahrayn and met with a cruel death, being buried alive after having been maimed. I believe that this account has been invented by ancient antiquarians who knew from the poems of al-Mutamimms that he made mention of a letter in his poems, the contents of which are not even known and may have been of an entirely different nature.

Ibn al-Anbarsi in the introduction to his commentary on the Mutlala'qa claims an uninterrupted chain of authorities down to al-Mutamimms himself, a chain which has every semblance of being genuine, unless we cast suspicion upon Hammed al-Riwiya (ed. Rescher, p. 1). From the same commentary we learn that 'Tarafa had already received discreditors from king 'Amr and his brother Khabis when he visited the court during the reign of their father (Ibn cit., p. 5) I am inclined in consequence to believe that 'Tarafa never visited the court of king 'Amr at all during his reign, but took sides with his half-brother, 'Amr b. Umama, went with him to the Yamana, where they stayed for some years, because 'Amr b. Umama married there and had several children, before he undertook his expedition to the Yamama (Commentary of Ibn al-Sikkit). This also makes it impossible that 'Tarafa died at a very early age; he had been at the court of al-Hira before the accession of 'Amr, probably as one of the notables of his tribe and spent several years in South Arabia. Young he may have been in comparison with other Sahids, but it would be rash to make any definite statements. As regards his religious views we can only say that from his poems we can glean nothing that would point to anything else than the customary pagan fatalism.

As regards his value as a poet we can only repeat the opinion of native critics who are...
only undecided whether he is one of the greatest poets of the time of paganism or the greatest of all. His description of the camel in his Ma'allaqa is justly celebrated and hardly surpassed by any other Arab poet. As regards the genuineness of his poems I must refer the readers to the conclusions of Ahlwardt and Geiger, though I should like to suggest that perhaps more is genuine than these two authorities will admit. If al-Malikamis, al-'Aghi, 'Ubaid, the 41st of the latter, Simak b. Harb, Hammad al-Ra'wiya and al-Haitham b. Adi really handed down his poems we may expect that his poems did come down to the time when they were finally commented by grammarians and are preserved with a certain amount of accuracy. The best accounts we have of the poet are contained in the Divan in the recension of Ibn al-Sikkit, where unfortunately the editor has mixed the latter's notes with those of al-A'mi and in the introduction to the Mu'allaqa by Ibn al-Ansabir.


F. Krenkow

TARANCI, Eastern Turkic word for agriculturists; as the name of a people, applied to the colonists transported by the Chinese government in the middle of the xvi century from Kâshgharia to the Ili valley; cf. Radloff, Wetterer's, p. 841. The Taranci are said however, even in the Ili valley, to have described themselves as the native population (Yarod, cf. Radloff, p. 343). They numbered 6,000 families of whom 4,000 were settled on the right and 1,900 on the left bank of the Ili; for further particulars see Radloff, Aus Sibirien, ii. 233. Acc. According to a census of the year 1834 the number of families had increased to 8,000. Down to the beginning of the rebellions of the Muslims in Kâshgharia the lot of the Taranci is said to have been quite tolerable; but their prosperity was hencethence undermined by frequent requisitions for military purposes. After 1863 the Ili valley also became involved in the rebel movement; after hard fighting an independent principality of the Taranci arose under Sultan Abu Tafacl or Ali Khan [see article KSHIR]. In 1871 this was conquered by the Russians and remained under Russian rule till 1882. The Taranci then numbered 51,000 of whom 45,372 went over to Russian territory, when the Ili valley was returned to the Chinese (treaty of St. Petersburg, Feb. 24, 1881). They were settled in the district of Semiryecye (Semiryecenskaya Oblast'); the leader of these emigrants was a wealthy merchant, Wali Akhun Yuldashev. The Taranci formed the majority of the population of the town of Djärkent which was founded at this time (in 1911: 16,000 of 25,000). Up to 1887 the lands allotted to the Taranci were several times taken from them for Russian Cossacks and the Taranci moved to other places. The Taranci are valued not only as agriculturists and gardeners but also as artisans and labourers; they are said to be unrivalled in building with clay. According to the census of 1897 they numbered 55,993; for a later date, larger numbers (up to 85,000) are given; the census of 1910 gave 82,505. The prosperity of the Taranci suffered severely with the rising of the Kar-khirläte in 1916 and the events of the revolution; in 1917 the number of Taranci living in towns in the administrative district of Djärkent was only 6,736 — compared with the previous figure of 16,000 in the town of Djärkent alone, a considerable reduction. In Soviet Russia, the Taranci do not form a political unit; they live in the autonomous republic of Karakulistan; there is also a Taranci colony in Baimur-Ili in Turkestan. The Taranci along with the Turkomans (Kâshghari) who later immigrated from Kâshgharia claimed they were Uighurs by race. This is due to a misunderstanding as the historical Uighurs never came so far west.

The number of Taranci remaining on Chinese territory was about 8,200 at the beginning of the xxth century. Measures were taken at that time by the Chinese authorities, not without some success, to induce the Taranci who had emigrated to Russia to return to their original homes.


W. Barthold

TARAWIH (A.), plural of the usual sing. TARAWI, the sâliuto which are performed in the nights of the month of Ramadân. Tradition says that Muhammad held these sâliuto in high esteem, with the precaution, however, that their performance should not become obligatory (Bukhâri, Tarîkh, trad. 3). 'Umar is said to have
been the first to assemble behind one šeji, those who performed their prayers in the mosque of al-Madīna singly or in groups (loc. cit., trad. 2); he is also said to have preferred the first part of the night for these pious exercises.

Canon law recommends the performance of the tarawīḥ shortly after the qalāt al-lūhā. They consist of 40 tashīlmās, each containing 4 raddās; after every four raddās a pause is held; hence the name tarawīḥ ‗pauses‘. In the Makkīte rite they consist of 36 raddās. They belong to the qalātā which are sunna and are as popular as any rite connected with Ramadān [q. v.]. Shūrī būkhārī prefers a thousand supererogatory raddās throughout the month of Ramadān.

In Meccā people assemble in groups varying from 10 to 150 persons, behind one imām [q. v.], who acts in this case unofficially, even if he should be an appointed official. The recitation of the Kurān has a prominent place in these qalātā. Very busy people may perform even this prayer within a short space of time; other groups abide behind their Imam’s reciting the Kurān once or several times in the nights of Ramadān. Even after the tarawīḥ many people stay for pious exercises.

In Aṭchin every night large crowds assemble in order to perform the tarawīḥ. Usually, however, it is the tūnīs alone who takes the active part in them, the others limiting their part to a disrespectful joining in with the sinān and the eulogies on the Prophet. The sinān receives the qalāt al-lūhā as a remuneration for his endurance. In his Arabic New-Year (Yerk. Ak. Amst., new ser., xxv., No. 2) Wensinck traces the rites of Ramadān back to pagan times.

Bibliography: Bukhārī, Tariqūṭh with the commentaries; Mālik, Mawṣū′a, Šaḥīṭ fi Ramadān with Zurāqūṭh’s commentary; Abū ʾIshaq al-Shāhī, Tandīḥ, ed. Juynboll, p. 27; al-Ramlī, Nihāyāt, Cairo 1288, l. 503 sqq.; Ibn Hadajr al-Haṭṭāmī, Twāṣf, Cairo 1282, l. 505 sqq.; Abū ʾI-Iṣām al-Hilī, Šarīṭ al-Islām, Calcutta 1555, l. 51; Castani, Annali, A.H. 14, § 329 sqq.; Juynboll, Handleding, Leyden 1925, register; Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka, ii. 81 sqq.; do., Mechaschische Sprichwörter, No. 49; do., De Afghāni, l. 247 sqq.; d’Osson, Tableau général de l‘empire ottoman, Paris 1787, l. 214 sqq. (to be used with caution); Lane, Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians, London and Paisley 1809, p. 481.

(A. J. WESINNCK)

TARĀZ, Arabic name for Talas, a river in Central Asia and the town on it probably near the modern Awdyā Ate [q. v.]. The town was probably of pre-Muslim age, presumably Sogdian origin [cf. storia]; Soghian and Turk were spoken in Taras and in Basiliskē [q. v.] as late as the fifth (eleventh) century (Mahmūd Kāshgarī, Divān Lūghat al-Turk, l. 31). As a town (gūrūn) Talas is first mentioned in the report of the embassy of the Greek Zamaropoulos (Frages. Hist. Grec., iv. 228) in 568. About 630 Talas (Chin. Tai-lo-see) was described by Hsien-Thang as an important commercial town (Ministres sur les contrées orientales, transal. by Stan. Julien, Paris 1857, l. 14: ab al-marchands des différents pays y habitent pélemes). Islam was first introduced there by the campaign of the Saimāīd İsmāl b. ʿAbdārā [q. v.] in Muḥarran 280 (March–April 893); *the emir and the dīḥūnī* had to submit; the principal church (kīla-ḵān barār) was turned into a mosque (Narahbāl, ed. Schefer, p. 84). This shows that Christianity had gained a footing in Taraż earlier than Islam. In the account of the same campaign in Tahtī, ill. 2138, the name of the town is not given: İsmāl captures the town of the "king of the Turks." In Ibn al-ʿAtīʾir (ed. Tornberg, viii. 97) a dīḥūnī of the region of Taras is mentioned under the year 316 (922–923). Under the Sāmānīs Taras was an important trading centre on the frontiers of the lands of Islam and of the Turks (B. G. A., ii. 191). Coins were first struck in Taras under the İskändin [q. v.]. In the Mongol period we find alongside of Taras the name Yangi first in al-ʿOmari (N. E., xii. 263), where Yangi appears as a distinct town from Tarāz or Talas. Under Timur and his immediate successors (Zafar-nāma, Ind. edition, i. 229 where it is wrongly given as Nakhri; ii. 653 where Taras is erroneously placed between Akhsīkant and Kāshgar; Ḥaṭīf-i Abrū [q. v.], Cod. Bodl. Elliot, No. 442, f. 1555; Abū al-Razzāq Samarkandī, Cod. Univ. Petrov., No. 157, f. 1901) Yangi is frequently mentioned, sometimes in the combination Yangi-Taras (so Mirḵᵛānd, in Barthold, Umgang i ego vremena, St. Petersburg 1918, text, p. 8). According to Ḥāidār Mīrāz [q. v.] Yangi was the Mongol name for Taras. In Muwarz al-Nahr there were people who came from Yangi originally and were called "Yangīli." There was no longer a town of Yangi; there were many ruins in the same region but even then it was no longer possible to say with certainty what ruins corresponded to the town of Yangi (or Tarāz) "Yangi-ḵā Kāżghā," transl. E. D. Ross, p. 364). At the present day no traces of the town of Taras are known. (W. BARTHOLD)

TARI, a gold coin, a quarter-dinar. When the Fatimids conquered Sicily in the second decade of the fourth (tenth) century they struck quarter-dinars (rūḥān) there in large numbers. This denomination was new to Muhammadan coinage and the fact that it was also introduced into Syria by the Fatimids suggests that it was intended to take the place of the Byzantine tremissis. The source of this denomination was continued by the Norman Dukes who succeeded the Fatimids. For the history of the tari as an Italian denomination, which does not concern us here, see the article tariene in F. Martinetti, La Moneta, Vocabolario delle Monete Generali, Rome 1915. No satisfactory etymology of the word has yet been given; the one usually given connects it with dirhem. (J. ALAN)

TARI, leader of the first Muslim forces to land in Spain in 91 (710). The Arab historians are not agreed as to the origin of this client of the famous general Mūsā b. Nuṣair [q. v.]; some say he was a Berber, others an Arab. Al-Rasāʾil calls him: Abū Zara Tari Tarif b. Mālik al-Maṭfīr and Ibn Khaldūn: Tari b. Mālik al-Nakhaʾī. He has also occasionally been confused with the other client of Mūsā b. Nuṣair, Tarik b. Ziyād [q. v.].

We know nothing when Mūsā b. Nuṣair was urged by Constatin Julian to cross to Spain with an army he consulted his master, the Caliph al-Walid; the latter ordered him to explore before any expedition the south of the Iberian peninsula with a small contingent of light troops. Mūsā b. Nuṣair therefore sent Tari with 400 foot and 100 horsemen, all Berbers. Tari with this little force crossed the Straits of Gibraltar and landed on the penin-
sula which since has borne his name (Qārraṭār Tāriq), now Tarifa [q.v.]). He raided the vicinity of Algerias (al-Lījarāt al-Khḍrā [q.v.]) and returned to Africa with rich booty and captives. This first reconnaissance was made in Ramādān 96 (July 710). It was followed by the great expedition of Tāriq b. Ziyād; and after this we hear no more of Tarīf.

**Bibliography:** The Arab historians of Muslim Spain, especially the anonymous chronicle called Al-Ḥārīr Madīnata, ed. Lafuente y Alcántara (Afjar mustahmad), Madrid 1867, p. 6 of the Arabic text and 20 of the transl.; Ibn ʿIdhārī, al-Bayān al-muqaddas, ed. Dory, ii. 5–6; transl. Fagnan, ii. 6–7; al-Makhzūn, Annalistes, Index; R. Duyss, Histoire de l'Espagne musulmane, ii. 327; Fourmil, Les Berbères, Paris 1875, i. 240–241; E. Sauvèdes, Estudio sobre la invasión de los árabes en Españat, Madrid 1892.

(E. LEVY-PROVENÇAL)

### TA'RIF

1. **A.** _Explanation, definition, description, from a'rafa, to know; e.g. tārīf Ayn Sājā, description of St. Sophia; Kālib al-Tārīf, book of definitions, a well-known treatise of Sāliḥ Shāfi‘ī al-Qurṭubī on the explanation of ṣuff terms._

2. **B.** _Administrative language, in the feminine form, tārīfa or tarīfa with a short i, the word has the meaning of tarīf, tax, price of food, of transport, etc.; e.g. in Turkish: gumrük tārīf, customs duties; demir yel tārīfeli, railway charges._

**Grammar:** This word means the Arabic definite article al-, which is called the particle of notification and ʾilm of definition; shaf al-tārīf, ʾilm al-tārīf.

**TA'RIFA,** in Arabic Lījarāt Tarīf, *island of Tarīf*, from the name of the client of Mūsā b. ʿNaṣir, Abū Zirā Tāriq [q.v.], who landed there with the first Muslim force at the beginning of the conquest of Spain, a small town in Andalusia on the north shore of the Straits of Gibraltar, at the foot of a mountain range called the Sierra de la Luna, and almost the most southern part of the European continent. Tarīf, with Algerias (al-Lījarāt al-Khḍrā‘; cf. i., p. 277a) and Gibraltar (Dibaṭ al-Tariq; cf. ii., p. 169 cc), under Muslim rule had always considerable trade with the Mozarabic ports on the other side of the Straits. Al-Idrīsī says that it was surrounded by a dry stone wall. A tower (lījar) was built in it by orders of Abī al-Rhmān al-ʿAtūrī, in 349 (960) as we know from an Arabic inscription above one of the gates of the castella of Tarīf. Tarīf was taken from the Muslims in 1292 by the King of Castile, Sancho IV, and it was in vain that they endeavoured to retake it two years later when it was admirably defended by Gamsnus el Bueno de Leon.


(E. LEVY-PROVENÇAL)

### TĀRĪK

1. **A.** Ziyād b. ʿAbd Allāh, a Berber chief and leader of the Muslim forces in the conquest of al-Andalus. Ibn Idrīs gives a complete genealogy of him and connects him with the tribe of the Nafza. Idrīs says he was a Berber of the Zanāja; Ibn Khaldūn calls him Tāriq b. Ziyād al-Laṣīt. Others again say he was a Persian, a native of Hamadān.

2. After the reconnaissance undertaken by Tarīf [q.v.] in the south of Spain in Ramādān 96 (July 710), Mūsā b. ʿNaṣir, emboldened by its success, entrusted the command of the expedition on a larger scale to his client Tāriq b. Ziyād, then leader of his advance-guard. He sent him to the Peninsula at the head of 7,000 men, for the most part Berbers, who crossed the Straits in small contingents in ships supplied by Count Julian. The crossing was probably effected in Rajab 92 (April–May 711). As his troops landed in Europe, Tāriq concentrated them on a hill which took his name, the Qābar Tāriq (Gibrallār, q.v.), the ancient Ǧapla on which the Almohad sovereign ʿAbd al-Muʾmin was later to build the town of Gibrallār al-ifikasi (1555 = 1160). Almost all the Arab chroniclers repeat in connection with ʿAṭīf’s crossing the story of a vision which he had during the passage which foretold victory. Tāriq lost no time in taking Carteya and Algerias. The Caliph ʿAbd al-Rahman II collected a considerable army to face the invaders in view of the danger that threatened his country. Tāriq then asked Mūsā b. ʿNaṣir for reinforcements; he sent him 5,000 Berbers in addition to the 7,000 he already had. The references in the Muslim and Christian historians are brief but sufficiently precise regarding the course of the conquest after the decisive battle fought between the Muslims and the Goths at the mouth of the Waṭī Bekka (Rio Barbate) on the shores of the lagoon of the Jandā. Tāriq’s 12,000 Berbers would not have held out for very long if Mūsā b. ʿNaṣir, in spite of his reluctance to increase the scale of the conquest, for it was only intended at first to be a simple reconnaissance and razzia, jealous of the bold and triumphant progress of his lieutenant which did not fall for a year, but a part of the Arab forces had been sent to fight the Goths prince Theodemir in Cabilia. After the surrender of Merida, Mūsā b. Ṭaṣir advanced to Toledo and joined Ṭaṣir on the way. The latter after the defeat of the Goths had marched on Ecija, then on Toledo, at the same time sending three columns to take Cordova, Archidona and Elvira. At Toledo, Ṭaṣir, the Arab historians say, captured fabulous wealth and wrote to Mūsā b. ʿNaṣir to give him an account of his victory.

The meeting of Ṭaṭir and his master is a favourite subject with the historians who say that Ṭaṣir inflicted the worst humiliations on his client. The conquest went on and soon the Muslim troops reached Saragossa and the highlands of Aragon, Leon, the Asturias and Galicia. When Mūsā b. Ṭaṣir returned to Damascus to report their success to the caliph, Muslim Spain with its little nucleus of Berber and Arab soldiers had already practically attained its extreme geographical limits.

**Bibliography:** Ibn ʿAbd al-Hakam, Fatḥ Murj, ed. C. Torrey, Yale Oriental Series, 1922; index; Ḥālīr al-maṣūma, ed. Lafuente y Alcantara (Afjar mustahmad), Madrid 1867, text,
TAİRĪKA (pl. muqāb). This Arabic term, meaning "road, way, path", has acquired two successive technical meanings in Muslim mysticism:

1. In the ninth and tenth centuries A.D. it was a method of moral psychology for the practical guidance of individuals who had a mystic call; 2. after the 11th century, it becomes the whole system of rites for spiritual training laid down for the common life in the various Muslim religious orders which began to be founded at this time.

Muslim mysticism itself in its origins, ideas and tendencies will be examined elsewhere [cf. the article TAŞAWWUF]; here we only deal with its results on society and the organisations which are the development of its practice by groups of devout Muslims.

In the first sense (cf. texts by Ljunaid, Hallâdî, Sanâ'îd, Kûshkîrâ, Hujwîrî), the word farâka is still vague and means rather a theoretical and ideal method (fâ'yâ, sulûk are stronger) to guide each one who has had a call by tracing an Itinerarium mentis ad Deum leading through various psychological stages (ma'âmulât, aha'îl) of the literal practice of the revealed law (sharî'a) to divine reality (khâdiyya). This bold claim having provoked criticism and even persecution from the canonists, the teachers of mysticism devoted themselves to defining and restraining their activities on more orthodox lines, compounding rules calculated to avert suspicion (zādîh al-tišfîya), from Sudan and Makki to Ibn Tâhir Maqâdîn (yâfûrî) and Oghâzî. In practice, while keeping as goal direct access (fâkî) to reality, they gradually abandoned the freedom of musical assemblies (ru'mâ) stimulating themselves with the ecstasy of theophanic utterances [cf. farâku], often open to criticism, for regular recitations of litanies founded on the Qur'ûn (dikhr); thus preparing the adept for a state of mental concentration (taṣâkkûr) which he experiences in silence by himself, a state in which the successive perception of lights (ru'mâl) differently coloured gradually denudes from its covering of words the "clarity" (of the recited litany) and "substantialises" it in the heart, which then participates in the divine essence of its prayer (dikhr al-abâd, bi-tâfâswâk nûr al-dîkhr fa'-l-hâl, sâya Suhrawardi on chap. xxvii. of the Awarîf, il. 191).

Thus farâk comes finally to mean a common life (wâla'îhara), founded on a series of special rules in addition to the ordinary observances of Islam: to become an adept (fâkî, Perf. darâkîhâ) the novice (wurid, gandâ) receives initiation (hâdî, talâm, shakîh) before a hierarchy of witnesses (shakîh al-tashâfîyya = Pers. pîr = Turk. hâbîb, mudâbîd, múdubab, khâbîf, tashûjumânî, Pers. rinid, rûqâ'î, etc.); even if he is of an order allowing a wandering life (isâqîyâ), he has to make periodic retreats (nîgâh, khâbûm, arba'îmâyâ = Pers. tâhirî) with them in a monastery (râjîf, sâmîyâ = Pers. khanbû = Turk. tekîlîyâ) of the order, supported by expiatory alms (hâsya), generally built near the tomb of a venerated saint whose anniversary (nawârid, 'u'ûrî) is celebrated and whose blessing is invoked (zâyûra, barâkâ).

In the interior of the monastery the common life of the brethren (îkârân = Turk. âirûli, an Anatolian term of the 11th century; there were only attempts to found convents of sisters in Egypt and Syria in the 12th and 13th centuries) is at the same time distinguished by supererogatory exercises, vigils (sahîb), fasts (jâ'âm), invocations (wâdî); e.g. yâ latîf, repeated 100 or 1,000 times, litanies (dâhirî, hâdîh) especially at certain festivals (a kind of liturgical office for the vigils, bâzû, raghâb, khawîr), and by dispensations (rukhûs), like the collections of alms (basama, collected in the kajîhûl) and private assemblies (haçra, maçuva, arba'da) in which in addition to litanies, platonic glances (maqârîla 'l-mawûd), jesting (muqâlî) even going as far as horseplay, dancing (raîb) and the rending of garments are allowed.

The actual ritual initiation, identical to that of initiation into trade-guilds of Karâmiq origin, as Kahle has observed, was probably borrowed from them in the 10th century (Taschchner, Islam, vi. 169-172; published a Turkish miniature of the 15th century representing the scene). The diploma of initiation (îqâla) in use since 1237 (cf. Ibn Abi Usâlîla, 'Uyûn al-Indiyya, ii. 250) reproduces the isâqî of the traditionists to give the new initiate his double chain of affiliation (siyâtî, khâqiyya). At the same time he is given a double trock (bîshîrât al-wîrîd, bîshîrât al-tahvîrûk) to show his twofold taking of an oath ('ahd al-yad wa 'l-kihîdâ = talâm and 'ahd al-khâzîrî), his double adopted genealogy, instruction (oral transmission of the rule) and inspiration (individual illumination), to which his vow of obedience entitles him.

The orthodox canonists (fâkkahû) have constantly attacked the innovations (bi'â) propagated by the farâkîs: their supererogatory exercises and their dispensations, their special costumes (characteristic headdresses with strips of colour, kulâh, âllâf etc.), their use of stimulants (coffee, bâzû, opium), their jugglery, their belief in the supernatural efficacy of the talâm and the barâk. They have devoted special attention to the critical history of the isâqî of initiation, exposing the lacunae and the improbability of their chains [cf. TAŞAWWUF] and they have protested against the isâqî al-hâmî (spiritual) which bases the privileges of the order on the apparitions of a holy being, mysterious and immortal, al-Khâji (q. v.), whom all the orders revere as the "master of the path" (parsî), since having been the guide of Moses (Kûrân, xviii. 64-81) he is superior to the law (sharî'a) and the prophetic and capable of guiding the soul of the mystic to the supreme reality (khâdiyya).

In Turkey the government has often persecuted the orders on account of their Şâra' associations; and after a brief truce during which the pan-Islam of 'Abd al-Ḥamîd endeavoured to make use of them, they were dissolved in 1925 for reactionary conspiracy. In the other Muslim coun-

---

[The text continues in the same manner, but is not fully transcribed due to the length and complexity of the content.]
tries in spite of some attempts at reform interesting from the moral (India) or intellectual (Algeria) point of view they are in a state of complete decline. The acrobatics and juggling practised by certain adepts of the lower classes, and the moral corruption of too many of their leaders has aroused against almost all of them the hostility and contempt of the elite of the modern Muslim world.

The ṭARIQA however cannot be completely neglected: and although their average moral level is very far below that of the great examples of the first ṢUFIYA, the great part that they have never ceased to play in the everyday life, humble but profound, of the Muslim community, promises important results to those who undertake a thorough study of their rules and writings. Ethnologists like Trenearne and Westernmay have already shown that several of their rites, incorporated in an Islamic liturgic structure, in which they play an unexpected part, are in reality pre-Islamic survivals (e.g. in the East Indies and in Java) or animistic inflations (e.g. sūr of the Gūlghānta of Cairo borrowed from the Asante; sacrifices of the Ḳawwāls of Mecca, modelled on the bārī of the Hansa; cf. R. M. M., xliv. 1—52). Comparative folklore and psychology will also have something to learn from the hagiographic history of the saints documentation of the great Muslim orders (cf. Mill. R. Basset, 1923, i. 259—270 and Journal de Psychologie, 1927, p. 163—168).

INTRODUCTION TO THE LIST OF THE ṬARIQA OF ILM."
Adhamiya. — Q. — artificial Turco-Syrian inād of the xvth century, referring to a saint († 776).

Ammadiya. — U14 S3 G114 M117 — Egyptian order († 1476).


Aidarūsīya. — U13 S23 G27 — Yemenite branch of the Kubrawiyya (xvth century).

Akbartya. — G7 — Hāzimīya.

Alawīya. — G26 — artificial inād referring to the 4th kalīla († 953).

*Allawīya. — Algerian branch of the Darāwīya (Mostaganem — Ben Aliouna, since 1919).

Amīrḫiyanīya. — Nubian branch of the Idrīsīya († 1553).

Ammāriyya. — M110 — Algerian-Tunisian branch of the Kādiriyā (xvth century).

Arbaṣīya. — R9x — Tripolitan branch of the Kādiriyā (Zītīn, xixth century).

Aṣhīqīya. — P9 — heresy.

Ashrafīya. — O10 — Turkish branch of the Kādiriyā (Isnik) († 1493) — Wāhīdiya.

Awāmīrīya. — M107 — Tunisian branch of the Iṣawīya (xivth century).

Azēzīya. — M107 — small Tunisian order (xivth century).

Bābāsiya. — G17 — Turkish order (Adrianople) († 1465).

Badawīya. — O14 G20 — Ähmādiyya.

Bairamīya. — O14 G20 — Turkish branch of the Saifawīya (Angora) († 1471). Sub-branches: Hamrāwīya, Shāqibīya, Khwājda-Humaymīya.

Baiyūmīya. — G38 — cf. Ähmādiyya.


— name sometimes given to the Bait al-Bakr (Shuyukh al-Sufīya in Cairo since the xvth century).

— U10 G14 R11 — Syro-Egyptian branch of the Shāhīliyya († 1503).

— Egyptian reformed Khalawīya († 1709).

Banānīya. — branch of the Kādiriyya in the Dekkān (xixth century).

Bekrātāniyya. — T8 O14 G12 — Anatolian (since before 1536) and Balkan order (Albanian branch autonomous since 1922; centre at Ağva Hissar).

Bihārīya. — M188 — small Cīcīšīli order (in 1924).

Bisnīniyya. — Gh6 — artificial Turkish inād of the xixth century (cf. Tāfīrīyya).

Bītālīya. — M107 — Egyptian branch of the Kādirīya (xixth century).

Būyūrīya. — Gh8 — not identified.


*Būrāhāniyya (or Burhamīya). — U16 S8 — Egyptian order (1fr. Dašqūtī † 1227). Branches: Shāhawīya, Shārānīya.

Dardirīya. — Egyptian branch of the Khalawīya († 1786).


Dhahābiyya. — T6 — Persian name of the Kubrawīya.

Djahariyya. — U12 S30 — Yemenite order (xvth century).

— M47, M107 — orders authorising the dhikr in public, in China and Turkestan (Kādiriya); cf. Khāfīya. — (xixth century).


Djumālīya. — T11 — Persian branch of the Subhawārīya (Ardāsīnti xixth century).

— G18 — Turkish order — Stamboul. — († 1750).

Djarrālīya. — Turkish branch of the Khalawīya. — († 1735).


Djīlīliyya. — Sahmāliyya, Djīlīliyya. — Moroccan name for the Kādiriyya.

Djumālīyya. — H4 U30 S4 R9 — doctoral Baghdādī school († 909) which was evolved in the Shīfiyya in the xith century, and gave rise to the Khwā((__j[(())j(()j, Ḥubbawīya and Kādiriyya — name revived in the xixth century for the artificial inād of a dhikr.

Firdawīyya. — Persian name of the Kubrawīya.

*Ghawwīyya. — U17 S80 — Hindu branch of the Šagārīya (Gawth, † 1562 at Gwallor).


*Ghāziyya. — R9 — branch of the Shāhīliyya in South Morocco († 1536).

Gūlghāntiyya. — O14 G14 — Rawḥāniyya.

*Gurmar. — Hindi branch of the Kādiriyya.

*Haḥbiyya. — R12 — branch of the Shāhīliyya in Tafsīlī († 1752).

Haddādiyya. — Gh21 — not identified.


*Haṣawīyya. — R17 — Egyptian branch of the Khalawīya († 1749).

Haṣariyya. — Persian branch of the Kālandariyya (xixth century).

— = Khāṣār. — Persian artisan brotherhood (xixth century).

Hakimīya. — H7 — doctoral school of Ḥakim Tirmidhī († 898).

Hallādīyya. — H10 S8 — doctoral school of Husain b. Muṣūr Hallāj († 1924); name revived in the xixth century for the artificial inād of a dhikr.

Hamadānīyya. — U7 S4 — Kashmiri branch of the Kubrawīya († Alt Hamadānī † 1385).

1) Cf. ʿUmāriyya (G27), ʿUthmāniyya (G24), *Abbaṣiyya (G23), Zainabiyā (G27).
2) Cf. Ghassābiyya (G27), Ḥaḍārīya (G30).
Hamādinya. - Moroccan branch of the Djarāliya in the Zerouh (xviith century) with sub-branches: Daghriyāliya, Sādāshīniya, Riyāshīniya, Kāshāniya, — with al-Sa'āda and at Salē.  
Hamānīiya. - GM — mixture of Bairaminya and Malāmiya.  
Hāșāliya. - R 26 — small Orano-Moroccan order.  
(† 1702)  
Chleh branch of the Nāsirīya.  
( sixteenth century).  
Hāsirīya. - Haussanian branch of the Rūfūtīya.  
(† 1247).  
Hāṭāmiya. - doctrinal school of Ibn 'Arāūf(† 1240).  
Hudīya = Djalwatiya.  
Hušulnīya = H 11 — Hušūliya sect of the sixteenth century.  
Hušulniya. — H 11 — heresy.  
Hušulniya. — heresy.  
Ibāshīya. — heresy.  
Istitrīya. - M 44 — branch of the Khājiyāniya settled in 'Asr (sixteenth century).  
Ighīt-Bāshīya. — G 25 — Turkish branch of the Khabrawīya († 1544).  
Ighīt-Başıshiana. — T 7 — Khurāsān branch of the Khabrawīya (Ibab Khattallah, T XVIII th century).  
Isawīya. - R 3 G 26 (?) — Moroccan branch of the Djarāliya at Meknes († 1524).  
Ishārīya. — doctrinal school of Subhawardi 'Ilalāb († 1191).  
Ismā'īliya. — Nubian order in Kurdufan (sixteenth century).  
Ithulhāya. — heresy.  
Kabariya. - UL S5 T 12 O 4 G 4 R 4 — Baghdād order developed from the school of the Djarāsiyā (Abū al-Kādir Liṣānī † 1166). — Many branches: in Yemen and Somalia, Vāyiya (xivth century), Murghārīya, Urūshīya; in India, Bankawa and Gurmar; in Anatolia, Ashrafīya, Hindīya, Khabrūsīya, Nabūsīya, Rūmīya and Waṣlatīya; in Egypt, Fāridiya and Kāshāniya (xvith century); in Maghrib, 'Amāmīya, 'Arūshīya, Bašūliya and Djalāla; in western Sudan, Bakkāshīya.  
Kalāndarīya. - UL S 20 — itinerant order founded in Persia (Sāvīdūj † 1218), spread to Syria and India (xivth century—xvith century) now extinct.  
Karrāiya. — M 97 — small Tunisian order (sixteenth century).  
Karrāiya. - R 38 — Shādīshīniya branch in Taifeli (sixteenth century).  
Kasrīya. — H — doctrinal school of the sixteenth century: Malāmiya.  
Kāshāniya. — Persian order descended from the doctrinal school of the Khashāniya, at Shirāz. — († 1304).  
Khashāniya — R 27 — Moroccan order (Ibn al-Dabābigh † 1717) whence are derived the Amटrathania, Istitrīya and Sādāshīniya.  
Khashāniya. — H 21 U 30 — doctrinal school of Ibn Khāshīf † 93); name revived in the xivth century for an artificial ismā'i.  
Khaṭīya. — surname of the Naqshabandīya in China and Turkestān (sixteenth century); cf. Djarāliya.  
Khalāliya. — M 97 — small Tunisian order (sixteenth century).  
Khalawatiya. - UL S 10 T 15 O 10 G 18 R 20 — branch of the Subhawardiya which arose in Khurasān (Zahir al-Dīn † 1397) and spread into Turkey. — Numerous branches: in Anatolia, Djarāliya, Ighītšīniya, 'Ushāshīniya, Nusīnīya, Subhānīya, Gisaburaniya and Shudālīya; in Egypt, Djarāliya, Mabnawīya, Shuraym, Sāfīnīya, Al-Indānīya at Būry.  
Khammūniya. — M 97 — Tunisian order (sixteenth century).  
Kharrāiya. — H 20 U 30 T 15 O 9 H 21 — doctoral school of Abu Sa'id Khārāz († 899); then artificial Turkish ismā'i of the xivth century.  
Khawārīya. — U 34 S 34 — Hujjāzī order of Mada'īniya (Ibn 'Arābī † 1556).  
Khārājīya — T 72 — Persian order descended from the school of the Djarāsiyā and spread in Tārakstan (= Yavasīya). — Yāsuf Ḥamaṣhān † 1140.  
Kūshāriya. — T 72 — doctoral school of Sādī Ĺūnī († 1273), descended from the Hāṭāmiya.  
Kuṣṭāriya. — U 38 S 34 — artificial ismā'i of the xivth century, referring to KuṣṭāriYA († 1074).  
Madaniya. — U 37 S 7 — first name of the Shādīshīniya.  
— Tripolitan branch of the Darkawīya at Misurata († 1823).  
Maddāniya. — U 38 S 34 — wandering Hindu order (Ṣḥīh Mādār, † 1428 at Makanpur).  
Maghrībīya. — G 49 — perhaps to be identified with the disciples of the Persian poet Maghrībī († 1406).  
Malāmiya. — UL S 34 — doctoral school of Khurāsān (ixth.—xvth century), opposed to the Shiyya of the Trak - name revived in the xivth century for an artificial ismā'i.  
Malāniya. — G 49 (= Hammāwīya) — branch of the Rauhmāniya of Turkey († 1553).  
Manṣūriya = Ḥallādiya.  
Marāzīya. — branch of the Ahmādiya (xvth century).  
Mashāhiya. — disciples of the Moroccan saint Ibn Mašīḥah († 1220), at first confused with the Shādīshīniya, then regruped in the xivth century.  
Mathlūliya. — G 49 — small Egyptian order († 1275).  
Miṣrīya = Niyyātīya.  
Maḥmāmīdīya. — U 37 S 6 — devotional artificial ismā'i referring to the Prophet without intermediary: utilised in the xivth century by 'Alī Jākhāwīs and Shīhīnī; also used in connection with the recitation of Daʿūlī of Djarāli.  
Muḥākhīya. = H — doctoral school of Ḥārīth Muḥākhī († 590).  
Murādiya. — O 90 — Turkish order in Stambul. — († 1719).  
Muṣṭāriya. — U 38 S 34 — Yemenite branch of the Kudirātiya (xvth century).  
Mujāfīya = Ahmādiya.  
Nakshabandīya. — U 36 S 34 T 10 O 9 G 4 R 39 — order in Turkestān, claiming descent from the school of the
Taiftriya. — Branches in China, Turkestân, Kazan, Turkey, India and Java. — (Baha’ al-Din † 1355).

Nâşihabandîya = Khâlidîya. — Reformed Turkish (sixth century).

Nâşîriya. — Râfî South Moroccan branch of the Shâhidîya, at Tanghrû (seventh century) with Tunisian sub-branch (Shabîbîya).

Nâmûmatallâhîya. — Tâ — the only order of the Persian Shi‘a in Kûrmâin: descended from the Kâdirîya-Yâfîyah. — († 1430).

Niyyâtîya. — Oâî Turkish branch of the Khalwâtiya. († 1695).

Nubuwîya. — Artisan brotherhood in Syria (seventh century).

Nûr-Idînym. — Oâî = Dîrâshîya.

Nûrîhâshîya. — Tâ — Khurshân branch of the Kubârîwîya (Muhammad Nûrîkhâlah † 1465).

Nûrîya. — Hâ — doctoral school of Nûrî († 907).

— Uâî Sâî — dissenting branch of the Ruknîya (sixth century).

— = heresy.

Pîr-Hâdîy. — Tâî = Afghan order professing to be that of Ânsârî Hasavi († 1088).

Râbîliya. — Order of Moroccan jugglers (seventh century).

Râhmanyâ. — Râî — branch of the Khalwâtiya in Kâbylia. — († 1793).

Râshîdiya. — Râî — small Algerian order formed dissenting from the Vîsufîya (sixth century).

Râshîlîghâshîya. — Mâîî = Hindu order of Gudjarat (sixth century).

Rawâhaniyya. — Branch of the Khalwâtiya, in Turkey and Cairo (Gûsîhani † 1533).

— = Afghan branch of the Suhrawardîya (Bâyazîd Ânsârî, † end of the sixteenth century).


Sâbilîya. — Doctoral school and wandering order of Ibn Sahlîn († 1268).

Sâlîyya. — Oâî Gîî = Syrian branch of the Rîf’îyâ (Sa’d al-Din Dîjubâî † 1335). — Branches: Abd al-Salâmî, Abu I-Wâsîf al-Salâmî. Safawîya. — Tâî — Azéri branch of Suhrawardîya at Ardâbîl. — († 1348). It gave rise to the sect of the Khâlidîyya, to the Persian dynasty of the Safawîs, and to several Turkish orders. Sahlîyya. — Hîî Uâî Sâî = doctoral school (Sahl Tustari † 896); name revived in the sixteenth century for an artificial ißnâd. Sâkâtîya. — Oî = Turkish artificial ißnâd of the sixteenth century. (Sâkâtî † 867).

Sânîmiyya = ‘Arûsîyya.

Sâmîmiyya = Sahlîyya (in the first sense).

Sâmûnîyya. — Egyptian branch of Shâhidîya (sixth century).

Sâsa’nîyya. — Mâîî — minor Tunisian order (sixth century).

Sâshîfîya. — Râî — military order, descended from the Khâdîrîya, at Lâshabûl then Cufra, in the oriental Sâhâraz. — († 1859).

Sâsînîyya. — Artisan brotherhood in Syria and Anatolia (xîlah—xvith century).

Sâyîrîya. — Hîî = doctoral school of the âth century.

Sa‘drînîya. — Gîî = Turkish branch of the Khalwâtiya at Kastamuni. — († 1569).


Shâmnamadîyya = Malang = Mâdhîyya.

Shâkhîyya. — Râî = name given to the Shâhidîyya Ulûd Siîtî Shâikh of Oranîa (xîlah century).

Shamsîyya. — Oî = Turkish branch of Khalwâtiya. — († 1601) = Nûrîyya-Sîwâstîyya.

Shârkawîya. — Moroccan branch of the Djuzîlîyya at Bujad (1599).

Shârkawîyya. — Egyptian order of the Khalwâtiya (xvith century).


Shûshîyya. — Went wandering Spanish order of the xvith century based on the Sâmûnîyya.

Shiddîkîyya. — Uâî Sîî Rîî = artificial ißnâd referring to the second Khalîfa (invented by ‘Alî ‘îlî, xîlah century).

Sîlâm-ûmmîyya. — Oî = Turkish order († 1668).

Suhailîyya. — Rîî = Algerian branch of Shâhidîyya (sixth century).

Suhrawardîyya. — Uâî Sîî Tâî Oâî Gîî Rîî = Baghdâd order founded by ‘Abd al-Kâhir Suhrawardi († 1167) and ‘Umar Suhrawardi († 1234) who were called Sîdîkîyya = descendants of the second Khalîfah; found in Afghanîstân and in India. — Branches: Djuzîlîyya, Djamalîyya, Khalwâtiya, Rawâhaniyya, Sâmûnîyya and Zainîyya.

Sulâmîyya. — Mâîî = order of Turkestân (sixth century).

Sûnûbîyya. — Oîî Gîî = Turkish branch of the Khalwâtiya († 1529).

Tabbîyya. — Mâîî = Tunisian order (xîlah century).

Taibîyya. — Râî = Moroccan branch of the Djuzîlîyya at Ouezzan († 1727).

Ta’îrîyya. — Hîî = doctoral school of Djuzlîyâ and Khurshân (xvith century), descended from Abû Yazîd Ta’îrî Bišâmi († 877).


Ta’îkînîyya. — Rîî = heresy.

Tajjullîyya. — Rîî = Algero-Moroccan order († 1815). From Temâcin and ‘Alîn Mahdî, it has spread through Eastern and Western Sindân.


Tûhâmîyya = Taibîyya.

Uwâtanîyya. — Oî = Turkish artificial ißnâd of the xvith century, referring to a saint of Djozda of the viith century.

Ummit-Sünlüya. — O34— Turkish order— († 1552).
Ubruhiya. — L13 S5— branch of the Kıdîrîya (12th century).
Ushâhiya. — (138 S29— Hindu branch of the Shattârîya (Abû Yazid İshâq) of the 13th century).
Ushâhiyâ. — (1552 G11— Turkish branch of the Shattâriya († 1552).
Uwâliya. — U32 S38 R2— Turkish artificial inéd of the 16th century, referring to a Shâhî.

Wâfiya. — R17— reformed Syro-Egyptian of the Shattâriya († 1358).
Wâfiya. — P3— herey = Wâfiya.
Wârîth al-Mahdîya. — Hindu order (end of the 9th century).
Wâsîliya. — P1— herey.

Yasawîya. — branch of the Kûdîjâjân in Turkestan (Yarawî † 1167).
Yânumiya. — wandering Syrian order (Shaibi † 1222).

Yusufiya. — R12— Maghribi branch of the Shattâliya at Mâlîn (13th century).

Zarâtîya. — U18 S16 R10— branch of the Shattâriya of Fès († 1493).
Zarâtîya. — O11— Turc branch of the Shattâriya at Bursa (Kbî 1435).

Ziyâniya. — R18— Maghribi branch of the Shattâriya (16th century).
Zurnîiya. — P1— herey not identified (name perhaps wrongly transcribed).

Biography: The principal sources are enumerated at the head of the table given above. One may add those given by G. Pfannmüller, in *Handbuch der Islam-Literatur*, 1925, p. 304—315. — Cf. also in the Encyclopaedia the articles BEIÎAH, DEREKWA, DERWISH, DÆKH, FUTUYWA, GULMîAN, HÀLÎDD, KAMWA, KALANDARîYÂ, ... SÀDÎVA, SÀLÎMIYA, SÀNÎYA, SHAÎDA, SHAĎILÎYÂ, SHAṬÎ, SHATTâRÎYÂ. ... (LAM MlSSANCQ).

**TARİKH (A.), t.** history in general, annals, chronicles. It is the title of many historical works, like the *Tabâbîl Tûrîkh al-Tabari*, supplement to the *Annuals of Tabari*; *Tûrîkh Baghîdî, Mekhî*, etc., history of Baghdad, of Mecca etc.; *Tûrîkh al-Andalús*, history of Andalusia. The work has also been applied to works of a very different kind, like that of al-Bûrînî on India, *Tûrîkh al-Hind*, which is rather a study of the state of learning in India, or to special dictionaries like the *Tûrîkh al-Yahmanda* of Ibn al-Kifîn, a biographical and bibliographical dictionary of early scholars and Arab continuers of the Greek tradition.

2. Era, computation, date. Besides their own era of the Hijra (q.v.), the Muslims have had several other eras: that of the Creation or of the world (*tûrîkh al-âlam*), a very uncertain computation which shows great variation among Jews, Christians and Magi. Al-Bûrînî and the Christian historian Abu l-Farajî (Bar-Hebraeus) reproach the Jews with having reduced the number of years since the Creation so that the date of the birth of Jesus is no longer in agreement with the prophecies relative to the Messiah; thus they placed the birth of Seth, son of Adam, 100 years too soon and have done the same with the other patriarchs down to Abraham so that their computation gives 4,210 years from the Creation to the age of the Messiah instead of 5,586 approximately given by the Torah. The Jews, according to al-Bûrînî, expected the Messiah at the end of the year 335 of Alexander, so that Christ was born, in the general opinion, in the year 311 of this era. — The Era of the Deluge, which also shows differences between Jews and Christians; the astronomer al-Ma'âsharî used it in his *Canon*. — The era of Nebuchadnezzar (the first Bûhûtajârî) used by Ptolomy in the *Almagest* concurrently with the Cycles of Callipus. — That of Philip Arrhidæus, father of Alexander, used by Theon of Alexandriâ in his *Canon*. — The era of Alexander, with Greek months, or era of the Seleucids, dates from the entry of Seleucus Nikator into Babylon, twelve years after the death of Alexander, in use among the Syrians and Jews (era of the *Contracts*); the Kûmî also used it with a slight variation. Muhammad was born in the year 142 of the era of Alexander. — An era of Augustus; one of Antonius used by Ptolomy for corrections in the position of the stars. — The era of Dioecletian or era of the martyrs which dates from the first year of the reign of Dioecletian, in 596 of Alexander; it is that which was used by the Copta. — In Persia and among the Zoroastrians, the two eras of Vardenjîr III are dated one from his accession and the other from his death.

Under Muslim rule in Persia an interesting reform of the calendar took place when the Caliph al-Mu'taqîd brought the *Nawwârî* or Persian New Year day, which the abolition of the intercalation had advanced too much, back to a date more in keeping with agricultural work. The Khâsian, the son of the Ilkâhî, was introduced into Persia by Ghiyáth al-Mahmûd on Radjab II, 701 a.d.; it is a solar era. Another reform is that of the Seldûq Sultan Malik Shâh who instituted the *Ilkâhî* era. — On March 1, 1876 (old style) the Khâsîns adopted a solar calendar based on the Julian, and called it "The Ottoman fiscal calendar". The Julian year began about 11 days before the lunar year, the dates of the calendar did not keep in agreement with those of the Hijra. The *Ilkâhî* era was established by Akbar in the 30th year of his reign. It dated from the 5th Rabi' II, 962 (Feb. 19, 1555), the date of his accession; the years are solar. In modern times, Mu'āmr Pasha Ghâzî has prepared another solar calendar of remarkable accuracy, which would only show an error of 0.28 of a day in a 100 centuries. — In 1926 the Kemâllî Turks abandoned the Muhammadan lunar calendar and adopted the European system.

While talking of dates it may be worth mentioning the system of notation called *jumâl* (chronogram) which is sometimes found in texts of a literary character; it consists in dating by forming words, the numeral value of the letters of which gives the date. Thus the sentence *Nâzîm al-khâbîrî al-Mâshîî al-Muhammîd*: "Muhammad saves the world from unbelief" gives, when the total value of its letters is added up, the date 1335 (an example from al-Bûrînî).

TARIM. local (Turkish) pronunciation *Terim*, the principal river of modern Chinese Turkestan (length about 1,200 miles). It is probably the Oikhardas of Ptolemy (vi. 16). In the first (seventh) century the river is mentioned by the Chinese pilgrim Hsuan-Chuang (Houen-Thang, Monographs, transl. Stan. Julien, ii. 220) under the name Si-to (Sanskrit Siita). In the fifth (sixth) century Mahmud Kâshghari (i. 116) mentions the river Usni Tarim "which flows out of the land of Isfâm into the land of the Uighurs and loses itself in the sand there". According to the same source (op. cit., p. 332), Usni-Tarim was a place near Kuča on the frontier of the land of the Uighurs along which the river flowed. The name Tarim then as now was applied to the lower course of the river; in its upper course, often also down to its mouth, it is called after the capital of Chinese Turkestan, Yarkand Darya. The source of the Yarkand-Darya is the Raekem-Darya which lies in the mountains of Karakorum on the frontier of India. In the history of Timur (Zafar-Nâma, Calcutta 1887–1888, ii. 219), a place called Tarim is mentioned not far from Bâi and Kušan (Kuča). Tarim appears also in the Turâxh-i Rúghišt of Muhammad Haidar (transl. E. D. Ross, p. 67) as the name of a district, along with Turfan, Lob and Katak; the name of the river is not mentioned in these sources. According to the Turâxh-i Rúghišt (op. cit., p. 11), the town of Lob-Katak (or the towns of Lob and Katak) was destroyed by a sandstorm in the viith (sixth) century. As Sven Hedîn (Through Asia, London 1898, p. 850) has ascertained, legend has it that the destroyed town of Katak ("Szekre-Ètékkh or else Szeresz-Katakh") have survived to the present day, although now one has made the ruins of this town. An arm of this river, Tarim in its lower course is called Ketek-Tarim (Kornilow, Kaghariya, Taghchent 1903, p. 164). In the time of Mahmud Kâshghari, Isfâm had apparently not yet spread on the lower course of the river. The people of town and desert of Lob on the other hand are described as Muhammadians by Marco Polo (Ch. 57).

The Yarkand-Darya leaves the mountains and enters the plain at the village of Kärêm and receives on the left bank the Kiiff-Su or Kâshghar-Darya, the Aksu or Aqsu-Darya, the Muzart or Shîh-Yâr-Darya and the Koncê-Darya, on the right the Timâb, the Khatam-Darya and the Kery-Darya. The right bank tributaries only reach the Tarim when they are flooded. Below the mouth of the Aksu the river is about 400 yards broad; in this region it is divided into several arms; the principal arm, the Ugen-Darya, is 170 yards wide. The Terek where Sven Hedîn crossed it (Through Asia, p. 847). The separate arms are lost in the basin of the Lob or Lob-nor (Mongol: Lake Lob) in which the Čerên-Darya also flows; the Suliho also flows into it from the east. (Lop or Lob), according to Sven Hedîn (Through Asia, p. 871), is now the name applied to the whole region from the mouth of the Ugen-Darya and the Tarim in the north to the village of Carlhöök (south of Čerên-Darya) in the south; as Pelliot (Journ. As., Ser. xi., vol. vii. 119) suggests, the same word Lop is reproduced at the beginning of our era in Chinese by Loo-lan. As the terms Lob-nor and Tarim-gul (gul, Mongol: river; the latter on the map by J. Klaproth of 1832) show, the earliest accounts of the lake basin and lower course of the Tarim reached European scholars from Mongol (or Kalmuk) sources. Quite recently the geographical conditions and the archaeological remains on the lower course of the Tarim have been investigated by numerous expeditions and many endeavours have been made to connect modern sites with references in the literary, especially Chinese, sources. According to Sir Aurel Stein's most recent explorations (1914; cf. Geogr. Journ., Aug. and Sept. 1916), there has probably been a large delta in the now almost completely dried up bed of the Lob, but never a large lake within historic times.

On account of its continental climate, the Tarim in spite of southern situation is covered with ice about three months of the year. On the lower course of the Tarim the natives (Leplâ) catch fish in special boats. Sven Hedîn explored the region of Lob-nor in one such boat; there has never been any navigation in the proper sense on the Tarim. As in the time of Mahmud Kâshghari, the river was swallowed up by the desert before it reached the bed of the lake; the fishing village of Kâm-chap ghan is described by Hedîn (op. cit., p. 884) as "the entrance to the tomb of the Tarim".

Bibliography: A particularly full account of the most important sources is given in Kornilow, Kaghariya, Taghchent 1903, p. 157 f figs., from his own researches and the narrative of Przewalski, Hedîn, Pertzow, Kozlov etc. (W. Bartold)

TARIM, an old town and still one of the most important in northern Hafragmât, on the left side of the main wâdi which traverses the whole of Hafragmât and is called Wâdi Mâzle east of Shihâm or Wâdi Hafragmât or simply Wâdi; others distinguish Wâdi Mâzle and Wâdi Hafragmât, but are not agreed on the position of the confluence of the two (cf. Sisiler's map 60 in his Handatlas* [Gocha 1905] and the Map of Hafragmât [surveyed by Imam Shaîr Khan Isha'dar] in Th. Bent, Southern Arabia, London 1900, p. 70). The statements of the Arab geographers regarding Hafragmât, especially the interior (already in part utilised by Kitter, Erdhûkk, ssc. Berlin 1846), passim and brought together in a critical survey based on all texts, so far accessible, by M. de Goeje, Nouveau Recueil Coloniale Internationales, ii. 1886, p. 101 f figs.) are exceedingly scanty and do not give the impression of being based on the accounts of eye-witnesses, but contain the same matter as the isolated references in the travellers' before Wrede and his own information about district which he was not able himself to visit. The Arab geographers describe Shihâm and Tarim as two (principal) towns in Hafragmât, without further defining their situation, e.g. Vârû, Mu'âmmam, ii. 248; iii. 247; i. 746; al-IDrisi (see Jaubert, Géographie d'Edith (Paris 1836), p. 149 sq. and 52) and others (see below). Al-lâhâm-sâ', Djiâsîra, p. 87, calls Tarim a large town (as he does the Târs northeast of Shihâm), Shihâm the great capital (p. 86). Of most importance are the mere references, as in al-Hamdânti, p. 177 (along with Taris) etc., or references in poems in al-Hamdânti, p. 182; al-Bakrî, p. 107, 184 etc. K. Niebuhr, as early as 1763 (see his Beschreibung von Arabien [Copenhagen 1775], p. 286 et seq) received in Şan'â and Maskat from Araba stories of the existence of Tarim and Shihâm (on p. 286 the mention of "these two most prominent towns of Hafragmât" is quoted from the Geographia
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Nubienais [the Latin synopsis of al-Idrisi, Paris 1619] and Abu 'l-Fadl', Kitter and others have given mistaken accounts of the geographical position of Tarim; according to the best available map of Hadramüt (that of L. Hirsch) it is approximately in 29° 55' E. Long. and 16° 44' N. Lat.

L. W. C. van den Berg, from his official position in Batavia, was able to get very full particulars of their native land from Arabs from Hadramüt, who had migrated to the Dutch East Indies, as their countrymen still do; most of his informants came from the district of the principal Wadi between Shibām and Tarīm. This information he worked up in his Le Haôrâîmât et les Colonies Arabes dans l'Archipel Indien (Batavia 1886) (cf. C. Simon, Hurongrie, Arabes en Outre-Indies (Leyden 1907, p. 19 sqq., French translation in Revue de l'Histoire des Rel., lxxii, 1908, p. 74 sqq.)). Along with much other information we owe to van den Berg the first more accurate details of Tarīm. According to him it was the old capital (Maltzan marks Tarīm on the map in his Kriis as "capitał of Haḍramüt proper"); Sāʿūn (p. 13), he says, is the modern capital. On p. 26 he describes the waddās that come from the north from the al-Wādī mountains. On p. 18 sqq. he gives distances for the various stations on the road from al-Shīr to Tarīm. Tarīm is surrounded by Sāʿūn in all respects in which it once had the supremacy in the land, number of inhabitants, trade, industry and it is more advanced generally. Several houses were already uninhabited, streets deserted, a large number of mosques no longer visited or fall into disrepair. The decline of the town is said to have begun as early as the thirties of last century and to have been brought about by the constant feuds between the tribes of the district. According to a not very probable report in the Arabic newspaper al-Djawālī of 18th Rabī' I 1299 (Feb. 8, 1882, Constantinople), Tarīm had about 25,000 inhabitants (cf. Wrede's statement); according to the results of van den Berg's enquiries (p. 52) it had only 10,000, which coincides with Wellsted's statement. Tarīm was formerly the centre of the textile industry of Hadramüt, which however was only carried out in private houses and in his time (p. 78) was still of importance, although it had begun to decline as a result of European competition. So early a writer as Scotzet (ZAA's M. m. d., Correspondence, 1814, xxviii., p. 249) knew that silk shawls embroidered with gold thread were made in Tarīm. The town was at one time also the centre of higher education in the land (grammar, theology and law): Sāʿūn has now taken its place in this respect also (p. 88).

In the collection of Ḥadramī stories collected by C. Landberg (Études sur les dialectes de l'Arabie méridionale, l., Ḥadramūt, Leyden 1901) from the lips of natives, Tarīm is mentioned (p. 175 [185], 432) (in the last passage there is a reference to the school there, Ḥijj Tarīm; further particulars of it on p. 450 ff.).

The first European to visit Shibām, Sāʿūn and Tarīm, (July 1893) and to be able to report on the town from his own experiences, was Leo Hirsch (Reisen in Südarabien, Malay-Land und Ḥadramüt, Leyden 1897). His description of the journey from Shibām to Tarīm (p. 209 sqq.) and his account of the latter town are full of information. Tarīm, he says, lies on the left bank of the Wādī Mustṭī (going from Shibām) on the side of a hill, according to his map on the southern slopes; v. d. Berg's statement: "Tarīm (es situé sur le versant) de la chaîne des montagnes septentrionales" (p. 22) should therefore be corrected. On p. 227 sqq. Hirsch gives a fuller description of the town and its situation. Here we will only mention that whole quarters of the town, especially the south-western part, present a desert-like appearance and among the houses which are mostly in ruins—as v. d. Berg already mentioned—are there very few distinguished for size or good repair. The number of mosques, the well kept whitewashed minarets of which rise up among the houses, is not very large according to him (p. 239) (according to v. d. Berg over 300). With his statement "The medressa, where theology and law are taught, is joined to the Rukba Mosque" we may compare the reference quoted above from Landberg and v. d. Berg's note (p. 88) that the high school, also a hostel for students, at Sāʿūn, an annex of the great mosque there, is called Rukba (cf. ṭuḥ in the meaning: "hostel for poor Muslim students"). According to Landberg's information, the school at Tarīm was closed and its place taken by that at Sāʿūn (see also v. d. Berg). Hirsch learned from a saiyid of the town, who was lamenting its increasing decline, that it had consisted from early times of five biyād (quarters) and its population was then 3,810. The Sāʿūn of the town had only a nominal authority and was in reality in the hands of the great saiyids (p. 231). Tarīm like Sāʿūn belongs to the Kathīr tribes; it has its own coin of silver and copper (a collection in the Berlin and British Museum; some reproduced at the end of Hirsch's book; see also Sir John A. Buckland, A Note on some coins struck for use in Tarīm, Southern Arabia, in the Journal of the Malay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, vol. iii., part i. [April 1925] with a plate). On account of the hostile attitude of the population, Hirsch had to leave Tarīm after a few hours' stay only and return to Shibām next morning; he had no time for a thorough examination.

From a comparison of his statements with the second-hand information of earlier writers, it is evident that, apart from the points of difference already indicated from v. d. Berg, in the latter's map the places from Shibām to Tarīm are put too far to the east and that he has also not given correctly the size and population of the three important towns. Shibām the largest town—as it was even in al-Hamdān's time—which has about 6,000 inhabitants (Hirsch, p. 198 and Bent, op. cit., p. 148); on the other hand v. d. Berg, p. 42 says only 2,000), is considered an important town and far surpasses Sāʿūn (with c. 4,500 inhabitants, according to v. d. Berg on the other hand 2,500) and Tarīm as a centre of life and activity (Hirsch, p. 205), is put by him too far below Sāʿūn, whose Sāʿūn is said to be recognised in Tarīm also, and even below Tarīm in importance. The opinion of D. G. Hogarth, The Penetration of Arabia (London 1905, p. 222), that *the rivalry of these towns is such, and the changes in them are so frequent, that it is not impossible that Van den Berg was right at the moment, in regarding Sāʿūn as the capital of Hadramāw, with Tarīm for its only peer", is hardly plausible in view of the shortness of the interval. We may note here the reference to the "journey of Musulam Abūūd from Gishin to Tarīm" in W. Hein (Südarabische Itinerarien, M.G.G.W.,
TARIM — TÄROM

form Tiryam (on the authority of al-Djawhari; the K‘amān, n. v. knows only this form) and then, after others, Taryam (cf. al-Bakri, p. 195 sq. i. and the records the statement that it is a wādī near al-
Najīf — which is disputed by many on the ground that al-Najīf is a wādī near Madina — according to the contrary view, a wādī near Yanbu‘ in the Hijāz (cf. al-Hamdānī, p. 181 and Yāghī, l. 346; cf. thereon al-Bakri, p. 195 and 548). In any case it is different from the Tiryam mentioned by Yāghī (sp. c. i. i.) which is in the north near Madyan (the Turanian of the Admiralty Chart; or it cf. Ritter, xiii. 252; Spranger, sp. c., p. 23) according to the Tā‘ī, Tiryam is also a wādī in the desert of Baya‘. He then goes further than the Lī‘ān and after mentioning the Tarīm in Hijārmort, says, that there is a Tarīm in Syria and then goes on to deal with the *Yemen town* — Wūṣenfeld, Yemen im XI. Jahrhundert (Abhandl. der Kén. Ges. d. Wissenschaft, xxii), Göttingen 1885, p. 39, only mentions, in connection with the history of Ḥasan Fāgha (from al-Mubābīhī that Tarīm should be read for Tarım in the list of fortresses taken by the Emīr Sinān in 1006 (1597—1598) This is correct, but the reason given that "Tarım is in Hijārmort" is not. There is certainly a Yemen Tarım also, but the geographical situation of these fortresses, which are in the Ṣan‘a region, shows that it is not the one in question. Sieler's Hanbalat, pp. ed. Gotha 1905, Karav von Arabien (ed. by Habensch), marks Tarım west of Ṣalā in approx. 43° 20‘ East Long. and 16° 37‘ N. Lat. which agrees with the statement of the Lī‘ān-namā; the English General Staff map of the coast (Sheet 3, Su‘ma, 1916) does not mark it.

**Bibliography:** given in the text.

(T. J. KRATZER)

**TARIK BAND** is a poem composed of stanzas of from five to eleven couples. Each stanza, like a ra‘ay, has its own rhyme, the first two hemi-tichs and the second hemistich of each succeeding couplet rhyming with one another, but the rhyme of each stanza varies from that of the others, though the metre must be the same throughout the poem. After each stanza occurs a couplet in the same metre as the last couplet of the poem, but with its own rhyme, the two hemistichs rhyming with one another. When the same couplet is repeated after each stanza, as a refrain, the poem is called Tarīk Band, but the older writers on prosody applied this name to all poems in this form, whether the couplet was repeated or varied.


**TAROM** (TARIM), 1st district on the Kilij-Usūn (cf. SAF., xiv. 985).

**The name.** The Arabs call it Tarım, Tarım (Munawabih), Tarım (B.G.A., vi. 404, 405). Yāghī mentions it on two occasions, under Tarım and Tarım: Mustawfı‘ uses the Arabic dual form Tarım, the "two Tarım". The modern Persia pronunciation is Tarım. Although Taröm is now the name of the district, there is also a little town

J. v. (1014), p. 37 sq. published by his widow from his literary remains), according to which al-Salih is larger than Tarım, and Shibām smaller than these two towns and larger than the others (p. 43), which would rather agree with v. d. Berg’s estimate. Against this view however are the statements according to which Shibām is 7 to 8 days’ journey from Tarım (p. 42). Here again Hirsch’s testimony seems to be preferable.

In January of the year after Hirsch (1894) Bent and his wife succeeded in reaching Shibām; they did not get to Tarım. Bent also says (l. c., p. 119), in contrast to v. d. Berg and others, that the Salāhān of al-Salih and Tarım have no authority outside their towns (on the southern Arabian Salāhān, cf. C. Smouck Hārgotge, L’interdiction .. en Hadramaut, Revue Africaine, 1905, p. 92).


**TARIM, 2. According to Ḥadjīlī Khalīfah, Lī‘ān-namā, p. 490 (cf. Hammer-Purgstall, Über die Geographie Arabiens, Jahrbücher der Literatur, Vienna 1841, xxiv., p. 93 and following him Ritter, xii. 727), a fortress on the road which runs from the coast-town of Djąūn on the Red Sea eastwards via *Nawidieh* and the castle of Felekī (according to v. H. Hammars’s transcription, which seems not quite certain) to Ṣa‘da; that is in the Upper Yemen. From the mention in the verse of Kuthayiyir referred to by al-Hamdānī, Sīfi‘, p. 182 and quoted by al-Bakrī, p. 184 (cf. 107) and 196, the situation of the place cannot be more accurately deduced. Al-Hamdānī, immediately after mentioning Ḥunais lying between Mecca and Ḥa‘a‘r, mentions Bāsā laid and Tarım only on the authority of Kuthayiyir without saying anything about its position. Al-Bakrī mentions (p. 195) Tiryam, for which he gives references from poets, and (p. 196) the Tarım occurring in al-‘Alîh and Kuthayiyir, which either has this vocalisation on account of the metre or is another place, and only then proceeds to deal with the town of the same name in Ḥadramūt (cf. NP. 1) under Tarım. Tarım is certainly to be distinguished from Tiryam. The verse refers, in a purely poetical simile, to a "desert of Tarım" without any geographical precision, a reference which like so many topographical references in the poets seem to be quite a conventional one, for the poet was not at all concerned with its geographical position. As regards Kuthayiyir it is certain that he is not thinking of either of the two places in Ḥadramūt of this name (NP. 1 and 2). Al-Shābīnī, mentioned by him in the same verse immediately after Tarım, is said by al-Bakrī, p. 184, to be a coast-town on the Yemen road, which is in keeping with the order in al-Hamdānī. The verse of al-‘Alîh which also mentions Tarım without further precision, is quoted by Yāghī, Ma‘ṣūm, i. 346, as referring to the town in Ḥadramūt, while al-Bakrī quotes it along with Kuthayiyir’s verse without however giving his opinion of the localisation of the Tarım mentioned by the two poets, p. 196, n. v. Tiryamu, and not when discussing the Tarım in Ḥadramūt. — The Tā‘ī, Jī‘ār (viii. 211) which gives further places named Tarım, gives as the first of them in almost the same words as the Lī‘ān al-‘Arab (xiv. 332) the
named Târom on the right bank of the Kišl-Uzan (between Wenisara and Kallad); another village of Ţârn (Târom) lies to the right of the direct road from Ardabil to Miyâna outside of the district of Târom.

Târom, like Khalkhâl, which adjoins it, is not yet sufficiently explored.

Below Miyâna (q.v.), the Kišl-Uzan reaches its most northerly point near the Pardâli bridge. From there to its junction with the great Shâh-rûd (q.v.), the Kišl-Uzan — for a distance of about 100 miles — follows the general direction of N.W. to S.E. Târom roughly speaking lies on the middle section of the river.

To the south the mountains of Cilâs-Khânâ etc. separate Târom from Zandjan (q.v.). To the east the boundary of Târom is the junction of the great Shâh-Rûd with the Kišl-Uzan above the Mandjîl bridge. To the N.E. the mountains of Gilân separate the basin of the Kišl-Uzan from Masûlla (Gilân). To the north and north-west Târom is contiguous with Khalkhal. To the southwest it is bordered by the districts dependent on Zandjan (notably the old canton of Kâghâd-Khunân).

In its northern bend, the Kišl-Uzan cuts itself a passage through an impassable defile the depth of which is 2,000—2,700 feet. The villages and arable lands of Khalkhal are on the high plateau (5,200 — 6,000 feet high) above the sides of the defile. The ravine runs for a distance of 60 miles to Miyâna, where on the left bank the Kišl-Uzan receives the waters of the little Shâh-Rûd (to be distinguished from the great Shâh-Rûd, which comes from Tâlaqân and flows into the Kišl-Uzan on the right bank to the west of Mandjîl). Below the ravine the valley of the Kišl-Uzan widens for a distance of 60 miles and there are quite a number of villages on both banks. Near Darband the cliffs contract the water-course but afterwards the valley broadens again till just before Mandjîl (12—13 miles).

Târom properly so-called begins where the Kišl-Uzan leaves its gorge and the gorge at Darband divides it into two parts, an upper and a lower. Details of districts of Târom are given in the Nasihat al-Kulûb (1740) but the names of the villages are corrupted in the manuscripts.

a. The upper district includes the following cantons: 1. Dîzâhâbâ-i Sulûf with 25 villages; its position on either side of the Kišl-Uzan at the mouth of the defile is indicated by the villages Nimahil, Gûl-čin and Kaflas (Khârâh). We may further note that the upper part of the same canton (Dîzâhâbâ-i Ulyâ, Nasihat, p. 66) used to belong to the town of Kâghâd-Khunân (the old Khâlân), the exact site of which has not been identified.

2. The canton of Târom-i Ulyâ in the strict sense (with 100 villages) lies on both banks of the Kišl-Uzan. Its position is indicated by the villages (still in existence) of Kałât (cf. Yâh Kol), on the right bank of the Kišl-Uzan and to the right of the road from Zandjan via Akh-ğaduk, and Dârûn on the left bank. The position of the canton of 3. Nîmbar (?) Britûn (?) is not clear, unless the first name corresponds to Pashar (?) which the Russian map puts on the left bank near the Obar mentioned by Rawlinson. According to the latter, Upper Târom (which should be called Târôm-i Khalkhal) consists of the narrow strip on the right bank while the left bank bears the name of the Pashût-i Khî ("the back mountain"); with reference to Gûlûn (cf. Gûlûn), the existence of the Nasihat al-Kulûb, as well as that of Fortescue, however suggests that Târom includes some villages on both banks of the Kišl-Uzan. On the other hand, the strip on the right bank is not very narrow; many torrents descend from the mountains which separate Târom from Zandjan and before reaching the Kišl-Uzan disappear in the irrigation canals.

b. The cantons of the lower district are 4. that which is commanded by the fortress of Shamirân (50 villages) and which is situated on both banks (on the right bank there is still the village of Karlât) mentioned in the Nasihat; "Absen" must be Alûm-Kûsh on a little tributary on the right; cf. the Mirât al-âlîdân and the Russian map; 5. the canton of the fortress of Firdawsi (20 villages), the situation of which is indicated by the village of Safidán (on a right bank tributary above Alûm-Kûsh). Another passage in the Nasihat al-Kulûb, p. 217, adds that the canton of 6. Bara, where the great Shâh-Rûd rejoins the Kišl-Uzan also belongs to Târom. The town of Safidán, p. 335, shows that in the Safidâw period, even Mandjîl and Khârâh, to the east of the Shâh-Rûd went with Târom. At the present day the important town of Mandjîl which may correspond to the old Harkâm (Yâhût, iv. 963) and which commands the entrance to Gilân by the valley of the Safid-Rûd, belongs to Gilân (Rashîd, F. M. M., xxiii. 239). Lastly, according to the Nasihat al-Kulûb, p. 67, the revenues of the cantons of 7. Tîrâq (cf. Yâhut, iv. 963) and Andjân (cf. Yâhût: Andjân) were divided between Târom and Kâghâd-Khunân. These cantons must be at the source of the Yûz-Bashî-Cal (the gorge of Moûlê-Alli) the waters of which flow from the left bank into the Shâh-Rûd on the Russian map we find here the villages of Mârân and Anda marked.

Khâlkhâl. The frontiers of Târom are little known on the Khalkhal side. Târom is generally included in the dependencies of "Irâk-e Adîm" (cf. Schwart, p. 736 and Nasihat, p. 65 sq.). As to Khalkhal, it formed part of the Astarabad (or more exactly of its zomar Arabdal, Nasihat, p. 81). The name Khalkhal is not found before Yâhût, ii. 475.

The name Khalkhal of Adarbadjan must be connected with that of the old town of Khalkhal of the district of Ti in Transcaucasia (cf. Shshk) which Greek and Armenian authors mention between the second and fifth centuries as the winter-residence of the kings of Armenia and later of those of Albania (Arzan); cf. Marquart, Erânât, p. 116. It is possible that in the early centuries of Islam, the whole country between Ardabil and the Kišl-Uzan was known as al-Bahr (he reading is not quite certain; Nöldeke, Geschicht, p. 481). This old term is frequently used alongside of Talâs = Tah; cf. Balâdshâh, p. 318, 322, 327; Ibn Khurdâbîbîh, p. 37, 119; Kûšâna, p. 245, 26; Dinawart, p. 197; Masûd, Mawûli, i. 287. The Kišl-Uzan forms a serious barrier to communication and thus forms a convenient administrative boundary between Adarbadjan and Irâk-e Adîm. The name Khalkhal comes from the town of this name which became the capital after the disappearance of the ancient centre Firdawš (now Kabâkh). Khalkhal practically coincides with the valley of the left bank tributary of the Kišl-Uzan. One of
the arms of this river comes from the north (from
the pass of Khñl-Yokğal, on the Ardabil-Pardal
road) and runs past the village of Sandjawa
(Yâkût, iii, p. 160: Sîndjâlûh or Sîndjâbûl; Sîndjâbûl,
ed. Le Strange, p. 180, 223: Sandjâlis
e.; Olearius (1663), p. 472: Sengox). The sources
of the other arm is the northeast on the western
slopes of the mountains of Tâlesh (near the pre-
current capital of Khalkhâl; Herow < Hîrîhâd). This
arm has joined the village of Kû (Nushat,
ed. Le Strange, p. 223: Gazid, Kadpû, but p. 84:
Kû); the two river arms join near the village of
Kalanâh; finally the river receives its left bank
the stream from the old town of Khalkhâl (there
are now several villages of this name in the valley)
and flows into the Kîlî-Usân a little below the
bridge of Pardals (cf. Nushtat al-Kûlûh, p. 81:
Bardallas, p. 180: Bardâlû). The river Kû describes
a wide curve from east to west. To the south
of the town of Herow is the high massif of Akh-
daghd, the ramifications of which separate the valley
of the Kû from that of Târom. From the mouth
of the Madjarâ (or Barnâbât) pass exactly
south of Herow comes the little Shâh-Rud (Nâr-
hut, p. 223: Shâh-Rud, from the name of the village
of Shâh which still exist) which enters near the
Kîlî-lûân from the left side near the Mîyân-Sara
(where the Kîlî-Usân leaves the gorge). Among
the dependencies of Aradâl, the Nushtat, p. 82,
mentions the valley of the little Shâh-Rud (30
villages) as well as a considerable district of Dâr-
marzin (100 villages) which has not been identified.
In any case Khalkhâl, Dârmarzin and Shâh-Rud
leave little room for dependencies of Târom on
the left bank of the Kîlîl-Usân.

Communications Products. The
principal route between Ardabil and Zandjân (by the
old bridge of Pardals in the middle of the gorge
of the Kîlî-Usân) passes via Khalkhâl to the
west of Târom. The caravans which take a short-
er route through Târom (Ardabil-herow-Barandak-
-Kalût-Akhñlakûh-Zandjân) have to cross the
Kîlî-lûân in boats (hulôt). The traffic between
Ardabil and Zandjân is not important under
the Fâhâwi regime the question has been raised of
joining Fûmen (in Gilân) to Zandjân by a road
through Târom.

According to Yâkût, Târom is very mountainous
and in spite of that fertile (nuâs shâhshûn mîshshâ-
thamûn *rich in herbs*?). The cotton of good quality,
the name of which, according to Yâkût, was
associated with Târom must have come from the
canton of Diabûh for the factories of Kâkhâla-
kanûn (literally *place where paper is made*)
could not have existed without cotton. The high
plateaus of Khalkhâl were still at the beginning of
the sixteenth century regarded as the granary from
which âbbâs Mîrzhâm drew his supplies of wheat.
Rawlinson saw in Târom many orchards but in
1921 the district made a very poor impression
on Fortescue. According to the Mirzât al-Ruddân,
Târom has lead, copper and vitriol (sûlû) mines.

Tow7ns and Villages. According to the
Nushtat, p. 65, the capital of Târom was at
first Fûrûzhâm (in the lower district) took its
place. According to Rawlinson, Venissent (the
Russian map: Venissent) on the right bank was
the centre of Târom; according to Fortescue, this
is Banari (left bank). The new centres seem to
be gravitating towards the Ardabil-Herow-Zandjân
road.

The fortress of Sâmîtrân (Shâmîtrân) was of much
more importance; it was visited by Mîsrâr b. Mub-
hâlî, Nâşîr-i Khusrâw and Yâkût. The site of
Sâmîtrân has not been discovered but the itinerary
of Nâşîr-i Khusrâw enable it to be fixed with
sufficient accuracy. The traveller coming from
Kazvûn arrived at Khârziwul (below Mandjil); from
there after a descent of 3 farsâks, he arrived at
Bazalikhet (fâh), a dependency of Târom. He then
came to a village of Khandân on the Shah-Rud near
its mouth. At Khandân a toll for crossing
(hâshâk) was levied by the Atmar (or Târom). From
here to Shâmîtrân, Nâşîr-i Khusrâw reckons it
3 farsâks in reality the distance from Khârziwul
to the Shah-Rud in a direct line is not over 5
miles. In the more open country to the south
of the Shah-Rud, 3 farsâks would be equivalent
to a longer distance in mountains. According
to Yâkût, Shâmîtrân was "on a large river"; all these
details enable us to locate Shâmîtrân near Darband.

Melded Rawlinson mentions the ruins there of a
"large and very strong fort" (3 miles below Gilî-
ân) and the Russian map shows the "ruins of a
fortress" on the cliff on the left bank (c. 7 miles
above the mouth of the Shah-Rûd). The strategic
importance of Shâmîtrân was that it guarded at
its narrowest point the entrance to Târom by the
valley of the Kîlî-Usân while the fort of Khâlût
commanded the entrance from the Zandjân side.

History. We do not know who were the
early inhabitants of the district of Târom. Raw-
linson located in this part of the Kîlî-Usân, the
ancient people of the Caduasi and relied for this
on the authority of Diabûhî (âbbâs-tâshâh) who still
(19th century) can call this district Kûlûh (fâh). The wild and remote country of
Târom-Khalkhâl only played a part in history in the
period of the Musâfîrî dynasty (q.v.) which,
with Shâmîtrân as its capital, ruled Ashlarbâdân,
Arun, Gilân and the country as far as Kâlû. As
early as 316 (928) we find Sallâr b. Aswâr lord of
Shâmîtrân; cf. Iba al-Athîr, viii. 142, Mîsrâr b.
Mubhâlî (c. 330) quoted by Yâkût speaks of
2,350 large and small buildings in Sâmîtrân. From
the interesting letter of the Bûyid vizier Shâhû b.
âbbâs Tâlaâkânî, quoted by Yâkût (xv. Samîtrân)
it seems that Târom was at first under Kazvûn,
from which it was detached by Mîrzhâm b.
Musâfîrî, who coveted the district for its fortress.
Shâhû pays a high tribute to the importance of
Shâmîtrân by calling it "sister of the fortress of
Alemit" (Mûzâdâlî, p. 360) and mentions the
ornamentation of the fortress of Sâmîtrân (sic!) in
the form of lions in gold, the sun and the moon.
In 379 the Bûyids acquired Shâmîtrân by a matri-
culture alliance, but after the death of Fâhîr al-
Dawla, the Musâfîrî Ibrâhîm seized Zandjân,
Abhar, Sâmîtrân (a district to the north of Abhar
near Saînî-kalûn = the old Khûdûh) and "Shâhiniyât"
(readin uncertain, but the place must be identified
with "Shâhiniyâr, Shâhiniyâr") which the Nushtat
al-Kûlûh, p. 85 mentions among the dependencies
of Lower Târom). Shâmîtrân is not explicitly
mentioned among these domains but in 438 (1046)
Nâşîr-i Khusrâw found at Shâmîtrân (Samîtrân)
a Musâfîrî prince and a garrison of 1,000
men on a cliff commanded the town (fâh); it was surrounded by
a triple wall; a subterranean passage (hârûn) going
TAROM — TARRAGONA
down to the river enabled water to be procured. According to Yâkı, the fortress was destroyed by the Isâmillâ in circumstances which are still unknown. Khâlid in the time of Yâkı was occupied by the lord of Alâmist.

Under the Mongols, especially when the capital was transferred to Sultâniya (q.v.), Tarom gained in importance, and the Nasab al-Kulî (740 = 1340) gives evidence of the exact knowledge then possessed of this district. Under Udhjâr, Tarom was ruled by a certain Shâhânu Girî (I) who is mentioned as sending the expedition into Gilân in 700 (1307) (Darn., Avestb., p. 139). Under the Timurids, the Khân of Khâlkhî (cf. Tarâk and the year 787 (1385)) and of Tarom (Shâhîk Zânid Târoul; Darn., Avestb., p. 237, 234, 385) played a role of some importance. Shâmilãn also must have been re-ruled for the historians of the Gilân tell how after the death of Yâkı, the Aq-Koyunlu (956), the Aq-Koyunlu Mirzâ Ali seized the fortress by a stratagem. Later a certain Mir Zain al-Âbîdîn Târoul rebelled against Mirzâ Ali but without success. In the reign of Kustam-beg, the Aq-Koyunlu (997–902), his general Kustam-beg with 10,000 men recaptured the *fortress of Tarom* but later during the struggle between the Aq-Koyunlu Aband and Muhammad (905–906), the general of Aq-Koyunlu Mirzâ Ali “feared Tarom from Turkish rule” (cf. Mirzâ al-Bulbân, p. 235).

Under Isâmîl I, Tarom was on the most convenient route between the lands of the Kar-Khis Ralph, where the young monarch was in hiding and Ardashir, the ancestral home of his family. The route followed in 905 by Isâmîl in his famous march was by Tarom—Barandâk—Naâsin—Kîlî-Hîf-Abâdî-Khân-Abâd—Abarâdî; cf. E. D. Ross, *The Early Years of Shah Isâmîl* (J. R. A. S., 1894, p. 332). Tarom is several times mentioned in the Turkish “Alamârâ as the place where the Khâlid spent the winter of 921 and hunted (1003, 1003) and from where they sent expeditions against Gilân.

The Turkish elements gradually absorbed the Iranian (Dailamî and Gilânî) elements. Under Naîdir, the Aamarî Khurs were settled in Mandjîl and in the Paghî Tâkh of Tarom. According to Rawlinson, they were of the Lûlî tribe (Lûlî), traces of which are still found in Upper Syrî (Le Conq.), near Tâhârân (Brugsh) etc.; but in his time they had already become turkized. Kâbilân however (K. M. M., xxxii, p. 261) distinguishes between the Rîhâwâr Khurs of (Sułamâniya) settled near Mandjîl by ‘Abdâ I and the Aamarî Turks (I) who came in the time of Naîdir. In any case Tarom has now a Turkish population; according to Fortescue after Gilân the peasants do not understand Persian. In the toponymy also a Turkish layer gradually obliterates the old Iranian names (cf. Pardis from *prâd*, bridge, Nîmâhî, Nîyâb, Gâlûn etc.). A study of the old Iranian toponymy in Aâbârdâkîšan still has to be made, but it is evident that the local dialects belong to the group called “Northwestern” (cf. Tâlî). According to the Mirzâ al-Bulbân, p. 335, the Khânîs made Tarom a separate domain and gave it as a fîst (îfîst wa-hereyy) to Muhammad Khân Dâwâlî, to his son Allah-yâr Khân Afshâr al-Dawalî etc. After the accession of RIDA’Sâb a punitive expedition was sent to Khâlkhî and several local Khân (Radshîl al-Malâmî etc.) were hanged.


TARRAGONA (Arabic طارقونا), a little town in the northeast of Spain on the Mediterranean and capital of the province of the same name. This town, which now has a population of 23,100, occupies the site of the ancient acropolis of Tarraco, which became one of the centers of Roman domination in Spain and from the time of Augustus, the capital of the province of Hispania Tarraconensis. The Muslims when they occupied Tarragona retained its old name. They sacked it in 724, then occupied it for the whole of the Umayyad Caliphate of Cordova, not without having twice to retake it from the Christians, once from Louis of Aquitaine and the second time from the Catalan prince Ramon Béanger. It was taken from the Muslims definitely by Alfonso el Batelador in 1220.

The Arab geographers sometimes call Tarragona (as they do Granada) "the town of the Jews", which shows they formed a notable part of the population. In the cloisters of the Cathedral of Tarragons is preserved a blind arcade in the form
of a niche of marble with commemorative inscription in the name of 'Abd al-Naṣrān III and the date 349 (960).


**ṬARSÚS, a town on the frontier between Asia Minor and Syria, the birthplace of the apostle Paul. It lies in a very fertile plain through which flows a river (Cydnos, later Nahr Baradīn). Situated at the junction of several important roads and not far from the sea, even in ancient times it played an important part as a trading centre and was distinguished in the Hellenistic period for the activity of its intellectual life. Christianity spread early there, and bishops and metropolitans of Tarsus are mentioned in the *Acts of the Councils*. When the Arabs had conquered these regions, the Umayyads rebuilt the fortifications of Tarsus and the other towns on the Byzantine frontier. These towns which formed a girdle were later called "the protectors" (*al-ʿAwaṣīm, q.v.*). According to the Arab division, they belonged to the most northerly *jund* but were separated from it by Ḫūrūn al-Raḥid. Their situation was very exposed and dangerous and Tarsus especially, being a rich commercial city, suffered a good deal. In the continual fighting between the Muslims and the Byzantines, marauding bodies of troops attacked and plundered it, sometimes from one side and sometimes from the other, and the inhabitants had frequently to save themselves by flight, whereas the victors sometimes brought a population from other districts and settled them there. In 162 (779) the Ṭayyi Ḥasān b. Kahtab brought the caliph a description of the ruined Tarsus, which in his opinion could hold 100,000 inhabitants, and when Ḫūrūn al-Raḥid at a later date learned that the Byzantines intended to rebuild the town, he gave orders to anticipate them and Tarsus was restored in 172 (785), populated by Arabs and given a maritime trade. It must have again been lost by the Muslims soon afterwards, but after a truce between Muslims and Byzantines for a period, the caliph al-Maʿṣūm in 215 (850) undertook a campaign against the ʿAwaṣīm, which brought Tarsus and Mopsuestia east of it into his power. The Caliph himself was buried in Tarsus, where his tomb was to be seen in later days. There is a reference to Muslim judges in Tarsus at this period (Ibn Sa'd, VII, 93). In 269 (882) Ibn Ṭullān conquered the frontier country but Tullān did not last long. In the middle of the 15th century Tarsus passed into the hands of the Hāmāshids, when Saif al-Dawla conquered northern Syria, but shortly afterwards in 354 (965) the Byzantine emperor Nicephorus succeeded in taking Mopsuestia and Tarsus with other towns of the ʿAwaṣīm and Tarsus remained for a considerable period in Christian hands. Nicephorus had the Kutʿāns burned and mosques torn down and gave the Muḥammadan population the choice of adopting Christianity, migrating or remaining on payment of a *qiyaṣ* [q.v.]. The majority preferred to emigrate but not a few went over to Christianity.

In the period which ended in this way, Tarsus was in a flourishing condition as a result of its industries and exploitation of the fertile country round. The population was continually being increased by immigrants from adjoining lands, who wished in their glowing enthusiasm for ʿIlām to take part in the holy war till they met their death. Particulars of the town towards the end of the period are given by several Arab authors. Masʿūlī says that it had originally a garrison of 8,000 men and that one of the gates was called Ḫust al-Liqāh because those who set out to fight the infidels left the city by it. Ḫuskākī in 340 (951) calls Tarsus a large town with a double wall and a garrison of 100,000 men, infantry and cavalry. People came thither from all parts of the country and usually settled there. Ibn Ḥawkal (1067—978) treats this description but with some additions: the well built city had a large population, several of whom were distinguished for their wisdom; pious men came thither from all the lands of western Asia, as every nation had there their ḍār, where they lived on the gifts sent thither from all parts until they fell in battle. As Ibn Ḥawkal wrote after the taking of the town by Niceta, his description is not of the time of his own but is taken from an older source; but on the other hand the well informed Ḥusayn b. Ḥaḍdās says that he will not give a description of Tarsus as the town was in the hands of the Byzantines.

The Crusaders combined the ʿAwaṣīm with the principality of Antioch. According to Idristi's description Tarsus was then a large town with a double wall in a very fertile region. Vākū expressly remarks that in his time it was in the hands of the Byzantines (beginning of the 12th century). He also mentions the double wall, the broad ditch surrounding it and the six city gates. Before the Byzantine conquest the town was very prosperous and a series of highly gifted men came out of it. In 1275 the country of Tarsus and Adzhanīa was plundered by the Mamlík Sulṭān Raḥbars and later it was conquered by Saif al-ʿIn Kalātān. In the middle of the 13th century, Khalil al-Zahirī mentions it as under the jurisdiction of Ḥalāb; the town then had a wall and a fine castle and was surrounded by a number of villages.

At the present day Tarsus is a wretched little ruined town without any remembrance of its great past. The Baradīn now flows at some distance from the town and the overflow has turned the immediate vicinity into a swamp.


**ṬARTUS,** earlier Antarṣa, frequently Antarṣa (by analogy with Antarṣa), a town on the Syrian coast; the ancient Antarados opposite the island of Arados (Arabic Qasarrat Arwād, also written Arwād), now Rawād. Under the Roman empire, Antarados was called Constantia but the old name remained alongside of this and in the end drove the latter out again.

The Muslims took the fortess of Tarsus under
When in 357–358 (968) the Byzantines under Nicephorus conquered Northern Syria, the strong defences of the town protected it from capture by the enemy according to the evidence of the contemporary Ibn Hawkal (B. G. A., ii. 116). On the other hand a generation later, Yahya b. Saj'd of Antakya reports that the Emperor took Tarfus, Marakya and Jzhaba (Yahya, ed. Kedrinski) and Taib and Vasild (Patrol. Orient., xii. 810). In 386 (994–995) the emperor Basil II took the town (Yahya and Qiamal al-Din b. Zafir in Rostem, Zafriri imp. Abad. Nashi, xliv, 32, 33 sqq., 244; Schummerger, L'Empire byzantin, ii. 95 sqq., who wrongly distinguishes Tarfus from Tortosia). At the beginning of the year 999 the Crusaders took Tarfus but soon afterwards lost it. It was not till 495 (1102) that they finally attained possession of it under Raimund of Toulouse (Rohricht, Gesch. d. Kgr. Jerusalem, p. 33; van Berchem, Voyage, p. 322). After Raimund's death Count William of Castiglione was given Tarfus and Jzhaba as a fief (Weil, Gesch. d. Chalifen, iii. 176). By the treaty of Devol (Sept. 1105), Arwad and Tarfus among other places were promised to the Byzantine emperor Alexius Comnenus (Anna Comnena, Alexiad, ed. Bonn, i. 241; Atabidey yerca antevs, the first of which refers to the island of Arwad, inula Antaurhidas in Antouin. Placent., ed. Geyser, p. 152; cf. Dussaud, Topog. hist. la Syrie, p. 124). The town later passed into the possession of the Count of Tripoli (references in van Berchem, Voyage, loc. cit.). From a poem dedicated to Usama b. Munjib by the Egyptian vizier al-Malik al-Salih Abu l-Ghurair Tail' ib. Fuzayr, it is evident that the town must have already been in the hands of the Templars before 1158 (Derenbourg, Osmuna, p. 293). In July 1158 Saladin advanced on the town, and found it deserted by its defenders, as they had retired into two strong towers on the city walls. Saladin occupied the town in less than an hour; one of the towers was stormed by his vassal, the lord of Irill, and Saladin had destroyed it and the rains thrown into the sea. The other which was built of large hewn stones and surrounded by a well-watered garden was so bravely defended by the commander of the Templars that Saladin raised the siege and contented himself with destroying the walls and famous Church of the Virgin (van Berchem, J. A., 1902, p. 424 sqq.; Voyage en Syrie, l. 322 sqq.). The earthquake in May 1202, which devastated the whole Syrian coast, is said also to have affected Tarfus but to have spared the Church of the Virgin, which had been rebuilt in 1158 (van Berchem, Voyage, l. 323, 324). This edifice, celebrated for the miracles and cures wrought in it, which contained a valuable image of the Virgin, was considered her oldest sanctuary in Syria (Ummayya, ed. Mehran, p. 208); Idrisi apparently already knew it (he wrote in 1154 or later, cf. Paris, Recl. geogr. ital., xxiv, 1917, p. 308 sqq.) although he seems wrongly to transfer it to the island of Arwad (Dussaud, Rev. Arch, 1896, l. 317, note 5; van Berchem, p. 331). In 1215 the year 611 (1214–1215) Count Rainioud of Tripoli, son of Bohemund IV of Antioch, was murdered by Ismailis; in revenge, the prince led an expedition against the fortress of Khawabi (Kamal al-Din, transl. Blochet, R. O. L., v. 48; Ibn Farat in Rohricht, Gesch. d. Kgr. Jerus., p. 271, note 1; 715, note 4) The Church of the Virgin lay within the area of the sanctuary of the apostle Andrew, as appears from a letter from Pope Clement IV to Bishop William of Tortosa of April 22, 1265 (Sharaglia, Bullar. Francisci, iii., Rome 1759, p. 4, note 6).

In the treaty of 1229 between the Emperor Frederick and the Sultan, Tarfus was promised to the Sultan, Marak, Tarfus and Antakya were not included; the emperor had to pledge himself to maintain neutral in case of a war between these lands and the Muslims (Rohricht, Beltrage d. Gesch. d. Kreuzzugs, l. 41, 77 sqq., 210; Gesch. d. Kgr. Jerusalem, p. 785).

When Bailturs in 669 (1267/8) was advancing on Antioch via Tarfus, envoy from the Templars of Safirah and Antarquz appeared before him with presents and 300 Muslims, lately prisoners, and thus succeeded in having their territory spared (al-Makrizi in Quatremerue, Hist. des Sultans Mamelouks, i, 11ii. 34; Rohricht, Gesch. d. Kgr. Jerus., p. 953). An attack by the Sultan on Tarfus and other towns in 669 (1267/8) met with no success (note; Makrizi, op. cit., ii. 84; Mufaddal b. Ahi 'l-Tarqih ii, Histoire des sultans mamelouks, ed. Blochet in Patrol. Orient., xii. 528). Later however the Templars found themselves forced to conclude a treaty with him by which their territory and that of Marak and Baniyus was divided between them and the Sultan (Makrizi, op. cit., i, 15ii; Mufaddal, op. cit., xii. 536; xiv. 445; Rohricht, p. 953). The Master of the Templars, William of Bennieu (De Bellacoco), in 681 concluded a truce with al-Malik al-Mansur for the Tarfus and the district around for ten years and ten months (from April 15, 1282) and the possessions of the two parties were accurately delimited. To Tarfus belonged 37 districts of the region round 'Arramah (now 'Ata' al-'Arabie) and Mafar (now Busrij Minar) (Makrizi, ii. 177 sqq., 221–223; Rohricht, Regesta regum Hierosolym., p. 377, No. 1447; do., Gesch, d. Kgr. Jerus., p. 984). After the conquest of 'Alej, Tarfus was taken from the Franks by Sultan Khaal, being one of the last towns to fall, on 5th Shawal 690 (Aug. 3, 1291) (Makrizi, Salt. Mamluk, ii. 126; Abu l-Fidai, Annals Mamelouk, ed. Reiske, v. 88; Recueil des hist. ar. d. Crois., i. 164; Weil, Gesch. d. Chalifen, iv. 181, note 1; Rohricht, Gesch, d. Kgr. Jerus., p. 1026 sqq.; van Berchem, Voyage, p. 234).

The Templars temporarily succeeded in establishing themselves again in Tarfus in 1300–1302 from the island of Arwad (A. Trudon des Ormes, Maisons du Temple en Orient., R. O. L., v. 1897, p. 426–428; van Berchem, a. a. O.). The island was not taken till 102 (1302/3) in the reign of al-Malik al-Nasir, the Christians there put to
death or carried into captivity and the citizens were killed. (Maghríb, Sult. Moth., ii/ii.

Herodoteus Turfûz was a little district under the nāhir of Tarshish (Kalkula, Sīd, al-Thuqla, in Gaudeyrim-Dom-poundies, La Syrie, i, 116; 228; 'Umar, Turfûz, p. 182 in K. Hartmann, Z. D. M. G., lxx, 1916, p. 36; n 7). The town declined more and more, and the castle of the Crusading period serves the few inhabitants of the present Turfûz (Trotta) as a dwelling place. The Church of the Virgin still survives in its later form (for further particulars see van Berchem, Voyage, i. 329–334; cf. also Enlari, in Syria, ii, 1921, p. 333 and M. Pillet, in Syria, vi, 1926, p. 420; also the fortifications (Syria, iii, 1922, p. 268 sq., for Jesseren's defences).


(T. E. HONIGMANN)

TARUDANT, the principal town in the district of Sûs, to the south of Morocco on the right bank of the Wâdi Sûs, about 100 miles S. W. of Marrakesh and 45 E. of Agadir on the Atlantic. These two towns may be reached from Tarudant by tracks passable by vehicles. It is a little town with about 7,000 inhabitants. For further details and the history of the town see the article AL-ADÂS AL- ASQâ, especially p. 566 sqq.

(É. LEVY-PROVENCAL)

TARWIYA is the name for the 8th Dhu 'l-Hijjah (yuwm al-tarwiya). The Muslim Hodjji began on this day; on it the pilgrims go from Mecca to Minâ and as a rule after a short stay there go on again to be able to pass the night in 'Arafa. In Muhammadan works the term yuwm al-tarwiya is usually explained from the fact that the pilgrims on this day give their animals a plentiful supply of water in preparation for the ride through the waterless area or from their taking a supply of water with them themselves. But as tarwiya properly means rather "pouring" than "watering" animals or "taking water with one" it has been suggested that the expression goes back to some kind of sympathetic rain-charm with which the rite of the pilgrimage was introduced in the oldest period. With this one might compare the pouring and sprinkling with the sacred water of Zamâm as observed by Ibn Dujjair in Sha'bân 579 (1183) among the Meccans and by al-Batanînî among the B Duals during the pilgrimage in 1909. See also HAJJ}


TAŞAWWUF. I. Etymology — madâr of form vi, formed from the root râfâ, meaning "wool" to denote the practice of wearing the woolen robe (labaq al-râfî) — hence the act of devoting oneself to the mystic life on becoming what is called in Islam a râfî.

The other etymologies, ancient and modern, proposed for this name of râfî may be rejected: such are abî al-lâfî (devotees seated on the "bench" of the mosque at Madina in the time of the Prophet), râfî awalî (first row of the faithful at prayer), bâni Râfî (a Beduin tribe), râfa'â (a kind of vegetable), râfâ'at al-lâfî (a lock of hair on the nape of the neck), râfî (passive form of root III, of the root râfî, to be purified; at a very early date — the eighth century A.D. — this passive is found in puns on the word râfî "mystic clothed in wool") and the Greek σκέφτε (the attempt has even been made to derive tašawwuf from theoskefaia); Nöldke (Z. D. M. G., xxvii., p. 45) refused this last etymology by showing that the Greek σκέφτε regularly became sin (and not pâd) in Arabic and that there is no Aramaic intermediation between σκέφτε and râfî.

The individual surname al-râfî first appeared in history in the second half of the eighth century with Djiâbîr Ibn Hajîyan, a Shî'ite alchemist of Kûfa, who professed an ascetic doctrine of his own (cf. Khashlî, ibid. 253 [867], Istâfâm, v. 7, and Abu 'l-Hajîyan of Kûfa, a celebrated mystic, As to the plural râfîya which appears in 199 (814) in connection with a man or rising in Alexandria (al-Kindi, 'Odâs Miyr, ed. Guest, p. 460, 440), it means about the same date, according to Muhabât (Mâhîb, Pers. MS., p. 87) and Djiâbîr (Hijârûn, i. 194), a semi-Shî'ite school of Muslim mysticism which originated in Kûfa, the last head of which, 'Abdâ al-Shî'î, a vegetarian legislator, died in Baghdad about 210 (825). The name râfî is then at first clearly confined to Kûfa.

It was destined to have a remarkable future. Within fifty years it denoted all the mystics of the 'Irâ (in contrast to the Mal'mîyya mystics of Khorasan) and two centuries later, râfîya was applied to the whole body of Muslim mystics as
our terms Şûfî and "Sûfism" still are to-day. In the interval the wearing of the şâfî or "cloak of white wool", considered in 100 (719) as a foreign and reprehensible fashion of Christian origin (with which Fârîd Shâhî, a disciple of Ḥasan Baṣrî, is reproached), had become what it henceforth remained, an eminently orthodox Muslim fashion; numerous hadîths (handed down and probably invented by Dâshbâniyâr) even make it Muhammad's favourite dress for a religious man.

2. Origins. The mysticactic and the mystical hadîth of the inner life of Muḥammad, about which we know so very little, are comparatively late and therefore suspect. But the tendencies to mystical life, which are of all countries and of all nations, were not lacking in the Islâm of Arabia of the first two centuries A.H. and when once the later legends are eliminated, Dâshbâniyâr and Ibn al-Ḍlawt (ṣûfîyâ) have preserved for us the names of over forty authentic ascetics of this period, among whom the "interiorisation" of the rites of worship show distinct features of the mystical life. It cannot, however, be any longer asserted that Muḥammad a priori excluded mystics from his Muslim community, for it is now known that the famous hadîth: "La rakbîn yata fi'l-Islâm: *no monasticism in Islâm*" to which Sprenger had given this meaning, is apocryphal, and that it must have been invented at latest in the third century A.H. to encourage and strengthen a new, deprecatory and interdictive interpretation of a famous verse of the Kur'ân (Ivii. 27) where rakbîn yata (monastic life, vows of chastity and seclusion) is mentioned: a verse unanimously interpreted in a permissive and laudatory sense by the exegists of the first three centuries, like Muğîhîd and Abû Imâmâ Bâhîlî (cf. my Essai, p. 123-131) and by the more cautionary of the old mystics (cf. Djanâd, Dâshâni before the opposite interpretation became disseminated and Zâmakhsârî made it predominant.

Muslim mysticism may claim among the Ṣâbîhî two real precursors in Abû Ḍairr and Muḥdish (the cases of Uwâlî and Ṣuhâb are not conclusively proved). After them came ascetics (maṣâkîh, maṣkîh), penitents or "weepers" (bakhrûâ) and popular preachers (ṣûfîyâ). At first isolated, they gradually tend to fall into two individual schools, like the adepts in other branches of Muslim thought, schools which had their headquarters on the Mesopotamian frontier of the Arabian desert, one at Baṣra and the other at Kûfâ.

The Arab colony at Baṣra, of Tamîm origin, realist and critical by nature, enamoured of logic in grammar, realism in poetry, criticism in hadîth, the sunna with Mu'tazîl origin and Kadari tendencies in dogmatics, had as teachers of mysticism: Ḥasan Baṣrî (d. 110 = 725), Mâlik b. Dînâr, Fâṣîl Râkîshâr, Râlîb. b. 'Amr Kâisî, Šâhî Mûrri and Abî al-Ṭâhîsh b. Zâîd (d. 177 = 793), founder of the famous caenobiotic group of Aḥdâhânî.

The Arab colony of Kûfâ, of Yemeni origin, idealist and traditionalist by temperament, enamoured of hadîth in grammar, Platonic in poetry, Zâhirî in hadîth, the Şî'î with Murdîl tendencies in dogmatics, had as teachers of mysticism: Râhî b. Khâshîhâm (d. 67 = 656), Abî Ismâ'îl Mâlî (d. 140 = 757), Dâshbâniyâr, Hâjîyân, Kûshî b. Sâdâwî, Mâshîrî b. 'Ammar, Abû l-Athâibîyâ and 'Abdâb. The three last-named spent the latter part of their lives in the capital of the empire, Baghdâd, which became the centre of the Muslim mystic movement after 250 (864): the date when the first meeting-places for religious discussions and sacred concerts (ṣâfîyâ) were opened, with the first public lectures on mysticism in the mosques.

This was also the period in which the mystics had their first open encounter with the theologians, the trial of Dâshâniyâr (240 = 854), Nûrî and Abû Ḥâmmâ (between 262 = 875 and 269 = 882, according to Ibn al-Ḍlawt, Tâhî, p. 183) and Hâllîsh before the šâfîyâ of Baghdâd.

3. The part played by Ṣûfism in the Muslim community. The early Muslim mystics had not foreseen that they would come into conflict with the administrative authorities of the Muslim community. If they lived rather retired lives in voluntary poverty (ṣâfî) it was in order to be the better able to meditate on the Kur'ân (tâhîr'în) the old synonym of ṣâfîwâsâ) by seeking to draw near to God in prayer. The mystic calif is as a rule the result of an inner rebellion of the conscience against social injustices, not only of others but primarily and particularly against one's own faults; with a desire intensified by inner purification to find God at any price; this which is already clearly seen in the life, examples and sermons of Ḥasan Baṣrî (cf. Schaefer, I., xiv. 1-72, and Massignou, Essai, p. 173-179), is magnificently expounded in the moving autobiographies of the two great mystics, Muḥsihîn in his Wašqâ (transl. in Massignou, p. 216-218) and Ghâzîlî in his Mânâmîdî (transl. by Barbière de Meynard), but this does not yet threaten the established order, however unrighteous it may be of the conduct of the ruler. But it was the canonists and professional theologians, jâhâbî and muhlabîsî, who, very disapproved at seeing people speak of searching their consciences and judging one another by this inner tribunal — since the Kur'ânic law had only legislated for an external tribunal and punished public sins and had no weapon against religious hypocrisy (ṣâfî) — tried to show that the ultimate results of the life led by the mystics were heterodox, since they held that the intention is more important than the act, that practical example (inwâh) is better than strict letter of the law (fârûf) and that obedience is better than observance.

Among the Muslim schools, the Khârîjîs were the first to display their hostility to Ṣûfîm, in the case of Ḥasan Baṣrî; then the Imâms (Zâdî, Twelvers and Ṣâfîyâ) in the third century A.D. condemned all calls to the mystical life as introducing among believers a kind of unusual life (râfî, hâshâbî) finding expression in the search for a state of grace (râfî) dispensing with devotion to the twelve Imams and an apostolate, contrary to their custom of ṣâfîyâ.

The Sunnis were slower in declaring their attitude and there was never unanimity among them in condemning mysticism. The attacks on mysticism came from two sections among them: on the one hand from conservative circles (ṣâfîyâ); Ibn Ḥanbal accuses mysticism of developing meditation at the expense of open prayer and of seeking for the soul a state of personal friendship with God (khâlîq), henceforth freeing it from the observances prescribed by law (iḥâf); his immediate disciples, Khâshîhî and Abû Zu'a, put it in a special subsection (râfîyâ) of the heresy of the sanâdîq.
On the other hand, the Muʿtazilites and Zāhiris denounce as absurd the idea of a common life (rādk) uniting the Creator to his creatures, for it implies in theory anthropomorphism (rādk) and in practice, contact and incarnation (mulāmata wa jawāli).

As a matter of fact, however, moderate Sufis has never been excommunicated by Sunni in writing, which has always provided the professional morality and its life of prayer, from the popular little books of Ibn al-Farābī (d. 484) to masterpieces like the Kitab al-Khulāṣah of Aḥmad Makdisi (d. 496) and especially the Ḥaṣāl of Ghazālī; learned Sufis, who were hostile to mysticism, like Ibn al-Djwārī, Ibn Taimiyya and Ibn al-Kaṣīm, respected the great moral authority of Ghazālī and it was only against the monism of the disciples of Ibn al-ʿArabī that the fulminations of the late Sufi canonists were thundered, without much success however. The founder of the Wāhhabīs, prejudiced against mysticism as he was, himself wrote a commentary on the Ḥaṣāl by the ʿAbī Ṣaḥīḥ to Ḥātim al-ʿArūsī.

4. The history of the evolution of the conception of mystic union. Primitive Sufism was based on the following postulates:
   a. the fervent practice of worship engenders in the soul graces (frāh) and realities (a postulate rejected by Ḥaṣālī ever)
   b. the science of hearts (al-ḥaṣālī) will procure the soul an experimental wisdom (marāja), which implies the ascension of the will to the graces received (a postulate rejected by the Muʿtazilites, who are content with a theological psychology).

The Sufis assert that there is a dynamic characteristic in the science of hearts; its traces its itinerary (ṣafar) to God, marks it by a dozen stages (ṣafarān) and steps (ṣafara), some virtues acquired, others graces received, as in the Sāfa Sātāsa of St. John Climacus; their double list varies with different authors (e.g. Ṣarrāj, Kūshairī, Ghazālī) but contains almost always well-known terms like ṣafar, ṣafara, ṣafaran, ṣafarul, ṣafarul. Without laying stress on the individual modalities of this mystical itinerary the Sufis aimed especially at defining the ultimate goal when, triumphing over its attachment to the flesh, the soul finds the true God to whom it aspires, the Real (al-ʿAbābī), a word used as early as the third century A. H. and perhaps borrowed from the pseudo-theology of Aristotle). But how are we to define in orthodox terms this supreme state in which the soul enters with God into this ecstatic dialogue of which the first revelations are made by Rūqān, Mūhāshāb and Yahyā Rāzī, a state which raises the difficult question of theophatic conversation (ṭuṣq) (q. v.)? The mystics are obliged henceforth to have recourse to the theological vocabulary of their time: they borrow from it here and there technical terms of which they twist the sense a little, without giving a fixed meaning to them. Thus Ṣaḥīḥ introduces ʿalāʾ, Miṣr and Ibn Karrām murīja, Miṣr and Ḫaṭāni fami (opp. ʿaṣāf = cf. ʿAṣām in lv. 26-27), Ḫaṭāni ʿaṣām al-gām, Tirmidhī wāliya, etc. In doing this, primitive Muslim mystics involved itself in the natures of the metaphysics of the first mutakallimīn, atomism, materialism and occasionalism in metaphysics, denying the spirituality and even the immortality of the soul, confounding ontological unity with arithmetic unity, which makes it necessary to classify the attempts at explanation of the first Muslim mystic schools with the heresy of the Ḥaṣālīyya. If we take the Karrāmiyya who desire to emphasize the actual interest which God has in the souls, Ashʿarism accuses them of inserting students into the being of the Eternal; or the Sālīmiyya who wish to assert that ardent souls became capable of adhering to the divine presence, the Ḥanbalīs say that they introduce G-d into the tongue of the reciter; finally when the Ḥaṣālīyya conclude from the ecstatic dialogue, from the intermittent change in subject which is then produced in the depth of the soul, that God has made living testimonies (ḥaṣāalī) out of the saints, this view is accused of becoming blasphemous and impossible, of implying the asportation of the divinity by the humanity of a perishable body, since two substances cannot occupy the same place at one and the same time.

In the fourth century A. H. infiltrations from Greek philosophy, which had been continually increasing since the early Karmatian gnostics [q. v.] and the physician Rāfī ḏiʾ Ṣūrī, brought into existence a more correct metaphysical vocabulary implying the immateriality of the spirit (raf) and of the soul, the consideration of general ideas, the chain of secondary causes. But this vocabulary became amalgamated with the pseudo-theology of Aristotle, with Platonist idealism and the Platonist doctrine of emanation, which influenced profoundly the further development of Sufism. The learned mystics of this period hesitate between three explanations of mystic union: a. the ittiḥādīna, from Ibn Masarra and the Ḫaṭāni ʿaṣām al-Gāmī; this Ḥaṣālīyya from Shurwardi, Ḥaṭāni and ʿAbānī to ʿAṣāmī and Ibn Karrām, teaching the essentialisation (ṭuṣq) of the soul, the divine spark reviving under the illuminations of active intellect (identified with the rūr waḥammad of the Karrāmiyya and the Sālīmiyya) on the passive soul; b. the Ḫaṭāniyya from Ḫaṭāni and ʿAbābī and Ṣadīr al-ʿAbī Ṣaḥīḥ, teaching the essentialisation (ṭuṣq) of the soul, the divine spark reviving under the illuminations of active intellect; c. the Ḫaṭāniyya from Ibn Ṣūrī to Ibn Ṣūrī and Ibn Ṣūrī to Ibn Ṣūrī and Ibn Ṣūrī, arguing himself to the effect that the soul attains agreement with God, then taking on the consciousness of a total differentiated existence, which there is no longer number nor discrimination of any sort. We may note in passing that Ghazālī (Moṭāfiq, p. 74) related the thesis of the ittiḥādīna, a thesis which Ibn Ṣūrī had admitted into his Naṣīrī (Cairo, p. 402, 48) but rejected in his Ḫaṭāni (ch. ix., p. 118; cf. Ibn Ṣūrī, Taqāfīlīya) and that Ibn Ṣūrī, a convinced gnostist, sees in God only the form (ṭura) or principle of individuation (anmiya) of all created beings.

The third and last period in the development of Sufi doctrine begins in the viiith (xiiith) century; its predominant school has been justly given by its adversaries the name of Ṣufis (or Wajfūdīya) as professing the doctrines of essentialist monism (wājfulā al-wajfūdīya) of the Wajfūdīya claims a long descent: it turns to its advantage the Ḫaṭāni verses (ii. 109; xxviii. 88; l. 12), the primitive Aḥṣāʿi kāfūm regarding every spiritual happening as an immediate act of God and extravagances of language of the early mystics like Ḫaṭāni and Ḥaṭāni (in those that ʿAin al-ʿAbī Ṣaḥīḥ Hamadānī collected in his Taḥālīf, the word wajfūd, derived from waqīf, ecstasy, still means the qualification by God of a creature
in opposition to ḍawāra, his extension in space). It is however really derived from the identification, proposed as early as the third century. a. d., of the nūr muḥammadia of Muslim gnosticism with the active intellect of the Hellenistic doctrine of emanation (from which Ibn Rushd himself is not free, since he asserts in the Taḥāṣufī that divine presence is the superior degree of the existence of things and that souls ought to unite in it like a single passive intellect in the active intellect). Ibn 'Arabī (d. 578 = 1240) was the first to formulate the doctrine of existentialist monism; for him at bottom "the existence of created things is nothing but the very essence of the existence of the Creator" (nūr al-maḥdūd 'ain nūr al-khāliq, Ibn Ṭa’limyia justly remarks). He teaches in fact that things necessarily emanate from divine presence in which they pre-existed (ḥubūt) as ideas, by a flux evolving in five periods and that the souls by an inverse involution logically constructed re-integrate the divine essence. Farghānī and Dīlūr only add a few touches of detail to this main theory, which to this day has remained that of all Muslim mystics. It is the one which the Persian poets have sung interminably in the simplified form which Ṣūfī, putting into order the ideas of Ḥaṭṭār expresses thus: "God is existence in as much as it is general and unconditional"; it is that which flows, like the sea under its waves through the fleeting forms of individual beings; and at the end of the xivth century of our era, Kawkānī and Nābuluṣī aroused the indignation of orthodoxy Sunnīs by concluding that this pantheistic monism is the only correct interpretation to give to the monothestic profession of faith of Islam (cf. Massignon, Ḥalāta, p. 784–90); in their eyes, the ḍawāda by which Islam had thought to affirm the pure transcendence of the one God signifies the absolute immanence of God in his creation and that the totality of all beings in all their actions is divinely adorables. This quietism, which established the supremacy of the divine decree over legal precept, led the Suūfīs among other paradoxes to the rehabilitation of Ibīs (supported by Dīlūr) and of the Pharaoh of the Exodus (the celebrated thesis of Ibn 'Arabī).

5. The other characteristic features of Suūfīs and the study of its sources: The other doctrinal peculiarities still to be noted are a. the ḍawāda or spiritual genealogy imagined to link up, as is done in the case of ḍawāda, the chain of teachers of mysticism to the direct teaching of the Prophet. The earliest known ḍawāda (Fihris, p. 183) is that of Kūhūlī (d. 435 = 950) which claims to go back to the Prophet by the following links: Dīnawī (7), Ṣαḥābī (6), Maḥrūf Karkhī (5), Fir_MUTEX, Ḥasan Bāṣrī (3), and Aḥmad b. Mālik (2). Twenty years later Dākākī (d. 405 = 1014; cf. Kūhūlī, p. 158) goes back to the same names except that he only gives the name of Dāwūd Tāʿī (4), before Karkhī. Finally the classic ḍawāda fixed in the xilth century (Ibn Aḥmad, ʿAlī, p. 250) and since adopted by all the great religious orders, gives after Dīnawī (7), Ṣaḥābī (8), Aḥmad b. Mālik b. Zuhḍīlī (9), Maḥrūf (10) and Gurgīst (11) and, going back before Dāwūd Tāʿī (4), Ḥasan Bāṣrī (2), Aḥmad (1). Ibn al-Djewad and Dhāhībī have shown that the four oldest links in this ḍawāda are false, since these men never met one another. Some religious orders utilise an ḍawāda which goes back (before Maḥrūf Karkhī) to the nine first Shīʿī Imāms and is still more apocryphal.

A. The invisible hierarchy of believing souls in the world (riqṣīt al-ghabāb); the world is supposed to endure, thanks to the intercessions of a concerted hierarchy of "averting" saints, fixed in number, the place of one of whom dies being immediately filled. These are the 300 maḥdūdī (the 40 abīdāt, the 7 sanāʿīn, the 4 'amārah and their ḍawāra (pole or mystic axis of the world = ḍawāra).

C. The privileges and dispensations (wujūd) on which is founded the communal life of the Suūfīs (cf. Taṣīrī); privileges frequently of an anarchical and unusual character from the distant days of Bāṣṭānī, Bībī and Abū Saʿīd down to the more or less irresponsible and scandalous Marż insignes of modern times. At their assemblies the Suūfīs recite special poems; this literature, which is very characteristic of Islam, has developed everywhere in extreme profusion and as a rule has not escaped either monotony or dullness; it is intended to provoke among listeners a psychic excitement by aesthetic means so as to release a sort of artificial ecstasy.

This literature extols in mystical language wine (ḥāmon) interdicted by the law in this world and reserved for the Paradise of the elect, the loving-cup (hām al-maḥdūba) which the cup-bearer (ḥabīb = ḍawāda al-dawir = terseddub) sends round and gives them, detailed allegorical descriptions with an enthusiasm of a frequently dangerous kind which the majority of western translators prudently shun ever. Among such poems the following are especially famous in Arabic, those of Ibn Fārūd and of Shūshīrī; in Persian, the quatrains of Abū Saʿīd, the long mukammals of ʿAlī and Rūmī (cf. his monastic apologue: "Who is there? — It is Thou etc."), the ghawāf of Ḥājīb and the various poems of Dīlūr, in Turkish the works of Nešān and Nīṣāṭī. This kind of literature has become naturalised in Urdu and in Malay, where it still survives at the present day although it has now disappeared in the nearer East; the modern Muslim élite are more and more abandoning it.

The critical study of the sources of Suūfīs is far from being completed. Surprised at the profound dogmatic difference which lies between its present monism and strict orthodoxy, the early students of Islam thought Suūfīs could be explained as a doctrine of foreign origin, derived either from Syrian monachism (Mere) or Greek Neo-Platonism or Persian Zoroastrianism, or from the Vedānta of India (Jones). Nicholson has shown that in this simple form the hypothesis of borrowing is untenable; made from the very beginning of Islam, it can be observed that the formation of the theses peculiar to Muslim mystics went on from within in the course of assiduous recitations of and meditations on the Karṣān and Ḥudūlī, under the influence of social and individual crises in the very centre of the Muslim community. But if the initial framework of Suūfīs was specifically Muslim and Arab, it is not exactly useless to identify the foreign decorative elements which came to be added to this framework and flourished there; in this way it has been possible for recent students to discover several devotional elements derived from Christian monachism (Asin Palacios, Wensinck, T. Andrac) and several Greek philosophical terms translated from the Syriac; the Iranian analogies (suggested by Blochet) have hardly been examined;
as to the Indian elements (Horton's theory) few arguments have been added to the old similar conjectures of al-Būrānī and Dārā Shikoh on the parallels between the Upaniṣhads or the Vāgī Śutras and the ideology of primitive Śūfīism. On the other hand, it is probable that the critical student of the material processes producing the ḍīkā of the modern congregations [cf. tākīq] would establish the infiltration of certain methods of Hindu asceticism.


TASHĪH (a.), infinitive II from sd-ḥ, saying Subhan Allāh [q.v.]

TASHĪH, assimilating, comparing (God to man), anthropomorphism, and tājīr, emptying, divesting (God of all attributes), are the names of two opposite views of the doctrine of the nature of God in Islām; both are regarded as heresies and grave sins in dogma. The fierce dispute over these conceptions, by which even the dogma of the Kur'ān is influenced, is explained by the central position of the doctrine of the nature of God in Islām. The formal cause is to be found in the Kur'ān, which strongly emphasizes the absolute uniqueness of God and yet at the same time naïvely describes him in the language of anthropomorphism, giving him a face, eyes and hands and talking of his speaking and sitting. The commentaries, such as, for example, Jāhārī on the Throne-verses ii. 256 (cf. also Goldscheider, Vorlesungen, Heldbergen 1925, p. 102 sqq.), enumerate the most diverse interpretations, most of which can no longer be justified; these vary from crude emphasis of the literal meaning to its explanation as allegorical. Instead of the name sāifūl, which came very early into use and means not merely referring to God in phraseology which is ambiguous because generally used of man, but which had, one might say, the sanction of the Prophet, we find tawbah, also used in connection with Sūra, xiii. 9 where the possibility of anything like God is excluded, while the verb tš-š-b ḰII is found only in Sūra, iv. 156, applied to the docetic description of the death of Jesus. Ta'wil, the rational interpretation of the anthropomorphic literal meaning, is also found, it is true, as a means and introduction to tš-p but not uniformly as the root Ḳ-Ṭ-II in the Kur'ān has not a sensuous sense. Here again the Sūna plays its double part. There are ḥadīths which were devoted to the question, not only partly tendentious sayings, which originated in this dispute and were coined for the purpose, but also such as are quite free from dogmatic prejudice, just as in certain Sūfī circles the longing aroused in the mystic worship of youth may have found expression in the strongly anthropomorphic visions of God in the form of a noble-looking youth (Riṭār in Isl., xvii. [1928], p. 257; cf. also his references in earlier pages to manuscripts). Other ḥadīths again were cited as arguments in the dispute on the strength of a superficial interpretation, e.g. that of the nightly descent of God to earth, in itself really soteriological and edifying, in which the real point actually lies in the hearing of prayer.

It is exceedingly difficult for us to approach the question, since, so far as we can see, none of the Muslim theologians declares frankly for one of the two views of God, but rather every one asserts that he stands for tawbah, keeping (God) pure, against sāifī and tawbah, positive determination in the basis of tawbah, the recognition of the revealed text, against tš-p. All the more eagerly however, do they accuse one another of one or even both transgressions. The use of these terms is quite relative and the grouping of their alleged representatives is equally relative. There are no definite sāifūs and muṣḥabīs sects; on the contrary, the differences in the teaching about God's nature and attributes do not run parallel with any other statements about God and still less do they coincide with other differences in dogma and religio-political theory. Little is known of Dji'd b. Dirham, said to have been the first sāifūl, whom even Ibn Taimiya, in al-Furūq (cf. Muṣafār al-Rasā'īl al-Kabīr, Cairo 1323, l. 137, 11 sqq.), still makes responsible for the fall of the last Omayyad, who is definitely called a Dji'dī and in remarkable contrast also responsible for the Ba'ṭnīya of the Assassins and the Rāṣīlīya of Syria. The exponent of tš-p most frequently mentioned, the somewhat younger Djiham b. Sāfāwān al-Rāṣīb [q.v.], put to death in 128 (745), was described by the Shī'ī Ibn al-Ruwallānī as a Mu'tasili Unitarian (muṣ̄abbīl) and was re-
ected from the Mu‘azzila (as "the ‘ismâs of the muqaddâshâ") by the Mu‘azzil Abû ‘l-Hasan al-
Khayyat in: the Kitâb al-Istinâf (Le Livre du triomphe, ed.: Nyberg, Cairo 1925, p. 133 ult.,
134 a) on the authority of a poem cursing him by Biyûr b. Mu‘ammâr and, on account of
the one principle in common,—that God’s knowledge of things only comes into existence at
their creation — classed with the ultra Shi‘î Ibn al-
Hakam (see below) (p. 126 b, the ‘Shi‘î of anthropomorphism”; al-Khâyûtî, as a rule attributes
anthropomorphic views particularly to the Nâbiti, i.e. the ‘Uqâmânic–Qumaytî party (p. 457, v.): Ibn
Hâzim (Fîfûl, Cairo 1320, iv. 205, 10): classs Lâhirian
among the Mu‘azzilis are Abû ‘l-Ashârî, Sharâ–
štâînî (ed. Cureton, p. 41) and the Hâfiz Abû Sâ‘îm
Muhammad al-‘Ushâî (on the margin of Qanîkhâwî,
Kitâb al-Wadjî), Cairo 1355, p. 70) put him with
the Dâshâs who believe in predestination. Al-
though the description of Djahân as a mu‘azzîl
seems to be the general, the writers on heroes can
only be used as authorities with the greatest
cautions. While Kâshâsh al-Nisâ‘î (d. 845 = 857; see
Masson, La passion d’al-Hâfiz, Paris 1922, p. 635 and note 2) calls the dogmatists of Djahân
tashkî (purifying from any attributes of a created
being), and Ashârî, Mâshâîl al-Islâmîyin (ed. Ritter,
p. 267, 10, 27) and similarly Baghdâdî in Farâb
al-Farîsî (Cairo 1328, p. 199, 11) only point out
that Djahân from fear of tashkî did not teach
“God is a something”); Ibn Hâzim also quotes the
negative denial: but also “not a not-an-anything”;
which reveals the same anxiety about tâfîf or its
intenser form tâfîf, destruction, annihilation, ni-
hilism. Of the numerous pamphlets against Djahân
that of Ibn Hânbal is accessible in al-Râfîd al-
l-‘Azâ‘îqâsî wa l-Qâhidâtîya (see ‘Ukhtîr Fikrî, Fikrî,
Mâshâîl al, 1917, p. 313—327). Ibn Hânbal allows
his opponent to say very little and the latter’s
arguments must not be taken as authentic without
further evidence; the subject of the dispute and
arguments from ‘Alî and Sunna are however
clear. Djahân is said to have denied that God can
be seen by the blessed in Paradise, that he talked with
Moses and that he sits on a throne. Here
however Ibn Hânbal interprets Djahân’s fear of
fixing God to a definite place in such a literal and
anthropomorphic manner that he says the
logical consequence for the Djahânists is to believe
that God is in their bodies, in the bellies of swine
and latrines. He himself has however to explain
God’s being among men in ‘Sura iii., 8, 33 48;
ix. 40 etc. as metaphorical tawwîl, which shows how
little it is possible to draw a dividing line: on the
one side Sunna with verbal exegesis and on the
other Mu‘azzilas with tawwîl! At the same time
Ibn Hânbal earns from Djahân the grave reproach of
hypostasizing after the fashion of the Christian
Trinity for his dogma that God is eternal with all
his eternal attributes, for which he unhesitatingly
uses the metaphor of the palm-tree consisting of
root, trunk, branch, twigs, leaves, and sap.
Ahmad b. Hânbal has become the great orthodox
authority against tashkî and tawwîl. Al-Ashârî
(q. v.) relies on him for his confession of faith in
Mûkâtîb, p. 277 b. He gave his views on the
subject in many special treatises especially on the
possibility of seeing God. The happy manner
which he struck by simply recognising the hands,
the face and the sitting down of God “without a how”
(bâd-là, Kâfî) is continually developed by his
followers, as every Muslim of himself states the
problem. It has however been brought against
him as “the entrance to the doctrine of the
anthropomorphists” by Ibn Hâzim, who at the same
time regards Ibn Hânbal as an authority (ii. 166,
92–93); Ibn Hâzim for his part attacks the Mu‘azzilas
turning down of the conception with equally colour-
less tawwîl (cf. ii. 166, 91 sq. to 167, 4 sqq.). That
the Ashârî doctrine of the nature of God was
always considered tashkî by the Shi‘îs is shown
quite recently by al-Kâshî n. Sa‘îd al-Shamâshî
in al-Râfîd al-‘Azâ‘îqâsî wa l-Qâhidâtîya (Cairo
1924, cf. esp. p. 67 sqq.). His verdict is no more lenient than that of the Almohad Ibn
Tûnî in (Le Livre de Muhammad Ibn Tûnî, i., ed. Goldziher, Alger 1903, p. 261, no. 234 b)
on the tawwîl of the Almoravids.
In the effort to keep as near to Ibn Hânbal as
possible while averting the suspicion of tashkî the
Mâshâîrs rather emphasised the negative: God
is not bounded, not numbered, not divided, not
composed; e. g. Abû Hâfîṣ al-Nasirî (cf. D. B.
Macdonald, Development of Muslim Theology, Juris-
prudence and Constitutional Theory, New
York 1903, p. 309). This brought upon them, as it had
on their forerunner, Biyûr b. ‘Ukhtîr as-Dâ'imî, and on ‘Ukhtîr as-Dâ'imî from strict
Hanbalis like Ibn Tîmîyâ (esp. cit., i. 425, b)
the reproach of the “diverging” tawwîl. But the
Hanbalî school of theologians did not remain at
one. In Dar al-Tâfîf b. ‘Ukhtîr as-Dâ'imî wa l-
Râfîd al-‘Azâ‘îqâsî (ed. Husâm al-Dîn al-Kadîb, Damascus,
esp. p. 5 sqq.) Ibn al-Daiwî attacks three
fellow Hanbalis for lack of purity of conception.
On the other hand it is Ibn al-Daiwî’s celebrated
pupil Ibn Tîmîyâ who is regarded, along with
men like Abû ‘l-Ammîr M. b. Sa‘îd al-Kazâhî, as
a bad anthropomorphist since the too much quoted
note of Ibn Ba’ttûta that he said that “God comes
down just as I am now coming down (from the
pulpit)”. More serious than the striking note on
48, note) may be the attack in his own works
on the idea “Look like my look, hand like my
hand!” (Farâb., i. 119, v.); also his explanation of
God’s being among men, which may with equal
justice be called rationalistic tawwîl (i. 456 sqq.);
then the constant endeavour to transfer anthropo-
morphic expressions applied to God in a sphere
sui generis, but particularly his opinion on all grossly
material Shâhîh of God’s coming down to earth
as delineate forgeries of the zâids, invented to
make the Sunnis appear ludicrous (l. 286 a), and
in general his continual attacks on tashkî and
tawwîl (i. 270 a, 1 sqq.; 395 b, sqq., etc.) which
at least reveal his aim and his personal conviction.
The case is worse with Abû Muhammad Hâfîz
b. al-Hâfîz (d. c. 199 = 814) since we possess
all of his writings. Ashârî however in Mûkâtîb,
p. 299, 3 sqq., reveals the lack of agreement among
the notables of him when collected. Among them
is a definite testimony that this Hâfîz is free from actual tashkî and a complete rejection of
the view held, of an affinity and correspondence
（muqaddâshâ）in: Djurgjads on ‘Idî, Maxâsîfî, ed.
Schoenemann, Leipzig 1848, p. 347, 12 sq. and xx: muqaddâshâ), which first of all makes possible the relation
of God to what is created and only makes his
knowledge possible by his emanating penetration,
which is only to be conceived in this way. When
then in spite of this, Ashârî opens his section on
the anthropomorphists with this Hishām “who
compared the object of his adoration to a man”,
we have a glimpse of the origin of this careless
labelling such as became common among the later
historians of heresies. The very full special ex-
positions of the Shi‘is are themselves contradictory.
Among them another Hishām, Ibn Sīlīm al-Dījā-
walīkī, seems to be the cruelest because he talked
of God’s hair and side, citing the hadith “God
created man in his own image” and referring the
“his” to God (Kashsha‘ī, Mu‘taṣīf Hāfiẓ al-Nīfūd,
Bombay 1517, p. 153; Astārahālī, Manāhīj al-
367). Hishām b. al-Hakam on the other hand
with all his care for ibrāhīm and anxiety about
ibrāhīm, which made him choose the term “body”
(qātān) beside the vague expression “a something”
(tashbīh), yet tried much to keep his distance from
anthropomorphism. Generally speaking tashbīh, i.e.
attributing to God a body, should not without ado be ranked with tashbīh a sits cruder form.
Indeed, very much “not like our body” is expressly
added, for example even by Hishām b. al-Hakam.
In spite of the efforts of later Shi‘is to clear their
ancestors from the stain of heresy, Astārahālī still
passes the damning verdict upon him as the pupil
of the even more monstrous “Iraṣīm” Abī Shāhik.
Perhaps the most suggestive remark is that of
Aḥṣārī who says that Hishām b. al-Hakam expressed
different opinions on the nature of God in the space of one year. This is quite possible in
one who, as Shi‘i sources record, was a highly
strung temperament, a member of the circle of
the Imām ʿAlī’s Arabī-Shādik at a time when dogmatics
were still in a very unsettled state, as is shown
by the many polemics of the circle which include
some of the two Hishāms against one other. The
Shi‘is themselves therefore have drifted widely
apart. The Nasairis under Ibn Ḥamdān al-Khaṣṣāt
were classed as Muḥabbakīts. The Bātins who differ
considerably among themselves are usually branded
as symbolising nihilists; one of their leading
expounders, Naṣīr Khusraw, in his Zabīh Muṣālikīn
(Berlin 1929, p. 250 sqq.) champions a doctrine
of the Creator which with its emphasis on the
body rather recalls the principles traditionally
attributed to Hishām b. al-Hakam, although it cannot
be brought into a class of the scheme, with the
causal conditionality of God, its unlimitedness in
space and its divesting Him of an independent will.
The Twoelīs have waged a vigorous war on tashbīh
and tashbīh with due emphasis, it is true, on
ibrāhīm, but with especial Muʿtarrīs suspicion
against degrading tashbīh. Their views will be
found under the rubrics (with reference to God)
“object of a body, of a form, and of tashbīh”
“external of time, space, movement, change of place”
in the encyclopedia of Maḍžīs, Bihār al-Anwār,
book II, Tehran 1306, p. 89–105. It is only
in the later authors such as Kulain, Ibn Bābyya,
and Tafsīr we can verify the statements attributed
to them.
The dangers, which Hishām b. al-Hakam sought
to avoid in such varied ways, show the immanent
dogmatic difficulty felt between “the two limits
(badra)”. The problem is not so simple that it
could be clearly defined in general terms as a
twofold struggle over the recognition of God as
a purely spiritual being on the one hand and over
His in some way personal reality on the other.
For where in that case would be put Aḥṣārī, for
e.g. example. The one thing certain from the history
of Muslim dogma is that every Aḥṣārī would
object to the classification of his master in one
of two so distinct classes. Tashbīh is dreaded as
a transition to idolatry and pantheism, tashbīh
as a prelim inism to atheism and pantheism, but both
are felt to be originally related. It was because
Uṣūl imagine God’s speaking only as a stomach,
swallowing from a tongue and two lips, i.e. antith-
omorphically, that, according to Ibn Ḥanbal, he
fell into his “divesting” interpretations of the
passages in question in the Kurʾān; Ibn Tanmīya calls
him “a divester of anthropomorphism” (Mu‘taṣīf
Maḥmūdīhī, i. 127, s.).
Bibliography: The sections mentioned in
the historians of heresies and anecdotes of theo-
logians are, in view of the relativity of the points
of view, not simply to be dismissed as malevolent
inventions; at the same time they can only give
indications of some value as to what views
were considered to be particularly expounded
on one side or the other. The value of the polemics
also as authority for the doctrines of those
people is just as for any one the only
criterion is his own exegesis of the Kurʾān
and dogmatics, e.g., Ghassāl, Ḥayyā ʿUllam al-
Dis, book i. 2: Ka‘bād al-Aḥṣārī and book iv.,
5 and 6: al-Tawḥīd wa-l-Tawhīdūl al-
Maḥābbakīts, cf. H. Bauer, Die Dogmatische G. Gassāl, Halle 1918, 48 sqq.; J. Obermann, Der philo-
osophische und religiöse Subjektivismus Gassālīs,
Vienna 1921, 197–200, 127; Abī Manṣūr ʿAbd al-
Kāhir al-Baghdādī, Uṣūl al-Dis, Stambul 1428,
1: 73–130 (not so much a systematic treatise as an account of ibrāhīm on the lines of his above mentioned Fārīkh bain al-Firākh).
(R. STROTHMANN)
TASHFĪN n. Arî, one of the Almāvīd
[q.v.]. Sovereigns.
TASHKENT, usually written Tāshkend in Arabic
and Persian manuscripts, a large town in Cen-
tral Asia, in the oasis of Cīrīk, watered by
one of the right bank tributaries of the Sr-
Daryā [q.v.].
Nothing is known of the origin of the settle-
ment on the Cīrīk. According to the Greek and
Roman sources there were only nomads on the
other side of the Yaxarties. In the earliest Chinese
sources (from the second century B.C.) mention
of a land of Yu-ni, later identified with the
territory of Tashkent; this land is later called
Cū-čhi or Cū-shī or simply Shi. The corresponding
Chinese character is used with the meaning
of “stone”, and this is connected by A. Chavannes
(Documents sur les Taux-biie occidentaux, St.
Petburg 1905, p. 140) with the later Turkish
name (tash, "stone" and kum, "village" = "stone
village"). The Chinese transcription must certainly
correspond to the native name Cāčī, known in
the Muslim period; the Arabs here as usual
produce the sound ʔ by š. The Arabic form Shāhī
gradually dropped the original name out of use in
the written as well as the spoken language. If
and how the modern Turkish name, first found
in the fifth (fifth) century, is connected with Cāčī
or Shāhī is still doubtful. The etymology (Tas-
kent = town of the Tāshīk i.e. the Arabs) proposed
by E. Polivanov (Ibī q. al-Qāsinān, for W. Barthold,
Tashkent 1927, p. 395 sqq.) will hardly find favour.

Details of the land of Cæs and its capital, the circumference of which was about 10 ½ (less than 3 miles), are first found in Chinese sources of the third century A.D. In the time of Hsüan-Chang (Mémôires sur les cent seize anecdotes, i, 1857, p. 16) there was no ruler in Cæs to whom the whole country was subject, as in other countries.

The separate towns were under the sway of the Turks. In the history of the wars of conquest of the Arabs in the second (eighth) century there is frequent reference to a "king (malik) of Shash"; his capital is given by al-Balúduri (ed. de Goeje, p. 421) and al-Ṭabarānī (i, 1517 and 1521) as the town of Ṭarbānā, not otherwise mentioned in the Arab geographical literature; that is, we have here as the editor (D. H. Müller) assumes a "formula" contracts for Ṭarbānā (B. G. A., iii. 61 infra) is more than doubtful. The ruling family was presumably of Turkish origin. The suzerainty of the Turkš Khāns was at times replaced by that of the Chinese. In 751 the Chinese governor Kan Sièn-Či (Chavannes, Documents etc., p. 207; F. Hirth, Nachweise zur Inschrift des Tunisjukh, 1897, p. 70) executed the prince of Shash and son appealed for assistance to the Arabs. Žiyād b. ʿAlî, sent by Abī Muslim [q. v.], inflicted a severe defeat on the Chinese in Dhu ʿl-Hijjah 133 = July 751 (cf. Ibn al-Athīr, p. 344) on the Talâs [q. v.] and Kan Sièn-Či was killed in the battle. This battle established the political supremacy of Islām in Central Asia. No further attempts were made by the Chinese to dispute it.

Under the Caliph, the territory of Shash was regarded as the frontier of Islām against the Turks; the settled lands were protected from the raids of the nomads by a wall, remains of which still exist (G. M. S., N. S., v, p. 172). Nevertheless the land was conquered by the Turks, probably for a short period only, in 918 (806–807). A "prince (râḥîl) of Shash with his Turks" is mentioned as an ally of the rebel Râfī b. Lâthî (al-Ṭabarānī, iii. 712). Under al-Maʾmūn, Shash again belonged to the Caliph’s empire; when in 204 (819) the Sâmânids became governors of various districts in Mā warā al-Nahr, one of them, ʿAbd as-Samad, was granted Shash [cf. Sâmânids]; in contradiction to what is there stated we know not only the year but also the very day of the death of ʿAbd as-Samad, it was Thursday five days before the end of Rabi' II, 241 (Sept. 12, 855); cf. G. M. S., xx. 286ff. In 325 (900) the eldest of the brothers, Nābū b. ʿAbd as-Samad, the senior governor of the lands entrusted to the Sâmânids, by conquering Isfâbâd (the modern Sârîm) succeeded in advancing the frontier further north. About the same time a canal in Shash was restored, which had become silted up in the early days of Islām. The Caliph al-Muʿtaṣim (833–842) contributed ۲,۰۰۰,۰۰۰ dinars towards the work on these canals (al-Ṭabarānī, iii. 1326).

To the period of the Sâmânids belong almost all the surviving geographical descriptions of Shash (and indeed those of most Muslim lands). Shash appears in these as the name of a country: the capital is called Binkâth; on coins the mint is always given as "Shash", rarely with the addition of "Binkâth". The territory was farsakh (2½ miles) in length and breadth. The modern Tashkent is of much greater extent, but the position of Binkâth or the distance given by the Arabs geographers corresponded roughly to that of Tashkent (W. Bartheol, Turkestan, G. M. S., New Series, v. 711, not to the position of Iš-Šaţkhent as in Le Strange's The Land's of the Eastern Caliphate, Cambridge 1905, p. 480); there is still shown in Tashkent the tomb of the Šaţši scholar Abī Bakr al-Ḳaṭṭal al-Šaţši who died in 365 or 366 (975–977).

Whether the name was in use before the Turkish conquest (before the final collapse of the Sâmânids dynasty, the whole Sâr Darya territory had been ceded to the Turks in 386 [995]) is doubtful. So far as we know the name "Tashkent" is first found in al-Birûnī (Ṭārîkh al-Hind, ed. Schau, p. 149, translation, l. 298); from the etymology of the name al-Birûnī wrongly identifies it with the Atlantis of Polybius [i.e. the ancient Er-Ānâbâr, Berlin 1901, p. 155]. Mahmud Khâqan (i. 369) mentions "Terken" (otherwise unknown) as a "name of Shasha" in addition to Tashkent. The name Tashkent first appears on coins in the Mongol period. In the second half of the 11th (xii.) and in the first half (xii.) century coins were struck in Banâkêt, Fânâkêt or Banâkêt, which lies quite close to it on the right bank of the Sâr Darya; it is possible that this town at this time was of greater importance than Tashkent. In Djumâlî’s account of the Mongol campaign (G. M. S., xvi. 70 sq.), Tashkent is not mentioned; only the taking of Banâkêt is recorded. Under Mongol rule Tashkent, for reasons unknown to us, had a better fate than Banâkêt. Tashkent continued to exist as a town and was occasionally visited by the Khâns [cf. DURâKH ân]; on the other hand Banâkêt, although it had offered no resistance to the Mongols, was in ruins at this date, and it was not till 1392 that Timür rebuilt it under the new name of Shahrâkhâyán. After the decline of the Mongol empire of Chestâvîl [q. v.], Tashkent belonged to the empire of Timûr and the Timurids. In 890 (1485) the town with the lands belonging to it was ceded to the Mongol Khân Yūsûn who died there in 893 (1487) (Ṭârîkh-i-Rashîdî, transl. Ross, p. 142 sq.). His tomb is in the mosque of Shâh Khânâd-i-Tulûr (popularly Shahtutuqan), a local saint; on his period (xivii.–xviii. century) cf. A. Semenov in Protobeli Turk. Kul’t. Ljud. Arkh., xx, 1915, p. 29. Khân Yûsûn was succeeded by his son Mahmûd Khân; after 1503 Tashkent belonged to the kingdom of the Ozbeks who had, however, to give up it only a short time after the death of the founder of this kingdom, Shāhîn Khân [q. v. and cf. Šâhânânâds]. During the centuries following, Tashkent was sometimes under the rule of the Ozbeks, sometimes under the Kazâk [q. v. kirgh.] and in 1723 it was conquered by the Kalmucks, but not at once occupied by them; the town continued to be governed by a prince of Kazâk descent who was now a vassal of the rulers of the Kalmucks. Sometimes its rule passed into the hands of the Khodjas, the descendants of the local saint (e.g. Z. D. M. G., xxxviii. 311).

During these centuries, the possession of Tashkent was frequently the cause of heavy fighting. Some of the accounts of these battles are of importance for the understanding of the topographical conditions of the period. The records of the battles of Tashkent in the time of Abî Allâh Khân b. Iskânî [q. v.] clearly show that the town of Tashkent had not yet assumed its present form. It is not till the sixteenth (xviith) century that the
division of the town into four quarters (Kukka, Shakhkantaur, Siibar and Besh-Aghat) with a common bazaar is mentioned. Occasionally each quarter has a chief (hakiam) of its own; each quarter formed an entity by itself and was very often at war with the others. About 1727, Yūnus Khodja, the chief of the Shakhkastaur quarter, succeeded in combining the whole town under his rule. Yūnus Khodja fought successfully against the Ḳaraḵ ṣ but suffered a severe reverse at the hands of the Šezbegs of Khojkūr under Ālīm-Khān; after his death, in the time of his son and successor Sulṭān-Khodja, shortly before 1810, Taškent had to submit to the rule of the Khāns of Khojkūr. For its history in this period cf. KHOJKŪR.

On June 15/27 1865, Taškent was taken by the Russians under Černyavé. As capital of the Si-Dārāy territory and of the governor-generalship of Turkستان, Taškent attained great prosperity. Alongside of the old “Asiatic” town, a new Russian city arose as the residence of the officials, and the two parts together formed one town from 1877 with joint municipal institutions, but the Russian town, although its population was nothing like the size of that of the “Asiatic” town, enjoyed special privileges; little attention was therefore paid to the old town. The Russian part alone had a civic life in the European sense; in it were the government offices, the schools, the scientific and learned societies and associations. The number of the population (of the old and new Russian town together) amounted to 155,673 according to the census of 1897.

As a result of the revolution Russian Taškent has lost all the privileges it had over the old town. Since the recognition of the principle of nationality in Central Asia and the foundation of national republics, Taškent has lost all political importance. The town belongs to Šezbegistān while its northern suburbs are in Karakstān; the seat of government of Šezbegistān is in Samarqand [q. v.]. As the largest town in Central Asia, Taškent has however retained its importance as a commercial and educational centre. It is the meeting-place of the “Economic Central” (ekonomicheskij sovet) for the whole of Central Asia, has a large ill founded in 1920, a very large “Central Asiatic” library, the “principlal Museum” (glavnye muzei) of Central Asia, the Central Asiatic section of the Russian Geographical Society etc. Commerce is declining, as elsewhere, and the number of inhabitants is smaller than formerly.


TAŠKÇOĞRÖZADE, the name of a family of Turkish scholars, taken from the village of Taškçogrözade near Kastamun (q. v.) in Anatolia (cf. Kapılıtlar, called after the adjacent village of [W]Taškçogrözade).

1. Muṣṭafâ b. Khaliṭ al-Din, born at Taškçogrözade in 857 (1453), studied at the high schools of Brassa and Stamboul, became professor in Brassa, afterwards (901) in Angora, Usküb and Adrianópolis, was for a time tutor to the prince, afterwards Saltān, Salīm I, then again professor in Amsīs and Brassa. He never took up the office of judge in Aleppo, which was given to him. He died in 935 (1528) as professor in Brassa. Muṣṭafâ b. Khaliṭ was the author of a number of commentaries on books on law but, as a result of his busy life, he was never able to put them into final shape.

2. Ahmad b. Muṣṭafâ b. Khaliṭ, son of 1, a distinguished Ottoman encyclopaedist and biographer, born on 14th Rabi‘ I 901 (3rd Dec. 1495) at Brassa, studied under his father at Angora and Brassa and later in Stamboul and Amsīs. At the end of Radjab 931 (May 1525) he became professor in Dimotika, in the beginning of 933 (Oct. 1526) in Adrianópolis, at the beginning of Dhu l-Idhā’ 936 (July 1531) he went to Usküb. Five years later he again became professor. In Stamboul, was transferred on the 4th Dhu l-Ka‘dā 945 (March 25, 1539) to Adrianópolis, but went back to the capital in the same year in the capacity of “guardian”. He again held a teaching post in Adrianópolis, then reluctantly became bābā in Brassa, but soon returned to his chair. On Shawwal 27, 958 (29th Oct. 1551) he became judge of Stamboul. Three years later his eyes became affected and ultimately he went quite blind. He died on the last day of Radjab 968 (April 16, 1561) in Stamboul, and was buried there in the “Aškî” Pasha quarter in the mosque of the “Aškî” Pasha monastery. Ahmad b. Muṣṭafâ had an encyclopaedic mind of astonishing versatility. He compiled an encyclopaedia of arts and sciences in Arabic, which was afterwards translated by his son (see 3) into Turkish and in this form it has been printed under the title Muḥafrat al-‘Ulamā (Stamboul 1313, 344 and 712 pp.). The number of his other works is considerable. The most important is al-Nimāniya written in Arabic in which he gives biographies of 522 “Ulumā” and šaılmaks of orders divided into ten classes (takāfūl) according to the reigns of the ten Ottoman Saltāns, ʿOṯmān to Selimān. At the end he gives his own autobiography. The work, which was finished on Ramadān 30, 965 (July 16, 1568) is our main source for the intellectual history of the period. It was several times translated into Turkish and has been brought down to the present day (cf. F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 86 under 1. Mejid). While the original work has been printed in the Arabic version, and in the expanded Turkish translation of Mehmed called Mejdīl of Adrianópolis, and also in the first continuation by ʿAṭī, the important continuations to the present day still exist in manuscript only, an almost incredible neglect of the most important sources for the history of Ottoman scholarship. On the printed editions cf. F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 86 sq.: A German translation of the basic work was published in Constantinople in 1927 by O. Rescher (iv. 601 pp., 4th).

Bibliography: Autobiography at the end of Şaṭār; German translation in F. Wüstenfeld, Die Geschichte der Araber, p. 341 sqq.
Broekelmann, G. A. L., ii. 425 sq. (with Bibliography); further references in F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 84 sqq.

Kemal al-Din Muhammad b. Ahmad, son of 2. Turkish historian. Kemal al-Din Muhammad was born in Stambul in 950 (1552), became professor and kadi successively in Salonica, Scutari, Aleppo, Damascus, Brussa, Cairo and Galata. Later he was kadi in Stambul and repeatedly held the post of kadi saker of Amoulia or Rumelia. In this capacity he took part in the Wallachian campaign, fell ill and died on his way back to Stambul in Isberi, in Rummania. His body was taken to the capital and burial beside that of his father. As a poet he wrote under the pseudonym of Kemali. He was a translator (see under 2) and also an historian. Under the title Tarikh-i sâf or Twâfet al-Ashâb he composed a history of the Ottoman empire down to Ahmad I (1603/16), to whom he dedicated the book. He is also said to have composed a poetical Şâhâname, but no trace of the work seems to have survived; cf. F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 143. His Tarikh-i sâf was printed in three fascicles in Stambul in 1287.

Bibliography: "Alt., p. 641 sq.; Riyâq, Tashkirk, Şahâni, 1374, lv. 30; J. v. Hammer, G. O. D., iii. 602, 603 sq.; M. O. G., t. 164 (F. Babinger); Brissal Muhammad Tahir, "Othmanî Murâkhkât, t. 347; F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 149, where further references are given.

(TANGRAH). General sense: opening, exposition. It has two special meanings: i. exposition of a science, commentary on a book, like sharh (q.v.); 2. the science of anatomy which is the "opening" and exposition of the structure of the body. The two meanings are found in one sentence in Ibn al-Kifî: *Galen was the key of medicine, its štoq and its šarh, that is to say, it was he who expounded it and commented upon it... No one ever surpassed him in the science of šarh and he wrote 17 books upon it." The reference here is to anatomy.

Anatomy was not a very popular science in Islam; the reproduction of the human figure was forbidden on religious and moral grounds dissection objected to. This was not practised among the Muslims any more than among the ancients, except at Alexandria. Galen took advantage of the opportunities he had to study the anatomy of man, but in general he worked on the monkey. Muslim observers also took advantage of any chance opportunities of advancing this science; we have an example of this in the travels of 'Abd al-Latif: the author, with his friends, having learned that there was at Maks in Egypt a hill formed of human remains went to examine the skeletons and made notes.

In spite of the disadvantages under which they laboured, several Arab scholars studied anatomy, in which they followed the Greeks, notably Galen, Oribases and Aetius. A number of works of Galen were known to the Arabs and translated into their language, for example the De Anatomia, the De Venas Sectionem, the De Musculorum Directione, the De Ostiorum, as well as the treatise on the pulse. Books x-xv. of the great work of this scholar, the De Anatomiae Administrationibus, were preserved only in Arabic. A German translation has been published by Max Simon.

P. de Koning has published three long extracts from works on anatomy as known to the Arabs, one from Avicenna, another from 'Ait b. 'Abba', a Zoroastrian physician born in Persia (4. 384), and the last from the famous Razes (Muhammad b. Zakarîa al-Razi, d. 320). The chapters from Razes, which are the least advanced, come from his book al-Manâhîr; those of 'Ait b. Abba', from his *Royal Book* (al-Malîkî) and those of Avicenna from his *Kudüs*. These three works have practically the same arrangement, which is clear and logical and is found already in the classical writers. They begin with: osteology; first generalities about the bones, then a detailed study from head to foot of the human frame: bones of the head, the body, the vertebral column, the thorax, the bones of the upper limbs and of the hands, the lower limbs and of the feet. The subject of dentistry was not then a separate one. — Next came the study of the muscles, myology: they are enumerated and analysed in the same order; — next the nervous system and the arteries: nerves, brain, spinal fluid, arteries and veins; — then the description of the external organs, organs of sight, taste, hearing, the tongue, larynx, lungs, heart, stomach, intestines, liver, spleen, kidneys, bladder and organs of generation.

Opposite the same chapters of Avicenna, de Koning has placed the corresponding passages from Galen and Oribases: they deal among other subjects with the trapezius muscle, the fector muscles of the fingers, the pulmonary artery, the valves of the heart, the iris of the eye and the bone of the heart.

All this anatomy is already quite advanced, and very analytic; it is also quite final; every bone, every organ, every muscle is described from the point of view of its function and object. We may note that Arab anatomy has a vocabulary of its own. Unlike medicine and botany, it does not use Persian and Greek words, and on the other hand, unlike mathematics, astronomy and alchemy, it has not given us any technical terms. We do find a few in the Latin translations of the middle ages, like "meri" which is Arabic māri, oesophagus; "myrnic" which is Arabic marâb, "abdomen"; "sipnic" which is Şûf, peritoneum; but these terms have not come down to our time.

In surgery "Abulcasim" who is Abu l-Kâsim al-Zahra'î, physician to 'Abd al-Rahmân III of Cordova (17th-18th century), and Avenrouq (Ibn Zohr, d. 595) of Seville are the greatest representatives of science and experiment among the Arabs. The former wrote a book entitled al-Tarîfî, the anatomical and surgical part of which is taken mainly from Paul of Argina. The latter is the late Byzantine author, a contemporary of the beginnings of Islam, who travelled in Arab lands and was much admired by the Arabs for his skill as an operator. Abu l-Kâsim deals with operations, describes and gives drawings of instruments. We have a number of his works illustrated in this way. This work was translated into Latin by Gerard of Cremona in the 13th century and published in 1497 at Venice, and at Basle in 1728. Adapted by Guy de Chaulliac (1300-1368) it had a great influence on western science. — As to Avenrouq, a progressive and practical mind of great skill, he cast off to a large extent the authority of Galen and substituted his own experience. He is the main source for Armand de Villeneuve. — We may
conclude with a mention of the earliest western translator, Constantine Africanus (1020–1087) who translated "Alt b. Ablus." The Arabs also knew ophthalmics as a special subject. To them also we owe observations on the anatomy of animals, on hybrids and on monsters.


**B. Carra de Vaux**

**TASHRĪH** is a special name for the last three days of the Muhammadan Ḥaḍḍāj (11th–13th Dhu 'l-Ḥijjāja: Ayyām al-Tashrīh), during which the pilgrims, having finished their regular rites, stay in Mina and have to throw seven stones daily on each of the three piles of stones there. In the early period of Islam the name tashrīh was also given to the solemn ṣalṭān on the morning of the 10th Dhu 'l-Ḥijjāja. The term is probably a survival from the pre-Islamic period and therefore could no longer be explained by the Muslims with certainty. For example the obvious explanation which derives the term from "cutting into strips and drying" the sacrificial meat left over on the Dhu 'l-Hijjāja is insufficient. An isolated tradition derives tashrīh from the recitation of the words *ṭāḥyr taḥbir kāmīn mūghir* (cf. *ṭāḥīr, *talbiya tashār*). One would therefore have to assume that this formula was originally used not only as we, as we are told, on the 10th Dhu 'l-Hijjāja before sunrise but also at the lapidation on the following days and that as an essential element it later became the name for the whole ceremony. In Islam this lapidation is accompanied by tashār (pronouncing "Allāhu akbar") among other exclamations. This is perhaps why Abī Ḥanifa explains tashrīh as tashār (*Tufāl al-Ārūs, vi. 393*). Cf. also the article ḤADĪD.


(R. Paret)

**TASNĪM** is a legendary tribe of the prehistoric period of the Arabs, closely connected by descent, dwelling-place (in al-Yamāmā), conditions of life (agriculturists and cattle-breeder) and history with the Dājīl (q.v.). (with whom they are always numbered) b. Ḥajjār b. Iram b. Sām b. Nūh. The story, frequently mentioned in Arabic literature, of the fall of the two sister-tribes is in its main outlines as follows: They were at one time under the tyranny of a Tāsnīm named Amlīk(*) (or 'Amlīk). Appealed to in a matrimonial dispute of a Dājīl woman named Huzaila he gave an arbitrary verdict. Enraged at the opposition of the woman, he claimed the *jus primae nocei* over all the brides of the Dājīl. After exercising this tyranny for 40(50) years, a highborn Dājīl woman named 'Afnār bint 'Iyār who had fallen a victim to it roamed her tribe to vengeance and open rebellion. Her brother al-Aswān, however, advised cunning and carried his plan through against his proposal. He invited 'Amlīk and his tribe to his sister's wedding. During the feast the Dājīl fell upon and killed the Tāsnīm with weapons which had been hidden in the sand. Only one escaped, Riyyāh b. Mūr, who fled to the Himyarite prince Ḥassān b. Tabūs and persuaded him to undertake a campaign of vengeance against the Dājīl. When the army had come within three days' journey of Dājīl, the settlement of the Dājīl, Riyyāh advised branches to be cut and carried by each rider to conceal him. For in Dājīl there was a wise woman named Yāmāmā (or Zarkūsh) who could see anyone approaching at three days' journey distant. She, however, was able to recognize the enemy force in spite of their covering and advised her fellow tribesmen to get ready to defend themselves. They paid no heed to her and were surprised and the men killed and the women, including Yāmāmā, taken prisoner. Hassan had her eyes torn out and crucified her dead body on the gate of Dājīl, which was henceforth called Yāmāmā. This is the legend. In many of its features it is quite mythical but it may in part relate to a historical event (cf. Dājīl). The fragments preserved in the sources of old couples in the style of a folksong are probably the remains of a ballad form of the legendary material.

**Bibliography:** Tābarī, i. 771 sqq.; Kībāl al-Aqūhān, x. 45 sqq.; commentary of Nashāwīn on the Ḥimyar Kiṣaṣ, extracts from which are given in D. H. Müller's *Südostab. Studien*, p. 67 sqq.; also very fully in the commentary on the 17th verse of the 13th poem of Aḥmād Maimīn, ed. by R. Geiger; ibid. (p. 74, note 12) an exhaustive list of Arabic sources for the Tāsnīm-Dājīl-saga.

(H. H. Brād)

**TASMIYA.** [See *Rasmala*]

**TASNĪM,** 1. name of a fountain in Paradise, occurring in the ʿArāb, *Sūra l-tājāl*, 27, where it is said, that its water will be drunk by the *mubarrābīn*, "those who are admitted to the divine presence," and that it will be mixed with the drink of the mass of the inhabitants of Paradise. The commentaries are uncertain, whether tasmiya is a proper name — which, according to the Lišūm, is inconsistent with its being a diphtote — or a derivative from the root ʿ-m-n, a root conveying the meaning of "being high." In the latter case the meaning of the verse would be: "and it (viz. the drink of the inhabitants of Paradise) will be mixed with water which is conducted to them from a high place."

Al-Tābarī mentions a third explanation, viz. "hidden things gladdening the inhabitants of Paradise."

**Bibliography:** al-Buhārī, *Tafṣīr*, *Ṣūra l-tājāl*, xxx. 59; Fākhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, *Maṣūṣ al-Qāḥfī*, vi. 502 and the other
2. Infinitive II. of z-aq-m: "raising graves above the level of the earth". It is said that Muhammad's grave was mutananneem (Bukhari, *Lisan* b. 56). On the other hand it is said that Muhammad ordered that graves should be levelled (Mishkat, *Lisan* b. 56; Ahmad b. Hanbal, *Musnad*, vi. 18 bis, 21). Al-Shâfi'i's opinion was that graves should be raised only so much that they could be recognised as such, lest people should sit or walk on them (al-Tirmidhî, *Lisan* b. 56). The Mâlikites, however, preferred tartûf al-Nawawy's Commentary on Muslim's *Sunna*, Cairo, 1285, ii. 344. (A. J. Wensink)


2. A territorial division. Nûlâke, Gesch. der Perser und Araber, p. 16, contrasts the term *taqûd*, *tassûd* ("office") meaning a district in the *Irâq* with that of *râzq* ("parish") a division of a *kûta* (from *kûta*) in Fârs. The province of the *Irâq*, according to Ibn Khûrusadîhî and Kûdâma, was divided into 12 *ašûm* (ašûm) each of which contained a certain number of *tassûdâ*; the total number of the latter was usually put at 60 (Le Strange, *Eastern Celephate*, p. 79). The term *tassûd* however, the phonetical form of which actually belongs to the S. W. dialect, is known throughout Persia. The province of Abârâqûr in the strict sense (Nâšîrî) was divided into 13 *raziq* and 4 *tâbû* (Ibn Rusta, p. 171: arba'at arba') namely Ziwand, Takbâh, Buhtâr Farurîn (f) and Mâsar. Ibn Rusta, p. 155, mentions a *tassûd* of Rubâ at the dependencies of Ifshâhân. There is also a district of *Tassûd* in the province of Fars (Istakhri, p. 102) on the right bank of the Kurr near Lake Bâhgîhân; its capital is Kûhramâ (cf. also Stolzer, *Persien*, p. 1885, preface). The division into *tassûd* must have been based on irrigation. The water of a river in theory forms 6 *dâng*; thus the two watercourses into which the Kûrõmâ divides at Shuq tart (the Shuq tart and Gargar) are called in the *Zafarvûna*, i. 591 and 599, "the river of 4 *dângs" and "the river of two *dângs". A *tassûd* seems to represent the area irrigated by a quarter *dâng*.

3. *Tassûd* is more particularly the name of a small town in A'dharbâjîn, on the north bank of Lake Urmîya to the south of the Mishôgan range. It is the capital of the district of Gîney (in Turkish "exposed to the sun") including the north shore of Lake Urmîya. The old name of the district still used in government documents is Arawâma-Anzâb. Since Arwasâm means particularly the eastern part of the district (Naschot al-Kâtib, p. 79) *Tassûd* seems to be in Anzâb. The town of *Tassûd* (Taswûd) lies about 3 miles from the lake; it is watered by a stream from the Kûrûsh. Near the town which is surrounded by gardens are quarries of rocksalt, gypsum and limestone. The population is not more than 1,000 but the fact that it is divided into 12 quarters and has 50 mosques (i) shows its former importance. The town must date from before Islam. The Armenian historian of the eighth century, Lèvond, p. 134, mentions it among the places in A'dharbâjîn which king Gagik passed through coming from Thornâvar (in Vasparsak): Zarrevar, Zîdûd, Tâbûs, Gâzmak, Oran, Surenajat. The importance of *Tassûd* in the Mongol period is seen from the fact that in the *Nuzhat al-Kâtib* Lake Urmîya is regularly called dâr-yâ-zi *shîb-i Tassûd*. The revenues of the district however were not over 5,000 *dângs*: this sum was earmarked for the maintenance of the pious foundations of the Kâsh Abû Sa'id. Clavijo in 1404 who had to pass through *Tassûd* on his way from Khoi to Tažrûz seems to call it as *Fard* ("a populous fine township which lies in a plain and is surrounded by many orchards that are irrigated by numerous streams"; transl. Le Strange, *London*, 1928, p. 150 and note on the form *Fard*--*Tassûd* on p. 352).

Ewliya Celebi (ii. 242; iv. 319) calls the town *Tâsûd* and its river *Itrâ* (?). According to him, it was a *mawlid* of some importance with about 3,000 soldiers and artillery. The town had 3,000 houses, 7 mosques etc. The people were Shi'ites; Ewliya says it was founded by Yezdîglîr in honour of his wife Tâshûhân (?). It is said to have been destroyed by Timûr (? cf. Clavijo) and rebuilt by Dîhânshâh (of the Kūrâ-Koyunlu). To the east of *Tassûd* is the village of Kûnûla (Kûnûla) known from the fortifications erected there in 1158 by Afzâl Paşa at the time of the conquest of Tabût (q.v.) in the reign of Mûsâ III; cf. Ewliya, *ibid*.

European travellers have rarely visited *Tassûd*; cf. E. G. Browne, *A Year among the Persians*, p. 56. (V. Mixorovský)

**TAŞWîR** (A), fashioning,形成; an image, a picture; for the prohibition of images and pictures of living beings by the Muslim jurists, see *šûra*; here an account will be given of the artistic activity in the Muslim world that has produced sculptures and pictures, despite the condemnation of the theologians. Examples of the former are rare e.g. in Egypt, Khamârâwa (q.v.) had statues of himself, his wives and singing-girls made, and in Spain, *Abd al-Rahmân III* (q.v.) set up a statue of his favourite wife al-Zahrîn in the palace he called after her name, while the marble lions supporting the fountain constructed in the Alhambra for Muhammad V, in the latter part of the sixteenth century, still exist. The Seljûq princes of Asia Minor employed sculptors to decorate their capital, Konya (q.v.), and several stone figures, both human and animal, of this period are preserved in the museum of that city. The first statues of Muhammadan potentates known to have been erected in public places, are those set up in the city of Cairo by Ismā'il Paşa (q.v.). Under the Fatimids in Egypt a large number of bronze ewers and perfume-burners, in the form of birds and animals, were made, and rock crystals of the same period often have animal forms cut upon them. The metal-workers of Mawjîl and their fellow craftsmen who carried the same art to Persia, Syria and Egypt, made lively representations of court life, the monarch drinking among his servants and musicians, hunting, playing polo, or engaged in battle; some of these metal-
workers were certainly Christians, but their patrons were Muslim princes who paid no heed to theological opinion on the matter. A similar disregard of the prescriptions of the Sharī'ah is found on the pottery of Rayy (xiiith and xiiiith centuries), with its brilliantly coloured representations of princes, musicians, singing-girls, dancers and knights, as well as animals of various kinds, both real and imaginary. Figures are also found on the pottery from other towns, but not with the same wealth of imagery. Carvings in wood, particularly under the Fātimids and Mamluks in Egypt, often represent figures, human or animal; figures also form part of the decoration of carpets, ivories and glass. Such objects, of these various classes, as have survived the many catastrophes that have swept over the Muhammadan world, or have escaped destruction at the hands of fanatical iconoclasts, probably form only a small part of the total number that once existed.

More abundant evidence of the existence of representational art and the use of figure-forms, in the Muhammadan world, is found in paintings, especially in Persia, India and Turkey. The existence of fresco-painting as a decoration of the palaces of Muslim princes is testified, for the Umayyad period, by the pictures of royal personages, dancers, musicians, gymnasts etc. in Kusair 'Amra (see 'AMRA, i. 338), and for the early 'Abbāsid period, by the pictures of dancing-girls, animals, birds etc. at Sāmarra (see E. Herzfeld, Die Malereien von Samaarja, Berlin 1927). There is ample literary evidence for the practice in the palaces of later Muslim monarchs, and remains of frescoes executed in the xiiith and early xiiiith centuries for Persian Shāhs still exist. But the majority of Muslim paintings are to be found as illustrations in MSS. and to some extent also on separate sheets of paper. Hardly any examples of paintings on paper have survived, of a date earlier than the xiiiith century. Among the earliest books of Arabic literature so illustrated were the Maqānil of al-Harrātī, Kalila wa-Dimna, works on astronomy, medicine and mechanical science, etc. Persian literature has much more abundantly received the attention of the painter, and writings of many different kinds contain pictures. Poetical works are most commonly illustrated, e.g. the Shāh-nāma of Firdawsi, the Khamās of Naṣīrī, the Kulliyāt of Sa'dī and a large number of other poets. Illustrated MSS. of historical contents are less common, but there are MSS. of the Dalā'il al-Tamārium of Rashīd al-Dīn, the Rawdat al-Šafā of Mirkh-wallī, and the Zafar-nāma of Shāhar al-Dīn 'Ali Yazdī, and various works on Indian history, with pictures. Illustrated MSS. in the language of the Kūfīt al-Anbā'ī by more than one author, and of the Maqānil al-Uṣūshī by Shafān Ḥusain Mīrāt (himself a generous patron of painters) are of special interest as providing Muslim representations of history which included the holy personages of Islamic history. Later, illustrated prose romances became common. Besides Arabic and Persian, MSS. in Caggātāi Turki (especially those produced in Harāt in the latter part of the xvith century), Hindūstāni, Pāshī and Ottoman Turkish have been illustrated by Muslim painters.

In addition to the illustrations in manuscripts prepared for royal personages and men of wealth, mention must be made of instances of popular disregard of the prohibition of representations of living beings; most noticeable among these are the figures used in the shadow-plays, popular in Java, Egypt and Turkey. The houses of the poor are often decorated with crude drawings of animals, especially in Egypt, painted to celebrate the return of a pilgrim from Mecca, and cheap pictures of Burāq [q.v.] are common.

The sources of Muslim pictorial art are obscure, but influences are traceable from Christian (Johannite and Nestorian), Manichean, Sasanian and Chinese paintings. In Persia, the pre-Muslim artistic traditions re-appear in the later art, and in India Hindus and Buddhists contributed elements characteristic of the country. Some attempt has been made to distinguish different schools of Muhammadan painting, but there is little agreement in the suggested divisions. The Primitives of the xiiith century form a group apart; and there are special characteristics that mark the work of the painters in the service of the Mongol rulers of Persia at the beginning of the xixith century, the Timūrid princes of the xvith century, the Saḥāfis of the xxiith and the Mughals in India during the xviith and xviith centuries.

Of the personality of the painters very little is known; the greater part of their work is anonymous, and it often happens that no biographical material is available in cases where paintings bear a signature. Even of the greatest of Persian painters, Bihāzī [q.v.], little is known, except the names of the princely patrons for whom he worked, and critics are not agreed as to which of the pictures that bear his signature, are authentic. Historical material regarding the Persian painters begins to be available in the xviith century, and for Indian and Turkish painters a little later; but the details provided are very meagre and in no instance are they sufficient to render identification of any particular picture possible.

Finally, mention may be made of coins bearing the effigy of a Muslim monarch. The earliest of these are obviously imitations of Byzantine coins, and cease after 'Abd-al-Malik's [q.v.] reform of the coinage about 727 A. H. There are isolated examples of coins bearing the portraits of the 'Abbasid Caliphs Mutawakkil, Muqtadir and Ma'mūr. But coins with human figures become more common under the Seldjūks of Asia Minor, the Urtuks of Dīyarbakr and Zangids of Aleppo; but they are generally imitations of some foreign coinage, and in no instance appear to be portraits of the monarchs whose names and titles they bear. In India, however, Dūjangīr [q.v.] struck coins bearing his own effigy, and even ventured to outrage Muslim sentiment so far as to represent himself as holding a wine-cup in his hand.

AL-TASYIR (in the west: atazir, atazir, altazir, directio, prorogatio, ḥaraq, théorie abépiténique) is a process used in astrology of artificial continuation of a planet or of an astrological house or any other definite part of the heavens to another star or its aspects, or other houses with the object of ascertaining the equalitarian degree situated between these two places, the figure of which is used, by converting it into a definite period of time to prognosticate the date of a future happening, either good or evil.

The astrological magnitude ascertained by this process played a very prominent part among the ancients as well as among the Arabs and in the west, for on the one hand it made possible a judicium speciale (i.e. definitely laid down the time of fulfilment of statements made in the judicium generale of a nativity about future good or ill fortune and in particular enabled the length of life to be calculated or the choice of particularly auspicious days (al-żīyār) for beginning a journey, for holding weddings, for founding a city, for beginning a reign, etc.), and on the other was distinguished by special complexity in the method of its calculation.

The astronomical calculation of the arc of special importance for our task (we call it briefly the tasyir arc) is not particularly difficult if once the limits of the places in the heavens defining the arc, the "advancing" planet or place (al-mutājabandim, al-khalil, significator) and the "successing" or second (al-ḥātīn, promissor) are ascertained. In fig. 1 (and 2) A is the significator, B the promissor, P the visible pole of the celestial sphere, N.B.S. (NAS) the circle of the promissor (significator), C the intersection of the circle parallel to the circle of position drawn through A (B). The circles of declination drawn through A (B) and C cut out the tasyir arc as (bc). The tasyir arc is thus the curve of the equator, which in general does not exceed 90°, which passes over the circle of position during the period in which the significator (promissor) is transferred by the apparent daily revolution of the celestial sphere on its parallel circle to the circle of position of the promissor (significator) assumed to be fixed within this period (for further information on the conceptions that occur, see the article ASTROLOGY).

According to the respective positions of the significator and promissor, two kinds of tasyir are distinguished:

a. Direct tasyir (directio directa) when the significator precedes the promissor in the order of the signs of the zodiac. Here the significator is the place to be "directes", the promissor regarded as fixed (fig. 1).

b. Indirect tasyir (directio conversa) when the significator precedes the promissor in the order of the daily motion of the celestial sphere. In this case the promissor is moved to the circle of position of the significator which is assumed to be fixed.

A special form for application of the calculation of the tasyir (a kind of inversion of the process) was developed in choosing days in this way that the position of only one star was given and also a definite time or what is the same thing on account of the conversion of periods of time into degrees of the equator, a definite number of tasyir degrees. The problem is to find the degree which corresponds to the end point (the "goal") of the
3. Place the movable pointer at the place $A$ on the back, read the degree of the equator $a$.

4. Move the alidade to the front, place it on the degree of the equator $a$ until the alidade on the movable pointer running through the parallel circle from $A$ points to the circle of position of $B$ (in C).

5. Read the degree of the equator $c$ through which the alidade now points: the curve $ae$ is the tasyr curve desired.

Works in Arabic on the tasyr or the plane of the tasyr were composed by Muhammad b. 'Omar b. Farrūkhīn (H. Suter, Die Mathematiker u. Astronomen der Araber etc., Abhdlg. a. Gekt. d. math. Wissensch., XIV, Heft 10, 1900, N° 34); al-Battānī (Suter, N° 89); Abū ʿAbūl-qāsim al-Khuj新城 (Suter, N° 124); al-Bīrūnī (Suter, N° 238); but the complete astronomical works of the former have not survived. The "Book of the Ataqū" in the astronomical works of Alfonso X is by Rabī ʿCag de Toledo (Isaac ibn Sīd), the editor of the Alfonse Tables, but seems to be merely a translation of an Arabic original.

In the "History of Scholars" by Ibn al-Kīfī the following astronomers are honorably mentioned for their particular ability in calculating the tasyr: al-Hāsan b. Mīghāf (p. 163); al-Marrawī (p. 170, Suter, N° 22); al-Khuj新城 (p. 281, Suter, N° 206); Sīnī b. ʿAll (p. 206, Suter, N° 24); al-Bīrūnī (p. 223, Suter, N° 262); al-Bīrūnī b. Saʿīd al-Djāwīsī (p. 213, Suter, N° 21); Ibn Vānasī (p. 205, Suter, N° 178); Ibn al-ʿArīs (S. 235, Suter, N° 137); Muḥ. b. ʿIbrāhim al-Fāṣīrī (p. 270, Suter, N° 1); Muḥ. b. Khaḍlī al-Marrūwī (p. 281, Suter, N° 46); Yahyā b. ʿAbbās al-Mansūrī (p. 337, Suter, N° 14); Yahyā b. ʿAlī al-Saʿīd Abū Bīgīr al-Takritī (p. 365); Abū l-ʿAbī al-Yāmīsī (p. 426).


(T. Schiemer)
(Slove "baldaš") in Dolgocan ve tureckih počihak, Zborna Starina, 1909, fasc. ii—iii, p. 156—164). For the history of the name Tat there may be some importance in the name Tagat, Tagat, Tanit, which the Wogula and the Oulaks give to the river Irtil; cf. Marguari, Stresfuz, p. 409.

According to the Drusen Lughat al-Turk (1486 = 1093) the Persians (alt-šuritam) among all the Turks; more particularly among the Yaghn and Turkic tribes the term refers to the Uigur. In both cases tat has a contemptuous sense as is evident from the proverbs: *grab the thorn by the root and strike the 'Tat in the eye', *but for the Tat there would be no Turk, just as but for the head there would be no hat (to cover it)*.

Later in the language of the conquering Turks the word tat became especially associated with the conquered Persians. Even Djalal al-Din Rumi in his Turkish poems (Glob, A. Hist. of Ottoman Poetry, i. 150 and especially Martinovic, Zat, xxiv. 1917, p. 221) uses the terms par (sic!), pat-qas for the Persian and their language. In a curious passage, already noticed by Khans, Pietro del Vallo, French trans. 1603, ii. 458—459 who uses the current phraseology of the Safranli period contrasts the 'Kizil-bašh (q.v.) a "certain race of men who were introduced ... with the King Ismail Softi" with the Tat "the dregs of the populace but descended in a direct line from the true old stock of the Persians". The Turkish tribe of Kaškaši (in Fars) also uses the word Tat in the sense of "non-Turk"; cf. Komakvli, Pemri khatam, Sorna, manaya Anbrop, pri Akademii nauk, v/ii, p. 587. The Turkish speaking followers of the religion of the Ahl-ı Haşak in Ağašahadəšan also seem to use the word Tat with the meaning which it must have had in the mouths of their presumed ancestors, the Kara-Koyunlu Turcomans; cf. Minovsky, K. M. M. xlv., p. 247, etc. the article Matte.

The Turcomans of the Transcaucasian territory give the same Tat to the Iranian Tadjik; formerly, according to Samoilović, they gave the name to the people of Khiwa. [In this a memory of the old Iranian population of Khiwa? Cf. now A. Z. Waliudd, Hniewnitchi Shikar, Islimica, iii/ii. 1927, p. 190—213].

The term Tat has however been applied to other ethnic elements. Schubdinger (1394—1427) tells us that the "afifels" give the name Tat to the inhabitants of Karcker (probably Kirk-šar in the mountains S. W. of the Crimes). In another passage he says that one of the languages spoken in the Crimes is called Kathia and that the afifels" call it Tat ("die stolten sprach hast Kathia sprech und die höflein sannerte That"). From this it is evident that the same Tat in the language of the Muhammadans of the Kipates of the xvit century was applied to the Goths of the Tatars (whose kingdom was destroyed by the Ottomans in 1475).

Later, beginning with the yarlik of Djani-beg Girši, dated 1537 (1628) (cf. Velianinov-Zernov, Materiali dla istorii Crineshstva, St. Petersburg 1864, p. 25), we find in the title of the Khans of the Crimes, the official reference rät tat Tanigahmi al-şir żahədbi, Budagov, Soro, l. 329, explains tat has a sort of the Genoese without giving reasons (the meaning of Tanigah in the title is still quite obscure). At the present day the Noghaš Tatars of the northern Crimes give the name Tat to all the Muhammadans of the southern coast of the Peninsula, who represent a mixture of nationalities that have become Turkicized (personal information from Samoilović); cf. also Radkoff, Vorsich eines Wiehertuchas, iii, vol. 899, anh 58.

It may be also mentioned here that a section of the "Greeks" (i.e. Orthodox) settled at Mariakopel in 1778 is often referred to as the Tatami Tatars migrating from the south east coast of the Crimea and speaking a Greek dialect. The name Tat in, however, not applied to the other section of the "Greeks of Mariakopel" who speak Turkish (which they write in Greek characters) and who seem to the true descendants of the Goths of Tauris. Cf. Grigoriowitsch-Blaß, Über die griechisch-türkische Mitbewahrung in Mariakopel, Z. d. d. G. xxiv., 1874, p. 574—583 and ibid, p. 562—576; Tomuscheck, Die Gothen in Tiavrnen, Vienna, 1881, p. 3, 48; Th. Born, Mariopolitishe Grebb, Zborna Starina, St. Petersburg, iv/ii. 1890, p. 78—92.

According to Tomuscheck, o.c. p. 43, the Magyars call the Slovak Tat (= "Tat")?

The primary meaning of the word Tat (= "non-Turk, foreigner") is given in the Caghatai-Ottoman Dictionary of Shalib Sulaiman Efendi (ed. Kimn, p. 184): "nations that have passed under the rule of the Turks, e.g. the Turks". [On p. 179 however, the author says that the people of foreign origin who speak Turkish are called Tat and those who speak Persian are called Tadjik. In this connection may be noted the statement of Zaki Waliudd, according to which the word Tat was applied in Turkey in (in the sixtieth century) to all the settled elements of the population, including the Turks settled in the country before the coming of the Mongols]. Ahmed Weli, Lüdey-yi Oğullari, Stambol 1906, p. 288, whose interpretation of the word seems to be influenced by local Ottoman conditions says, "the former Kud (sic!) and Persian inhabitants of the provinces subject to Turkish rule", Barbier de Meynard in his Dictionary adopted Ahmed Weli's explanation, but thought it applied to Turkish.

The Caghatai dictionaries also give the secondary meanings of the word Tat: "the class of subjected people living outside the town" (cf. above Zaki Waliudd, "ravagbont" etc. Cf. Velianinov-Zernov, Slovar' jiažha-tačuči ("Almaka"), St. Petersburg, 1868; Pavet de Courteille, Dictionnaire türk oriental, 1870, p. 194; Badoff, Versuch, iii, col. 899, rub 5c and d; Melkonian, however, who has specially studied the word Tat, Zap, xlii, 1899, p. 0154—0158, has shown that the examples of these meanings taken from the works of Mur "Ali Şir Name" are very doubtful.

2. In a special and evidently secondary sense the term Tat is applied to certain Iranian peoples whom the Persians themselves regarded as distinct from them. These Tat groups are found in Persia and in Transcaucasia.

A. In northern Persia, there are little islands of people speaking their own dialects. The "southern" dialects of Fars are called Tadjik among the Persians [only the Kaškaši Turks use the term Tat in Fars, cf. above]. Even as applied to people speaking northern dialects the term Tat is only used in Persia for certain dialects of the North-West. It has not yet been found for example in the region of Kaškaši.

The most important group of the Tat is found to the west and south-west of Kašwin; the Tat
Tatt very rarely has šēfrāt: its place is taken by an original construction: ṣ̣hāna-ānawân = Pers. khooneh-štābāt etc. The dialect is rich in post-positions (e.g. with, in, and in genitives (šoṭe-hārāt, "things being-so")). The vocabulary is full of Turkish loan-words. Like most Persian dialects, Tāt is not very regular in its characteristic features. Broadly speaking, it occupies a position intermediate between modern Persian and the Caspian dialects (where rhoticism is also found sporadically).

The Muslim Tātis who form the bulk of the people speaking Tāt, live in the districts of Bāţān (q.v.), Kūmān (q.v.), Shamsābād and Gūl-e-Tāt. There are some in the province of Qočān and in southern Daghstān (the districts of Kāla-Tubanār immediately west of Darband; cf. Kermān, Kermān, Daghstān, o. d.).

The majoriy of the Tātis live on the two slopes of the eastern extremity of the Caspian range and the peninsulas of Altaiuran (Altaiuran) except the south-east point. On the ethnographic map of the Caspian by Bīrlīch (before 1877) the total number of Tātis is put at 64,729; Kondratenko's ethnographical map appended to vol. xii of Zapadné Kavk. Otd. Russ. Geogr. Otdel gives for the district of Bāţān (in 1886): 58,621 Tātis. The Great Russian Encyclopaedia, vol. XXXIII, 1901 gives the total as 135,000. The Soviet census of 1926 gives 98,020 Tātis "by language" and 2,875 "by nationality". In the former are included 970 "Tatis" of the Transcaspian (i.e. the Tadhik whom the Turkomans call Tāt). In addition, in the Soviet republic of Altaiuran there are 20,000 individuals speaking Tāt. In all, we may say about 90,000 people speak Tāt. The decrease in the number of Tātis may be the result of their gradual turkeisation.

The Jews speaking Tāt (the "mountain Jews" in Turkish Dagh-inşa#/) numbered in 1886: 21,000, 10,000 in villages and 11,000 in towns. Their largest colonies were at Kūhba (6,280), at Darband, Temir-khan-šura, Groznī, Nalīk (a Circassian district of Kābārda). They are also found on the Kubān (q.v.). The dialect of these Jews is remarkable for its gutturical articulation: in it we find š, ūn, ẖ, and ū, even in purely Iranian words (ḥāfiz, "seven", dost, "horse", dostūr, "know", par, "wet"). V. F. Miller thus defines the character of Jewish Tāt: "It is an Iranian dialect, spoken with the Semitic articulation, the phonetics of which (in part) and the morphology (in part) have been formed on the "Turkish model". As to articulation, it could be explained by the fact that these Jews had formerly spoken Arabic, or more simply by the proximity of the peoples of Daghstān who not only have the sounds "ūn and ġi but have always cultivated a knowledge of Arabic, in which until quite recently, correspondence in Daghstān was conducted. For the rest, the Muslim Tātis also have the sounds "ūn and ġi. The influence of Turkish on Tāt is in any case not to be exaggerated. The morphological phenomena and even the vocalic assimilation in the syllables of the same word discovered by V. F. Miller do have purely Persian parallels. Iranian influence on these Jews is not confined to language; Jewish folklore reflects it also (sār-ūn, "spirit of the waters", akshayūn, "dragon" etc.).

The Tātis of the Armenians (the little town of Matras [Madras], Kīvāl etc.) is marked by the
simplification of vowel sounds (\(\delta > a\)) and by the aspirated character of certain consonants.

The Täts of the Caucasus are at the present day entirely surrounded by Turkish and Daghestanian peoples. Their present habitats must always have been separated from the main body of Iranians. Their geographical distribution along the eastern coast of the Caucasus with an out- thrust to Darband seems to suggest the idea, which decided their settlement in those regions, namely the desire to reinforce the natural line of defence by Iranian colonies to meet invasions from the north. It would be tempting to recognise in the Tät remains of ancient colonies transplanted to Daghestän in the period when the Sâsánians were fortifying Darband. According to Balânjürit, p. 194, Aryan (531–579) had settled the region of Darband–Shâhîrân [cf. yârân] with people from Sassan (al-iyyân]. This last province was situated on the left bank of the Arazes (practically the district of Nakhchivan with the surrounding mountains) immediately north of Aighbarbâdjan. The people of Sassan were Christians, but from the political and linguistic point of view held a special position in the Kingdom of Armenia. In 571, they begged the Sassanian king to detach their province from Armenia and include it in Aighbarbâdjan; cf. Margarit, Erânkub, p. 120–122, Hübschmann, Die alten Armenier, Orienten, Indien, Forschungen, xvi, 1904, p. 266–266, 247–249.

The late Darband-nâme, ed. Kazem-beg, Mem. présentés à l’Académie des Sciences pour savants, vi. St. Petersburg 1831, p. 461, says, Aryan people settled in the towns of the province from Aighbarbâdjan and Fars and the towns to the south of Darband (the region of Shâhîrân–Maqâhûr; cf. the word garn in the language with the word of the Sassanians) and on this occasion entered into relations with Fars from Mawsil and Syria. According to the same source (p. 530) however, the fortresses around Darband were re-built under the Abbâsid al-Mansûr (754–775) and on this occasion Arabians from Mawsil and Syria were received by the Sassanians. Among the places fortified are especially mentioned Muṣṭâr, Kamâkh, etc. which at the present day are inhabited by Täts. It might be concluded from this that the presence of Täts at Muṣṭâr etc. represents a migration later than the eighth century, but the text of the Darband-nâme, the original Persian of which has not yet been found (cf. Barthold, in Iran, i, Leningrad, 1926, p. 42–58) is not certain (according to Klapper’s version, three hundred families settled at Muṣṭâr came from Tabasaran). The historical sources at our disposal thus reveal the ethnical context of the colonies established in Darband. On the other hand, Tät in its general characteristics is a modern dialect which (apart from rhetoricism) does not show any special traces of antiquity such as might be expected if it had long been isolated. The question of the Tät Jewish dialect is only a subsidiary one, the Jews even if they had been in Daghestân before the coming of the Täts (cf. Miller, 1892, Introduction) may have adopted Tät in place of their old language (Arabic).

As to the affinities of Tät the rhetoricism of its dialects has analogies in the Iranian islands of Persian Aighbarbâdjan at the present day. For the region of Ardabil, we have examples from the sixteenth century (Ahmad Kârâi Aghtari, Zâhdi-i hâdî-i Aghtari, Tîhrân, 1304 [1927]). The early borrowings made by Armenians from Iranian (Marc < Mâra, spârpa < spârpa) also suggest the existence at a very early date of this peculiarity among the Iranian neighbours of the Armenians (Marquart, Erânkub, p. 174, note 6; Bartholomae, Indoger., Forsch., Suppl. to vol. xiv, 1906, p. 43, note 1). The other curious feature is the name of the town of Lâhîîd inhabited by Täts (at the sources of the Gök-tâl) and perhaps mentioned in the Georgian Chronicl., Breslau, i, p. 364, under the year 1120 (Lidathâ or Lâîâkh). The inhabitants themselves believe they came from Lâîîhîd (cf. vi). The investigation conducted on the spot by V. F. Miller in 1928 has shown that the dialect of Lâhîîd has certain special features and it is possible that some colonies of Täts were settled in Transcaucasia later than others and that the dialect of the principal group exercised a levelling influence on the neighbouring dialects (according to the Gulîshîrî Iran, of Râshî–Khanî, Bâlût 1928, p. 14, the people of Mîskinjî in the district of Samur came from Astakhbî in the time of Tâhsîlî).


TÄTAR, written Tätar, Tätar and Tatar, the name of a people the significance of which varies in different periods. Two Tatar groups of tribes, the "Thirty Tatars" and the "Nine Tatars," are mentioned in the Turkish Orhan inscriptions of the eighth century d.o. As Thomsen (Intercision
The peoples of Mongol origin and language had apparently always called themselves Tatars. After the time of Cirgiz Khan, this word was completely supplanted in Mongolia and Central Asia by the word "Mongol" (in Muslim manuscripts Moghol or Moghul and in the every day language of the descendants of the Mongols in Afghanistan, who have kept their language to the present day, Moghol), officially introduced by Cirgiz Khan. In the westernmost parts of the Mongol empire, the word Mongol never became predominant, although it was also introduced there officially, as we know from European travellers (John of Plano Carpini and William of Rubruck; Hâkî, Sec., 1905, Index s.v. Mongol and Tatar). The people of the kingdom of the Golden Horde [see BAYât Kâin and Berke] and of the later minor kingdom in the same region are always called "Tatars". As the many documents preserved in the Public Library in Leningrad show, the Turkish-speaking peoples of the Crimea were not only called "Tatars" by the Ottomans (as by the Russians) but also called themselves Tatars. A Mongol force had been transferred to Asia Minor at the time of the conquest. Their descendants (who no doubt became turkicised) were called "Black Tatars" (Kara Tatar); at the time of Timur's campaign they were leading a nomadic life in the country between Amasia [q.v.] and Kajariya [q.v.]; they numbered 30-40,000 families (Zafar-nama, Ind. ed., Calcutta 1888, ii, p. 502 sq.). Timur had these "Tatars" deported to Central Asia, according to Ibn 'Arabshâh (ed. Manger, ii, 338), on the advice of Sulân Bâyanid; there they were allotted dwelling-places in Kaghâr on an island (which now no longer exists) in Lake Issák-Kul [q.v.] and in Kâvaristan; a section of them succeeded in escaping to the lands of the Golden Horde. After Timur's death, the Black Tatars returned to Asia Minor; in 1419 they (or a part of them) were deported to the Balkans and settled west of Philippiopolis; the town of Tatar-Pazardjik takes its name from them (J. von Hammer, GÖK, Pesth 1834, i, 292).

Later in Russia and in Western Europe we frequently find the name Tatars applied to all the Turkish peoples with the exception of the Ottomans; this use of the word is still found in Radloff, Aus Sibirien, Leipzig 1884, passim. After the example of the Chinese, the name has been extended to the Mongols also and especially to the Manchus (cf. the "Tatar town" in Peking). As the name of a particular people, the word Tatars is used only for the Turkish-speaking peoples of the Volga basin from Kazan to Astrakhan, the Crimea, and a part of Siberia; in the printed list (episk) of the year 1927 of the peoples of the Union of Soviets, the Tatars in the Crimea, the Tatars of the Volga, the Tatars of Kasimov [q.v.] and the Tatars of Tobolsk are therefore given as separate peoples, in addition to the Tatars of White Russia whose ancestors were deported to Poland as prisoners from the Crimea. They have adopted the language of the White Russians but have remained faithful to Islam. The name "Tatars" is now rejected by the people of the Crimea. The Turkish-speaking people of Astrakhan according to the most recent investigation belong to the Noghai stock. In the central course of the Volga also the "Tatars" are usually given this name by their Christian fellow-countrymen, the "Kryashens" (from the Russian krâshenny, "baptised") (Radloff, Wörterbuch, iii, 101 sq.). They prefer to call themselves "Muslims" rather than "Tatars" which was more fitting their heathen ancestors, just as the Ottomans have for long preferred not to be called "Turks". Even in the last year before the Revolution when the principle of nationality had already come to the front it was disputed whether they should be called "Turks" or "Tatars" (M.I., i, 1912, p. 270 sqq.); the name "Tatars" has now prevailed; since 1920 there has existed an autonomous Tatar Socialist Soviet Republic with capital
Kazan (q.v.) and a population of 2,780,000 of whom rather less than half (1,305,292) are Tatars. Cf. the ethnographical survey (övér) by Prof. D. Zolotarev in the book of travels Povest'vi, 1926, p. 99 sqq. (the figures are given on p. 123 and 126).

Bibliography: given in the article.

(W. BARTHOLD)

TAŞIL: a technical term used in dogmatics meaning the divesting of the conception of God of all attributes; see the article TAWADDUD.

TAWADDUD, the heroine of a story which is preserved in the 1001 Nights as well as in an independent form. Tawaddud (as a personal name not found elsewhere in Arabic literature — however frequent it is as a nomen verbi — is of similar formation to Tawanin, Tafjami, and similar women's names) is the slave of a merchant who has fallen into poverty and, following her advice, offers her for sale to the caliph Hârûn to free him from his difficulties. Hârûn declares himself ready to pay the high price demanded on condition she shows by an examination that she possesses all the knowledge she claims. In the tests made by a number of learned men, including Ishâq b. Sâiyîr al-Nâṣrîn, Tawaddud answers all the questions put to her in the field of theological knowledge, astronomy, medicine and philosophy, solves all the riddles put to her and proves herself an expert in chess, backgammon and playing the late; finally she in her turn puts questions to her examiners which they cannot answer and in this way she puts even the proud Naṣrîn to shame. When the caliph then asks her to beg a boon of him, she asks to be given back to her former master; which the caliph does and gives her a present besides, and makes her master one of his boon companions.

For the date of the story the name of al-Nâṣrîn (d. 231 = 845—846), preserved in all versions even the Shi'a and Christian forms (see below), gives a terminus post quem, while the oldest Spanish version going back probably to the eleventh century gives a lower limit; but we shall hardly have to go beyond the xth or xith century. Several manuscripts which contain the story as an independent story give the name of the narrator but it is not always the same and his identity has so far not been established. The essential features for him are the questions and answers which take up most of the space; the story of Tawaddud only forms the framework which he fills out with these. Several motives, such as the magnanimity of the purchaser, are found in other stories of the Arabian Nights and outside this collection also; the didactic purpose however and the form in which the learned matter is conveyed, ally the story to the books of questions found among the Parâs, in the Christian east and European middle ages and in Arabic literature also. The Arabic books of questions are sometimes like the Kîtâb al-Tarîk wa 'l-Tawaddûr of Dîshîn intelligible only to the learned, sometimes for popular instruction like the questions of 'Abd Allah b. Sallâm, which have passed into other Muslim literatures. Tawaddud belongs to the latter group although the theological in the didactic part of the story is by no means so predominant as in the questions of 'Abd Allah. A Shi'a version of Tawaddud is found in the Hâsanîya of Abu 'l-Futuwwa, popular in Persia in Malcolm's time. A Christian version is the Spanish Historia della domanda Theoder, of which we still possess an older form free from the Christian insertions of the later. The Historia della domanda Theoder — the manuscript in Madrid of the Hikâyât al-Latî'îya Tâdûr already has this corruption of the name — was repeatedly reprinted as a chap-book down to the nineties of the last century, and in the Portuguese translation down to the first decade of the twentieth.


(T. HROVITZ)

TAWĂF (A.), from tawâf with š of place) encircling; in the language of ritual the running round or circumambulation of a sacred object, a stone, altar, etc. There are variations of the rite having existed among the Israelites, cf. especially Ps. xxvi. 6 (xxvii. 6, lxx.) and the ceremony of the feast of booths in the time of the Second Temple, where the altar is circumambulated once on the first six days and seventimes on the seventh. The rite however was also found among Persians, Indians, Buddhists, Romans and others and is therefore very ancient. It played a very important part in the religious ceremonial of the ancient Arabs. We find the synonymous dawâr (from daru) also used. Thus Ibn 'Abd Allâh, Mu'allâjah, 63, compares the wild cows with young women in long trailing robes, who perform the circumambulation (dawâr, a circumambulated idol like darû in Antara 10, if darûr is not to be read here). In Mecca the Ka'bah which enclosed the Black Stone sacred from very ancient times used to be circumambulated and Muhammad adopted this old rite when he established the rite of his religion and centred them round the Ka'bah. When, in the year 3, he made his victorious entry into his native town, he is said by Ibn Hishâm, p. 520 and Tahtâ, l. 1652 to have performed the tawăf riding on his camel, touching with his crooked staff the ruhh (the eastern corner of the Ka'bah where the stone was). This was however something exceptional and according to Ibn Hishâm, it was only shortly before his death at the "farewell pilgrimage" that he laid down the authoritative rules for the circumambulation. It may however be assumed with certainty that he observed ancient traditional forms ("handed down from Abraham": cf. Ibn Hishâm, p. 54, 55) so that we can deduce from Muslim practice what the ancient pagan custom was; one feature of the latter was that the circumambulation had to be performed three times in succession (cf. above on the feast of booths) the three first at a greater speed, beginning at the black stone and ending there and during the course keeping the Ka'bah on the right; one should make a special effort to kiss the stone or at least touch it. On the contrary, if Wellhausen is correct, it was an innovation that the tawâf which previously took place only at the "amrûr (q.v.)" was inserted by Muhammad in the great ḥajj when the pilgrims visited Mecca. This suggestion is however disputed, cf. ibl. ii., p. 199 sq, where Sura iii. 91 is quoted against it, but the expression ḥajj al-ba'tî is hardly decisive.
since Muhammad may have decided on the expansion of the rites of the ḫalqūd, when he conceived the verse, if the expression was not inserted in the text later. The following special courses are certainly Muslim innovations: the ṭawāf al-tābiyya or al-būdām (circumambulation of greeting or arrival) and the ṭawāf al-nawwāb (circumambulation of departure, cf. Burchhardt, Religion in Arabien, p. 439) which are, it is worth noting, not obligatory. Of the old pagan customs, one at least was strictly forbidden by the Prophet, making the ṭawāf naked; see Sīra vii. 29; Ibn Bahšām, p. 921; cf. Ibn Said, i. 6, 17, where there is reference to a wooden object at the Ka‘ba, where the heathen laid their clothes at the circumambulation. The pavements surrounding the Ka‘ba on which the pilgrim ran is called maqṣaf. At the al-ハウス wall (see ii. 585) they run close to the outer side of it, not as usual along the Ka‘ba.

The ṭawāf, except for the special forms above mentioned, is strictly compulsory and therefore became an important factor in Islam. It is therefore significant that the caliph 'Abd al-Malik, who was the role of the anti-caliph 'Abd Allah b. al-Zahabār made the visits of the faithful to Mecca difficult, proclaimed: that a ṭawāf around the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem would have the same value as that around the Ka‘ba (cf. Goldziher, Muḥammdanische Studien, i. 35). The complete omission of this rite would have meant a serious gap in Muḥammdanism. But the innovation soon disappeared with its cause and in orthodox Islam any ṭawāf except that around the Ka‘ba became more and more pointless. That the old ritual custom survived in the lowland tribes of Arabia life is revealed in an interesting fashion by ʻUdājān, who says the Beduins emulated to perform the ṭawāf not only around the graves of their ancestors but also around the tomb of Ibn al-ʻAbbās in Ta‘if.
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**TAWAKKUL**, trust in God, is enjoined by the Qur'ān, but the musawwakkilīn whom God loves (li. 133) do not form a special class of quietists like those known by the same designation in the 8th and 19th centuries A. H. The doctrine of the latter, closely connected with that of ṭawāfīd (q. v.), and probably developed under Christian influence (cf. Matt. vi. 24-34), was sometimes carried in practice to such lengths that the com
parison of the musawwakki to a corpse in the hands of the washer who prepares it for burial (Ku
thairi, *Bḥ al-Tawakkul*) seems quite appropriate. According to these realists, tawakkul is directly oppo
to every sort of ṭazkīa ("acquisition", personal initiative and action): how can a man seek to help himself if he really believes that God is the only Provider? The answer given by Kuθairi, that a man's activity in making use of the means which God provides need not impair his inward trust in God's providence, indicates the line of advance by which the old ascetic school of Syri
am was left behind.
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**TAWAKKUL** K. SASTRÉ (Tilki [9] b. Isma‘īl), a dawrīsh, author of the *Sīfat al-Ṣafā*. This work is a biography of the grand Şah Şāfī al-Dīn of Ardashīl (650—735 = 1255—1334), ancestor of the Şafawī dynasty. The book was written in 590 (1535) under the direction of Shaikh Sadr al-Dīn, son of Şāfī al-Dīn, whom Tawakkul quotes as an authority. Later under Şāh Ṭahmāsp I the text of the work was revised by a certain Abu ’l-Fath Husain, the Persian text was published in *Caferī* in 1329 (1911). The *Sīfat al-Ṣafā* is a work of considerable length, about 216,000 words. It is purely hagiographical in form but the historical and geographical details, important as supplementing our knowledge of the history of N. W. Persia, are overlaid with the miraculous elements. In it we find for example specimens of the old Iranian dialect of Aḏharbāḏjan (sixth century). The *Sīfat al-Ṣafā* does for the grand Şāfī al-Dīn of Ardashīl what the *Manāṣir al-Adl* of Alīkī (q. v.) does for the grand masters of the Mawlawī order of Konya. Like the history of Şah Isma‘īl (by Khwāja ‘Abd Allāh Muruwiī) [cf. J. R. A. S., 1922, p. 170] the beginning of which was translated by E. D. Ross in the *J. R. A. S.*, 1895, p. 249-340, the *Sīfat al-Ṣafā* is a valuable document for the study of the moral and religious factors in the great Şafawī movement out of which modern Persia arose. It enables us to watch the formation of the Şafawī "secret doctrine": the belief in the sanctity of Şafī al-Dīn (of which historical ortho
doxy has no doubt) later led to the extremist Şia doctrine, the aberrations of which are evident in the poems of Şah Isma‘īl himself [cf. KHAṬĀ].
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**TAWĀMĀN**, the Twīne, the constellation Gemini. According to al-Karwīnī, the constellation contains 18 stars and seven which do not belong to the figure, and represents two men with their heads to the N. E. and their feet to the S. W. The two bright stars in the head are called al-Dhībī or al-umrah, the outstretched arm, and form the seventh station of the moon; the two at the foot of the second twin form the station of the moon called al-Hawā. The whole constellation is also called al-Djawa, like Orion; hence the name Ras alginac for the star β (Pollux). In Ptolemy the stars now known as Castor and Pollux are called Apollo and Hercules, which become Avel-lār and Abra-calus in the Latin translations of 'Ali's commentary on Ptolemy.

**Bibliography:**


(J. RUSKA)
TAWASHI, one of the many words used as a euphemism for a camel. According to al-Maqrizi, the word is Turkish and is originally *tawashi* or *tawash*. The reference is clearly to the word which is *tawashi* in Ottoman Turkish and means "servant". The word has therefore undergone the same change of meaning as *khudum*, which is a legal and official position with the same status as a camel. Thus we find the word in the language of administration in Egypt, where it means the military rank in the bodyguard (khudam). The meaning is also used alongside of it.

**Bibliography:** al-Maqrizi, Historia des Sultanes Mameluken, transl. Quatremère, s.t. (1840), p. 132, note 163; the Turkish Dictionaries and Brockelmann, Mittelmärk. Wortlex. (1915), p. 95; Mez, Die Rechnungen des Iskandar, p. 334, exp. 334 and note 4; Wattenfeld, Geschichte a. Warendorf von Ägypten, p. 179. (M. Plessner)

TAWBA (א), repentance, originally meaning "return", is a verbal noun derived from *tawba*, the verb is used in the Koran, either absolutely or with lā, of one whoitten to God with repentance, and also with lā of God, who turns with forgiveness to the penitent, for He is tawwaab rażīm. "very forgiving and merciful" (Korān, ii. 35, 258). The validity of tawba depends on three things: 1. a conviction of sīn, 2. remorse (muṣaṣṣa), 3. a firm resolution to abstain from sin in the future (Qurān, i. 53, 258), where the subject is discussed in detail; Korān, iv. 21, 22; x. 109, 31i. 24). If these conditions are fulfilled, God always accepts repentance, not from obligation (waṣlāf) as the Mu'tazilis hold, but in virtue of His eternal will; on the other hand, an *deadly repentance* is unwavering (Korān, iv. 22). Sin being an offence against God, tawba is indispensable for salvation, though Ahmad b. Hanbal and others deny this (Massignon, La Passion d'Abdal-Lāh, p. 666). The Şafi'i, rising above the legal notion of sin, attach a correspondingly higher significance to tawba. Amongst them the term denotes the spiritual conversion which is the necessary starting-point for those entering on the Path (tarbi'a), and which is represented as an act of divine grace. In its most proper sense tawba is not so much an acknowledgement and renunciation of sin as a new orientation of the entire personality, so that the penitent is wholly turned towards God. Any recollection of sin or thought of remorse is wrong; for to remember sin is to forget God, and self-consciousness is the greatest sin of all; hence, according to a well-known Tradition, the Prophet sought forgiveness of God seventy times a day.


TAWHĪD (א), inductive, is the sense of *y*h*ūd, means literally "making one" or "asserting oneness" (Lamb, p. 207). In consequence, it is applied symbolically to the oneness (maṣūlah, tawhīd) of Allāh in all its meanings. The word does not occur in the Korān, which has no verbal form from this root, nor from the kindred *bāt*; but in the *Sahih* of *Abu* Dür, *s* 4 to 6* s below* there is an elaborate metaphorical statement of the meanings of the different forms from these roots as applied to Allāh and to men. Technically the science of *tarjim* and of the *Qualities* (*ilm al-tawhīd wa l-`esāl*), is a synonym for "the science of *kāf*" [see article KĀF], and is the basis of all the articles of the belief of Islam (Introduction by Taftāzānī to the *Alif* of Nasātī, ed. Cairo 1321, p. 4 sq. and the marginal commentaries thereon; Dict. of techn. terms, p. 22). In this definition the Mu'tazilites would exclude the qualities and make the basis *tawhīd* alone. But unity is far from being a simple idea; it may be internal or external; it may mean that there is no other God except Allāh, who has no partner (shirk); it may mean that Allāh is a Oneness in himself; it may mean that he is the only being with real or absolute existence (al-`ād), all other beings having merely a correlative existence; it may even be developed into a pantheistic assertion that Allāh is Everything. Again, knowledge of this unity may be reached by the methods of systematic theology (`ilm) or by religious experience (maṣūlah, waṣlāf). If we turn to the other hand, a *deadly repentance* is unwavering (Korān, iv. 22). Sin being an offence against God, tawba is indispensable for salvation, though Ahmad b. Hanbal and others deny this (Massignon, La Passion d'Abdal-Lāh, p. 666). The Şafi'i, rising above the legal notion of sin, attach a correspondingly higher significance to tawba. Amongst them the term denotes the spiritual conversion which is the necessary starting-point for those entering on the Path (tarbi'a), and which is represented as an act of divine grace. In its most proper sense tawba is not so much an acknowledgement and renunciation of sin as a new orientation of the entire personality, so that the penitent is wholly turned towards God. Any recollection of sin or thought of remorse is wrong; for to remember sin is to forget God, and self-consciousness is the greatest sin of all; hence, according to a well-known Tradition, the Prophet sought forgiveness of God seventy times a day.

**Bibliography:** cf. the article `ARD. (Moh. Ben CHERIE)

TAWIL (א), originally meant quite generally interpretation, exposition. In some of the passages from which the word occurs in the Korān it refers definitely to the revelation delivered by Mahommad. The use of the word *tawil* afterwards became more and more limited to this special meaning and it meant exposition of the Korān, and was for a time synonymous with *tarjim*. In the time the term seems to have become more specialised although not yet confined to this one meaning: it became a technical term for the exposition of the subject matter of the Korān. In this latter sense *tawil* formed a valuable and necessary supplement to the more external philological exegesis of the Korān, which was now distinguished as *tarjim*. So long as it did not come into contradiction with the obvious literal meaning of the Korān or with Tradition, orthodox theology had no reason to
deny its right to exist. The question was altered however when ta'wil no longer satisfied its conditions. Suff, the Ikhwan al-Safaw, the Shi'a, especially such schools of thought as, without abandoning Isla'm itself, diverged to any extent from the path of orthodoxy, saw in ta'wil a suitable instrument for bringing the views held by them into harmony with the literal text of the Kar'anic revelation and even for deriving them from it. Alongside of the literal interpretation of the text there grew up a blissed allegorical exposition which found the most for fetched ideas conceived in the text. With the extreme schools, this transformation of the "external" meaning came to be held up as being of looking at the Kar'a, so that the traditional exposition fell into dispute and the legal enactments of the Kar'a were even declared not to be binding.

Details in the method of using allegorical ta'wil may, as Goldziher (Richtungen, p. 210 sq.) has suggested, be ultimately traced back to the influence of the Neo-Platonists, especially Philo. The method itself however was the direct result of the necessity of sanctioning new views by a new interpretation of the words of the revelation that had been handed down; allegorical ta'wil may be considered essentially of native Muslim origin.


TAWILAH, a town in South Arabia, formerly the headquarters of the Kâkimâtun of the Kâjâ of Kawkabân, to which the town already belonged in Niehues' time. It lies on a tongue-shaped spur of the Jebel Dhu'ul on the left bank of the Wadâ'il which forms a continuous chain of four rocky hills, the second (from the east) of which is called al-Djum. In the SSW. of the town a little lower but not 500 yards away stands the Masjid al-Zahr, a mosque now in a fine cistern, from which one well-made paved road (ta'mâd) leads eastwards towards the town. Barely 200 yards east of this ruin or rather of the ruin built of its stones (tâmir) is a huge building of blocks of black rock, from which another paved road leads to the town. The town is small and unwarred but has a considerable market. The administrative buildings used by the Turks when they run here lie to the extreme S.W. of the town which was visited by the explorer E. Glaser on Dec. 2-3, 1885.

Bibliography: C. Niehues, Beschreibung von Arabien, Copenhagen 1772, p. 258; E. Glaser, Geographische Bezeichnungen im Sana, Jena 1834, fol. 59, 60; A. Defers, Voyages aux Yemen, Paris 1885, p. 71. (A. Grimann)

TAWIL, a South Arabian coin, see the article TAKIN.

TAWIH (Ar.), lit. "a document with the signature or device ('alamâ) equivalent to a signature of a ruler"; hence generally, edict, decree of a ruler, and its preparation in written form. Tawih has the special meaning of the title of the ruler (roughly equivalent to the tâghit [q.v.]) of the Ottoman empire to be inscribed in the chancellery, which gives the document validity, in contrast to 'alamâ, the mark or device of the ruler put on it with his own hand, which was regarded as his signature. The use of the two words is however to some extent indiscriminate, for tawih was also used for motto.

In the Tawih-litterature edicts (tawih) of the Sâmilian kings are mentioned. Under the Omayyads it is said to have arisen the custom — no doubt really an old oriental one — of the Caliph himself deciding (tawîhâ) in public audience on complaints (qiyâd) brought to him; the secretaries had then to put the Caliph's tawih into writing. For the 'Abbasid period, Kâlima mentions a special Divan al-Tawîh (office for edicts). It may be considered an important increase in the power of the visiers under the 'Abbasids that Harûn al-Rashid for the first time entrusted the valuable Diwan to the right of dealing with petitions (tawih 'ala 'l-qiyaq). According to Ibn al-Salih, there was in the Fatimid Diwan a special secretary for dealing with petitions. This secretary for the tawîh 'ala 'l-qiyaq was one of the highest in rank. Under the Mamlûks the private secretary (Kalîth al-Sirr) received the right of tawîh 'ala 'l-qiyaq. As a general rule, however, the sulthan exercised it themselves however

In the Mamluk administrative system, tawih was also used as the name of particular classes of diplomas of appointment, and according to Ibn Fa'dl Allah, it was applied to the diplomas of all officers, the lower as well as the upper, up to the great governors (mu'allim), and therefore became the word most used for appointment generally. Ibn Fa'dl Allah however says that it was only used for the appointment of the lowest ranks of officials. A little later it came into use for the appointments of "turban-wearers" (mu'allimunna), i.e. the ecclesiastical and Diwan officials. According to Kâlima, tawih is the fourth and lowest as well as the most extensive group of diplomas of appointment (wilâyât).

In the Ottoman empire the imperial edicts were dealt with by a special official, the nishîndî or tawîh, who was responsible for the documents bearing the Sultan's style and titles. He was one of the highest officials in the kingdom (the Elys-e-i Divan) and a member of the imperial Diwan. A device written by the Sultan himself was no longer in use here; in Ottoman diplomatic, 'alamâ, like the Persian word nishûn, means the imperial sign-manual (the tawih), the style of the Sultan drawn in the chancery of the nishûndî by a special assistant, the tawihbâš. Amâmet was in this case synonymous with tawih.

Lastly tawih meant a special style of script in use at the close of the middle ages (xii-xiv century), which was specially used for documents of this period in the Mamluk as well as the Ottoman dominions. In the great period of Ottoman history (xvith century downwards) it was ousted by the Diwan script.

TAWRÂT. Heb. תְּוָרָתָה, is the name of the Medine period (cf. also an alleged verse of Jewish poet Samâkî in Ibn al-Hâjîm, p. 659) of the holy scripture revealed after the time of Hurshîm (iii. 35) and Isrâ'îl (i.e. Jacob; iii. 87) and afterwards confirmed by Yâsî (iii. 44; v. 50; Isr. 6) which contains the žakir Allâh (v. 48). While obedience to it brings a reward in Paradise to the "people of the book" (v. 70), those who do not take upon themselves the tawrât imposed upon them are "like asses who carry books" (Isr. 5). The Tawrât also contains a prophecy of the coming of the Nabî as-sâmî (vii. 156) i.e. Muhammad, and in it Paradise is promised to the faithful who "fight on the path of Allâh" (Isr. 12). A sentence from the Tawrât is quoted in v. 49, which repeats approximately the text of Exodus xxviii. 25: 28, while the parable quoted in xlviii. 29 from Tawrât and Isrâ'îl comes not from the Tora but, although only in its gist, from the Psalms; cf. for example, Psalm i. 5; lxvi. 14 ff., lxvi. 14. In iii. 87 the Jews are challenged to read from the Tawrât the law (Genesis, xxxiii. 33) which corresponds to the substance of iii. 87. On the other hand the sentence quoted in v. 35 comes not from the Tawrât but from the Mîsqâl Sâhadât, iv. 5. Besides such express references to the Tawrât, the Qur'ân contains, frequently repeated, a number of stories from the Pentateuch—usually in their Haggadic form and not infrequently adapted to Muhammad's special purposes—and many laws from the Pentateuch, both without mentioning their origin. Of the books of the Old Testament, in addition to the Tawrât, Muhammad only knows the Zekâr, i.e. the Psalms; perhaps, as the Jews themselves sometimes do, he meant by Tawrât the whole of their holy scriptures (see Bacher, Exodus Terminologie, i. 197). In Ḥâshîf the Tawrât is also frequently mentioned and in several passages Mâsûh is named as he who observed it (Bâkhîrî, Tafsîr, Sûra li. bâb 1; do. Tawhîd, bâb 10, 24, 25; Mâsûh, loco cit., trad. 222; Ibn Mâdjâl, Zikrû, bâb 37). While the Jews pride themselves on having a great treasure in the Tawrât (Tirmidî, Tafsîr, Sûra xxvii., trad. 12; cf. for example Prov. iv. 2) it is on the other side pointed out that its possession has availed them nothing and the Tawrât contains nothing equal to the Unw as-karânî, i.e. the Sûra mîn al-Mâhîfî (v. 39. 40. Tafsîr, Sûra xlvii., trad. 5; Tâfṣîr as-karânî, bâb 1). The description which the Tawrât gives of Muhammad and which according to Bâkhîrî (Tafsîr, Sûra xxiv., bâb 3: do. Bâyqûn, bâb 50) has passed in part into Sûra xlvii. 34; xlvi. 8, in the form given, loc. cit., proves to be only a rather inaccurate paraphrase of Is. xiii. 1-4 (cf. similar passages in Ibn Sa'd, vili. 87 sqq.). In Bâkhîrî, Tawhîd, bâb 34, 47:

Mâsûh al-Sâlih, bâb 17, the Abî al-Tawrât in a judicious moulded on the parable of the labourers and their hire, complains that the reward of those who obey the Quddî is greater than theirs, although the former are "less in work" again "more" than they, a reference to a greater number of the Jewish prescriptions. In explanation of Sûra iii. 87, Bâkhîrî (Mâsûhî, bâb 26; Tafsîr, Sûra iii., bâb 6; Tawhîd, bâb 51) says that the Prophet put the question to the Jews asking how they dealt with adulterers. They tried to give him a wrong answer and to conceal from him the passage in the Tawrât, in which the punishment of stoning is prescribed (Corintius, xxi. 26 sqq.) but they did not succeed. According to Ibn Mâdjâl, Mîsqâl Sâhadât, bâb 39, it is said in the Tawrât "The wages in the honour of mealtimes" a sentence which sacrifices the Jewish command to wash the hands before meals to the Târîkh, in which the Jewish students of the scriptures also claim to find it indicated (Julin, fol. 166 sqq.).

The Qur'ân allusions early assumed in Muslim scholars the desire to have a closer acquaintance with the contents of the Tawrât, a knowledge which was however not without its dangers because it brought out certain contradictions which existed between the Qur'ân and the Biblical revelation. How this danger was to be met, the Prophet himself gives a hint in an utterance several times quoted by Bâkhîrî (Tawhîd, bâb 51; Tafsîr, bâb 21; Tafsîr, Sûra ii., bâb 31): the Abî al-Kâfîrî were in the habit of explaining the Hebrew text of the Tawrât to the Muslims in Arabic, whereupon the Prophet commanded the latter *Declare ye the statement of the Abî al-Kâfîrî neither true nor false but say 'we believe in Allâh and what He has revealed'*, an utterance, which Bâkhîrî, as the title of his paragraph shows, wants to be able to apply to the decision of the question whether the translation of the holy scriptures of foreign religions into Arabic is permitted. While in Bâkhîrî, Mîsqâl Sâhadât, bâb 29, asking members of another faith about the substance of their revelations is deprecated, just as they should put no questions to Muslims about the contents of the Qur'ân, there is no lack of references to distinguished men of piety (Ibn Sa'd, vii. 179) who studied the Tawrât in the original or even (op. cit., p. 161) had read it through to the end in a week. The numerous quotations from the Tawrât, which cannot be identified in the Pentateuch, preserved in Hadîth, canonical and extra-canonical, as well as in edifying literature, have tempted Chishâkhî (M., P. O. E., iv. 39 sqq.) to the untenable thesis that there was a book called Tawrât different from the Hebrew Târîkh, from which these quotations were taken: in reality the passages in question are either pure invention or inaccurately modelled on sayings in the Bible of the Talmud. An intimate knowledge of the text of certain parts of the Târîkh is shown by some chronological or genealogical statements about the Biblical period, such as are given by Ibn Ithâr (d. 150 = 767) in his Ma'dîkî, while Ibn Hâjîm (d. 213 = 828) in his unpublished Kîthî al-Târîkh, quoting Wahb b. Munabbîh (d. 110 = 786), gives certain Biblical names not only in their Hebrew but also in their Syriac form. Thus the statements of Musâlim tradition by the Biblical text is recorded in his Kîthî al-Mekdiyîf, p. 13, by Ibn Kâtalîn (d. 276 = 889) who also gives in this
work-word for word quotations from Genesis; the biblical quotations in others of his works do not always correspond exactly to the original and the same is true of the quotations in Ḭāḏit, al-Kadd ṣāla’u-ṇ-Naṣīṣ. On the other hand, in another contemporary of Ibn Katala, the convert to Islam, 'Ali b. Rabi’a al-Taibri, we have many literal quotations from all parts of the Old Testament canon in his Book of Religion and Empire, written about 240 (854-855) (ed. by A. Mignan); if this work really belongs to him; cf. Eouyez, in M.E.O., x, 242 sqq.; some also are to be found in the Rifā’i of 'Abū al-Maṣūḥ b. Iḥāṣā al-Kindī. While the text of the Bible was accessible without difficulty to converts like 'Ali b. Rabi’a, the biblical quotations in authors born Muslims were either learned translations from the Jews or Christians or from another Arabic translation of the Bible. Ahmad b. 'Abd Allāh b. Sa‘īd al-Indjī (whose relationship to 'Abd Allāh b. Sa‘īd, the Jewish convert of the time of the Prophet, cannot be certainly established) is said to have made one such, notably a translation of the Tawrāt, and according to the Phrēiēíst, p. 22, in the reign of Herūs al-Rāḥῑd. Three further translations are mentioned by Māḏḏ (Ṭanbih, p. 112): that of the Nestorian Ḥannā b. Isḥāq (d. 260 = 873-874) based on the LXX and two by the learned Jews Abū Kāthīr (between d. 321 = 933, or 329 = 941) and Sa‘īd b. Yussīf al-Fayyūmī, best known under the name of Sa‘īdāy al-Gūn (d. 331 = 943) from the original Hebrew. Of all these translations only that of Sa‘īdāy has survived (ed. Lohriacut, Paris 1893) and the only other of the period of existence is one made in Spain in 943 (956) by a Latin of all later translations from the Coptic, Syrian or Hebrew by Christians and Samaritans, bibliographical details are given in the article "Biblidēvēsēmata, Arabisēs", in Herog: Realencyklopädie. Sura vii. 156 firmly convinced believers that the Tawrāt contained a prophecy of the coming of Muhammad. Attempts to prove this go back to the earliest period of Islam (see below) but it is not till the middle of the third century that definite verses of the Pentateuch and other books of the Old Testament are quoted in a literal translation and interpreted as prophecies of Muhammad’s coming. From an unnamed work of Ibn Katala, Ibn al-Dawwār, in his Kitāb al-Wafā’ quotes several passages of this kind and many others are given about the same time by 'Ali b. Rabi’a al-Taibri (see above) and these recur again and again in the apologetics and polemics of the following centuries with greater or less completeness. From the Pentateuch the verses Gēmit, xvi. 9-12; xvii. 20; xx. 21; Dent, xviii. 18; xxxii. 2, 12, play a prominent part in these polemics. Since according to Gēmit, xxi. 21, Farn was the abode of Ishmael, and according to Sura ii. 119 he stayed in Mecca, Farn is identified with Mecca. On the basis of the same identification, Dent, xxxii. 2 is referred to Muḥammad, as is xviii. 18, and in xxxii. 2 a reference to the Kultuṣ al-Nabīmūs is found. Even in the Qur’ān we find the Jews reproached with "displacing phrases from their context" (iv. 45; v. 16, 45) and an example is given in iv. 45; further they are charged with having forgotten or concealing a part of what had been revealed to them (v. 16; iii. 64; vi. 94). We have already had from Ḫāḏit an example of this concluding: the Jews wished to keep from Muḥammad the verse of the Tawrāt which prescribes the punishment of stoning for adultery. The reproof of "altering the words" is more precisely defined by Buḥāṣ, Zāḥiḥa, bāb 29, who says that the "possessors of the scripture" had altered the book of Allāh with their own hands and said it was Allāh’s. Not all Muslim apologists go so far, however, as to assert deliberate falsification of the text; the wilder school ascribes to the Jews only distortions of the meaning. The most distinguished representative of the stronger view is Ibn Hāṁū (d. 456 = 1064) who raises objections to no less than 57 passages in the Tawrāt and collects the impossibilities and contradictions which he had found in them. Bibliography (so far as not given in the article) W. Rudolph, Die Abhängigkeit der Koran von Judäum und Christentum, p. 13, 54 sqq.; J. Horovitz, Keramische Untersuchungen, Berlin-Leipzig 1926, p. 71; òo., in lit., xii., 298; M. Steinschneider, Die polemischen und apologetischen Literatur in arabischer Sprache, I. Goldziher, in Z.D.M.G., xxiii. 341 sqq.; òo., in K. E. f., xxvii. 793; òo., in Zeitschr. f. Wiss. u. Christen, xxx. 315 sqq.; Grimmkunck, Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft, p. 100 sqq.; M. Lichthein, Die prophetische quäst düstur legendār, Leipzig 1893; G. Rothstein, Die bibliographie arabie anomoum, p. 49 sqq.; A. Spangenberg, Leben und Lehre Muḥammadis, l. 56; G. Graf, Die christlichen-arabische Literatur; M. Steinschneider, Die arabische Literatur der Juden, s. 243; M. Schreiner, in Z.D.M.G., xiii. 501 sqq.; òo., in Kolos Memorial Volume, p. 496 sqq.; C. Brockelmann, in Z.A.T.W., xx. 136 sqq.; H. Hirschfeld, in J.C.R.E., xxii. 260 sqq.; òo., in J.C.R.A., xxv. 202 sqq.; W. Bucher, òo., in J.C.R.A., p. 242; Graf, in Bibliol. Zeitschr., xxxix. 193 sqq. 291 sqq.; Di Matteo, in R.S.O., p. 391 sqq.; Barrett, xxxviii. 64 sqq. (J. Horovitz). TAWRIYA (A.), syllepsis in oratory, a figure of rhetoric (bęb), which consists in using a word having two different meanings, one obvious and the other secondary, selecting the second sense by the first so that it is the first sense which strikes the listener first. Tawriya is called ḫānē (dis-simulation) because he who uses it conceals the remotest meaning he had in view by the primary sense which is seized on first. It is sometimes called ḫānē ("act of concealing or masking"). There are two kinds of tawriya: 1. that which is "deprived" of everything that might indicate the meaning one has in view (mudīfīr, for example "The Merciful is seated (ṣanwīl) on his throne") (Kūrān, xx. 4); here the remoter sense of "to make oneself master of" is in mind and there is nothing in the phonetic which may suit the nearer sense of "to rest; to establish oneself, to sit"; 2. that which includes something which suits the obvious sense, for example "And the heavens which We built with power" (Kūrān, ii. 47), literally "and the heavens which we built with our hands" in which one notices that "hand" here, taken in the secondary sense of "power," is accompanied by the verb "is build" which suits its primary meaning of "part of the body at the end of the arms." The figure is also used by the Persians who seem to have borrowed it from the Arabs. Bibliography: Fahṣīr al-Dīn Muḥammad b. ʿUmar al-Rāzī, Nihāyāt al-Lähīs fī Dirāyāt
The work consists of the single sana/'s of over six hundred sabtis and is arranged in the same way as other works of the kind. It contains 2,767 traditions; this means that its bulk is about one tenth of Bahkšt's Šabih or 1/3 of Ibn Hazáb's Musnād. The contents cover the whole field of classical ṣafiyy; all subjects of some importance are represented, though on a moderate scale. It may be remarked that the materials concerning some persons who played a part in Muhammad's history are perhaps more scanty than in any of the other collections; there are e.g. no traditions on Khudzaid, Zainab bint Dájir, or Maysir b. Sufyân, 'Abd Allâh b. al-As, Abî Makki b. Asârî, 'Abd Allâh b. Ṣülûk, Abî Ubayy, 'Abd Allâh b. Sâlih, Ibn Sa'îd, 'Abî Mâlik, Khâlid b. al-Walîd, Sa'd b. Ma'dâh, Salmân f. al-Farsi.

The book contains scarcely any tradition which is not to be found in the classical collections; in rare cases the wording may be helpful in understanding of difficult traditions.


(T. J. WENINK)

TAYYUMM (a), the recommendation, or permission to perform the ritual ablution with sand instead of water in certain cases, is based on two passages in the Kûran, Sûra iv. 46 and 6. The latter passage runs as follows:

And ye may be impure, wash yourselves. But if ye be sick, or on a journey or if ye come from the privy or ye have touched women and ye find no water, take fine clean sand and rub your faces and hands with it. Allâh will not put a difficulty upon you but He will make you pure and complete. His favour upon you, perhaps that ye may give thanks. Sûra iv. 46 is somewhat more briefly expressed but the law is formulated there in almost identical words except that the phrase "with it" is lacking from the sentence "sand rub your faces and hands with it." According to the Shâfs (see Bai'dârî on Sûra iv. 46) "with it" means that there must be some sand in the hand. The Ḥanâfî on the other hand consider the rite valid even if the hand has only been touched by a smooth stone.

In his Mūsâ b. al-Kâdîrî, Cairo 1279, i. 143 sqq. al-Shârâ'î gives 14 such points of difference between the maqāds; they refer to a. the material (earth, sand etc.); b. the obligation to look for water; c. the question how far the face and hands are to be rubbed and into what legal categories these rubbings fall; d. the question which one should do if he finds water after he has already begun the ṣalât; e. the question whether a single tayyûnum suffices for two ṣarî' rites; f. the question whether one who has performed the tayyûnum before his ṣalât may act as imám for persons who have performed the ablution with water; g. the question whether tayyûnum is permitted before the ṣalât at festivals and for the dead, if one is not on a journey; h. the question whether one who is not travelling, and has difficulty in getting water for a ṣalât the legal time for which is about to expire, should
repeat the qal'āt performed after tayammum as soon as he has found water; i.e. the question whether it is permitted to use the little water one has for a partial washing and do tayammum for the rest; ii. the question what is to be done in cases of injury; iii. the question whether the qal'āt is to be repeated in four cases, in which it has been performed after tayammum.

There is agreement among the mālikīs on the point that tayammum is only done for the face or hands, whether after a minor or major haddāth [q.v.], whether in place of a washing of all or any parts of the body is a matter of indifference (al-Nawawī, on Muslim, Saḥḥā; Cairo 1283, i. 406).

From various traditions it is evident that 'Abd Allah b. Mas'ūd and 'Omar had misgivings about declaring the qal'āt valid after tayammum in cases of mundhāb (cf. e.g. Bukhārī, Tirmidhī, Ḥadīthī, b. 71; Muslim, Ḥadīth, tr. 110). On the other hand the saintly 'Abd Allāh Al-Barrā, who had similar misgivings, is made to say that the Prophet had disposed of them by saying: "fine sand is a means of purification when one cannot find water, even if he should look ten years for it" (Al-Badr b. Hanbal, Musnad, v. 146 sg.).

The permission is said to have been revealed on an expedition of Muhammad or was held up so long looking for a necklace of A'shā's that its water became exhausted.

In the Tāgbūt (Foraker, fol. 152) a permit to use sand in case of want of water similar to that of the Qur'ān is given and Credernus, Annulales, ed. Hylander, Basle 1566, p. 206, tells how an occasion in a journey through the desert, Christian baptism was performed with sand.


TÁZÁ, a town in eastern Morocco, about 60 miles E.N.E. of Fās, in a great depression, called the "trough of Táza" which separates the Rif from the northern spurs of the Central Atlas. To some authors of the middle ages (Jāθbārī, al-Marrākūshī), Taza marks the boundary between the extreme and central Maghrib. The great importance of the great natural route from the east to west through this depression, the strategic and economic advantages secured by the occupation of the site in part defended by the ravine of a wādī, must have early encouraged a foundation of some importance at Taza. Prehistoric settlements have been discovered there and many tombs of uncertain date in the cliffs on which the town is built.

In the beginning of the middle ages (9th-10th century) Taza was the most important settlement in the region occupied by one of the groups of the Mknīnī, semi-nomadic Berbers. According to Ibn Khalīdūn, it was they who founded the ribāt of Taza. This statement is evidently inaccurate in this form. Taza was not yet reckoned a ribāt. It must nevertheless have played an important part in the defence against the Idrīsids as partisans of the Fātimids of Kairawān, then against the Fātimids as partisans of the Omayyads of Cordova. Taza however, as a fortified town and a ribāt, was properly a foundation of the Almohads. In 528 (1133) 'Abd al-Mu'min, having made himself master of the High and Central Atlas, had arrived in the depression of Taza. There the conqueror seemed to have suspended his advance. It was only a little later that he tackled the ranges of the Rif and did not yet attempt to descend into the plains to meet Almoravid forces. He seems however to have felt the necessity of holding the important strategic point, of building a citadel there and placing a garrison in it. Those who held this frontier post of the Almohad dominions were naturally assimilated to the men of the ribātu' (we know that the struggle against the Almohads had the attractions of a holy war). To call the new fortress a ribāt, was giving it the value of a pious work. As a matter of fact Taza never played the religious part of a ribāt. It remained, as before, a military post guarding the road to Fās. A great part of the ramparts built by 'Abd al-Mu'min seems to have survived. It is a curtain of rubble flanked by towers unequal in size, with the remains of an outer wall in front of it at places.

For lack of defenders, Almohad Taza hardly made any resistance to the Marinids who took it in 612 (1216). Its new lords also devoted attention to its defences; they restored the great mosque on two occasions (1294 and 1353) and endowed it with madressas. In their time Taza for once at least did its duty in guarding the pass, when it was attacked by the Sulṭān of Tlemcen, Abbās Hammādh II, who besieged it for a week in 734 (1328) and was forced to retrace his steps.

In the beginning of the 16th century, we have a description of Taza by Léo Africanus. He regards it as the third town of the kingdom; it was now administered as a kind of amān allotted to the second son of the Wālid Sulṭān of Fās. The population, which numbered about 5,000 householders, including many Jews, lived under a continual menace from the mountainians around.

To secure control of the springs which watered the town, and to protect himself against the attacks of the Tāraks of Algiers, a Sa'diān Shārīf — perhaps Abūn al-Manṣūr — provided it with a ābābīna, which still stands in the S.E. corner of the enceinte. It is noteworthy however that in the result this fortress of Taza never served as a defence against enemies from the east, but rather became a citadel ready at hand for every pretender who rebelled in those regions against the Makhzen who had built it (H. Basset and Campardon, This was the case in 1596 when al-Nṣir, a nephew of al-Manṣūr, rebelled against the Sulṭān and made Taza his base of operations, and again in 1664 when the first of the Alawī Sulṭāns al-Rashid made it his headquarters for his attack on Fās, and in 1673 when Abūn b. Muḥrīs held out there against his uncle, Sulṭān Mawlay Ismā'īl. Lastly in 1902 the agitator Abū Hāmidī there in his struggle with 'Abd al-'Aris made Taza his capital. It was occupied by French troops on May 10, 1914.

TAZIR (A.), punishment, intended to prevent the culprit from relapsing, to reform him (fa 'l-taṣir).—The Qur'an does not know this kind of punishment; on the contrary it classifies several transgressions afterwards punished with taṣir merely as sins, e.g. slander, for which there is no hadd punishment (Sūrah iv. 112) and the bearing of false witness (Sūrah ii. 283; iv. 134). Tradition has very little to record about it. According to one tradition of Abū Allāh b. 'Omar, in the time of the Prophet, Abū Bakr, those who bought provisions wholesale without measures or weights in order to sell them again were punished by whipping (Bukhārī, Ḥadīth, bāb 43): disregarding the development in legal theory of this tradition by the commentators, it is clearly one of the many traditions which attack speculation in the necessities of life (cf. C. H. Becker, Pa prophyl Schett-Reinhardt, Heidelberg 1906, p. 51); it is in any case based on later usage in commerce. According to another tradition of Ibn ʿAbbas, the Prophet is said to have threatened with 20 lashes any man who insulted another by calling him soft or effeminate (Ibn Mūjaʿa, Ḥadīth, bāb 15). Very frequently on the other hand we find a tradition of Abū Burdā, of Abū al-Raḥmān b. Jaʿābir, of Abū Humayrā, according to which the maximum which can be inflicted except for hadd is 10 lashes (Bukhārī, Ḥadīth, bāb 43; Muslim, Ḥadīth, tr. 391; Ibn Mūjaʿa, Ḥadīth, bāb 52; Ibn ʿAbd Allāh, bāb 466; iv. 45). The traditions however can only have arisen later in the difference of opinion about the amount of taṣir, especially as the later law-schools admit a much larger number of lashes. In any case taṣir is a kind of punishment, which only found its way into Muslim law at a comparatively late date. For this view it is noteworthy that tradition does not connect the later technical sense with the verb 'azzār. It is true that it occurs in the above mentioned tradition in Ibn Mūjaʿa, Ḥadīth, bāb 32: ʿaṭṭārāt; but in a tradition of Ansār b. Mālik the verb azzurra is used with reference to the hadd punishment for drinking wine in contrast to its later technical sense. (Ibn ʿAbd Allāh, bāb 180; a duplicate of this tradition in Ibn ʿAbd Allāh, bāb 115 men ḥizāra in this passage.)

According to the ḥadīth-books, taṣir is inflicted for such transgressions as have no hadd punishment and no hadīāt prescribed for them; whether it is a question of disobedience of God such as neglect of the fivefold ṣalāt or of fasting, or a question of crime against man such as deceit, bearing false witness, theft of an article of trifling value (cf. sānr) etc. In the second group however there is also a breach of the divine law (ḥadd Allāh) as well as the breach of man's law (ḥadd al-nās).

The most remarkable condition for the application of taṣir is that the delinquent must be in full possession of his mental faculties (Ṣāfī). The kind and amount of taṣir is left entirely to the discretion of the judge; he may administer a public reprimand, expose him in a public place, banish him, confiscate his property (but there is a difference of opinion, for the goods and chattels of a Muslim are regarded by some as inviolable in this case), throw him into prison or have him whipped. Except in the Mālikī school however, the number of lashes must not be more than in the hadd punishment; according to the Shāfiʿī school, the maximum for a freeman is 39, for a slave 19; according to the Ḥanafīs, the maximum is 75 (some take the hadd for drinking wine, others the hadd for slander [ḥadd] as the maximum); the Ḥanbalis on the other hand only allow to lashes, relying on the above tradition. There are also very minute and varying rules regarding the administering of the lashes in the different schools. As the primary object of the taṣir is reformation, and the degree of punishment to cause this varies with each individual, men are classified systematically by some jurists for this purpose. Al-Khaṭṭāb, for example, distinguishes four classes: 1. the most distinguished of the upper classes, i.e. officials and officers of the highest rank; for them a personal communication from the judge through a confidential messenger is sufficient; 2. the upper classes, i.e. the intellectual and personal elite and the wealthy; they are summoned before the judge and admonished by him; 3. the middle classes, i.e. the merchants; they are punished by imprisonment; 4. the lower strata of the people; they are punished with imprisonment or flogging. Other jurists however reject this external classification according to social status and lay stress on the inner worth of the individual, his attitude to religion and his mode of life.

If it seems advisable, the judge can completely remit the taṣir, in so far as it concerns the divine law; but the portion based on the law of man is not dropped even if the person injured renounces it. The process of trial is simple in contrast to that for hadd. Taṣir is inflicted on a confession, which however cannot be withdrawn, or on a statement of two witnesses, one of whom may even be a woman; ṣuḥbāt al-nāṣ ṣuḥbāt (cf. ṣulūk) is also admitted. According to some, it is even enough if the judge alone has knowledge of the transgression.

How these cases for punishment left by the sherīʿas to unfettered judgment were dealt with by those in authority is very clearly seen from the stories in the ʿAdab Allāh (cf. Rescher in ʿAd., 1919, 65 sqq.). On the other hand the attempt was made to escape this arbitrary punishment by bribery. Frequently also the secular legislation of rulers interfered, regulating the sentence left to the judge's discretion by laying down definite punishments for a series of transgressions, as is the case in the Kanduğ-ensiye of the Turkish Sultāns, where moreover a fine is always provided for besides the flogging (cf. Mahomed Ila Ḳanduğ-ensiye in M. O. G., i. 1922, 13 sqq.).

The term drama can only be applied with reservation to the series of sometimes 40–50 independent tableaux which constitute the performance. The events, especially the actual death of Husain, are prophesied from the beginning in all details by Gabriel to the early prophets and Muhammad himself, foreseen in dreams, foretold and afterwards narrated again and again.

The characters in the play are, in addition to the angels, principally taken from the story of redemption including the Old and New Testament. Their fate is frequently compared with that of the martyr. Jacob and Joseph confess that Husain and his children have suffered more than they have; Eve, Rachel and Mary understand the mother's anguish of Fatima; Muhammad, given by the angel of death the choice of surrendering to him his little son Ibrahim or the little Husain, abandons to him the former so that the latter may be preserved to die as a redeemer. Muhammad and Ali are only brought in as subsidiary to Husain, who even as a child plays the principal part in their thoughts and hours of death. The brother Hasan and his relation to Husain is very much idealised. Of the latter's nearer relations, there appear in addition to the spirit of his dead mother Fatima, his sisters Kuthum and Zainab, his wife Shahbani, daughter of Yezedgird III, and his son Ali Akbar, who falls in battle. Very popular is the wedding of his and Shahbabani's daughter Fatiha with Husain's son al-Kaisim celebrated just before the catastrophe, in which the bridegroom is almost immediately killed. The death of a little son and a small nephew who are struck by an arrow, while clasped to his bosom aims at producing a great effect on the spectators, while the surviving son Ali Zain al-Abidin plays the main part in the mournful procession which brings the head and the captured women and children to the caliph Yazid I. If this procession spends a night on the way in a Christian monastery, the prior pronounces the Muslim confession faith before the head. Similar scenes are introduced with Jews and pagans and with Christian ambassadors at the caliph's court. The humility of a lion which pays homage to the head of the martyr produces a great effect on the audience.

More important, and also more serious, is the fact that these spectacles produce a completely biased view of the figures of early Muslim history upon the Shi`as; such as Salamai-Fartir, Abu Dharr, Bilal, al-Hurr who goes over to Husain, all on the Shi`a side and the enemies of Abi Bakr and Umar who are represented as depriving Fatima of her inheritance, the oasis of Fadak, with cruel blows. No distinction is made among the non-Shi`as; 'Ali's slayer Ibn Muljam is not for example branded as a Kharijij [q.v.]; his murder likewise is laid to the charge of the Sunnis. Ibn Sa'd, the leader of the hostile force, Shammar who is said to have dealt the fatal blow, and especially Yazid I are painted in the blackest colours. The fury against the Sunnis is so pronounced that non-Muslims are tolerated as spectators but certainly not non-Shi`a Muslims. National hatred of Arabs (and also Turks) is seen in such scenes as that in which Husain's widow Shahbabani returns to her home in Persia or the young Fatiha is rescued by a Persian king.

The scenes mainly written in the hazadi-metre have grown out of various sources, but the material...
and the words are often old: verses of the Qur’ān, interpreted from the Sahāi point of view, and particularly old traditions with Sahāi bias, which are clothed in a form calculated greatly to impress the hearers; sentences from the khitfas are found also as the basis of Tātār criticisms. Whole sermons, curses and prayers are already found in the earliest Sahāi’s literature (cf. Shāh A.), in Ibn Bahlīya, Kūlānī, Shāhī Shāhī, especially in the chapters Ziř-ša’t (visits to tombs) in the books on pilgrimage and the inanimate and also in the maqālim works. There also are found many hymns, while on the other hand songs of lamentation are still written in modern times.

Judged from the effect on the spectators the tāzīya is a most impressive spectacle. Strangers, who cannot appreciate the inner significance of it, may find its broad realism repellent, especially in the closing scenes where the decapitated head is the principal speaker and actor. They might easily get the idea that the spectators are simply revelling in the pain and cruelty of the spectacle. The real significance can only be ascertained from an unprejudiced examination of what is actually said. As already indicated the plays are full of dogmatism with emphasis on Sahāi’s hatred. It is possible that with the primitive nature of the production, touching and exciting scenes are introduced simply for their own sake. But the leading idea is a soteriology that rules everything and is brought out, in harmony with the text books but in much more clear fashion. Here we will only refer the reader to one of these mysteries easily accessible in Chodrko (see Bibl.). In the very first scene ‘The Messenger of God’ Ghabriel, representing Ḥasan as sharing his brother’s fate, announces to Muhammad: ‘Thy two grandchild shall fall under the haws of a very contemptible enemy, not because they have in some way transgressed God’s laws; no, the filth of sin has never soiled a member of thy family, 0 Phoenix of the Universe!’ Rather are they sacrificed for the salvation of the people who adore them so that the hawr of the martyrs shall eternally reflect the brilliance of the elect of God. If this desirest the forgiveness of the sins of these avenging peoples, do not oppose the two roses of thy garden being plucked before the time!’ (p. 37.) And after this theme of the vicarious death for the forgiveness of sins has been again and again clearly formulated, the mystery comes to its logical conclusion in the last scene, in which the whole hierarchy of patriarchs from Adam to Ḥasan’s mother Fāṭima is assembled round the sacred head. To Fāṭima her father Muhammad (p. 215) says: ‘Then are right to weep for thy slain child soaked in his noble blood; but there is a secret about the true reason of this martyrdom; as the price of this martyrdom God, on the Day of Judgement will give into our hands the keys of Paradise and of Hell’. How old such ideas of this salvation by intercession are, is seen from the prayers of those ‘penitents’ under Sulaiman b. Šurad who fortified themselves to fight to the death against the Omāya-ids by doing penance at Ḥasan’s grave four years after the battle of Kerbela; they wanted to atone for their guilt which they had brought upon themselves by not having fought or died with the dead Ḥasan. One of them, ‘Abd Allāh b. Wāli al-Taimī, calls Ḥasan and his brother and father the ‘bond of reconciliation’ (maqālim) with God on the Day of Judgement’. Šurad, ii.

Tāzīya,—Tebessa

437. records this from Abū Mīkhīf but on the authority of an ‘Alī, Ḥusain’s grandson Muḥammad al-Bakrī, through a Ṣafārī authority Saylān b. Shāhī; but the latter, generally considered a Zaidī, does not belong to an ultra-Shī’a school. They

In their elaborate form, the tāzīya are recent and at one time could not be carried through without opposition from the mollah on account of their crude dogma and irreverent accomplishment of dances and processions. Ahmad Onārīn who witnessed great celebrations in Ardabīl in 1637 does not mention tāzīya, nor does J. B. Tavernier (cf. Vierges-Jährliche Reliquienbezahlung, Nürnberg 1681, p. 178 sqq.) mention any special play among the Mūḥarrar ceremonies in Ḥisbān in 1667; on the other hand it was noted for example by J. Motte in 1811 in Tebrīz. It is probable that ancient rites of earlier mythological festivals like the Tamūs and Aḏoniss cults have survived in the subsidiary plays which in India have been adapted by some Sannā and even Hindūs; the banners for the processions, a large staff, the hand which is carried round by those who examine the festival and is now interpreted as the banner of Ḥusain which is cut off, have kept their ancient prototypes. That the ignorance of the sacred properties has altered is shown by the fact that among the Mūḥarrar’s the Šāhīya is called the ‘marriage house of Kūrīn’, in many places there are accompanying rites with water, which were originally indulgence: the throwing of the Šāhīya into water among the Indian Mūḥārrars may be due to Hindū influence. Even the style of the mourning garments is partly influenced by earlier forms. But the passion play itself is the popular expression of that religious feeling which has its roots in the historic fact of Kerbela.


TAWZIJ. [See Nickl.]

TOCH. [See Thad.]

TEBESSA, a town in Algeria, 106 miles S. E. of Constantine and 12 from the Tunisian frontier in 35° 25' N. lat. and 8° 35' E. long. (Greenwich); the population is 16,340, of whom 1,614 are European. It is the capital of a mixed commune of 345 sq. miles, corresponding to the territory formerly occupied by the confederation of the Nūṣaṭa, with 56,992 inhabitants, of whom 56,963 are natives.

Tebessa lies in the centre of a plateau of an
average height of 3,000 feet bounded by the massifs of the Osme and of the Djebel Dukhn, eastern extensions of the Asir, well watered by wadis coming from the mountains; this region was once covered by dense forests; now almost entirely cleared of trees except in the immediate neighbourhood of the town, which is surrounded by a belt of gardens; it is very well fitted for growing cereals, which is done by both natives and Europeans. This circumstance, along with the position of the town at the intersection of the roads from the plateau of Numidia to central and southern Tunisia, made Tebessa an important market. Since the beginning of the 14th century the exportation of the phosphates worked in the vicinity of the town and sent southwards by road to Sila Ahras has brought increased activity to Tebessa.

Tebessa corresponds to Thvesta, where in 25 B.C. Augustus established the head-quarters of the Third Legion Augusta. The town which grew up around the camp had 30,000 inhabitants by the time of Trajan. Raised to the rank of a colony by Septimius Severus, it was at this time considered the most important and most populous town of Roman Africa next to Carthage. Some writers give it a population of 100,000. It declined after this period. After suffering considerably in the social and religious troubles of the fourth century, it was taken and sacked by the Vandals in the fifth century. Reoccupied by the Byzantines, it was restored by Solomon. He built fortifications around it partly out of materials from old buildings and thus made it a vast citadel. Nevertheless it passed into the hands of the Moors i.e. of the Berbers in 597, then to the Arabs in 682 (45 A.H.) after a battle the memory of which is preserved in the Frisique I'hissiya. Tebessa henceforth shared the destinies of this part of Africa. It belonged to the Aghlabids, to the Fātimids (from whom Abd Yarith took it temporarily), then to the Zirids and the Almohads. The Ghurids took it on two different occasions without being able to hold it permanently. It finally fell to the Hafids who held it for centuries but their hold on it seems always to have been rather precarious. The Turks took it, probably at the end of the 18th century, and put a garrison into it to watch the lands on the Tunisian frontiers which were being disputed by the powerful confederations of the Hafids and the Nasrids. At this date Tebessa consisted of the town itself enclosed in the Byzantine walls and the village of the natives inhabited by the descendants of the marabout Sidi Abd al-Rahman and by freed negro slaves.

The population of the town is very heterogeneous: families originally from the neighbouring small towns of Oukess and Belarbia, immigrants from Tunisia, from Djaili, Kulugia, born of the union of soldiers of the garrison with women of the country. The last element finally became predominant and forced the Hafids to submit to the majority of the population. After the capture of Constantine by the French in 1837, the Turkish garrison fled into Tunisia and the town was left defenceless against the attacks of the nomads. To put an end to this state of the notables appealed to the French. French troops appeared before Tebessa in 1842, and again in 1846; a permanent garrison was established there in 1851 and a European colony soon began to gather round the military establishments.


(G. Yves)

TEHERAN (Tehran), 1. the capital of Persia.

The name of the town has been changed many times during the period of Persian history. Teherān' is an alternative spelling.

In 1828 the population of Teheran was about 30,000 and the city was a centre of trade and commerce. The population of the town has since increased considerably and is now over 100,000. The city is situated on the Euphrates, about 250 miles from the sea, and is surrounded by a wall which is about 10 miles in circumference. The interior is level and fertile, with a number of wells and springs. The climate is mild and healthy, with an average temperature of 65° F. in summer and 45° F. in winter. The soil is well suited for agriculture, and the town is noted for its wool and silk productions. The chief exports are wool, silk, cotton, and leather goods. The town is also a centre of learning, with several colleges and universities.

H. Schindler, East. Pers. ish. London 1896, p. 131, sees Teherān, tahrān "plains" (Vullers, 146, tahrān "plains, desertum"). In order to explain tahrān we have to start from its final form tahr, but certainty will only be attained when the word in its original form tahr is found in documents. The preservation of -ahr (-/ahr) shows a word of the northern group in the south. Schindler compares the name Teherān to that of the mountain Shāmār (written Shāmāri, below) in which he sees a plural of Shāmar, "mountain on which the water is kept to supply the plain" (Bahrān-i Shāmār, without an example). Shāmar n. a rd means "pond, reservoir" (Vullers, 146) which gives quite good sense. In any case the name must have a common origin with that of the Dālam castle Shāmārī, cf. Ramān.

Position. Teherān lies in 35° 25' 28" E. Long. and 35° 4' 68" North Lat. in a depression (mound) below the outer spurs of the Alborz. The pass of Sād-i Tawčāl, which is a dozen miles north of the town, is 12,000 feet high. This chain does not form the watershed with the Caspian basin; from behind Sād-i Tawčāl rise the rivers of Karad and Džajdar, both of which run towards the Central Persia desert. A southern spur of the chain runs along the right bank of the Džajdar and forms a barrier to the east of the plain of Teherān. It is called Sād-i Tawčāl (mountain shaped). The little town of Shah 'Abd al-'Azm lies at its southern end. The ruins of Raq (q.v.) lie between this town and Teherān. The altitude of Teherān is 3510 feet (H. Schindler). The ground rises im-
mediately to the north of the town and forms 3 stages from Teheran to Kaš-ši Kaylūr (3 miles), from there to Zarqan and another 3 miles (alt. 4,500 feet), from there to the foot of Tawālā.

Here on the slope of the mountain is the verdant district of Shimīrān, which not only gives a cool retreat for the people of Teheran in the summer (May-Sept.), but also provides the city's water-supply. Teheran has no river; water is brought to it by some thirty sleep subterranean conduits (kānār; kārān) from 5 to 10 miles in length, which come from the springs in the mountain.

The climate of Teheran, agreeable in winter, is unhealthy in summer; typhus and other fevers and dysentery are endemic there; every evening mist rises from the soil which is soaked by irrigation and envelops the town. The climate is dry. According to the observations of H. Schindler, Klimatafel aus Persien, Pet. Mitt., 1909, p. 361-370, made in Teheran during 17 consecutive years (1892–1908), the annual snowfall and rainfall varied between 134.25 (1901) and 330.75 (1904) millimetres. The winter of 1894–1895 was distinguished by a complete absence of snow or rain. During the summer of 1905-1906 there was not a drop of rain. The snowfall in winter varied between 16.50 and 96.25 mm. The average fall in mm. and the temperatures °C per month were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>°C</th>
<th></th>
<th>°C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>32.26</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>34.20</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>46.03</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>28.12</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>47.72</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>Sept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>35.56</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>Oct.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean annual temperature is 16.9 °C with the extreme limits of +42.3 and —16.1. Other meteorological observations are given in Brugesh, II., p. 475–481 and in Stahl, p. 52.

The choice of Teheran as a capital is represented by certain writers (Kaneir, Curzon) as proof of the wisdom of the Qadjar who wanted to control the northern frontier. In reality, the choice of Teheran was dictated primarily by the desire of the Turkish dynasty of the Qadjar not to be too remote from their ancestral seat of Astarābād and to remain in contact with the Turkish tribes of northern Persia. The majority of early travellers (Olivier, v. 87; Dupré, ii. 187; Flandin, i. 235) emphasise the disadvantages of the site of the capital (want of water, bad climate, distance from the great roads). Some of these defects have been considerably mitigated by the improvements introduced since their day, but the main inconvenience, the eccentric position of the capital, will be felt when the development of the natural resources of the south of Persia will make clear their importance for the life of Persia. The following distances have been calculated by H. Grothe, Persien, Frankfurt 1911, p. 98–99:

- Teheran—Amol 220 miles
- Teheran—Tabriz 360
- Teheran—Meshhed 575
- Teheran—Muhammad 660
- Teheran—Bushahr 764
- Teheran—Bandar-Abba 890

Routes. Fairly good natural roads connect the capital with the provinces. For communication with Māzasdār a road passable only by horses and miles, was built by the Austrian engineer Gasteiger Khaṭ in 1875. Between 1883 and 1892 a carriage road was begun by the Persians and finally finished by the English company of Lynch Brothers (95 miles). Communication with Russia used to be by Kārin–Tehrāb–Djehāl-Tbilis. In 1850 a regular line by Russian steamers began to run between Bālāt and Anzali. Although, as the crow flies, the distance between Teheran and the Caspian is only 70 miles, the passage of the Alburz was always very difficult. In 1893 the Russians obtained the concession to build a carriage road from Baghīl to the capital (it was opened as far as Mandal on Jan. 1, 1890, and to Teheran on Sept. 15, 1890). Henceforth the great majority of travellers took this route, which has also become of considerable commercial importance. Since the Russian revolution, all kinds of Russian enterprises have been introduced into Persia. Since 1917 there has been a motor-car service between Teheran and Baghīl, recently continued to Bairist (Syria). An aeroplane service has put Teheran within a day’s journey of Bālāt. Since the accession to power of Rīs Shāh, a plan for a trans-Persian railway has been drawn up and even partly put into execution (1925). It is to connect Teheran on the one hand with the Persian Gulf (Khor-Muṣṭ from Lūrūstān) and on the other with the Caspian (Bandar-Gār vin Fīrzābād).

The province of Teheran. It consists of six districts (H. Schindler): 1. Shahrīyār or the N.W. on the right bank of the Kand; 2. Sawjd-\bula (q.v., No. 2) to the N.W. of Shahrīyār; 3. Pašāhīyā (Pašāhpāyā) to the S.W. of the town in the direction of Rāhāt-Kārān; 4. Warāmin (q.v.) to the S.E.; 5. Shimrān to the north of the town, with 63 flourishing villages, of which the principal is Tādār; the villages of Kohāk (Gulnāk) and Zarqan are occupied by the British and Russian legations respectively, to which they were given in 1835 by Mūhammad Shāh; 6. Kārān, to the north of Shimrān on the upper course of the Dījārjārū. As subdivisions of less importance, the Persian map gives Gīrā immediately to the south of Teheran (with the little town of Shāh ‘Abbāl-al-‘Azm); Lawāsūlū to the east of Shimrān; Kand (Kān) and Sawīlūn to the west of Shimrān; Shahrīstānā to the north of Kand; Aranje between Kand and Kārān.

Early references. De Goeje (Iṣkāh, p. 209) proposed to identify with Teheran the sitān, sitān or bīnūn, mentioned by Iṣkāh, p. 209; Ibn Ḫawkal, p. 366 and Mākaddasī, p. 375. This hypothesis has again been revived by Mūhammad Khān Kāzīnī, sīz., cit., p. 39. But according to Yūltī, I, 769 (although late and not very explicit), the place Bīhān which represented the old site of Rāyī lay 7 farisks (this) from this latter town, while the same geographer places Teheran as one would expect 7 farisks from Rāyī. The earliest reference to Teheran is provisionally that of the Fārsānā, G.M.S., p. 134 (written before 510 = 1116); its author talks highly of the pomegranates of Teheran, also mentioned by al-Samānī (in 555 = 1160), G.M.S., p. 373. But independently of these references, the village of Teheran must have existed before the time of Iṣkāh (in 340). For the Samānī mentions his ancestor ‘Abbāl ‘Abbāl Alī Mūhammad b. ʿAbdāl al-Thirānī al-Rūzī, who died at ‘Askalān in Palestine in 261 (874). According to the Rūḥāl al-Sudūr (written in 599 = 1203), G.
Ambassador Clavijo (ed. St. Petersburg 1881, p. 156; transl. Le Strange, London 1928, p. 166). At this time the province of Raiy was governed by Timur’s son-in-law, the Amir Sulaiman-šah (Zafar-nāma, ii. 591; Clavijo, p. 159, 351; Zuleukan or Cunaleza Mirnose). He lived in Varāmīn (Ya-

The tower of Raiy (Maharset) was not inhabited (“agora deshabitata”). In the tower of Teheran was a representative of the government and there was a house where the king stopped on his visits (“una posada onde el Señor suele estar quando allí venía”). Teheran had no walls.

The Šafavids. Under the Šafavids the capital was moved in turn from Ardabil to Tabriz and then to Kāšān and finally to Isfahān. The district of Raiy was no longer of great importance. There were only two towns of note in it: Varāmīn, which after a brief spell of glory under Shāh Rūḥ had rapidly declined, and Teheran. According to Rūh-Ṣāliḥ Khān (Awačat al-Šafā’ī y Nā’ir, the first visits of the Šafavids to Teheran were due to the fact that their ancestor Saiyid Hamza had been buried there since Shāh Ṣoltān Abūl-ʿAqīq. The prosperity of the town dates from Taḥmāsp I who in 961 built a bazaar in it and a wall (kārā) round it which, according to the Zinat al-Majdī-

The tower of Teheran was a result of the disappearance of other large centres in the neighbourhood. The decline of Raiy dates from its destruction by the Mongols in 617 (1220). In the Mongol period Teheran is occasionally mentioned in the Qāmūs al-Tavārīkh: in 683 (1284). Arghūn, after the victory gained near Ak-Khvādū (Šūmākān, Nusbat al-Kulāk, p. 173) over Yânak, Ahmad Tākhtādžī’s general, arrived at “Tirān of Raiy” (cf. Muhammad Kāshnī, op. cit, p. 38). In 694 (1294) Ṣāḥīb coming from Frīzkūh stopped at “Tirān of Raiy” (Dorn, Aṣūzāy, p. 138). According to the Nusbat al-Kulāk (written in 1340; G. M. S., p. 55), Teheran was a considerable town (mū’āṭir) with a better climate than Raiy. Formerly (mī bāhī) the inhab-

In 958 Teheran was the scene of the execution of Prince Mīrzā, whose enemies had accused him to Shāh Ismā’īl II of aiming at the throne. In 998 (1589) Shāh ‘Abdūs I going against the Uzbek ‘Abd al-Mu’mīn Khān fell severely ill at Teheran (al-ʔalam-dār, p. 473), which enabled the Uzbeks to seize Meqīḥād. It is said that this gave Shāh ‘Abdūs greatest dislike for Teheran. It is however from his time that the building of the palace of Čahār Bāgh dates, the site of which was later occupied by the present citadel (arq). Pietro della Valle visited Teheran in 1618 and found the town larger in area but with a smaller population than Khānābād. He calls it the “town of plain-trees”. At this time a beglerbegi (“gran capo di provincia”) lived in Teheran; his jurisdiction extended as far as Frīzkūh. In 1627 Sir Thomas Herbert estimated the number of houses in Teheran at 3,000.

The Afgānīs. On the eve of the Afgānī invasion Shāh Ḥusain Šafavi made a stay in Teheran and it was here that he received Durri-Efendi, the ambassador of Aḥmad III (at the beginning of 1720; cf. Relation du Dourri Efendi, Paris 1810).
Here also was dismissed and blinded the grand vizier Fath 'Ali Khan Fīrūz al-Dawla ("Athenar") of the Europeans) which precipitated the debate; cf. Kremlicko, [not by Du Cerceaux], *Histoire du règne de Fath 'Ali Khan*, 1742, i. 215. Shah Husain a.i. 1136 returned to Isfahan (June 1, 1721); La Mamye Clairec, i. 200) to lose his throne. Tahmâb II made a stay in Tehran in August 1725, but, on the approach of the Afghans, he fled to Māzandaran. European writers say that Tehran resisted and Asfārī lost many men (Krusslak, *et. vte.*, p. 351; La Mamye Clairec, *Histoire du Perse*, 1750, ii. 230; Hanway, *et. c*., p. 334). Some time afterwards Tehran fell in spite of the feebler attempt by Fath 'Ali Khan Kādata to relieve the town (cf. Olivier, v. 89 and *Mīr al-Dawla*). According to this last source, the *Dārūn-i Yā 'Abdallāh* and *Dārūn-i-ye *Aَاhl gates date from this period, for the Afghans everywhere showed themselves careful to secure the ways of retreat. The reference is of course to the old gates of those names.

After the defeat of Asfārī at Mīmāndāūst (6th Kābi I, 1141 = Sept. 20, 1728) the Afghans in Tehran put to death the notables and left for Isfahan. The inhabitants fell upon the impediments they had left and through negligence a powder magazine was exploded (*Histoire de Naṣir Chah*, transl., Jones, London 1776, p. 28). Asfārī himself was soon driven out of Warrān and Shah Tahmâb II returned to Tehran.

Nādir. In 1154 (1744) Nādir gave Tehran as a fief to his eldest son Rūdān Khān Mīrzā, who had hitherto acted as ruler of all Persia. The nomination to Tehran was preliminary to the fall and blinding of the prince; cf. Jones, ii. 123; Hanway, ii. 357, 378; *Abul al-Kauthar*, *Voyage de l'Italië*, ed. de la Métèque, vol. v. 2, Paris, 1825, p. 93.

During the fighting among the successors of Nādir, the following year 1156 (1747) took refuge in Tehran but was seized and blinded by Nādir's supporters (*Tāriḥ-e Bādeh Nādir*) ed. D. 0. Mano, p. 34). After the fall of the Nādiris, Tehran passed into the sphere of influence of the Kāddārs, rivals of Karim Khān Zand.

Karim Khān. In 1171 (1752) Sulṭān Muḥammad Hasan Khān Kādata, after an unsuccessful battle with Karim Khān near Shiraz, retired to Tehran where his army was disbanded. Having learned that he had withdrawn from Tehran, Karim Khān sent his best general, Shāh 'Ali Khān, with an advance-guard. With the help of Muḥammad Hasan Kādata, Muḥammad Hasan Kādata was killed and Karim Khān with his army (which had arrived at Tehran in 1172 (1759)). The head of Muḥammad Hasan Kādata was buried with all honours in Shah 'Abbās al-Asmā'. The next year the order was given to build at Tehran a seat of government (ilamārā‘), "which would rival the palace of Cleopatra at Cēstipouïa", a *sabīn-bakhshā*, a garrison and quarters for the bodyguard of Sultan Musa, *Tāriḥ-e Gīl Gūnlak*, Bīlī Natīq, Suppl. Pers., N°. 1374, fol. 29. 'Ṣāfī al-Dawla added to these buildings the garden Diwānāt and says that Karim Khān intended to make Tehran his capital. It was to Tehran that 'Abbās Muḥammad Kādata, captured in Māzandaran, was taken to Karim Khān, who treated him generously, for which he was very badly requited later. In 1176 however, Karim Khān decided on Shirāz to which he moved the machinery of government. Ghāfir Khān was left as governor in Tehran.

The rise of the Kāddārs. Karim Khān died on the 12th Safar 1193. By the 20th Safar Aḥmad Muhammad was in Shirāz 'Abbās al-Asmā' and the next day he succeeded the throne (*Gūnlak*) in the capital of Tehran (Mīr 21, 1194). Tehran however passed into the sphere of influence of 'Abbās Mīrāz Khān, half-brother of Dā'ūr Khān Zand (*Tāriḥ-e Zandiyān*, ed. Bārī, p. 8; 13; 25), in 1197 (1782). Aḥmad Muslim Khān made a first attempt to get possession of Tehran but the governor Ghafīr Khān, Tahmānī managed to procrastinate and an outbreak of plague forced Aḥmad Muhammad to withdraw to Damghān (*Mīrāz*). After the death of 'Abbās Murūd Khān (1199 = 1785) the town was besieged by Aḥmad Muhammad's troops. The inhabitants did not wish to surrender the fortress (*fawā‘*) before Aḥmad Muhammad had taken Isfahan. The news of the advance of Dā'ūr Khān Zand from Fārs caused Aḥmad Muhammad's troops to disperse. He was however received with open arms by the chiefs of Tehran (*Shāhī wa-nānī*) and hunchbacked the town was his capital (*ma‘ṣāfa naṣīfat, dar al-ṣafāna and later dar al-ṣafā*) from which he led the expeditions which united all Persia under his rule. According to the *Mīrāz-e Yā ‘Abbās* transit, therefore of the Kāddārs, p. 18, Tehran became the capital in 1200 (1786) and the foundations of the palace were laid then. After the capture of Shiraz all the artillery and munitions of the Zands were taken to the new capital. The last Zand king Lutf 'Abbās Khān, blinded and kept prisoner in Tehran, was put to death there in 1209 and buried in the sanctuary of the *iman*-ābād Zand; ibid., p. 21, 25, 30, 76, 82, 101.

After the assassination of Aḥmad Muslim Shah (21st Dhu ‘l-Hijja 1212 = June 16, 1797) his brother 'Abbās Khān appeared before the capital but the prime minister Mīrzā Shofī would not allow him to enter. In the meanwhile the heir to the throne Bibī Khāna (*Fatḥ 'Abbās*) was able to reach Shiraz and after the death of the second claimant Sādīq Khān Shāhshāh, was crowned at the beginning of 1798. The Shāhkhāns [p. v.], prisoners and employed to dig the ditch of the capital (cf. Schlecht-Wessendorf, *Allah Shakh of Iran*, 2nd ed., Leiden, 1884, p. i–31).

During the period of Anglo-French rivalry a series of ambassadors visited Tehran; on the one side Sir John Malcolm (1801 and 1810), Sir Harford Jones Brydges (1807), Sir Gore Ounley (1811) and on the French side Gen. Roux (d. at Tehran in 1806), A. Jaubert (1806), Gen. Gazdane (1807). The Russians concentrated their efforts on Tabas; the collection, the resistance of the Persian Crown Prince. It was only after the treaty of Turkmenian (q. v. 1858) that the Russian minister A. S. Griboyedov paid a short visit to the capital. Just before his return to Tabas, Mirza Ya’qūb, one of the Shah's chief menials, an Armenian of Erivan formerly converted to Islam, presented himself at the Russian legation and asked to be repatriated by virtue of article 15 of the treaty. This "repatriation" provoked an attack on the Russian embassy and on Feb. 11, 1829, 45 members of it were massacred (Griboyedov, his secretaries, Consacks and servants). The tragedy took place in the legation's quarters (house of the zamānī-nābātī, near the old Shah 'Abbās al-Asmā' gate; now the street called Sar-pālak in the Zargastiāh.

When the death of Fatḥ al-Shāh (Oct. 19, 1834) became known in the capital his son 'Ali Mirza Zīlī-Sulṭān proclaimed himself king under the name of 'Ali Shāh and struck coins. But the heir to the throne Muhammad Mirza arrived from Tabrīz, accompanied by representatives of Britain and Russia, and entered the capital without striking a blow on Jan. 2, 1835. 'Ali Shāh only reigned for six weeks (cf. Tornau, Anma. d. neueren Geschicht der Persien, Z. D. M. G., 1849, p. 1-15). The succession of the next three Shāhs took place without incident (cf. Kālīkāzī, even after the assassination of Muhammad al-Din Shāh on May 1, 1896). The history of Teheran under these Shāhs is that of all Persia. The tranquility of the town was only disturbed by epidemics and the periodical migrations caused by famine; cf. the rioting on March 1, 1851 described by Eastwick, op. cit. and Usher, Journey from London to Persia, London 1865, p. 625.

Among the more important events may be mentioned the persecution of the Bābās [q.v.], especially in 1850 after the attack on Warī al-Dīn Shāh. The movement against the concession of a tobacco monopoly to the Tobacco Monopoly Corporation in 1851 also started in Teheran; cf. Browne, The Persian Revolution, Cambridge 1910, p. 45-57.

The Revolution. Since the Persian revolution, the capital, previously somewhat isolated from the provinces, has rapidly become the political and intellectual centre of this country. The chronology of the events of the period is as follows: The death of the merchants in the Madīlīs Shāh, Dec. 1905. The death of the constitutionalists at the British legation from July 20 to Aug. 1, 1906. The opening of the Majūs in the palace of Bahārūstān on Oct. 7, 1906. The death to the throne Muhammad 'Ali Mirza signs the constitution on Dec. 30, 1906. Death of Muḥāfaẓ al-Dīn Shāh on Jan. 8, 1907. The assassination of the Atabeg Amīn al-Dawla on Aug. 31, 1907. Counter-manifestations by the "absolutists" from Dec. 13-19, 1907. Bondsmanship of the Majūs in June 23, 1908. Capture of Teheran by the nationalist troops commanded by the Sipāḥbāz Shāh of Qāsh and the Sardar-e Asbāb Bākhtīyār on July 13-15, 1909. Abdication of Muḥāfaẓ 'Ali Shāh on July 16, accession of Sulṭān Ahmad Shāh on July 18, 1909; cf. Browne, Persian Revolution and D. Frey, Persian and Turkey in Revolt, London 1910, p. 82-116; on the events of May 12, 1911, and Jan. 11, 1912, information will be found in Morgan Shuster, The Strangling of Persia, London 1912. In 1915 Teheran became involved in the Great War. The representatives of the Central Powers nearly carried Shāh Sulṭān Ahmad off to Kānī with them. The capital was outside of the zone of military operations proper but on several occasions movements of troops took place in its vicinity (skirmish on Dec. 20, 1915 near Qāš and Kur Khan, between Russian Column and the Amir Ḥājīmat's gendarmes who were on the side of the Central Powers; cf. Emelianov, Persiski front, Berlin 1923). Down to 1917, Russian troops controlled the region between the Caspian and Teheran. From 1918 English troops took their place; cf. Dunsterville, The Adventures of Dunsterville, London 1920. The division of Persian Cossacks commanded by the old Russian instructor was also employed to protect Persia against a possible offensive from the north. The Russian officers were dismissed on Oct. 30, 1920. The greater part of the division was stationed at Kazvin where an English force under General Ironside was still quartered. On Feb. 11, 1921, 2,500 Persian Cossacks who had come from Kazvin under the command of their general Kiāstān Khān were quartered in the capital. Saiyid Ḥusayn al-Dīn formed the new cabinet (Feb. 24—May 24) and Ḥusayn Khān was appointed commander-in-chief (Sarvār Sipāḥ; cf. J. M. Balfour, Recent Happenings in Persia, London 1922). Towards the end of 1923 the Shāh Sulṭān Ahmad left the country at the same time as the prime minister Kāwān al-Salṭāna (from June 4, 1923), who was accused of intriguing against the Sardīr Sipāḥ. The latter remained master of the situation and was finally crowned on April 25, 1926 (cf. Pahlavī).

The growth of the town. Yākīr's account of the houses of Teheran suggests that the oldest part of the town is in the south (the Ghār quarter) and that it developed from south to north (i.e. from the desert to the mountain and to the springs). There is little left in Teheran of the Zand period. The modern town has been entirely created under the Kāšāns.

Olivier who visited Teheran in 1796 says that the town, which looked entirely new or rebuilt, was in the form of a square of a little more than 2 miles (f.), but only half of this was built upon. The population did not exceed 15,000 of whom 3,000 were soldiers and Olivier remarks with justice that the gold scattered around the throne did not fail to attract inhabitants. The palace in the citadel was built in the time of Āqā Muḥāmmad Shāh. In the Tābīṣābī Muraqar were placed the pictures, glass and marble pillars from the palace of Kāvār Khān in Shīkāz. Under the threshold of a door were buried the bones of Nadīr Shāh so that the Kāšān prince could trample on them every day (Ouseley). On the accession of Rūkhī Shāh the bones were taken from there.

According to General Gardan (1808), only the poor remained in Teheran in winter, but in winter the population reached 50,000.

Morier (1808—1809) says Teheran was 4½ miles in circumference. Kinneir about the same time put the summer population at 10,000 and the winter at 60,000. The town was surrounded by a strong wall and a great ditch with a glacis but the defences were only of value in a country where the art of war was unknown.
Ouseley (1811) counted 6 gates in Teheran, 39 mosques and colleges and 300 baths; he put the population in winter at 40,000. Ker Porter (1817) mentions 8 gates before which large round towers were built (cf. his plan) to defend the approaches and control the exits. In winter the population was from 60,000-70,000.

Fath 'Ali Shah had considerably improved the town but towards the end of his reign it passed through a period of neglect. According to Fraser (1836), there was not another town in Persia so poorly looking; "not a dome" was to be seen in it. Until Muhammad Shah things were improved a little.

Berizin has given a particularly detailed description of the palace (gard-e-dowlat-khâna) with its four courts and numerous buildings (Dawlat-khâna, Daftar-khâna, Kullâh-i firangi ("pavilion"), Sanâlik-khâna, Zargh-khâna, 13-mârt-i Shâh-i Khosrow, Sarvestân, Khâlât-âwâl Shâh, Guthistân). The same traveller gives a plan of the palace and of the town, very important for the historical topography of Teheran. At this date (1842), the town within its walls measured about 3,500 Persian arshin (roughly yards) from west to east and 1,900-2,450 from north to south, i.e. occupied an area of about 3 square miles (Polak's calculation, cf. cit., p. 243: 83,750 square metres is obviously wrong). The new city (the arâb) was in the shape of a parallelogram (600 arshin W. to E. by 1,175 N. to S., i.e. a fourth of the whole town). The north side of the arâb touched the centre of the northern face of the outer wall. Gardens occupied the parts of the town next the wall. The most animated quarter was that which lay to the S.E. of the citadel in the direction of the Shah 'Abd al-'Azm gate. Only five gates are marked on this plan. The only open space, the Mâdâr-i Shah close to the citadel on the south side, was not large (cf. the plate in Hommel's de Hal). Among the mosques that of the Shah and the tâbâna side of Zaid and Yahyâ alone are of any importance. Gardane had seen the Maqâbul-i Shâh being built in 1807. Its inscription from the hand of the court calligrapher Muhammad Mahdi is dated 1224 (1809); according to Schindler, the mosque was not finished till 1840 (cf. Fraser above).

The plan by Kreß (1857) much resembles that of Berzin, but around the town he marks by dotted lines the bounds of a new extension of the town, which according to an explanatory note by Dr. Polak, had been begun considerably before 1857. Polak himself in 1853 had built a hospital to the north of the north gate of the town. These new buildings were few in number and not built under any regular scheme. In 1858 the town was still within the old square; the population was 80,000 in summer and 120,000 in winter (Brugnach).

The new town. A radical change took place in 1865-1874 (cf. Caron, Stahl and H. Schindler; the official figures on the projects for the development of the town have not yet been discovered). The town was extended on all sides. The old ditch and the bulk of the walls disappeared. Teheran assumed the form of an irregular octagon surrounded by new fortifications (bastions of earth, with fosses) modelled on those of Paris but of no military importance. According to Caron, 1,305; the work was done during the famine of 1871; cf. Brittlebank, Persia during the famine, London, 1873. The town was given 12 gates. The old gates were retained within the city but their names were transferred to the corresponding gates on the new lines of fortification. The later are 20,000 yards in length; the area now occupied by Teheran is 750 square miles (H. Schindler). Before the old Dawlat gate the important Tâpjâhân (airstan) 250 x 120 yards was built, surrounded by the artillery barracks. A champa de Mars (Mâdîân-i Mâshâ) even more spacious (550 x 350 yards) was laid out N.W. of the Tâpjâhân. Two parallel and important arteries, Khâyîânâ-âl 'Alî al-Dawâsir and Lâilâfiz, now run from the Mâdîân-i Tâpjâhân to the north. The old promenades beside the walls, Lâilâfiz, Nîghtâfiz etc. were incorporated in the new. These streets attracted first of all the foreign legations. The first French (Gardane) and British (H. Jumeau, Ouseley) missions had been lodged in the house of Amin al-Dawâsir near the old Shah 'Abd al-'Azm Gate. In the time of Ouseley a British legation was built on land belonging to the Zandâkîâbâsh in which the Shah gave to the English (it was near another estate of the same owner that Griboedow was assassinated). The new British legation was built in 1870 at the end of the 'Alî al-Dawâsir avenue. When the Russian legation was definitely established in Teheran in 1834 it was lodged in the house of the grand vizier Mîrzâ Mirzâ Aghâ in the arâb itself. In 1850 the Russians built their Legation in the Fâminâr quarter, (east of the arâb) but in 1915 they finally settled in the "park of the Atâbeh" immediately to the north of the English. The Turkish and French legations are east and west of the English. The European and Persian notables have followed the legations but the centre of trade is still the old bazaar, which is entered to the south of the arâb.

Teheran has no fine public buildings. The mosque of the Siqâhâlîr (Mîrzâ Husain Khân, d. 1298 = 1881) is the most imposing edifice in Teheran (in the new quarter on the N.E. beside the Bahârian palace, which has been occupied since 1906 by the Majlis); the building was begun in 1296 (1878) cf. Ma'dâh-i al-Asbâr, p. 83, and finished about 1890. Its Madrasah bears the date of 1302 (1884).

The principal beauty of Teheran is the large private houses with their gardens and flowers. Around it there are many country houses and palaces of the Kâjîar style, which is not unattractive in its own right, and which contains the traditions of Safavid architecture. Such is 'Ishârat-shâh just north of Teheran; see the picture in Caron, i. 102 (cf. xvi and in d'Allemagne the pavilion of the Shams al-'Imârâ in the arâb). The castle of Kâş-âl Kâjîar is now in ruins (cf. the plate in Saltikoff, de Coste and Hommaire de Hal). The hunting-lodge Vowshântaps, "hill of hyssop" (popularly called Dowshântâp = hill of the hare) situated at the foot of the mountain of Se-pây (to the east of Teheran), is connected with the town by a good road (3 miles) opened on Oct. 14, 1874 (Serena). Pious people of the town make the pilgrimage to Sîhâb 'Abd al-'Azm, a little town beyond the ruins of Râsî (q.v.). The railway from Teheran to this sanctuary is 5 miles in length (with two branch lines, one one mile long and the other 1/2 miles); it was built between 1888 and 1893 and till 1915 was the only railway in Persia. The ass
of gas was introduced into Persia in 1875 (Serena); electric light began to be used about 1905.

Under the Pahlavi regime considerable public works have been undertaken in the town. A Society of Friends of Old Teheran was founded in the capital in 1926 and it is to be hoped that it will be able to describe and protect what there is remarkable among the buildings of the Kâfîhâr period.

Teheran which still continues to grow towards the north, is now the largest city in Persia. In 1878 Mme. Serena reckoned the population at 200,000 in winter and 300,000 in summer. In 1895 she gives 250,000 in the city and 350,000 in the 670 adjoining towns and villages. Balfour (1921) quotes a Persian testimony to the effect that the minimum number of inhabitants of Teheran is 250,000 while the "reasoned highest figure" may be 380,000 (for the province of Teheran these figures are 700,000 and 800,000).

Bibliography: In addition to the Oriental sources quoted in the text see: Abd al-Rahîd Inâqî, Tuhfât al-Adîlîn, N.E., ii, 1758, p. 477; Zalân al-Abînî, Jâzân al-Stûhajan, Tihbîn 1315, p. 354; Khâlid al-Kallsî, Lâdîqan-nawwâl, Stambul 1145, p. 322; Eshâ-ye Câlehî, iv, 352-383, e.s.v. Key (not very accurate); Sanî al-Dawla, Mîdîd al-Bulûdîn, Tihbîn 1294, l. 505-504 (an important compilation); Muhammad Khân Khârimî, Tihbîn, in Kitâb Madâkhân-e 1zamîn, Bombay 1282, p. 36-391; Kârâî, 1921, No. 2.


Cartography: the plan of the town in Beviri (1843); J. E. Pulk, Topozî, Beschreibungen u. Karte d. Umgang und zu d. Plane v. Teheran, Mitt. d. K. K. Geogr. Gesell., xx. (1877), Vienna 1878, p. 218-225 (with a map 1:100,000 and a plan of 1:20,700 made by Comm. Krütz in 1857-1858); A. F. Stahl, Teherân und Umgebung (1890-1894), P. Mitt., 1900, p. 49-54 with a map 1:210,000 (the two articles are full of interesting information); the Persian map by ‘Abd al-Razâk ‘Khân Baghîrî (c. 1910) on the scale of 1:200,000. Besides his own surveys the author of the map has used the following sources: 1. the map by ‘Abd al-zâfîl ‘Khân made in the time of the grand vizier Mirzâ Taqî ‘Khân (1849-1851); 2. two maps by ‘Abd al-zâfîl ‘Khân made in the time of the grand vizier Mirzâ Taqî ‘Khân (1849-1851); 3. the map prepared by Persian officers under the direction of Baron Leitner (?): 1:225,000 (1880); 4. the map by General Wetch 1:12,500 (c. 1893); 5. Stahl's map.

2. A village in the province of 1sfâhân (in the district of the lower Kârômân, to the N.W. of 1sfâhân): Samîrî, p. 375, knows the two ‘Thir-kân of which "that of Raîî is better known than that of 1sfâhân". He mentions several traditions born in the village, the oldest of whom is ‘Ukull
b. Yahya Abbé Şillî, d. in 358 (871); cf., also Yâkût. The name is now pronounced Trân, cf. Cirkow (1859), Pununul Journal, p. 158, but Ibragîm, ii. 39 writes Tehran. According to Hosten-Schindler, Ost. Persien Trak, p. 124, 127, 134, near Isfahàn there is still a Tîrân ("Tiran Aghanaran"). The Tiran canal (which runs from there?) waters the Mahalle-yi now and Bâb-i-âli quarters of Isfahàn. (V. Mikhaylov.)

TEKE OR TEKE, a Turkoman tribe. They are not mentioned among the deserters of the Salar [q. v.]. Abu T’ghâar [q. v.] comprises the Teke with two other tribes, the Sărî and the Yomut, under the name "Outer Salar" (sâlîr Salar; ed. Desmasions, p. 209). In his still unprinted history of the Turkomanen, Abu T’ghâar describes the Sărî and Teke as descendants of the Salar Toi-Tumas (transl. Tumansky, p. 67). From certain passages in Abu T’ghâar’s great work (see Index in Desmasions’ edition) it is evident that the Teke in the 8th (svith) century and 10th (twelfth) century lived on the Balkhân [q. v.] and Kûrân-Dagh. There were also Teke traders in this nomad tribe (cf. cit., p. 324: râvandagar).

Towards the end of the eighth century the Teke began to move eastwards, where they gradually displaced the Enrelli (descendants of the old tribe of Kimür) and the Kâradaghlî (descendants of the old tribe of Yaghur or Yezlî) from the Akbal [see KÂRÂ-TEKE] and the Sărî from Sarakhs [q. v.] and Merw. The final occupation of Merw by the Teke did not take place till 857 and 859 under Kowshät-Khân (d. 878); in the fighting with him in 855 the Khân of Kûrân (see Kûrân-Dagh) was killed at Sarakhs and in 860 the Persians were defeated at Merw.

After the establishment of the Russians on the Balkhân (foundation of Kranovodak in 869) the Teke had to be conquered. Fighting began in 877 (conquest of Khât-al-Awari by the Russians and the attack on the Teke by the Khât-al-Khâvar and Kranovodak itself in 878) and was only ended in 884 by the conquest of Merw, although the whole tribe of the Teke according to the Russian calculations only numbered about 300,000 and did not form a single political unit. There were a large number of separate leaders who claimed the title of Khân; but even among those whom who distinguished themselves by personal ability or valor (in addition to Kowshät-Khân, especially Nür Werdî Khân who died in 880 in Gök-Tepe) could only influence a small section of the tribe. The fighting during the siege and storming of Gök-Tepe (Jan. 12–21, 884) was particularly bitter. This was the only fighting in Central Asia in which the Russians lost standards and guns.

Since the establishment of Russian rule, more especially since the revolution, the various tribal names included that of Teke lost their special significance before the general term "Turkoman."
The history of the Turkoman tribes scattered over Asia Minor who included also the Warsak (the Barasax of Chulkomylus, p. 243) is wrapped in obscurity. As to the Teke Turkomans, they are known to have frequently changed their place of settlement (cf. J. v. Karaschev, Zur ur. Altertumskunde, iv., Muhammad al-Kustamania, in the S.B., Abhandl., i, Vienna 1913, p. 32 sqq.); they belonged to the Khatib, who were known to have been disseminated over Teke-eli. The ancestor of the Teke-oghlu is given as a somewhat legendary Teke Beg, also called Tekë Paşa, who ruled over Adalia under Seldjuk ascendency. His son Yumnus Beg succeeded him but nothing is known of his reign. When in 1333 (1333) Iltu Hitam travelled through Adalia, he found Yumnus son Khiidr Beg ruling as chief of Teke-eli (cf. Hamid). He was succeeded by his brother Mahmud Beg, about whose reign we are not better informed. In 1774 (1372) we already find his son Mehmed Beg in his place (cf. Sahinîn Fikrî, Anfûsîn Ta'irîhî, p. 68). Ewliya Celebi in his Travels (Seyahat-nâmeh, cf. T.O.E.M., No. 2 [79], p. 81) mentions an Arabic inscription of 1774 (1372) dating from him. Otherwise we know practically nothing of Mehmed Beg's activities. In 1794 (1592) Sultan Bayazid I Veldirm put an end to the sovereignty of Teke-eli and incorporated it in the Ottoman empire (cf. Sa'id al-Din, Ta'dil-i Ta'irîhî, i, 128 sqq.) the Ottomans rule only lasted till 1805 (1230) when a son of Mehmed Beg named Othman Celebi appears as ruler. Two years later he made an alliance with several other rulers who had meanwhile risen to power. Twenty years afterwards (847 = 1444) Othman Celebi again appears in history, when he was defeated and slain at the siege of Adalia by the Ottoman governor of Karshirî-Sâhî [q. v.], Hanna b. Firda Beg (cf. Şolak-zade, Ti'ârîhî, p. 153 sqq.; J. v. Hammer, G. O. K., i, 425). A sister of Othman Celebi passed into Ottoman captivity; cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. K., i, 425. With her the line of the Teke-oghlu probably became extinct. Its genealogical table is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teke Beg</th>
<th>Yumnus Beg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Khiidr Beg</td>
<td>Mahmud Beg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Tekke-oghlu Dengbej (q. v.) mentioned by European travellers in the reign of Adalia as late as the reign of Mahmud II, can hardly be connected with the dynasty of the name on them, see W. Beaufort, Karmania, London 1817, p. 118 sqq.; W. Turner, Journal of a Tour in the Levant, London 1820, ill. 386; C. R. Cockerell, Travels in Southern Europe and the Levant, London 1903, p. 182 and V. Cuniet, Terare d'Asie, i, 850.


The Encyclopaedia of Islam, IV.
TELL BÂSHİR, a fortress in Northern Syria, on the Nahr Sûjar near 'AinTâb, two days' journey north of Aleppo. It lies in a broad plain and according to Abu 'l-Fida' was mainly inhabited by Armenian Christians; the Armenians explained its name 'Telbâshir' as a translation of the Armenian Tel Avetseg, i.e. "hill of the glad tidings (good news)" which it formerly bore (Matthäus Ussher's, ed. Dulanier, p. 330, 433 sqq.). It had markets and a suburb (probably the modern Tell Bâshir Meznait S.E. of the fortress and was surrounded by well watered gardens.

The town is mentioned as early as Assyrian times as Til Baseré (Salmanassar, Monothor, rel., i. 17; Dussaud, Topographie hist. du Levant, 468); on the other hand it has no connection with the hill Bâshir nor the town Telâshir (Sayce, P. S. B. A., xxxvi. 175; Dussaud, op. cit., p. 464). Its name is not mentioned in classical antiquity; but the Tabula Peutingeriana mentions a Tâbaôvata 15 Roman miles from Tigranocerta (Sachau, Abb. Pr. Ak. W., 1886, Berlin 1881, Abb. ii., p. 53; Markwart, Handtlex, xxx., 1916, col. 118 sqq.).

The town is mentioned as early as Assyrian times as Til Baseré (Salmanassar, Monothor, rel., i. 17; Dussaud, Topographie hist. du Levant, 468); on the other hand it has no connection with the hill Bâshir nor the town Telâshir (Sayce, P. S. B. A., xxxvi. 175; Dussaud, op. cit., p. 464). Its name is not mentioned in classical antiquity; but the Tabula Peutingeriana mentions a Tâbaôvata 15 Roman miles from Tigranocerta (Sachau, Abb. Pr. Ak. W., 1886, Berlin 1881, Abb. ii., p. 53; Markwart, Handtlex, xxx., 1916, col. 118 sqq.).

Arab authors do not seem to mention Tell Bâshir before the Crusades. In 1095—1096 Ridwan in alliance with Djâjâl al-Dawla took from Yaghi Sha'ban an Anjûkis the fortresses of Tell Bâshir and Shujâ al-Dair (Kamâl al-Din, transal. de Sacy, in Rôrchihi, Beitr. x. Gesch. d. Kres- reinst, v., Berlin 1874, p. 216). In 1097 Tell Bâshir and Rûmânûn were taken by Count Baldwin of Bourg, Godfrey's brother, and made part of the county of Edessa (Matthâus, op. cit., p. 91, ch. 6). In 1102—1103 Bâshir gave the town of Kûris (Khosımı), Sâmûd (Tell Khuwáil), Tell Bâshir (Tell bâshir), and Sâmûd (Sâmûat) to his nephew Joscelin of Courtenay as feoff (Revue hist. et crée, iii. 623; Will of Tyrre, x. 244; Rôrchihi, Gesch. d. Kr. Jermel, p. 49, note 3). In 1102—1103 the Franks moved from Tell Bâshir to the district of Halab, took Basarîf and were only repulsed at Kafarita by the Bani Ulâm (Kamâl al-Din in Rôrchihi, Beitr., i. 231). After the defeat at Harrân in which Joscelin was captured by the enemy, his companions from Tell Bâshir went into captivity as hostages for him after a ransom had been fixed and he had been released to procure it (Michael Syrns, ii. 195; somewhat different in Frankish sources, cf. Rôrchihi, Gesch. d. Kr. Jermel, p. 75, note 3). In 1098—1099 Joscelin along with his uncle Baldwin (Baghdâinî and Djâlîwall, with Tell Bâshir as his base, fought Tancred (Tanâkût) of Antioch, who chased Abîâhâwî (Ree. hist. et crée, i. 266; Matthâus, op. cit., p. 267; Rôrchihi, op. cit., p. 73 sqq.). A large Turkish army sent by Sultan Muhammad under the Amir Mawlid of Mawlikh, who appeared with the lords of Khûth, Manîkha etc. in 1054 (1111) before Tell Bâshir, besieged it for 1½ months in vain (Ree. hist. et crée, i. 282, 287; iii. 496, 542 sqq., 599 sqq.; Matthäus, op. cit., p. 275; Michael Syrns, ii. 216; Rôrchihi, op. cit., p. 90 sqq.).

Khihit was also an important site of the 3rd century, but there are no remains of the town at Tell Bâshir, which was besieged for several days without success (Ree. hist. et crée, iii. 623 sqq.; Abu 'l-Fida', Annals Musil., ed. Reiske, iii. 396). In the following years the Halabites were often harassed by raids from Tell
TELL BĀSHIR — TELL AL-KEBİR

Bāshir (Kamāl al-Dīn, in Rec. hist. or. crois., iii. 625 sq.; 634). In 1124 Nūr al-Dawla Būbak was planning a campaign against Tell Bāshir, but he was mortally wounded before Manbij]. [q.v.]. A note, not quite clear in Michael Syrus, iii. 211, seems to say, which is incorrect, that he took Tell Bāshir and three other fortresses from the Arabs and Franks. Joscelin I died towards the end of 1131 (Michael Syrus, iii. 232). He was succeeded by his son Joscelin II of Edessa, whose mother was a daughter of Leo I of Little Armenia. Unlike his valiant father, he was from youth upwards given to drinking and debauchery and spent his time in his palace in Tell Bāshir in riotous living (Will. of Tyre, xiv. 3: consuetudinibus supra modum deditis, Fieritis auxiliis et consulis in depositione immundatis, navem ad infaneriae notis). The region of Tell Bāshir had therefore soon to suffer repeated raids by Saif al-Dīn Sawār of Ḥalab (Rec. Hist. or. crois., ii. 665; Michael Syrus, iii. 230. 233; Röhrich, op. cit., p. 197 sq.). The Emperor John II Comnenus invaded Northern Syria in 1142 and appeared before Tell Bāshir (Will. of Tyre, xv. 19: Turbelzel; et autem practicat locus exatum opulentissimum circa Ephesiam, ab eo dictum milliarium XXIV vel medium amplius). Joscelin II had to give hostages and gave him his daughter Isabella to wife (Will. of Tyre, loc. cit.).

The raids of the Sahālīq Sultan Mas'ūd (Michael Syrus, iii. 294—296; Röhrich, p. 263, note 1) and his ally Nūr al-Dīn who defeated the Franks at Tell Bāshir in 546 (1151—1152) (Rec. Hist. or. crois., iv. 16, 68) still further weakened Joscelin's power. In May, 1150, he was taken prisoner and interned in Ḥalab, Mas'ūd who had already attacked Tell Bāshir in the previous year (Matthēos, op. cit., p. 330; Michael Syrus, iii. 296) took the fortresses of Kāsim, Bāshām and Rabān, but could not take Tell Bāshir (Matthēos, p. 333; Michael Syrus, iii. 296 sq.; Will. of Tyre, xvii., ch. 15; Röhrich, p. 265 sq.). After he had withdrawn, the king of Jerusalem came to Tell Bāshir and brought with him Isabella and children of Joscelin including the young Joscelin III from there to Jerusalem to safety. In Tell Bāshir, 'Aza' al-Rawandān, Rūm Kāl'a, al-Bira and Sumāsh, he left garrisons of Byzantine soldiers, whom he had brought with him; but they could not restore the Franks (Michael Syrus, iii. 297; Will. of Tyre, xvii., 16). The garrison of Tell Bāshir by the 25th Rabī' I (July 8, 1151) found themselves forced, after the fall of Dulkak to offer the keys of their town to Nūr al-Dīn who appointed Ḥassān al-Manbūṭī to receive their capitulation (Rec. Hist. or. crois., i. 29, 34, 407; iv. 73 sq.; Abu l-Fida', ed. Reiske, p. 516; Matthēos, op. cit., p. 333; Michael Syrus, iii. 297). The Franks and Armenians were granted liberty to go to Antioch (Matthēos, p. 333; Röhrich, p. 281, note 2, where mention is wrongly made of an 18 months' siege of the fortress). Nūr al-Dīn handed Tell Bāshir over to Ḥassān who restored its defences and provided it with provisions for several years (Rec. Hist. or. crois., i. 498). On 12th Shu'wār 565 (June 28, 1170) Nūr al-Dīn went from 'Aṣhtarā via Ḥalab and Tell Bāshir to Mosul (Rec. Hist. or. crois., iv. 150).

The emir of 'Aiš, Tell Bāshir and other places in northern Syria submitted in 1176 to Ṣalādī (Michael Syrus, iii. 366). In his retinue before 'Akkā was the Amir Badr al-Dīn Duldirīm b. Būḥa.

The region of Tell Bāshir was then used as the scene of various conflicts, and the fortresses were successively occupied by the Armenians, Seljuks, Ghurids, Mongols, and Mamluks. The Seljuks held it until 1260, when it was taken by the Mongols, who destroyed it. The Mongols were succeeded by the Mamluks, who held it until 1411, when it was captured by the Hulaguids. The Hulaguids were followed by the Timurids, who held it until 1660, when it was taken by the Ottomans. The Ottomans held it until 1918, when it was captured by the British. The British held it until 1922, when it was transferred to the Mandate of Syria. The Mandate of Syria was transferred to France in 1932, and France held it until 1946, when it was transferred to the Arab League. The Arab League held it until 1961, when it was transferred to Syria. Syria has held it ever since.


(E. HONIGMANN)

TELL AL-KEBİR, a village in the Egyptian Delta, with a station on the Cairo—Zaflākī—Ismā'īliyya–Suez line, about 30 km. distant from Zaflākī, 50 from Ismā'īliyya. The station is some distance from the village on the north bank of the Ismā'īliyya Canal. A market is held every Thursday. The Bedouin tribes of the neighbourhood
are the Ḥanādī, the Naṭaf and the Ḥunālī. Wide stretches of sand-dunes and undulating desert extend north and south of the Wādī, with traces of ancient fortifications and the mounds of buried cities. In the depression here, known as the Wādī Ḥunālī through which flows the fresh-water canal, rich agricultural land is to be found. The province (muḥāfaẓa) is al-Ṣahrāy; the district (murād) Ṣārāh. It is a police outpost. The inhabitants, as given by Boinet Bey, are 3,194, being the population of 3 naḥiāh and 5 dāra. There are 4 naṣīfah and 3 batūbā. In modern times the place achieved fame as a result of the short but fierce encounter in 1882 between the British under Sir Garnet Wolseley and the Egyptian troops under Ṭarahī Ṭāghā. A small graveyard with the names of British soldiers who fell in the fight may still be seen.

**Bibliography:** Boinet Bey, Geogr. Econ., p. 224; C. Royte, The Egyptian Campaign, London 1886, i. 312 sqq.; Stanley Lane-Poole, Watson Pasha, p. 168 sqq.; Prince Ibrahim Hilmy, Lit. of Egypt and the Sudan, a.v.; C. G. Gordon, Journals, p. 60; Miller, England in Egypt, p. 116; E. L. Butcher, Church of Egypt, ii. 389; W. Scawen Blunt, My Diaries, i. 38–39; Baedeker, Egypt, Index.

**TELLOH,** a site in 'Irāq, consisting of a number of artificial mounds, covering an extent of 4–5 miles. It is situated on the eastern side of the Shāfīf al-Ḫajjī, which links the Tigris to the Euphrates, at 8–10 hours from Nāṣīrīyā. Here the French consul in Baqra, Ernest de Saracé, discovered in 1877 archæological remains. Under his guidance excavations were begun in 1880, as a result of which the site proved to be that of the Sumerian town of Lagas or Sīrpufla. The greater part of the material excavated — including numerous statues of Gudea — was placed in the Louvre in Paris. After de Saracé's death, in 1901, the excavations were continued by Cros.

*Tellōh* is a local name, containing no doubt the word "tell". According to Schefer, the name may perhaps be derived from Tell al-Lawā, "tablet-hill".

**Bibliography:** E. de Saracé, Discoveries in Chalda, Paris 1884–1912.

**TEMÜČIN.** [See Čīngi-Khs.]**

**TENES,** a town in Algeria on the coast, 125 miles from Algiers, 160 miles E. of Montaganaem and 35 N. of Oran, is a town in the valley of the Chelīf; its position is 36° 30' 50" N. Lat., 1° 18' E. Long. (Greenwich). The town is built on a rocky plateau commanding the sea; the harbour lies below in a bay sheltered from the east winds by the bulk of Cape Tenes, but unprotected against the north and west which makes the anchorage unsafe in spite of the considerable work done to secure the protection of ships. Trade is confined to coastal traffic and the total of merchandise handled in the port hardly exceeds 10 to 20,000 tons per annum. A railway recently opened to connect Tenes with the valley of the Chelīf will probably increase the trade of the port. Two miles south of the European town is a native village, with about 120 inhabitants, called Old Tenes. It is built on a plateau along which runs on the east like a natural foss, the Wāli Aflaha. Tenes is a commune de plein exercice with 6,507 inhabitants of whom 4,620 are natives; it is also the capital of a mixed commune with 7,459 inhabitants of whom 5,708 are natives.

**History.** The modern town occupies the site of Carteines, a Phœnician and Carthaginian factory which became a Roman colony under the Empire. Sacked by the Vandals, then by the Arabs, Carteines disappeared almost completely. In the time of al-Bakrī, all that was left was a castle built on the hill and at the present day only insignificant traces of it have been found (remains of ramparts, visterna and tombs). In the 12th (11th) century a new town was built two miles from the sea by adventurers from Spain. This is the modern Tenes. Al-Bakrī states its foundation to 262 (875–876) and attributes it to Spanish sailors who used to winter in the port. They invited richer people from Elvira and Marissi some of whom, dismayed by the yaws, soon went back to the Peninsula; the others remained in Africa and were reinforced by Berbers from Sug Ḥarrān, a place in the valley of the Chelīf. The primitive settlement of these immigrants, who were at first content to encamp in the fortress built by the Spanish Moors, gave place to a town surrounded by walls with a mosque and bazaars. Traces of it still survive in Old Tenes where a part of the ramparts still exists, a bridge and notably the mosque mentioned by al-Bakrī. In spite of the unhealthiness of the climate, Tenes rapidly prospered owing to the fertility of the environs which produced in abundance fruits of all sorts and cereals which, according to Idrīsī, were exported abroad. Governed by a family of Ālīl origin, Tenes recognized the suzerainty of the Omaysiids of Spain, who seem to have regarded this town as a place to which to deport any one they had reason to complain of. From the 10th (11th) century the town passed in turn under the dynasties who disputed the possessions of the Central Maghrib: Fātimids, Sāḥīdīs, Maghrībi, Almoravids and Almohadids. After the dismemberment of the Almohad chieftain, it passed to the Ziyānids of Tunisia, then in the second half of the 12th century threw off this yoke and formed an independent principality ruled at first by members of the royal family, then by local shāhīs, the last of whom became a vassal of Spain. Artugj [p. 4] took it in 1317 and a few years later Khair al-Din [q.v.] definitely established Turkish power there. Tenes was given a mālik and a qurra. Henceforth its prosperity declined rapidly. The trade in corn with Europe which still went on in the xvth–xvith centuries completely ceased in the early years of the xvith century. The town was several times pillaged by the natives and rebelled against the Turks.

After 1830, Tenes was for a period independent.

Abd al-Rahmān who had incorporated this town in his possessions, tried without success to revive the trade of the port. In 1845 the inhabitants submitted without resistance to the French. Bigrad, then on the point of erecting buildings intended to facilitate the provision of supplies for the troops operating in the valley of the Chelīf. This was the origin of the present town.

**Bibliography:** al-Bakrī, transl. de Slane, revised by Fagnan, p. 128; Idrīsī, ed. Dyosy and de Gois, p. 73; transl., p. 96; Lavoisier, Almoravids, transl. Schefer, iii. 56; Dessau-Lamarcq and G. Marples, La mosquée de Vieux Tenes, R.A., 1929.
TEPTYAR, a Turkish people who call themselves Tepire or Bashkurt. According to Vambahéry, the name is derived from a verb tepë "to roam" and means "hostile"; in Radöf's Worterbuch (iii. 1114) no such verb is mentioned and the word tepë only quoted as the "name of a tribe in the government of Orenburg." In Russian documents of the xviiith century the word tepë is frequently associated with the word bols, which is of course not a tribal name but means "peasant without land and family." According to Karain (vol.1, note 73), the Tepters were a mixed people composed of Céreni, Voytaks, Cwagh and Tatars, who had fled in the xvith century after the fall of the kingdom of Kazan [q.v.] to the Bashkirs [cf. Kaspir]. According to the mode of view, the Tepters are a mixed people in which the Bashkir element predominates, but other elements from the Volga and Ural territory are represented. Their language is Bashkir. The Tepters took no part in the great Bashkir rising of the 1755. At the present day, the Tepters live mainly in the government of Orenburg and also in the former governments of Ufa and Perm; their territory belongs to the autonomous Bashkir republic; they engage in agriculture and bee-rearing. Their numbers are about 300,000, the figure given in older accounts. According to Vambahéry there were besides Muslims, pagans among them and more recently also Christians. At the present day the Tepters are all regarded as Sunnis.


TERDJUMÁN, turkicised form of the Arabic tursümaine (cf. Muhammed Hafid, al-Chahafi al-maghrabi, p. 110) meaning an interpreter. The word is of Aramaic origin and early entered the Arabic language. Interpreters must have always played an important part in the commercial and diplomatic relations of Islamic states with foreign peoples, but their activity begins to enter into clearer historical light only in the xviith (xvith) century; from that time date the earliest known treaties between Christian towns or states and Muslim rulers of the countries around the Mediterranean. From the treaties with the states in Northern Africa, as published and studied by de Mas Latrie, it appears, that the "tornmani" (for the other numerous Latin and Romance forms in that time cf. de Mas Latrie, Introduction, p. 189 sqq.) were an indispensable class of functionaries in the commercial chancellories, called "donune" (from diounin), that existed in the sea-ports accessible to foreign trade. Nearly all commercial transactions took place through the intermediary of these interpreters, who formed a kind of hierarchy; evidence given by them was accepted everywhere. Special duties were levied on merchandise negotiated through their intermediary. These interpreters were originally appointed by the local authority; they were Muslims, Christians or Jews; in certain places a particular interpreter was charged with the interests of each foreign nation. Some of these functionaries had to be present at the still more important business of concluding treaties and, when needed, of interpreting treaties, when there were difficulties concerning the text. In these cases the name of the interpreter was specially mentioned in the text of the treaty. It appears likewise from these texts, that some of them were especially attached to the local ruler. The existence of interpreters in Syria is also mentioned by the French sources on the Crusades.

Under the Ottoman Empire the position and the function of the interpreters in the different administrations remained practically the same as it had been in former centuries. But, as commercial and diplomatic relations became more frequent and more important in time, the need of good and reliable interpreters increased and so we find more and more mention of them in historical sources. The most common name for them in European sources is the Italian form *dragoman* or *dragomano*, at the side of which the French *truchement* remained a long time in use. In the many Turkish sea-ports all the Turkish government offices had their dragomans, as was also the case with the consulates of foreign nations that were established there. The position of the dragomans in the capital was naturally more important; the foreign embassies had many in their service.

The most important post was, however, that of dragoman to the Turkish government. As a special office, it was perhaps already in existence under Muhammad II, but the first dragoman to the Porte, who is mentioned was the pa bashí Ali Beg, who brought the peace treaty of 1502 to Venice. After him came Yünes Beg, who died in 1498 (5141-1542) and went often as emissary to Venice; he was the builder of a mosque in Constantinople called Durugmán Kasıjli (Sülih-ı 'Ottomân, iv. 657; Hadjiyan al-Djamiun, No. 226). Yünes Beg was a Greek and his successor Ahmad was originally a German from Vienna called Heins Tulman. Another dragoman in the service of the Porte in the xvith century was Murad Beg, a Hungarian who was captured in the battle of Mohács, and known as the author of an apologetical treatise on Islam and especially on a bilingual hymn in Turkish, Latin and Hungarian (published by F. Bahinger, in Literaturdenkmale aus Ungarischer Türkenskiö, Berlin 1927; cf. also p. 39 sqq. of this book for historical data about the dragomans of the Porte). About this time there probably were already several dragomans in the service of the Porte, one of whom was the bash térkunim; they were almost without exception Christians (Greeks, Germans, Italians). As the foreign relations between the Ottoman Empire became more important and more complicated, the influence of the interpreters of the Porte increased, until, in the xvith century, the position of dragoman of the Porte became almost hereditary in the powerful Greek families of Mavrogordato and Glikas. It became the custom that, after having occupied the office of dragoman, they were appointed as prince of one of the Dalmat principalities. As it was still a rare exception, at this time, for Turks themselves to know European languages, the influence of these mediators on the foreign policy was necessarily very strong; on the other hand executions of former chief interpreters were not rare. It was only under the reign of Mahmúd II that, together with the increased importance of the activity of the Re's Efendi [q.v.], the Turkish government was able to liberate itself from the help of these not overtrustworthy ser-
vants. A special study of the role played by the Porte dragoman on Ottoman policy has not yet been made. An incomplete list of them is given by von Hammer, G. O. K., vii. 627.

The dragomans of the embassies and consulates were often no less powerful international mediators. They generally belonged to the same class of people, i.e., local Christians, as those in Turkish service. The treaties or capitulations and also the diploma's (kerîlay) granted to them by the sultan, guaranteed them the protection of the nation which they served in the consulate or the embassy. One of their special functions, which is expressly mentioned in the capitulations, derives from the right of the consulate to be represented by their dragomans in the processes before Turkish tribunals, in which their subjects were involved. This function had developed very naturally from the part played by the dragomans since the middle ages. As, however, since the xvith century, the influence of European Powers and their representatives in Turkey became preponderant, the interference in Turkish affairs, exercised by the dragomans, became insupportable to the Porte; moreover the consulates made a too extensive use of their right to appoint Turkish subjects as dragomans, withdrawing them thereby from the authority of their government. As a result of the remonstrances of the Porte, an agreement with the foreign missions was reached in 1853, by which the power of the embassies and consulates to appoint native dragomans was restricted. About this time, most of the European governments had begun, however, to create a special interpreter service from their own subjects, for which a proper training was required. In the second half of the xixth century and the beginning of the xxith century, the chief dragomans in the embassies of the great powers at Constantinople were still the acknowledged authorities for conducting negotiations of all kinds with the Porte, especially with regard to the interpretation of the capitulations and the application of the special extra-territorial rights derived from those treaties. When, however, in 1914 the Turkish Government abolished the capitulations, it refused at the same time to recognize foreign diplomatic or consular functionaries with the title of dragoman. Accordingly the title is no longer officially used in Turkey.


TERDJUMAN, in the terminology of Turkish mystics, has two meanings: 1. a member of a bali, who accompanies a neophyte of the order during his initiation, as a spiritual interpreter. When a murid is initiated in the Bekâtâl tariqa, he is led by two terdjumans into the presence of the Shâhîk and eleven other persons representing the eleven inîsâm. During the ceremony the terdjumans guide him and say for him the formulars he has to recite (cf. J. T. Brown, The Darvishes or Oriental Spiritualism, ed. H. A. Rose, London 1927, p. 206 sqq.).

The function of these terdjumans is analogous to that of a certain class of functionaries in the organisation of Islamic guilds, after the Futüwboks, who are called askî, but also terdjumân al-îlâh (or terdjumân al-futuâ). During the ceremony of the reception of a new member in the guild, these terdjumans play a similar part to those mentioned with the Bekâtâl (cf. Thüring, Beiträge zur Kenntniss des islamischen Verismaus, Berlin 1913, p. 106 sqq.).

2. With the Bekâtâl, terdjumân means also a prayer. Only special prayers, recited at special occasions, are called terdjumân. It is also said to be the name of the secret word or phrase of the Bekâtâl (cf. Brown, The Darvishes, p. 186, 199).

(J. H. KRAMER)

TEREK, a large river in the Caucasus (length about 300 miles, breadth in some places up to 500 yards). In its upper course it is a mountain torrent and even in its lower course so swift that navigation is impossible upon it.

During the golden period of Arab geographical knowledge ([it the 13th century] the Terek must have belonged to the kingdom of the Khazar [q. v.]). This portion of the Khazar dominions is not described by Arab geographers and the Terek not mentioned. The name seems to appear for the first time in the history of the fighting between Berke [q. v.] and Hitlagî [q. v.] at the beginning of 661 (Nov.—Dec. 1262) in Rashid al-Din (ed. Quatremère, p. 394). Hamid Allah Karwînî (M. S., xxii. 239) mentions the Terek (in Le Strange's translation, p. 250: Türk) along with the Sîl (Volga) as a river in Dâsh-i Kipîk (cf. türk). The land of the Terek at that time belonged to the kingdom of the Golden Horde and probably adopted Islam at the same time as the latter in the viiiith (sixth) century. A few years after the conquest of Astrakhan [q. v.] in 1554, Russian Cossacks began to appear on the Terek and in the Terek region formed the "Terekshesk Cossack army" (Terekshesk kharbëd); at first independent of Moscow, it was afterwards incorporated in the Russian empire. For the political life of the Muslim world, the Terek lands have never been of great importance; even the fortress of Kistlar on the north bank of the Terek was, in spite of its Turkish name, built by the Russians in 1735.

Bibliography: In addition to the works quoted in the text see E. Weidenhausen, Federodialle zu Karawan, Tils 1888. (W. BARTHOLOI)

TERNATE, a small volcanic island, west of Halmahera in the eastern part of the Malay Archipelago. From the administrative point of view, it forms with several other small islands and groups of islands a subdivision of the residency of Ternate in the government of the Moluccas. Only a part of the island is directly under the control of the Dutch East Indian government; the other part belongs to the autonomous district of Ternate, which includes several portions of Halmahera, the Sulu Archipelago and some other islands. From early times the trade in spices has brought many foreigners to these islands; the population, especially that of the area under the government, is therefore much mixed; the main element shows a strong resemblance to the native population of northern Halmahera. The standard of living is
not high, partly because the natives are not fond of work; they live mainly by fishing and a primitive agriculture. The language, Ternatan, is the tineina 
frances of the Molucca Archipelago; it belongs to the (non-Indonesian) north Halmahera group of languages and is a rather degenerate specimen of it. 
The early history of these regions is little known. In the period when our knowledge begins to increase, the north-east corner of the archipelago was divided into 4 kingdoms: Ternate (then called Gapi), Djalolo, Tidore and Batjan. There must have been some connection between these kingdoms (tradition traces them back to one single kingdom). But they seem to have been continually at war with one another. Djalolo originally had a certain predominance but had later to give way to Ternate; and especially in the xviith and xvith century Ternate showed a great desire to extend its power. We have very little, and that unreliable, information as to the time and manner in which Islam spread here. According to one tradition, a Javanese merchant named Husain (or Dja Huiun) (Husain) preached Islam in Ternate early as the reign of king Gapi Baguna (also called Mahboun) in 1495–86 and he is even said to have been successful in converting this ruler. In native chronicles, however, this king is not numbered among the Muslim rulers, the series of whom begins with his son Zain al-'Abidin (1486–1495) who was also the first to replace the old title khanum by that of Sultan. Under him the whole population is said to have been converted to Islam; we are also told that he made a journey to Java in order to be more accurately instructed at Giri in the principles of Islam. Islam is now found here in the same form as in other parts of Indonesia; several old pagan customs still exist but the principal precepts of Islam are followed with comparative fidelity, especially at the courts. There is no fanaticism. 

The Portuguese were the first Europeans to conclude a treaty with Ternate (beg. of the xviith century); when in the beginning of the xviith century the Dutch appeared in the Moluccas, an ancessing struggle began between them and the Spaniards and Portuguese; in 1683 Ternate recognised the sovereignty of the Dutch East India Company. In 1915 the reigning Sultan was deprived of his throne for his disloyal attitude; since then the autonomous area has been governed by a council of notables.

Bibliography: A full account of Ternate is given in T. S. A. de Clercq, Bijdragen tot de kenosis der residentie Ternate, Leydon 1890; see also: Legenden en geschiedenis van Ternate, in Tijdschrift van het Bondstaand Bestuur, II. 310. (W. H. Rassens).

TESHRIN, the name of the first two months of the Syrian calendar. It is found as early as the Palmyrene inscriptions and there means only one month, namely the first (in the Jewish calendar, the seven days, while the text was called Kain in [q.v.]). In the calendar of the Syrian church however, we find this name applied to two months, the third and fourth Syrian, ninth and tenth Jewish, Kisiw and Tebbith, while the original Kain was replaced by a second Teshrin month. As a stage in the development of the first Syrian names of months from four different to two pairs A. v. Gutschmidt has recognized the calendar of Heliopolis, the first four months of which bore the names Ag, Thori, Gelou, and Chanu. The last three names corresponded to Tisht, Kisiw and Kain. The development from Gelou to Kain is explained by the change of letters, while the replacement of Ag by Tisht might be due to Jewish influence. The Syrians distinguished the two Teshrit by the epithet 'r̄em and ṭry (so al-Biruni) for which the Arabs used al-arwāt and al-ūdār or al-dūn. 

In time, the two months coincide with the October and November of the Roman calendar and have 31 and 30 days. In the two months the four first stations of the moon set and the 15–18 rise. The days on which this happens are, according to al-Biruni, the 10th and 23rd T. I. and 5th and 18th T. II, according to al-Kawin, the 18th and 31st T. I. and 13th and 26th T. II. In 1300 of the Seleucid era (= 989 A. D.), according to al-Biruni, the stars of the four stations rose or set on the 22nd T. I. and on the 5th, 18th and 31st T. II.

ed-Din, 1299; İstanbolsu bir Semti, 1299—1300; Buadem, 1299—1302; Taşküdrü-i Kharabāt, 1301; İbi qeyin Odad, 1301; Tevrikk şeyład bin yus yetimid ibnish iyya, 1302; Kazanlıe-yes'av, 1305; Lafiye-i-emr-ı End, 1307—1310; Ulu-i Inzir-i Kutsal-i İsmim-i Mekki-i Edi.


(Th. Menzel)

TEFİF FIKRET, whose real name was Mehmed Tefik, the poetical name of Fikret being assumed later instead of Tefik Nâzım, which he first took, an important Turkish poet and metrical, founder of the modern Turkish school of poetry. 

Born on the 24th Shabāb, 1284 (Dec. 25, 1867) in Constantinople, he was the son of the secretary to Fa'īma Salțın, afterwards mütejarif Hussein Efendi (descended from a family of notables of Çerkeş in Anatolia) and Khaâlidhifi Reyna Khanmâ, a Turkish lady from the island of Chios (probably originally of Greek descent), received a careful education; he went first to the Mâhîmâdet-i Worldâ Khâ'idiyâ school in Azkera. At the latter the student was closely accustomed to the influx of the mîhrâjîr in the Russo-Turkish war, he entered, at the age of nine, the Galata High School (Geçelâsê Seray Salțin), with which he had to remain connected for almost his whole life. At eleven he lost his mother, who had gone with her elder brother on the pilgrimage to Mecca, and both died of cholera in the desert (Fikret, who only came to realize his loss fully when his sister died, dedicated to her her touching merîhiyye: Hişâhâr, Kim in 1318 = 1900). As a child, he was unmanageable and self-willed but later obtained a masterly control of himself and became serious, almost misanthropical and hypersensitive. In 1304 (1886—1887) he passed out of school as its most distinguished scholar, entered an office of the Porte, which he left in 1311, as the inactive life, then typical of a Turkish government office, did not satisfy his honourable nature. At the same time he taught French, Turkish and calligraphy in the commercial school in Gedîk Pasha. In 1306 (1888—1889) he became teacher of Turkish at Galata Sera High School, which he left in 1311 (1893) because the government cut down his salary. In 1312 (1894—1895) he became a teacher at the Robert College in Rumeli Hisar, where he remained till his death. In Rumeli Hisar he built his own house in which he decorated according to his own artistic ideas (he was also an artist) with a splendid view, where he lived the peaceful stylic life of a poet with his wife whom he was also his cousin, whom he had married in 1306 (1888) and his son Khaâlid, to whom he dedicated a volume of poems. (It was a remarkable decree of fate that while his mother died while on the pilgrimage, his own Khaâlid became a Christian in Glasgow, is now working as an engineer in America and is therefore lost to the Turkish cause).

From 1307 he was a contributor to the periodical Mişîhd, which was edited by the poet İsmâ'il Sefzî. In 1309, along with a few friends of like literary tastes he founded the Mu'vâmmâ, which was suspended by the censorship after 24 numbers. In 1311 he undertook the literary editorship of the illustrated periodical Tefiîf-i Fikret founded by Ahâmed İhsân in 1890. His wide literary activity was then begun which in a short time made him a most famous author. After suffering all kinds of restrictions under the regime of Abd-ul-Hamîd, after the revolution in 1908 he was appointed Director of the Galata Sen-i High School by the Young Turkish government, when he refused the Ministry of Education. He endeavoured to make the school a modern Turkish seminary, but soon came into conflict with the conservatism and red tape of the Ministry of Education and finally retired in 1910 (1327) to devote himself entirely to his poetry and his teaching in the Robert College. To this period belongs his scheme of educational reform for a new type of Turkish school (yevî Mezhebi), which he was never again carried through. After a long illness, he died on Aug. 18, 1915 (1331).

At the early age of 14, Mehmed wrote a hâdiî, of course in the old style (Mucâkkahi-i Tercüman-i Haşaht), p. 533). He developed his literary abilities under his teachers of literature, Feiz, Mu'allim Süleyman and particularly Redjî ekrem, who won a lasting influence over him as on the whole of the younger generation. It was Ekrem also who decided him to become chief editor of the Tefiîf-i Fikret. With Fikret's accession to the staff, a new era began for the Tefiîf. The periodical set the standard for the whole of modern Turkish literature, which is known as the Tefiîf Fikret (poetry) and Khaâlid Ziya (prose) period. Very soon all the collaborators of the Mezhebi, edited by Hussein Djîfis on western lines, joined the Tefiîf, whose staff included Ali Ekrem, Abd-ul-Hafiz, Emnidj Shahîd al-Din, Khaâlid Ziya, Ali Nûrî, Hussein Nâzım, Ahmed Redjî. The Oriental trend in the new literature was represented by the Mu'vâmmâ.

Two years after taking up his duties Fikret published his principal work; Aşıkâr ibâkit, "the Broken Lute" (Edebiyât-i élîyeti Kitâb-i Kâmlû, No. 2, Stambul 1314 [1896]) which had an unparalleled success and went through many editions (later with the addition of his later works). In 1317 (1899) he wrote Sir (Mist), his most vigorous poem directed against the despotic rule of Abd-ul-Hamîd. At the present day, it reads rather tamely. After the revolution he published his Risâdâ (1321 [1903]). In 1320 (1903) he wrote the merîhiyye: Hişâhâr, Kim in 1321 (1904) on the occasion of the unsuccessful attempt on the life of Abd-ul-Hamîd: Dâvûz-i Timânt; in 1908: Millit Sarhad. In No. 1 of the paper Timîfî, founded by him he published Sir and Risâdâ, which had previously passed secretly from hand to hand. In 1329 (1907) appeared the book Doğan kekbe dogran, which found whole-hearted approval in a special number of Fikret-i, Rûbâhin Ârsâhâlî, Khaâlidhifi Oğuzî, (in facsimile in the Edebiyât-i élîyeti Kutsal-i Kânûnî, No. 31). In 1328 (1910) appeared the poem Khansâhâmî, in 1330 a collection of songs for children in Puanâk Haşip, Shermih, his last work at all.

The amount of his work is not large but its importance for Turkish literature is unique. Fikret is now a much disputed personality. While he was praised to the skies in his life-time.
and lauded as a classic poetical genius, since his death an attempt has been made to minimise his importance and even to deny that he is a real poet and to describe him as a mere virtuoso and skilful metricist. A reaction has followed his incredibly rapid rise to fame. The following criticism sums up this modern attitude to him: *Fikret is immortal in Turkish literature as a technician, unforgettable as a man, but as a poet perhaps already forgotten*.

Like every poet, Fikret is to be studied in his period and milieu, in order to do justice to him. He is a finished master of technique, the creator of the Turkish renaissance, the main representative of the westernising school. The preceding period (Kemal, Hâmid, Ekrem) had abolished the dominance of Persian and Arabic forms but left the Oriental spirit. The task now was to get rid of the Muslim outlook on life and replace it by the western, i.e. French, point of view. For models Fikret took the French, especially François Coppée, Leconte de Lisle and Sally Pradhomme along with Musset, Lamarine, Baudelaire and Verlaine.

He created a new language of poetry, made new rules for rhyme on the principle that rhyme is not intended for the eye, as is the case with Ekrem and 'Abd ul-Hâkk Hâmid, but for the ear. With this fine taste and sound judgment, he succeeded in developing the language in spirit and structure on Turkish lines, doing away with linguisitic anarchy, turkicising the foreign elements and rhythms, although from the point of view of vocabulary he had no objection to overloading Turkish with Arabic and Persian words and his poems contain many rare non-Turkish words. Fikret did for the language of poetry what Nâmîk Kemal had done for prose. The rules laid down and followed by him are now so generally adopted that they are no longer felt to be innovations. The main object of his attention was language as such, much more that had been the case with other poets. In accuracy of language he resembles Ma'allim Nâdîr and surpassed them all in command of language. He recalls to some extent Platon not only in the perfection of his language and the freedom from error of his verse, with which even the opponents of the *Decadence* like Ahmed Miqhat could find no fault, but also in the soullessness of its marble smoothness.

Even in his earliest ghazels his own special characteristics are apparent, although he is still entirely under the influence of the older school. His mastery of language and rhythm developed very rapidly and it is this that distinguishes him from all others and which have made him a model for all other poets.

In contrast to the old school, which made each verse end as a closed unit in itself (which is why, particularly in the ghazel, the verses are so arbitrarily transposable), Fikret makes the sentiment run through a series of verses. His verses have thus a flexibility and naturalness which is still lacking in the verse dialogues composed by Hâmid. The language of his verses endeavours to adapt its melody to the subject matter, which Nefi before him had tried to do. Specially noteworthy is his introduction of the sonnet, which has since been much cultivated in Turkish.

In his metres he is still absolutely quantitative, with the exception of his poems for children. Otherwise the followers of the old school could not have so readily felt that he was indisputably a poet.

Fikret's was a hypercritical intellect which dealt with the moral, religious and political problems of his time, unswervingly following the voice of his heart and conscience. But he was not a philosopher who could solve the problems of humanity, no metaphysician who could penetrate into the depths of the soul. His mental processes were of a very ordinary, almost trivial nature. His *İsmâ'îl Hâşim* and his *Târîkh-i Fikret* are typical of the unbelief of his time. In the poisoned atmosphere of 'Abd ul-Hâmid's despotic rule and later in the time of the unrestricted and one-sided administration of the young Turks, with his pure personality, with his steadfast confidence in himself, his earnest devotion to duty and his sacred enthusiasm, by his poems he performed a duty to his country nobly so that the appeal was made to the young men of the day: *To thyself be like Fikret, to thy country like Nâmîk Kemal!* As there is something to be learned from every one of his poems, he had a great influence as an educative force on the youth of Turkey. He had a great belief in the value of education.

Tewfiq Fikret is a poet although not of the greatness that his contemporaries thought. He lacks the poetic fervour of Nâmîk Kemal, especially in the poems of his second period. The poems in which he sacrificed despotism, like his fervent *Ses*, which in its day was accepted like a gospel by the young men, now seem colourless and unreal. They are not born of desperation like those of N. Kemal. Fikret also celebrated in his verse the smallest and most insignificant things, going much further than Ekrem, who although he said that everything is poetry, in practice only applied it to flowers, clouds, water, dawn etc. A number of poems which Fikret wrote, following the practice of the day, for pictures in periodicals, were published in the *Rubâb-i zikrât*. Special mention may be made of the clearly outlined poems characterising *Nedim*, *Nefîz*, *Fazlî* and *Hasûm*.


(Th. Menzel)
Tewfik Pasha, Khedive of Egypt: (1879–1892), was born on December 15, 1852 as the eldest son of the Khedive Isma'il Pasha. He was educated in Egypt and began his political career at the age of 19 as president of the Council of State (al-majlis al-thawri). On March 10, 1879, after Nubar Pasha had resigned, he was appointed Prime Minister by his father. In his cabinet, as was the case in the former, an Englishman was Minister of Finance and a Frenchman Minister of Public Works. But already on April 9 of that year, Isma'il, by a kind of “coup d’état,” dismissed his new cabinet and Sharif Pasha [q.v.] became Prime Minister. Soon afterwards political difficulties led to Isma'il’s deposition by the Sultan (June 26) and Tewfik followed him on the throne according to the latter’s succession promulgated in 1866.

At the very beginning of his reign Tewfik Pasha had to face considerable difficulties. The draft of a constitution, submitted to the new Khedive by Sharif Pasha, shortly after his accession, was disapproved and Sharif tendered his resignation (August 18). For a short time Tewfik became his own Prime Minister, but soon Riyad Pasha was appointed to that post, to keep it for about two years, till the outbreak of the army rebellion of 'Arabi Pasha. In the meantime the "dual control" of England and France over finance was re-established, and in 1880 Egypt seemed to have entered a new prosperous period. In January 1880, however, occurred the first troubles in the army, which led to the nationalist revolt of September 9 on the part of the officer corps to power of Sharif Pasha; 'Arabi Pasha [q.v.] soon appeared as the most prominent man in the nationalist movement. The Khedive had no strong party on which he could rely to keep up his authority against this movement, and likewise the position of Egypt's suzerain, the Turkish Sultan and natural protector of the Khedive's government, was too weak to be of any importance. So, in the period that followed, the Khedive could not but play a passive part and allow the nationalists to take the measures they thought fit. One of these measures was the convocation of a national assembly of notables, but although at first the nationalist leaders showed moderation, the international financial troubles brought about at last a serious anti-foreign feeling in the country, which culminated in the massacre in Alexandria (June 11, 1882), followed on July 17, by the bombardment of that town by the British fleet. The Khedive with his government had already fled from the capital to al-Ramlah near Alexandria, while 'Arabi, now in open revolt against the ruler, retired to Karfi-Dawar, a few miles distant. This was the most difficult time of Tewfik Pasha's reign; he had to choose between the nationalists and foreign intervention and, at the same time, the Sultan contemplated his deposition and the installation of his uncle 'Abd al-Halim in his place and even the despatch of an army to Egypt, from which he was prevented by the attitude of the European powers. At last the nationalist insurrection was crushed by the military intervention of England (battle of Tell-el-Kehir on September 13, 1882), followed by the military occupation of the country. After the battle, Tewfik had returned to Cairo, but the only possible way, in these circumstances, to keep his throne was now to fall in with the wishes of the occupying power. In fact, the Khedive's government, again presided over by Sharif Pasha since August 1882, was now quite impotent. All the measures after the English occupation, taken with regard to the administration of Egypt, the new Organic Law of May 7, 1883, the international regulation of the financial administration in 1884, had to be accepted. There was, however, a loyal collaboration between the Khedive and the British resident with the title of Consul General, the later Lord Cromer, in the difficult years that followed. One of the most disastrous events in this time was the Mahdist rebellion in the Sudan and the abandonment of this province by Egypt, much against the personal wish of Tewfik, after the vain struggle to defeat the Mahdi (fall of Khartum in January 1885). It was only towards 1890, that a more prosperous time announced itself for the country; soon afterwards, on January 7, 1892, Tewfik Pasha died unexpectedly in his palace at Hulwan, to be succeeded by his eldest son 'Abbas al-Himîn.

Tewfik Pasha is said not to have had a character strong enough to face the overwhelming political difficulties; especially the whole attitude of himself and his government towards the first manifestations of rebellion in the army seems to have led inevitably to the complete loss of control over the course of events. On the other hand this Khedive has left the reputation of a mild and enlightened personality, who was esteemed by all those who had personal intercourse with him, amongst them Lord Cromer and other European statesmen who have given descriptions of him. At the age of 21 he had married a lady belonging to the Khedivial family and he remained strictly monogamic during all his lifetime.


TEZKARA, [See TADMIKH.]

THÂ', [The name of the fourth letter of the Arabic alphabet with the numerical value 500. Its form is a horizontal stroke, curved upwards at its ends, with three dots above it. By these three dots it is distinguished from the third letter of the alphabet, thâ' [q.v.], which has two dots only. This similarity explains also the place of thâ' immediately after thâ'.] Of the other Semitic alphabets it is only the South-Arabic which has a special form for the sound dh.

Etymologically thâ' corresponds to Canaanite wî, Aramaic wî (early-Aramaic wî), Assyrian wî, Aethiopic φ. In Arabian its place is sometimes taken by jî.

(A. J. Weninger)

AL-TH'ÀLÎBI, Nîaba of three Arab authors:

I. Abu Mansûr 'Abd al-Malik b. Muhammad b. Isma'il, one of the most fertile intellects of the 9th (xvii) century, of whose life we only know that he was born in 350 (961) in Nasîbîr and died in 429 (1038). His numerous compilations, in which he deals by no means scrupulously with the intellectual property of his predecessors and repeats himself frequently, deal mainly with the poetry of his time but also with lexicology and rhetoric.

His most famous and, for us most important, work is the Vâmittel al-Dahr fi Mustang Abî al-Aswâr on the poems of his own and the preceding
generation, arranged under countries, in the main an anthology with bibliographical notes as a rule very brief. Like most works of its kind, it went through several recensions as may be seen from Yākūt’s statement in the *Ifrīdīd, ii. 320 that he read the story given in the Damascus edition, ii. 33, at Cairo in a copy given by the author to Ya’qūb b. Ahmad b. Muhammad, while it is found in the usual texts. In the manuscripts given by Persch, *Verg. der ar. Texte zu Gottha*, No. 2127 and *G. A. L.*, i. 284 may now be added those in Paris (filoteo, Catalogue des manusc. des nouvelles acquisitions, Paris 1935) No. 6442, in Cambridge (E. G. Browne, *Handlist, 1900*) No. 1224 and in Nicholson’s possession (*J. R. A. S.*, 1899, p. 912), as well as an anonymous synopsis in the British Museum Or. 7745 (*Descriptive List*, p. 61); to the printed edition (Damascus 1304) may be added the index of Mawlawī Abī Muḥammad al-Ihākī entitled al-Fā’idat al-Ayr, a comprehensive index of persons, places, books etc. referred to in the *Fatimma al-Dahr*, the famous anthology of Tha’labī, Calcutta 1915, *Bibl. Ind., N. S.*, No. 1215. The first continuation of the work was written by the author himself and entitled *Tutmim al-Yātima*, quoted by Ya’qūt, *Ifrīdīd*, vi. 411 and in the Paris ms. No. 3308 (s. Mirza Muhammad on Samarqand’s *Cahār Maqāla*, p. 129; on a ma. in Aleppo *Revue de l’ar. et ar. de Damas*, vii. 529—535), in other ms. like the Berlin (s. *G. A. L.*, loc. cit.) it is simply called *Dhali*; s. also al-Badr (Tunis 1340), i. 2, 36 sq. A further continuation in part coinciding with the *Tutmima* was written by al-Shāhārī [q.v.]. An anthology arranged under subject matter is the *Kitāb Fi maṣāḥīh al-Dhāt* which is mentioned in the *Kūprīlī mutamid*, s. Rescher, *M. S. O. S. At.*, iv. 154a. In the printed edition of the ma. in the Khedivial library in Cairo (1324), transl. by O. Rescher in *Et-T’alāhibi, Heft 3*, Leipzig 1916. Subsidiary to it is the *Kitāb maṣhūr ʿanu al-Mufrid*, the autograph of which is in the Lézïe mosque in Istanbul (No. 1946, cf. Rescher, *M. O.*, vii. 109). It is printed in the collection al-Tūrī al-sābī bi-qāidal (Stambul 1302), p. 250—294 and Bairūt 1309, transl. by Rescher in *M. O.*, xvii. 31—198, xviii. 81—109. Similar anthologies, in which however the poet’s names are not given, are the *Kitāb al-Ṣalāḥ bi-al-Khâṣṣ*, Cairo 1326, the *Kitāb al-Mundhūl*, pr. with commentary by Abūd b. ʿAli as al-Mundhūlī fī Ṭurūq shādaru al-Mundhūlī, Aleksandria 1331, and the *Kitāb Tawāf at-Turayî in al-Aya Soṭa mas. 3767 (Z. D. M. G., lxiv. 504), Kōpurū 1330 (M. S. O. S. At.*, iv. 176) and Top Kapu Surai (R. S. O., iv. 606). For the especial use of secretaries he prepared the *Kawāk al-Kuttābī, 2,500 passages from 250 poets, s. Flīqel, *Die ar. etc. hrs. der K. H. Heftblietheek zn Wien*, No. 242; on this the Turkish poet Lāmi wrote a commentary, s. Toderrini, *Lit. Turch.*, ii, app. xxiv. Here also may we mention his prose versions of the verses in the anthology *Muṣir al-Udāba* of an unknown author which he prepared by command of the Khwārizmīshāh Abū ʿAbd Allāh entitled Nasīr al-Naṣm wa-Ḥallī al-ʾĀlā min makhfīt al-ṣīr wa muḥittī yakhnīnī mutaqī al-Kitāb al-mandīgārīn al-Muṣir al-Udāba*, pr. Damascus 1317, Cairo 1317.

A second series of his works belong to the field of entertaining literature but also contain all kinds of useful information especially historical anecdotes. Among these are the *Kitāb Lajīf al-Muṭāsīf, ed. P. de Jong*, Leyden 1867, the *Kitāb al-Farādīd wa ʿl-Kālidīd wa Kitāb al-ʾIḥāsī wa-Nuḥbat al-dālāl*, pr. Cairo 1317 (on the margin of the Naṣr al-Naṣm), 1324, the *Kitāb al-Mubahīf (or al-Mubāhīf)*, pr. Stambul n. d., Cairo 1324 and the two works on praise and censure of things, that old topic of school adepts entitled *Kitāb al-Lajīf wa l-ʾAṣārīf wa Yarīdīṣīt al-Munāsibīs* to the MSS. quoted in *Cat. cod. ar. Bibl. ac. Lund.*, No. 455 may be added: Paris, *cit.*, No. 5934, Petersburg, No. 857, Nicholson, *J. R. A. S.*, 1899, p. 913, Haupt, No. 2658. The two books were translated into one by an unknown hand in the Leyden ms. No. 456 and by Abū Nayr Abūd Mūhammad b. Abū-Raṣīf al-Maṭdīsī; the latter was lithographed under the title of the former at Baghdād 1252 and printed as the *Qayṣam al-fā’id bi-nāma Kitāb al-Thālibī etc.*, Būlāk 1290 and Cairo 1300. Finally must be mentioned the *Kitāb Gharar al-Balūgha wa-Turaf al-Baraʿa*, MS. in Berlin, No. 3341, or *Gharar al-Balūgha li-l-Nasm wa-l-Naṣm* (thus in Köprülī MS. 1200, s. Rescher, *M. S. O. S. At.*, xiv. 197) or with the addition of *al-Baraʿa* in the Brit. Mus. 7758 (*Descriptive List*, p. 63), another MS. also in Nicholson’s possession (*J. R. A. S.*, 1899, p. 913). Wrongly ascribed to him in the *Khams Rauṣā*, Stambul 1307, and on the margin of the Naṣr al-Naṣm, Cairo 1317, the *Kitāb al-ʾA Śhālij*, Cairo 1347, the *Kitāb al-Farādīd wa l-Kālidīd wa al-ʾIḥāsī wa ʿl-Hamān wa ʿl-Ulāmāy* (Cat. *Lugd.*, No. 4553; Paris, No. 5801, 2), from this is taken Tūrīīyī ṣyngatus dictionis brevium et auctorum, ed. J. J. Ph. Valetton, Leyden 1844; this work was later included in the larger Kitāb al-Fṣīla wa l-ʾĪfāzi, pr. in Khoms Rauṣā, Stambul 1301 and Cairo 1897. To the same class belong the *Kitāb al-Jīyat al-Mū늃, Kitāb al-Maṣāḥirīn at-Tallūhī al-Maṣāḥirīn wa-Maṭāfikat al-Muṣāwara, Paris, No. 5914 and the *Kitāb Lajīf al-Shāhadā wa al-Tūrīī*, *Lit. Selecta et Tha labīi libri facit prism., ed. P. Cool in the Chrestomathy to Roorda’s *Grammatica arabica*, Leyden 1835. Cheikho published another collection of wise thoughts in *Makhtīq*, v. 831—834. Finally he also compiled an adab work called Muṣir al-Waḥīd (in Ḥādīṣī Khālīf, No. 13454) which seems to survive in the Cambridge MS. (Browne, *Suppl. Handlist*, No. 1257, while the text publ. by Flīqel entitled *Der verstandne Geschichten der Einsehen* is only a portion of the Muṣāhadāt of Rāgbīl al-Ifṣāḥīn; s. Gildemeister, *Z. D. M. G.*, xxiv. 171. According to Ḥādīṣī Khālīf, No. 7543 he wrote a mirror work entitled Masīr al-Muṭāliq or al-Kitāb al-Muṭāliq. It still has to be investigated whether this survives in the *Sirāf al-Muṭāliq*, an ethical work ascribed in the Brit. Mus. Or. 6368 (*Descriptive List*, p. 64) to Thaʿlabī; a counterpart of this is the *Kitāb al-Waṣṣār*, in Gottha, No. 1886. Shorter adab-works are the *Kitāb Miṣrī al-Maṭāfikat wa-ʾĀmil al-Ḥasanāt*, pr. Cairo 1318 and
the Kitâb Bârd al-Abbâd fu'l-Adâd, Stamblû 1301.
A third group comprises his philological works in the narrower sense. The most famous of them is a work on Arabic synonyms composed very late in life to which he first gave the title Shâmu al-Adâb fu'l-tîfâf al-'Arâb. It consists of two parts, synonyms in the narrower sense, entitled Arâr al-Lughâ al-'Arâbîyya wa-Khaqâniyya and notes on style entitled Muğafir Karâm al-'Arâb bi-Rusûmilâ ma-
ma yatu'allakh bi'l-Nâzîr wa'l-Mubâhin mînà wa'l-Istiqâld b 'I'l-Kurân 'alî al-akbahârist; the bulk of this second part is worded for text from the Kitâb Fîkh al-Lughâ of Ahmad b. Paris. This old version of the work only exists in the Leyden MS., No. 66 and Berlin, No. 7032-7033. He later published the first part separately as Fîkh al-Lughâ; in this form it attained great popularity, as Proemium et specimina lexica synonymica arabicë Athisbâli, ed., vertit, notis illustratv J. Seligmann, Upsala 1863; Fleischer, Kleine Schriften, ii. 152-
166 and the printed editions Paris 1861 (ed. R. Dabdi), Cairo 1284, 1317 (with the original form Arâr al-Lughâ on the margin), 1325, Bârist 1885 (bowdlerized). In the Cairo editions 1284 and 1325 the second part of the original version is also printed as the Sîr al-'Arâbîyya fi Muğafir Karâm al-'Arâb wa-Sîlâtâh wa-l-Istiqâld b 'I'l-Kurân 'alî al-akbahârist also printed as the Sîr al-Adâb fi Muğafir 'Ullâm al-'Arâb along with Mâdînîn al-Sâni fi 'Aâsîmîn, published in Teheran n.d. and to be found separately in the Paris MS. No. 5989 with the error in the title Muğafir for Muğâfi in the MSS. also found elsewhere (e.g. Bâshâli Khßila, ed. Flügel, iv. 590). The work was put into verse by an unknown author in 742 (1341) as the Nazm Fîkh al-Lughâ in the Leyden MS. No. 67; cf. Weijers, Orient., i. 360 sqq. In 400 in Kâhirâ he wrote a handbook of Rhetoric with special references to Metaphor for the Khâriżmânî Mâ'mûn b. Mâ'mûn, which in the MSS. is sometimes called al-Kifâyâ fu'l-Kimyâ (so Paris, No. 5934), sometimes al-Nihâyâ fu'l-Tûrîf wa-l-Kimyâ (so Brit. Mus. Suppl. No. 1110, 1), sometimes simply al-Kimyâ wa-l-Tûrîf (so Berlin, No. 7336). It has been printed under the last named title at Mecca 1301 and Cairo 1326 along with al-Djûrânî's al-Muntâqhab min Kimyât al-
Ushâb wa-Surât al-Bulûghâ. A collection of elegant Arabic expressions is the Kitâb Sîr al-
Bulûgha wa-Sîr al-Bârdîn (to the MSS. enumerated in G. A. L., i. 285, No. 7 may be added Cairo (see Fihrist, iv. 183) and Paris, No. 6744, from which extracts have been printed in Stamblû (Reuiter, Verz., i. 33). Finally he compiled a collection with annotations of constant generic combinations entitled Thîrûr (Thamûr) al-Kullâl 'l-Muğafir fu'l-Mâmnût, which he dedicated to the Amir Ubâdallâh b. Ahmad al-Mikâlî (d. 436 = 1044); to the MSS. in G. A. L., i. 285, No. 9 add Paris No. 5942, Camb. Suppl., No. 354, and Brussels B. K. C., vol. 81, pr. Cairo 1320. A supplementary is the al-Târîkh al-mas'ûdî min Thamûr al-Kullâl, which collects the names of famous men, in the Paris MS., No. 6029, a synopsis entitled Jâmi' al-Djûrânî was composed by 'Abd al-Ra'ûf al-Manûsî (d. 1031 = 1622); cf. Codd. ar. bibl. reg. Hofyn, No. 206; Kema al-Fâ'il al-Adlan de Damas ii. 747; Fihrist Dîr al-Kutub al-Mu'arrabîa, iii. 3; Z. D. M. G., lxviiii. 855 (on a MS. in Brussels), was put into alphabetical order by Mub. 'Abd al-Mujîbî (1699) entitled Ma' ya'ammad 'alâkhî fî 'l-Muğafir fu'l-Malû'ûdî; MSS. in Cairo, Fihrist, ii. 385; Top Kapû, No. 3455; Aîl, No. 2247 (R. S. O., iv. 727; M. F. O. B., v. 496), Aya Sofia, No. 4136, M. O., viii. 132.


2. Abu Mansûr al-Husâîn b. Muhammad al-
Marghânî (from Marghân in Ghûr, Afghanistan), an Arabic historian of whom we only know that he dedicated his work, Ghuwar al-Siyar, to Na'rî, brother of Muhîmîd of Ghâzâ who died in 412 (1021). It gives the history of mankind from Adam down to Muhîmîd Subûkquq. The first part is in Stamblû in the Ibrâhîm Pâşi Library, No. 916 and in Paris No. 5953. Zotenborg published the history of the Persians from it (Histoires des rois des Perses, Paris 1900); in the introduction he sought, without convincing reasons, to show that it was written by the better known man of the same name (No. 1). This part of the book is specially valuable because it gives the sources used by Firdawsi for his Shâhânâmê in many places more accurately than even Tabârî. The author apparently translated fairly literally the whole book of kings prepared in Persia about 950 by four men for the ruler of Yûn, Abû Mansûr Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Ra'ûzak but he also used Tabârî, Djawâli and other Arabs quite uncritically. Of the four volumes which according to Ifdâšî Khßilfâ No. 8592 (ed. Flügel, iv. 319, where he is wrongly called al-Mârâzî) only one survives in the Bodleian (Orv., x. 2). This covers the period 747 to 158 A.H.

3. was a very laudable endeavour to cast off the fetters of the purely chronological arrangement of Arab historiography, and give history in its psychological setting. From this Persian Homa he published the account of Bibûsî, W.Z.K.M., iii. 30-37.


3. and al-Râmîn b. Muhammad b. Mâkâleb al-
Djâ'fâri al-Djâ'fâri, North Africa theo-
logian, b. in Algiers 786 (1386), studied from 821 (1417) in Bijdîya, Tunis and Cairo, the pilgrimage from the Tunis where he died in 875 = 1468 (so his tombstone, while Ahmad Bâdîh gives 872). His principal work is the commentary on the Kurân finished on 25th 
Rabî 1, 833 (Dec. 17, 1420) entitled al-Djâwâhir al-hisâb fi Ta'tuf al-Kurân; to the MSS. given in G. A. L., ii. 249, 31 may be added Paris, No. 5283 and 5379; Escorial 2, No. 1324; Fâs Ksarw., No. 1267/7; Algiers, No. 132/7. Of his works an eschatology has been printed, al-Ullâm al-fâhîs fi l-Nâzîr fi Umûr al-Aghâr, Cairo 1317-1318 and a portion of his ethical [Djâmûs al-
PECIALISATION] [Djâmûs al-
Djâ'fâri] entitled Nafîah min al-Djâmûs al-}
THÄBIT, whose personal name was 'AILX Al-DIN, an important Ottoman poet of the transition period (mainly under Sultan Ahmad III [1703–30]) with a distinct style of his own, quite outside of the usual. Born in Utça in Bosnia about 1650 (1650) of humble origin and of Serbo-Croat parents, he was related to the poet Wusul 'Ali Bey Padić of Utça and Mahur 'Ali Pasha of Sarajevo. He died in Constantinople in 1712 (1712–13). He adopted a theological career and went to Constantinople at the end of his studies, where as a result of his early developed poetical talent he soon became famous and gained patrons but also the hostility of many of his colleagues. As a result of the prevailing corruption and on Sinān b. Thābit and other later members of the family see the full treatment in Chwolson, Die Säbäer, i. 566–610.

neoplatonism in the appointments to public offices, in spite of his acknowledged ability he never succeeded in rising higher than müfüldim which rank he reached in 1589. He therefore resigned from the Ministrelsh, which alone formed the steppingstone to higher offices and adopted a judicial career, which took him to Corlu, Burgas, Adrianople (1097), Kaffa, Rodosto, Serajevo (1112), Konia (1117), Diarbekir (1119-1121 to which he had been particularly anxious to go). As the tenure of office was as a rule only one year, and after each period there was a considerable period of enforced inactivity (cal) without a pension, he had continually to struggle with financial worries and difficulties, especially as he was ashamed to enrich himself by irregular means. His high moral character was recognised even by his enemies. At the same time he suffered heavy blows from fate; he lost all that he owned through the outbreak of war; a portion of his family was massacred and others carried off into captivity. When he died in 1124 he had been for some considerable time without a post.

Thâbit had an impediment in his speech which hindered his advancement in his official career; he was however all the more fluent with the pen. Various peculiarities of language reveal his non-Turkish origin. His command of vocabulary and language is very powerful. His Turkish vocabulary is one of the richest and most valuable in the whole of Turkish literature, especially for its idioms. One of his characteristics is the frequent use of proverbs and popular sayings, even the most trivial ones. His language surprises us with its youthful vigour, power of expression and its wealth of bold imagery.

In spite of his reputed membership of the Melânû-l-Basîrî order and his not infrequent use of Sûfî nomenclature, there is nothing of the mystic in him. His feeling for the real is very pronounced, a feature he has in common with other Ottoman poets. What gives him a note of his own and raises him high above the level of other Ottoman poets is the manner in which his own individuality comes out in his poems. He was able to invigorate the tonelessness of Turkish poetry, usually abstract to the verge of desperation, by colouring it with his personality which breaks out everywhere and fills it with the spirit of a warm-blooded man. In spite of the fact that, with his remarkable facility with words, he does not reveal great depth of feeling, he is yet a true poet. But what always won hearts and secured him a certain popularity is his inexpressible humour and his sarcasm, which compel laughter and are not found in a similar form in other Ottoman poets. He is always full of jokes and witty remarks and punning allusions and double entendres, not always easy to understand. The strong contrasts which follow in rapid succession are typical of him: the simple and involved, even tortured, beautiful and coarse, pious and frivolous, even obscene.

Although he is not a popular poet in the proper sense of the word (there are for example no şarfi by him and his great learning makes his poems not easy to understand) he was much admired at all times in many circles. The number of manuscripts is large at his Divanı was often copied. The fact that he has not been printed is probably due to the large number of manuscripts available. Modern Turkish literary criticism has now, but not quite justly, rather turned against him. His works consist of a Divan with 37 bayâdes (incl. his Mervâdiyya, which is said to have been lithographed, and 2 na'ât), about 364 şahâiet (the şahâiet are the weakest part of his poetry), a few adlih, riddles, 60 quatrains, 100 muhfrâfed and about 50 chronogrammas; also of a number of meşhûre's: A Zafer-nâme, composed for Selim Girey (pr. Stambul 1299 and 1311); Edhem u-Hüna (Edhem-nâme); Beber-nâme; Dervâ-nâme (Hikâyêt-i Khâdja Fehid, Hikâyêt-i Donin Dev and Hikâyêt-i Amr u-Läîkh).


ThâKîf, On the eve of the Hijârâ, the tribe of ThâKîf, settled in the district of Tâ'if, claimed a common ancestor called ThâKîf. His real name is said to have been Kast and ThâKîf a surname. A malicious tradition has identified this Kast-ThâKîf with Abû Rîghâl, the traitor, who guided the Ayyubian army from Abraha to Mecca, and whose tomb used to be stoned on the road from Tâ'if to Mecca. It was when they wished to ascend beyond this eponymous ancestor that divergences began. Some connected ThâKîf with Yâd, others with Hâwâzin [q. v.]. Genealogists were still hesitating between these two schemes in the second century A.H. Most of the ThâKîfs declared themselves for the descent from Hâwâzin. This was in order to connect themselves with the group of this name which was also a subdivision of the mass of tribes connected with Kâsî. Their interests, their geographical position suggested this opportunist solution to the ThâKîfs in the 9th district.

Tâ'if, On the eve of the Hijârâ, the tribe of ThâKîf, the tribe seems to have included only a small proportion of nomads. As for the town and the surrounding gardens, it contained the fertile country villages of Waît, of Lyûa and others which stretched in the direction of the Yemen. Its islamisation took place at the same time as that of Tâ'if. It shared the reputation for trickery of the Tâ'ifs, took part with them in the conquests of Islâm, above all in the 'Iraq, where the foundation of Mâqâm was due to them. Like them, the tribe rallied readily to the Omayyad regime, an attitude which earned them the hostility of the 'Abbasids rulers and also that of the 'Abbasids and 'Alîids traditionalists.

Meanwhile a slight movement of the tribe towards the south took place, all along the farms which they were developing in this direction. From the third century A.H. small numbers of ThâKîfs are found as far as the Yemen, in the Banû Hâdâm country and in the district of Nadîrân, on intimate terms with the tribes of the country. It is thus that we find them in the Yemen supporting the Zaid al-Hâdî ila 'l-Hâjî, studied by Van Aredonk. For the rest the history of the tribe is not distinct from that of Tâ'if, the
The centre round which the majority of the tribe remained settled.

At the beginning of the 6th century, the traveller Burckhardt described the *Thekif* as a "very powerful tribe"; it possessed the fertile country round Taif, its gardens, and other sites on the eastern slopes of the mountains of the Hedjaz. A great many *Thekif* have fixed abodes. Half the inhabitants of Taif belong to this tribe; others continue to live in tents. The *Thekif* have very few horses and camels but they are rich in sheep and goats.... They can turn out two thousand men armed with rifles; they defended Taif against the Wahhabis*, in 1803. One of the last European visitors to Taif, Mr. Philby, found them on the slopes of Mount Ka'ab, between Taif and Mecca, where they devote themselves to agriculture.


**THÂLAB, Abu 'l-ʿAbbas ʿAlam b. Yahya b. Zaid b. Saʿiyd (or: ʿAbîr) al-Shābāni (Mawāsī of the Banū Shābān), an Arab grammarius, although regarded as of the *Kūfī* school (see below), spent his life in Baghdad. Born in 600 (815), at the age of 16 he began to devote himself to the study of the Arabic language and literature. Abu ʿAbd Allah b. al-ʿAbbas b. al-Zuhmir b. Bakkar were amongst his teachers. He also studied with great enthusiasm the works of al-Kisāʾi and especially of al-Farābī; he is said to have known all the latter by heart at the age of 25. Later he himself taught public and privately and in this capacity received a considerable salary from the court at the suggestion of the vizier Ismaʿil b. Balbul. His best known pupils were Abu Bakr b. al-Anfārī and Abu ʿUmar al-Zahrid. For thirteen years he was also private tutor to the son of Muhammad b. ʿAbd Allah b. ʿĀthir, governor of Baghdad. His scientific activity also found expression in a number of publications of a philological, especially grammatical, nature. Of most only the titles have survived. Only two of them (Khitāb al-Furqān and Khudad al-Maṣṣūr) have been printed. Thālab's hearing became very defective in his old age. This defect was the cause of an accident which he suffered on his way home from the mosque one day, as a result of which he died in Djumaḍ 1 291 (904). As he had led a simple life, he was able to leave his daughter a considerable fortune. His extensive library was purchased after his death by the vizier al-Ḵāsim b. ʿUbayd Allah.

The later Arab grammarians class Thālab as belonging to the so-called Kūfī school, which is said to have reached its zenith and also its end in him. He himself indeed declared he was an ardent follower of al-Farābī, the Kūfī ʿArab. He also waged a constant feud with al-Muharrad, his famous contemporary of the *Buṣira* school. But, as G. Well has shown, one cannot really talk of a regular school of Kūfī grammarians; when its alleged representatives are considered to form an independent group, this is simply an invention of the later grammarians, who considered themselves the natural continuers of the *Buṣira* tradition and thought that the state of affairs in grammatical study with its opposing schools in their time must also have existed in the past. Thālab no doubt continued the tradition of al-Farābī but he was no more able than the other *Kūfīn* to do more to establish his grammatical method, still less to develop it. His interest also was too much devoted to accumulating material to be organised and to acquiring a knowledge of special linguistic forms, to enable him to develop a fruitful activity in the field of metempsychosis.

*Bibliography:* Dura, Khatib al-ʿIraqi, ed. Wüstenfeld; Tabari, ed. de Goeje, Index, s. v.; Wüstenfeld, *General Tabalun und Register; Caesarea de Perceval, Historie des Arabes*. (H. H. BRAU.)

**AL-THÂLAB, ʿAbd b. Muhammad b. ʿAbd al-ʾĪbih al-Nihānī, a famous theo-

alogian and Kūfī exegist, born in Muharram 427 (Dec. 1935). His great work is the commentary on the *Kūfī* entitled al-Kaṣīfi, wa l-Bayān an Taṣfīr al-Kūfīn, which Ibn al-Jawzi (according to Ibn Taghtibird, p. 660; ed. Popper, ii. 166)
criticises on the ground that it accepts weak traditions, especially in the early Sūras, but which according to Schwall (in Noldeke's Geschichte der Qur'ān, ii, 174), must be one of the most useful works on the subject, as he uses about 100 sources in addition to Ţabari in an intelligent fashion, and with every endeavour to attain completeness the work is only twice the size of Bahjāwi. Nevertheless the work which was still very widely used in Yāqūt's time and had a criticism written on it by Ahmad b. al-Mukhtar al-Razi about 631 (1233) (see Fīhrist al-Kutub-khānum al-Khadwatī, i, 198) has now fallen into oblivion and has never been printed. Much more popular is his History of Prophets, which grew out of his Kurān exegesis and was to be a supplement to it; it gives all the stories in very great detail but keeps on the whole clear of the worst fears of imagination of the ʿanāʿīdī, such as we find in al-Kisāʾī's [q. v.]. The book has been often printed e. g. Cairo 1297, 1303, 1306, 1310, 1314, 1521, 1524, 1340, Bombay 1306, and Tokyo 1908. We have also a translation with commentary by Ahmad b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Yaḍī, Kasan 1902. As it became a popular work, the text was not treated with care, for example in the Paris MS. 1923, it is worked into that of al-Kisāʾī.

Bibliography: Yāqūt, Irshād al-ʿArūb, ii, 104; Ibn Khallikān, Cairo 1299, No. 30; al-Suyūṭī, De interpretibus Corani, ed. Meisinger, No. 5; Wüstenfeld, Geschichtsschreiber der Araber, No. 185; G. A. E., i, 350.

(C. Brockelmann)

THAMŪD, the name of one of those old Arabian peoples, which the ʿAd, Iram (Aram), Wihār (Jabalat) had disappeared some time before the coming of the Prophet. A series of older references, not of Arabian origin, confirm the historical existence of the name and people of Thāmūd. Thus the inscription of Surūn of the year 715, e. g. mentions the Thāmūd among the peoples of eastern and central Arabia subject to the Assyrians. We also find the Thāmūdīs, Thāmūdīs, mentioned in Arista, Platen, and Pliny. The latter mentions as settlements of the Thāmūdīs Domatha and Heqra, which are probably to be identified as the modern Dūmtā al-Djandal in Djof and al-Hijr on the Hijāz railway north of al-ʿEmās. Old Arab tradition also locates the Thāmūd at the last named place. The older poets mention the Thāmūd with the ʿAd as examples of the transitoriness of worldly glory, e. g. al-Athsāh and Umayyā b. Abī ʿIrādī, who quotes several legendary features of their story. In the Kurān the fate of the Thāmūd along with that of the ʿAd serves as a warning from native history along with the foreign ones from the Bible: for example in the curic: xi, 6 q.; xv, 89–90; lv, 23–31. Arab tradition of the fall of the Thāmūd, which was further developed by the earliest exegetes from the references in the Kurān is in its main lines as follows. Just as there was a prophet named Ḥūd among the ʿAd so there was one called Sāliḥ (b. ʿUbaid b. ʿAmīr b. Sām, q. v.) among the Thāmūd. Challenged by his opponents, whose leader is said to have been Dūjand (b. ʿAmīr, to give a sign of his divine mission, he conjured up a pregnant she-camel out of a rock. The terrors of this animal, sacred and inviolable as ʿAllāh's camel", were however cut along with those of its foal by the scoffers. In punishment the whole people was doomed to destruction. The manner of their destruction is said in Sūra xii. 76 to have been raqqā, earthquake, in Sūra xii. 12, 16, 162, a thunderbolt. These expressions make it probable that tradition associated the fall of the Thāmūd with one of the volcanic outbreaks which led to the formation of more or less extensive fields of lava called ḥara in Arabia. West of al-Hijr lies one of the largest of these ʿārān (cf. B. Moritt, Arabien, Hanover 1923, p. 28). E. Glaser thinks the Thāmūd are closely connected with the Lībīn [q. v.], the Lechelīt of Pliny, that Thāmūd was the older, Lībīn the later name of the people still surviving in the two Lībīn class of the Hajāḥīs, and that the decline of the Thāmūd coincided with the end of the Lībīn kingdom, somewhere between 500 and 600 a. d. The rock inscription found by Huber, Katting and others in al-Eis, al-Hijr and neighbourhood are called by epigraphists Lībīn or Thāmūdīn.

tertium comparationis is an all too frequent and confusing habit of the Muslim champions of orthodoxy.

The above charges against the three last-named are taken from al-Khayyāt, Kitāb al-Indikhāj, ii, 157, 159, 161, and also, in the index under the name mentioned here and below). To appreciate his opinions properly, one must remember that they are counter-attacks on Ibn al-Rawandi, who in his Kitāb Fadālah al-Mutūthlih has branded several leaders of the Mu'tazilah [q. v.] as dualists. It is true that these circles produced many polemics against Thānawayya, Manichaean and Da'ishi; but Ibn al-Rawandi seized upon the Mu'tazilah endeavour to make God not the originator of evil. Even al-Dhāibli is said to have endangered monotheism by the assertion that the bodies develop out of their nature. and that "God cannot destroy them" (op. cit., p. 168). Ibn al-Rawandi particularly characterized Ibrāhīm al-Naẓīr, the teacher of Dhāibli, although he wrote against the Thānawayya (op. cit., p. 17, 18), as a downright dualist Manichean and Da'ishi (op. cit., p. 167, 168); and particularly on account of a view of the absolute opposition between good and evil, as between light and darkness. So long as the original works are not available, we must accept with caution the distorted reproduction of his opponents' views by Ibn al-Rawandi and the evasive exposition by al-Khayyāt. It is, however, not only these opponents who suspect the Mu'tazilah, who take pride in calling themselves the people of true monotheism and not only the Mu'tazilah mentioned who have become suspect, but several others like "All al-Aswārī and Abu Bakr al-Aswārī (cf. also de Boer, Geschichte der Philosophie im Islam, Stuttgart 1901, p. 47: Hogen, Die philosophischen Systeme der spekulativen Theologen im Islam, Bonn 1912 and his other works by index under Dualismus). The Mu'tazilah counter-attack however was able to reproach the Sunnis with their Kurfān which they asserted had existed from the beginning alongside of God.

Dualism is said to have been distinctly taught by some disciples of al-Naẓīr. Just as they are said to have intensified his Shi'i tendencies till they became ultra-Shi'a, so did they develop his christianizing logos-theory into the doctrine of two creators: God and God's word. The latter however, identified with the Messiah, does not mean complete incompatibility with monotheism, as it is only a created creator, an intermediary. Even the names of these heretics are, it must be confessed, uncertain. In Shahrastānī (ed. Cureton), p. 42 whose authority is Ibn al-Rawandi they are called al-Faḍil al-Hadathī and Ahmad b. Ḥāfīz. The latter is also the name given in Masʿūdī, Murādī (ed. Barbier de Meynard), iii, 266, but in another classification; in Ibn Hamd, Fīqīr (Cairo 1331), iv, 197, 199; Ahmad b. Ḥāfīz and al-Faḍil al-Hārbi (cf. Nyberg on Khayyat, p. 148 on p. 222 esp. and Friedländer, The Heterodoxes of the Shi'is, in J.A.O.S., xxix. [1909], p. 100). The ultra-Shi'i Bāyān al-Samān al-Tammī is said to have interpreted Surat xliii. to mean that there is one God of heaven and another, inferior however of the earth, and Abu ʿl-Khaṣṣāb Banīyah and a certain al-Surī are said to have agreed with him (al-Kashshāb, Muṣaffāt Abūl-Bāqil, al-Bīrāq [Bombay 1317], p. 196, 295). This seems to lead towards those Gulātt (cf. nasriya) who see in 'All not so much the incarnate identity with God as the demigare under the highest God. It is often insisted by theologians and philosophers (cf. Ibn Harm, Fīqīr, iv, 37; see also Schreiner, in Z. D. M. G., iii [1928], p. 479 sqq. and Nallino in the Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, ii, 91 sqq.) that the participation in rule by the stars as second forces in addition to God, because it is dualism, is no less infidelity than the purely atheistic paganism of an absolute astrology.

To Islam with its striving after monotheism, duality means the abolition of the very idea of God (cf. on Surat xvi, 51: al-Khaṣṣāb, Musaffāt al-Qāhir [Cairo 1308], v, 327, 34, 36; al-Baiḍāwī, Anwar al-Tamīd [ed. Fleischer], p. 517, 52; al-Naṣīrī, Tażīrī on the margin of Ṣafarī, Tażīrī, Balić 1323, ed., xiv, 74). Thānawayya thus became a term of contempt, but even in this use, it is not absolutely free from ambiguity but is used to some extent synonymously with the commoner word šarīf, the application of which is much wider. Of the philosophical systems the Neoplatonist brought a dualistic system, of metaphysics into the Kalām of Islam. Ghasālī very strongly emphasises its halfway position, full of contradictions, between the true belief in tawḥīd on the one hand and complete infidelity on the other, as taught by the Dahirī [q. v.], naturalism, erroneous it is true, but quite conceivable: "the philosophers think that the world is eternal, but in spite of this they assume a creator; this is a self-contradictory proposition which requires no refutation"; Ghasālī insists it is only hiding and not bridging over the difficulty when the empiricism of the Peripatetics summons to its assistance, from the Neo-Platonic doctrine of emanation, from the fashion of the Brethren of Purity (cf. ighāṣīn al-Sākīn), a being intermediate between God and the universe: "a caused (creative intermediary) alongside of the prime cause gives two creators and those eternal", cf. Taḥafut al-Falsafīya (ed. with the works of the same name by Ibn Rāhīd al-Khwādżāzāvī, Cairo 1319), p. 33, 37 and thereon J. Obermann, Der philosophische und religionssubjektive Ghasālī (Vienna-Leipzig 1921), p. 43 sqq., 57 sqq., 63 sqq.). It is at the same time (p. 35) strongly emphasised that from the Aristotelian Neo-Platonic point of view of Fārābī or Ibn Sīnā a proof of tawḥīd need not be given. He is therefore not all impressed in any way by the fact that the latter tries to remove the danger, which he himself feels of a "second Necessarily Existing One" (see Hogen, Die Metaphysik Avicennas [Halle 1907], p. 542 sqq.; esp. p. 551 on Ibn Sīnā, Kitāb al-Sifāʾ, iv, treatise 9). Even more uncertain sounds the monotheistic assertions of Ibn Sīnā in the narrower scope of his Kitāb al-Najdār (Cairo 1317), p. 337 sqq., 356 sqq., 374 sqq., in view of the granting of the independence of the hybrid sublunar created creation, as it is reflected in his dualistic anthropology also.

The contamination of Muslim monotheism by dualism from outside Islam presents itself to the Sunni Ash'arīs may be seen, for example, in ʿAbd al-Khālid al-Raghibīdī. In Farḥ bān al-Farḥ (Cairo 1328) he expresses surprise even more ironical than Ibn al-Rawandi (see in Khayyat, p. 30, 31) at the fact that al-Naẓīrī in his arch-dualism (Farḥ, p. 120, 121: tāḥif bānīmilt ʿan al-Thānawayya) wrote against the Thānawayya and the Manichaeans (p. 117, 120, 120, 123 sqq.)
Al-Baghdaṭī in Uṣūl al-Din (Stambul 1928, p. 54) associates al-Nazārī directly with the Thānawīya outside Islam, among whom he in error includes the Marcohites, unlike the other heresiologists: He describes the Bāṭiniyyah [q. v.] without qualification as dualists (p. 322): "They were originally Madżūs and Thānawī, then in the time of al-Maḍīn their prophets like ’Abd Allāh b. Māmin al-Qāḍīb [q. v.] and Ḥamād b. Kārun preached that there were two creators whom they called the first and the second; but this is in substance the teaching of the Thānawīya about light and darkness and the substance of the teaching of the Madžūs about Yaḥdān and Aḥrimān. Who are meant by the "two creators" is not recognisable with certainty from the brief general observation. It might be thought that al-Baghdaṭī had accurately, emphasised only the nūr aḥzā vivini and the nūr ẓulmi out of the series of emanations [see Ḫañwaṭiyya] in order to assert the Madžūs character of the Bāṭiniyya. The known monotheistic tendency of the Bāṭini Nūṣir-i Khusrav (Zadrā Muṣṭafīr, Berlin 1925, p. 74 160, 15g. 160 sqq.) does not support the idea of a duality of this kind (cf. also Scharf), "Die islamische Lehre vom vollkommenen Menschen," in Z. D. M. G., N. S., iv. [1925], p. 222 160, esp. p. 231). The subordination of the second god would, it true, not fit the comparison with the Madžūs made by al-Baghdaṭī but it is just this point that would not be regarded as proper dualism in the usual language of the Muslim heresiologists. They expressly excluded the Madžūs from the Thānawīya, distinguishing them from the three groups mentioned at the beginning of the article, because, according to their dynamic monochronic view of Aḥrimān-darkness was a temporary condition of Yaḥdān-light, the sub-group of the Za‘rūṭiyya (Zaraqūṭṭiya) teach, both are equal to each other, but are subordinate to a supreme God as the first things created by him.

**Bibliography:** Besides the books mentioned in the text, cf. the works quoted in the articles cited. (R. Strothmann)

**THĀNĪSARI, MAWLĀNA,** whose real name was Ḥamīd, was a disciple of Shākh Naṣīr al-Dīn Mahmūd Ṭūrābī b. Dīlī (d. 757 = 1356), and was distinguished for his learning and piety. When the news of the arrival of Tiμūr (d. 807 = 1404) spread in Dīlī, most of the "Ummā" left the place but Thānisari stayed till he and his dependents became prisoners of Tiμūr. As his fame was widespread and Tiμūr had previous knowledge of his learning, he was set at liberty and was made a friendly advisor. Although he had been removed from his office, discussion arose about the precedence in the assembly between Thānisari and Shākh al-Islām who was the descendant of Ali b. Abī Bakr al-Farghānī al-Marghīnānī (d. 593 = 1197), the author of al-Ḥidāya. Tiμūr took the side of Shākh al-Islām and said that the latter was a descendant of the author of the Hidāya, meaning that preference should be given to him. On which Thānisari replied that it was no wonder that Shākh al-Islām had committed one mistake, for his ancestor, the author of the Hidāya, had committed many mistakes. Whereupon Shākh al-Islām became very angry and asked him to point out the mistakes. Thānisari told his pupils to do so. But Tiniμūr stopped the discussion, in order to prevent further disturbance. When Tiniμūr left India, Thānisari also went away from Dīlī and settled at Kālpi where he engaged in teaching till his death in 820 (1417) and was buried in the fort of Kālpi.

Among his compositions the ʿeqāda Dāliya is very famous.

**Bibliography:** 'Abd al-Ḥakīm Dīlamī, Aḥbar al-Ākhyār, p. 142; Azālī Bilgārīn, Sūrat al-Mārjām, p. 57; Sāliḥ Ḥasan, Aḥbar al-Ūlām, p. 892 and Ḥadāthāl al-Hamaynī, p. 313. (M. Ḥosayn Hosayn)

**THĀR.** [See Ẓiḥār.]

**THĀWBAḤ & IBRAIḤIM.** [See Dīlī 'l-.MM.]

**AL-THĀWBR, the constellation of the zodiacal circle. The figure is the front half of a bull whose head is turned to one so that the horns face east. The constellation consists of 32 stars in the figure and 11 outside it. On the sector (ṣafā, ʿawrān) are said to be four stars in a straight line; in reality the stars ʿawrān form a curve. The bright star of the north horn also belongs to the constellation of the Steer-man. The eye of the bull, 'Ain al-Thawbr, the star with a red light of the first magnitude in the centre of a thick group of smaller stars, the Hyades of the Greeks, is given many names by the Arabs. The name al-Fālak, the "large camel," seems to be genuinely Arabic; around it are grouped the other stars or al-Kīlāf, "small camels." Other names of the stars are connected with the Pleiades. As this constellation is called al-Najmam, "the group of stars," by the Arabs, it is called Ḥādāt al-Najmam, the "driver of the stars," and ūlaq al-Najmam and al-Dakrīn, the "follower of the stars." This last name has passed into our star names in the form Aldebaran. The stars and near the ear of the bull are called al-Kalbāzh, the "two dogs," i.e. of the driver.

**Bibliography:** al-Kazwīnī, ʿAlgār ib. al-Ḥakīm, ed. Wüstenfeld, i. 355; transl. by H. Eth, as the *Cosmographie,* p. 74; I. Ideler, *Untersuchungen über den Ursprung und die Bedeutung der Sternnamen,* p. 136. (J. Ruska)

**AL-THUGHHR (plur. of thawr, "heaf, opening"), the zone of the fortresses built against the Byzantines in the Syrian and Mesopotamian marches (here also Zuhūhr al-Rumīyya). In Constantinople Porphyrogenetos they are called τῷ Ὀρνικ (De Cerimon., ed. Bonn, i, 657; cf. Reiske's note, ii., p. 777 = Migone, *Patrol. Graec.* exil., col. 1220, note 38), by the Syrians the "land of Tagris" (Michael Syrus, ed. Chabot, iii. 20, 49, 467; Barthelemaeus, *Chron. Ecclesi.,* ed. Abbeleu-Lamy, i. 339 sq.).

This frontier was swept from the Tarsits [q. v.] in Cilicia, the Turks on to Malayta [q. v.] to the Euphrates and sought to protect the frontier province of the Awšazīn [q. v.] from enemy invasion. It corresponded in object (but not in position) to the ancient times, and a distinction, analogous to the old division into Limes Arabicus, Syrianicus, etc., was made between the Thughūr al-Shawmiya and the Thughūr al-Dzariyya. The most advanced town in the former was Marāṭsh [q. v.] and in the latter Malayta [q. v.]. Al-Iskāḫānī mentions in the Thughūr the fortresses of Malayta, al-Hadith, Marash, al-Hārānīyya, al-Kantā (= Kanṣir, al-Sawārī); 'Ain Zarba, al-Maṣṣūrā, Adhān and Tarsis; al-Dimāḥqī gives the following as the fortresses on the Mesopotamian frontier: Malayta, Kāsakh, Shinadīlī, al-Bīrā, Ḥuṣn Mānūr, Kāfīr al-Rūm, Hadāth al-Ḥamadī and Marāṭsh, on the Syrian
Thulā, Thilha, a town in South Arabia, at the foot of a reddish range of hills, which branches off from the great chain of Kawkaban, Hadhir al-Shihā, Dīn Ibn to the east (S.E.) and forms the southern boundary of al-Bann. According to E. Glaser who visited it on Dec. 5, 1883, the town is very clean, and has narrow streets and very high regularly built houses of yelllowish-red limestone, which is hewn into neat blocks of about 10 inches by 4 and shows the same character in the whole town. The town is built against the eastern side of 1,000 feet high sandstone cliff, on the top of which is the castle (husn) el-Nakir and is surrounded by a wall with 4 gates, beginning and ending against the cliff; it is at least twice as large as Shibam and one and a half times as large as Kawkaban and after Sa'īn, one of the largest and finest towns in the Yemen. The citadel, which was entered through a great archway, which spanned a deep cleft, but was later destroyed, is extraordinarily strongly built and apparently very old. It is said to have been previously called Husn al-Ghurāb (castle of the Raven), the name of the famous fortress on the coast at the old harbour of Kane (el-Madījāba). It is one of the finest castles in the Yemen; unfortunately the Turks at the conquest of the country destroyed all the outer works. The entrance gate of the castle is at a height of 15 feet in an absolutely perpendicular wall, over a ravine 60-100 feet deep. Besides a fine mosque, the castle had also a large dwelling-house in the extreme east on the highest part of the hill, which looks at a distance like a low square tower; besides it a little lower is a higher tower, also square. Water was supplied from 4 or 5 deep well cemented cisterns; 15-20 granaries (madāfīn) cone-shaped caves, hewn out of the sandstone served as storehouses for provisions; the opening was at the narrow end. They are 13-20 feet deep, are 12 feet at the bottom and not quite 3 in diameter at the opening. The summit of the mountain, on which the castle stands, has on all sides caves hewn out of the rock (dīrāb) with regular dwelling-houses with windows, niches and doors. Some are whitewashed and have 5 or 6 rooms of varying size. They seem to be old and were at one time used as dwellings by the Arab garrison of the fort. West of the above mentioned tower-like square ruined building are several large tombs built on the sandstone with old Arabic inscriptions. A saint (wa'll) is said to be among those tombs.

According to local tradition, there was originally not a town of this name but a group of villages; the latter — said to have been over 40 in number — were under the rule of Thulā down to the Turkish conquest. In C. Niebuhr's time the administrative district of Thulā (he writes Tulla) comprised also the lands to the north like Kohlān, 'Affār, Hadji, Dōfar, Kawkaban (near Hadji), Djebel Sherif, Habūr, Sūda and Djebel Shabara with about 300 villages, and was therefore much more extensive than at the end of the sixth century. 

**Bibliography:** C. Niebuhr, Beschreibung von Arabien (Copenhagen 1772), p. 251 sq.; E. Glaser, Geographische Forschungen in Fernen 1883, p. 251 sq.; (Manuscript), fol. 61. (Grohmann)

**Thuluth.** (See Arabia, i. 380; 387.)

**Thumāma b. Ashras, a theologian, representative of the liberal movement under the early 'Abbāsids. On account of his great learning and intellectual ability he was invited to the court by Hārūn and Ma'mūn, to whom his sharp criticism of conservative views was no doubt also pleasing. This brought upon him the enmity of the conservative school of thought, which began to come to the front again after Mutawakkil and they have endeavoured to belittle his reputation. To the burning questions of his time he took up an independent position, logically thought out, which often seemed peculiar and arbitrary. The "consequences" of actions, e.g. the turning of a key by a man, are produced neither by man (otherwise he would be able, like God, to bring into existence new realities, i.e. to create) nor by God, for them. God would also create sin and moreover be in dependence on the will of the creature. The "consequences" (mutawalli'ār) are rather subjectless acts of God (ou phrasing). The liberal school traced them to tawlīf, the "engendering" of man, without being willing to call this a "causation". Our knowledge is therefore, according to Thumāma, something originating in time but is without a prime cause (muḥbīt) working in time. Our spirit itself cannot produce it, for then it would be exercising a function of the Deity.

Only the internal activity of the will (tā'add), excluding all its consequences, is our own special
possession and "free". The world is created by God through his nature (tiḥāb = phylos), i.e., synonymous with "physical" necessity. It must therefore have been, as Ṣahrāstānī rightly observes, produced "eternally" i.e., without beginning, and this is the root of falsafīja. Our natural reason decides on the ethical value of the moral action (taḥsin al-ʿaql). God cannot arbitrarily establish the moral. All our intellectual apprehensions are necessary (gārūrī), and have no connection with chance. He who does not know God in this logically compelling fashion is not bound to obey his commandments; but thereby he also loses the dignity of man's nature and becomes like the beasts. In the next world he will fall into dust. He is not conceded an immortal soul. This is true of Jews, Christians, followers of the Duḥar, Mazdak (Zanadīdā), Magians (fire-worshippers, Parais) and children, even those of Muslims. Ibn Murtaḍā in his "Book on the Sects" (Khitāb al-Milāt bi'l-Nīfār, ed. T. W. Arnold, Leipzig 1902, p. 35 ę.) puts him in the seventh generation, which follows that of al-ʿAlīf (d. 849). He was a pupil of Bījār b. Moṭamār (d. 704), who taught him "philosphy and intellectual culture in his day" and was Mehemed Thurayā's opponent in disputations. His full name was Aḥbār Maʿān al-Nurānī.


**THURAYĀ, the constellations of the Pleiades.** According to al-Kazwī, the group is made up of two brighter stars between which are three others close together like grapes in a bunch. The group is also called simply al-Nāṣīm "the (group of) stars" and the principal star (ė Alkynoe) is called Waṣāf, Liwaʾ or Naṣīr al-Thurayā i.e., middle, heart or bright star of the Pleiades. The word Thurayā is a diminutive of gharwā which means "existing in plenty" and would correspond to the Greek πάντας if this name could be connected with παντες and not with παντες "to navigate." According to others, the constellation is so called because rain at its rising at the dawn brings gharwā i.e., great plenty. In any case, from early times the Pleiades have been credited with great influence on the weather and the processes of nature dependent on it. A more popular name for the group is, according to the astronomer Ibn Aḥbār ʿI-Ridjālī (Abenragel, in the xith = xvith century), Daḏāḏaḏ al-Samāw wād Baṣṭānī, the hen of heaven with her chickens, also found in the English name Hen and Chickens. The constellation is also regarded as a diadem with jewels and it is mentioned in countless passages in the poets. In the form Ṣwara the word has recently become widely known as the name of the queen of Afghanistan.

**Biography:** al-Kazwī, Ḥāfīz al-Maḥākif, ed. Wistenfeld, l. 35; 43; transl. by H. Etbe, as the Kūsempograph, p. 75, 90; L. Ideler, Untersuchungen über den Ursprung und die Bedeutung der Sterennamen, p. 146. (J. Rukka)

**Thurayā, Mehemed, an Ottoman biographer, born in Stamblu, the son of a certain Husni Bey (cf. Südlīl-i ʿOltāmānī, ii, 178), adopted an official career and died in his native town as an official in the education service on the 19th Dhu ʾl-Hijja 1236 (Jan. 12, 1609). His tomb is in Scutari in the Karadja Ahmad cemetery. Mehemed Thurayā has earned lasting fame as the compiler of an Ottoman Dictionary of National Biography, which he called Südlīl-i ʿOltāmān and published in 4 volumes in Stamblu between 1308 and 1315. On the plan, contents and importance of this work to historians cf. F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 396 ę.; the fact that the statements of the Südlīl-i ʿOltāmān must be used with great caution does not lessen the magnitude of the achievement, which is an astonishing one for one man. Mehemed Thurayā has however not rendered the compilation of an Ottoman biographical dictionary on scientific lines superfluous. Under the title Nəbbaret al-Waṣāfī (Stamblu 5 parts, complete to 1787 = 1287) Mehemed Thurayā began his dictionary, but did not finish a collection of public appointments from 1447 (1821) to 1592 (1787) with biographical notes. Among his literary remains were found copies of several biographical works and works on contemporary history which he had begun, which still await publication or utilisation; cf. G. O. W., p. 387.

**Biography:** Mehemed ʿĪbār, ʿOltāmān Māʾlīfīsī, iii, 39 ę.; F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 385 ę. (Franz Babinger)

**Ṭībb (A.), medicine.** This is one of the branches of science in which the Arabs have attained most fame. The Muslims received their knowledge of the subject mainly from the Greeks, first through the intermediary of the Syrians and Persians, then directly by the translation of classical works. Muslim rulers and princes were at all times very eclectic in the choice of their physicians; there was a conflict at the court of the caliph. Ghurānī was Jewish, Christian, Mazedan, Sabaean and even a few Hindu physicians. Medical science had been much studied in the eastern world in the period that preceded Islam, especially at Alexandria in Egypt and at the school of Dānandārā in Persia which lasted down to the time of the ʿAbbāsids.

The Greek medical authors known to the Arabs were especially Hippocrates and Galen, besides whom may be mentioned Rufus of Ephesus, Oribases, Aëtius and Paul of Aegina. Hippocrates [cf. Bokād] was translated into Arabic by Ḥusain b. ʿĪyāb, Ṭūḥa b. Lūṭa, Ṭūḥa b. Yahyā and ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAll; they translated his book of "Aphorisms"; his treatises on "Prognostics" and "Epidemics" were later studied and annotated. A large number of the works of Galen were translated into Arabic: the Art medici or Iqṣād which was later very popular in the middle ages, the De elementis secundum Hippocratem, the De temperamentis, the De sanitate tuenda, three books on the properties of foods, De alimentorum facultatibus, 14 books on Therapeutics, Methods medendi, a treatise on diagnosis, De morbis et symptomatis, another on fevers which was well known in Latin, others again on the pulse, on tumours and several commentaries by Galen on Hippocrates, especially on the book on Epidemics.
and on the Aphorisms to which should be added the commentary by the same scholar on the “Timaeus” of Plato, which HUNAIN B. IŞĀK translated.

Among Christian physicians, who distinguished themselves at the court of the caliph was Ibn Munāṣab, physician to Harūn al-Raḍīd. He was given by the caliph the task of procuring translations of the books of medicine of the ancients and he taught medicine in Bagdad. In the same period, the family of the Bokht-išāb was celebrated: one of its members attended Raḍīd at the beginning of his reign. They are said to have come from Djuḏūdsīlūr, “Alt b. Ridyān, an Egyptian Christian, was physician to the Fāṭimid caliph Hākim in Egypt. He wrote a commentary on Galen.

A Zoroastrian, “Alt b. Abānās, was physician to the Būyid sultan ‘Aḍūd al-Dawla and wrote a treatise entitled “The Royal Book,” which had the greatest vogue before the Canon of Avicenna. The Sabaean Sinān, son of the great geometer Thābit b. Kurra [q.v.], attended the caliph Kāhir. It was he who had official medical diplomas instituted: aspirants to the medical profession had to pass examinations and certificates were given them defining within what limits they were to be permitted to practice. In Bagdad alone there were over 800 doctors, held this certificate, not counting those who, on account of the renown they already had, had been exempted from the examination. Sinān having been persecuted by the Caliph, fled to Kūhrānān; he later returned to Bagdad where he died in 942.

These differences of origin among the physicians did not mean that they had serious differences in their idea or practice of their art. A few prescriptions, a few methods on some question or other, may have been peculiar to one or other school. Thus Ibn al-Kīfī tells a story of a prince of the family of Harūn al-Raḍīd, who had fallen into a lethargy. A Christian physician was sent to attend him and then a Jewish one; they were told to do anything; a Hindu was then summoned and he succeeded in reviving him. In this case it was “Indian medicine” that triumphed; but one must not conclude that it was quite different from Jewish or Byzantine medicine, nor that it was in any way superior to them.

The Muslim physicians surpassed even the preceding in reputation. Raż, so well known in the middle ages in the Latinised form Razès, physician, apothecary, surgeon and alchemist, left two principal works—al-Rūbūl and al-Manṣūrī, dedicated to the Sāmānid Abū Sāliḥ Manṣūr, on “special” maladies. Abū Raż was head of the hospital in Rayy and then of that of Bagdad. The foundation of regularly organised hospitals under official control is a thing that reflects the greatest honor on Muslim science and government. The authors also mention the hospital of Damascus. There were besides in large towns “Chief of the doctors,” appointed by the authorities. Among those quoted as having had this title is the second Ibn Zahr.

The great philosophers of the Hellenistic schools, the “scholastics,” were physicians and wrote on medicine. Avicenna was a practitioner with a high reputation. His great work, the “Canon on Medicine”, is the largest treatise on the subject produced in the Middle Ages; it was several times annotated in Arabic and became authoritative in the east and then in the west. It is divided into five books.

The first is devoted to the general principles of medicine, the Kulliyāt; these generalities are anatomy, hygiene, the diseases which as a rule affect the whole body in opposition to “special” diseases which affect particularly one organ or limb; these are enumerated and studied in Book III, beginning at the head and going down to the feet. General diseases are also dealt with in Book IV; then come different accidents, tumours, poisonings, fractures of limbs. Book II is a treatise on “simple,” and V is devoted to “compound” remedies, called akhruḍhīn, i.e. pharmacetics.

In the Maghrib, Ibn Bīḍāja and Ibn Ṭuafīl were physicians to the Almoravids. Arborves, who succeeded Ibn Ṭuafīl in this capacity, wrote a Kulliyāt, the popularity of which rivaled that of the Canon of Avicenna in the Muslim world and then in the Christian world. Muslim Spain also produced the family of Ibn Zuh, the Avuarzoar of mediaeval Latin.

Arab medicine had an enormous influence in the western world. It passed first to the Jews, especially to Maimonides, whose medical work is very considerable, then to the Christians. This is how Gerard of Cremona came to translate the Canon of Avicenna and the Kulliyāt al-Manṣūrī of Razès. The translation of the Canon was revised by Andreas Alpagus of Bellona, who also translated the De Theriaca of Avorrosse and the Pratica of Ibn Serapion. Faragut translated the Continuus of Razès, and Bonacossu, a Jew of Paliza, the “Colligit” (Kulliyāt) of Avorrose. These translations were published at the beginning of printing.

The pharmacopoeia and the knowledge of “simples” are represented in the treatise of Ibn al-Beṣīr of Malaga in addition to the parts of the Canon of Avicenna which refer to this subject. The Arabs themselves studied herbs and further developed the knowledge of their medicinal properties from the teaching of Dioscorides and Galen. Through their sailors they were able to introduce into medicine the use of new plants from the Malay Archipelago and China, like camphor, cassia and sandalwood. They developed pharmacetics and invented several preparations, syrups, juleps and alcohol.

One branch of study closely allied to medicine, veterinary science, was the subject of a number of special treatises among the Arabs.

Bibliography: Full information on the physicians of the Muslim world is to be found in several Arabic works: Ibn Abī Usābi‘a, Tabajrāt al-Aḍabī, ed. A. Müller, 1884; the Turāgī al-Dhawām of Ibn al-Kīfī; the Mukabbār al-Dawāl of Abu I-l-Faṣrī, ed. Sāliḥ; Maḥkār, Analecta, for Spanish physicians; the “Canon” of Avicenna, ed. in Arabic at Rome in 1593, at the Typographia Medica, reprinted Būlāk in 1294.


(B. Carra de Vaux)

TIBBU. [See Tubù.]

TIBET, a country to the south of China. Yākūt gives the forms Tabbat, Tubbāt, and Tabbat,
preferring the first of them. The oldest Arab notices of Tibet and the Tibetan kingdom are probably of Turkish origin. The ruler of Tibet is called Kḥāşān; the names Ṭūpūt and Tūpūt-Kḥāşān are found as early as the 8th century inscriptions. A fancied resemblance of Tablat to Ṭūpūt and Tābūt has given rise to stories of the veneration of Tablat as the 'ruler of the Tibetan kingdom; cf. e.g. al-Ṭabarī, i. 656 supra; Gardizi in Barthold, Oktō e göçakte v Srednyymu Asiyu, p. 87 sqq. There is much more that is legendary in the Arab notices of Tibet; the story of the inexplicable joy and desire to laugh that overcomes every stranger in Tibet, first found in Ibn Khudīddībīh (B.G.A., vi. 170), is frequently quoted in Muslim literature (cf. Niżāmī, Shīkmur-nauma, Cawnpore 1830, p. 226, even in the best account of Tibet we have (in the anonymous hadīth al-ʿĀlam, text in Comptes Rendus de l'Acad. de Russie, 1924, p. 73), the first that mentions the town of Ṭhannya. There is said to have been a mosque in Ṭhannya and a Muslim community, not however, very large. The period of the Arab conquests in Central Asia was not that of the zenith of Tibetan power against Tibet's usually successful wars against China. In the Chinese annals, Arabs are often mentioned as allies of the Tibetans and vice versa. Chavannes sums up the relationship in these words: (Documents sur les Touksins [Turcs] occidentaux, St. Petersburg 1903, p. 291): "L'appui que les Tibétois prêtaient aux Arabes dans la vallée de l'Yaxasites, les Arabes le leur rendaient en Kasgarie". It was not till the 7th-8th period (785-805) that the Arab expeditions met with a war against Tibet. Henceforth the Tibetans had continually to send armies to the west, so that the Chinese frontier districts suffered less from them than before (E. Breuschneider, On the Knowledge possessed by the Ancient Chinese of the Arabs, London 1871, p. 16). In Arabic sources there is no reference either to the alliance or to the estrangement. According to al-Ṭabarī, the Arab ruler Muhammed b. Abū al-ʿĀlam, "Abd Allāh b. Ḥāṣim b. Abū al-ʿĀlam, was attacked during his rule in Ṭarak (fifteen years: al-Ṭabarī, ii. 1160 infra, till 85 = 792) by the Ḥajjāz or Ḥabštāna (see ch. ii., p. 845), by the Tibetans and Turks, and Turks (in the parallel passage in Puladži, p. 418, the Tibetans are not mentioned); the attack was repulsed. According to Yaʿqūbī (ii. 362; also B.G.A., vii. 301 infra), in the reign of ʿOmar II (717-720) an embassy was sent from Tibet to Ḥāʾirāt b. Abd Allāh, governor of Khorsān, with the request that a teacher of the Muslim religion should be sent to that country. Salīḥ b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥanāfa is said to have gone on this errand. In the same source, the king of Tibet (p. 479) is mentioned among the kings who submitted to the Caliph al-Mahdi (933-962). In the last years of the reign of Hārūn al-Rashīd (170-195 = 786-809), the rebel ʿAlāʾ b. Lāḥīj ṭ. al-Maqārin, was supported in rising in Samarqand against the government by Tibetan troops (djanguč) (op. cit., p. 526). In the reign of al-Maʾmūn (193-218 = 813-833), the king of Tibet is said to have adopted Islam, and in token of his conversion to have sent to Khorsān his golden idol reproduced on a golden throne. Maʾmūn sent the idol to Mecca (op. cit., p. 550); the governor Yazd b. Muḥammad al-Makrumūn during a rebellion struck gold coins from it (p. 544). In Ṭabarī (iii. 815) the "Khāṣān, king of Tibet" is mentioned under the year 195 (810-811) as one of the enemies of al-Maʾmūn, with whom he had to come to terms before attacking al-ʾAmīn. In 956 (811-812) al-ʾAfdal b. ʿAbd Allāh (q.v.) was given the governorship of the eastern provinces from Ḥamadān to Tibet" (Ṭabarī, ii. 844). The Arab geographers seem to have generally understood by Ṭabarī, Little Tibet or Barīstān (q.v.). There were routes to it from Khotan (q.v.) and Badakshān (q.v.) via Wakhān. It is to the Khotan-Tibet road that the story given by al-Birūnī (Chronology, ed. Sachau, p. 271, xi, where Ṭabarī should be read for ʾAbūt and by Gardizi (op. cit., p. 88) from ʾAṭjarī about mountain sickness refers. On Djirm in Badakshān as a frontier post on the road to Tibet see B. G. A., vii. 288 infra. The fullest notices of the road through Wakhān are given in the Ḥadīth al-ʿĀlam (fol. 25a). As a frontier port of Māwarī al-Nahr in this direction there is mentioned the "large village" of Samarqand (probably meaning "little Samarqand") in which Indians, Tibetans, Wakhāniya (Wakhānīa) and Muslims lived. Musk was brought from Tibet to the Muslim world by this route (B. G. A., i. 280 supra, 297 infra). In contradiction to the historians and to his own statement against the frontier defences between Tibet and China (l. 208), Yaḥyā b. Lāḥīj (l. 204) says that no one ever waged war on the northeners. Probably the first campaign of a Muslim ruler against Tibet was the campaign of the Sultan of Bengal (q.v.) Muḥammad Bakhšīya Khābdūji towards the end of the 6th (xiib) century (the date 641 = 1245-1244 given in the text cannot be right as the same source gives the year 670 = 1205-1206 as the date of this ruler's death); it is described in the Tābakht-Naqṣir of Minhād al-Dīn Dārādū (ed. W. Nassauss-Lees and Mawlawī Khāsid Ḥusain and ʿAbd al-Ḥai, p. 553; transl. by Ravyrty, p. 560 sqq.; Elliot History of India, ii. 310 sqq.). The name Tibet (Ṭebet, Thibet, Thibet, Thibt, Thibet) contrary to Breuschneider, Medieval Research, ii. 21, probably reached Europe independently of the Arabs through European travellers in the Mongol period, although Tibet (Ṭabbot) is already mentioned in the xiib century by Benjamin de Tudela (transl. Adler, p. 59): his account, however, probably did not become known in Europe until later; Benjamin, as is now supposed, only went as far as Baghādā (J. K. Wright, The Geographical Lore of the Time of the Crusades, New York 1892, p. 282). He gives only a very confused account of what he picked up in the Muslim world, probably from Jews; for example he says that one can go in 4 days from Samarqand to Tibet. Rashīd al-Dīn's great work on the Mongol empire also contains some references to Tibet. The name: Būrī Tabbat (Rashīd al-Dīn, Ṭabul Vost. est. ord. Atrak, a. 1302, xiii., text, p. 237) is not found elsewhere in Muslim writers, is mentioned in the xvi century by Flavio Filarete (Buriablet) and in Chinese sources (cf. the references in Breuschneider, op. cit.). Tibet was already converted to Buddhism in the xiib century, was from the Mongol period of importance for the spread of Buddhism. Rashīd al-Dīn expressly says (ed. Blachot, p. 545) that of Buddhist monks (bakrūk) those of Tibet enjoyed the greatest prestige. After the final triumph of Islam in Central Asia and Northern India in the 15th (xviiib) century, Tibet was invaded by Muslim rulers under pretext of a holy war, Little Tibet in particular. Towards
About 1682 when Central Tibet was under the rule of the Kalmucks [q.v.] the celebrated Khodja Apa’k (his tomb is still revered in Kâshghâr) who had quarrelled with his Khân Isâm’lî (1670–1682) went to Lhasa, which he calls “town of Bâq” (Bâq’ Şâhr) after a great statue of the Buddha. At his request the Dalai Lama (in a Turkish manuscript we have the plural form, Dal’watnâder) gave him a letter of safe conduct from the Khân of the Kalmucks, Gâldân Böshokta. At the head of an army, which included the Khodja, the Khân invaded Kâshghâria. Isâm’lî Khân was carried off a prisoner, and the rule given to the Khodja (M. Hartmann, Der islamische Orient, i. 210, 212, 321 and 326; Zap., xv. 250).

In the last few centuries, Tibet has had little contact with the Muslim world, although Muslims were not barred from visiting Lhasa during the period when Europeans were. It was a matter of years before an embassy arrived there with presents from Kâshgîr. In a plan of Lhasa given by A. Waddell (Lhasa and its Mysteries, London 1905) we may note a mosque and a court of law for Muslims from Kâshgîr and an inn for Chinese Muslims.

Bibliography: given in the article.

(W. BARTHOLOM)
II, 502 (Feb. 2, 1109) [so Ibn Khallikân: Yâkût I, which is wrong, as the day of the week shown]. His tomb is at the Ahraz gate. — Among his various pupils a number of sources mention al-Khaṭṭîb al-Bâghdâdî, the historian of Bâghdâd (Brockelmann, G. A. L., i, 329); but this statement, which goes back to Samâ'îl and is adopted by Yâkût, Maş'ûn (see Bibl.) and Ibn Khallikân must be due to an error as al-Khaṭṭîb al-Bâghdâdî was thirty years older than Tâbrîzî. Ibn Khallikân and Tâbrîzî refers to his article al-Khaṭṭîb al-Bâghdâdî, where he says he gives further particulars of the relations between these two but there is no information in the passage to which he refers (Nâ, 33). On the other hand Yâkût himself in the Erûkhât s.v. al-Khaṭṭîb al-Bâghdâdî gives a story with a Wâzâd going back to Tâbrîzî. The kheira Tâbrîzî is not given: but there can be no doubt that our Tâbrîzî is meant by Abu Zakariyyâ Yahya b. 'Ali al-Khaṭṭîb al-Lughwâi, especially as the link in the chain is Abu 'l-Faṣîl Nâṣir al-Salâtim, apparently the father of Abu 'l-Faṣîl Muhammâd b. Nâṣir al-Salâtim, the pupil of Tâbrîzî, which is probably only a slip for the name of his son, since M. b. N., besides being a pupil of Tâbrîzî, is also known as a teacher of al-Samâ'îl (cf. Bergrässer, in Z. S., ii. 205, N. 154) while his father is in the first place quite unknown and could hardly have also had the kawâna of Abu 'l-Faṣîl, but secondly because the poverty of the narrator which occasionally crops up in the story agrees very well with the poverty of Tâbrîzî, which we know of from the story of his journey to al-Mârâz. Tâbrîzî must thus have come to Damascus in 456 and studied Abu 'l-Faṣîl al-Bâghdâdî; the story of his thirst for knowledge is told in detail. Tâbrîzî lived in the midst of the great mosque (this also is evidence of his poverty). One day al-Khaṭṭîb visited him in his abode and they talked for an hour. Just before leaving al-Khaṭṭîb gave him something wrapped up in paper as a present with the request that he should buy pens with it. When Tâbrîzî unfolded the packet, he found it contained 5 Egyptian dina'ar. Al-Khaṭṭîb visited him a second time and gave him money of the same value as or even higher than on the first occasion and asked him to buy paper with it. This story of Yâkût's is corroborated by the same author in his own article on Tâbrîzî in the Erûkhât is certainly correct in contrast to that in the Maş'ûn, so that al-Khaṭṭîb al-Bâghdâdî was really Tâbrîzî's teacher. Otherwise al-Bâghdâdî would certainly have devoted an article to him in the Wâzâd al-Bâghdâdî. Tâbrîzî's pupils were: Abu 'l-Faṣîl Muhammâd b. Nâṣir al-Salâtim (457—550 = 1074—1155, cf. above), Abu 'l-'Iṣâฮîn Sa'd al-Khair b. Muhammâd b. Saïl (in al-Maš'ûn, i, 895: Sa'd) al-Anjârî al-Andalusi (al-majhâlî) s.v. 541 = 1146 in Baghdadî, Abu 'l-Tîhir Muhammâd b. Muhammâd b. 'Abd Allâh al-Sinjûlî (462—548, lived in Merw) and lastly Abu 'l-Qawâlidh (q.v.), his successor in the Nîşâmîya. His conduct was not of the best (he is said to have drunk wine, worn silk garments and a turban trimmed with gold so that he must have later become prosperous); but his scientific authority is undisputed.

His works that are known by name are all of a learned nature; but Ibn Khallikân quotes two verses by him and a poem of al-'Imâd al-Fâyîsî to him with his answer. In the list given below of his works, those already mentioned in Brockelmann (G. A. L., i, 279 f.) are only given again when further remarks can be made on them. On the Hâmâsa of Abu Tamâmî (q.v.) Tâbrîzî wrote 3 commentaries, first a short one on each ba'tt and then one on the whole work. The second has been edited by Freytag. On the sources cf. Freytag's preface. Yâkût had an autograph copy of Tâbrîzî's commentary on the Mu'llâkâtî. It is annotated the Divân of al-Mutanabbi (G. A. L., i, 85), the Muṣafâdâtî, the Kâtha Bûnîd Sînâsit (on the edition s. the art, the Kâ'î b. Zûhair), the Mâfûra of Ibn Durayd (q.v.), the Kâ'î b. 'Ahnâm b. 'Abd al-Uqîl of an unidentified Ahmad b. 'Ali b. al-Salâtim al-Bâghdâdî (the author of this name in Brockelmann lived later than Tâbrîzî, i, 382), and the Kâ'în. The same authority also says he edited the Kitâb al-Fârîq al-Mushîfî of Ibn al-Sâkînî (q.v.) in a corrected version. It is the title the Tâbûdî (MS. Stambul, 'Ajîf, N. 2716; cf. Rescher, M. F. O. Beyouâd, 1912, p. 495), pr. Cairo, a.d.; but there is also a commentary printed in Shiraz (1895 sg.) by him on the Kâ'î b. 'Iyâfû of the same author. An extract of the Kâ'î b. 'Iyâfû al-'Arîb wa l-Kawâfû is perhaps contained in the collected volume Maṣ'ûn min Muhammâtî al-Murînî, Cairo 1325, p. 550 sqq. where no author is named but, according to Brockelmann, Index s. v. Kâ'î, at least two others are possible authors of it. Attention has been called by Rescher, Z. A., xxvi, p. 156 to another proseody entitled Risâla b. 'l-Arîbî in the Stambul MS. Hamidîye, 1127, which does not seem to be identical with the two mentioned by Brockelmann. A MS. of his commentary on the Divân of Imrîn' l-Kâ'î is mentioned by Rescher, Z. D. A., lvii, 63; but the sources say nothing of this work. Of other works, now unknown, by Tâbrîzî Ibn al-Anâhîrî and Yâkût mention: Muḥâfîz al-Fârîm, Ibn Khallikân, 11. Charkî al-Fârîm, Vâkîl: Muḥaddidatatat b. 'Iyâfû. Bibliography: (so far as not already given): al-Samânî, Anisâd, ed. Margoliouth, 1912, G. M. S., xx., fol. 1039; Abu 'l-Harâmî Ibn al-Anâhîrî. Nasîh al-'Arîbî fî Turûsî al-'Arîbî, Cairo 1294, p. 445—448; Ibn Khallikân, Wafayât al-'Arîm, ed. Wüstenfeld, N. 810; do. Engl. by de Slane, lv., 1874, p. 78 sqq. (with valuable notes); Yâkût, Muṣafâdâtî, ed. Wüstenfeld, i, 822 sqq.; do., Erûkhât, ed. Margoliouth, G. M. S., vii. 254 sqq.; vii/1vii. 286 sqq.; Sceiss, Dictionnaire encyclopédique de Bibliographie arabe, p. 625 sqq. (M. Plessner) al-Tâbrîzî. [See Muhammâd Husâin al-Khalâl.]

Tâbrîzî, commonly calledシャムス-蓮Tâbrîzî (SHAMS AL-DÜN Muhâammad b. 'Ali b. Mâlîkînâbî Tâbrîzî, according to Dînî, Nafâṣât al-Un, ed. Lees, p. 335), a Şûfî, was the spiritual guide of Dînî al-Dûnî (or Dînî b. 'Attîsî) who composed in his name the greater part of the collection of mystical odes known as the Dînîsî Shamsî-Tabrîzî. Born in Tabrîz (q.v.), where his father carried on the trade of a cloth-merchant, he is said to have studied in Shiraz under Shâhîb Ābî Bakr Zanbûlî (Sâlsbîlî), Shâhîb Rûkîn al-Dûnî Sindi, and Bâhîb Kâmil Dînjî. Afterwards he became a wandering dervish, and in 642 arrived at Konya. So profound was the fascination made by his enthusiastic personality on the young Shams al-Dûn that the disciples of the last, bitterly remembering their master's devotion to his beloved friend and meşâsî, caused Shams-î Tâbrîzî
to leave the city. It is said that after spending some time at Damascus he returned to Konya in company with the poet's son Raḥā al-Dīn Sulṭān Walad, who had been sent in search of him. In the month of Shawwal 643, he vanished mysteriously. The stories which represent him as having been put to death by the myrmidons of the government or murdered by a band of conspirators, amongst whom was one of Djalāl al-Dīn's sons, are not confirmed by the best authorities, namely, the Muḥammadīyāt of Sulṭān Walad and the Rūḥāt-i Sipāḥīlār of Farīdūn b. Aḥmad, an account of Djalāl al-Dīn and his successors written in Persian circa 720. Some modern scholars hold the view that Shams-i Tūbštī never existed save in the poet's imagination: "c'est son propre génie inspirateur" (Rīḍa Tawfīq, in Textes l'arabe, G. M. S., i., 270, note 1); but even if we suppose the dates and other circumstantial details given by the biographers to be fictitious, such a theory rests on frail foundations. It is impossible to regard the case of Shams-i Tūbštī as unique: the terms of "delegation" which the poet applies to him in the Dīwan-i Shams-i Tūbštī are entirely parallel to those used of Huṣain al-Dīn in the Maḥānawī and of another dear friend, Șahāb al-Dīn Zarkāb, in some of the odes. So far as the evidence of language is concerned, these three inspirers of Djalāl al-Dīn stand or fall together; and that evidence can with more reason be interpreted in a different way. To readers of Dante it will not appear strange that the great Persian mystic should have clothed his feelings of intimate spiritual relationship and personal affection in words which reflect the ideas of a pantheistic philosophy. Bibliography: Faridun b. Aḥmad, Rūḥāt-i Sipāḥīlār, Cawnpore 1901, p. 65 sqq.; = p. 164 sqq. of the Turkish translation by Muḥāfaẓ Bahārī Huṣainī, Constantinople 1913. Allātī, Muḥammad al-Ārīfīn, transl. by C. Huart in Les scribes des derviches touaregs, Paris 1918 and by J. W. Redhouse in Th. Monnier, Book I, London 1881. E. A. Nicholson, Selected Poems from the Dīwan-i Shams-i Tūbštī, Cambridge 1898. (R. A. Nicholson) Al-Ṭūfštī, an Arab author of Tūnīs. Practically nothing is known of his life. His name is not even recorded in a single form. The manuscripts of his Rūḥāt (see the works by Rousseau and Bel quoted below) all seem to call him Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh; so he is also called in Ibn al-Khāṭīb Ibn Kūnṭūfī (G. A. L., l. 241), al-Firayisi fi maḥālāt ʿAbd Allāh al-Haḍīsī (in Cherbonneaux in J. A., iv, 17, 1851, p. 53, transl. in J. A., vi, 64). In his Tūfštī al-Ārūs wa-Nasāḥat al-Ṭūfštī on the title page we have Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad; this is what Ṭūfštī Khalīfa, no. 2652 and also written as al-Zarkašī, Tūfštī al-Dawla al-Mūwāhidīya wa-l-Haḍīsī, Tūnīs 1289, p. 51, except that the latter calls him Ibn Ibrāhīm. The sources also differ regarding the quantity of the first syllable of the nība. There is no question of: more than one author of the two surviving works attributed to Tūfštī is made certain by two circumstances. In the first place al-Zarkašī, who uses the form of the name found in the Rūḥāt as well as Ibn al-Khāṭīb who uses the form of the Rūḥāt tells us what we also know from the Rūḥāt that al-Tūfštī had dealings with the Ḥafṣid emir Abū ʿAbd Allāh Zaḵrātī b. Abī ʿAbd Allāh Aḥmad al-Liḥāyānī (711–717 = 1311–1317). In the second place the authors of the works quoted in the Tūfštī come down to a period which make it clear that the author must have written at the beginning of the viiith (xivth) century. Of his life we only know that he made a journey with his royal master through North Africa, which he describes in the Rūḥāt. It began in Tūnīs towards the end of Dījmārād I 706 (beg. December 1306) and his fellow-travellers were on the Ḥaṣṣaṣi to Mecca. Al-Ṭūfštī had however to separate from the caravan at the beginning of Maḥarrām 709 (June 1309) because an illness forced him to return home. They had not got much beyond Tripolis, as long halts were made everywhere. These long delays were all to the advantage of the book of travels. Everything that was of any interest in a comparatively small stretch of country could be noted down. The Rūḥāt thus became a regular mine of geographical, scientific and particular historical information about the country passed through; extracts are also given in it from authors, whose original works must now be regarded as lost, and copies of documents. When the prince became amir, al-Ṭūfštī became one of his highest officials. The year of his death is not known, nor that of his birth.

There is not yet a complete edition of the Rūḥāt; long extracts are given in M. Amari, Bibliotheca Arabo-sicula, 1857, ch. 45. A short extract with translation has been published by A. Bel, Les Bensou Ghomma (Publications de l'École des lettres d'Alger, xxvii., 1903), appendix. A translation of extracts from the whole book was given by A. Rousseau in J. A., iv, 20 (1852), p. 57 sqq.; v. 1 (1853), p. 101 sqq., 354 sqq. The selection is however quite arbitrary; the reconstitution of the text is defective and the translation to be used with great caution. The text can be checked for several passages in Ibn Khaldūn's Dhur.

Al-Ṭūfštī's other book is a compendium on love and marriage. In 25 chapters it gives advice on the choice of a wife with very full description of the marks of beauty arranged according to parts of the body and on their treatment and on married life with means to heighten its enjoyment, all in the form of traditions and extracts from writers, roughly in chronological order. Theologians and jurists are quoted at great length but more with regard to ethical paraenesis than the regulation of the Rūḥāt. Manuscripts and texts of the book are given in Brockelmann, G. A. L., ii. 257.

Bibliography: given in the article; cf. also M. Amari, Stori dei Musulmoni di Sicilia, l. 1854, p. l., and the works quoted by A. Bel, op. cit. (M. Plessner) Tūfštīya (the forms Tūfštīn, Tūfštī occur also), order founded by Abu l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. al-Muḥtār b. Saʿīd al-Tūfštī (1150–1230 = 1737–1815).

1. Life of the Founder. This person was born at ʿĀin Mūḍī, a village 72 kil. W. of Laghouat, 28 E. of Tumurt. His family were the Awlād Sīdī Shāhīd Muḥammad, and his parents both died of plague in 1166 (1753). After pursuing his studies at his native place, he went to Fez in 1171 (1758) to continue them, thence to Abyad, where he stayed five years, thence in 1181 (1768) to Tiemcen, thence in 1186 (1773) he went to Mecca and Medina; thence to Cairo. At all these places he heard ṣaḥīḥs, and at the last of these at the suggestion of one Muḥammad al-Kurdi he founded a new order, having previ-
only been admitted to the Kādiriyā, Taḥriya and Khāliwatiya; of the last of these his own is regarded as a branch. He then returned to the Maghrib, and after visiting Fez and Tlemcen went to Ila Semghān in the Sahara in 1196 (1782), an oasis S. of Geryville, where he believed himself to have received a commission from the Prophet to proceed with the propagation of his Order. A disciple, 'Ali Ḥāṣim, suggested to him to return to Fez, whether he went in 1215 (1798), and was given possession of the palace Ḥawāḥ al-Maṣūrāt. Though much of the remainder of his life was spent in travelling, in order to regulate the affairs of his Order, Fez remained his headquarters till his death, and he was buried in his Zāwiya in that city.

2. Doctrine s and Practices of the Order. The members of the Order are called Aṯkhāη "friends", and they are strictly forbidden to join any other ḫāṣaṣ. Their ḏīḥr consists (as usual) in the repetition (usually a hundred times) of certain formulas, at particular times of the day, these are translated by Depont et Coppolani, p. 447. Their most important doctrine is that of submission to the established government, whence ever since the French conquest of Algeria they have been ordinarily on good terms with the French authority.

3. History of the Order. On the death of the founder in 1230 his two sons (Muḥammad al-Kādir and Muḥammad al-Ṣaḥghir) were left in charge of one Maḥmūd b. Aḥmad al-Tūnīsī, who was succeeded as guardian by al-Ḥāḍirī 'Ali b. ʿAṣṣ, himself head of a Tāḏīḏīna Zāwīya at Temmān and nominated by the founder chief of the Order. They were brought by the latter to Aṯīn Māḏī, the palace which had been occupied by their father in Fez having been seized by a new Amir, Vazīr b. ʿAbdullāh. After a time 'Ali b. ʿAṣṣ left the two sons in charge of the Zāwīya at Aṯīn Māḏī, and returned to Temmān. It would seem however that a splitter had occurred in the Order, even in the founder's time, the dissidents, who were called Tāḏīḏīna, having been expelled by him from Aṯīn Māḏī. In 1235 (1820) these dissidents invoked the aid of ʿAbd al-Muṭṭī, Bey of Oran, who besieged Aṯīn Māḏī, but was induced by a heavy payment and the failure of an attempted storm to retire. Two years later the Bey of Titteri attacked the settlement, but unsuccessfully. These military achievements encouraged the two sons of the founder to take the offensive against the Turks in Mascara; they failed however both in 1246 (1829—1832) and 1257, and on the latter occasion Muḥammad the Elder lost his life.

Under the direction of ʿAṭī b. ʿAṣṣ, who remained at Temmān, the younger Muḥammad, now in sole charge at Aṯīn Māḏī, proceeded with the propagation of the Order, especially in the Sahara and the Südān. Great success attended these efforts, but though the power and wealth of the community increased, neither 'Ali nor Muḥammad ventured on any military operations. Hence when after the French invasion of Algeria the Derkāyī Muḥammad desired the aid of the Tāḏīḏīn in the Sacred War, it was refused.

In 1296 (151—1525) the Amir 'Abd al-Kādir, who aimed at the expansion of the French, endeavoured to enlist their services; the Tāḏīḏīn chief replied that it was his purpose to live in the calm of a religious life, and after a long and fruitless correspondence the Amir in 1298 (1554) presented himself at the head of an army before the walls of Aṯīn Māḏī, and demanded the submission of the Tāḏīḏīn chief. This was refused, and in spite of the inequality of the numbers the latter held out for eight months, whereas various expedients for reducing the place were tried by the Amir and frustrated by the astuteness of the Tāḏīḏīn and his advisers. When the Tāḏīḏīn found the place no longer defensible, he took refuge in Laghūṭ. The reputation of the Order was vastly increased owing to the length of their resistance; and in the following year (1540) he offered his moral and material aid against the Amir 'Abd al-Kādir to the French Marshall Valette. 'Ali b. ʿAṣṣ, who remained at Temmān, also declined to join resistance to the French, and on his death in 1544 left the control of the Order to the surviving son of the founder, who died in 1553, when the son of the son of 'Ali b. ʿAṣṣ, Muḥammad al-Ṣaḥghir, succeeded.

The sons of the third Master of the Order, Aḥmad and al-Baghīr, were of tender years at the time of his death, and fell under the charge of one Rāyān al-Mahṣūrī, who renamed the Zāwīya of Aṯīn Māḏī independent of Temmān, a policy which caused the relations between the two Zāwīyas to be strained, though it did not result in a definite split. In 1569 the two became suspected of disloyalty to the French, and were arrested and sent to Algiers. They succeeded however in making their peace with the French authorities, and the heads of the Order have ever since maintained a friendly attitude towards them.

4. Distribution of the Order. Although the missionaries of the Order in the period of its greatest prosperity obtained adherents in Egypt, Arabia and other parts of Asia, its main expansion has been in French Africa. One Muḥammad al-Hāḍirī b. Muḥtār b. Ḥabīb, called Bāddi, who visited the founder in Fez about 1780, received instructions to spread it among the Saharians of the extreme South of Morocco; "Returning home via Shingora and Tijikya, he conducted the aggressive propaganda in favour of the Tijikya Order, and by 1830, about the time of his death, he had the satisfaction of leaving the whole tribe ʿAbd al-Ḥādī to it" (Paul Marty, R. M. M., xxxi. 239). Under his successor, who died in 1807, this attachment steadily increased. To the Meccan pilgrimage, faithfully observed by this community, there was added the practice of pilgrimage to Fez, to visit the tomb of the founder, and this is ordinarily performed before the visit to Mecca. The Order was propagated in French Guinea by one ʿAbd al-Ḥādī ʿUmar after his return from Mecca to Dinguiray, which in consequence became one of the most important religious cities in this region; "the Tijikya doctrine supplanted almost everywhere the Qāḍīriyah traditions" (ibid., xxxvi. 203).
TIDJÂNYA — TIDJÂRA

Thidjâni min al-Ashâb was composed by Abu l-Abbas Ahmad b. Ahmad al-Ashâbi Sukairîdî (Fes 1235 and 1332). 

Tidjâra (a), trade, commerce; masdar from tâdâr, "to trade," which again is a denominal verb from tâdâr "a merchant." Like many terms in Arab commercial language, tâdâr is an old Aramaic loanword (cf. e.g. Syr. ṣâ̇dk and ṣâ̇dk, "merchant," derived from the verb ṣâ̇dk, "price, reward"), which again comes from ṣâ̇d, "price, reward"

This is the place to write a history of commerce in the lands of Islam, especially as the necessary preliminary work has hardly been touched (cf. e.g. Meis, Die Renaisances des Islams, Heidelberg 1922, p. 441 sqq.). Nor shall we attempt to characterize the spirit of Muslim commerce or its usages, but rather deal primarily with the problem, what position Islam as a religion adopts with regard to commerce, and how its attitude is expressed in Hadith particularly, and in ethical works. On the legal aspects of the whole question cf. the article Tidjâri.

a. That Muḥammad, who himself belonged to the merchant class, was favorably disposed to trade was natural in a commercial republic like Medina, whose prosperity entirely depended on trade. At least so we must interpret one of the oldest sūtras of the first Meccan period, Sūra vii. 251, the time of the origin of which is just before the conflict with the Meccan aristocracy. "As often as the Kurâñh equip their wares and summer camp," they "shall worship the Lord of this House (i.e. the Ka'ba)." But even in this period Muhâammad raises a warning voice against the evils which were beginning to be associated with trade; trade is to be conducted according to law and justice. "Woe to those who give short measure," says Sûra lixxiii. 1 sgg. "who, when they receive good measure from other men demand the full measure and when they measure out or weigh out to them, depraid!" (cf. Sūra lv. 6—8; and from the third Meccan period Sûra vi. 153; vii. 53). At a later period this attitude of the Prophet underwent a certain change, which must date from the Meccan period, although there is only evidence of it in the Kurâñh from the Medina period. Under the influence of Christian ascetic ideas, his attitude to trade was modified; he does not condemn it, it is true, but he now sees in it something which may detain believers from the worship of God and from performing the salât. This is most strongly marked in the description of the monastery in the Medina Sûra xxiv. 37: "Men whom no trade nor purchase keeps from the thought of God, from performing the salât and from paying the zakât from fear of the day on which hearts and eyes shall be fully of trouble." In any case, one can deduce from this passage that the Prophet was fully conscious of the deleterious influences of trade on religious life. The result of this train of thought was in the Medina period an express prohibition of trading during the Friday service, in Sûra lixxii. 11—11: "O ye who believe, when ye are called to the salât on Friday, hasten to the worship of God and cease trading; this is better for you, if ye knew it; and when the salât is over, then disperse yourselves in the land and strive after the benefits given by God and think often of Him that ye may prosper, and when they see trading and empty chatter, they turn to it and leave thee standing. Say: What is with God is better than chattering or trading and God is the best provider." On the other hand, the Prophet in the latest Medina period expressly permitted trading during the pilgrimage (Sûra ii. 194). And yet the emphasis at the same time once more that family and clan, goods and chattels and stock in trade are not to be preferred to God and his Prophet (Sûra ix. 24). To this late period also belong the well known Kurâñhic regulations for the conclusion of agreements (Sûra ii. 282 sqq.).
dirham which comes from trade is better than ten otherwise gained". In trading it is recommended to be generous and conciliatory; one should give food weight and measure and in weighing give overweight. The morning is recommended as particularly blessed and profitable for trading. One should be careful to avoid deceit and deception, which cancel the blessing (baraka) that rests upon trade. Defects in the goods should be pointed out to the purchaser. "If any one sells defective goods without pointing this out, God will hate him for ever and the angels will also curse him" (Ibn Mādīq, Tijārat, Bāb 45). But if one has been guilty of such faults in trading, he can atone for it by alms (qaddās). The Prophet is further said to have condemned the adulteration of goods, especially the adulteration of foodstuffs, to be carried on by mutual agreement, but never under compulsion. An agreement already made can only be cancelled if buyer and seller have not yet separated; in this period it can also be cancelled by tacit agreement (Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, ii. 536). A further sale can only be effected when one has obtained possession of the goods (gawā'id) or Istīfā'; the traditions in this connection speak only of foods (qā'idūm) but we are told by commentators that foods are only taken as examples and in fact one tradition talks of a baṣr in quite general terms (Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, iii. 402). If in disputes between the contracting parties one is not able to prove his point, the purchaser either remains valid and the assertion of the seller is taken as authoritative — or both must abandon the transaction. If there are two claimants to be the purchaser, the first is held to be the actual purchaser.

The traditions in general have nothing to say against business being arranged for a definite date or on credit (mawā'iq). But no increase of price must take place nor is a reduction allowed if payment is made at an earlier date (Mālik, Buwayṭ, tr. 81). The making of a debt on a credit transaction also is allowed as the Prophet once purchased provisions on credit and left his iron body-armour as a pledge.

Tradition frequently objects to a practice of traders of protesting the quality of their articles with oaths; e.g. one tradition says: "Swearing furthers the disposal of goods but diminishes their blessing" (Buḥārāt, Buwayṭ, Bāb 25). According to another tradition, Sulrā, liii. 71 was revealed in this connection; this verse has however nothing to do with the swearing of oaths when selling; its associations are other and purely religious.

A series of articles are excluded by Tradition from buying and selling: firstly all that is not one's own property (Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, i. 186, 190); secondly a series of articles the use of which is forbidden or which are considered unclean—wine, wine, swine, dogs, cats, idols (ṣayyām) and ma'ūn [q.v.] and also water; water according to a tradition is one of the three things which are re's communes, the price of which is harām (Ibn Mādīq, Kukhān, Bāb 16).

Tradition strongly condemns a practice still very prevalent in the east: haggling or bargaining; in selling also one should not outbid his fellows. Tradition also condemns the raising of prices (maqāṣid) and speculation in or holding up of foodstuffs (iyākās); on the expression, cf. Fraenkel, op. cit., p. 185). Anyone who holds up food supplies and thus raises prices "is a sinner" (Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, ii. 351). "He who holds up food supplies, God will punish with leprosy and bankruptcy" (Ibn Mādīq, Tijārat, Bāb 6). "The speculator is cursed" (Ibid.); according to other traditions, he "will be thrown into the deepest hell-fire" (Ṭayyālist, No. 928). On the other hand, the prophet is said to have declined as an injustice to fix prices for foodstuffs in a time of scarcity (Ibn Mādīq, Tijārat, Bāb 27 etc.). Generally speaking, however, Tradition condemns any speculation in foodstuffs. It is forbidden to buy or sell provisions wholesale without fixing weights and measures (dīnārīs); food should not be sold again in the same place as it is purchased in but only in the particular market-place intended for the purpose. One should not go out to meet caravans to purchase goods (taṣrīḥ); the townsmen should not purchase from the man from the desert in order to sell again in the town at a profit; brokering (ṣinār) is therefore condemned.

Finally may be mentioned a whole series of branches of business and practices which are described by Tradition as improper. They will be mentioned here:

1. In the first place it forbids the conclusion of two transactions in one contract e.g. one portion of the goods on credit and another for cash (cf. Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, i. 398).

2. Baṣr al-ṣurūbān: a form of sale in which an earnest-money (ṣurūb, or ṣurūb) is given which belongs to the vendor if the transaction is not carried through (Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal however considers earnest-money permissible; cf. Ibn al-Aṯīr, Nihāyāt, u. v.);

3. Auction (baṣr al-muṣūyaha): in three cases it is permitted however: in direct poverty, in sickness or when deeply in debt.

4. Baṣr al-μuṣāba: (presumably also of Aramaic origin; cf. Fraenkel, p. 189), i.e. when any goods the weight, size or number of which is not known is sold in bulk for a definite measure, weight, or number of another commodity, e.g. the stilb of dates for a definite tree for a definite amount of dates or the seed for a definite amount of provisions. The unreal and speculative in this transaction is seen by Tradition in the fact that the yield which cannot yet be defined may bring the purchaser more or less than he has given for it (cf. Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, ii. 64). This rule is in the direction of the prohibition of profiteering. — But according to one tradition of the Prophet, an exception was allowed, the baṣr al-ṣurūyān; according to this, a poor man who does not possess a palm-tree of his own, in order to procure his family fresh dates may purchase for dried dates the fruit of a palm on the tree, but it has to be valued. In the opinion of several Traditionists, this transaction is limited to cases where not over five wāḥ assessed are involved while 'Aḥbāb Allah b. 'Amr b. Al-ṢāQA transmits a tradition according to which the Prophet prohibited even this (Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, ii. 183).

5. Baṣr al-μuṣūyama, is the purchase of the yield of palm-trees for two or three years in advance. This is a question of the sale of things which are not yet in existence at the time of the contract.

6. Baṣr al-μuṣūyaha. In this the exchange is irrevocably concluded by the two parties handing over the goods without seeing or testing them beforehand. Another form of this transaction is
7. Bah al-mar‘ama. In this the transaction is also concluded without the goods being seen or examined beforehand, the covered goods being simply touched with the hand.

8. Bah al-zhar: “dangerous or hazardous trading”. For this kind of transaction the traditions give a series of examples, e.g. the milk in the caddar, an escaped slave, booty before its division, fishes in the water etc. (cf. e.g. Ahmad b. Hanbal, l. 302, 338; iii. 42). The commonest example is the very complicated case of bah al-habala, namely the sale of a pregnant sheep-camel for slaughter with the prospect that it may produce a female young one, which will again bear young.

All these transactions are condemned by Tradition on account of the element of uncertainty in them. On money-changing (tijji) and the prohibition of profiteering (rida), see these articles. The above transactions are in all the older collections; a still larger number with a great wealth of detail are given in the later collections, e.g. Kansa al-‘ammad (cf. Kitter in lit., viii. [1917], 28 sqq., where a series of such traditions is translated).

c. In the traditions of the first three centuries an open and honourable attitude in business is demanded of the merchant; he is to treat his customers “like his brother” and refrain from cheating them in any way. Tradition therefore also condemns any business in which there is an element of uncertainty, in which chance can play any part, so that no one may suffer injury. These fundamental principles of Muslim commercial ethics have found their classical expression in Ghazal’s It’ab and Uloom al-Din, Cairo 1326, ii. 48 sqq. According to Ghazal (l. 505 = 1111), one should strive to earn one’s living with a view to the next world. To him the acquisition of a livelihood is a means of attaining bliss, the world is a field sown, a preliminary to the next world. But Ghazal does not regard trade as absolutely better than any other means of earning one’s living. “Through trade”, he says, “one can either attain a sufficiency or wealth and superfluity”. He condemns the accumulation of wealth, in so far as it is not applied to good purposes. But if the merchant obtain a sufficient livelihood for himself and his family, it is at any rate better than begging. But certain types of men do well to refrain from any such activities, for example, the plebs, the mystics, the learned and the officials. Ghazal then gives his views on the ethics of commerce of which only a brief resume can be given here.

Even if a business is legal and irreproachable, yet it may be immoral and injurious to others; for not every prohibition makes the agreement invalid. Ghazal then distinguishes two kinds of business, those that injure the community and those that only injure the individual. To the first group belong speculation in foods, especially in corn (iktibar), and the putting into circulation of false coins. In the case of false money the merchant has to pay attention to the following points: 1. If he takes false money, he should throw it down a well. 2. He must acquire a thorough knowledge of the coins current in the country. 3. If he pays another false money with the latter’s consent, he is not free from guilt, as the other may put them into circulation again. 4. If he takes false money to oblige some one, he will only participate in the blessing which rests upon a good feeling in trade, if he does it with the intention of throwing the false money into a well.

Ghasali then deals with the conduct of business, which is only injurious to the individual. The guiding principle in trade is that one should only do to a fellow Muslim as he would be done by. Therefore, the seller should not praise the wares and not emphasise his statements by oaths; he must only emphasise such qualities in the goods as the customer cannot know without further trial, e.g. the capability of a slave; 2. he should tell all the faults of the goods, he should for example not show only the good sides of a material, he should not exhibit materials in a dark room etc.; for this is deception and neglect of the “good counsel” to which his brother is entitled. The merchant must remember two things, firstly that though he can dispose of his goods by concealing defects, he thereby loses the blessing which rests upon trading, and secondly that the benefit of the goods of this world ceases with the end of life and that only the injustice and sin remain, which were committed in trading; 3. the merchant must give just and full weight and measure; 4. he must quote the correct price of the day.

Ghasali then deals with the showing of little kindness and civilities in trading, i.e. one should allow the other an advantage which he is not strictly compelled to do. Such little civilities are: 1. if the seller refuses a price offered which is much above the market price; 2. if the purchaser allows himself to be charged too much when the vendor is a poor man; 3. if in the collection of arrears, one allows a remission or prolongation of the period; 4. if the debtor brings the money to his creditor to save him the trouble of coming for it; 5. if at his request the contracting party is allowed to annul an agreement to purchase that has been concluded; 6. if one sells to the poor on credit and only demands the price, when it is possible for one’s books of the debt and leaves the payment completely to their pleasure.

The merchant however in his pursuit of profit should not neglect the salvation of his soul. The merchant should therefore 1. begin his transactions with good intention (niyya) and good faith (‘ishla); 2. he should conceive of trade as a “social duty”, as al-fard al-kifaya, as his trade is only a part of the complicated system of the whole; 3. he must not let the market of this world distract him from the markets of the next world, i.e. from visiting mosques and performing the salat; 4. in entering the market and in it itself he must often think of God; 5. he must not be too eagerly set on the market and trading, not be the first to enter it and the last to leave it and must not cross the sea; 6. he must not only avoid what is forbidden, but also avoid all doubtful and suspicious business; he should enquire after the origin of goods and not deal with notorious swindlers or thieves; 7. he must carefully watch his words and deeds in business, as on the day of judgment he will be called to account for them.
According to Gharîbî, the market for the merchant is the scene of his qîthîd, his "holy war" where he has to wage a war against his own ego in his intercourse with his fellow-men. Since for Gharîbî, commerce is a preliminary and a preparation for the next world, he therefore discards the ascetic ideal of fleeing from the world for the ordinary mortal as an evasion of the struggle. Similar views, although not always of such high moral worth as in Gharîbî, are found throughout adab and akhlâq literature. For example, Tâbâq al-Dîn al-Suhî, the biographer of the Shâfi'i jurist (d. 771 = 1370), in his Mu'âd al-Nûmân discusses the merchant in several passages. In these he no doubt takes typical cases of his age. Thus the paper merchant should give preference to those of whom he knows that they buy the paper for the preparation of religious works (kutub al-hikma). On the other hand, he should not sell paper to those of whom he suspects that they will use it for the preparation of heretical works, false documents, increases of taxation etc. (ed. Myhirmann, London 1908, p. 188; transl. Rescher, Constantinopel 1925, p. 138). The bookseller must not sell religious works (kutub al-hikma) to people who will destroy or criticise them. He further must not deal in books by heretics or by astrologers nor in fabulous works like the Straî 'Antar, nor must he sell copies of the Kûran or works on Tradition and Law to unbelievers (cf. thereon al-Shâfi'i, Umm, iv. 132 and Heffening, Fremdenrecht, p. 49, note 5, where the "keine" should be deleted before "banan. Werke"). Lastly the dealer in lands must take care that he does not sell poor estates (ed. Myhirmann, p. 205; transl. Rescher, p. 119).  

2. A more selfish morality on the other hand is championed in the book ed. and transl. by Ritter, Kitâb al-Insân ilâ Ma'âlim al-Tâbâ'î (by Abu l-Faţl Dîjâr bi-'All al-Dimâshqi) (of the 12th/13th centuries). The book consists of two parts, one dealing with the merchant and the other with his goods. On the subject of merchandise there are many other works, some independent and some in the well known Muslim encyclopaedias, on which see Ritter, op. cit., p. 17 sqq. Here we are mainly concerned with the sections on the merchant. The classes of merchants distinguished are: 1. The wholesaler (khâsîh). He endeavours to purchase his goods under the most favourable conditions in order to sell them again, when there is a scarcity of them and the price has gone up. He must therefore keep accurately informed about the position of the market at the places of production and the security of the roads thither so that he does not let the best time for buying and selling pass him. A purchase of larger consignments is recommended to be carried through in four instalments at intervals of 15 days so that no loss may be suffered by a sudden change in price or by some unforeseen circumstance. The wholesaler must also take account of the state of the government of the country, whether it is just and strong or if it is just but weak or tyrannical. — 2. The travelling merchant (rakâtî). He must take especial heed as to what goods he buys and must exercise great caution; for his journey may be prolonged, or some unforeseen accident may happen to him, like danger on the road, which will delay him so that he must again sell the goods in the place where he has purchased them and thereby suffer considerable losses. He must also know the average prices, which the goods he is buying will attain in his native land as well as the tariffs, lest he throw away his profit even before purchasing in a foreign country. He should also look out for a reliable agent, and a suitable warehouse etc. at his destination. — 3. The exporting merchant (mujâhîdîn). Here we have to deal with agencies. He must have a reliable agent in the place to which he is exporting; to him he sends the goods under reliable care; the agent then has to sell the goods and buy others, sharing the profit. Besides much other valuable advice for the merchant and warnings against swindlers and deceivers, al-Dimâshqi's work also contains discussions of questions of economic theory such as the fixing of the market price, the "average price" about which the merchant must keep himself accurately informed. How far all this is connected with economic views of the ancients has not yet been investigated.

Ibn Khâlid in the chapters on trade in his Mushâhidîn (Caer. 1317, p. 444 sqq., transl. in N. E., xx. [1865], p. 348 sqq.) expresses himself in similar terms. He also classifies his observations under the heads of the wholesale and the travelling merchant, while he apparently omits the export merchant. He defines commerce as the art of increasing one's fortune by buying goods and selling them again at an increased price, either by storing them and awaiting an increase of price, or by taking them to another country where the price is higher.

Ibn Khâlid's verdict on merchants: in general is of interest; for the trade of merchant, one requires to have much skill, to praise his goods untruly, to deal cunningly and stubbornly with his customers, all things which affect a man's sense of honour and justice and unfavourably influence his character. It is the small trader who succumbs more readily to the influence as he has to deal with his customers day in and day out. It is otherwise with the merchant who through some favourable circumstance has risen rapidly to wealth and fortune and has attained a position of esteem; he is rather protected from the evil influences of trading as he can leave the actual dealing to his employees and has only to supervise them and give them general directions.

The question raised in the beginning of this article of the attitude of Islam to trade is one aspect of the problem, several times discussed in recent years, of the possibilities of the economic development of the lands of Islam. Until shortly before the world war the possibility of development was denied, as is still frequently done in missionary circles. W. Barthold in his introductory essay to the Mîr Islâmî mûâsir may be regarded as the first to show the untenability of this view on historical grounds, Following Max Weber's religions and sociological studies, C. H. Becker, R. Junge and more recently Alfred Rüdî have dealt with this question and come to the conclusion that Islam has never been hostile to economic development. But the Oriental mind thinks of economic problems quite differently from the Western, which is the result of the peculiar conditions of the east, especially certain racial characteristics and the dry climate prevailing almost everywhere with the
supreme importance of the question of water supply. These conditions produced a much closer bond of union between the individual and the community. The prevailing principle is not competition but cooperation. Under these circumstances one can understand the fundamental principle of Muslim commercial ethics, that the merchant must treat his customers like his brother. To this strongly marked feeling of being a member of a community is added religion, which for every Muslim is the main guiding principle of all his dealings. Even business must submit to its control and cannot take up an independent position with a morality of its own.

In spite of this however, Muslim lands will be quite capable of adopting modern business methods; Islam in the past has often displayed its adaptability and capability of development and various Muslim lands like Turkey and Egypt are at present making up for what they have long neglected in various fields: figures like Ziya Gökalp and Muhammad Abd al-Áhad are milestones on this path of progress.


TIDORE, a small volcanic island west of Halmahera in the eastern part of the Malay Archipelago. For administrative purposes it belongs to the residency of Ternate but is not under the direct authority of the Dutch East India government; along with various other small islands and a part of Halmahera it forms an autonomous district also called Tidore, formerly under a sultan, since 1909 under a council of notables. The population is in every way very like that of Ternate (q.v.). From Portuguese sources it may be deduced that Islam first introduced into Tidore about 1470; according to native tradition, an Arab named Shalih Mansur was the first to teach Islam here and Tjililiti (also Tjililit and Tjiri Lelii) about 1495 was the first ruler to be converted, when he took the name Djamal al-Din.

Bibliography: T. S. A. de Clercq, By-dragen tot de kennis der residenten Ternate, Leyden 1890. (W. H. Rassers)

AL-TIFASHI, Shams al-Din Abu l-'Abbas Ahmad b. Yuhayr, d. 651 (1253), is the author of the Kitab Asbik al-Áfghar f't Djamal·d·d·d Al-Afghar, one of the best known works on jewels which he describes — in all 25 kinds — according to their origin, provenance, natural and magical properties, defects and merits, price and appreciation of particular varieties. An edition and translation of the book which exists in good manuscripts is a great desideratum, as that by Count Raineri Bisio of 1818 (new edition 1906) no longer suits modern requirements. Nothing is known of the second mineralogical work of which there is a manuscript in Paris. To Tifashi are also ascribed some writings of an obscure nature.


TİFLİ (Ahmed Čelebi T.), an Ottoman Turkish poet and maddâh of the 16th century. Shalik in the Shaikh al-Sharî (say) he was born in Constantinople but the other sources say he belonged to Trebizond. He was the son of a certain 'Abd al-Ázîz Efendi and wrote poems while still a mere child, hence his sobriquet of Tiflî. Of a very keen wit he acquired a reputation as a maddâh and nesmil rather than as a poet. In this capacity he was a member of the entourage of Murâd IV and was very well off, as a result of the income granted him from the customs and c u s . A ll the sources record that he used to recite the Ṣâlâmâniya in the circle of Sultan Murâd and that he composed witty and amusing stories (to gain an idea of the importance and place of the Şâlâmâniya in the palaces of India, Persia and Asia Minor, cf. Köprüli Zade Fuâd, Türkîyec Mejdî muş'tâz, i. 4—5,10—12). Efîliyâ Čelebi who confirms these statements adds that he was called Lâleci Tiflî on account of his height (l. 671). Although he belonged to the Mejmû'î-ye Bârâmiye order and was an adept of Idris Mahjûfî (MS. of Mustâkim Zâde, Menâşîf-i Mejmû'î-ye Bârâmiye in my private library), he led a dissolute life. According to the Mejmû'î-ye SaleÎmân Fuâd Efendi, he lived in the vicinity of Köşkî Maşafa Pasha. The anecdotes about his relations with the poets of his time are famous. We know from Şâfî-I that Târîş Mejmû Melebi of Eski Zâhîrâ wrote two satirical treatises in verse called Ważîyet-nûme and Dhilî-nûme and represented them as the work of Tiflî. There is a copy of the Ważîyet-nûme in my own library. He is also mentioned by the poet Gaflî of Edime in his amusing rhymed biographies of poets. He died in 1701 (1665 H.) and was buried near Hazret-Kull outside Siîvîr Kapî. His tä'rîş was engraved on his tombstone by his relative Nasîm Mejmû Efendi. The celebrated poet Nâlî Kapî also wrote a tä'rîş of his death (the tä'rîş of 1707, given by 'Atîm in the Dhašl Zadab al-Áf'gâr and by Shalik as well as the tä'rîş of 1707 given by Şâfî-I are wrong. Hammer, Osmanische Dichtkunst, iii. 449, gives the date 1704 on the authority of this last source and Rieu repeats it in the Catalogue of Turkish MSS. in the British Museum, p. 198). Tiflî — who according to Şâfî-I wrote a Divân — is not however quite negligible as a poet. Biographers like
Shaihti, Riza, 'Aqin and Safi'i include him among the poets. There is a Dithon of his in the British Museum but it contains only his qaneh-fat (Rieu, Catalogue, p. 198; Add. 7953, fol. 18–25). In the meqimmâ dating from this period we have several of his poems (Flügel, Katalog der orient. HSS. Wien, l. 721).

It is to his quality as a meqdim and metem that he owes his great fame. The sources of the xvith century are all agreed in this respect and Mirza Zade Sallim, author of a taheh-e in the xviiith century, in order to emphasize the skill as a meqdim of his contemporary Kirtam says that he was a teller of stories as skilful as Tiflis, which shows that the latter's fame still survived (Taheh-e Sallim, Constantinople edition, p. 568). Suleiman Fakî Efendi, author of the Meqimmâ, says he was the first and oldest of the 'Othmanî meqdim's but this is wrong, as my investigations on this subject have shown. We may however regard Tiflis as the most famous of the 'Othmanî meqdim's. In some old meqimmâ, we find fragments of his work and anecdotes about Tiflis and Sulțan Murad have been kept alive to the present day. In the story of Şâmil Mufta contained in No. 1208 of the library of the University of Stambul and in another copy in my private library, Sulțan Murad and Tiflis appear as the dramatis personae. In the story of Khanlarî Khanîn, also one of the oldest stories of meqdim's, Tiflis and Sulțan Murad play a part ('Ali, the editor of the Djebrilî'ân-20, has republished this old story at the Djebrilî 1954 well press under the title Khanlarî Khanîn. Hâkîyâ-i cheatî). On the life of this 'Ali and a résumé of the story cf. the article Meqdim-i Meqdimî by Ibn al-Amin Mah- mûd Kâmil in T. O. E. M., No. 96, 1928). It may be asked if these stories which are of an extraordinary value for a knowledge of the social life of old Stambul, were really composed by Tiflis himself, or if later meqdim's, remembering the great fame of Tiflis, adapted them and introduced Tiflis into them. No definite answer can be given, but these stories of meqdim's show in any case what a great reputation Tiflis had acquired.

Bibliography: (besides the works above mentioned) the addition of Shaihti to the addition of the Shâmilî, entitled Wâfik al-Fudâlî (there are a number of copies in the libraries of Constantinople. The author's son completed his father's work and added the biographies of the niâm and itisîms from 1131 to 1143; there is a copy in the Aya Sofia, No. 3198); Riza, Taheh-e, Constantinople 1316, p. 63; Safiî, Taheh-e, Library of Fakî Efendi, No. 3549; Seirek Zade Meqdim 'Aqin, Dagh Zah- da al-Akbar, in my private library; Gufî, Taheh- e, in my private library; Meqdimî of Suleiman Fâlî Efendi (on this Meqimmâ and the different manuscripts of his works cf. Tîrîsî Medînedî, i. 35); Meqdim 'Ali 'Ainî, Hâfizî hâ'irâm well, Constantinople 1343, p. 127; Köprülü Zade Meqdim Fâdî, Tîrîsî Medînedî, i. 31–34.

(TORALÖ ZADE MEKİMPÉ FÉAD)

TIPLIS, the capital of Georgia and also the eastern part of Georgia (Kharthlia).

The Name. In Georgian the town is called Tphlis, which is usually explained as derived from tpbli 'bot' (referring to the hot springs of Tiflis), in Armenian Tphhis (Tphis).

in Arabic Tafaîs (Balâdhûr: Taîlîs). Among similar names we may note the town Taffiâ or 6 mediante mentioned by Ptolomy v., ch. ii to the N.E. of Abania, i.e. in Daghestan and the place called Taîfis to the south of Lake Urma (cf. Kadima, p. 215: the road running from Dajnavar to Ashârâdïn forked at Barâ (='Sâkka'î or q.v.). Taîfis lay 2 farsakhs north of Barâ on the road to Urma.

Before 112b. The old capital of Georgia was at Mskheta (Ptolomy, Geography, v., ch. x., Marqâma = 'Marqâma' which the Arab geographers by a popular etymology sometimes call Madjîd Dhi 'l-Karmîn (Mas'udi, Murâdî, ii, 56; cf. Mar- quart, Svenskgeogr., p. 185). According to the Georgian Chronicle the Persian erîshaw ('ethnarch') sent against Waraz-hakar (379–395), king of Georgia (of the Khosroïd dynasty descended from the Sasânians), built Tiflis "between the Gates of the Caucasus" (between Darial and Darban) "to serve as a bulwark against Mskheta" (Brousse, Histoire de la Géorgie, i. 140).

During the wars of King Wakhmat Gursual (446–499) with the Persians, the fortress (baia) and the village (napheil) of Tiflis were destroyed. Wakhmat laid the foundations of a town at Tiflis and his son Dalî (499–514) completed its walls (cf. cit., p. 180, 196, 201).

After 453, the Persians, having suppressed the ruling dynasty of eastern Georgia, maintained a Persian marrasân in Tiflis, beside whom representatives of the Georgian nobility had a nominal share in the administration of the country (Brousse, i. 226; Marquart, cf. cit., p. 397, 431–432; Ljahakhow, Khrist. Vostok, i. 110). The governor of Mskheta was under the marrasân. Theophanes of Byzantium (xvith century) is the first Byzantine author to mention Tiflis. (Tâphis) marrasân under the year 571 (Theoph. byz. apud Photius, in Migne, Patrologia graec., cl. 139; cf. Muradî, Emarî de chronologie byz., St. Petersburg 1855, i. 156).

The wars with the Turks and the Byzantines having detracted the attention of the Persians from Iberia, the Georgians asked the Byzantine emperor to give them a king and the Bagratid Guaram (571–600) was set up at Mskheta. To this king tradition attributes the resurrection of the foundations of the church of Sion in Tiflis (l. 222). After the victory gained over the Byzantines by king Khwaraz Parwâz (after 606), the son of Guaram, Stephanos I (who was content with the title of erîshaw = 'ethnarch'), joined the Persians. Later when in 624 Heraclius and his Turkish allies laid siege to Tiflis, Stephanos defended the town bravely. Heraclius appointed as mikhawî (chief) Adarnases of the old Khosroïd family, who associated with him the erîshaw Dîshghâ (Theophanes: Dîshghâ); according to Marquart: Thong Vaghba Khayan). The citadel (baia) was taken and Stephanos slain.

The Arab conquest. The Arabs conquered Armenia and Georgia (cf. Balâdhûr, p. 194; and Yâkût, ii. 58 where Djarâm is a mikhâyê of the country of Armûni). According to the Georgian chronicle (Khârthlia tikheoreîa), the Agarians invaded Somkheta ['Armenia'], a rather ambiguous term, for "Somkheta of Kharthlia" began to the south of the river Khram, about 20 miles S. of Tiflis in the reign of Stephanos II (659–663), son of Adarnases, who lived in Tiflis. On the death of this king, his sons Mir and Arêl
withdrew to Egris (Mingrelia, the land north of the Rion and to the west of Imeretia as far as the Black Sea). In the period of their joint reign (665–668) Georgia was visited by the ferocious Murwan Kru ("M. the Dead") sent by the Amur Al-Mu'minin Ezghr (I'li Haghani, who was actually 105–125 = 724–743). Such mistakes and anachronisms may be explained by the fact that at this period the national life of Georgia had taken refuge far to the west in lands not easily accessible from Corokhi (Klardzhetia). The thread of events may however be pieced together from Arab and Armenian statements [cf. the article ARMENIA].

In reality Arab expeditions penetrated into Transcaucasia in the reigns of the early caliphates. According to Tabbari, i. 266, in 22 (643) Sufakh having made peace with Shahr-Burzin (king of the Bah Al-Awab) sent Habib b. Maslama against Tiflis. To the same year Tabbari, i. 2674, puts the peace with the people of this town but it was actually made in 25 (645) in the reign of Othman (al-Yakub, p. 194; Baladshuri, p. 198). When Habib b. Maslama had conquered Armenia [q.v.] he turned his attention to Georgia. A Georgian ambassador (Nikly = Nicolaus; Tfly = Theophilos II) appeared before him to testify that the khatrib of Djuraz and his people were well disposed. Habib's answer (cf. the versions in Baladshuri, p. 201 and Tabbari, i. 2764; Yakuti, i. 857 rather follows Baladshuri) was addressed simply to "the inhabitants of Tiflis, in (the rustak of) Mandjasis (now Manglis) in Al-Djuranj (i.e. Georgia) in the land of Hinduza". Habib guaranteed the people the exercise of their religion; but he sent again to Tiflis the learned 'Abd al-Rahman b. Djar to expound the law of Islam and indeed the people of the town were soon converted to Islam.

After reducing Tiflis, Habib extended his conquests or his treaties of peace over other regions inhabited by the Georgians and their neighbours (Baladshuri, p. 202–203; cf. the attempt to analyse them in Ghaurani, op. cit.). Among these the Shanirya play a prominent part (Ptolomy, v., ch. viii., § 13: Shanairia; in Armenian: Tzarnakh), a very warlike Christian people who lived in Kakhetia and the high Alazani and who, according to the hypothesis of N. Y. Marr, were identical with the modern Thshkh, whose language is related to that of the Cechs (cf. Isae, Abd. Nakt., xiii, 1930, p. 1379–1408).

From the time of Habib's expedition to the reign of al-Mutawakkil (212–247) the Djurzan (eastern Georgians) and the Akhbagh [q.v., here in the wide sense of "western Georgians of the valley of the Rion", i.e. of Imeretia) paid tribute to the Arab military commander in Tiflis (Murudi, ii. 65; Yakuti, ii. 583). Of the time of Yazid II (101–105) we have a letter in which Djurrah b. 'Abd Allah confirmed to the Djurzan the guarantees given by Habib b. Maslama (Baladshuri, p. 202; there is a reference there also to the rustak of Mandjasis, but several place-names are still unidentifiable).

As to the "Murwan Kru" of Armenian and Georgian tradition, two personages seem to have been confused in this figure (Marquart): Muhammad b. Murwan of the Georgians says he had heard the Armenians mention him as 'Abd Allah, and his son Marwan b. Muhammad who (in the reign of Haghani, 105–125) was fighting mainly in Dagesthan but whose expedition against the "Gate" of the Alans must have passed through the region of Tiflis. His headquarters were at Kisal (?), 20 farshaks from Tiflis and 40 farshaks from Burgahia (probably Kesal under Ta'lis) which satisfies the description; below). A dirham is known of 'Abd al-Malik struck at Tiflis in 85 (704).

The 'Abbasids. In 141 (758) the Khazars under Ka's Turkhan invaded Armenia (Ya'qubi, ii. 424). Tabbari (ii. 326), speaking of the same event under 147 (764), says that during the invasions of Ashtar Khan al-Khuwarizmi (ii) many Muslims and dhimmi were made prisoners and the Turks entered Tiflis. Ya'qubi immediately after 141 mentions a raising of the Sanjar. The latter were defeated by 'Abd al-b. Isma'il who then returned to Tiflis and executed his prisoners there.

Another Khazar invasion took place in 183 (790). Their king came as far as the bridge over the Kur and ravaged the country but the taking of Tiflis is not mentioned by the Arab writers (Ya'qubi, ii. 518; Tabbari, ii. 648) while the Georgian chronicles say that in the joint reign of the brothers Ioane and Dizanaher (718–786?) the Khakan's general Blcan (in Armenian Bul'n'an) took Tiflis and conquered Kharthlia.

Of the governors that Harun al-Rashid (170–193 = 786–809) sent to Armenia the harshest was Khusaiba b. Kha'if (Baladshuri, p. 210). The Georgians called him Ch'um-Asim. Ya'qubi, ii. 210 confirms the cruelty of his second government. The Djurzâh (read Djurzân) and the Sanjarîya rebelled. Khusaiba's general Sa'd b. hastily defeated them, drove them out of the country and then returned to Tiflis.

Under al-Mu'azzam (198–218) a certain Muhammad b. 'Attâb established himself in Armenia. In 214 (829) he conquered the land of the Djuran and the Sanjarîa joined him (Ya'qubi, ii. 540, 565–566). Khallid b. Yazid gave the awâd to Muhammad b. 'Attâb and defeated his allies, the Sanjarîa, but the disturbances in Armenia went on (Ya'qubi, ii. 566; Baladshuri, p. 210–211). In 215–239 (830–853) Is'kâh b. Isma'îl carved himself out a principality in Georgia.

Is'kâh b. Isma'îl. According to Mâṣūdi, Murudi, ii. 65, he was of Kumaq origin. His father Isma'îl b. Shu'âib al-Murdi, a client of Harun (126–132 = 744–750); he had settled in Georgia in the time of the caliph Amin (193–196) and had had skirmishes with the wali Assad b. Yazid (Ya'qubi, ii. 528). The uncle of Is'kâh, 'Ali b. Shu'âib mentioned in the Georgian chronicle, i. 260, 265; is said to have received Tiflis from Khallid, probably after Muhammad b. 'Attâb. But already in the governorship of Hassan Badghihstî, the second successor of Khallid, we find the name of Is'kâh. When the Byzantine troops of Theophilos (829–842) reached Wangand (near Kars) they "were cut to pieces by Salak, son of Isma'il" (cf. Stephen Asolik, ii, ch. v., trans. Daluanier, p. 171). As a result of such exploits the caliph Wallih (842–847) recognised Is'kâh as lord of Tiflis, but this did not last long. Muhammad, son and successor of Khallid, defeated Is'kâh and drove out the Sanjarîa. According to the Georgian chronicle, the Georgian princes (who had less fear of the central government so far away) supported Muhammad against Is'kâh and his allies, the people of Kakhethia and the Sanjarîa.

Finally in the reign of al-Mutawakkil the Turk
Baghā al-Kalb or al-Shāhīd was sent to Armenia. In Rabī‘ I 238 (autumn 852), he left Dublis for Tiflis. Baghā watched the operations from the high hills besides Saghdiabat (the reference is to the heights of Makhatha to the north of Isani = Saghdiabat; cf. the description of Tiflis below).

Ishākh made a sortie but Baghā’s nāfiṣāt (throwers of Greek fire) set fire to the town. Ishākh’s palace was burned. He and his son Ḥamīd were taken prisoners by the Turks and the Moors.

Dadish was decapitated and 50,000 (?) men lost their lives in the destruction of the town by fire. The Moors took the survivors prisoners and spoiled the dead. Ishākh’s wife, daughter of the lord of Sarra (= the princedom of the Avars in northern Daghestan), was at Saghdiabat, which was defended by the Khwawilīya (people of Sarra; cf. MAIYĀK-AHMET). Baghā granted them the amanu on condition that they laid down their arms and continued his operations in the direction of Djarndan and Bailsaḵān (Tabart, iii. 1114–1116; cf. Thomas Artzruni, iii, ch. 9–10, ed. Brosset, St. Petersburg 1874, p. 140–150. A Georgian inscription on the church of Ateni gives the Muḥammadan date 259 for the taking of Tiflis by Baghā; cf. Djaswakhw, Krist, Vostok, 1912, i. 284). The destruction of the Muslim princedom of the former clients of the Omayyads, which was a focus around which local elements gathered, was an irreparable mistake for the caliphate. The Arab authors (Masʿūdī, ii. 67; Yāḥīṯ, ii. 58) date the decline of Arab power in the Caucasus from this. Baghā was soon recalled; cf. Brosset, op. cit., i. 266–268 and Thomas Artzruni, ibid.

There was an Aḥṣāṣi mint for dirhama at Tiflis till 922 (pieces are known of 210, 248, 250, 294, 298, 304, 307, 311, 324, 334, 339, 337); cf. Tiesenhausen, Memoirs des khāṣīṣ orientaux, St. Petersburg 1873 and especially Pakhomov, op. cit.

The aid which Bagrat (826–876) had lent to the caliph against Ishākh did not bring the reward desired by the eastern dynasty. The rival dynasty called of Akkahan (cf. the explanation of this term above) seized Kharrithia, Thus Masʿūdī (writing in 332 = 942), Mūrīḏī, ii. 69, 74, says that the Kur left the possession of Djarndan (Bagratid of the lateral line, d. 941; Marquart, op. cit., p. 176) crossed the land of Akkahan (sic) and arrived in front of Tiflis, the inhabitants of which although surrounded by Muslim invaders on all sides still retained their courage and continued to defend their city. The founder of the Armenian Bagratid kingdom, Aḥṣāṣ (880 a. n.) also interfered in the affairs of Kharrithia (Brosset, i. 270, note 12). Masʿūdī gives Masʿūdī Dhib ʿl-Karnān (= Mskheta) as the residence of the king of Djarndan [al-tamahabat], ingeniously emended by Marquart, op. cit., p. 186 to the Armenian *mamabat > mamapat, a Georgian title.

The Sādīqā, the Sīhrids and the Shaddādids. In the meanwhile there arose in Adharbādšīn the first Muslim dynasty that owned the suzerainty of Baghdād, the Sādīqā (276 or 279–317; cf. this article and R. Vasmer, O mearlyā Saghdiabat, Topozia Ohkōh, Ined. Aretb., Baku 1927, No. 5, p. 22–31). Abu ʿl-Kasim Yāṭān went to assist the isolated Muslims in the north. In 912 (?) he came to Tiflis the amir of which was called Djaṭfar b. ʿAlī (cf. below) and seized the fortresses of Udjarmon and Bokhara (on the upper Iora) (cf. Brosset, i. 275, note 9). The chronicle also mentions another expedition (between 918 and 925) of the Sādāqā called Saiṣīl in the course of which Mskheta was taken. The Muslim sources are silent about these expeditions. Immediately afterwards the chronicle mentions the appearance of the Shaddādids [q. v.] at Barḏa and in Adharbādšīn.

Bagrat III and Bagrat IV. The series of reigns “shows the greatest confusion” (Brosset) until the king Bagrat III (980–1014?) reunited Kharrithia, Akkhāz, Tuo (on the Ḍorokh) and Ardanaq. In his time the Shaddādids [q. v.] Fadjīl invaded Armenia but was defeated by the Georgians and Mskheta was always regarded as the royal city although the rulers resided in Kutais (Khanthahāni). In 1030 (421) the Georgian and Khakhthia notables, with the help of the amir Djaṭfar of Tiflis, undertook an expedition against the Shaddādids Phulion (Fadjīl of Ganda). But when the latter died, Liparit Orbeliani, the powerful lord of Thurialet (on the upper Khram), captured Djaṭfar by a ruse and only released him on the appeal of the young king Bagrat IV (1027–1072), who evidently did not wish Tiflis to be annexed by the turbulent Liparit. Djaṭfar was re-established at Tiflis but a few years later the king himself laid siege to Tiflis. The siege had lasted for two years when suddenly the king at the suggestion of Liparit made peace with Djaṭfar. After the death of the latter the elders (ber) of Tiflis offered the keys of the town to Bagrat, who occupied the citadel Dar al-Djallī and the two “towers” Teḵaḵān and Thabor (cf. the description of Tiflis below). The inhabitants of the Isan quarter on the left bank of the Kur however destroyed the bridge and Bagrat had to turn his ballistas upon Kutais.

The Sādīqā. In 1045 the troops of Irthym Yambil (in Georgian Bahram-Lam) appeared for the first time in Isulan (Pass on the upper waters of the Arazas). In 1053 (?) the Sādīqā undertook an expedition against Gândīa but a counter-movement by the Byzantines who were allies of Bagrat IV saved the town. Thereupon the people of Tiflis again invited Bagrat but as a result of Liparit’s intrigues, the Byzantines kept Bagrat prisoner in Constantinople for three years. Then Bagrat recovered the greater part of his fortresses, when suddenly Alp Arslan (1063–1079) invaded Georgia (Brosset, i. 326). On Dec. 10, 1068, Alp Arslan accompanied by the kings of Armenia and Khakhthia (Aghsārthān, son of Gagik, of the dynasty of Korishe [Chorespiscoph] which ruled from 787 to 1105) as well as the amir of Tiflis marched against Bagrat. All Khakhthia was occupied and many Christian slaves or taken prisoners. The Shaddādids were given compensation. Tiflis and Rastaw were given to Fadjīl of Gândīa and Aṭi to Manṭulib b. Abuʿl-Awsār. In the spring of 1069, Bagrat returned to Khakhthia. Fadjīl encamped at Isan (a suburb on the left bank) and with 33,000 men ravaged the country. Bagrat defeated Fadjīl who took the road through Kakhthia but was taken prisoner by Aghsārthān. At the price of conceding several fortresses on the Jora, Bagrat ransomed Fadjīl and received from him the surrender of Tiflis where in the meanwhile a certain Sīhrbarā (Sīyaḏ al-ʿArab) was acclaimed amir. This plan failed for Alp Arslan obtained the liberation of Fadjīl (Georgian, Gorgis, son of Bagrat (reigned 1072–1089, lived to 1185), lived in Kutais. In Kakhthia Aghsārthān retained
his possessions on condition that he adopted Islam.

Dawid II. The revival took place under Dawid II Aghmushenebeli (the "Bridegroom") who took the title of king of Kharthila and Alekha (1089-1125). Dawid brought into Georgia through the pass of the Alans (Darial) 40,000 Kipchaqs (Polovtsi) and 5,000 slaves converted to Christianity. In spite of their unrilliness (Brosset, op. cit., l. 379) these warlike elements enabled Dawid to throw off Seldjuk domination. He ceased the payment of the kharaj and put an end to the seasonal migrations of the Turks into Georgia. He gave his daughter Thamar in marriage to the Shirvanshah [q.v.] Akhmet in (Georgian Aggharsht) and treated him as his vassal.

The capture of Tiflis in 515 (1121). On the complaints of the Muslims of Tiflis the Seldjuk Mahtmut b. Muhammed (1118-1154) sent an expedition into Georgia in which the Urtukhs Nadji in-Din Ghiyat, the Maryzadi Dubais b. Sadzaqa (Dubata of the Georgian chronicle) and the brother of the Sultan Tughra (lord of al-Arran and Nahkibewan) with his atabeg Konchegh all took part. On the 18th August 1121 this army entered Tirkhelet and Manglis but was destroyed by Dawid and his Kipchaqs, after which in 515 (1121-1122), Dawid stormed Tiflis so that the town might become "for ever an arsenal and capital for his sons"; Brosset, l. 365-367 and Addition, l. 230, 256-241; cf. Ibn al-Athir, x. 395-399 (= Defremery, Fragments, p. 26); Kamal al-Din, Ta'rikh Halab, in the Recueil des hist. des croisades, ii. 628; Yaghi, l. 857 (Tiflis). The Arab historian al-Ain (1360-1451) who utilises sources, some of which are no longer accessible (Brosset, l. 241), admits that Tiflis was taken by a pilleaged but, contrary to the other sources which emphasize the atrocities committed by Dawid (Matth. of Edessa in Brosset, Add., l. 230), says that the king respected the feelings of the Muslims more than Muslim rulers had done; Dawid is also said to have promised to strike coins with Muslim legends; the coins however of the king (cf. Pahkomow, Monists etc., p. 77-81) bear the image of the Virgin. Great caution in dealing with the Muslims was necessary because as the Georgian chronicle acknowledges, the fighting between Muslims and Christians was still very bitter (cf. Brosset, l. 380).

The Banu Dja'far. Dawid succeeded in Tiflis to the Banu Dja'far of whom it is not known whether they were of Arab or purely Georgian origin. While the Georgian Chronicle (l. 367) puts at 400 years the period of Muslim rule in Tiflis, al-Ain gives the Banu Dja'far alone a period of 200 years. Indeed, we have heard that about 912 the amir of Tiflis was already called Dja'far [b. 'Ali] (Brosset, l. 275). His successor struck coins at Tiflis; dirhams are known of Mansur b. Dja'far, dated in 342 and 343 (with the name of the caliph al-Mujj II l'talih), and of Dja'far b. Mansur, dated 354, 368 (al-'Tayy II l'talih). In the time of Bagrat IV (1027-1072) the amir of Tiflis was called Dja'far (his father 'Ali had carried off the property of the Swetsi-Taykoweli church of Mtksheba). The Chronicle calls him Mukhad Gward Dja'far (Mskhath Gward is a place near Mtksheba). During the 400 years before the conquest of Tiflis by Dawid, the town was governed by the young members of the Banu Dja'far family, each of whom in turn held power for a month (al-Ain).

The strong kings. The reign of Dimitri (1125-1154) was occupied with a civil war with the Orbelian family. The Muslim rulers contemporary with him were: in Adharbajjian, the Banu Dja'far Ilidugs (in Georgian Djudzor); at Ani, the sons of the Shahbaniyeh Khatun, Zahir al-Din Shahb-I-Armun (1128-1133); at Erzerum the amir Saltuq b. 'Ali, whom the Georgians defeated near Ani in 548 (1153); cf. Ibn al-Athir, xi. 126 sub anno 548 (1157); Muneqdeljim-bashi, ii. 577; Defremery, Fragments, p. 40. It was Dimitri who, taking advantage of the earthquake in 1139 at Gandja, carried off the famous iron gate of this town and took it to the monastery of Gelati (cf. Frazhin, Mem. Ac. St. Petersburg, viith series, St. monast., vol. iii., p. 531). The position in Tiflis is described by Ibn al-Azra'k, historian of Muyafafrpshin [q.v.] who visited Tiflis in 548 (1153). He says the Muslims were in a favoured position. Every Friday Dimitri came to the mosque and sat on a dais (dabhe) opposite the khatib; cf. Ademov, Three Arabic MSS., J. R. A. S., 1904, p. 791 (al-Azra'k may have been the source used by al-Ain).

Under Giorgi III (1156-1184) the Muslim kingdoms around Georgia remained the same and the king conducted vigorous campaigns against Erzerum, Ani, Dvin, Nahkibewan, Gandja, Bardha'a and Baillejan. To assist his cousin the Shirvanshah Akhmet, son of Thamar, Giorgi's aunt, the king even went to Darband (cf. Brosset, i., p. 393-403 and Add., l. 255-257, 266; Ibn al-Athir under the years 556, 557, 559, 561, 569).

The reign of Thamar (1184-1211 or 1212), the "Sun of Khurthlia", is the culminating point in the history of Georgia, now on the threshold of terrible trials. Having forced the diadochoi of the Seldjucks to the Christian king now assumed the offensive and surrounded itself with Muslim vassals. Thamar played an important part in the creation of the empire of the Comnenoi of Trebizon (Knik, Ostrov. Trapes. imperii v 1904, Utia. Zap. Akad. Nauk, 1853, vol. ii., p. 705-733). The troops operating from Erzerum and Eraniqian inflicted defeats on the Ilgidists of Adharbajjian. The sack of Ararat by the Georgians (Brosset, l. 469-473) finds confirmation in the Sililat al-Nanab-i Safawtes, Berlin 1843, p. 43; cf. Khanykow, Misc. Asiaticques, i., 1852, p. 580-583. The Chronicle also mentions in 1210-1212 an expedition through the whole of northern Persia as far as Romguaro (= Ramaljar near Nahkib) but beyond Tabriz the stages in this march seem to be quite fanciful (Brosset, l. 471-473). In spite of the brilliant success of the generals Zakhar' and Iwane of the Mkhargrdzel family (Armenian of Kurd origin; cf. Brosset, Add., l. 267), the Georgian victories were not lasting and of all her conquests, Thamar could only retain Kars (Brosset, l. 467). At home also (Djwaswhow) the growing power of the feudal lords demanded the attention of the queen. Muslim customs penetrated into Georgia; the general Iwane was given the title of Atebeg ("used among the Saltans"; Brosset, l. 474). In the reign of Thamar, we find mention of a rebel, 'Oozan son of Abu l-Hasan, "amir of Tiflis and Khurthlia" (is this a scion of the Banu Dja'far?).

The Mongols. The son of Thamar, Giorgi III Lasha ("splendid" in the Abkhazian language) who ruled from 1212-1223, levied the khorruf of Gandja, Nahkibewan, Erzerum (Kurnakalak) and
Khitai but in 617 (1220) the Mongol troops of Subatai and Djebe (in Georgian: Saba and Loma or Çeba) made their appearance in Persia. The Georgians were several times defeated; the Chronicle (Brosset, l. 493) considers the defeat at Birdbul (on the Berda) as the turning-point in the fortunes of the Georgian armies, henceforth invincible.

Gori in suddenly and the throne passed to his sister Rusudan (1223-1247) (Khulati, the "maiden king" of the Muslims), a beautiful princess devoted to pleasure, whose hand was sought by her Muslim neighbours (Brosset, l. 495). In the end she chose the son of the Saljuq of Erzerum, Mughith al-Din Toghril (in Georgian Orthiul) who by his father's orders became a Christian (Ibn al-Athir, xii. 370: شیخ شریف شریفیان فی شیخ شریفیان). In the letter from Rusudan to the Pope Innocent III (which reached Rome in 1224) the king speaks of the Mongol invasion as an insignificant episode, but a new enemy was at the gate.

The Khwarizmshah Djalal al-Din defeated the Georgians at Garin in Shaibann 622 (Aug. 1225) (Ibn al-Athir, xii. 383; Nasawi, ed. Houdas, p. 112; Brosset, add.). This was the last of the Georgian commanders who had been taken prisoner. Tiflis was occupied on March 9, 1226, thanks to the treachery of the Persians who lived in the town. According to Diuawani, Djalal al-Din spared the inhabitants and allowed them to withdraw to Ab-kharaz but destroyed all the Christian places of worship. Ibn al-Athir on the other hand says that the town was taken by storm (اوکار وفکار می شریت ونی و) and all those who did not accept Islam were massacred. Nasawi (p. 122) also confirms the massacre of all Georgians and Armenians in Tiflis (cf. Brosset, l. 304-307). The visier Shahar al-Mulk was appointed governor of the town. When he left for winter-quarters at Gamdja, the Georgians returned to Tiflis and burned the town, knowing that it was impossible for them to hold it (Nasawi, p. 125). Djalal al-Din, occupied elsewhere, did not return to Georgia until 1228 when at Mindor (in Georgian "field") near Lord he scattered the forces of the commander-in-chief Iwane, made up of very diverse elements: Georgians, Alban, Armenians, people of Sarf (= the Avar of Daghestan), Lak, Kipchak, Swan, Abkhaz, Djani (= Can-ethi; cf. the article Laz), men from Syria and Asia Minor (cf. Diuawani, li. 170). The Georgian Chronicle (Brosset, l. 310) says that after the victory at Bolsin (= Mindor?), Djalal al-Din committed fresh atrocities at Tiflis.

Second coming of the Mongols. Djalal al-Din disappeared from the scene in 625 (Aug. 1221) but the remnants of the Khwarizmians disturbed the eastern part of Georgia and shut the feudal lords up in their castles. Tiflis however was still in possession of Rusudan, who when the Mongols of Djurumghan entered Georgia via Gandja. This took place in 1236 (Brosset, l. 333; according to d'Ohsan, ill. 75: ca. 632 = 1235). Rusudan left Tiflis for Kutais and the governor of Tiflis burned the town (Brosset, l. 514: "thus was ruined the city of Tiflis").

The whole of whom the Chronicle always mentions four (Carmaghian, Caghtar, Iseri and Bibe) occupied the country and restored Tiflis. Rusudan's rule was confined to the valley of Koni. The Mongols broke up the political organisation of the country; the Georgians were pressed into the Mongol service (expeditions against the Saljuq of Rum, Ghiyath al-Din, against the Isma'ilis of Alamut, against Baghdad etc.). The country was divided into six rumais and the Georgian feudal lords (emirvans) whose feuds underwent changes, were divided among the rumais. The people of note fled there to Batum-Khan and then to the Great Khan in Mongolia, where they were kept for years. In this way the heir to the throne, Dawid (called in Mongol Nurin "splendid"), was removed from the country. A certain Egrasian tried to unite the country against the Mongols ("he only lacked the name of king"; Brosset, l. 542) but the Mongols set up against him Dawid, son of Georgi Lesha, who was crowned at Mtkakheta. He also had to go to Batu and to Karakorum. The "two Dawids" are mentioned among these present at the kurultai of Guyuk-khan in 643 = 1245 (cf. Diuawani, l. 205, 212; Raghid al-Din, ed. Blochet, p. 242). Returning to Georgia, after the accession of Mongke (1248-1259) they ruled together at first.

As Hulagu did not love Dawid Nurin, the latter escaped to Abkhazia. "It was thus that our country became two principalities" says the Chronicle (Brosset, l. 546). eastern Georgia owned two suzerains: on the one side Battu-Khan, lord of the country north of the Caucausus, wished to extend his authority over Georgia; on the other side the Ilkhan of Persia asserted their rights over it. Dawid, son of Lasga, exasperated by the exactions of Khodja Azis, collector of Mongol taxes (Raghid al-Din, ed. Quatremere, p. 395, calls him "one of the governvors of Georgia"), fled to his cousin. The novein Ouat Arghun occupied Tiflis. A reconciliation only took place when the son of Lazha had fought beside Hulagu against the troops of Berke, successor of Batu who had invaded Shirvan in 1262 (d'Ohsan, ill. 182). In the reign of Abagha, Berke returned to Transcaucasia and reached Tiflis, where many Christians were massacred (in 1266; cf. ibid., p. 418).

The successor to Dawid, son of Lasga, was his son Dimiri II (1273-1297). He took part in the numerous campaigns of Abagha and Amanud but in the reign of Arghun he behaved as if he were himself heathen after being bastinadoed at the ordina. The Georgians call him Thaw-Dadchuli, "he who gave his head as a sacrifice".

Several further kings were nominated and deposed by the Mongols. In vain Dawid VI (1292-1310) endeavoured to negotiate with the Khan of the house of Batu (Otabba = Tokhtoghul); he had to send to Ghazan an embassy consisting of the orthodox Catholicos and the khatif of Tiflis (cf. Brosset, l. 615 [this last detail is evidence of the revival of Islam as a result of the accession of Ghazan!]). The Georgians continued to take part in all the campaigns of the Mongols, which they never saved them either from persecutions (cf. the activity of the Muslim novein Nawritz in the reign of Ghazan: Brosset, l. 617) nor from attempts to convert them (e.g. after the Gilan expedition of 1307).

Giorgi V. After the death of Iuliani (1316) Giorgi V (Britiismonata, the "Splendid") was placed on the throne (1316-1345) under the patronage of the amur Cobu. Giorgi profited by the troubles in the last years of the dynasty of the Ilkhan to drive out the Mongols. He exterminated the rebels, went with his army into Imeretia and united under his rule not only the Georgian lands
TIFLIS. It was during the long reign of Bagrat V (1360—1395) that Timur made his appearance. The official historian of his reign represents his campaign in Georgia as a ḥaṣāb. Timur set out from Kars in the winter of 788 (1386) (Ẓafar-nāma, i. 401). Bagrat had shut himself up in the capital of Tiflis. The town was captured and the King and Queen taken prisoners. The Chronicles and Thomas of Metsop (Nève, Exports, p. 37) mention the apostacy of the King but represent it as a clever ruse which enabled him to exterminate 12,000 of Timur's soldiers and regain his lands. His son Giorgi succeeded him in 1395. The Ẓafar-nāma, i. 735, 730 does not give these details. In 796 (1394) he only mentions the dispatch of four generals to the district of Akghal-tiske (Askheiska, q.v.) in order to apply the law of ʿādm. Timur in person finally chastised the Georgians called Kara-Kalkandil ("with black bucklers") —the Georgian mountaineers, the Pahaws and Khevares—and returned via Tiflis to Shekki (q.v.).

In 798 (1395) the Georgians, allied with ʿAll of Shekki (q.v.), inflicted a defeat on the troops of the Timurid Miran-shah who was besieging Alinda (near Nakhchiwān) and delivered Sultan Ṭehrār Ẓalāfiyir, who was shut up in it (ibid., 303). This event brought about its reaction in winter 802 (1399) when Timur took Shekki and mercilessly ravaged the wooded defile of Khimishi (?), probably in northern Kakhetia: where a Khimishi family held a fast at Mucwel to the east of Timtheth (Broset, t/a, p. 464). In the spring of 1400 Timur marched on Tiflis and demanded that King Giorgi (Gurgun) should hand over Sultan Tahir. On receiving an evasive answer, Timur laid the country completely waste (ibid., l. 241). Tiflis received a Khorasanian garrison but Giorgi retired again to the mountains. After the voluntary submission of a Georgian prince named Dżam-beg and the capture of the fortress of Zarḵ (?) Timur's troops set out in pursuit of Giorgi and laid Swinathwa waste. Giorgi went into Abhazia and sent Tahir back to Asia Minor. Through the intermediary of a Muslim named Inmek (Broset, i. 668) he offered to Tiflis to pay the ḥārārāj, Timur accepted the offer. Next the land of the Georgian Iwane (the attah of Samakhe) was converted to Islam, and that of the Kara-Kalkandil plundered. After resting for two months in the summer quarters of Min-göl ("1,000 Lakes") near Kars, he sent troops against the Georgians who had concentrated at Farasgird (Phanaskert, on the upper Čorokh); ibid., i. 250.

In 804 (end of 1401) Timur returned to Transcaucasia via Siwās-Bağdašl-Khurāb. His delegates (muḥāsir) went to collect the tribute (saww waḥrārūd saw-dīša) from Giorgi who sent his brother with the contributions. Timur gave Giorgi the amān on condition that he supplied him with troops and treated the Muslims well (ibid., ii. 379). In the summer of 804 (1402) Timur went from Karabaḵ to Min-göl and took the fortress of Tortum occupied by Kürdül, lieutenant of a certain Taghi (?)

When, in 805, Timur returned to Erzincan, he decided to punish Giorgi for not having come to present his congratulations on his victory over Bayzid. At Min-göl, Iwane, son of Al-Ḥūgha, arrived with gifts as idd Kustandil (Constantine), brother of Giorgi, who was then on bail terms with his brother (ibid., ii. 521). Šāhku ʿIrāhim of Shīr-wan went to estimate the revenues and expenses of Georgia (ibid., ii. 521). Giorgi sent new presents but Timur refused them and summoned Giorgi to appear in person. In 806 (Aug. 1403) he himself laid siege to the impregnable fortress of Kūrttān defended by Nasrūl (or Narwāl (the Chronicle calls it Birthwīs on Alget) and took it in nine days (ibid., ii. 524—532). The troops then laid waste the country round (ṣaṭr) Georgia as far as the borders (ḥalaṭ) of Abkhasia: "which is the end of this country", 700 towns and villages were destroyed and the historian of Timur waxes eloquent over the massacres and destruction (li. 536). Timur only stopped the waste when his son Ḥusayn decided it was possible to grant the ʿāmārī. The Georgians sent 1,000 tanges of gold struck in the name of Timur, 1,000 horses, aruby weighing 18 miṣwaḵūr etc.

Timur passed through Tiflis, destroyed all the monasteries and churches and went to Bâlaḵān (winter of 1403—1404). All the country from Bâlaḵān to Trebizond was given as an appanage to the prince Khâhl Mirsā (li. 545).

Post-Timūrid period. The general disorder after the havoc wrought by Timur, is reflected in the part of the Chronicle which gives a brief account of the reigns. The Muslim sources (Mītāl al-Salātār, N.E., xiv. 235 and Mīrkhud; cf. Debrémery, Fragments, p. 245) mention an expedition of Šāhku ʿIrāhim of Shīrwaḵan, a friend of the dynasty of the Ẓalāfiyir, against the Kara-Koyanlu Kara Yūsuf in which Kustandil, king of Gurdżistān, took part. The allied forces were defeated to the north of the Araxes and Kara Yūsuf slew Kustandil with his own hand. This happened in 815 (1412—1413). 300 ʿaḏārūs (Georgian nobles; cf. Armenian ʿaḏār “race”) were also massacred. Wakhquhurst (Broset, i. 689) alone mentions Constantin as king and puts his death in 1414. In 1415 (1416) on the invitation of the Persians (= Muslims) of Akghal-tiske, Kara Yūsuf invaded this region and laid the country waste (Thomas of Metsop; cf. Nève, loc. cit., p. 96; Broset, Add., i, p. 399). The Chronicle confesses that down to the accession of Alexander (1415—1442) “no conqueror arose from anywhere.” This king gradually drove out the invaders, restored the cathedral of Sweti Ẓalāfiyir (at Mtkhet) and repaired the fortresses. The Georgian envoys who greeted Shāhrukh in 823 (1420) at Kara-bāgh (cf. Mīrkhud in Debrémery, ap. cit., p. 251) must have been sent by Alexander, and when in 841 (1437) Shāhrukh arrived in Somkhetia (cf. above) Alexander sent him rich gifts after which the son of Timur left Georgia.

In 1444 (843) the Kara-Koyanlu Ẓāḥān-šāh made a raid to Akghal-tiske (cf. Broset, i. 683; according to Thomas of Metsop, Ẓāḥān-šāh took Tiflis in 1440; cf. Nève, p. 149).

Partition of Georgia. At this period Georgian tradition becomes exceedingly difficult to unravel (Broset, i. 679—689). The history of Wakhquhurst, which continues and corrects the Chronicle and agrees better with the statements of the Muslim historians, begins with the reign of Constantin III (1469—1505) during which Georgia was divided into three main kingdoms (Broset, ii/1, p. 11—18, 147, 208, 249): Khârūthala (on the Kar [i.e. Georgian Mtkvar], with capital Tiflis), Imerethia (on the Rion, with capital Kutaisi).
and Kakhchita (on the Alazan, with capital at Gremi [in Persian Gurin] and later at Tbilw]). In addition, the atabeg of Samtșke (with capital at Akhal-tash) was detached and founded the independent principality of Saatibabo (consisting of Samtșke, on the upper course of the Kura, and of Klarjetia on the Corokh) the princes of which from Mansur III to Safar-pâša (1625) had become Muslims. (Brosset, II, 228). A number of local princes also became independent of Imeretia (the Gurics of Guria, the Dadians of Mingrelia, and the Gelowani of the Swans; cf. the article ABL Gil). In Kakhchita also, Constantine III's reign was disturbed by the invasion of Bagrat II of Imeretia.

The Aḵ-Koyunlu. In this period Urōn Hasan comes on the stage. According to Mūmūl[ji]-bāghš, III, 160, he went to Georgia for the first time in 871 (1466) when he liberated the Muslim prisoners and took the fortress of Čemča (I). Civil complications prevented him taking Akhal-tash but he returned to the attack in 877 (1472). King Bakušt (read: Bagrat II of Imeretia) was dethroned (bakr) and 30,000 prisoners taken from Georgia. According to Waḵhūti's version, Tiflis was surrendered to Urōn Hasan by Constantine, evidently to prevent Bagrat getting it. Urōn Hasan left a garrison in Tiflis but entrusted its government to Constantine (cf. Brosset, II, 13 and 25). The Tareq-i Amīn however calls the governor (āydl) left by Urōn Hasan, Shīr Kahlīl Beg, who stayed there till the death of Urōn Hasan in 1478 when the Georgians re-occupied the town.

Sulṭān Yāḡū Aḵ-Koyunlu invaded Samtșke in the autumn of 891 (1486) to chastise the Atabeg Kvarqāvari. In the next year Yāḡū sent Shīr Kahlīl Beg to conquer Georgia. The construction of the forts of Aṛkha-taša and Kozani was begun by the Turkomans on the lower course of the Debed (Borșala) at the place which commands the approaches to Georgia from the south (cf. the Geography of Waḵhūti). Kustāndī (Constantine III) withdrew from Tiflis. Shīr Kahlīl began the siege with the help of reinforcements which arrived in the winter; he took first of all the fortress of Kadër (Kodjori, south of Tiflis). In the fighting around Tiflis the Muslims suffered heavily but finally Wali ağa Īsḥāḳ-āğa had the town (3rd Rabī' I, 894 = 1490) (cf. the unpublished history of the reign of Yāḡū, Tareq-i Amīn, MS. Bibl. Nat. Paris, No. 101, fol. 101r–105r and 157r–159r). The Chronicle (Brosset, II, 326–327) which confirms many of the details, denies however that Tiflis was taken and adds that the people of the City of Tiflis (called Barzil-li by the Muslims) on Alget inflicted a defeat on the Turks.

The Safawī. In 907 (1510) a detachment of Ismā'īl I's forces under the command of Khadīm-beg invaded Georgia (Ṣāḥīḥi Khāna, quoted by Dora). The invasion by Dīw Sulṭān in 916 (1520) was stopped by the embassy of Ramaz, son of Dawōd VIII, to Ismā'īl I (cf. Ḥabīb al-Siyar, Bombay, iii, 352, p. 92). In 929 (1522–1523) the founder of the Safawī dynasty seized Aṛkha-taša and by making certain promises obtained the surrender of the citadel of Tiflis; he desecrated the churches and built a mosque "at the corner of the bridge" (cf. Waḵhūti, in Brosset, II, p. 23) (the mosque is still standing on the right bank). The Chronicle mentions four expeditions on a large scale sent by Shīr Taḥmāsp against Georgia. In 947 (1540) Taḥmāsp seized Tiflis, the governor of which (for Lurāsh I) submitted to the Persians and became a Muslim. Next the fortress of Bābī (Bardāsh (Bābi), c. 1541, 1542) was taken (Aḵ-[y]-rā Ṭeherān, 1542, p. 63). The second time was in 952 (1548) when the Georgian princes came to pay homage to Taḥmāsp at Shīrāqān (near Germā = Alexandropol = Leninakan). The third expedition in 958 (1555) was sent from Shīrak to the appeal of the atabeg of Kār Khusraw, son of Korkūr (Kvarqāvari) who complained of the injuries done him by Lurāsh (Iskandar Munāḥ writes Lawārāb but the name is Iranian: Lawārāb; cf. Mirʿat al-Bulān). According to Iskandar Munāḥ, Aḵ-[y]-rā, p. 65, by the Turco-Persian peace of 961 (1553) the territories of Māk (Mogī = Samtșke), of Kārī (Kakhchita) and of Kahlīl were allotted to Shīr Taḥmāsp, while Sulṭān Sulaimān received those of Bashāk-ānīk ("with head uncovere", a nickname of the king of Imeretia), of Daftiyān and of Gūrīyān (Gūria) as far as Tēvōrinān and Tārās (Tēvōrinān and Tārās). Lurāsh I however continued to worry Tiflis. This provoked the fourth expedition. Barzdī (Salaštāhān), Gori and Ateni were occupied and the king himself fell in battle. Waḵhūti dates the four expeditions in 936, 954, 955 and 958 respectively. Brosset, II, p. 450, considers these very probable as they coincide very well with the visitations of the Turko-Persian war. King Swīmōn I, son of the indomitable Lurāsh, had a troubled reign (1558–1600). He was defeated by the Persians and replaced by his brother Dawōd (Dāwūd Khān) who purchased the throne at the price of apostacy. Swīmōn was imprisoned in Alamāt from which he was released by Ismā'īl II (1576–1577) to checkmate the activity of the Ottomans.

Ottoman Domination 1578–1603. In 1578 during the reign of the weak Shīr Khānābāda, the Ottomans under Muṣṭafā Lāš-Pāshā penetrated into Georgia via Samtșke and in August seized Tiflis from which Dāwūd Khān had fled. The Turks put a garrison of 200 men with 100 guns in Tiflis. Muḥammad, son of Ferḥād-Pāshā, was given the sandjaq (pāšalik) of Tiflis (v. Hammer, G. O. F., ii, 483). Two churches were turned into mosques. In October, Gori received a Turkish garrison and was given as a sandjaq to Swīmōn. When Muṣṭafā-Pāshā returned to Erzerum, Ismā'īl Khūl Khān, son of the Shamsīl alān al-Dżemā'īr-Pāshā, and Swīmōn laid siege to Tiflis. Supplies were brought to the garrison by Ḥasan-Pāshā (ibid., p. 480) but the struggle around the town continued. In 1580 the new erāshker Sinān-Pāshā arrived in Tiflis and appointed as governor a son of Lurāsh who had adopted Islam under the influence of Yūsuf (?). Swīmōn made advances to the Turks which were not accepted. In August 1582 Muḥammad Bey left Erzerum to bring supplies to Tiflis but was defeated at Gori by the Persians and Georgians. Ferḥād-Pāshā put himself at the head of a new expedition (Dec. 1581) intended to strengthen the towns held by the Ottomans. In 1584, Rīwān-Pāshā left for Tiflis. Dāwūd Khān, on further reflection went over to the Turks. Swīmōn attacked Rīwān but without success. Ferḥād-Pāshā's Janissaries mutinied at Akhal-kalāk which forced him to retire. After the campaign of 1585 against Tabriz (q. v.), the Ottomans obtained from Persia thecession of Āḏarbadījān and of Transcaucasia including Georgia (treaty of March 31, 1590).
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cf. the Chronicle of the Pahlari of Mashki (1599–1587) in Takavishvili, *cit. op. cit.*, p. 183–214; von Hammer, il. 481–497 (Brosset has given an annotated translation, 1/1, p. 411–419). The principal source used by von Hammer is the *Nuqret-Nama* of Ali (Jan. 1578–Jan. 1580). On the other Turkish sources cf. Balinger, *G. O. W.*, p. 117, 181. Soon after the accession of Muhammad III (1595) Swinom was taken in a skirmish and sent to Constantinople where he died in 1600. Ottoman rule, more or less undisturbed, lasted from 1591 till 216. Oct. 1603 when Tiflis was retaken by Shah Abbas I. The Turco-Persian treaty of 1612 re-established the situation as it had been under Sultan Selim (1512–1520). Shah Abbas I and the Muslim Kings. The worst misfortune that fell upon Georgia (and especially on Kakhetia) in the reign of this monarch, although Giorgi of Kharthlia and Alexander of Kakhetia had fought under his banner at the siege of Erivan in 1602, Abbas after his victory took love from Georgia. He married the sister of Luaraeb II (1605–1616) but brought the latter to Persia and had him strangled at Gulbash-kala. In 1625 (1616) Abbas came in person to Georgia and granted Kharthlia to the Muslim Bagrat VI (1616–1619). He then punished Kakhetia. According to the official history of the reign, *Alam-ārā*, p. 635, the number of those put to death was 60–70,000 and the number of young prisoners of both sexes 100,000–130,000: "since the beginning of Islam no such events have taken place under any king." In 1633 (1623) Kharbash-Safi, on being sent to Georgia called to the colours 10,000 men of Kakhetia and instead of leading them against Erithia had them massacred "as if at a banquet" (*qulat-e-sef-e Alam-ārā*, p. 719). Exasperated by such treachery the *muqraw* ("governor of lower rank"); Brosset, 1/1, p. 148; the Persians write *muhurav* Giorgi Sasakidze (a Muslim and till then a faithful servant of the Shah) raised a rebellion in Kharthlia which the Persians did not overcome till 1626 (Isselian, *Zam muqrawa G. Sasakidze*, Tiflis 1848; Brosset, 1/1, p. 53–59 and 489–497). In spite of all these disasters, the part played by Georgians in the life of Persia becomes more and more important and Shah Sāli, successor to Abbas I, owed his throne to the support of Khrsaw Mirzâ, brother of the king Bagrat who was *dargaha of Iqbashān.*

When Swinom II perished in the civil war (1629), Theimuraz I of Kharthlia (1605–1664), a very troubled reign marked by all kinds of misfortunes; his mother Khetkhanen was put to death at Shērāz in 1624; Brosset, 1/1, p. 167) came to Kharthlia where he reigned from 1629 to 1664, after which the Khrswar already mentioned arrived from Persia and set himself up in Tiflis under the name of Rostom (1634–1658). The old king, brought up in Persia, took the Persian title of *sultan-e-zâlir* and ordered his court in the Persian fashion. Persian garrisons were installed at Guri and Saram. The Georgian prisoners who had become converts to Islam returned from Persia; Georgian manners and customs became the fashion. On the other hand, as if to celebrate the fusion of both cultures, Rostom celebrated his marriage both in the mosque and in the church, and restored the cathedral of Mikhetsa etc. In 1656 Mustâd IV took Erivan and by the treaty of 1641 (1639) Persia renounced her claims to Kara and Akbal-tishke (Za'rifā-i-Nūmān, p. 686); according to Wakhsht (Brosset, 1/1, p. 68), the Sultan received Imerchia and Saaxbago and the Shah kept Kharthlia and Kakhetia.

Wakhtang (to Muslim, Shah Nawzâ I), adopted son of Rostom, succeeded him (1658–1676). The Persopolish policy continued. Shah Abbas II (1642–1667) married the daughter of Shah Nawzâ. The latter, although a Muslim, favoured the Christian religion and even restored the confession and the communion of which the people "had been ashamed" in the reign of Rostom (Brosset, 1/1, p. 79). In order to give more support to Shah Nawzâ the Muslim tribes of Agharatbādjin and Karabagh (10,000 Djasavān and Djasavān) were settled in Kakhetia (cf. the History of Shah Abbas II by Muhammad Tāhir Wahdā, in Dorn, p. 109, 111 = Brosset, 1/1, p. 503–504). Shah Nawzâ fought in Imerchía, but when he set his son on the throne there, the Shah restored the situation as guaranteed by the treaty of 1639.

Giorgi XI (Shah Nawzâ II) received investiture from Shah Sulaimān. In 1688 he fell a victim to his own intrigues in Kakhthia and the Shah replaced him by Erkole I (1688–1691; 1695–1703). This king who had been brought up in Russia became a convert to Islam under the name of Najar 'Al Khān.

Afghan Invasion of Persia. When the Balû and the Afghans began to disturb eastern Persia king Giorgi with a body of Georgians was sent against them by Shah Hasin. He restored order in Kandahār but in 1709 was treacherously slain by Mir Wals cf. the article Afghanistan who then defeated the new Georgian forces led by Giorgi's successor, Kai Khurasaw (1700–1711). These events paved the way to the Afghan invasion of Persia.

Wakhtang (governor of Kharthlia 1703–1711; King, 1711–1724 with interruptions) was at first a Christian. The Persian garrisons with the connivance of certain Georgian elements went in for slave-trading. Wakhtang tried to put down this traffic (Brosset, 1/1, p. 97, 101, 105) and in general "humbled the Muslims, especially those who garrisoned the citadel of Tiflis." Between 1614 and 1616 he was replaced by a servent Muslim lâse (i.e. 'Al Khāl Khān) and only regained the throne at the price of professing Islam.

After the decisive victory of the Afghans at Gānabāb, near Iqbashān (1723), Shah Husain sought help from Wakhtang but in November 1721 the latter had offered his services to Russia (Brosset, 1/1, p. 117). Peter the Great who reached Darband on Aug. 23, 1722 had to return at once to Russia. On the other hand the King of Kakhthia Muhammad Kûli Khân (Constantine III) took the field on the side of the Lezgis against Wakhtang and in 1723 took Tiflis, which was plundered for three days.

Second Ottoman Occupation (1723–1734). The troubles in Persia and the Russian advance disturbed Turkey, War against the Shâhs was declared permitted. In June 1723 the se'asker Ibrahim Pâshâ, who had been negotiating with Wakhtang, installed in Tiflis the latter's son Bakar (in Persian Shah Nawzâ and now given in Turkish the name Ibrahim Pâshâ). The Janissaries occupied the citadel. Bakar soon rebelled but the Turks sent to Tiflis reinforcements under Jese, uncle of Bakar (who now assumed the name of 'Abd Allah).
In the meanwhile the Russo-Persian treaty of Sept. 12, 1723 was signed by which the provinces on the Caspian were ceded to Russia. As a counterpoint to the good offices of the French ambassador, a Russo-Turkish treaty was concluded at Constantinople on June 12, 1724: Russia kept Daghestan and the narrow strip of litoral; Turkey obtained all Transcaucasia as far as Shamilka, including the Georgian territory (von Hammer, G. O. R., iv. 206–214). The Ottoman historian of these events is Celciö-üke; on the other sources cf. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 289: Nāmi, Feth-Name der 'Abd-ı Gürüşhâni.

The deposed King Waghntagh went to Russia with a retinue of 1,400 (Aug. 1724). The Turks having taken possession of Khartli took a census and levied taxes on the inhabitants. The stay at Tiflis of the noble 'Oţmān Topal Pāshā alone has left a pleasing memory among the Georgians (Brosset, ii/, p. 129). Isse did not bear the title of king and the real power passed to 'Isăk Pāshā, a hereditary ruler of Akhal-tsiike established at Tiflis. After the death of Isse (1727) 'Isăk Pāshā was appointed governor of all Georgia (Brosset, ii/, p. 236). In 1728 he divided Khartli among the feudal lords (mētkawar) whose dimensions made it easy for him to control them. The Leegis continued to ravage Georgia (cf. Brosset, l. c.; v. Hammer, iv. 223, 231, 235, 280, 313).

Nādir Shāh. In 1143 (1730–1731) after a war in which he won little glory, Shāh Ṭahmāsp recognised the Araxes as the frontier between Persia and Turkey (Mahāl Khān, Ṭokhtābā Nādirī, Tabriz 1384, p. 90 = trunal. Jones, l. 144; v. Hammer, iv. 227 dates the peace on Feb. 6, 1732). Nādir dissatisfied, dethroned Ṭahmāsp and resumed the conquest of Transcaucasia. While he was operating against Daghestān (1143: autumn of 1734) 'Isăk Pāshā of Tiflis set out with an army to the help of Gadjū, Theimuraz, son of Nāṣir Āl Khān (= Erkē I), and his nephew Āl Mirzā, Alexander (son of Mūsā Kuli = Dawid III) attacked 'Isăk Pāshā and forced him to shut himself up in the citadel of Tiflis. Nādir, highly gratified, gave presents to the two princes (ibid., p. 114 = Jones, l. 200). At the siege of Gadjū, Nādir ordered Ṣafī Khān Bagh'īrī to lay siege to Tiflis with the help of the Georgian nobles (ma'mūnān wa-mawā'nūn = ibid., p. 116 = Jones, p. 205).

When ʿAbd Allah Pāshā was defeated at Baghāward near Ervān, 'Isăk Pāshā surrendered the citadel of Tiflis on the 22nd of Rabi I, 1147 = Sept. 17, 1734 (ibid., p. 123). Nādir summoned the nobles (māwā'nūn wa-mawā'nūn) of Khorāshān and Kakhkhteh among whom Ṭahmāsh (= Thimuraz) had most importance and privileges. Nādir however appointed as wali of Khorāshān and Kakhkhteh, Āl Mirzā, because he was a Muslim, and his brother Muḥammad Mirzā (= Leon) had fallen in battle against 'Oţmān Pāshā. Ṭahmāsh was allowed to go to Kakhkhteh to bring his family (kiš) to Tiflis. Now he was a „man of the sword and rapid decision“; he fled to the mountains of "Karalakhlān (Pāhaw), Rūs (Ru'īn, west of Gori) and Čerkes." Nādir sent his troops in pursuit of him, arrived himself at Tiflis on the 29th Djamād I, where he distributed punishments and rewards. 6,000 Georgian families of the Kašal (Abots) were transferred to Khorāshān (ibid., p. 124 = Jones, p. 210). In 1736 Ṣafī Khān captured Theimuraz and sent him to Persia. At the beginning of the
Description of Tiflis. The Arab geographers give few details about Tiflis. According to Iṣṭakhri (p. 185) the town was very large; it was surrounded by walls of clay. (jin) with 3 gates and had natural hot baths like those of Tiberias. According to Muṣfir b. Muḥalḥī (in Yūṣif), these baths were reserved for Muslims. Ibn Hawqal (p. 142–144) compares the water-mills of Tiflis (urūb) with those of Mawsūl and Raṣṣā. He is filled with admiration for the plentiful supplies of food at Tiflis and the hospitality of the inhabitants. Tiflis was an outpost of Islam, beyond which there were no Muslims (Iṣṭakhri). The town was surrounded by enemies (Ibn Hawqal). An interesting detail is given by Balḥastān in the 14th century: the town was built of pine wood (fīsamukh) (according to Kāẓımī, only the roofs were of pinewood).

In the Mongol period, Zakariyya Kāẓımī tells us that on the one bank of the Kur at Tiflis could be heard the call of the muqadhdha and on the other the peals of the Christian māṣūf. The Christians were in the majority. Hāmīd Allāh Mustawīl describes the houses of Tiflis built one above the other, the roofs of the one being the courtyard of the next.

From the xviith century we have the Turkish descriptions of Haḏīdī Khalla (his brief narrative refers to the years 1630–35) and Ewiliyya Cebeli (in 1648) and also the first detailed description by a European (Chardin 1673). Ewiliyya gives many details of the citadels. The larger (that on the right bank of the Kur) was 6,000 paces in circumference and its walls were 60 ells (ghirâs) high. It had 70 towers and a garrison of 3,000 men. There was no ditch. There was a tower fitted up to supply the fortress with water (sultaḥ būl). In the large citadel there were 600 houses roofed with clay. In the smaller citadel (on the left bank) there were only 300 houses but it was very strong on account of its walls. Pl. iii. of Chardin’s Atlas gives a general view of Tiflis in which the traveller shows the 19 principal features (churches, palace, etc.).

For the xvith century we have the descriptions by Tournemont (1701), ii. 307 (with a view, p. 314) and in Wakhaugh’s Geography (the difficulties in which have now been cleared up by Brosset, p. 180). A panoramic plan of Tiflis was published by De Fīlā, Averission sur la carte générale de la Géorgie, Paris 1766 (the editor had received it during his sojourn in Russia from the “prince of Georgia”). The gazetteer by P. Fossellian (1866) is valuable as it locates ancient buildings.

Old Tiflis consisted of 4 quarters, of which three lay on the right bank of the Kur (which here bends from N. to S. to N.W. to S.E.): 1. Kula or Kulli (= Arabic Qal‘a), the old quarter intra muror (between the streams Sololaki and Dabakhana which flow into the Kur), with the citadel (Narin-kala. 2. The town properly called Tphĭli, which grew up around the hot springs (according to Brosset, iv. i. p. lxxxiv, it was founded by Armenian inhabitants). The town was situated on the bank of the Kur opposite and below the Kura (Shah Safi); it had settled a colony of Sāyida on the heights of Thab-dom to the east of Dabahkana, whence the Persian name of this district: Sāyīdshāb. 3. The outer quarter Garesh-ubani near the race-course (eķēs), above and to the north of the first two quarters. 4. The quarter on the left
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bank opposite the Kala was called Isani or Nisan (later Awlabah) and had the heights of Mahkorta to the north of it. Isani corresponds to the Sughdhab of the Arabs. It is the cemetery Sardegbel, in Georgian "place of granaries", mentioned in the Life of St. Abo; cf. Broset, Additions, p. 156 and Schulze, Das Martyrium d. hl. Aba von Tiflis, Texte und Untersuchungen, 1905, xiii., fasc. 4, p. 35. The same name occurs twice in the Georgian Chronicle (cf. Broset, i, 407 and 653).

Three citadels have to be distinguished at Tiflis:
1. The old citadel of Thabor (Korol'Kal'a) on the hill on the right bank of the Dabat-khana destroyed in 1618, in 1725, and finally in 1785; it defended the southern gate of the Kala, called the Gandja Gate. 2. The citadel Narin-Kali on the hill of Kala. Before Islam, this fortress seems to have borne the name of Shuris-Tikhe (Wakhsha). It was dismantled in 1818 (cf. the picture in Gambla's Atlas). 3. The citadel of the left bank (Isani) served as a bridge-head; in 1728 the Turks began to fortify this place for the last time but left the work unfinished.

As to the royal palaces the oldest was that of Metekhi on the left bank in front of the old bridge. In 1538 the Muslim king Rostom built a palace about 400 feet in length along the Kur in Tphiliis. Here Chadin was received by Shakh-Nawaz. A little farther to the south King Wakh-Taghi built a palace very richly adorned in the Persian style; it was destroyed by the Turks in 1725; cf. Iosselian, Opliuniye (on the mosques cf. p. 239).

From the nature of the site, compressed between the Kur and the heights of the right bank, Old Tiflis attained no considerable extent (cf. Chadin). In the 16th century the town began to extend far beyond its ancient limits and is developing especially on the left bank along which runs the railway lines (Tiflis-Baku, Tiflis-Batumi, Tiflis-Dulfa and Tiflis-Kakheti).

Population. In 1783 after the prosperous reigns of Teymurz and Erekle, the town had 4,000 houses with 61,000 inhabitants. In 1803 it had only 2,700-3,000 with 35,000 inhabitants. This was the result of Agha Muhammad's invasion in 1795, traces of which could everywhere be seen even in Tiflis's time. The more exact figures for 1834 (Dubois de Montpéreix) give 3,662 houses, 4,936 families and 25,290 inhabitants, not including Russians. The population grew rapidly: 1850: 34,500, 1865: 70,000, 1897: 160,605. Of the last figure the Armenians formed 38.1% (cf. the Georgians 26.3% and the Russians 24.8%). The census of 1892 gives 233,958 inhabitants for Tiflis, of whom 85,309 were Armenians, 80,884 Georgians, 38,612 Russians, 9,768 Jews, 3,984 Persians, 3,255 Adharbajdzhani Turks, 2,437 Germans etc.; cf. the Zakhmaley, Tiflis, 1925, p. 156–157. Lastly the census of Dec. 17, 1926 gave 282,918.

Bibliography: The standard work is M. F. Broset, Histoire de la Géorgie, St. Petersburg, 1849–1857: vol. i; / — Additions, — an important introduction by the author and the early history to 1450; vol. ii / — Additions, for which an Armenian and Muslim sources have also been ransacked; vol. iii / — History of prince Wakhshut (± 1450–1750): separate histories of the four kingdoms: Kharthlis, Kakhethi, Saatabago, Imereti; followed by Additions; vol. iv / — Later chronicles, memoirs etc. (circa 1659–1856); in all 2,424 pages in 4°. Cf. also Laurenti, Broset, Bibliographie analytique des ouvrages de M. F. Broset, 1824–1879, St. Petersburg 1887 (analysis of 271 books and articles). For the history of the sources cf. the three chronicles translated by Takaishvili in Shornik materialow, Tiflis 1900, xxviii. 1–214. The chronicles are supplemented by the important Geography of prince Wakhshut [finished at Moscow in 1745], transl. into French by Broset, Description géographique de la Géorgie, St. Petersburg 1842 (with the original maps), Russian transl. by Dianashvili, Tiflis 1904, in Zap. Kavk. Otd. Russ. Geogr. Obshch., xxxiv., fasc. 5; P. Iosselian, Tiflis in russ. istoria, 2 vols, Tiflis 1915 (down to the Mongol invasion); vol. iii, ed. 1928, a part of vol. iv. (Post-Timurid period), 1924.


The desert of al-Tih which formed the most southerly district of Filastin was 40 farsakh long, about as much broad, and stretched from the district of al-Djiyf (the region of al-Farama), al-‘Arab, al-Waradah to the mountains of Sinai (Tur Sina); in the west it was bounded by the Egyptian province of al-Rif (Maspero-Wiet, M.E.F.A.O., xxxvi. 101 n.), in the east by the districts of Jerusalem and Southern Palestine.

According to the description of the Arab geographers, it consisted partly of stoney and partly of sandy soil, contained also salt-marshes and red sandstone hills, a few palm-trees and springs.

In the desert, there was a fortress bearing the same name (De Guignes, Perle des Merveilles, N. E., ii. 31); there was a Wadi ‘I-Tih in the eastern part of it (Quatremère, Mémoire sur l’Egypte, i. 186).

On the relations with Russia (which begin in the xvth century): Perepiska gruzinshchikov (correspondence in foreign languages of the kings of Georgia with the rulers of Russia from 1639 to 1770), ed. Brosset, St. Petersburg 1861 (contains, i. p. 1-xxi., a memoir by F. Floen on the Russo-Georgian relations to 1739); Berghe, Abk sabran. Kaukaz. arkeograp. Kommissiyay oficjalnyy dokumenty referentnyy k Kaukazu; 10 vols. in folio, Tiflis 1856—1859, R.K. Bulakh, Materialy novoye izvestiya Kaukaz, (1772—1803), St. Petersburg 1860, 3 vols. (with a detailed chronology by L. Brosset); Belokourov, Soweteniya Rosit k Kaukaze, i. (1578—1613), Moscow 1889; Belokourov, Arseni Sakhnov, i. Moscou 1892; Tsagareli, Perepiska gruzinskiy xvIII veke, St. Petersburg 1890; do., Gramoci otnoishcham k Grussi k xviii century, 2 vols., St. Petersburg 1891, 1898 and 1902; Belovskii, W. potto, Utverdzenie russ. vladetstva na Kaukaze, Tiflis 1901—1908, 12 vols.; Avalov, Prizvedeniei Krussi k Rosit, St. Petersburg 1901 and 1906 (also gives a sketch of the relations with Persia); W. E. Romanowskii, Ocherki o istorii Grussi, Tiflis 1902.

Works specially dealing with Tiflis: P. Isnellaa, Opisanie drevnosti Tiflis, Tiflis 1866 (Maunz, notes on antiquities, p. 272—273); Brakke and Basenov, Tiflis v istor. i etnogr. otnosheniyakh, St. Petersburg 1870; Dianashvili, Tiflis-tiflisos Gruisi, Tiflis 1899 (in Georgian).

Bibliography of western and Russian travellers in Miasnarov, Bibliographia Caucasia, St. Petersburg 1870, esp. p. 87—89; Dubrownin, Istoriya voyeki na Kaukaze, vol. i—v, St. Petersburg 1871; la Grande Eneyel. russ. (articles by Masalak, Tsagareli). The earliest notices of Tiflis are by Josephat Barbaro (1436) and A. Contarini (1473); Chardin, Voyages, ed. Langlès, ii. 22—38 and pl. ii. of the Atlas; Tournefort, Relation d’un voyage au Levant (1701), Paris 1717, ii. 307—320; Guldensztad, Reisen durch Russland, 2 vols., St. Petersburg 1787; la Grande Eneyel. russ. (articles by Masalak, Tsagareli). The earliest notices of Tiflis are by Josephat Barbaro (1436) and A. Contarini (1473); Chardin, Voyages, ed. Langlès, ii. 22—38 and pl. ii. of the Atlas; Tournefort, Relation d’un voyage au Levant (1701), Paris 1717, ii. 307—320; Guldensztad, Reisen durch Russland, 2 vols., St. Petersburg 1787—1791; do., Reisen in Georgien (1770), ed. Klaproth, Berlin 1815, p. 127—134; Gamba, Voyage dans la Russie méridionale, Paris 1826, ii. 154—184 (Tiflis and the Atlas); pl. 152; Duboin de Montpère, Voyage autour du Caucase, Paris 1839, iii. 225—275 (Tiflis); etc. (V. Miroséy.)

TIRGIS. [See Didjla.]
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and send out a ridge to the east. The frontier of Tihamā is in the west the Gulf of el-Kulām and in the east a range of hills running north and south (the Sarṭ). The province called Tihamā stretches, according to Idriṣī, from Sarṭa to 'Adnā, 12 days' journey along the sea-coast and a 4 days' journey by road from the mountains as far as the land of Ḥalāfāḥa (not Ḥalābāḥa). The greatest breadth of Tihamā is in the hinterland of Jidda, the port of Mecca, which is also usually included in Tihamā — as districts of Mecca in Tihamā are also given Ǧanbān, ʿAsma, Bilād and ʿAkī — although writers differ in their views on the extent of Tihamā in this particular direction. Al-ʿAṣimāʿ for example makes Tihamā begin at al-Dhīr Ḫaṣrī, Ibn al-Kuṯāmīnī puts its frontier at Dhāt Ṭārṣ and al-Ǧaḥba and in the Yanān highlands; according to ʿUṣmān b. ᴫqī, it stretches from the sea to Ḥarrā Sulaqīm and Ḥarrā Lailāt; al-Madīnī says that everyone who passes through Wadār, Ǧabara and al-Ṭūf in the direction of Mecca is already in Tihamā, which he puts south of the Ḥijāz, others again make Tihamā stretch from Ǧilīrān via Mecca to al-Ṭif (between Mecca and al-Madīnā) (all the statements are recorded by Yāqūt, Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAbd al-Muṭṭab, I, 902; of the Yanān Tihamā, extent and particulars of the people etc., a full account is given by al-Hāmidī, Ǧīlīrān al-ʿArab, p. 54, 119–121). In any case the geographers not only use Tihamā as a synonym of "coast" (ṣabl al-bahr) and "depression" (ghawr) or "hollow" (ṣifāḥ) but they place it as an independent geographical or political entity alongside of Ǧamāl, al-Yanān, and al-ʿArabī (B. G. A., viii. 79). Indeed Tihamā at various periods in the history of Yemen was a separate province for administrative purposes, for example as early as the period of the Persian conquest of the Yemen (end of the vii. century A. D.), presumably a survival of the organisation of the late Sabaean kingdom, and at a later date under the Ǧizyālīs; then it had a period of independence with Zahid as capital (1118–1174 A. D.) to become a province again under the Imām of Ǧimālī al-ʿAbd."}

It is significant of Ibn Ḥajr al-ʿAsqalānī's keen perception of the similarity of the coast on both sides of the Red Sea that he also speaks of a Tihamā of Ethiopia (B. G. A., vii. 155), by which he apparently means practically the coast of Erythraea. Ibn al-ʿArḍī describes the Tihamā as mountainous country, which is peculiar, no doubt on account of the hills which run through the plain along the coast and are also mentioned by al-Idrīsī. Al-ʿIṣḥāqī and Ibn Ḥawqal in this way made the Tihamā stretch far into the mountains while others expressly define Tihamā as the land between the sea and the Sarṭ.

As to the etymology of the name, B. Moritz, Arabien, p. 9, note 1, for example thinks Tihamā is taken over from the Hebrew-Babylonian ʾḥāmā ʾḥāmā, "sea". On the other hand, H. Zimmern, Die Kellinschriften und das alte Testament, Berlin 1902, p. 402, note 2, is not certain whether Hebrew ʿtḥāmā like the Arabic Tiḥāmā, as a name for a coastal region is originally connected with Babylonian ʾṭāmuṭu or, what is more probable, in both cases we have a case of an early borrowing from the Babylonian. When it is suggested that ʾṭāmuṭu, ʾṭāmuṭu (in Berossos ṕaʾaʾ) with the meaning of "ocean", "salt sea" is connected with the Hebrew ʾḥāmā meaning to "stink" (cf. P. Jensen, Keltinisar. Bibl. vii., p. 559 sq.), it should be pointed out that the Arab philologists also quote ṣāḥāma with this meaning to explain the name Tiḥāmā (on account of the malodorous air there), but at the same time they compare ṣāḥāma with the meaning "intense heat", "calm" (Yāqūt, Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAbd al-Muṭṭab, I, 902; Bakrī, Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAbd al-Muṭṭab, I, 203). The name Tiḥāmā moreover occurs already in the South Arabic inscriptions, Glaser, Nos. 554, 3, 5, 618, 8, 90, and Rehasek, 4, 8 as ṣāḥāma with which may be compared the ṣāḥāma in Cruttenden, line 10. The muṣāʿir inscription of king Ǧabāl II. Yahya quoted by Yāqūt, Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAbd al-Muṭṭab, p. 208, 9, mentions al-ṭāmuṭu wa-ṣāḥāma "people of the Tihamā (coastland) and of the mountains", quite in keeping with the passage in Glaser, No. 554, 3, 5, 618, 8 sq. ( предостה ( предостה). With the first of these musāʿir, which is evidently taken from an inscription of a late period, may be compared the inscription No. 13 of the académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres in Paris, published by J. and H. Derenbourg in which the rulers mentioned by name are described as "kings of Saba" and the Tihamā.

The origin of the Tihamā, the breadth of which varies considerably — sometimes it is merely a narrow strip of coast, as at places between al-ṭūf and Sues and at Kenfuḍa and Lahayya — probably dates from the middle Pliocene period and is connected with the subsidence of the Red Sea. Coral formations and modern alluvial deposits form the material of which this plain consists; in the Yanān portion it rises to 2,000 feet above sea-level and then suddenly ascends sharply to the great highlands of the Yanān Sarṭ. The Yanān Tihamā begins at al-Ṭūf and stretches to "Adnā if we include the Tihamā of ʿAsīṭ. In the Yanān part the breadth varies between 30 and 50 miles. From the slightly undulating country, especially towards the high lands — isolated hills which consist either of recent limestone, which often contain fossils (mammaliths) at a considerable height, or of volcanic rock. The climate is very unpleasant. It is hot and dry and extreme temperatures are recorded at certain periods in the year (May and Sept. 35°–45° C, April 40° C). In the summer the temperature drops a little under the influence of the frequent rains but on the coast 40° C by day and 30° C by night are not unusual. In the winter the temperature varies between 25° and 35° C but the minimum even in the coldest months is never below 14° C on the coast. The rainy season is from February to March or from May to the end of September. Only the most southern part of the west coast of Arabia belongs to the region of tropical summer rains, and the south coast as far as 50° East Long., 15° or 16° N. Lat. A feature of the Tihamā are the mists called ʿtḥāmānīt or ṣāḥāma which rise in the mornings and drift towards the highlands and make these regions regular hothouses in which flourish numbers of valuable crops, notably coffee.

Tihamā, hot and dry, is the natural soil for the vegetation of a plain with thornbushes, thistles and grasses. The saline steppe which adjoins the coast (ḫāḥā) is covered with bushes; in the in-
terior especially towards the highlands, durra, barley, maize, wheat, sugar-cane, date palms, sesame, indigo and cotton flourish. The population of Ti-
hamah, estimated at 30,000 (secondly to 'Abd al-Wāsīl b. Yāḥyā, Ṣurkhāl al-Yaman, p. 292) on the coast is engaged in trading, shipping, fishing (also pearl-fisheries) and shipbuilding and in the interior mainly with agriculture. They appear to be a mixed race with olive-coloured com-
plexions; their woolly hair and thick lips show a strong admixture of African blood. Their colour is described e.g. by Botta as quite black; Bury speaks of the negroid taint and calls the Tihamah people slightly built. The largest tribe, the Zerāńt, is characterised by the crisp short beard and straight hair (cf. the picture in Bury, Arabia Infelix, facing p. 28). The language of the Tihamah Arabs is generally said to differ very much from pure Arabic and to contain numerous foreign loanwords.

The southern Tihamah, the natural frontier of which runs from Mulghā to Mawsā is traversed in all directions by volcanic ranges and shows only scanty deposits of sedimentary rocks; it is mainly formed of the same rocks as the continent. There is no continuous strip of flat coast; this is only found at intervals between projecting spurs of the highlands of the Interior or the volcanic features of the coast. Perpendicular cliffs and sandstone cliffs which run along the coast alternating with white deposits of chalk and sandy depressions are characteristic of the southern Tihamah which rarely ever exceeds 25 miles in breadth. In the interior the southern Tihamah is more steppelike in character; in the valleys of the Wādis on the other hand, fruitful oases are found after the fertile summer rainfall, for example the extraordinarily rich oasis of Lāḥaj or of the Wādi Mawsā which has the same flora as the western Tihamah. The southern Tihamah has as a rule a slight rainfall. The winter rains are irregular although they seldom fail. At the end of April heavy rains begin, often accompanied by severe thunderstorms; occasional rains fall in January, February, and December and July, and August.
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S.G., xlii (1874), 115 sq., 125; P. E. Botta, Relation d’un voyage dans l’Yémen, Paris 1850, p. 160 sq.; A. Delfers, Voyage au Yémen, Paris 1859, p. 23, 25, 30; C. Landberg, Arabica, vi, Leyden 1858, p. 115 sq.; M. Hartmann, Die arabische Frage, Der islamische Orient (Berichte u. Forschungen, ii, Leipzig 1909), p. 113, 278, 532, 537, 540; G. W. Bury, The Land of Us, London 1911, p. 27, 35, 40, 43, 100, 107, 113, 138; A. Grohmann, Südarabien als Wirtschaftsgebiet, i. (Osten u. Orient, ed. by R. Geyer and H. Heuberger, I. Reihe, Forschungen, vol. iv, Vienna 1929), p. 5-8, 17-24, 40-42, 53 sq.; B. Moritz, Arabien, Studien zur physischen u. historischen Geographie d. Länder, Hanover 1923, p. 9, note 1. Tík, a technical term in Arabic music, corresponding to the learned term ʿbūd; also used in Arabic dialectic metres for the sugāf. It means the note struck, sharp and heavy: a. on the edge of the tambourine, sometimes on the little cymbal that is fixed there, k. on the back of the closed left hand when the hands are beaten, c. with the left foot on the ground when the hands are beaten, d. on the open palm when the hands are beaten; the latter being Balābāl, sometimes ʿtā or ʿlābāl (usually ʿlābāl); the first being the sharp and heavy blow and the latter, ʿdāl, the dense and sonorous. The latter being struck on the stretched skin: a. at the centre of the tambourine, k. on the centre of the open left palm if the hands are beaten, c. with the right foot on the ground when dancing. Just as classical prosody built up a series of metres by arranging long and short in varying order so the popular Arabic prosody of the mu-
ważkahāti built up a series of special rhythmic
TIK — TILIMŚAI

types (called ʿurrā') on differentiated series of ʿāṣāt and ʿādāt with pauses between. The maqāṣid rhythm for example may be thus written:

$$k, m, a, k, z, m, m, m, r$$

(where $k = 'a'$, $m = ʿādāt$, $a = silence$ and $r = ʿāṣāt$).

So that the phrases in the song may coincide with the series of characteristic beats of the rhythm selected the following rules are observed:
1. each syllable must correspond to one beat (naḥra) at least; 2. one or more ʿāṣāt may be intercalated (intercalation = riḥū) in the rhythmic series; 3. but certain pauses must not be interferred with, intangible cesuras, characteristic of the rhythm (first by pause after ʿādāt, otherwise short pause after ʿāṣāt); 4. contrary to Arabic classical metre, we may have open syllables when the time is strong and closed when the time is weak. Martin Hartmann was therefore wrong in trying to reduce the rhythm of the suṣmaḥābāt to the ṭaḥdāl of the Arabic classical metres. Several Oriental musicians have given tables of identification, confusing intensity and duration, so as to force the Arabic ʿurrā' to correspond with European musical notations. Indeed modern Turkish music counts a ʿādāt as a quaver and a ʿāṣāt as a crochet.

Bibliography: Kamīl Khālīf, Mūsīḫ ʿarabī, Cairo n.d., p. 64-77; ib., Agīdīn ʿarīfa, Cairo 1912; anonymous, Mūṣābān miṣraṯ, Cairo 1911; M. O. Guindi, Nauj al-Muṣarrūt, Cairo 1917; Shāhī Shāhāb, Sufīnāt al-Mulāj wa-Naṣīḥyāt al-Falāḥ, Cairo 1309 (and other editions), p. 9-16; the notate published in R. M. M., Paris 1935, xxxix., p. 145-150; also, Paris 1938, p. 526. (L. Massinon)

TIKIRI. (See TAIKIR.)

TILIMŚAI. Many Arabic scholars are known by this name, but generally the three following are meant when mentioned in books of adab:
1. ʿAffāl al-Dīn Sulaymān b. ʿAlī b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAli b. Yāsīn claimed to be descended from a family which originally came from al-Kifā (Dhahabi in MS. Or. 53 reads however Kūm al-ʿAṣād) and was born at Tīlimsān (?) in 616 (1219) according to his own statement. He came early to Syria where he occasionally filled official positions, but was also frequently out of employment. He claimed that in Aḥsan Minor (Rūm) he had as a Sufi gone forty times into seclusion (ḥidrāt), each time for forty days, without interruption, a statement which Dhahabi rightly questions as the total makes 1,600 consecutive days. At one time he filled the post of supervisor of the market-dues (maṣṣāl, q.v.) and when al-Aṣād came to Damascus in the retinue of the Sulṭān al-Mansūr Kālabīn he demanded from ʿAffāl al-Dīn a balance-sheet of his accounts. As this after repeated requests was not forthcoming he upbraided ʿAffāl al-Dīn, who then lost his temper and wanted to remonstrate with the Sulṭān for having, contrary to the Sharīʿa, placed a Coptic Christian over Muslims. He was finally appeased and probably never rendered the desired accounts. ʿAffāl is said to have been a pious man of affable manners with a certain amount of dignity, but he was always under suspicion because, as Dhahabi puts it, one could never really ascertain what his true opinions were and he was even accused of being an adherent of the Nusayrī sect (q.v.). The difficulty lay in his poetry which was eloquent, easy and pleasant, but, his biographers say, contained hidden poison. His poems collected in a Dīwān of which copies are in the libraries of the British Museum, the India Office, the Bodleian at Oxford and elsewhere, certainly do not openly contain any heresies, but are in many cases after the style of Sufi compositions addressed to some imagined object of love. ʿAbd al-Dīn al-Sultānīn found him pleasant company, and says that he laid claim to ʿIrāqīn (q.v.), the full conception of God. This he is said to have expressed upon his death-bed when he is stated to have said: "How can any one who knows God fear him, and since I do know him I have no longer any fear and am happy to meet him". He died in Damascus on the 5th of Rajab 690 (July 1, 1291) and was buried in the Sufi cemetery of that city. He composed a number of works upon various sciences, besides his Dīwān, of which apparently only his Kānīš fī ʿIlm al-ʿArāb, Berlin No. 712, has survived. Dhahabi mentions in addition: Sharīʿ al-ʿArāb al-I ṣārāar, Sīhā, Mākhām al-Madār, Sīḥā, Fawāʾid al-Ḥiṣām of Ibn al-ʿArāb. The titles of these works indicate the school in which he was trained and we may assume with safety that he was an ardent follower of Ibn al-ʿArāb.


2. His son Shams al-Dīn Muhammad b. Sulaymān, called al-Qāsī b. al-Zafīf (the intelligent youth), was born in Cairo in 601 (1203) and died young two years before his father in Rajab 688 (June 1289). He held an appointment in the office of the treasury in Damascus and is described as a young man given to pleasure and amusement. His reputation rests mainly upon his poems collected in a small Dīwān which has been printed several times. These poems consist principally of short sayings addressed to males, occasionally to fictitious women, in simple language. A Sufi interpretation is possible, but hardly likely. His other compositions preserved in manuscript convey the impression that the poems also are realistic. Two Makhāzīn contained in the MS. Berlin No. 3953 are jocose and lascivious and the same appears to be the case with two other works contained in MS. Berlin No. 8509 entitled Ṣulḥāt al-Maddāt fi Madār māṣṣāl al-Maddāt and Māṣṣāl al-Maddāt wa ʿIrāqīn. The Māṣṣāl al-ʿIrāqīn contained in the Paris MS. No. 3947, and the Damascus print of a māṣṣāl, are perhaps identical with the lastnamed work. A short notice on Shams al-Dīn by al-Dhahabi, in the biography of his father, concerning him lends colour to the suspicion that ʿAffāl al-Dīn looked upon the extravagances of his son as a step towards becoming an accomplished Sufi by the way of madhāmā (q.v.), but they were in reality perhaps one of the causes of his premature death.

in Spain. Three years later they removed to Malaga and there Dethlim conducted most of his studies. Later he went to Salta (Centa) where he married the sister of the Malik bar Malik b. al-Marrab and in this city he died after 690 (1291). He was a learned Malikij lawyer, skilful in drawing up contracts and a poet. At the age of 21 he composed his arfajus upon the law of inheritances, which has been the subject of a number of commentaries preserved in manuscript. His other works are:

**Bibliography:** Ibn Faruq, Diljâl, ed. F. Dujarric de la Gravière, Paris, 1889; Dujarric de la Gravière, Dictionnaire arabo-français, 1, 1885. No. 20, 50, 25, 385, 387, and 386.

**TILISM.** [See TILSAM.]

**TILSAM,** also tilum, tilim, tilim, tilum etc. from the Greek τήλης, a *talisman*, i.e. an inscription with astrological and other magic signs or an object covered with such inscriptions, especially also with figures from the zodiacal circles or the constellations and animals which were used as magic charms to protect and avert the evil eye. The Greek name is evidence of its origin in the late Hellenistic period and gnostic ideas are obviously reflected in the widespread use of such charms. The wise Ballûnus is said to have been the father of talismans; according to tradition, he left in many towns charms for protection against storms, snakes, scorpions etc. Many rules for preparing talismans are also ascribed to Hermes Trismegistos.


**TIMAR,** a grant of land for military service (*haf伞* or *honné*), or more exactly, a kind of Turkish *levée*, the possession of which entailed upon the feudatory the obligation to go mounted to war (*khassoeb*) and to supply soldiers or sailors in numbers proportionate to the revenue of the appanage (*diriib*).

The feudatory or *stamiat* was called *timm* (*fild* or *fild*), *timar* or *timur* (*fildushia*—ed. Gine, p. 22, 38, 22) or *fild* (*fildushia* or *fildushia*), i.e. "horseman," whence the popular name *fildushia* for the *timur*.

There were three classes of military seizes, according to their importance:
1. *khâsha* (plur. *khâshâ* or *khâshâ*) or more exactly the majority of the *khâshâ* of the governors of provinces;
2. *zâmer* or *zâmer* with a minimum annual revenue of 20,000 aspers (*jâsh* or *âsh*);
3. *timar* with a maximum revenue of 19,999 aspers.

In a wider sense the same *timar* is sometimes applied to the two last and even to all three classes.

*Timm* has often been translated "commandership" (*commanderie*; Meiuni, Michel Bandier, Pitton de Tournefort) by analogy with the *commandeur* of the Knights of Malta and the Teutonic Order but the institutions are very different; the commanders were former Knights whose services were rewarded by giving them the right to collect for themselves a part of the revenues of certain estates of the Order.

The word *timar* has further the meaning of care given to a sick or mad person, a wounded man, or beast of burden (still used in many modern Persian); *timmar* might tend a horse, whence *timmar* (*Egyptian tamarrag*), a male nurse. It further means rest-cure or open air sure for servants or slaves (*khâshâ* or *âsh*), and care given to an estate, a farm, or a vineyard (*shams al-Din Sâmi Bey*).

**Etyology of the word timar:** Leunclaire seems to have been the first to connect this word with the Greek *timarion* honorarium which in turn comes from the Greek *tîmos* (cf. Leunclaire, *Pandectes historiae turcicae*, N. S., 1865, l, et the end of Annales Sallustianorum Othmanidiarum, Frankfurt 1925). This hypothesis was admitted by Michel Bandier (*Histoire générale du serfage*, 1624, chap. xvii) and by Ducange, who pointed out that the word *timarion* in the sense of feif is taken by Leunclaire from a text of the xvth century (the reference is to the *Ibâdan hâwa* or *hâwa* of Damascus Thesal; cf. Emile Legrand, *Bibliothèque hellénique*, li, 1885, p. 12). The quotations, including this reference, given by Ducange in his *Glosarium* and its Supplement are, as has been already pointed out by V. D. Smirnov (Vuzihek glonsirâm, St. Petersburg 1873, p. 73, note 1) of much too recent a date. They are all later than the Ottoman conquest. The "novelists" of the Byzantine emperors do not use this term for military feifs, but others like *vroum kar* or *vroum kar* or simply *vroum*. As more technical terms we find "sipyche" and later "vroum" when the military benefice had developed more towards the form of a seignorial *fief* (Ernst Stein, *Untersuchungen zur späbyzantinischen Verfassung*, M. O., G, ii, 9).

In 1598 we find the Venetian senator Luaro Sorano (*L’Ottomano*, p. 12) proposing, but not conclusively in opposition to the Greek the Persian etymology *timar* "care, anxiety, pains, dressing." It may be objected to this etymology, which has the support of von Hammer (and more recently also of Gregorowiski) that the word *timar* has never been applied to military feifs in Persian and that the Turkish feudal organisation seems to have been borrowed from the Byzantines and not from the Persians.

In my opinion the word *timar* is an echo of the Byzantine *frėmyn* (princess). In other instances also it can be noticed that the semantic evolution of terms can be paralleled from language to language. The Latin synonym of *frēmyn*, beneficium, French *prévôtage* (cf. Ducange and the edition of Pachymeres in the Corp. Script. Hist. Byz., ii, 715) is also a term relating to benefices. The Latin and low Latin *cura* and in a less degree the French and English *cure* have almost all the acceptations of the word *timar* (except that
they have no military associations) "care, treatment (medical), country, estate, cleric's benefit".

We need not waste time on the explanation of the Arabic Hệm, plural of Hệm, "fruit", provided by Belin de Vagnerre and Trévoux's Dictionary.

Origin of the Institution. Von Hammer, in spite of the importance he gives to Persian influence, Worms, who has however corrected several of his predecessor's errors, Belin, and Tischendorf have represented the Hệm as being a kind of adaptation of the Muslim "feudal" system. Although the historian Sa'd al-Din uses this term of lands which were distributed to the musellem of Turkey (cf. below) it seems to me difficult to recognize in the Arab Hệm the origin of the Turkish timars. The more particularly Muslim element in the Turkish legislation, was the legal and political distinction between the yükîyya (little-lands) i.e. *those conquered by force and divided among the conquerors on condition they paid a tithe* and Hệmâgîyya "tributary lands, taken after capitulation and left to the liqâmi (<lîqâmîs) or infeudals on payment of tribute*. Now the military feuds as Belin himself says (Progr. foncière, N° 305) could consist of any kind of land and it is only by a very wide interpretation that some lawyers have assimilated to Hệmâgîyya lands constituted into washer for military requirements (ibid., N° 298). The jurists of the period — fairly late — of Salaiûn the Magnificent found some difficulty in defining the status of the military domains in the strict sense (cf. Steeg and Padel, p. 19-20 and especially M. T. M., p. 58-59 [Turkish text] von Hammer, l. 342 sqq. [German edition], Joüen. Ann. 1843, p. 56 sqq.). Voltaire was right when he said that the Turks had not borrowed the system of the Hệm from the Arab Caliphs (Essai des Meure, chap. xxxi).

The hypothesis of a Persian origin seems to me no more justifiable. Kremer (Culturtwiss. des Orientl, l. 109-110) has shown that the Persians had no influence on the Arab feudal system. Von Hammer certainly exaggerates when he attributes to Persian influence the organisation of the Byzantine and Turkish military feuds. There certainly is one feature in common to the three nations: this is the existence of mounted feudalatories wearing cuirasses (cf. for Persia Cl. Huart, La Perse, 1945, p. 184, 204). It is even possible that these cuirasses were of Persian origin (a novella of Nicophorus Phocas seem to speak of them as an innovation) but this is of no major importance.

It seems much more natural to admit that the Turks imitated or rather preserved the Byzantine institution which they found in existence. What would tend to confirm this is the existence of feuds with the obligation to naval service alongside of those supplying horsemen. This was also the case with the Byzantines (Ang. Fr. Gröger, Byzantinische Geschichte, III. 21). It is not our task here to inquire to what extent the Byzantine military feuds were related to the Roman beneficia or to the colonies of German soldiers (on the mailed horsemen of Byzantium, cf. Winkler, Un Gouvernement, Un Empereur byzantin au Xème siècle, 1937, p. 40 and p. 288 and on Greek military feudalism: Rammel, L'Empire grec au dixième siècle, 1870, chapter entitled La féodalité dans l'Empire grec: les feux militaires; L'histoire générale de Lavius and Rammel, chap. xiii. of vol. I, by C. Bayet, p. 680 sqq.; Zacharias von Lengenthin, Histoire du droit gréco-romain, trad. into Fr. by Eugène Lanth, Paris 1870, p. 65, 129 sqq.; cf. Geschichte des griechisch-romanischen Reiches, 1877; Geugnet, Des timères militaires dans l'empire romain et spécialement en Orient au Xème siècle, Bordeaux 1898, p. 81, 85; Testand, Des rapports des païrautes et des petits propriétaires variants dans l'empire byzantin au Xème siècle, Bordeaux 1898, p. 75 sqq.; Firth Grove-romani et doua Johanna Lenciawian Amherst, Frankfort 1956, III. 144 sqq.; cf. also the works of Maurins, Motreff and the bibliography to the article benicha in the Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines by Darenberg and Saglio).

As to the influence which the Saldjaks of Asia Minor may have exercised on the Hệm, we know nothing about it nor about their military organisation in general (cf. however the remarks by Koprulâ- nâye Mehdân Fuâd in Millet et Mûlûm, N° 5, p. 213-214).

Formation of the Ottoman military feuds and their administration: We know very little about the administrative activity of the early bey or Ottoman rulers. The following words are put into the mouth of Oğluç, the founder of the dynasty: "He to whom I have granted a şef shall not be deprived of it without good reason; if he dies, his son shall succeed him; if the latter is too young, his servants shall take his place in war until he is fit to bear arms".

Under Orbân, "All al-Din formed a corps of horsemen called musellem exempted from taxation", who held in times of peace certain lands, free of taxes and who seem to have been served in part at least by the organisation of the timâr (on this milita, cf. Belin, Fiefs Milîtes, p. 39-40, Gregorzewski, p. 45; Marsigli: a firman relating to them, Bibl. Nat. Paris, MS. Suppl. Turc, N° 79, in fine).

Markâl I, assisted by Timurtash Pasha beylerbeyi of Rumelia, in 1375 issued a şâmâs laying down the distinction between the little Hệm and the şâmâs (Bibl. Nat. Paris, MS. Suppl. Turc, N° 65, fol. 63).

Mehmed II in 1381 a.t. instituted a more systematic method of keeping the registers (defters) of the military feuds. There is comparatively little reference to these feeuds in the şâmâs-Nezîm of this ruler (publ. in a supplement to T. O. E. M., 1330 A. H. 32 pp. 8°. Cf. v. Hammer, Shatavîy, m. 86; C. Orfelin, Les Myss en VIeuvre, N° 1820, 3rd and 1813, 3rd). The fiscal officials who administered the feuds (fâhîz peygâf-fâr) appear in it as completely organised in the provinces. They wore the timâr defter-dâri for the simple timâr on the defter hıbhâm (fâhîz) for the şâmâs. Both sets of officials were under the defter emini who in turn was under the defter-dâr of the empire (cf. the şâmâs above quoted, p. 19; von Hammer, p. 93 and Belin, Fiefs milit., p. 44). Details of the organisation of the timârs or defter-dâris will also be found in another şâmâs of Mehemel II, publ. by F. Kranz and Geissenhöft in the M.O.G., l. 173, 48. In contents this şâmâs is closely connected with şâmâs (cf. below).

Sulaimân the Magnificent is credited with the organisation of the timâr but it is probable that he only codified already existing regulations. In
any case he deprived the governors of control of the relatively more important timār which were called tekereli (cf. below). It is from this reign that the rather numerous collections of laws begin to date (fāṣlid, fāṣlid-name, ṣīnūl-name-i ʿUthmān, ṣīnūl-i milhān) or codes drawn up by the niẓāmī (more rarely by the ḥəfr-ādar and the ḥəfr rūm, with the help, more and more frequent as time goes on, of the šāikh al-ḥalak (cf. bibli.). These laws clearly reveal the haqqaq character of the institution of timār. The mettr lands or domains of which they were formed were fields lying around the villages, the houses in the latter being the property (milhā) of private individuals (M. T. M., p. 54). Otherwise any land under cultivation, even in a garden or vineyard belonging to the roya, became domain and paid dues to the sipahi. (M. T. M., p. 87; cf. J. A., Jan.-Feb. 1844, p. 87).

The timār, from the military point of view. We know that the Turks had a remarkably well organised regular army before the western powers. In the beginning of the sixteenth century, i.e. on the eve of the disappearance of the timār it consisted of the following elements:

1. The permanent regular army with regular pay, the public treasury, called ṣafu (kapul) zulj, servants of the Porte (of the Sultan) it consisted of the Janissaries, gunners, bombardiers, bomba

2. The cavalry (teşrakhl) and feudal troops.

3. The serakhl (ser-bad-ḥulul) or frontier troops, as a rule summoned to the colours and paid irregularly, and particularly at times of great danger, they comprised as cavalry the giznul (giznulli) or "volunteers", heavy cavalry, ṣafu or beli, a light cavalry (according to Montecuccili, like the Hungarian Hussars), and ḍeli or partisans, and for infantry, the ṣafu (ṣaful) or picked garrison soldiers (like the Hungarian hajduks), soldiers according to Montecuccili, named the giznulli as present volunteers, fighting like dragoons on foot or on horseback and placed in charge of the baggage and cavalry and the mamlūk or pioneers.

4. The yerkahl or "local troops" of the pasha, sandjakbeys or ḍāʾūn. Levied in theory by special authorisation of the Porte but often without this they enabled a number of ambitious Pashas to gain power (All of Teheran, Ljusnjar, Muṣṭafā Bāirakar etc.). Rightly or wrongly they are often confused with the preceding, and some writers like Ahīṣəl Rāmāt put among the yerkahl the māsul(teymon, and mamlūk mentioned above, or, giving the tufandul "families", yerkahl, "heavy artillery of the frontier forts" and even the ṣafu, it is into this second category, that of teşrakhl or territorial troops that the feudatories who held timār fell. Jacherea de St. Denis compares them to the "levies of the arrière-bas of the old feudal monarchies of the west".

There were no hard and fast divisions between these different categories of soldiers. Janissaries could obtain timār. On the other hand there were timarists in the frontier provinces and one of the means of promotion, the only legal one, for a man who was not the son of a sipahi or ḍāʾūn actually was to go as a volunteer (giznulli) "to the frontiers" to distinguish himself there by va
provinces. The former were held by governors either in full ownership (mülâkâyet, veziyyet or yurâlık) like the medium provinces or like the 5 Kurd sandjaqs called hâkimât or the 19 sandjaqs of the wilayet of Diyarbakır, or for a year at a time (iânâmât ilâ or seriye iânâmât ilâ, whence the word âyalâm). With this system the emoluments of the governors were deducted from the revenue of the state collected by the fiscal offices of the province (or levied on the iânâmât which represented, after deduction of allowances and the pay of the soldiers, the hâkimât, Turkish hâkim or "treasury" destined for Constantinople) without the iânâmât (vice-regal) "being able to exact the least thing from the people" (Marsigli) while the governors who held hâkimât levied taxes (îmarât, pl. dîhrâ) on these fiefs.

This distinction must not be taken too literally. Some sülâyman governors actually had hâkimât and the hâkimât were not all military fiefs. The Khân of the Crimea for example levied 1,200,000 aspers on the customs of Caffa, under the name of hâkimât. On the other hand sandjaqs of different character are found in the same province, some sülâyman, others hâkimât. This was the case with the provinces of Bagdád, Cyprus (already mentioned as hâkimât provinces), Damascas, Alepp, Chlidr, without reckoning the eyâlet of the Kapudan Paşa. This distinction between sülâyman and hâkimât provinces appears very clearly, when it is a question of a sandjak and not of an eyâlet as a whole.

The idea of hâkimât must not be confused with that of "military fief". It is larger and differs from it, in as much as the hâkimât was attached not to the person but to the position of the governor. At least this was the case from the time when in the reign of Murad III, the sandjak-beyi ceased to be inalienable (cf. Belin, Propr. fonc., N° 313).

The sulîn had also his regular private hâkimât which were called hâkimât-îhümâyîn.

With this reservation the vassals of the first category were represented by two kinds of high officials, the beylerbeyi and the sandjakbeyi both holders of hâkimât.

The beylerbeyi (cf. Deny, Sommaire des arch. turques du Caire, p. 41-52) held hâkimât the value of a annual revenue of which varied from 600,000 to 2,000,000 aspers (Marsigli gives 1,200,000) and were proportionate to their rank and precedence i.e. to the date of the conquest of the province. The hâkimât the revenue of which attained or surpassed the million were Rumelia, Anatolia, Damascus, Erzerûm, Diyarbakr, Van, Shêrûzûr, Khânate of the Crimea, Bagdád, Başra, Babêsh, Egypt and going down by 100 aspers: Rhodes, Cyprus, Algiers, Tunis, Tripoli in Barbery (it is probable that some of these hâkimât existed only on paper).

Each beylerbeyi had to supply one mûkemmel ighélî for each 5,000 aspers of revenue. Marsigli adds that some provinces, which were exempt from military obligations.

The beylerbeyi were allowed themselves to issue berat conferring the small timâr (teskeressî; cf. below). When a viceroy died the state gave timâr to eleven of his servants. The sandjak-beyi in theory held hâkimât of at least 200,000 aspers of annual revenue. In practice we find in the lists of 'Ain-i 'Ayt sandjaqs with a lower revenue. When the new holder was an officer of the palace (in such case the expression used was "to go out to

or ascend to the sandjak": sândjak-î hâmî, the minimum was higher and proportionate to his dignity. The Agha of the Janissaries had the highest: 500,000 aspers.

The augmentations or terâhâhî of the fiefs of the sandjak-beyi were made by sums of 100 aspers on each 1,000 of revenue, (i.e. 10/9). When a vacant fief was allotted to a sandjak-beyi who had not yet a right to the whole of the revenue it yielded, the surplus went to the mülâkâ (which was retained by the state) to be set aside for the janissaries who had a right to a timâr. Later, the hâkimât could be reconstituted in its entirety by the beylerbey of the same holder and the janissaries who were thus dispossessed were given compensation. This system prevented the domains being broken up into small sections.

The precedence of the sandjak-beyis was regulated by the importance of their hâkimât, but ex-grand viziers had always precedence over all others. A sandjak-beyi had also to supply one mûkemmel ighélî per 1,000 aspers of revenue. When a sandjak-beyi died, the state gave timâr to six of his servants. It is probable that it was not necessary to be a sandjak-beyi to obtain a hâkimât.

What was the lower limit of a hâkimât? The authors of Turkish works on the history of the Ottoman empire say that the hâkimât was a domain with at least 100,000 aspers of revenue, granted to a râsûl (plur. of râsîr — bey, which is applied to the sandjak-beyi and in opposition to vizier or pasha of 3 tails, to the beylerbeyi or pasha of two tails. At the present day, it is applied to the higher officers in contrast to the general or pasha). Although the figure of 100,000 aspers is confirmed from other sources (Tournefort, p. 319) it was probably fixed at a later date. We actually find, in the lists of 'Ain-i 'Ayt Efendi, hâkimât which are lower than this (for the benefit of the defterdar of a wilayet).

If we may judge by the total of the duties of Saltanîye (cf. below) paid by the hâkimât, the minimum revenue of the latter must have originally been 60,000 aspers.

Zî bar or zî û bar. Every fief called zî bar had a minimum revenue of 20,000 aspers, which could not be reduced or divided in case of transfer to an heir or another holder. This minimum was called hâkimât zî bar. The surplus, whatever its amount, was called jîfe or "part".

Every zî bar entered in the register (îgâfî) as irreducible and was called from this fact zî barî in opposition to hâmî or divisible into parts (Belin, Fiefs milîs., p. 55-57). It was the same with timâr; cf. Marsigli, p. 96-97.

The holders of zî bar were called zârîm (plur. zârûmîn), "chiefs". A zî bar had to go to war in person and supply one ighélî for each complete 5,000 aspers of revenue above 20,000 aspers of the hâmî zî bar. Nothing was paid on a sum less than 5,000 even if it were 4,999. The zî bar who lived in the capital of a ḥâfa generally became a bâbîzârî.

According to modern Turkish writers and Tournefort, the maximum revenue of a zî bar was 99,999 aspers but some states like the state of Baghdad held zî barî with a large revenue (lists in 'Ain-i 'Ayt 'Aghâ Čengisovski gives the maximum of 50,000. It is probable from what has been said above about the hâkimât that originally it was 59,999 aspers.

Timâr. The timâr were of two kinds:

1. — teskeressî, or given by berâî or sâkînî on pro-
Military organisation of the siefs. The high command of the feudatories was exercised by the governors of provinces (themselves important feudatories) and thus the title of mir-beyi (a synonym of sanqah-beyi) became the name for a brigadier-general.

Under the orders of these generals were officers whose duty it was to mobilise and probably also to command the feudatories, namely:

1. the ayay-beyi, a kind of colonel chosen by the feudatories of a sanqah. They had the right to a drum and a flag (the beyrakdar or "flag-bearer" was a kind of lieutenant-colonel and the savvah a kind of "major"). The Turks often confused the sipahi and the savvah (a loanword from the Slavonic) but distinguished between the sipahi of the kavak (Miri sabahli) and those of the timar (âbi timar zemdiyli). cf. the Künnün publ. in 1330, p. 28.

2. teri-bahş and sah-bahş. These two titles seem, as has been observed, to refer to the same officials (ce older zem is a synonym of teri "army, troops").

There was one brigadier division (teri-bahş) and two brigadier divisions (sah-bahş) in peace-time. the teri-bahş were officers of the police.

As to the teri sârâşı (from sâr-ı mevk); "to drive a flock or troops in front of one") Belgin makes them captains of ten, for the sake of symmetry with the preceding, but they were less regular officers than police or detectives, i.e. soldiers whose task was to bring back deserters to the army (cf. documents No. 85 and 72 in Grzegorzewski).

In case of mobilisation the Sultân sent a firman to the beylerbeyi concerning orderning them to raise the ban of the zâfim and sipahi (cf. a specimen of one of these firmans in the Müşayvat-name, transl. Piets de la Croix, p. 35-36; the same work p. 8, puts at 2,000 yüks i.e. 100,000 aspers, a sum set aside for the gifts which according to custom were given in this case to the militia and especially to the zâfim and timariots).

Administration of the military siefs. We have already mentioned the administrative and financial officials who had charge of the allotment of siefs. These officials who were called mühadet müammerler or "provincial writers" kept registers called sâbancilik or "general" statistics of the siefs and münaflul or "detailed" statistics. In another book called sâbancilik or "journal" were recorded the berat or orders relating to the siefs. The armies in the field carried these registers with them (probably duplicate copies) in order to enter at once on the battlefield the necessary distributions of timar (cf. doc. No. 78, 100 and 150 in Grzegorzewski).

In the Turkish archives are preserved registers which go back to the Conqueror and would be well worth studying. Cf. my article in Historie et historiens depuis cinquante ans (Bibli. de la Revue historique), Paris 1927, vol. 1, Turquie.

The berat granting siefs were liable to chancellery dues ("of the pen" kalemîye) levied by the Müşayvat-name. It was 4⁄100: 120 aspers for the holders of timar of 5,000 aspers, 800 aspers for the zâfim.

There were 15,000 aspers for the hâhi (we have used this figure to ascertain the probable original minimum of the hâhi). The berat, following a general custom, were renewed annually (teyâfiye-berat) and the same kalemîye dues were paid every year (cf. Müşayvat-name, p. 41, 78, 79).

It would take us too long here to give the regulations which were intended to secure the
devolution of the Eunay to men suitable for military service and who had to be by preference the sons or descendants of feudatories (sipahi-sudur, in plural ebn-i sipahi-sunur) or of old settlers who had done their service. Their legitimacy was established by the evidence of ten timariots (Koça-Bey).

When a timariot failed to obey the summons, he became muvāl "deprived" i.e. he was temporarily deprived for one or two years of his timar which was then called divliy-i taşenmãh. Every timar vacant (muvālî) thus escaped or default fell (divliy-i mevâlî) to be managed by the official called muvâlicheri, who collected the revenues until it was allotted to another. The money thus saved were bound to live on their estates. To look after the land one in ten was usually left at home and called the kurşuni or "guard". If the war was a prolonged one, the sipahi of each vakîli sent home a score of their number who, known as kurdâlî, had to send supplies (kurşuni-fık) to their comrades in the field.

A rayâ or peasant could only become a timariot by proving his prowess on the battlefield, which he could only do by going as a volunteer to the frontiers (cf. above).

Decline of the system of military fiefs. In spite of precautions and attempts at reform like that of 1632 as a result of the memoir presented by Kudî Bey (or Kûcûk, or better perhaps Koça Bey) of Korca (better of Gâmilâdji) and again in 1657 and 1777, the decline of the fiefs continued to be marked.

In addition to the laments of Turkish officials like Koça Bey and Aina-i Âli Efendi, we find frequent criticisms in western writers.

In theory the sıdhâ and timariots had to go to war, even if they were so ill that they had to be carried in a litter, with their children in panniers (Tournefort) but after putting in an appearance an opportunity was always found to return home (Abe-câli, 88, p. 18). We find in Grigorovetski orders to bring to the colours mutinous timariots, who were hiding in their çiftlik (çiftlık) (doc. No. 73 for example).

A timariot could buy himself off and this was a valuable source of revenue for some ministers, according to Philippe du Fene-Canaye (Le Voyage du Levant en 1577, Paris 1867, p. 137).

Another passage in the same traveller (p. 60) seems to show that foreign ambassadors could actually obtain timar for their protégés. Tournefort (ii., p. 319) writes: "The viceroy and provincial governors have such powers by their intrigue at court that commanderies which are outside of their districts are given to their servants or to those who give them most money".

Baron de Tott shows us that the khan of the Crimea was very disconsolate with the services of 10,000 sipahi sent by the Porte and says he was able to prove to himself that some of them were really Christians who pretended to be converted to Islam for the sake of the timar (Memorie, 1785, p. 112). Lastly there is an account of various other abuses in Mourad-Reis d'Ochsen, Tableau de l'Emp. Oth., vii., p. 375.

The suppression of the Janissaries and of the corps of cavalry or paid sipahi under Mahmûd II brought about the disbandment of the feudal militia. To safeguard the rights they had acquired, this Sultân formed the élite of the dispossessed feudatories in 1831 into four squadrons, which later formed the framework of the new regular cavalry. As to the other holders of the old fiefs now the property of the state, they received pensions which were provided for in the budget. The total of these pensions at first 120,000 purbes or 60,000,000 piastres (Bellin) fell in 1850 to about 15,000,000 without reckoning some 10,000,000 paid as indemnities to the farmers of the domain lands (leased since the ministry of Rustam Pasha, the Sultan's grand vizier).

On the 27th Radjab 1250 (Jan. 7, 1864) these pensions underwent a revision which still further reduced their number, from lack of certain formalities (Tischendorf).

There was no longer any military organisation of the fiefs but the state retained the tapu, which it henceforth levied for its own benefit, and the laws retained numerous survivals of the old regime (cf. below).

The timar and Ottoman land legislation. In return for his services the sipahi had the right to collect all or part of the hagiaconjur (of divine prescription) dues as well as "taxes deemed by the sovereign" râgumu ursîl (we should add or sanctioned by usage) on the lands of the fief. He exercised a kind of seignorial jurisdiction over the ratsi "Muslim or Christian peasants". If the peasants, the tillers of the soil, only held their land with a fief of title (possession not implying ownership) they hand it on to death to their children only. All other heirs or acquirees can only acquire possession of them by paying to the sipahi of the place the dues (muvâsâdîte) called tapu: if there are no heirs, the land is awarded to a new owner also by tapu and by regulations made ad hoc" (Bellin, Prop. fonc., No. 303).

In return for his military obligations the timariot enjoyed feudal privileges. As regards the proprietor of the soil he was his lord (sâhîh-i ır or ır for the Arabic ıfâ) but this right of ownership was not only bound up with military service: it was precarious and revocable.

The peasant (rîzîet; plur. also employed in the singular: rîzâ or rîza) Muslim or Christian — for western usage is wrong in applying this term only to Christians — was attached to the state and went with it (Bellin, Rits. mutl., spec. repr., p. 50).

He paid to the sipahi different taxes and dues which varied somewhat according to locality, a few of which may be enumerated here:

- Iştereb or mazbatı 5th" (Bellin, No. 303).
- Grigorovetski, p. 233; benachat or penak (Grigorovetski, p. 226 and doc. No. 84; 4th-nüme, ed. 1239, p. 16, note 2; Hammer, Statisticalg, p. 318), 2; 8th (Bellin, No. 318), 2; Grigorovetski, p. 238; 4th-nüme, p. 316, note 2; mizâr, "bachelors" (No. 321); 4th-nüme, "a girl, married woman" (No. 329, 330); dhahhân or râzân right of fuel for individuals foreign to the timar or haspiisâz (No. 326, 328); sâhîhe (No. 348);
- 4th-nüme, p. 16, note 3; rûgâ or depremen (münlâ) "winter pasture"; suâtâl "summer pasture"; ûbîl "water pasture"; sâhîhe kendi "sheep";
- 4th-nüme, "compensation for the maintenance of a falcon which comes to die"; bâdaya or bâdâ-ümuzi "extra ordinary taxes"; kovan "hives"; ûte "measure of wheat" (No. 345).

A fuller list of imposed and taxes will be found in Ahmad Wafik, Türkîf, 86-7, 86-7.

Western authors give as the most important impose on land in the country the tithe, but the older Ottoman legislators distinguish between:
Tapu, The Ottoman substantive tapu or by the operation of the law of vowel harmony tapi (as in Bâshî, ed. Dviotak, p. 171, 3 infra) for the older (Ogulı) tapu-ñe, Çaghatay tap-uñ, is derived from the verb tap-mak: 1. to obey, to submit to God or a conqueror by begging amin from him (cf. Ateş-paşâ-ûde Türkê, ed. Giese, p. 22; Nöddecke, Nebras, Z.D.M.G., 1859, p. 212: tapu wilâyet is not a proper name); 2. to worship (a divinity), 3. to pay homage. — Cf. also tapu, Vânbëry, Alt.-Osum. Sprache, p. 219; tabi, Codex Comunicans, 217; Houtman, Etn Türk-ev, Glossar; the Koman form with intervocalic sonant is found in the Karaitê tabu, tabû: thanks, gratitude (T. Kowalski, Karaimische Texte ... von Troble, Cracow 1920).

Tapuğ according to Kâshghârî means 1. "service (şâhidîya); 2. obedience (aâ)"; i. p. 311 and derivatives i., p. 410; ii., p. 132, l. 5; cf. ii., p. 278, infra, the proverb: sütin tapu ghiç, tägî sîvînîce "the priest is always ready to worship God but the latter is not at all pleased with him".

The Burûhan-î Kâ'în explains the Persian borrowing thus: "it is a polite custom which the Turks of Transoxania call tapu and consists in, when one has committed some crime, presenting oneself before the Şâlûn or viziers, the head uncovered, holding one's hands bowed down and seeking forgiveness." Cf. for the meaning the Turkish verb yâkûn-mâk so frequent in the Buddhist and Manichaean texts publ. by F. K. W. Müller, von Le Coq, Pelliot etc. The following passage is typical: sâ-ge Oghuš reseminde tapu vi-bhînem resemin yrine geterâlî, "protesting oneself" (or bowing) three times according to the custom of the Oghus, they went through the traditional gestures of tapu and homage" (Houtman, Hist. des Sedîî, d'Ibn Bûch, p. 10, l. 9). The ceremony seems to have included the offering of a cup for there is an expression tapu sağrâgîch "cup of homage" recorded by the Burûhan-î Kâ'în (p. 477 sub sağrâğî).

It may also be noted that according to Silvestre de Sacy, the Arabic šâhidîma "service" given above as the equivalent of tapu (according to Kâshghârî) sometimes has the same meaning as the Turkish timûr (N.E., i. 210, note 4; cf. Bibliothèque des Arabistes, Cairo, ii., p. 114, 116).

Lastly in Mongol, the same word (pronounced tabî according to Kowalewski which presupposes a Turkish form tap-i) means "offering, sacrifice, divine service, service, worship, act of honouring".

In connection with the timûr, tapu is the name of the title-deeds which confirm the tributary state of the land, the renewal of which is obligatory in certain circumstances and which establish the permanence of the right of conquest (Belin, No. 298, note 2).

From the preceding one might be tempted to see in the tapu a kind of homage and Ahmad Wâfiğ gives as the equivalent of tapu, the expression asgirî khâkî "right of the overlord", in the analogy it is only apparent: tapu existed between the sipâhi and the ra'ye and not between the sipâhi and the aserain (Şûlûn). It is therefore quite a real bond going with land. As the delivering of this title was done with the payment of a certain sum in anticipation (mûnâfiqel) the name tapu was given not only to the title but to the sum itself. And when on the abolition of the timûr the tapu was levied by the state, mêmûru
or ḥāṣālī was given to the employees who handed over the tāmu (Belin, N° 88, 335 spp.). Tāmu could only be taken when the employees became really vacant. Transmission by inheritance takes place without tāmu or gratis.

The following are some phrases in which this word occurs: tāmu-la-ayāt or tāmu-ya wār-nīk or tāmu-ya-ātashīk "to give by tāmu (speeching of the sināpāt); tāmu-ya alāmāt "to take by tāmu (speaking of the ravyā);" cf. tāmu-la-yāt-i-ān alāmāt, MS. suppl. Turc, N° 68, fol. 17: hāi tāmu or tāmu-i-akī "against payment of the tāmu", opposed to bu tāmu or motaīyīmīn "without expense, without paying tāmu"; tāmu-ya uṣwardāshi (land) which ought to be or perhaps as a result of a vacancy given to another or payment of the t.; (whence the expression isībāhīyā, with trāt understood, etc., opposed to 'āqīlīyya); tāmu-ya bu-nāma "to break an engagement by t.;" tāmu-ya īfīyī dūrī "cannot be given by t.;" ruwā-ta tāmu "tax paid as t.;" ḥātītī t. "right of holding land by t.;" tāmu-i tāsiī "right of proportional t.;" dam tāmuṣa "tax levied on any new buildings created by the raya" (M. T. M., p. 83; J. A., Jan-Febr. 1844, p. 88; v. Hamm. i. 399).

Comparision of the tīmar with western fiefs. The tīmar is more of an administrative than a social organisation. It is due to the initiative of the state and the latter has never lost its right to supervise and even control directly the tīmar, which are only hereditary because the state finds an advantage in this, but it sees that no dynasty of feudatories is allowed to establish itself in the provinces. The fief is and, in spite of certain abuses, remains closely associated with the obligation to military service and is taken away on the slightest sign of failure to perform this or of rebellion.

The possession of it is so precarious that some tīmar have returned as many as eight times to the state in one campaign (Thornton). The domain, which has not the same social importance as in the west, does not confer its name upon its holder nor give him any degree of nobility. There is even a somewhat unexpected tendency according to which a raya could receive a tīmar without ceasing to be a raya. He could not abandon his state of raya when the beyat conferring the fief specifically stated that his yod-dašīk was being rewarded, "his good services in war as a free comrade in arms" (Millī tett. m., p. 311). The feudal relationship is expressed only in the domain, an irreducible part of which only was guaranteed to the holder on condition that he give a service. The reward is, as it were, divided into small sections which are used to give regular increases, as to officials. One does not talk of a tīmar of so many aspers but of so many aspers of tīmar (ṣuḥ ḫāṭār aštā tīmar). The great feudatories are at the same time officials and if the state fears them it is not so much as feudal lords, but rather as viceroys of large provinces.

There are no vassals. Each feudatory owes his fief directly to the Sultan (except the very small ones appointed by the beylerbey). He is not under the orders of more powerful feudatories except when mobilised for military service. Over the raya he only has certain fiscal rights, as we have seen, some of which recall the rights of the census of a village or of the estate of a lord (ṣwārīkhe or yordā). Madame Louise Saint-Belloth thought it would not be unreasonable to admit that Napoleon borrowed his system of grants of land from the Turks.

Bibliography: Belin, secretary-interpreter of the French Embassy at Constantinople is the only man who has so far seriously studied the Turkish tīmar. To him we owe the two following monographs:


We may also mention the work of Worms, Recherches sur la constitution de la propriété territoriale dans les pays musulmans et indiennement en Algérie, J.A., 1842, 1843, 1844. As to the study by Paul Andreas von Tischendorf (Das Lehnsweise in den malemischen Staaten inbegriffigen im osmanischen Reiches, Leipzig 1872, 129 pages in 5°), this is simply a version of Belin's work with a few additions. We have been unable to procure the important work by Trudelka, Historiska och politiska agnemärken, i Stocni, publ. in the Tidnacks select Kunskapar i Sverige och Iveren, 1815, p. 125 sp.; a German version was published at Sarajewo in 1911, under the title Die Geschichtliche Grundlage der bosnischen Amtsverwaltung. For further details cf. Durnitir in Zapiski Kollegij Poteshnikov, II., 1926, p. 104.

The works of which we now give the full titles with some others of less importance have been quoted in the body of the article:


The Kīnām-nīmē. The bibliography of these codes has still to be compiled. Here we shall confine ourselves to giving the more important, neglecting those, not very many, which do not refer to military fiefs.

Apart from the Kīnām-nīmē of Mehmed II already quoted, these are:

1. Sūlaimān's code as published by the T.O. E.M. as a supplement under the title Kīnām-nīmē Al-ʿAṣr Olgīmān (72 pp. 1320). The editor Mehmed ʿAriż attributes it to Saiyidī Bey in spite of the copy in the library of ʿAṣhir Etabār which gives as its author the mishāfī Dīlawī ʿAriż as does von Hammer, Hist. de l'Empire Ottoman, Fr. transl., vii. 787, where the names are inverted), cf. also Bull. Nat. Paris, MS, suppl. Turc, N° 80 and also Anc. fonds Turc, N° 35, 16; Suppl. Turc, N° 79, 27;
the beginning of the latter seems to be the same as that of the manuscript mentioned by von Hammer, *Staatverfassung*, i, p. xxi, under Nr. vi, but the text of Hādżdji Khalīfa to which he refers really deals with mining laws.

2. Another version (later?) of the preceding (Vienna, N. 1799, 1st; Bibl. Nat. Paris, Suppl. Turc, N. 81). This version and the preceding should be compared with the text translated into German by von Hammer under the title *Staats- und Polizeiordnungen Sulaimans* (*Staatverfassung*, i. 143—62) which according to him (i.e., p. xix), is the part of the code of laws of Abī al-Ḥāfiẓ Efendi to be mentioned below (Nr. 6).

3. Code of Āḥūnā of the same sultan, commonly called *qādī* "the new" (although this qualification seems sometimes to be applied to the two preceding). If the somewhat confused explanations of von Hammer (Hist., vi. 247 and 267 and *Staatverfassung*, i. 375—376) are correct, this code, which is almost entirely devoted to questions of land laws, was first compiled by Abīd al-Ḥāfiẓ Mehmet Mehehī, in the early years of Sulaimān’s successor (Selim II). It contains a large number of *fītwās* of the celebrated Shāfī’ī al-Islām Abū l-Suʿūd and Kamāl Pāhsāzāde. It would be valuable to discover the original dated manuscript of this collection, of which we have a large number of copies more or less late (Rieu, Add. 7840, iii., mentions a copy of 1044 but there are some as late as the xixth century A.H.). The preface which invokes the authority of the great Sulaimān the Legislator is in all copies, but the more recent are interspersed with *fītwās* of later Shāfī’īs al-Islām: (Akhkhamzāde) Hüsain (d. 1043), (Zekeryāzāde) Yahyā (d. 1053), Mehehī Behā’ī (d. 1064), not to mention Pir Mehehī (cf. below), Abī al-‘Arwa, Mehehī Sa’d-also, Şan-also, Shāhīk Mehehī, Abī-ul-Hāfiẓ Mehehī, Abī-al-Ḥāfiẓ Mustafā and Mehehī Bruswī. These *fītwās* are mixed with *Qānūn* dating (der semen) from earlier memoirs such as (Tājī-bey-zāde) ‘Ijmā’ar Čelebi (d. 921), Dilâzāde (already mentioned), or older, like Hamza Paşâ (d. 1180), Mu’llaimzāde Lūm ‘Ali Efendi etc. The majority of the dated laws belong to the first half of the xixth century A.H., the latest being of 1129; a partial German translation of this text is given in v. Hammer, op. cit.

This *Qānūn* was published in N. 1 and 2 of the *Mīllet tıı, meyjmez*’l, there are MSS. of it in Paris, Suppl. Turc, N. 71 and 72, Vienna, N. 1816, 1817, 1822, 3rd and elsewhere (cf. a list in Rieu’s catalogue, Add. 7834).

4. *Qānūn* or *Risāla* by the Shāfī’ī al-Islām Čağrı Pir Mehehī Efendi b. Ḥasan, author of the *Mūn* il-Muṣṭa. This like the preceding is based mainly on the *fītwās* of Abī-ul-Suʿūd. MS. at Paris, Suppl. Turc, N. 68 and fragment at Vienna, N. 1804, 4th.

5. *Qānūn* i Zāhdi-i Derviş prepared by order of Sultanān by Meṣṭa a. Abīd Maṭbûl al-Daftār al-Khaṣāsun to the end of Dżanmāl I, 973 (middle of Dec., 1356) under the direction of the sultan, Mehehī Beşhāret, MS. at Vienna, N. 1804, 6th. Another MS. of the same work was compiled by Ḥan (Propr. fonc., N. 298, notes 2 N, 315 297). This text, along with some others has been published by Tānıkī in the *Günnet* of Sarajowe, xxviii; for further details cf. Dimitrew, loc. cit., p. 105.

6. *Qānūn* called that of Abīd I, edited by the *destiter emini Mu’ul-hi-nī-zade* ‘Ain-i ‘Ali in 1018 (1609) under the title *Qanun-i Ali-i Ḍaftār al-Khaṣāsun-i Meṣṭa-i Deft-i Dīnu* printed in Rab’i I, 1280 (Aug.—Sept. 1869) by Abīd Muḥaffaz Paşâ, the imperial commissioner in Asia Minor. MSS. in Vienna (4 copies), Leipzig, Dresden and Paris (incomplete). It was translated into French by Belin and into German by Tischendorf (cf. the Bibliography below). It is the only *Qānūn* that has so far been systematically studied. Hammer (*Staatverfassung*, i, p. xvii.—xx.) has given an analysis of a work, of which this *Qānūn* seems to be only the first part.

Ewštia Čelebi seems to have noted, in part at least, this *Qānūn* for the statistical information which he gives on the provinces and the military fiefs of the empire (i. 173—206).


10. The regular organization of the military fiefs promulgated in 1777 (1911) by ‘Abd al-Ḥamid (reproduced in *Djewdet, Turīdī* i. 154—192).

Among other *Qānūn* we may mention the MSS. of the Bibl. Nat. de Paris: Anc. fons Turc, N. 41, Suppl. Turc, N. 79, 1st (*Qānūn* presented in 1017) and Vienna, N. 1804, 3rd (*Qānūn* presented in 1028), N. 1822, 3rd etc. The list might be prolonged by searching the catalogues of various libraries. Marsigli’s work (cf. above) was compiled from a *Qānūn*, as far as facts dealing with military fiefs are concerned.

There is an important note on these *Qānūn* by Abīd Raffi Bey in *T.O.E.M.*, xixth year, p. 319—320 (which is not at the moment accessible to me). Cf. also the article by C. Brockelmann in *Irl.* viii. 261—267 (Der Göttinger cod. turc. 25. — Ein Beitrag zur Quellenkritik des Qanunnamace). There were also *Qānūn-nāme’s* for each vilayet. They were on the back or at the top of the *destiter manṣāfiz* of these vilayets (cf. M. T. M., N. 1, p. 109. Such is for example the *Qānūn* of the ilīs of Szegedin, Hatvan and Nógrád, MS. Bibl. Nat. Paris. Suppl. Turc, N. 76.

The majority of the extant *Qānūn-nāme’s* — apart from their original defects, often serious — are full of errors and obscurities, the result of the carelessness of copyists. They ought to be
completed and corrected from the collections of inscriptions or model letters and especially of original documents, firmanas, beatae et al., as for those of No. 823 of Suppl. Turc de la Bibl. Nat. de Paris and 1802 of Vienna; cf. also Gregorowicz's collection. Meminski himself has given three in his Institutiones linguae turcicae, Vienna 1756, ii., p. 174—175. A study of the rich archives of the Distier-bashâni in Constantinople would assuredly be most fruitful. (J. Devy)

TIMBUKTU (Tibmuchoo, French Tombouctou), a town in western Africa. It is not only of interest as evidence of the great extension of Islam to the south; it has itself been a centre of Muslim life of considerable activity; it possessed a celebrated university and produced learned men and historians who are not without merit. According to the author of the History of the Sudan, it was founded at the end of the viii (xiii) century by the Maghâharen Tâteg, a nomadic people who came into these lands to pasture their flocks. In summer they camped on the banks of the Niger in the village of Amadzah; in autumn they went back to their homes in Arman. At last they settled definitely on the site of this town. Timbuktu became an important commercial centre; travellers reached it either by the river or by caravans from the coast of Morocco and Tripolitania. The people of Maghâbim migrated thither in considerable numbers; the commercial centre had formerly been Walatta. Learned men and devout theologians soon followed the traders; they came from Egypt, from Ghadames, from Tuat, Tafalet, Fez, Sbâs etc. The town was given fine buildings and walls were built around it; the huts, once built of branches and straw, were replaced by houses of clay. A large mosque was built in Timbuktu itself and another to the north at Stankore.

The first dynasty, which came from Mâlli [q. v.] reigned at Timbuktu from 737 to 837 (1336—1433). The town in this period was visited by the celebrated traveller Ibn Battûta whose description is very interesting. In 753 (1352) he went there with a caravan from Morocco which included many traders of Sidjilmasa, then a very prosperous commercial centre. After a journey of 25 days he made a halt at Taghaza where there were mines of rock-salt, then at Walatta (Iyâkâlîwe), the first place in the land of the negroes, two mouths' journey from Sidjilmasa. Ten days after leaving Walatta he came to Zâgharti and reached the Niger near the town of Kâarkhâ; thence he went to Mâlli on the river Sansara and finally reached Timbuktu, after which he continued his journey by water. The people of these lands were Muslims; the tribe of Messâf was the dominant one. Ibn Battûta admires certain virtues of the negroes but cannot understand the nudity of women among the believers. The town itself does not seem to have impressed him greatly. The Messâfs who lived in it wore the âshqâ (q. v.), a veil covering the lower half of the face. We know that the Arabs usually gave the name of al-Mulâtchânin to the settled people, to the Berber peoples who led a nomadic life in the desert as far as Nubia (Juynboll and de Goeje, Descr. du Maghreb, Leyden 1860, p. 48).

A second dynasty that of the Maghâharen Tâteg, held sway in Timbuktu for 40 years. Then came the conqueror Sunni 'Ali whose rule lasted 24 years (873—898 = 1468—92). He made his victorious entry into Timbuktu in 873 and brought great havoc there. Local historians judge him very severely, as a wicked libertine and a bloody oppressor who persecuted learned men and laughed at religion. He performed the palâtî sitting. Nevertheless the Sungai dynasty which descended from this prince was a brilliant one and raised the town to a high degree of prosperity. The most eminent sultan of this dynasty was the askia al-Hâdi Muhammad, a patron of letters and learning. The last, the askia Dâwût, died in 935 (1528). Timbuktu then passed under Moroccan domination. The Pâshâ of Marrakesh Mahmoud conquered it from the Sultan of Morocco, Mulay Ahmad in 999 (1590). Moroccan rule lasted from 999—1164 (1590—1750); the exactions of the Pâshâs and the raids of the marauding Tuareg mark the period of decline. The Tuareg regained the town in 1207 (1792), then the Pal took it in 1245 (1827) and then the Tacouar. In the xvi (xvii) century Europeans came into contact with Timbuktu. Through Tunis and Tripolitania it had dealings with Italy; especially with Florence. Four great caravans routes led from it, going to Egypt via Kâen en Gao, to Tunis via the Haggâr, to Morocco via Sidjilmasa, Tafalet and Tuat, and to the Sudan by Mâlli. Two Europeans mention the town at this time and refer to it in terms which suggest that it was a well known place; these were the Florentine Benedetto Dei who visited it in 875 (1470) and says only "here coarse clothes are sold and seriges and materials which are made in Lombardy", and a few years later Leo Africano who is more enthusiastic: "the city", he says "is well provided with shops: it has a temple of stone and lime, built by an excellent architect of Granada and a splendid palace for the king. The latter is very rich in plates and rods of gold some of which weigh 1,500 pounds". The traffic in gold and in salt is specially mentioned at this time.

After the xvi (xvii) century Timbuktu became cut off from Europe. It was now only talked of in Europe as a mysterious and inaccessible town, thought to be very beautiful and rich, no doubt on account of its trade in gold, ostrich feathers, ivory, and slaves. The mystery of Timbuktu after various unsuccessful attempts and the assassination of Major Laing was pierced by the French explorer René Caillée in 1824 (1828) who was much disillusioned by it and greatly preferred Djenné. Barth then visited it in 1853.

The town, still modest in appearance, although the native architecture is not without taste, was incorporated in the sphere of French colonisation in 1311 (1893). Communication by motor-car (caterpillar wheels) was opened with Algeria in the Haaritz—Audouin—Dubreuil expedition. The town is no longer as large as it was under the old Sungai kings, whose memory the natives still cherish; in those days it was bounded by one of the arms of the Niger, but now the ruins lie 10 miles south of it. Caravans carrying salt still do a busy trade.

As to the works of Sudanese authors, the manuscripts of them have been brought back mainly by Felix Dubuis and Colonel Archirand. M. Houche has published several of them. The most important are the History of the Sudan and a Dictionary of the Fasah. The best known author of Timbuktu is Aham Bâ, who compiled a biographical dictionary. Taken prisoner when the town was occupied by the Moroccans, he was carried off to
Morocco where he lived till 1006 (1597). He died at Timbuktu in 1036 (1626). The period of the greatest literary activity in Timbuktu extends from the 11th (xvith) to the 13th (xvith) century. Educated Muslims are still to be found in the country, for example the ḵaḍī who a few years ago (1913) made available some inscriptions throwing light on the history of the Maghānanian penetrations of the Niger country.


(articles on the Timbuktu region in the *Business Review* and *The Times*)

**TIMSAH** (Lake), one of the series of swamps and lagoons in the Eastern Delta through which the Suez Canal passes on its way from Port Said south to Suez. The Canal enters the Lake at the 50th kilometre. On the northern shore lies the town of Ismaʿilya [q.v.], an exclusively French residential quarter. The Lake is about 6 sq. miles in area, although before the construction of the Canal it was brackish and reedy. Now it is very picturesque with its bright blue waters and the background of desert hills. The name means Crocodile Lake [cf. the preceding art.], being once upon a time the haunt of that creature. Archaeologists are undecided as to the part it played in historic times. Wallis Budge *Hist. of Egypt*, v. 131 sq.) supposes that it was somewhere in its neighbourhood that the Israelites crossed during their flight from Egypt. He identifies it with the *DEP* or Sea of Reeds mentioned in Exodus, xiii. 18.

**Bibliography:** A.H. Muḥammad, *Qīṭat Dēdīla*, viii. 405; S. W. Baker, *Ismaʿilya*, i. 190; Badecker, *Egypt*, Index. (J. Walker)

**TIMÜR LANG** (Tamerlane), the conqueror of Asia, born near Kaš in Transoxiana on the 25th Ša’bān of the year of the Mouse, 736 A.H. (8th April 1336), the son of Amir Tāṣhāghī (or Targhū), governor of Kaš and its district before Hashā al-Burā, and Takma Ḥāfū. His family claimed descent from Cinggis Khān and his epitaph gives the following genealogy: Timūnā, Kāzī, Ismāl Burā, Karāṭīr Nūṣān, ʿAṯīr, Burkāl, Tāṣhāghū, Timūr. A rabid detractor of Timūr, Ibn ʿArabī, ḫāṣ, says that he was the son of a shepherd and lived at first by brigandage and the epithet of Lang (lame) was given him as a result of a wound he received while stealing sheep. Timūr was also called Kūkān, the “son-in-law of the Ḫāfū”, Amir, “the Emir”, al-Amr al-Ḳabūr, “the Great Emir”, ʿṢāliḥ Ḫārūn, “lord of the fortunate conjunction of planets”. In 790(1388) he definitely took the title of sultan and after his death was given that of Dījan Makūn, “dweller in Paradise”.

While still quite young, Timūr distinguished himself by his intelligence, forethought and bravery. At first in the service of the local ruler, the amir
Kâğıtšâ, he accompanied Hâdîjî Bârîc facing before the invasion of Tughlâk Timûr Khân but soon returned to plead the case of his oppressed countrymen before the conquerors. He did this with such eloquence and courage that the invaders, eager to win over such an opponent, gave him the governorship of his native country. The next year (762 = 1361), Tughlâk Timûr organizing his conquests, made his son Iyâs governor of Samar- kand and appointed Timûr his vizier; the latter however, disguised with the consensuses of those around him, soon went to rejoin his brother-in-law Amîr Hûsaîn, who was preparing for resistance against the invasion.

Tughlâk Timûr and Iyâs, defeated in their turn, perished on the battlefield. Turning against his ally, Amîr Hûsaîn, Timûr made war on him, had him assassinated after a pretended reconciliation and becoming master of Bulqîk ascended the throne on Ramâzan 12, 771 (April 10, 1370), assuming the titles of successor of Caghâttiâ and descendant of Genghis. Success however only really begins with the conquest of Djâta and Khatvîrîm, which took over ten years of fighting (771-782 = 1369-1380) and nine expeditions: five to the first and four to the latter country. Becoming the official protector of Iâlam, Timûr favoured the priests and the new Nakhâbbândiya order and on his campaigns was accompanied by a long retinue of holy and learned men, men of letters and artists.

On the procession of the Kiçîlîk in 777 (1375) Timûr had taken the part of Tugisâvish [r.v.], Khân of the Crimea, who had been defeated by Urûs, ruler of the White Horde. In 782 (1380-1381) he sent him against the Russians; Moscow was taken and sacked. Four years later Tugisâvish rebelled against his benefactor; at first victorious, then defeated, he wanted to continue the struggle although Timûr offered to pardon him. In 790 (1388) he invaded Transoxiana, defeated 'Umar Shîshkî, son of Timûr, with his generals and threatened Samarqand. Timûr had to go to restore the situation. There was another invasion in 793 (1390-1391); this time 'Umar Shîshkî had his revenge and the rebel Khân fled into Georgia, abandoning his lands, to resume the offensive four years later.

Undertaken in 782 (1380-1381), the conquest of Persia began with the invasion of Khorasan, which submitted. On the return of an expedition against the pagan Mongols in 784 (1385), Gurgân, Mâzardarân and Seistan were conquered in rapid succession; the local rulers having submitted, retained a nominal authority. In the following year the rebellion of Herât ended in the suppression of the Kûrty dynasty. In 786 (1384-1385) Wâlî, king of Mâzardarân, was dispossessed. The years 787-788, 789-790 correspond with the conquest of Fârs, the 'Truk, Luristan and Âdhar- bâdjiâ. Sultân Alâjm Djalîr was defeated and put to flight. Timûr spent a winter in Tâbris and imposed a heavy fine on Isfâhân which having rebelled was punished by the massacre of 70,000 inhabitants. Towers were built of their skulls. Timûr is said to have had a lively disposition with Hâfiz in Shîrâk, but the truth of this story is not certain.

On the 10th Ramâzan 795 (July 31, 1392) Timûr set out on what is known as the "five years' war"; the main episodes of it were the massacre of the heretics in the Caspian provinces, the destruction of the Mu'âzîzârî dynasty of Fârs (795 = 1393) and the Mesopotamian campaign. Alâjm Djalîr after seeking to conciliate his rival fled into Syria, where he became a vassal of the Sultân of Egypt, al-Mâlik al-Zâhi Barâkî. The latter having refused the extradition of his protégé, Timûr invaded Asia Minor took and sacked Edess, Takrit, where he erected a pyramid of skulls, Mârdîn and Antî. 'Umar Shîshkî was killed in the course of the fighting. Forced to defend himself against a new attack by Tugisâvish, Timûr invaded the Kîpîkî (797 = 1395), occupied Moscow for over a year, undertook a campaign into Georgia and suppressed several risings in Persia.

According to Shahâr al-Dîn, Timûr thought the Muslim rulers of India much too tolerant; they ought, he thought, to have imposed Islam on their subjects. In Râjâb 800 (March-April 1395) therefore, he set out for India, crossed the Indus on the 12th Ramâzan 801 (Sept. 24, 1398) and on the 7th Rajab II (Dec. 17) took Delhi. In spite of the admiration with which this city inspired him, he plundered and destroyed it, massacring 50,000 of its inhabitants. The defeated Sultân Ma'âmûd III had retired across the Ganges. Timûr who had just divided his kingdom among his officers had to retire hurriedly to face new troubles. A rebellion had just broken out in Syria and Alâjm Djalîr's, once again lord of Baghâdâd, had invaded Âdharbâdjiân, the governor of which, Mirânshâh, son of Timûr, had compromised himself by his excesses. The rivalry between Timûr and Bâyazîd I was beginning and the new Sultân of Egypt, Fa- raqî, had refused to release a relative of Timûr's; the envoys sent to negotiate had been executed by the governor of Damascus.

Having taken the necessary measures against Mirânshâh, Timûr ravaged Georgia and set out for Asia Minor in Maharrâm 803 (Aug. 1490). At Sîrâs the Muslim garrison was surprised but 4,000 Christian soldiers were buried alive. Malatya fell, Timûr entered Syria, took Aleppo and after demanding of the "âlamâ", which, his men or the enemy's, killed in fight would earn the title of martyr, handed over the town to be plundered for three days. Hamân, Homs and Ba'âlbeck fell in their turn; Sultân Faraj was defeated. Damascus capitulated and Timûr sacked it, reduced its inhabitants to slavery and extorted from the "âlamâ", a fatâwî approving his conduct. On the 27th Dhu'l- Kâ'da 803 (July 10, 1401), he took Baghâdîb by surprise and wrought a great massacre there to avenge his officers killed in the siege. 20,000 inhabitants, or according to Ibn 'Arâshâbâh, 40,000 are said to have perished. Abu Bakr, son of Timûr, was given the task of defending the region against the attacks of Karâ Yûsûf and Bâyazîd, who had sought investiture from the "Abhâhsâda in Eyypt and attacked the Byzantine emperor, a friend of Timûr's, next molested his allies, the princes of Asia Minor. On Timûr's returning from a new expedition into Georgia, war broke out between the two rivals and their fate was decided at the battle of Ancyra, actually fought at Çîtqâbâh, N.E. of Angora on the 19th Dhu'l- Hijja 804 (July 21, 1402). Bâyazîd who had disposed his forces badly was defeated after a desperate struggle in spite of the valour of his troops. Imposed in his flight by the fall of his horse, he fell into the hands of the victor who treated him with respect and showed real regret when Bâyazîd died at Aş Şebir on the
14th Shab`āb Sūr (March 14, 1403). Owing its origin to a misunderstanding of a Persian verse, the legend that he ended his days in an iron cage is quite fictitious.

The captures of Brusa and Sozyn were marked by new atrocities. During his sojourn in Asia Minor, Timur lost his grandson and heir Muhammad Sulṭān, and received embassies from the Sultān of Egypt, who recognised his authority, and from the Byzantine emperor John VIII. Georgia having become tributary, Timur returned to Samarqand in 807 (1404) where he received a number of ambassadors, to one of whom, Ray Gonzales de Clavijo sent by Henry III of Castile, we owe a valuable account of the court of Samarqand and the festivities which took place there on the occasion of the marriages of several of the grandsons of Timur.

A new campaign was planned, this time against China, of which Timur was not content to remain simply suzerain. The Kurilus assembled at Samarqand accused the declaration of war. On the 23rd Djamād-i 1, 807 (Dec. 27, 1404) he began the campaign, crossing the Oxus on the ice. At Orār he granted Tōskānī the pardon which he sought of him. On the 10th Shab`āb Sūr (Jan. 12, 1405) he fell ill. Feeling his end near, he made all his dispositions and died on the 17th (19th) January aged 71, having reigned 36 years. His body was conveyed to Samarqand two months later to Samarqand, where his funeral was celebrated, and the magnificent monument, the Gūr-i-Mīr, in which he is buried, can still be seen.

Timur had married two Chinese princesses whom he called the, the Great Queen, and the , and the Little Queen, and the Queen, and also Tūmān, daughter of the Amir Mūsā, governor of Nakhshāb and Dāshāū, a woman of rare beauty whom he had executed for some imaginary fault. He had also a large number of concubines. His children were Ghiyāth al-Dīn Djamāngī (d. 779 = 1377–1378), Murāz al-Dīn `Umar Shāhī, killed in Syria, Daftāl al-Dīn Gurghā, called Mirānghā, Shāhshākh whom circumstances made his heir, and one daughter Sulṭāna Bakhtī, who married Sulaimān Shāhī, Realising that his rule could not last for ever and desirous to avoid civil war, he had divided his empire among his sons and grandsons giving them equal parts. But Muhammad Sulṭān, son of Ghiyāth al-Dīn, and after his death Pir Muhammad Djamāngī, his brother, were to have precedence.

Grave and serious, Timur did not love displays of gaiety and demanded absolute frankness in speaking to him even though it should pain him. Clavijo speaks highly of his justice and he certainly showed himself merciless to criminals. Gifted with a very fine memory but having little education himself, he encouraged and rewarded men of genius. It was in his reign that the art called Timurid had its origins. He enriched Samarqand with magnificent buildings and made it an international market which, in his lifetime at least, supplanted Tabriz and Baghdad and he transplanted thither the artists and craftsmen from the towns he conquered. He did everything possible to encourage commerce and industry and by his conquests he opened up new routes by land for the trade between India and Eastern Persia. Throughout his empire he carried through great public works, organised the administration and the army on rational bases and worked with all his might for the spread of Islam.

In physique, Timur was of middle height, had a large head and a high complexion. His hair had become white at an early age. Two wounds in the foot and the hand had made him somewhat deformed. Numerous portraits of him exist, by Persian or Indian artists, but they are for the most part purely imaginary (cf. Vānbēry, Gesch. Rechard’s, i. 212–213).

*Biography:* To Timur are attributed Memoirs (Malḥāba) and Institutes (Taḥṣīl) but their authenticity is very doubtful. He himself, however, had two official histories of his career written: one, the Tarḥītī Shāhī, written in Turki verse in Uighur characters, is now lost and the other the Zafar-nāme of Naṣīm al-Dīn Shāhī, still unpublished, survives in a unique manuscript in the British Museum (Add. 23,980); a recension of the latter work by Sharaf al-Dīn `Ali Yākid is the best known in Europe of his histories. The Aghāī al-Maḥfūz fī Nāvī Tarbih of Ibn ʿArabjāh is a bitter satire but it nevertheless contains a just appreciation of the character of the conqueror and valuable details about Samarqand. Murashīn (Kunya, Ba. vi.) and especially Khwāndūnī (Hakīmī Shāhī) are with Abū al-ʿAbd al-Ghayrī Samarqandi (Maḥfūz al-Sulṭānī) the most valuable of the later historians. In Books vii. and viii. of his Gesch. d. Osten. Reiches, von Hammer has given the substance of contemporary Ottoman and Byzantine chroniclers. We may also mention the Manṣūrī of Ferdiy, a valuable collection of documents. Among European travellers, we may mention Clavičio, Schiltberger and Boucicaut.


TIMURIDS This term, sometimes used to include all the descendants of Timur, means more especially the princes of his family who ruled in Persia and Central Asia in the 16th century; it is in the latter sense that it forms the subject of this article.

The history of the Timurids may be divided into two quite distinct periods (cf. Browne, *A History of Persian Literature under Timur* Dominions, p. 380). In the first the empire, divided between the sons and grandsons of the conqueror, was soon reduced to two great kingdoms — in the west that of Miranaghā and his sons Abū Bakr and Muhammad Umar — in the east that of Shāhrukh which, at first limited to Êupān, to which Transoxiana was next added in a few
years, comprised almost the whole of the lands that had been ruled by Timūr. It was a brilliant and comparatively happy period. Of a peace-loving disposition in spite of his success in war Shāhrukh endeavoured to repair the damage done by his father and favoured as far as he could men of intellect. In the second period from the death of Shāhrukh to the battle of Shurţ: which by securing the unity of Persia dealt the last blow to Timūrid domination, the empire was steadily breaking to pieces. Each prince wanted to have his own kingdom; thus facilitating the advance of the enemies who from all sides were threatening the enfeebled state. But by a bizarre contrast the renaissance which had marked the reign of Shāhrukh continued under his successors to the end of their rule in all its splendor. The whole 15th century is the golden age of letters, art, and scholarship. The court of Hūsain Bīškar, the second last Timūrid, was not inferior to that of Shāhrukh.

The amirs believing that by concealing the death of Timūr they could successfully carry out the expedition to China, decided to take as ruler for the duration of the campaign prince Khaṣīn, who was to be assisted by a council of regency and at the end of the expedition would surrender the power to Pir Muḥammad Dzhāhāngir, or Timūr had desired. War broke out between the two claimants and Pir Muḥammad twice submitted to the generosity of Khāhil who left him his lands. Six months later the vizier Pir All Tāz had Pir Muḥammad assassinated and tried to seize the throne himself; this cost him his life (808 = 1400). Abandoned by his troops, dethroned by his vizier, whom he reproached him with his extravagances, Khāhil was compensated with the governorship of the Šīrāz (809 = 1400-1407) in which he ended his days.

Mīranshāh reigned, with his son Abū Bakr, and under the authority, imposed by Timūr, of his youngest son Muḥammad ʿUmar over a kingdom which included the Šīrāz, Alḥārbiyān, Mughān, Shīrwān and Georgia. A quarrel broke out between the two brothers and the amir Dīlahānshāh tried to deprive them of their power which cost him his life. Mīranshāh having made a hostile demonstration against Shāhrukh had to submit (808 = 1405-1406). In 810 (1408) he was killed in battle with Kara Yūsuf. His sons perished about the same time.

Shāhrukh on the death of Timūr was ruler only of Khurāsān; he conquered Marandarān in 809 (1406) and Sistān in the next year, then extended his authority over Transoxiana to which he went in 811 (1409) to take possession of Samarqand, to organise the country, rebuild Merv and restore the old course of the Murghab; he further extended his power to Fārs (817 = 1414-1415), Kirmān (819 = 1416-1417) and Ḍarābīdjanān to which he had gone to attack his doubtful rival Kara Yūsuf; the latter having died suddenly, the enemy army dispersed (822 = 1419) but the fighting continued with the successors of Kara Yūsuf and the rival dynasty of the White Sheep. In the end, Shāhrukh held all the lands of Timūr except Syria and ʿArabistān. Many risings broke out in his reign but all were put down. Among them were those led by the amir Khudālān and ʿAbd Bahaʿ al-Dīn (813-1409-1410). Buğa Mīrzā at Shīhrāz (818 = 1415-1419), Kiskandar and Dīlahānshāh (832 = 1429).

In 820 (1417-1418) Shāhrukh put at the head of the government his son Bīsoṅqor, made all who had been false to their trust disgorge their ill-gotten gains. He survived all his sons except ʿUṯlīgh Beg and died in Fishāwārd (Raiyat) on the 25th Dhū l-Ḥijja 850 (March 12, 1447) leaving the memory of a generous and peace-loving prince, brave and free from ambition. To him we owe amongst other useful works the opening of a large library in Herāt. With China, of which he was suzerain, he was always on good terms and he asserted his nominal suzerainty over India. On the other hand, his relations with the Ottomans and with Egypt were always difficult.

After his death the decline began, rapid and irremediable. ʿUṯlīgh Beg, the "Estranged Princeling" (850-852 = 1447-1449), was a scholar and man of letters, more fitted to be a student than a ruler and incapable of facing the difficulties which assailed him. Conquered by his nephew ʿAbd al-Dawla he agreed to all his demands in order to obtain the release of his son ʿAbd al-Latif. But the conqueror failed to fulfil his promises. The ʿOfbeeks took and sacked Herāt and Samarqand; ʿAbd al-Latif rebelled, seized his father, who had been several times defeated, put him to death after going through the farce of a trial but was himself assassinated after reigning six months (853-854 = 1449-1450). ʿAbd Allāh Mīrzā, grandson of Shāhrukh, ascended the throne in spite of the opposition of Abū Saʿīd who sought the support of the ʿOfbeeks. ʿAbd Allāh was defeated and slain (853-854 = 1450-1451). Bābūr Mīrzā, a dissipated and drunken prince, who had vainly sworn to reform himself, lost the ʿIrāq, Fārs and Kirmān, invaded ʿAbd al-Dawla, failed against Abū Saʿīd and died (his successor (855-861 = 1451-1457).

Very different was the reign of Abū Saʿīd, the most powerful monarch of his time. A bitter opponent of ʿAbd Allāh Mīrzā he had at his death taken possession of Samarqand; the disappearance of Bābūr and his further conquests gave him Transoxiana, Bahaḵlušān, Kābul and Kandāhar, with the border districts of India, the ʿIrāq and Khorāsān, which he completely conquered in 863 (1458-1459). He was ambitious but the historians agree that he had fine qualities: dignity, discretion, frankness, energy and remarkable political ability. After fighting the Mongols he made an alliance with them, returning to the old traditions of his family. Declaring war on Ṣūfān Ḥasan whose attempts at a reconciliation he repulsed, he marched into the Kābūgh where his army starving deserted him. He fall into the hands of the enemy and ʿUṯlīgh Hasan's officers, in spite of their master's opposition, demanded his death (855-872 = 1456-1459).

Ṣultān Maḥmūd, who began by having the four sons of his predecessors assassinated, only reigned six months, detested and obfuscated. His tyranny, arbitrariness and depravity surpassed anything previously known. He was assassinated and a rebellion was just about to break out when his death which had been concealed by the astute vizier Khurān Shah (900-901 = 1494-1495) became known. He left several sons. Ṣultān Maṣʿūd who reigned four years had to fight for his throne with his brothers Ḍarābīdjan and ʿAll who, owing to the intrigue of Khurān Shah, failed miserably (901-905 = 1495-1499).

Ṣultān Aḥmad, son and successor of Abū
Sa'd, had a number of good qualities: he was loyal, frank, courteous and brave; but having no power he was only a puppet in the hands of his envoys especially the clergy; and except for an attack by 'Umar Shaikh and an expedition against Böber, the future conqueror of India, his reign was peaceful. Magnificent buildings were erected in Samarkand at this time and scholars and men of letters flocked to its court (874—899 = 1469—1494).

'Umar Shaikh, fourth son of Abü Sa'id, had made for himself a little kingdom in Farghâna of which the capital was Akhât. Brave and fond of fighting, although his army was only 4,000 men, he made several attempts to take Samarkand. His contemporaries praise his justice, his generosity and lovable disposition. Although given to drinking and gaming, he was very devout. A son-in-law of the sovereign of the Ghaznâvi, he had to cede to his father-in-law Yânî Khan lands which he could not keep and died after an accident after a short reign on the 4th Ramaḍān 899 (3rd June 1494) aged only 39. His son Zâhir al-Dîn Böber who succeeded him at the age of 12 after various successful expiditions in one of which he took Samarkand, was dispossessed by Şahbântî in 906 (1506). He went to India where he founded a great empire.

Sultân Hussain Bâikâra reigned at Herât for 37 years. Literary and artistic, a brave and successful soldier, he conquered Khurasan, Tukhâristân, Kandâhar, Sistan and Mazârâstan, victorious over all his rivals. But the eight or nine years of his reign were troubled. A martyr to rheumatism, threatened by the Ōzbekîs, he had to put down rebellions by his sons and finally died on his way to fight Shâhîm. At first an agnostic and pious Muslim, he latterly gave himself up to deauchery, an example which his sons and subjects followed. The literary circle at Hussain Bâikâra's court is famous. In it besides the famous visir Mir 'Ali Shîr, the creator of Turkî literature, were poets like Dîzânî, historians like Mirghând and Khândâmî, painters like Bahâ and Shâh Maqâfar. The palaces of Herât rivalled those of Samarkand (873—911 = 1469—1506). The son and successor of Sultân Hussain Bâikâra, Bâ'dî al-Zannân, was the last Timurid of Persia. Defeated by Şahbântî, a guest of Shâh Ismîl and finally a prisoner of Şultân Salîm, he died at Constantinople in 923 (1517) leaving a son Muhammad al-Zâmân, who went to try his fortune in India, where he died in 946 (1539) after vainly trying to become king of Gujûrî with Portuguese help.

The coming of Shâh Ismîl, the triumph of the Shâfi'i and the Persian unity which was the result, the realisation of national unity in China and in Russia in the same period, the foundation by the Şahbântîs of a great empire in Transoxiana deprived the descendants of Timûr of all hope of domination except in India which was passing into the hands of one of them.

The intellectual revival which characterises the 14th (xvth) century is in part the work of the Timûrid sovereigns and princes many of whom were themselves poets, artists and scholars, and attracted to their courts men of genius. Among the former were Shahrâkhû, who promoted historical studies, Ulugh Beg, astronomer, poet and theologian, Hussain Bâikâra, artist and poet, and Böber, who left a number of valuable works in addition to his memoirs, and among the latter, Bâisonghor, son of Shahrâkhû, a calligrapher of the first rank to whom the art of the book owed a great deal. Dâmi is at this period the greatest name in Persian literature which is also represented by the mystic poets, Sâyîdî Ni'matallâh Kirîmî and Kâschî al-Anwâr; by Hyâtî and Kâlibî, authors of matârân; Hussein Wâ'id Kâghî, a moralist and author of apologies; the historians Mirghând and Khândâmî, 'Abd al-Razâk Samarkandî, Hâfiz Abrû, the latter also a geographer. Besides Dâmi, the most notable theologians were Âmûd Taftânî and the traditionist Mir Dâmûl al-Dîn Mişâhâdî, jurists, mathematicians, physicians etc. were also numerous.

Of the Turkish poets of the time, Mir 'Ali Shîr is almost the only one known; he has however some noted disciples, like Shâhkhâm Beg Suhaîlî and Kamâl al-Dîn Gâzârî.

In the 14th (xvth) century Persia art attained its perfection. The schools of painting of Samarkand, Bukhârâ and Herât were at their best. We have already mentioned what Bâisonghor did for the book. Architecture, inspired alike by the Chinese pagoda and the Mongol tent is represented by monuments like the Gâr-i-Mîr, the mosques of Bîbî Khânâmûn, Ulugh Beg and Shâh Ziâdât not to mention those of Samarkand. Owing to the presence of the colonies of artists and artisans installed involunt volentes in Samarkand and A'dharbâd by Timûr, decorative arts, ceramics in particular, made remarkable progress. Music also was brilliantly represented.

Bibliography: For the whole period Mirghând and especially Khândâmî are very useful; 'Abd al-Razâk Samarkandî whose Matâtî, unfortunately still unwritten, was largely used by Quatemère (Mémoire historique sur le règne du sultan Schâh-rokhî, j. A., 1856, and Notice de l'auteur persan,... forming the first part of vol. xiv. of the N.E.); Mu'tân al-Dîn Isfârî, author of a valuable chronicle of Herât (extracts given by Barbier de Meynard in the J. A., 1860—1862). For the early years, Sharaf al-Dîn 'Ali Yarzî, Ibn 'Arâbahjî, Fâshîî, author of a Muifimal unpublished and incomplete. For the last years the memoirs of Bâber are most valuable, checked and supplemented by the Tarîkh-i Raghibî of Mirzâ Hâdîr Dughlât, and the Shâhîm-Nâmâ of Muhammad Sâli, Ferîdûn Bey and Muhammadjîm Bâsî should be consulted for the relations with the Ottomans. For further details the reader may be referred to the works of E. Blochet and E. G. Brown in quoted under Timûr Lânî, L. Bouvat, Études sur la civilisation timeride, j. A., cclvi, 1926, p. 193—299; do., L'Empire mongol (2e phase), vol. vii, of the Histoire du monde, publ. under the direction of A. E. Cavignac (Paris 1927).

On the literary renaissance, cf. the Tâdhîrî of Dawlatjâhî and the works of Mir 'Ali Shîr, his Madâtî al-Nufâtî in particular (extract in Belîn, j. A., 1861, xviii. and 1866, vii. viii). The European travellers who have given us descriptions of the Timûrid kingdom were: Clavijo and Pero Tafur, Oyon de Longaville, Ambrogio Contarini, Nicolò Conti, Hieronymus di San Stefano and Caterino Zeno, Italians; Boucicaut, French; Nikitin, Russian; Schlitzerger, German. The principal European historians are D'Herbelot, De Geignes, Gibbon, von Hammer and Vâmbây, Gesch. Bohrâr's, chap. xii.; Brown, op. cit., book iii.; Skrine and Denison
TIMÜR-TASH, an Ortoqšid, son of Nachçun al-Din Ɨlgāhshāh of the line of Mārdin. Al-Malik al-'Alîm al-Ądîl Ɨşām al-Din Timür-Tash, who died in 5081 (1104) and by the age of 12 (in 512) his father had left him in Aleppo as his temporary deputy. In 515, Timür-Tash was sent to the Saïdijšād Sulṭân Mahmid and as a result of this mission Mâlîyâfärîkîn (q.v.) was added to the territory of the Ortoqşids. After the death of Ɨlgâhshāh, his lands were divided up. Timür-Tash received Mârdin, his brother Sulaimân, Mâlîyâfärîkîn and his cousin Sulaimân b. Ɨbd al-Djâhîr, Aleppo. In 518, Balak b. Bahârân b. Ortoq al-Aleppo was killed while besieging Manbûj (which belonged to the amr al-Ḥasân al-Ba‘albek). Timür-Tash, who was in camp at Balak, raided the country as far as Aleppo which he seized on the 20th Rabi‘ 1 518. He left his lieutenant there, for Syria was full of fighting and he was a man who liked peace (Ibn al-Ąthîr, x. 450). As a result of the intrigues of the Shîf Dubâsis (of the Mâlîyâdîn dynasty) the Franks besieged Aleppo. The inhabitants, seeing the weakness (āwqah wa Ɨ-šâqīfah) of his master appealed to Ɨşâf-Şūkân al-Bursûqt al-Mawṣûl, whom they admitted into the citadel.

Timür-Tash suffered a series of reverses immediately after the accession to power of Imam al-Din Zangi (who succeeded Bursûqt in Mawṣûl in 521). Zangi, eager to extend his possessions, marched on Nîşîbîn which belonged to Mârdin; Timür-Tash sought the help of his cousin of Ɨşîn-Қalîf, Dâwûd b. Sulîmân, but Zangi, by a stratagem obtained the surrender of Nîşîbîn before the troops of the two cousins could arrive.

In 524, on his way back from Syria, Zangi besieged Sardjî (between Mârdin and Nîşîbîn; cf. Қašî Sereţîkhîn [1] S miles W. of Nîşîbîn). Timür-Tash, Dâwûd and the lord of Dijârâbîk collected 20,000 Turkomans but were defeated. Failing to take Ɨşîn-Қalîf, Zangi turned back to take the fortress of Dârâ.

In spite of these reverses we find Timür-Tash in 526 joining Zangi in the siege of Amîd (Dijârâbîk). The lord of this fortress summoned Dâwûd to his assistance but the latter was defeated. Zangi and Timür-Tash laid waste the district of Amîd but the fortress held out. Zangi recompensed himself by taking Qawr which belonged to Dijârâbîk; cf. Mîlîwî; the Ɨlbîl of Saurû. In 518 Timür-Tash was to succeed his cousin Sulaimân at Mâlîyâfärîkîn. His only success seems to have been the taking of Hattîkh (or Ɨṭṭîkh; Ɨwâf-sīmân, i. 245; Ɨlîk) to the north of Mâlîyâfärîkîn (q.v.) which he took in 532 from the last son of the Mawûndîns (q.v.).

Timür-Tash and Dâwûd took advantage of the death of Zangi in 541 to recover their former possessions which had been annexed by the lord of Mawṣûl. The latter's successor however, Saîf al-Dîn b. Zangi, not only regained them but laid siege to Mârdin and laid the country round it waste. The peace-loving Timûr-Tash confined himself to regretting the days of Zangi which now seemed to him like days of rejoicing (niyâmûba li-hâl Ɨsârät dîlîmî). He hastened to make peace with Saîf al-Dîn and promised him his daughter, Saîf al-Dîn died however in 544 and the young princess became the wife of his successor Ɨṯâb al-Dîn. Timûr-Tash "lord of Mârdin and of Mâlîyâfärîkîn" died in 547 (1152) aged 48 after a reign of 30 years. The same date is given by Abu ‘I-Faraj (ed. Pococke, p. 391) and by Abu l-Fidâ‘ī, while the name of his son is given by ‘Alî Etnîr (an Iyun al-Ibar of ‘Abd al-Salâm Etnîr, multif. of Mârdin [al. in 1359 = 1843] and Firdâ‘ī) give 548. Timûr-Tash built the Ḩisnātîyâ madrasa of Mârdin and the cathedral-mosque opposite it. The coins of Timûr-Tash described by Ghâlib Ed‘hem, Catalog des Monnaies Turcomanes, Constantinople 1894, p. 27. and by ‘Alî Amîrî, op. cit., p. 18, bear neither date nor mint. ‘Alî Amîrî interprets the symbol found upon them as the tângha of the Turkish tribe of Kayîl.

Bibliography: cf. the articles Ortoqšâd and Mârdin; Ibn al-Ąthîr, x. 373, 418, 426, 436, 440, 455, 526; xii. 6, 34, 81, 92, 115; Abu l-Fidâ‘ī, Annales musulmiens, ed. Reiske; Kâmil Ferdi, Mârdin Malûbî Urjûkîye Ta’ekîlî (944 [1537]), a quite unimportant list of reigns but supplied with valuable notes by the editor ‘Alî Amîrî, Stambul 1931. (V. Morosov.)

TIMûR-TASH, an ambassador and vizier, son of the Kâr ‘Alî Beg who, in the first year of the reign of Urkhan took the fortress of Herceke on the Gulf of Nicomedia and displayed particular bravery at the siege of Aidos, when he removed with his own hand an arrow that had pierced his eye. Of the origin of the family very little is known; as is also the case with the other noble families of the early Ottoman empire, viz. the Candarian [cf. Cenderelli], the Ewrenos [q.v.], and the Mîkûlî-oglu [q.v.]. Timûr-Tash’s Fasha is mentioned for the first time, when he continued the Sulṭān’s conquests along the Tündja by Murad Pasha’s order with the help of Lâilî Shâhîn Fasha. In 1367 he took Yenidîye Ksîlahgâh (cf. Hâdîlî Khâlah, Rumalî and Rumî, p. 49, where the date is given as 768) and Ed‘hem (ibîd., p. 763 sq. with the same date) in the plain of the Tündja. The sources tell us nothing of his activities during the next decade. When Lâlî Shâhûn died towards the end of the Serbo-Bulgarian War (777 = 1375), Timûr-Tash succeeded him as Begler-beg of Rumelî. In this capacity he distinguished himself in the first place by completely organizing the army, by founding the system of sîdâs of the sipahs [see TIMûR] and creating the vîmûz for the lowest ranks in the army, which consisted mainly of Bulgarian Christian towns who were chiefly used as drivers (cf. J. V. Hammer, G. C. R., i. 181 sq.). It appears that it was at Timûr-Tash’s instigation that the felt caps
(usually made in Bilećik) since the time of Urkhan were generally, were limited to the army and that red was decided on as the colour for the headaddresses of the beggs and officers (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., i. 89 sq.). Timúrtaš Pasha again came into prominence when he took the fortress of垄断 (the modern Buloš), Prilep and Ḡañip (the modern Stip) (the date given is 784 = 1382; cf. Hāǧidji Ḥaṭfatī, Romania and Beina, p. 97, 96 and 92 and also his Taḫṣīʿ al-Timúrtašī, Stambul 1146, p. 97 where the same date is given, but is difficult to reconcile with the reputed letter of Murād I to his son Bāyazīd I given by Fīrūz, Mansûrīyat al-Saltāna, i. 107, dated Adīrānī first tenth of Rabīʿ I, 787 = middle of April 1385; cf. thereon J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., i. 197 sq., where the extracts are given from the document). Until the chronology of the early Ottoman period is finally settled, it may be regarded as certain that Timúrtaš crossed the Wadzār, invaded the south of the modern Serbia and conquered there three strongholds for the Sultān, Kâfri-i, viz. Astočia and Acrarali, the land of the "King of the Epirotians" Carlo II Tocco (d. July 1429), was also hard pressed by him on this occasion. In 1385 Timúrtaš is said to have undertaken a campaign against the Arta (not far from the Ionian Sea), who were showing separatist tendencies (cf. Epitótes, ed. J. Behkner, 1849, p. 229 sq. and Jorgo, G. O. R., i. 273) so that he was sometimes here, sometimes there is Thessaly and in Epirus, districts in which Turāḳhān Beg (q. v.) also fought with success. In 788 (1386) Turāḳhān Beg suddenly appeared in Anatolia. In the battle which Murād fought in the plain of Konya against his most dangerous opponent, "Ali" al-Dīn "All of Kāramān, he commanded the rearguard of the Ottoman army and it was his intervention that put the ruler of Kāramān to flight and thus decided the battle in favour of the Ottomans. As a reward he was given the greater part of the plunder and the title of vizier i.e. a Pasha with 3 tails, which he bore as the first Beglerbeg of the kingdom. When in the following year (789 = 1387) Murād was again preparing for a campaign in Europe, Timúrtaš remained in Anatolia and administered the district of Germān-eli (q. v.) in the absence of prince Yâkhi. In 792 (1390) Timúrtaš again appears in the Balkans. In this year, according to Ḥāǧidji Ḥalīfatī's Taḫṣīʿ al-Timūrtašī, he took Kratovo (Turkish Kastrowa) east of Uzkuš, famous for its mines of silver and copper. In the next year (793 = 1391) he was taken prisoner in Brussa during a Kāramānian raid on it and Angora, was released and revenged himself by defeating the prince of Kāramān in the plain of Aļ-čai in Germān-eli. When he had him without ceremony although he was the brother-in-law of Bāyazīd I. From Mănești-Rășcan, who probably drew on Idris Būltī (iii. 311) we learn of the farther history of Timūrtaš Pasha that he conquered Klaughr (q. v.) in Anatolia. The year of Bāyazīd I is 799 (1396 and 1397) and in the following year (800, beg. Sept. 24, 1397) Athens (cf. Chronicon breve in Duca, Bonn ed., p. 516 [Mœurde]) and J. H. Mordtmann in Eva-Neogr. Tarch., iv. 1923, p. 346 sqq.) with the surrounding lands, also Behesti (q. v.) and Mālītāya (q. v.) from the Turkmans, Divrigi from the Kurds, Dārendre and Kemeḳ (q. v.) (cf. also Sa'd al-Dīn, i. 150) and he was busy with warlike enterprises, sometimes in Europe and sometimes in Asia Minor (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., i. 248 sq.) In the battle of Angora (19th Dha 1-Hijdhja 804 = 29th July 1402), he with his son Yâkhi shared the fate of Bāyazīd I and passed as a prisoner into Timūr's hands. When the treasures accumulated by Timūrtaš were discovered in Kūtāshıa (q. v.), Timūr heaped reproaches upon him and at first refused him his liberty (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., i. 330, following Şaraf al-Dīn 'Ali Vāzdi, Histoire de Timūr-Bēz, transl. Petit de la Croix, v. 34, p. 41.) He only survived the collapse of the Ottoman kingdom for a short time. While leading an army for prince 'Īsā in the battle of Ulbāb (Asia Minor) he was treacherously murdered by one of his own servants in 808 (1405). Sultān Mehμmed left the head of the old warrior to his brother Sultan in a token of victory. His body was taken to Brussa and buried there in the mosque founded by him. He had four sons, who also rose to distinction as viziers and generals, viz. (according to Sa'd al-Dīn) Urdül Beg, 'Umur Beg, 'Ali Beg, and Yâkhi Beg. The last named, who had distinguished himself in the Balkan campaigns (e.g. at the capture of Niža in 777 = 1375 [cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., i. 181] and of Provadija [Turk. Prăvădi, Bulg. Oveč, cf. K. Jireck, Das Fürstentum Bulgarien, p. 539 and Jorgo, G. O. R., i. 250], in 1388) seems to have perished soon after the battle of Angora. A son named 'Othμn Bey mentioned by J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., i. 495 (cf. however ibid., p. 492, where he is not given) cannot be traced in the Ottoman annals. There may be some confusion with a grandson of Timūrtaš who bore this name (see below). The family of Timūrtaš is set out in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Khan 4All Beg</th>
<th>Timūrtaš Pasha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urdū-Beg</td>
<td>d. 829 as Beglerbeg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umur-Beg</td>
<td>d. 838 as vizier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4All-Beg</td>
<td>d. 830 as vizier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yâkhi Beg</td>
<td>d. c. 865 (1429)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4Ali-Čelebi d. as διοριστικός to prince Muṣṭafā

'Othμn-Čelebi killed, it is said, in 832 (1428) as Sandjakbeg of Germān-eli at the siege of Varna
Bibliography: The works mentioned in the text and Belaghi Brasse, Gliederi, Kiyatfi, Serkan, Brusa 1302, p. 65, where two bearers of the name Timurtash appear in error. — On a general Timurtash under 'Oktun and Urgan, see Zinken, G.O.R., t. 112. (Franz Baringer)

Al-Tinnin, the constellation of the Dragon. According to al-Kazwini, it consists of 51 stars none of which lies outside of the constellation. Apart from the general figure of the constellation which comes from Greek (and probably earlier from Babylonian) astronomy the Arabs have names for smaller groups of stars within it. Thus the star μ is called the Dragon's tongue, al-rijāf; ω, one of the four stars of the head, al-sawadīf, the young dam-camels; ψ, a not very bright star between them al-rajlii, the camel-foot; the bright stars ξ and η are called al-dāhārin, the two jackals; the dark α and ζ agār, the jackal's claws. The Arabs imagine that the two jackals are trying to seize the camel-foot and that it is being protected by the dam. At the beginning of the Dragon's tail is the star al-dāshī, the male hyena. In Ulugh Beg we find the readings al-qawād the hute-player and al-rāshī the dancer (this also in Wattenfeld's text); these seem to have no further authority and are easily explained as misreadings of al-sawadīf and al-rijāf.


(T. W. Hunt)

Timur Sultan, the son of Haidar Ali [q.v.] of Misur, was born in 1753. His father employed him in many military operations, and on one occasion, in 1771, when he and his troops were not found where they were expected to be, publicly inflicted on him a most unmerciful beating. On his father's death, on Dec. 7, 1783, he succeeded to the throne of Misur, and in 1784 he concluded peace with the British, with whom his father had been at war. In 1785 war broke out between Timur and the Marāthā Pāshā, who was joined by Nīżām 'Ali of Hindərabād, but in 1787 Timur took alarm at some military reforms introduced by Lord Cornwallis and made peace with his opponents. He was a bitter enemy of the British, and was known to be secretly in communication with the French at Pondicherry, and in 1788 he attacked the Rādja of Trancore, who was under British protection. The Rādja appealed to the British for aid, and in 1790 Lord Corn-

Bibliography: Mark Wilks, Historical Sketches of the South of India in an attempt to trace the History of Mysore, 2nd ed. Mahārr, 1869. (T. W. Hurd)

Tirana, also Tirnā, capital of the kingdom of Albania, pleasantly situated 400 feet above sea-level on the well cultivated plain at the foot of the Mali Dajit (5,570 feet) enclosed on three sides (east, south and west) by hills, connected with the Adriatic and its seaport Durazzo by road (25 miles) and soon to be connected by a railway now being built. The town which in 1627 had 12,454, mainly Muslim, inhabitants only attained importance when it was chosen in place of Durazzo as the seat of government of the Free State and later kingdom of Albania. Tirana is also the seat of the chief Mufti of Albania and with its numerous Hungarian noble families forms a stronghold of Islam in Albania. It is important in commerce as the market for a large part of lower Albania. Tirana is usually said to be a foundation of Fārān-Şah Sulaimān Pasha (about 1600) who in memory of his Persian campaigns called it after the Persian capital Tavān of which Tirana is a corruption. This statement (cf. A. Degrand, Souvenirs de la Histoire Albâtie, Paris 1901, p. 205 sqq.) is not worthy of credence because as early as 1572 "Il borgo di Tirana" is mentioned (cf. M. v. Soffla, Städte und Burgen Albaniens, in Denkschr. Ak. Wien, lxi/1, 1924, p. 35). It is certain that Tirana was of no importance in earlier times, in comparison with the adjacent Krua. On Sept. 2, 1477, in the plain of Tirana the Venetian provveditore Francesco Contarini with 2,500 cavalry and Albanian infantry fought the Turks in a battle which ended disastrously for him (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O.R., ii. 154). Later the place passed into the possession of the powerful family of Topkan from Krua, who established themselves here through marriage at the end of the xviiith century. Their most celebrated member was Kaplan Ahmad Pasha (c. 1800) who was given large estates round Tirana for his services to the
Sultān in the war against Kara Mahmut Pasha Buqshafi of Scutari (Albania). The whole plain of Tirānā still belongs to the Toptani family. There are very few memorials of olden times in the town. The most important are the mosques of Šajdlji Edhem Bey, a descendant of the above mentioned Sulaiman Pasha, the Añaf Džami‘i, and a mosque founded by Sulaiman Pasha in 1605 with his ārāt beside it. On the S. E. side of the town, surrounded by very old cypresses, is a quadrangular open space called Namizgāzah on which the Muslims assemble to worship together at the feast of Bārām. In 1830 Tirānā suffered a good deal during the civil war. The Muslim inhabitants of the town until quite recently were reputed to be very fanatical.


(T. Baringer)

TIRÁZ. The word is borrowed from the Persian and originally means "embroidery"; it then comes to mean a robe adorned with elaborate embroidery, especially one ornamented with embroidered bands with writing upon them, worn by a ruler or person of high rank; finally it means the workshop in which such materials or robes are made. A secondary development from the meaning "embroidered strip of writing" is that of "strip of writing", border or braid in general, applied not only to inscriptions woven, embroidered, or sewn on materials, but also to any inscriptions on a band of any kind, whether hewn out of stone, done in mosaic, glass or faience, or carved in wood (cf. e. g. al-MA‘rūz, Kūtāf, ii. 79, 212, 407). The same fīrāz then becomes the special name for the inscriptions officially stamped upon the rolls of papyrus in the factories for papyrus with ink, sometimes in colours (red, green) and is next used for the factories themselves. The two last meanings are limited to a few occurrences (cf. J. v. Karabacek, Dix arab. Papyriprotokóle, p. 8 sqq.; A. Grobmann, Corpus Papyrorum Raineri, iib, N. 175 [p. 170], 204 [p. 200], 214 [p. 209], 265 [p. 239], 270 [p. 242]); when papyrus ceased to be made about the middle of the tenth century A.D. these two meanings of fīrāz disappeared.

Cloths, curtains and garments with embroidered, woven or stitched on them may be divided into two classes, distinguished by the contents of the inscriptions and the rank of the wearer. One class expresses the whishes of private individuals, the height of which is reached in the inscriptions contained in the Khōf al-Munawwi‘ah, p. 167 sqq. with which dandies and ladies of fashion liked to adorn their robes; the other is of an official character and may to some extent be compared with our orders and decorations. Such scrolls run, either along the border, sometimes arranged in two, or even more, strips around the upper garment, or were placed around the neck, around the sleeve, on the upper arm or wrists and even on the headdress. They were used not only as ornamental borders but were also put in the pattern of the material. The breadth varied considerably, and, while J. V. Karabacek (Svarand- schitura, p. 84 sq., note 56; Papyriprotokóle, p. 26) gives breadth of from 2 to 35 centimetres, this does not exhaust all the possibilities; on fragments of material from Egyptian graves, fīrāz borders of less than a centimetre in breadth have been found.

Ibn Khalidān is very well informed about the institution of the fīrāz; according to him, the majesty of the ruler found expression in his name or the royal badge (‘alāma) being put in the border (fīrāz) of the materials, which were used for his robes of silk or brocade, and the inscription was worked into the web of the material with gold thread or bright coloured yarn, which stood out against the background of the material. The royal robes were thus distinguished to mark out the royal wearer, or him who received the garment from the ruler as a mark of special favour, to show him honour or appoint him to one of the higher offices in the kingdom. Under the Umayyads and ‘Abdāsids the cloth mills which worked for their wardrobe were housed in their palaces and called Dīr al-Fīrāz.

They were under the control of an official called Sūkh al-Tirāz, whose duty it was to supervise the activities of the workers, the machinery and the weavers and to see that they were paid and that everything went smoothly. Only men of high rank and trusted individuals among their freedmen were given this office; the same arrangements were in vogue under the Umayyad caliphs in Spain and their successors, under the Mamūt sultāns in Egypt, and their contemporaries among the Persian kings in the east. It was only with the decline of the great Muslim empires that this system came to an end.

Ibn Khalidān’s statements, which are in the main followed here, find ample corroboration in the finds of Muslim textiles which have been made at different places in Egypt (notably Akhnim, Antinōi, Erment, al-Aṣm near Asyût) and are preserved in the museums in Berlin (Schlosmuseum, Kaiser-Friedrich-Museum, Kunstgewerbemuseum), Leningrad, Paris (Louvre and Musée de Cluny), London (Victoria and Albert Museum), Vienna (Österreichisches Museum für Kunst und Industrie and Sammlung Papyrus Erherzog Rainer in the National Library) and in many private collections, as well as in the rich stores of textiles found all over Europe in churches and monasteries. Ibn Khalidān’s information is obviously based on his own experience, for the inscription in these textiles does actually, without exception, stand out in bright colours from the background: e. g. the pieces of linen, Inv. Ar. Lin. N. 11 and 19 of the Rainer collection in Vienna show a border of writing embroidered in red silk (N. 19 reproduced in J. v. Karabacek, Führer, p. 228 and do., Papyriprotokóle, p. 38). In Inv. Ar. Lin. No. 18 of the same collection, on the other hand, the fīrāz inscription stands out from the background and is embroidered in black silk; in the fine brocades it is often woven in gold thread. The texts of the surviving inscriptions also fully confirm Ibn Khalidān’s statements. In the first place as to the names of the rulers, we find various examples of these occurring alone on textiles. A green silk
damask from al-‘Aṣm in the Victoria and Albert Museum, Inv. No. 760–1898 (Guest, No. 9, p. 395 sq.; A. F. Kendrick, Catalogue of Muhammadan Textiles, p. 39) has the inscription Nāṣir al-Din Muhammad b. Kātān; a piece of linen embroidered with red silk in the Leningrad Museum has the name of the Fātimid caliph al-Aṣwāt il-lilāh (363/975 a.H.; A. K. Guest, J.R.A.S., 1918, p. 263, No. 1). The name of the ruler in addition to his usual titles, is frequently accompanied by a conventional formula, as Ibn Kātān also tells us (cf. below); thus, a piece of linen in the Kaiser-Friedrich Museum, the inscription of which I copied in 1924, has the inscription woven in red and enclosed in a white border: Bismillāh al-Rahmān al-Rahīm, Baraka min Allāh wa-rabbir rūhā b-Ilāhī ‘Abd Allāh al-Mu’tūfī il-lilāh Amīr al-Mu’minīn, wa-ilāh ‘Abū ʿAbbās (cf. in the name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate. The blessing of God, grace, and good fortune upon the servant of God, Dżafar, the Imām al-Mu’tadir b-Ilāhī, the Commander of the Faithful, whom may God long preserve. [This is part] of what the vizier Abū Ahmad al-Abbās b. al-Hasan has ordered ...” (cf. J. v. Karabacek, Papyrusprotokolle, p. 39). One of the most important tīrāz in the collection of textiles in the Arab Museum in Cairo, found in al-Fustāj (cf. Herr-Bey, Catalogue rai-sonné, p. 271; E. Kühnel, Il., x, 83) bears the following inscription: Bismillāh, Baraka min Allāh il-lilāh Amīr Muḥammad Amīr al-Mu’minin, wa-ilāh ‘Abū ʿAbbās (cf. In the name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate. The blessing of God upon the servant of God, Amīr Muḥammad, the Commander of the Faithful, whom may God long preserve. [This is part] of what he ordered to be made in the public factory in Miṣr (al-Fustāj) through al-Faḍl b. al-Rahīm, the freedman upon the Commander of the Faithful”, al-Faḍl b. al-Rahīm, born 140 a.H., died 208 a.H., was according to Ibn Taghribirdi (l. 598), chamberlain and vizier of the caliph Hārūn al-Rashīd; after the latter’s death, he took possession of the storehouses (phāra) and handed them over to his successor designate, al-Amin in Baghdad, at the same time bringing him the insignia of the ruler — the cloak, the staff and the signet ring — for which al-Amin showed him marks of honour and entrusted him with the management of his affairs. In his capacity as Amīr’s vizier, he had also to see to the manufacture of the textiles intended for the caliph, as we learn from the above tīrāz. He is also mentioned in the tīrāz of two curtains (al-sūr) for the Küna‘ mentioned by al-Maṣūkht, Abū Dām, l. 181, 226 (cf. von Karabacek, Papyrusprotokolle, p. 35). In this connection, we may also mention a piece of linen from Sāmarrā‘ with an inscription embroidered in red silk (cf. E. Kühnel, Il., x, 87 and fig. 3) which reads: Baraka min Allāh bi-‘Abd Allāh il-Mu’min Allāh al-Mu’tamid ‘alā ilāh Amīr al-Mu’minin, wa-ilāh ‘Abū ʿAbbās (cf. in the name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate. There is no god but Allāh, Muḥammad is the Messenger of God, ‘Ali is the vice-regent of God ... al-Mustaṣāmīr b-Ilāhī, Commander of the Faithful, God’s blessing upon him and his ancestors (the most noble), the pure and his sons, the expectant”.

Sometimes, in addition to such conventional formulas, the name is given of the place of manu-
The text of the šārs inscriptions however very often consists only of the conventional title of the ruler without his name, accompanied, or not, by certain auspicious formularies, or of the latter alone. A few examples will suffice here. On the brocade in the Ducal Museum in Brunswick several times repeated and divided by rossettes is the inscription ʿIṣṣ il-Mawlawīn al-Sūltān Qalāda Mubāku (O. v. Falke, Siedemnowerli, ii, fig. 342). On a piece of silk in the Arab Museum in Cairo we find: ʿIṣṣ il-Mawlawīn al-Sūltān Qalāda Nazīru (cf. Herz-Bey, Catalogue raisonné, p. 272); on a piece of silk textile in the Victoria and Albert Museum in Guest, J. R. A. S., 1913, p. 405 (A. F. Kendrick, Catalogue of Muhammadan Textiles, p. 40): ʿIṣṣ il-Mawlawīn al-Sūltān al-Malik al-Munīr; on a piece from Granada in the same museum, continuously: ʿIṣṣ il-Mawlawīn al-Sūltān (O. v. Falke, Siedemnowerli, ii, fig. 372). The well-known specimen in Brussels of the xiiith century A. D. in O. v. Falke, Siedemnowerli, i., fig. 172, shows, on the wings of the birds on either side, the inscription: al-ʿīs al-dīn wa l-dīn allah bi-l-qiblā. Only a portion of this formula, al-ʿīs al-dīn, is found on the textile woven in Syria or Egypt, Inv., No. 1235—1864 of the Victoria and Albert Museum in Guest, J. R. A. S., 1918, p. 264; A. F. Kendrick, Catalogue of Muhammadan Textiles, p. 44 (xiiith—xiiiith century A. D.). The already mentioned formula al-ʿīs al-dīn wa l-dīn allah bi-l-qiblā often occurs alone (cf. O. v. Falke, Siedemnowerli, also ii., figs. 338, 339, 340, 342; A. F. Kendrick, Catalogue of Muhammadan Textiles, p. 37) and pl. 37, 339: wish may mean Allāh "victory from God" is found on several textiles in the same Museum in Guest, J. R. A. S., 1906, p. 398, No. 12—15 (A. F. Kendrick, Catalogue of Muhammadan Textiles, p. 14): the formula al-ʿīs lahu al-qiblā al-masjid "the glory be Thine, the fortune, the splendour" is found embroidered in red silk on a piece of linen with a coat of arms in the Arab Museum in Cairo (Herz-Bey, Catalogue raisonné, p. 274). The conventional title of the ruler is found on a textile in the Kaiser-Friedrich-Museum in Berlin with pairs of griffins; in the circles of the braided border we have: al-ʿīs al-dīn al-qiblā al-masjid, in the central bars of the circles of the compartments, arranged like a coat of arms: al-sūltān al-naṣṣār (O. v. Falke, Siedemnowerli, ii, p. 63 and fig. 363), on a textile in Damascus (xviith century A. D.): al-ṣūltān al-qiblā (O. v. Falke, Siedemnowerli, ii., fig. 325, 329) On a piece of Syrian silk in the Kunstgewerbsmuseum in Berlin in O. v. Falke, Siedemnowerli, ii., fig. 377, we have the title al-sūltān al-malik; on a patterned textile in the Arab Museum in Cairo we find al-ṣūltān embroidered in silk thread (Herz-Bey, Catalogue raisonné, p. 273 sq.). In conclusion we may remind the reader of the pious formularies, which often make up the entire šārs inscriptions. Thus on the Maastricht specimen, with the lion, we have on the lion's back: al-malik il-lūlā (O. v. Falke, Siedemnowerli, i., fig. 153); others have the formularies al-amr il-lūlā which means the same thing (ibid., i., fig. 187, 191). A much used formula is al-burāk al-khāmilā (arranged in as a coat of arms on right and left in O. v. Falke, Siedemnowerli, i., fig. 205) or burāk alone (ibid., i., fig. 202). On a textile in the South Kensington Museum (Inv., No. 613—1892) in Guest, J. R. A. S., 1906, p. 399 (A. F. Kendrick, Catalogue etc., p. 18) the formula ma ʿabūn il-lūlā hāya "What God wills is done", in addition to a series of other formularies, which have only survived in fragments but are known on other textiles in the same collection (ibid., p. 396 sq.). The finest specimen of the kind however is probably that in the Musée de Cluny (Inv., No. 6526 found in Bayonne) which shows a portion of the symbol of Islam in letters, a span wide, beautifully woven. Occasionally these inscriptions are abbreviated by the omission of some letters (cf. J. v. Karabaseck, Die liturgischen Gewänder, p. 142 sq.). It may further be mentioned that datel inscriptions are found among the šārs; for example the piece published by Guest, J. R. A. S., 1918, p. 407 from the Engel-Gros collection with barmala and date 448 (cf. A. F. Kendrick, Catalogue etc., p. 16, No. 651 and pl. 6); another with the name of the caliph al-Muʿtaṣid of the year 282 in the South Kensington Museum was also published by Guest (J. R. A. S., 1906, p. 391; cf. A. F. Kendrick, Catalogue etc., p. 35; G. Salles and M. J. Ballot, Les Collections de l'Orient Musulman, p. 74). It has already been pointed out that the šārs bands with inscriptions correspond in a way to our orders and decorations. The presentation of garments adorned with them was a sovereign right of the crown, as much as the right of coinage. The custom of presenting such robes is certainly a very ancient one in the East. The Pharaohs used to give their faithful servants robes of honour, in addition to golden neck-rings and other valuable presents. It was understood that only for eminence attained great proportions. Not only was the decree appointing high officials of the state usually accompanied by a robe of honour, but the officials also received, at least once a year, a robe of honour and, at the court of the Mamlūk Sūłṭān, the Mamlūk and high officials of state used to receive a robe corresponding to their rank, twice a year, in winter and in summer (cf. A. v. Kremer, Kulturgeschichte, ii. 220—23; Kālqaṣandī, Ṣabīʿ al-ʿĀʾidh, iv. 55). According to Ibn Djabair, Khilāfa, p. 94, the dress of the preacher in the principal mosque in Mecca — and no doubt of the other large mosques also — consisted of a black robe trimmed with gold and a similar piece of cloth wound round the head, with a turban cloth of fine chābī linen; it was given to the preachers of the empire from the caliph's own stores, so that it was an official dress, given by the ruler. The robes of the emirs, which they wore on state occasions, were of course more gorgeous. Those of the Fātimids consisted of materials from Ḏābī with head-dresses with golden šārs borders, which were given to the emirs from the Caliph's stores (Ḍār al-Kirwā) (Makhtī, Kīfī, i. 409, 427, cf. 440). Kālqaṣandī, Ṣabīʿ al-ʿĀʾidh, iv. 52 sq., tells us that part of the dress of honour of the emirs was a turban cloth with the name of the sultān embroidered on it and the robes themselves had similar inscriptions.

It was only natural that the caliphs should lay great stress on this important prerogative of the crown and take every precaution to prevent abuses. What importance was given to the šārs and its preparation is evident, for example, from the fact that in Hārūn al-Rašīd's will (186 A. H.), in the
portion dealing with the allotment of the province of Khorsâm to al-Ma'mûn, the tīrāz-factories (kurâs) are specifically mentioned amidst of the khasâsī, the lust and the treasures (cf. al-Asrâr, Aḥābūr Mekhu, p. 162, 166). The mention of the ruler in the tīrāz is a mark or sign of his sovereignty as in the khasâs and, when al-Ma'mûn rebelled against his brother al-Āmin, the first thing he did was to omit the caliph's name from the tīrāz inscriptions (Ibn Taghrîbrîdî, al-Nadîjûm al-akhîrîn, i. 544; cf. further passages in J. v. Karabacek, Papyrography, p. 25). When a successor was designated, his name was put into the tīrāz inscriptions (J. v. Karabacek, loc. cit.); this applies not only to the inscriptions on textiles and on robes of honour but also to those on rolls of papyrus (cf. Corpus Paq. Raineri, iii., vol. i/2, No. 150, 158, p. 145 sq., 153 sq.). But while, in the latter case, the visier is often mentioned in the protocol, it seems very rare and to be a special distinction for the name of the visier to be put in the tīrāz inscriptions of robes of honour. The Fâtimid al-Asît bi'l-lâh, for example, put the name of his visier Ya'rāb b. Ysâf b. Khîlis (d. 380 A.H.) in the tīrāz inscriptions (al-Asrâr, Khaṭṭâf, ii. 6, 11, 284 ult.). Similarly the Fâtimid caliph al-Mustâri bi'l-lâh (1094-1101 A.D.) allowed his visier al-Ājah to be mentioned in the tīrāz as we learn from the tīrāz inscription on a textile in the Vatican Library (cf. J. v. Karabacek, Papyrography, p. 39), but, in this case, the name of the visier is followed by the additional words "in the name of the Imâm" so that the sovereignty of the ruler is fully guarded. Later, it is true, high officials kept their own tīrāz establishments. Thus 'Ali b. Ahmad al-Ra'iî (d. 301 A.H.), who was governor of all the territory between Wâṣî and Dnjâdîbârî on the one hand and Sûs to Shahrîrî on the other, maintained no less than 80 tīrāz factories, in which cloth for his own use was woven (Ibn Taghrîbrîdî, al-Nadîjûm al-akhîrîn, ii. 192; A. v. Kremer, Kulturgeschichte, ii. 293) and on a piece of silk from Egypt (21st century A.D.) in the Victoria and Albert Museum (Guest, J. R. A. S., 1906, p. 59; A. F. Kendrick, Catalogue of Muhammadan Textiles, p. 43 sq.) we find al-soyîdi al-agdâli Yûnîn al-Dawâla Abû Yûnîn, asfâl Allah bağ'ahu, "the most glorious lord Yûnûn al-Dawâla Abû Yûnûn, may God give him long life"; on the splendid piece of silk in the Louvre, published by G. Migeon, Syria, iii. (1922), p. 41-43, we have 'îs wa'i-tâhîl li 'l-Khâjî Abû Mansîr Nasîrîjîn Yâdîsâha, asfâl Allah bağ'ahu. The sovereign rights of the caliph however did not find expression only in the inscriptions of the tīrāz on garments. The right of covering the khalif by tīrāz was originally confined exclusively to the caliph (al-Kâlâshandi, Sûbî al-Âbîn, iv. 37). The 'Abbasids sent such kiswa every year from Baghdad to Mecca—they were often manufactured in Egypt—then this duty passed to the rulers of Egypt. In a Kâlâshandi's time, the kiswa was woven in the Masjd al-Husain of black silk with an inscription in white; at the end of the reign of Zâhir Barâkchî with a yellow inscription gilt with gold. A collection of the inscriptions on these kiswas has been made by J. v. Karabacek (Papyrography, p. 35—39). According to these inscriptions, the kiswa were made either by direct orders of the caliph to the governors and at the direction of the latter's financial secre-

...
garment that came complete from the loom and had not to be cut or stitched (cf. Herz-Bey, Catalogue raisonné, p. 266–268; A. Mez, Die Renais-
sance des Islam, p. 433). The export of the materials produced in Tinnis was considerable and down to the year 360 A.H. reached a value of 20–30,000 dinars annually. The village of Ta'na, which belonged to the administrative district of Tinnis, made the kind of stuffs and also kiswas for the Ka'ba (al-Makritzi, Kābiṣ, i. 181; J. v. Karabacek, op. cit., p. 36). There was a ti'ras factory here also. Damietta produced not only the same linens as Tinnis—but white in colour—but also gold brocade and the material known as Balchan (balqāh) (‘Ali b. Dawud al-Khaṭṭī al-Djahwarī, MS. A. F., i. 282a, fol. 69a; cf. also A. v. Kremer, Culturgeschichte, ii. 289) and other textiles. Shāri‘a also made kiswas and the stuffs known as Shāfī‘nī (al-Makritzi, Kābiṣ, i. 226, 5. 94a). Of the former we are told that they were made in a ti'ras factory which belonged to the state, as we know from the kiswas inscription given by al-Makritzi (cf. J. v. Karabacek, Papyrusprotokolle, p. 36); as to the latter this is not definitely known. In a papyrus in the Rainer collection (NW. 849 in the Ausstel-
 lungs; cf. J. v. Karabacek, Führer, p. 227) in line 6 there is a reference to a braided head-cloth from Shāfī‘nī (madī‘ī ūqāfī mawla) worth 20 carats of gold. This price must be considered fairly high, as those of Shāfī‘nī and Darbār (Darab) and Du-
mairān were not so fine as those of Tinnis (Idrisi, p. 320). The work done here by Copt weavers was under strict state control (al-Muqaddasī, B. G. A., iii. 213; cf. A. Mez, Die Renaissance des Islam, p. 118; C. H. Becker, Islamadventure, p. 184) which held the moment the weaver began to work, to the stuff in his loom. An official stamp had at once to be placed upon it. What these were like we know from the red stamp on the piece of linen, Inv. Ar. Lin., NO. 1 in the Rainer collection with the inscription al-Malik al-Mu'min (cf. Corpus Papy.
Raineri, iii, Ser. Arab. 1/fi, p. 59 sq. and fig. 2). It could only be sold through brokers appointed by the state and a government official had to keep a record of all transactions; only when this had been done, was the cloth given to one work-
man, who folded it up, then to another who wrapped it in a packing, made of bast (kīghī), perhaps the coarse papyrus packing is meant), then to a third who did it up in bales and finally to a fourth, who tied these up; each of these men received a definite fee. The bales were then taken to the gate of harbour and here also a charge was made and each man put his mark on the bale. The whole process does not very much suggest that we have a state factory here. In the Delta at least, we seem rather to have an industry con-
ducted in private houses, probably alongside of the state factories. The lot of the workmen—
women span and men wove and the workrooms were rented by them—was wretched; the half dinar, which was the daily wage, was not suffi-
cient for the minimum necessities of life. Wages throughout Egypt, however, were very low. Silks and brocades along with the fine sharb linens were mainly made in Alexandria, also however in Tinnis, Damietta and Shāfī‘nī (cf. A. v. Kremer, Culturgeschichte, ii. 353) which even in Roman times was celebrated as a silk-weaving centre and where the Byzantine court had a gynaeceum. While the quality of the material under Muslim rule was at first not so fine as in the earlier period, in the viii-th and ix-th centuries Alexandria was supplying Byzantium and the Pope in Rome (O. v. Falke, Säidenwandel, i. 48, 51, 110); and several popes used beautiful stuffs with the horseman pattern as gifts to churches. The state factories in Tinnis, Alexandria and Damietta worked mainly for the wardrobes of the Fātimid caliphs (al-Makritzi, Kābiṣ, i. 433; al-Kalāqānī, Šuḥī al-Čīgh, iii. 476; F. Wüstenzfeld, Geographie, p. 175 sq.) and their successors, and Abu 'l-Fidā‘ī, Šuḥī al-
Čāmī, iv. 101 mentions that the Dar al-Ti‘rās in Alexandria worked for the ruler's private re-
quirements (li 'l-Kābiṣ al-ḥayatī) (cf. J. v. Karabacek, Die byzantinischen Gemälde, p. 195). Dabār, which produced the curtains which were used to drape the throne of the Fātimid Caliphs on ceremonial occasions (al-Kalāqānī, Šuḥī al-Čīgh, iii. 499), was celebrated for its linens and turban cloths. Dabār textiles are frequently mentioned in literature, notably in al-Makritzi. The manufacture was an old established one here; a richly em-
brodered saah of the Coptic period in the Austrian Museum has within the border the inscription

Tūhī, the Coptic name of the town (cf. J. v. Karabacek, Die Theodor Graf'schen Funde, NO. 427). Of the manufacturing town of Banā‘ah we know little more than the name. The fragment of a silk ti‘rās embroidered in black from the Rainer collection (Inv. Ar. Lin., NO. 18) published by J. v. Karabacek, Papyrusprotokolle, p. 39, has the inscription khāda‘ī mīlab al-mārā‘ ibn al-‘mārī fī ti‘rās al-‘lākāt bānā‘ah ("this is part of what was ordered to be made in the factory of the royal property of Banā‘ah"). Where then we have the case of a silk factory, which supplied the caliph only, and was state property. We also know the name of the place from papyri. Besides the Faiyum in Upper Egypt, al-Ush mānāsīn was celebrated for its manufacture of textiles (cf. al-Iṣākhī, B. G. A., i. 58; Ibn Hawqal, B. G. A., ii. 105; al-Idrisi, i. 124; A. v. Kremer, Culturgeschichte, i. 353) as was Taḥkī, where woollen goods were made (cf. A. Mez, Renaissance des Islams, p. 432). Al-Bāhnās occupied a special position; in it, according to al-Idrisi, i. 128, valuable materials were produced which bore the name of the town and were used for making garments for the ruler and high officials; ordinary kinds were also made. The lengths of stuff, which were made in pieces of about 100 dinars cost 200 dinars the pair. Every piece of cloth, whether woollen or cotton, cheap or dear, bore the name of the quality, so that the purchaser could know what he was buying. As to prices, we get some information from a papyrus in the Rainer collection (Ausstellung, NO. 849) according to which a long turban cloth from Bahnas (mandā‘ī bāhnasī jawīl) cost 1 carat of gold. Idrisi, unfortu-
nately, does not tell us whether the stuff intended for the court came from a ti‘rās factory or from a private firm. A ti‘rās sulū‘ī is mentioned in ‘Ali b. Dawud al-Khaṭṭī al-Djahwarī, A. F., No. 282, fol. 91b, but it is not stated where in Upper Egypt this state factory was. Two papyri in the State Library in Cairo (Inv, NO. 96 and 103) assist us on this point, for a certain Rūmāb b. Yūnis is described in them as al-Muṭawakkil bi-ti‘rās U‘ṣūbahu mu-
Anjīnī. The man was therefore manager of one of the ti‘rās factory of Uqūnī and Anjīnī, and managed them both together, in which connection it may
he noted that the two originally separate kûra's of this name were later combined into one (cf. C. H. Becker, Fağrî Şehitt-Reînhardt, i. 20). In Cairo (al-Fustûḥ) under the 'Abbâsidâs, there was already a public tîrâs workshop (tîrâs al-šāmâna bi-Mâşr) as we know from the already mentioned piece of cloth in the Arab Museum in Cairo. The šâmâna is here apparently contrasted to the kâşîra, which means a factory which worked only for the caliph. This does not mean that in al-Amin's time the Cairo factory had become a purely private concern; it can quite well have been a state undertaking, which supplied private individuals as well as the court. In no particular case can we see with certainty how the question of ownership stood. We cannot imagine, as it has hitherto been usual to do, following Karabacek, that the crown had exclusive control.

While the Umayyads and 'Abbâsidâs had already devoted great attention to the manufacture of fabrics with the tîrâs and to the preservation of the rights associated with them, the importance of such fabrics increased under the splendid-loving Fâtimidâs. The account which al-Mâkîrî gives, following the very well informed Ibn al-Tawârîsh (Kâhi'î, i. 469), sufficiently shows this. Besides the famous state Dîr al-Tîrâs in Alexandria there was a factory of the same name in Cairo, which was founded under the successors of the caliph al-Áţish bi-l'âláh, in the name of the vizier Abu'l-Farâdîq Yağhîb b. Yâsuûf Ibn Killa, who died in 380 (991) and was also called Dîr al-Dîhâdî, because silk brocades were made there (al-Mâkîrî, Kâhi'î, ii. 104, 105 sq.). At the head of the administration of these state factories there was always an official of high rank from the judicial or military service, who was held in particular estimation by the caliph. A picked staff was at his disposal for the transport of the products of the tîrâs factories, as well as the necessary means of transport. When he arrived with the fabrics intended for the royal use, among which were the parasols and the robes called bâlîla and bâdâna and the ruler's personal apparel, he was received with the highest honours and a steed from the caliph's stables was placed at his disposal for the duration of his stay. His quarters in town were in the Manşarâ al-Ghâzâla on the bank of the great canal, opposite the door of the Dîjâmî' Ibn al-Maghribî, which had also fallen into ruins in Mâkîrî's time, and he received the same hospitality as foreign embassies. When the bales with the precious fabrics were brought in, the superintendent of the tîrâs presented himself to the caliph, showed him all that he had brought with him and called his attention to each piece, that went into the caliph's palace through the hands of his chamberlain. When the presentation was over he was given a robe of honour by the caliph at a private audience, — the public being excluded, an honour which was shown only to him — and then returned to his lodging. Only at certain clearly defined times, could he be represented by his son or brother. He held a very prominent position and his salary was 70 dinârs monthly, that of his deputy 20. The latter took charge in his stead, when he had to go to deliver the fabrics, and was present as his witness at the packing of the bales. When the parasol and other articles for the personal use of the caliph were brought into the public room of the Dîr al-Tîrâs, during which ceremony the people present stood up, the superintendent of the Tîrâs sat in his seat and his deputy carried through his task standing (cf. also al-Kalâqshandî, Sîhî al-A'ârî, iii. 476; F. Wüstenzfeld, Geographie, p. 175 sq.).

As already mentioned, the tîrâs-factories brought a considerable sum to the state by their valuable products. It is significant that out of the treasuries of the towns of Tinni, Damietta and al-Ughmûn in 365 A. H., under the Fâtimid vizier Ibn Killis could pay 200,000 dinârs into the treasury in one day (al-Mâkîrî, Kâhi'î, ii. 6) and the expenditure for gold thread was usually 31,000 dinârs and under al-Amir bi-Áhâmî Allah even amounted to 43,000 dinârs (ibid., i. 469). Under the Manşikûs, conditions seem to have been somewhat altered. At least, Ibn Khâlûnî (i. 223) tells us that the fabrics and garments with tîrâs were no longer made in their factories and palaces, workshops, and were no longer produced by the state in its own buildings but what the state required was simply woven from silk and pure gold in the houses of the weavers.

The institution of royal tîrâs factories was of course not limited to Egypt. We find them in other lands also. If we turn to the west we find one in Palermo in Sicily. Ibn Dîjibûrî, Rîhâ, p. 329, even records the name of an embroiderer who worked in the Tîrâs al-Mâlîk, as the royal factory was called. The chief piece of evidence from this factory is still the cloak woven for Roger II in 528 (1133), later the coronation robe of the Austrian Royal Treasury. In its inscription the factory is called Kâhsâna al-mâlîkîyya (cf. F. Bock, Kleinode, p. 29). This regnum regis erat produced finely woven silks down to the xiii century A. D. (cf. O. v. Falke, Seidenweberei, i. 119, 121). In Spain, Almeria, when the first 100 looms were working in Ídirî's time and valuable brocades, sîflûn and silver were made in the style of those of Dînjânî and Îsfâhân, was the principal centre of manufacture, but Murcia, Seville, Granada and Malaga should also be mentioned. In the latter town there was a factory for gold brocade (cf. J. v. Karabacek, Über einige Benennungen mittelalterlicher Gewebe, p. 6; M. J. Müller, Beitrag, p. 52; F. Bock, Geschichte der liturg. Gewänder, p. 39 sqq.). In Asia Minor there was a tîrâs factory at the Saljuq court; one of its products is the gold brocade of the Lyons Textile Museum, the inscription on the border of which mentions: Sultân Çâlîshâhî, son of Kalâqshârî (1219—1236 A. D.). Marco Polo (cf. O. v. Falke, Seidenweberei, i. 106) notes the industry of the Greek and Armenian population of the Saljuq empire, who made the finest carpets and rich silks. In Syria, Damascus and Antioch were famous for their textiles (O. v. Falke, op. cit., i. 108; J. v. Karabacek, Die liturg. Gewänder, p. 196). In the 'Irák, Baghdad was the most important; its speciality was the white Mars fabrics (Ibn al-Fakîhî, G. G. A., v. 252) but it also made silks and richly embroidered brocades which were celebrated throughout the west as hâlâdchînus or haoudchînus (O. v. Falke, op. cit., i. 108). Silk-weaving here can be traced back to a colony of weavers from Tuscar who settled here at least as early as the middle of the tenth century (J. v. Karabacek, Über einige Benennungen mittelalterlicher Gewebe, p. 28). On a piece of silk published by A. F. Kendrick in the Burlington
The development of the weaving of silk in Persia seems to begin with the transplanting of workmen from Mesopotamia, Amid and other Byzantine provinces to Sûs, Tustar and other places in Ahwáz by Shâpur II (cf. al-Mas'ûdi, Muruji, l. 124). In the province of Fârs, which was celebrated for its weaving of linen, there were factories like those in Egypt, which, for example in Fâr, worked both for the ruler and for commerce, while the ruler had also his own establishments in Shînâr, Djan-nâbkh, Tawâ-djî and al-Grandûdîn. Ibn Hawkal, B. G. A., ii. 213 sq.; J. v. Karabacek, Safardschirch, p. 106 sqq.; al-Idrîsî, i. 391, 399 sq.). Kârûn, "the Damietta of Persia", later became the chief centre of the linen manufacture and about 500 a. n. (beginning of the xii century a. D.), this was so strictly controlled that the Râbâbîn canal, important for the making of the yarn and the transport of the finished articles, being the property of the royal treasury, was only available to those weavers who wear cloth for the emir; here also we find the production under state control (cf. A. Mez, Die Renaissance des Islam, p. 434). Not less celebrated than Persia was Khuzistân (Susiana) as a centre of textile weaving. In Tustar, where silk fabrics, brocades, velvets, turban shawls, curtains, and the heavy kharz stuffs were manufactured, there was a state factory with a superintendent (zâhib) at its head. The curtains for the Kâhs were made of brocade produced there and as these, as we have seen, were sent by the court in Baghâdâd, we can understand the significance of the remark by Ibn Hawkal, B. G. A., ii. 175, that every one who reigned in the Irâk had a factory and a superintendent in Tustar (zîrâs wa-qâhib) (cf. also J. v. Karabacek, Über einige Benennungen mittelalterlicher Genre, p. 30—32). In Idârî's time, the material for the kitâb was already made in the Irâk (Nushkat al-Majâ'hîlî, i. 385). Not less important than Tustar were the two towns of Sûs and Kûrkhûb. In Sûs, where there was a state factory, khaz harz fabrics and fine linen were made (al-I斯塔khîrî, B. G. A., i. 93; Ibn Hawkal, B. G. A., ii. 175; al-Mukaddašî, B. G. A., ii. 416). There was also one such factory (zîrâs wa-l-tulûbîn) in Kûrkhûb, where as in Sûs, royal robes, rich brocades, and the striped materials, which took the name of the town were made (al-I斯塔khîrî, B. G. A., i. 93; Ibn Hawkal, B. G. A., ii. 175; al-Idrîsî, i. 383 sq.; J. v. Karabacek, Safardschirch, p. 107); finally it may also be mentioned that in Sindistân also, there was a zîrâs factory working for the ruler, in which robes of honour were made, with which the was very liberal (Vâštî, Mâdhâfân, iii. 48). On the origin of the weaving of the zîrâs nothing has been definitely ascertained. J. v. Karabacek (Papyrologie, p. 27) endeavoured to trace its origin to foreign, probably Babylonian-Assyrian influences and even thought that the many factories of fabrics in Fârs which were state monopolies and the erection of great storehouses for garments (khasîn al-khâniwîrî) might be taken as a royal custom inherited from the Sasanians (Über einige Benennungen mittelalterlicher Genre, p. 20). Karabacek seems to be right in quoting in this connection the statement in Ibn Khaldûn (i. 222) to the effect that the Persian kings before Islâm put the portraits of kings or figures and pictures made specially for the purpose on ornamental borders, and the Muslim rulers replaced these by inscriptions containing their names and auspicious formulae. Karabacek also points out that they were in this matter influenced by the Byzantines, among whom they found the zîrâs, which they took from the same source. G. Fhers, Cleomen, i. 205 also connects the zîrâs with the clavus and O. V. Falke, Sefedwâberî, i. 77, holds the view that the key pattern was imitated by the Persians also in the fifth and sixth century A. D. on the celebrated robe of Zsedegerd (before 640 A. D.; cf. Falke, i. 83 and fig. 105), the dress of the great king has these typical key pattern stripes woven in it, which run downwards from the shoulder and also down the back, as we frequently find in tunics from Afghanistân. Falke sees in the borrowing of the key pattern from the west on the tunic a sign of a new Persian style (p. 85) and a comparison with the famous Sasanian fabric with the horseman in the Berlin Kunsthistorische-Museum (Falke, i. fig. 107) arouses misgivings against the assumption of adoption of the key pattern into Persian court-dress, but we see here in what an un-Roman and confused fashion the key pattern has been interpreted by the artist. Perhaps there are connections here which we cannot yet see in their completeness, but it is well worth noting that the Roman clavus — the sign of the senatorial and knightly rank — is ultimately traced to an Etruscan origin (cf. the article clavus in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyklop., vii., col. 4 sqq.), so that an Oriental origin for this remarkable institution is not absolutely excluded. Memories of the ancient clavi survived until quite late in the external form of the zîrâs borders. Thus the two pieces No. 921 and 922 of the Abyâbid and Mamlûk period published by A. F. Kendrick, Catalogue of Mummûdian Textiles, Pl. 5, still show the same fundamental form as Coptic fabrics, although the decoration is slightly varied (cf. O. V. Falke, Sefedwâberî, i., fig. 26); even the custom, so frequent in Mummûdian zîrâs borders, of placing a figured or decorative strip between two bands of writing is already found on the border of a strip of Coptic cloth of the viii century A. D. (cf. A. Kiegl, Die ägyptischen Textilfunde, Pl. 9 opp. p. 48). The text used here is Psalm 24, verse 10 sqq. The continuity in art in Egyptian industry, which in the Muslim period, as far as the production of textiles is concerned, was mainly in the hands of Copts, makes the preservation of old forms and customs quite intelligible. It is worth noting that in Muslim fabrics also, the band of writing was often embroidered or woven in red silk. Perhaps the preference for this colour is due to the fact that the clavi of the Romans were usually done in purple. The privilege of the Prince to grant the latus clauius to the senators and the reservation of purple for the use of the
ruiter and, from 369, the limitation of the production of gold braid to the gyaeece, at least, afford parallels to the sovereign right of the Muslim Caliphs to the širāz and its presentation. The institution of the gyaeece was not imitated in Islam however. Only in Cairo was there for a time a similar institution, where the garments intended for the caliph underwent a slight fitting by a staff of 30 women under a female superintendent (C. H. Becker, Islamstudien, i. 183 sq.). The institution of the širāz in Islamic is in any case found quite early under the Umayyads; we know this from al-Kisā's account of 'Abd al-Malik's reform of the coinage and adoption of the Arabic language for the text of official documents. So far, it is true; we have only found one caliph of the Umayyad house—probably Marwān II. mentioned, on a piece of silk from Ashīm which bears the inscription [Abd Allāh Marwān Āmmu al-Mu'Amin] (A. K. Guest, J. R. A. S., 1906. p. 390 and A. F. Kendrick, Catalogue of Muhammadan Textiles, p. 33). The Muslim širāz and the Muslim širāz bands were brought into fashion. As early as Parzifal (311, 8), Anfortas wears an Arab širāz braided on his head dress and it is very curious to find that the vestments of high dignitaries of the church were adorned with širāz braid, which contained the Muslim confession of faith. A collection of Arabic širāz inscriptions on robes of the Madonnas and on pictures by Italian masters was made by Sewell, J. R. A. S., 1907, p. 164. I may add that on fol. 28 of the fine Vienna manuscript of René d'Anjou's Le livre du cœur d'amour épris (written after 1457 a. D.), Cupid is represented with a blue tunic with Arabic širāz borders written in gold on a blue ground, and two Brussels gobelins of the xviiith century show Abraham with širāz inscriptions in gold at the wrists and sides. The often clumsy imitation of Arabic inscriptions on North Italian silks is well known.

TIRE, a town in Anatolia, capital of the kâş of Tired in the vilayet of Aidin, in the province of the Kütük Menderes, 18 miles S.E. of Smyrna with which it is connected by railway. The present town presumably occupies the site of the ancient Arcadiopolis, later called Teirra (i.e. "town"), e.g. in Thysa-teira; cf. W. M. Ramsay, Historical Geography of Asia Minor, p. 104, 114). In the Byzantine period the town appears as Thyrrea (Θύρρεα) and Thyrria (Θύρρια) (cf. Ducas, p. 38, 73, 97, 109, 175, 196) and repeatedly played a part in history. In 1308 Sasan transferred many of the inhabitants of Ephesus to Tired (cf. Pachymeres, ii. 558). Travellers like Ibn Battûta (i.e. 307 sq.) who went via Birge to Tired which lay in the midst of orchards, gardens, and streams in the land of the "Sulûn bir Birge", i.e. of the Aidin-oghlu or the adventurous Catalonian chronicler Ramon Muntaner (sec. 25) used to pass through Tired. When in 1403 Timur advanced against the town, the inhabitants fled to Smyrna (cf. Ducas, p. 38, 97, 109). After the collapse of the petty kingdom of the Aidin-oghlu in 830 (1426), Tired became Ottoman. It plays no particular part in later history; it was a mint down to the 17th century and is occasionally mentioned in connection with risings (cf. J. von Hammer, G. O. E., iv. 398, note v. and v. 50 note). In Timur is the tomb of the celebrated Iskender the "Abd al-Latif b. Abd al-Azîz b. Shirîfî (Ar. Ibn al-Malak, Turk. Firîştî-oglu, d. according to the Shihâb al-A’in of 1302, p. 239 in 799 [1396]; cf. on this point Şâhiîfî al-Nâmînîâyî, p. 66 sg.) known as the author of a once much used Turkish dictionary in verse (Lughâtî Firîştî-oglu) and of a commentary on the principles of jurisprudence, Manâhîl Arba‘înî of a Naqî (cf. s.v.). He taught there in a madrasa which bears his name and is still in use. Tired was also the birthplace of several Ottoman authors, e.g. Shaikh Haidar b. Sa‘îd Allah (cf. ‘Atî‘î, Dhâhil on the Şâhiîfî, p. 101), Molla Nasr Allah al-Kûrî (ibid., p. 123) and the scene of activity of kâshîs who also played a part in literature (cf. ibid., p. 130, 172 and F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 145: Djaşi‘hade). Tired is also mentioned as a place of banishment; the versatile historian Şâmî-Shâhde for example ended his life here (cf. F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 346). The earlier European travellers rarely visited Tired. The chaplain of the English convent in Smyrna, EDM. Chishull (d. 1755) is of the few who visited Tired (cf. Travels in Turkey and back to London (London 1747), p. 19 and Thos. Smith, Septem Asiae Ecclesiastarum Notit. It was then thought that Tired represented Thytâteîza (Tekâ Hitâya), one of the "Seven Churches of Asia". Ewliya Celebi (q. v.) describes Tired in the ninth, still unpublished, volume of his Travels. The town does not seem to possess any antiquities. Mention may be made of the library of 1,325 volumes (including the hagiology of the above mentioned commentary of Firîştî-oglu), presented by Nadîjî Pãhsh, governor of Baghda’d. Down to the Turk-Greek exchange of population, Tired had about 15,000, mainly Greek, inhabitants (cf. V. Cuinet, Turquis d’Asie, iii. 508 sqq.) who were mainly occupied in carpet-weaving and the cultivation of the vine.


TIREBOLI, capital of the kâş of Tired in the vilayet of Trapezunt in Anatolia on the Black Sea, picturesquely situated on three capes from which the town of Tripolis, founded by Greeks from Miletus in the eighth century b. c., received its name. The town is commanded by a mediaeval castle; the remains of two small churches still recall the Byzantine period. In view of its proximity to Trapezunt and Keraitis, Tired played no special part in history in ancient or modern times. The Comnenoi of Trapezunt were fond of living in the castle here. The conquest of Trapezunt by Mehemmed II in the autumn of 1461 also sealed the fate of Tired. The inhabitants fled to the fortress of Petrona 20 miles away and only surrendered after a long siege, when starved out. Henceforth Tiredboi belonged to the Ottoman empire. While the Spaniard Ray Gonnâle de Clavijo on his journey to Samarkand in 1405 still found Tiredboi ("Tripoli") a very large town, the place later sank into comparative insignificance. European travellers have often visited and described Tiredboi, e.g. J. Pitton de Tournefort (cf. Relation d’un voyage du Levant, ii. [Paris 1717], 222 sq. with picture); Wm. J. Hamilton (cf. Researches in Asia Minor, London 1843, i. 255); A. D. Mortmann (cf. Anatolien, ed. v. F. Babinger, Hannover 1925; p. 411); J. Ph. Fallmerayer (Fragmente aus dem Orient, ii. 131, 133 sqq.) etc. In Tiredboi, besides 8 mosques, there are a number of Greek churches, some of them old. Near it is the now deserted dortish monastery of Şârî Kahlâfî (cf. thereon J. H. Mortmann in M. S. O. A., xii. 112 sqq. and xxx. 206, perhaps the individual in question). Before the Turk-Greek exchange of population Tiredboi had about 8,000 inhabitants, 4/ of them Greeks.

Bibliography: (in addition to works mentioned): V. Cuinet, Turquis d’Asie, i. 53 sqq.; C. Ritter, Erdkunde von Kleinasiän, i., Berlin 1858, p. 821 sqq.; H. Barth, Reise von Trapezunt
TIROBOL, the Turkish name for TIRÌMÌMÌH, a celebrated poet of the first century of Islam. He was descended from a highly respected clan of his tribe and his grandfather Ḥākim Al-Tāyī was numbered among those who came to Mecca in the year 9 of the Hijra to pay homage to the Prophet. He himself, according to the most reliable accounts, was born in Syria and spent the earliest years of his life there. Later he came as a soldier to Al-Kāfān and through the influence of some Khāǰirdī leaders became himself one of their sect, and remained true to their doctrines to the end of his life. Either as a soldier or in some other capacity, he visited several parts of Persia. His collected poems, which are preserved only in part in a very old Spanish manuscript, are distinguished from those of his contemporaries by a studied use of uncommon words, similar to the compositions of the rasfas-poet Ru‘ba, who made a kind of speciality of this. Ru‘ba was for the grammarians of Bagh a source of information on questions of obscure words and he alleged, according to the grammarian al-‘Aṣname and a few others, that he had learned these strange expressions from Tirimimah. This is not unfounded because Tirimimah was dead when Ru‘ba came into prominence. Different was the intercourse of Tirimimah with the poet al-Kumait (q. v.), a fervent Shī‘a poet of no mean order, for in spite of their differences in almost every other thing, their friendship was sincere and lasting. The betrayal of the Tamiits of the family of al-Muhallab and the downfall of Yazīd b. al-Muhallab in 102 (720-721) and the undisguised joy of the Tamiits brought Tirimimah into opposition with the poet al-Farazdāk and in the end the stinging ḥiṣā‘ī poem by Tirimimah it seems as if al-Farazdāk gave up the contest. This poem remained for more than a century, the pride of the Yamanis and was continually cited against the Tamiits. Tirimimah’s grandson Amān a century later lost a post as secretary in North-Africa when Ibrahim b. Aghlab, who claimed to be descended from the fami le of governors of North-Africa, 184 (800). The fragmentary state of the ḥiṣā‘ī poem by Tirimimah gives us only an imperfect idea of his character, but through some of his verses runs a pious vein, so different from that of his prolific adversary. Veres of his from the descriptive poems, abounding in uncommon words, are often cited in Arab dictionaries as evidence of their existence in the language; but I have been able to ascertain with a fair amount of certainty that Tirimimah uses many words which are also found with the same meanings in the poems of his tribesman Abī Zubayd, and of Ibn Mu‘īn (Tamit b. Ubayy b. Mu‘īn b. Al-Aḍāḥa), whom he both have known personally in his younger years and we may assume that the words he uses were really found in the speech of some Arab tribes and not newly-coined words, as is frequently the case with Ru‘ba.

Bibliography: Al-Tirimimah e. Ḥākim Al-Tāyī, a celebrated poet of the first century of Islam; (F. Beringer)
TIRMIĐI, a town on the north bank of the Amū Daryā (q.v.) near the mouth of the Surkhān. As Samʿānī, who spent 12 days there, testifies, the name was pronounced Tarmidh in the town itself (G. M. S., xx., fol. 105b) which is confirmed by the Chinese Ta-mi (e.g. Hsien Tsang, Mémories sur les centures accidentelles, i, 25), Russian officers in 1889 also heard the pronunciation Termis or Tarmiz (Shornik materialov po Asii, iv., 393 and 399). The town is now officially known as Termes.

Tirmidh does not seem to have been touched by Alexander the Great and is not mentioned in antiquity, although its foundation was ascribed to Alexander. According to Ḥāfīz-i Abrū (q.v.) text by Barthold in al-Muqaffariyya, St. Petersburg 1897, p. 20 not only Tirmidh but also Bursīghbā, not far from it on the river, was built by Alexander; Bursīghbā is said to be a Greek word and to mean "inn" (mīthunakbhamā) (See Turkmenbā Yazdāni).

At the time of the Muslim conquest Buddhism was predominant in Tirmidh; there were 12 monasteries and about 1,000 monks there (Hsien Tsang, loc. cit.). Tirmidh was then under an important ruler who bore the title Tirmidh-Shīh (Tabari, ii, 1147; B. G. A., vi, 39); there was a powerful fortress on the bank (Tabari, ii, 1147). In the year 70 (689-690), Tirmidh was conquered by Mūsā b. 'Abd Allah b. Khāzām, who had thrown off allegiance to the Muslim government, and ruled for 15 years by him (cf. Balkhārī, p. 417 sqq.; Tabari, ii, 1145 sqq.). Only towards the end of 85 (794) did 'Ummān b. Masʿūd by order of the governor al-Muṣafīdāl b. al-Muṣafīdāl succeed in taking the town from the governor. In this fighting and in later sieges and bridge-building, the island at Tirmidh, called in the Arab period Dijāzrat 'Ummān, played an important part; in the Ŭzbeg period the island is called Orta-Aral or Orta-Aral ("middle island") (J. Senkowski, Supplément à l'histoire générale des Huns etc., St. Petersburg 1824, text, p. 20, and the passages quoted from manuscripts in Barthold, Kʻ itb-i orkhānīya Turkestana, St. Petersburg 1914). The worship of the prophet Dhu'l-Kif (B. G. A., ii, 201) mentioned as early as the fourth (tenth) century in Kāfīf, was transferred here; after this cult, the island is now called Aral Paḫmābar ("island of the prophet").

On geographical conditions in the fourth (tenth) century cf. especially B. G. A., i, 298 and ii, 291. Tirmidh was an important port on the Amū Daryā; boats bound for Balkh and exported from there (B. G. A., ii, 325, s.). Like Balkh, Tirmidh was noted for its soap (O. cit., p. 324). Two natives of Tirmidh have attained fame in Muslim literature; the author of the famous collection of traditions Abū 'Isa Muḥammad b. 'Isa Muḥammad b. 'Isa Tirmidhī (q.v.) (d. 279 = 892) and the traditionist and mystic Abū 'Abd Allah Muḥammad b. 'Ali Tirmidhī (q.v.) (d. 255 = 866); cf. Brockelmann, G.A.L., i, 164. The latter's tomb, probably erected in the ninth (xvth) century is now the finest building in the ruins of Tirmidh and one of the most beautiful in Central Asia (picture e.g. in Ion. Geogr. Othām., xiv, 1908, on p. 552 with a Russian translation of the inscription, and in Barthold, Islam, St. Petersburg 1918, p. 57). The inscriptions give us in full what we are told about Muḥammad b. 'Ali in the Tahdhīrat al-Aswāfī (Por. Hist. Texts, v, 93) of Farīd al-Dīn Aṭṭār (q.v.), and in the Nafḥāt al-Umā (lith., p. 77) of Dāqiqī. (q.v.); we are further told that he studied under the same scholars as al-Bukhārī, which Samʿānī (G. M. S., xx, 1069) refers to Muḥammad b. 'Isa.

Tirmidh afterwards shared the political history of Khorāsān and Čārukār al-Nahr, sometimes, as at the present day, the Oxus frontier and sometimes the connection with Balkh being of greater importance. Under Muḥammad and his immediate successors, Tirmidh like other dependencies of Balkh north of the Oxus belonged to the empire of the Ghāznavīs (q.v.). When as a result of the battle in the desert of Ḵᵛāyun near Samarkānd (5th Sefīr 536 = Sept. 9, 1141) rule over Mā warā al-Nahr passed to the Kara-Ḵhīṭāt (q.v.), Tirmidh remained to the Saldāḏūq as is shown by the fact that Sultaṅ ʿObây in 551 (1156) Tirmidh was later in the possession of the Kara-Ḵhīṭāt from which it was taken in Dhu 'l-Kahtān 601 (June-July 1205) by Imām al-Dīn ʿOmar, governor of Balkh for the Ghurīds (q.v.). Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 135). Imām al-Dīn's son Bahārūn ʿAbd the (name occurs in Nasawī, ed. Houdas, p. 39) was appointed governor of Tirmidh. The very next year it was taken by the Khwārizmshāh Muḥammad, then allied with the Kara-Ḵhīṭāt, and handed over to the latter; according to Ibn al-Athīr (xii, 152 sqq.), this news provoked great indignation against the Khwārizmshāh throughout the Muslim world. According to Djuwaṅī (G. M. S., xvi/i, 64), the town was surrendered by the governor on the advice of his father to ʿOṯmān, Khān of Samarkānd; in Murkhwāṅī (Hist. des sultans du Khwarazm, ed. by Defrémery, Paris 1842, p. 51 sqq.) the Khwārizmshāh is mentioned in place of the Khān. After the fall of the empire of the Kara-Ḵhīṭāt, Tirmidh belonged to the empire of the Khwārizmshāh; in the autumn of 1220 it was taken and completely destroyed by the Mongols. In Djuwaṅī's narrative (G. M. S., xvi, 102) the conquest is mentioned that half of the city walls are in the middle of the river.

A few years earlier, we have the first reference to the sāyids of Tirmidh whose importance was not affected even by the Mongol conquest. When the Khwārizmshāh Muḥammad had quarrelled with the caliph Nāṣīr, he proclaimed through the learned men of his empire that the ʿAbdālids had appropriated by unjust means the countries which really belonged to the descendants of ʿAlī, ʿĀlāʾ al-Mulk, one of the great sāyids (a ʿādāt-i hussaynī) of Tirmidh, was appointed caliph (G. M. S., xvi/i, 97, 122). The appointment had no further consequences and we know nothing of the life or end of this anti-caliph. In the Turāḳī-Gušāta of Ḥamd Allāh Karwīnī (G. M. S., xvi/ii, 496) he is called Sāyīdī Imām al-Dīn Tirmidhī.

In the next century Ibn Bāṭūta (q.v.) (ed. Defrémery and Sanuqminī, 1948) records happenings in the Caghātai (q.v.) kingdom. ʿAlī al-Mulk Khudāwānd-zāde, a descendant of Ḥusain b. ʿAlī, lord (ṣajīb) of Tirmidh is mentioned. He is said to have thrust himself upon the Khān Khudāwānd Allāh at the head of 4,000 Muslim and to have been appointed visir by him. The members of his house are also called Khudāwānd-zāde in later times (in the Zafār-nāma, 1nd. ed., i, 210, pass. and in the Khudān-nāma, facs. Beveridge, fol. 208 contrasted to Khudān-zāde. The full form is found in the oldest recensions of the Zafār-nāma, composed in Tirmidh's time (Tehrān po ʿitārī Sīorang
Aziz, St. Petersburg, 1895, p. 131 and 199). In the Zafar-nama the “Khān-sāde” Abu ’l-Ma‘āli and his brother ’Ali Akbar are several times mentioned; in 1371 Abu ’l-Ma‘āli was banished for his share in a campaign against Timur (Zafar-nama, i. 231), but his exile was not of long duration; in the very next year we find him taking part in Timur’s campaign against Khwārizm (cf. cit., p. 241). A Khān-sāde “’Alla” al-Mulk is again mentioned later; Timur stayed at his home on his return from his Indian campaign in 1399 and from the campaign in the west in 1404 (cf. cit., ii. 190 and 593). In 1487 Ahmad Mirza married a wife of the house of the Saliyds (Bahrān-nama, fol. 206).

In the time of Ibn Battūta, when Balkh was still in ruins, Tirmidh had already recovered from its destruction by the Mongols; the town was not rebuilt on its old site but two Arab miles from the river; it was a fine large town with prosperous inhabitants (Ibn Battūta, ed. Defrémery and Sanguinetti, i. 56 sq). Among the ruins of this town is the mausoleum described by A. A. Semenov (PRIVATELY LENDARKA, ARKH., xix. 3 sqg. with pictures) with the tombs of the sainys just called Sultan-Sadat (probably Sulṭān-i Sādāt). The descendants of the sainys now live in the village (according to the latest census: 724 inhabitants) of Şahlābād near Tirmidh. A. Semenov obtained from them a manuscript genealogy and history of their house ending on the 14th Dhu ’l-Hijjah 1046 (29th April 1637). According to this MS., the sainy Ḥasan al-Emīr, son of the emīr Ḥusain, came to Samarqand in 835 (849–850) and thence went to Balkh and Tirmidh in 246 (860–861). We are told some of his relations with the Sāmindīs, with a number of anachronisms; for the rest, the genealogy only contains names (Sulṭān-sādāt occurs in it as a woman’s name) without facts or historical associations.

In the Zafar-nama (i. 57) “Old Tirmidh” (Tirmidhi-i Khuna) is mentioned alongside of Tirmidh. In literary works, including the MS. just mentioned, and on coins Tirmidh after the Mongol period is frequently called “The Men’s Town” (madrasul al-ridāf). After Timur’s death, the Oxus frontier again came into prominence for a brief period. Khalīl Sulṭān who had seized Samarqand could only hold the territory north of the Amīr Daryā. During the preparations for war between him and Šahrukh [q.v.], Khalīl Sulṭān in 810 (1407) restored old Tirmidh and Šahrukh, the defences of Balkh (Ibn ’Arabshī, Egypt, ed., p. 205 sq.). It is in this period that probably belongs the memorial to Muḥammad b. ’Alī al-Tirmidh, as stated above.

From the 14th (xvth) century Tirmidh, and as a rule Balkh also, belonged to the kingdom of the Orbegas. During the fighting for Balkh between the Orbegas and the Indian prince (later emperor) Awrangzēb [q.v.] in 1646 and 1647, Tirmidh was occupied by Indian troops under Sa‘dāt Khān (Elliot-Dowson, History of India, vii. 79, also Barthold, in Bulletin de l’Acad. etc., 1921, p. 204).

In the early years of the xvth century Tirmidh was in possession of Shir b. ’Alī of the Khungrat family, the founder of the town of Shahrāb (J. P. M. G., xxxviii. 276). A distinction was made at this time between the “great citadel” (bār-i bahla) of Tirmidh and the “fortress of the village” (kula) where the bulk of the inhabitants (of Tirmidh) lived. The unsettled condition of the following decades brought about the complete ruin of Tirmidh and of many other towns. In 1758 Muhammad Rahman Khān rebuilt the town (Barthold, K. izet mir seniyya Turkestan, St. Petersburg 1914, p. 74); it was afterwards destroyed once more.

In the second half of the xixth century, there was nothing near the ruins of the old town of Tirmidh except the insignificant village of Patta Hijār (with 1,525 inhabitants) and Şahlābād (cf. above). Patta Hijār acquired more importance when it was made the starting point of the Russian steamships on the Amīr Daryā. In 1894 the Russian fort of Termez was built 5 miles from the ruins and gradually became a town, but with a predominantly male population (according to the last census: 8,052 men and 3,669 women). In 1910 the Buhārā–Karaghis–Termez railway was opened; during the revolution it was destroyed but has since been rebuilt. The excavations conducted on behalf of the Moscow Museum for Oriental Culture have yielded in theumpu numerous important art treasures; the objects of the Buddhist period have been found.


(W. Barthold)

AL-TIRMIDH, ABU ’IBN MUHAMMAD B. IBN BAWRA B. SHAHWAH, the author of one of the canonical or semi-canonical collections of traditions. The mīda al-Tirmidhī connects him with Tirmidh, a place on the upper Amīr Daryā, at a distance of 6 leagues from Balkh (about 37th Lat. N. and 62nd Long. E. from Greenwich; cf. E. Busk, Naukat al-Khulūf, ed. and transl. Le Strange, G. M. S., xxiii., India, etc., p. 143; Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphates, p. 440 sqg. and map, etc., facing p. 443), where he is said to have died in 279 (892–893); according to other reports, he died at Būgh, one of the boroughs of Tirmidh, in 275 (888–889), or in 270 (883–884).

Of his life very little is known. It is said, that he was born blind but also, that he lost his eyesight in his later years. He travelled widely, in Khurāsān, Ḥiraḵ and Hijāz, in order to collect traditions. Among his masters were Ahmad b. Muḥammad b. Ḥanbal [q.v.], al-Bukhārī [q.v.] and Abī Dawūd al-Ṣaḥḥātī [q.v.].

Two of his works have been printed: his collection of traditions (Cairo 1292, 2 vols., lith., Mirza 1283, fol.) and his Sha’mālid, a collection of traditions concerning the person and the character of the Prophet (Cairo 1306, with a commentary by Muḥammad b. Kāsim Dja‘a’ī, entitled: al-Fa’al‘id al-Djal‘ā‘ al-Baḥl‘iyah lata i-Sa‘māl‘i al-Um- maniyya; and ibid., 1318 with 2 commentaries: the first, entitled al-Wa‘al‘i, by ’Ali b. Sulṭān Muḥammad al-Kari; the second by Abī al-Ra‘i‘if al-Munkwi (for other editions and commentaries, see Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 162). Brockelmann, loc. cit., mentions also a collection of forty traditions; it does not appear whether this was made by himself or by others. In Arabic sources other works on various subjects — asceticism, names and banya’s,
law, history — are ascribed to him, none of which seems to have come down to us.

His collection of traditions bears the title of ṣaḥīḥ in the edition printed at Cairo; elsewhere it is called ṣaḥīḥ; it deserves the latter qualification (cf. Goldziher, Muhamedanische Studi., ii. 231, note 2), at it comprises, besides traditions on law, also some concerning other topics. A glance at the list of chapters shows that nearly one half of the work is devoted to such subjects as dogmatic theology (ʿUqād, ʿIyyāmā, Līlāma, Dāhānā, Ḥālia, ʿAqīla), popular beliefs (Pītan, ʿArwā), devotion (Ṣabab, Ṭawwābiʿ, Ṣaʿdi), manners and education (Ṭāʾlā, ʿAdb, Ṣaḥīḥ), philosophy (ʿUmmāt).

The work contains far fewer traditions than those of Bahūrī or Muslim, but also less repetitions. It is chiefly two chapters that are particularly extensive, viz. ʿUmmāt and Ṣaḥīḥ. They are lacking in the other three ʿUmmāt (by this title the four collections of Abū Dāwūd, al-Tirmidhī, Nasṣāʾī and Ibn Mājdā are sometimes denoted). Though traditions showing a predilection for ʿAlī are not rare, those which favour Abū Bakr, ʿUmar and ʿUthmān are not lacking.

By two features, however, Tirmidhī's work is distinguished: the critical remarks concerning the ṣaḥīḥ's and the points of difference between the ṣaḥīḥ's, which follow every tradition. On account of the latter feature, Tirmidhī's Ṣaḥīḥ may be called the oldest work on ṣaḥīḥ that has come down upon us; the remarks on this subject occurring in ʿAbd al-Rahmān's Ṣaḥīḥ al-Umm are much less complete and scarcely authentic.

According to the Ṣaḥīḥ, as cited by Goldziher (Muhamedan Studi., ii. 252, note 1), the MSS. are not uniform in reproducing Tirmidhī's remarks on the ṣaḥīḥ's and the points of difference between the ṣaḥīḥ's, which follow every tradition. On account of the latter feature, Tirmidhī's Ṣaḥīḥ may be called the oldest work on ṣaḥīḥ that has come down upon us; the remarks on this subject occurring in ʿAbd al-Rahmān's Ṣaḥīḥ al-Umm are much less complete and scarcely authentic.


AL-TIRMIDHĪ, ABD AL-LĀH MUḤAMMAD b.ʿALĪ b. ḤUSAIN, known as al-Ḥakim (the wise), a Sunni theologian of Khurāsān, a muḥaddīd, a jurist of the Hanafi school and a mystic, d. in 285 (995). Some of these works still exist in manuscript; their style is somewhat prolix but they are very fully documented.

In his Nawawī al-ʿUṯlāʾ and his Ḫulūl al-Wilāya, he attempts to give an exodok mystical exegesis of certain mystic themes (developed by the extremist Shīʿī like the pre-existence of the Nūr Muhammadī and the Ḫūṭṭa Ṣadūqīya, the value of the 98 letters of the alphabet, angelology, the criteria of the state of "sanctity" which he was the first to study ex professo under the technical name of wilāya (borrowed from the ʿShīʿī); in it he gives a particular role to Jesus.

He tries to explain rationally the form of the canonical rites in his Ṭalā al-ʿUblāyya (which were condemned), ʿṣārīb al-Ṣalāt, Ṣanāʾī maʿārūkhū; his curious kitāb al-Furūḥ endeavours to show that there are no true synoims (which is half-Muʿtazila). He insists on introspection of the heart and professes a very high morality; his Kitāb al-Maḥāl castigates the different professing categories of hypocrisy and refutes the ḥikāy of the canaists of the time. He was the author of the first collection of biographies on the history of Ṣaffism but this work is only known from quotations.

He is the true precursor of Ibn ʿArabī who three centuries later studied him closely and admired him.


TIRMIDHĪ, SAIYID BURHĀN AL-DĪN, a. 893, also known as Saiyid Husain Tirmidhi, Saiyid Sirānī, or Burhān al-Dīn Muḥaqqīkī, a native of Tirmidhī and a disciple of Mawlaʾnā Bahaʾ al-Dīn Walad. After studying for some time with the latter he spent a long time in ascetic practices and finally settled in Tirmidhī where pulpits gathered around him. After the death at Konya of Bahaʾ al-Dīn Walad (628 = 1231), Burhān al-Dīn went to Konya (632—630) in response to the appeal of his late master's spirit and undertook the spiritual education of the young Daʾūd al-Dīn Ṣalīm who up till then had been studying law and literature. After nine years, in spite of the appeals of Mawlaʾnā, he retired to Kašāriya. It is evident from his biographies that he was in this town when the Mongols took Kašāriya and made a general massacre here (the MSS. of Mūṣṭafā Bāšī, Zīwāt al-Dawli, No. 5019 and 5020 of the Kitāb al-Dīn ʿumānī say that this event took place in 641 [1245]; for the details cf. Recueil de textes relatifs à l'historie des Selō, ed. Houtsma, iv. 241)). Shams al-Dīn Isfahānī, the Sāljuq governor of Kašāriya, was the patron and disciple of Burhān al-Dīn. It was he who saw to the performance of his funeral rites and built his tomb. We do not know the exact date of his birth nor can we determine accurately that of his death. Ewliya ʿCeli states that the maqām of Saiyid Burhān Tirmidhī was in Kašāriya and that he died in 747 which is clearly wrong. At the present day there is in Konya near the ʿāqā' known as the Tātīr-ḵānārī Tūrsī (the tātīr ʿŪrūsī), who is called Burhān al-Dīn Tūrsī; although there is no inscription on the latter, it has always been regarded as that of Saiyid Burhān Tirmidhī. Dawlatabhā, who regards Burhān al-Dīn al-Muḥaqqīkī as the shākh of Bahaʾ al-Dīn and of Mawlaʾnā, says that he accompanied them on their travels in Syria and to the Ḥudayla and that he died and was buried in Syria. This is not in keeping with the facts (Dawlatabhā, ed. Browne, p. 194; Bombay edition, p. 86; and quoting Dawlatabhā: Fehm, Safar al-Šawārū, Constantinople, Maṭbaʿāʾi Amīr, 1259, p. 82), Saiyid Burhān Tirmidhī owes his fame more especially to the part he plays in the traditions of the Mew-
lewis. From this point of view, it is in the oldest and most important sources for the history of the Mewlet order, such as Sipahsalar Manṣūhii and Efendi Manṣūhii, that we must seek for reliable information about him.

*Bibliography:* (in addition to the works mentioned in the text): Feridun h. Ahmadi, Sipahsalar, Manṣūhii-i Hadisvii Khwāniwud, Turkish translation, printed 1313, p. 159-164; Efendi, Manṣūhii al-ʿArif, Pers. MS.; Sh. transl. into Turkish by Maḥmūd Mīde, MS. ch. ii. (The MSS. of both versions are in many libraries); the French translation by C. Huart, Les Saintes des derewihc toursneirs, Paris 1915; Lālīn translation of the Nafṣālāt, p. 515-516; Elyūsī Čelebi, Siyāṣatname, Derel Sehdet 1314, i. 186; Khalīl Edhem, Kolıyette Shkëri, Constantinopel 1334, p. 118; Koppelii, Zade Fuād, III Mutawafugwan, Constantinopel 1918, p. 245.

(TÒTT in the texts one finds sometimes the Berber name Tīt-an-Piris, sometimes its Arabic translation: "Aīn al-Piris, "Source of the Breaking of the Fast"), a place on the Atlantic coast of Morocco, some eight miles S.W. of Mazagan.

According to the local legend, Tīt owed its foundation to a saint, Ismālī Amghār (Berber = Arabic ʿAbī dhikr) who came from Medina, led by a light which guided him in the sky, and settled among the Guālis, a branch of the ʿAnṣārī of Azemmour. He settled in the forest opposite a spring "situated in the sea" to which he used to go walking on the waves whenever he broke his fast; hence the name of Tīt-an-Piris. If we may trust the synchronisms given by the legend, his settlement here took place in the tenth century.

Ismā'il married the daughter of the chief of the country and became the ancestor of the Shāfī family of the Amghārīyin (cf. the article SHUKAYA), one of the members of which Mawlay ʿAbd Allāh founded an important ribāt at Tīt in the first half of the eleventh century. The history of this stronghold is not well known and al-Bakri, who enumerates with details the ports and towns of the Atlantic coast, does not mention it; but it should be remembered that he also omits Azemmour. In the eleventh century, al-Umairi mentions Tīt as one of the 42 large towns of Morocco; it paid 5,000 mithqals of taxes, as much as Tīgās and a little less than Sufāt. When in 1513 the Portuguese occupied Azemmour, Tīt also submitted to them and paid tribute. But in 1514, fearing that the ribāt might serve as a base for the Christians, Maḥmūd al-Nāṣir, the Waṭṭāṣīd sovereign, dismantled its walls and transported the inhabitants to the region of Fās; Tīt henceforth lost all importance, which passed to the neighbouring port of Mazagan which became the principal Portuguese factory in the land of the Dukkāla. At the present day it is only a wretched village among the ruins of the towers and gates of the old ribāt; its old name is hardly known to the natives who call it after the founder of the ribāt: Mawlay ʿAbd Allāh.

In spite of the resemblance of meaning, this Tīt has no connexion with Tīt-an-Quwarṣīn "Spring of the Saint (9)" which the Almohad historian al-Baidaḫṣ says is in Tīmānā in the land of the Barqijin and Ḥāwāta; we know that Tīmānā lies to the north and not to the south of the Umma Rabī. This second Tīt should, it appears, be identified with the place-name wrongly written ʿAīnī Bāqī in the manuscripts of Idris "a little place but nevertheless a town in character, inhabited by Berbers of mixed origin and lying on the road from Tīdīl to Salé, four days' journey from Tīdīl and two from Salé". It must therefore lie approximately in the south corner of the lands of the present day tribe of the Zāzīr.


(G. S. COLIN)

**TIṬTAWIN, TETUAN, FR. TETOUAN, SP. TETUAN, the Tetuan of Leo Africanus, a Berber place-name meaning "the springs" (a quarter of the town is still called al-ʿUṭūn); al-Idrisi gives the defective form Tiṭṭawin and the modern popular pronunciation is Tiṭṭawin, Tiṭṭawin. The name Tetuan given it by the Spaniards comes from the form found at the end of the xviiith century on coins of the early sovereigns of the Fatimid dynasty. It is a town in the north of Morocco, 21 miles S. of Ceuta. It is built on a little terrace which juts out of Mount Darsa and commands the valley of the Martin (or Martil) which flows into the sea 7 miles away. Between Tetuan and the sea lies a little plain encircled by the mountains of Angjera, of Bud Ḥāzār and the lower hills of the Baḥ Maʿdān. The Martin corresponds to the Ṭuṣāt of Ptolemy and the Tamuda of Pliny. These old names are perhaps to be connected with the Berber nomads: *pond*, *marsh*, for the low valley of the Martin is very marshy. Pliny mentions an oppidum called Tamuda; this must have been the name of the Berber-Roman town, the ruins of which can still be seen on the right bank of the Martin 2½ miles west of Tetuan near the bridge on which the railway to Shafāshāwan crosses; an old Lybian inscription has been found there. The river was then more navigable and ships could ascend to the oppidum. The Novitia Digesturum (Occ., xxvi. 13) mention Tamuda as the residence of the praefectus and of the ala herculae. The lists of bishops mention a Tamudanus episcopus.

The name of Tetuan is not found in the early days of the Arab conquest; the country was then governed by Yūlyān (= Julian?) who ruled the whole territory of the Ghamrā but Cetua was the capital. Tetuan does not appear in the Muslim history of Morocco until the ninth century when the empire of Idris II was partitioned in 850; the town fell to al-Kasnī along with Tangier, Ceuta, Ḥaṣr Masmūḍa and Ḥadjar al-Naṣr but the capital of this kingdom was Tangier.

In the xixe century al-Bakri knows Tītawin as the capital of the territory of the Banī Sikkīn, a section of the Masmūḍa of the coast; it was a town with an old citadel and a minaret.

In 347 (953) the Fāṭīmid general Djawhar came from Morocco to fight the Omajyads and marched on Cetua and Tītawin after having taken Fās; but having failed in his attack on Cetua he went no farther and returned to Siddīnāya. In 399 (997) the Fāṭīmid general Bāqīn b. Zīr came to the top of the hill of Tītawin but did not take the town.

In the xixe century Tītawin is twice mentioned by the Almohad historian al-Baidaḫṣ; the Almo-
ravid general Reverter encamped there when he was pursuing the Almohad troops. Al-Idrisi mentions it as a stronghold (hisn) of the Madjaks. It does not seem to have played any special part under the Almohads. In 685 (1286) the Marinid Sultan Yusuf b. Ya'qub wanting to create a base for operations against Ceuta, held by the king of Granada, built an important fortress at Tetuan around which his successor the Sultan Abú Thabit 'Amir in 708 (1308) ordered a town to be built; the historians are not clear as to whether this was the restoration of the old Tetuan which had fallen into ruins or the creation of a new town on a different site. In 1350 Tetuan saw Abú 'Inan, son of the Marinid Sultan 'Ali b. Uquban, rebel against his father and proclaim himself sovereign. The new town barely lasted a century; it had become at the end of the sixteenth century a haunt of pirates, particularly dangerous to Spain on account of their proximity to its coast; in 1400 Henry III of Trastamare, king of Castile, sent a squadron of ships which penetrated into the mouth of the Martín and destroyed the corsairs' fleet; troops were landed who took the town, destroyed it and carried off many of the inhabitants as prisoners.

Tetuan remained deserted for about eighty years. In 1414 the Portuguese established themselves at Ceuta which was now to be held by Christians. After Ferdinand's capture of Granada, in Jan. 1492, many Spanish Arabs went over to Morocco; one of them, a valiant defender of Granada, Abu 'l-Hassan al-Mandari, obtained from the Wazir idr of Fès, Muhammad al-Shalih, the concession of Tetuan and the lands round it; gathering round him a number of emigrés from Spain, he built a fortress surrounded by ramparts and ditches. A new town was soon built with its Friday mosque. With a body of Spanish horsemen and contingents of mountaineers who had joined him, al-Mandari began to harass the Portuguese at Ceuta, the Ksar al-Shaghir and Tangier by his raids, taking many prisoners whom he employed on the building of the town. Leo Africanus passing through Tetuan saw over 3,000 of them, who were shut up at night in silos (a quarter of the town is still called al-Mu'minar, "the silos"). After the suppression of the risings of the Muslims of Spain, many came to join Mandari in the last years of the xviith and early years of the xvith century, especially in 1501 and 1502. To the war by land against the Portuguese was joined that of the corsairs by sea; Tetuan with the adjoining Shafahawan became one of the principal centres for carrying on the holy war.

With the death of al-Mandari the heroic period of the history of new Tetuan comes to an end; henceforth it was simply a town of bourgeoise from Spain whose only desire was to increase their wealth by trade and enjoy in peace the pleasures of art and letters. Independent and turbulent and favoured by the isolated position of their town, they tried to escape the authority and especially the taxes of the Sultan, but whenever they had begun to enjoy a semi-independence, they broke up into factions which conflicted the town and made foreign intervention easy.

Down to the time of the Alawid Sultan Mawlay Isma'îl, the supremacy seems to have belonged to the family of al-Nâşîst, which this ruler had to exterminate. The period of anarchy which followed the death of Mawlay Isma'îl saw the fighting between the Kà'id of the Dîhîbî, the Rif, Ahmad b. al-Bâjîyûr governor of Tangier, against the Tetuanese commanded by 'Umâr al-Wâjîûb; the Rifian leader finally succeeded in extending his authority over Tetuan. After his death (1743) the Tetuanese resumed their old habits, recognising all the pretenders who appeared in the district. In the xvith century, the important fact for the history of Tetuan is the Spanish-Moorish war of 1839—1860, at the end of which the town was taken by the Spaniards, who occupied it till May 1862. In 1890 Tetuan was visited by the Sultan Mawlay al-Hassan. In 1903—1904 it was blocked by the hillmen of the neighbourhood, who took advantage of the anarchy provoked by the rising of the pretender Abû Himâr. Lastly in 1913, the Spaniards occupied Tetuan which became the capital of their zone of protectorate in northern Morocco and the residence of the Sultan's shâhîf.

Tetuan, whose port is Ceuta with which it is connected by railway, is the centre from which the tribes of the Ghmâra and the region of Shafîthawwan obtain their supplies of imported goods. The local industries, especially the manufactures of brocade and of silk, are declining. The population is about 25,000 of whom 12,000 are Muslims and 4,250 Jews.


TIVUL, a term used in the administrative system of Persia (the usual pronunciation tivul is due to a false assimilation to Arabic plurals of the type fu'ul; in the same way Chardin's translation "perpetual" is due to an erroneous derivation from the Arabic fûtufl "long"). The tivul (at least in the xixith century and in principle) is the authorisation granted by the government to an individual to levy his salary or pension directly on the taxes which a village or group of villagers has to pay the treasury. In its simple form the tivul was a kind of guarantee to secure the payment of the pension. This guarantee was given sometimes simultaneously with the pension and sometimes later as an additional favour. The beneficiary could be a stranger to the village but he might also be its owner. The economic and social history of Persia still remains to be written and we can only indicate a few facts relative to the origin of the word tivul and the custom to which it gives its name.

Etymology. The word is of eastern Turki origin. Radloff, Öpt. Slav. u. lit., vol. 1343, 1380, explains it as "property assigned to any one, allotment" (das Zuerkleidt) and derives it from
the verb t-mah (== Constantinople Turkish, degmek == tayyak). From the point of view of morphology one might compare tayyel with the word baalul "camp" which has also passed into Persian (place to which one returns, from baalma, *to return*). The word tayyl is not found in the Mongol period: for example, it does not occur in Rashid al-Din’s chapter on Ghiyath’s reforms (MS Bibl. Nat. Paris, Suppl. Pers., No. 209, fol. 405r-413b and d’Ohsson, Histoire des Mongols, iv, 370-377). It is not even found for the period of Timur in the Zafar-nama. So far as one can see, the word first appears as an official term under the Timurids; cf. the Matul al-Sa’dain under 1110 (1407); cf. N.E., xiv, 1843, p. 124-125, where Quatremere studies the word and quotes passages from the Akbar-nama (concluded in 1597) and the Alam-ur (which comes down to 1629).

Origin of the Institution. Although the name tayyl is comparatively late, the practice to which it is applied existed in the time of the Saljuq or even earlier. The old Turkish word tayyl in the popular language must correspond to an official term like tayyl "feudal" (plur. tayyllari) which it finally supplanted. The Arabic term tayyl disappears just at the time when the terms tayyilghil (cf. below) and tayyil come into general use.

In chap. 3 of the Siyarat-nama, Nisam al-Mulk thus defines the prerogatives of feudalists (masal-gilan): *they must know that their statutory rights (as faraln) over the peasants (ra’sayla) are simply the levying in a mild fashion of the legal dues (madr-ba’ba) which have been assigned (hawalilat) to the feudalists. These dues having been levied, the cultivators remain free (alibin) in all that concerns their bodies, their wives and children. Their property — goods and lands (azbil wa-siyal) — is also free and the musabda’an have no claim on it*. The tayyl is thus reduced to the right to levy the dues (madr-ba’ba) payable by the cultivators. These dues have been levied, the cultivators remain free (alibin) in all that concerns their bodies, their wives and children. Their property — goods and lands (azbil wa-siyal) — is also free and the musabda’an have no claim on it*. The tayyl is thus reduced to the right to levy the dues (madr-ba’ba) payable by the cultivators. These dues have been levied, the cultivators remain free (alibin) in all that concerns their bodies, their wives and children. Their property — goods and lands (azbil wa-siyal) — is also free and the musabda’an have no claim on it*.

As to the first category the lands of the jami’at (ra’sayla) continued to enjoy their rights but paid all their dues (habra, madr, ba’afa), those of private individuals and of the musabda’ and those which are uncultivated. As to the first category the lands of the jami’at (ra’sayla) continued to enjoy their rights but paid all their dues (habra, madr, ba’afa), those of private individuals and of the musabda’ and those which are uncultivated.

Tayyl, a financial expedient. The regular tayyl is characterised by the simplification of the process, which is gradually transformed into a simple financial expedient in proportion as the number of payments increases and the central treasury finds a difficulty in making them in specie. Chardin, v, 416, for example, explains the origin of "payments by assignments" as mainly due to scarcity of currency.

The nature of the tayyl (i.e. of the right to appropriate the taxes of a village) was often complicated by privileges granted at the same time to the tayylidar (e.g. that of administering public domains on his own account). This explains the vagueness of the definitions given it by European observers.

Chardin translates the word tayyl by "assignation de terre" and distinguishes two categories of tayyl *for these estates are either the squandering of the charge, the great charges having all the marks of the "cultivator's estate under which condition the payment of the amount of wages and which remain perpetually attached to the charge; or they are assigned at the will of the treasury". In the latter case also, the payments had a character of perpetuity for a series of years. Chardin with much perspicacity criticised the system and concludes (p. 418): "the lands which are assigned for payment of salaries are not under the inspection of the king's men; they are as if they were the private property of the man to whom they are granted. He arranges about the revenue as he likes with the inhabitants of the place".

Similarly Kämpfer (1684—1688) enumerates three kinds of salaries in Persia: barat (claims on remote provinces), hamma salla (lands yielding only the amount of the pension) and tayyl. These *tayyl dar tayyl" which correspond, broadly speaking, to Chardin's first category are the lands (baghi, prudicia vel fundi) given to dignitaries of state (ministri regni) who during the term of their office enjoy possession of them (i) and of their taxes (Datum servitio cessar possession es et annum gaudent) and only draw from these lands (belonging to the Amir) a revenue equal to 3 to 10 times their salary.

Siyar-ghil. A distinction must be made between tayyl and the document by which the privilege was granted; this usually was given the Turco-Mongol name of siyvar-ghil (favour) or perhaps *inam", cf. Chardin, vi, 65 (who limits the meaning too much) and Badogov, i, 650. The firman of Shâh Housain Safawi dated 1113 [1701] (publ. by Khaykow, Mem. Isl. Hist., iii, 1859, p. 70-75) may be taken as a specimen of a siyvarghil (the only name for it has been used in the text of the document): the beneficiary has to put at the Shâh’s disposition seven armed men; for this he is allotted the annual sum of 6 tamsins, 3 hazars and 96 dinars and a half representing the taxes of the district of Dizmar which the beneficiaries have to pay their taxes (mud-dudvali [?] sada-usdudvali wa-bakshis-eti) to the beneficiary of the siyvar-ghil and the agents of the government are not to interfere with the exercise of this privilege. Thus the favour of the monarch (siyvar-ghil) constitutes the tayyl of the beneficiary.

Sixth Century. For the beginning of the sixteenth century we have confirmation of the exact sense of tayyl in Rawlinson, Notes on a Journey from Turkestan, J.E.G.S., vii, 1849, p. 5: "tayyl is a grant of the crown revenues of any town or district; the individual receiving the grant is usually entrusted with its realisation, though not necessarily so. The grant also extends only to his own lifetime, unless otherwise specified. It is calculated that about a fifth of the whole land revenue of Persia is at present thus extorted from the crown’s. But very often the tayyl proper continued to be associated with other privileges accorded to the same beneficiary, which disguised the extent of the tayyl. Dr. Polak who himself nearly became a tayylidar thus defines tayyl: *ebenfalls Kronland,
TIYUL — TIIMHCN

TLEMCEN, in Arabic TIMHCN, from the Berber tilmus (pl. tilmisiin or timlussin). *spring, well of water* is the *town of the springs*_. The old town a few hundred yards E.N.E. of the modern town was called both Tlemcen and Aguder, the latter, the old Phoenician name, which passed into Berber with the meanings given above [cf. Aqaddis] and also that of “steep cliff or plateau”, which corresponds exactly to the position of the place on a slightly inclined plateau rising abruptly from the plain which it commands to N. and E. Perhaps we may see in this name of Aguder the origin of the Arab legend which calls Tlemcen al-Djard or Madinat al-Djard and makes it the scene of the meeting between Moses and al-Khadij (q. v. and cf. Īrūk, xvii. 64996). The following other names of this town may also be noted: Pomaria *the orchards*, of the little town which the Romans had there and which is found in some Latin inscriptions found on the site of Aguder; — Tāgrāt, *the camp* (Berber), given in the 6th century A.D. by the conquering Almoravids who founded the modern Tlemcen and its principal mosque when they were besieging the older Tlemcen, i.e. Aguder, — and lastly that of Mansūra or al-Mahjud al-Mansūra (Arabic), the “Victorious” or “Victorious Camp”, a town 250 acres in area built by the Marinids of Fās a mile to the west with a great mosque, a palace and a walled fort at the end of the 13th century and beginning of the 14th, at the time of their first and great siege of Tlemcen. Of the three successive towns forming Tlemcen, Aguder in the east, Tāgrāt in the centre and Mansūra to the west, only the central one has survived and retained the name Tlemcen.

Geographical position. Tlemcen lies in 1° 30’ W. Long, of Greenwich and 34° 53’ N. Lat. It is 3,600 feet above sea-level. It is built on the north flank of a ridge of the massif of Tlemcen facing the sea, which can be seen 30 miles to the north, on the ravine which the Tafna makes in the chain along the coast. The massif of Tlemcen is a geographical unity; it consists of parallel chains running S. W. to N. E. which rise by stages towards the south from 400 feet just behind Tlemcen to 6,000 commanding the steppe of Alfa in the south. This Jurassic massif is bounded on the south by the ancient alluvial formations of the steppes, in the W. and N. by the argilaceous plains of the Cartemian and Middle Myocene (Horsemahn) and Lower Eocene, of the Helvetian and Pleistocene alluvial deposits of Lamoriciere and Bel-Abbs. From its geological formation of Dolomitic limestones resting on porous sandstones resting on clays and gravels so suitable for the collection of the rain water in vast subterranean basins, the Tlemcencian massif is a vast reservoir which distributes during the long summer the precious liquid from the countless springs, which never fail and give the region of Tlemcen for miles around the town the beautiful orchards and rich vegetable gardens which constitute its fortune and the luxuriant vegetation and beautiful woods which adorn it. The Jurassic massif, down the slopes of which run perennial rivers (Tafna, Mafrezah, Wād-Shullī, Wād-Isser) with their waterfalls and which is covered with forests (oaks of various kinds, thuyaus, terebenthines, wild olives etc.) and which gives a home to large fauna (lynx, hyena, jackal, fox, wild boar and other smaller quadrupeds as well.
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as countless birds). In the mountains are also many subterranean galleries, caves and caverns filled with pigeons and sometimes affording shelter to the animals and homes of the natives.

The soil is fertile and the flora varied; in the orchards of Tlemcen the trees and plants of the Mediterranean coast are grown as well as the species of Central Europe. The average annual rainfall is about 26 inches. It is spread over all the months of the year but is very low in July, August and September, which only have a few thundershowers. Snow makes a brief appearance each winter. The climate is healthy and invigorating and especially beneficial to anemic or neurasthenic people.

History. A situation so favourable for human habitation has naturally been occupied by man for millennia. Almost everywhere traces of prehistoric man have been found; but there is still much to be found in this region, so far little explored from this point of view and especially in the numerous caves, none of which, so far as I know, has been systematically excavated.

We know very little about the Roman Pomaria of which a few inscribed stones survive from its remnants. Avulisia (called on the inscriptions demus sanctus and demus invictus) forms the body of cavalry which garrisoned it.

Nothing is known of the history of Tlemcen between the Roman occupation and the Muslim conquest. If we do not know how Islam penetrated into this region in the viiith century A.D. we know no more about the Sofri Berber principalship whose chief in the viiiith century was Abil Karr. We know that on several occasions this emir of Tlemcen at the head of his Zenata Khairidji undertook military expeditions to the east as far as the Zift and Ifrikiya.

Sunni Islam was definitely established in Tlemcen and its vicinity at the end of the viiiith century. Idris I built a fine mosque in which he put a beautiful pulpit in 790. Henceforth Tlemcen—Agadir was the seat of a Muslim provincial government which experienced all the vicissitudes of the central and western Maghrib.

Modern Tlemcen (Taghritar) founded at the end of the xith century by Yusuf b. Tashfin developed considerably and the Almohads at the end of the viith (xiiith) century surrounded this town (Taghritar) with a rampart, for Agadir already had its own walls.

Of the Almoravid Tlemcen, which was a centre of theological and legal studies (1081—1144) in which celebrated masters flourished, there remains as an expression of religion in art, the great mosque with its vigorous and elegant floral epigraphic ornamentation of carved slabs around the mihrab. Almost 55 years after the occupation of Tlemcen that the Almohads finished the decoration of this part of the great mosque as we know from a beautiful inscription running round the cornice of the drum of the dome in front of the mihrab giving the date 530 (1135 A. D. BC).

It is remarkable that the great builders of monuments like the Almohads have left no trace of their rule in Tlemcen (1144—1236) except the solid rampart of terre pisé around the town. No building in Tlemcen or its immediate neighbourhood can be attributed to them. It was during this period (1197) that the great mystic, Abul Ma'dyan (q. v.) of al-Ash'ar, who is buried at Tlemcen, became the patron saint of the town.

In the first half of the viith (xiiith) century when the Almohad empire, weakened by lack of energy and authority in its rulers, was being exposed to the attacks of nomad Berber tribes in the west and the Hashif governors of Ifrikiya rebelled against the imperial authority and declared themselves independent, the Zenata tribes of the Banu 'Abd al-Wadid [cf. 'abd al-wadid] (q. v.) in the Central Maghrib and the Banu Marthin [cf. marthin] (q. v.) successively formed two kingdoms having Tlemcen and Fis as capitals.

In spite of the almost continual attacks, often successful, of which Tlemcen and the 'Abd al-Wadid kingdom were the objects during the viith (xiiith) and viith (xivith) century, especially from their Hashif neighbours in Tunisia and the Marthinids of Fis, the kings of this Tlemcen dynasty found time to embellish their capital with various buildings, some of which still exist. They also cultivated the sciences and founded madrasas for students, one of which, in the village of al-Chibba near Tlemcen, the great historian of the Berbers, Ibn Khludin, retired for a time, still exists. They realised the commercial importance of Tlemcen for relations with the Sahara, the high plateaus and the Tifelt and entertained constant relations with Spain through their port of Humaia; they also did not fail to take advantage of the favourable position of the town for trade with east and west since it was on the great natural road from east to west.

Tlemcen was not only a centre of trade, a market for the products of the country around, but its own industries produced articles which were much sought after as they still are. At the time of the emigration of the Moors from Spain in the xith (xvith) century, Tlemcen received an important contingent of them, which gave it renewed activity in various fields (learning, industry, art, literature and music, agriculture, etc.).

Unfortunately this town so well gifted by nature and climate was never rich even at the height of its power when it was the capital of the central Maghrib, to spread Muslim culture as one would have expected. This was because it was surrounded by nomad tribes in a continuous state of agitation: Berbers of the Zenata or Hilali Arab; the latter especially were much too turbulent neighbours and politically too unreliable for the capital to enjoy for sufficiently long periods the peace necessary to develop its culture.

The Turks and Christians of Spain disputed Tlemcen at the beginning of the xith (xvith) century. The last 'Abd al-Wadid prince accepted the sovereignty of the Spaniards in Oran, Salah Ra'is, pasha of Algiers, took final possession of Tlemcen for the Turks in 1558.

With the Turks, Tlemcen entered upon a period of moral and intellectual decay; commerce gradually declined and education ceased; no more fine buildings were erected; a number of public buildings and palaces were even allowed to fall into ruins. The popular poetry of this period gives an idea of what Tlemcen had become under the military and fiscal rule of the Beys:

*God has sounded Tlemcen's last hour! has He not devoted everything to an irrevocable end? For it the glorious days are over; the days of sadness and misfortune have come. It is ruined, it has perished, ruined by tyranny. It is clothed in mourning and covered with shame; vice has supplanted the former virtue."
In addition to the memory of three centuries of oppression, the Turks have left an important ethnic element in Tlemcen, the Kulgllis ('Korgii, "son of a slave or of a soldier"), the result of the union of the Turks with the women of the country. The Kulgllis still form a quarter of the native Muslim population of the commune of Tlemcen of which they form the most active element, the closest to European in character and the most accessible to progress.

From 1830 to 1853, Tlemcen, rid of Turkish domination, was under the Sultan of Morocco. This Moroccan suzerainty was even recognised by the emir 'Abd al-Kadir, who with the support of the Haçar (Moors and Berber-Arabs) had succeeded in establishing a precarious authority over Tlemcen.

The French entered Tlemcen for the first time in 1836 but abandoned it on May 30, 1837 (treaty of the Tafna) surrendering it to 'Abd al-Kadir's lieutenant. After the breach of the treaty of the Tafna, Bugeaud came and retook Tlemcen on Jan. 31, 1842. Henceforth peace and prosperity reigned in the town which had been ruined by the years of fighting between Muslims (Kulgllis and Haçar). Tlemcen was made a "commune de plein exercice" in 1854 and capital of an arrondissement in 1858. It is now also the capital of a judicial district, of a military subdivision and has a regiment of infantry and one of cavalry (aphis), many educational institutions, banks and agricultural credit offices etc. The population is about 30,000 Muslims, 6,000 Jews and 4,000 Europeans.

The attraction of Tlemcen lies not only in its verdant and picturesque situation but also in its monuments of Muslim art, which make it a regular museum of the best period of Hispano-Moorish decoration and in the public and private life of its Muslim Máliki population, who have for the most part remained faithful to the manners and customs of their ancestors. No other Algerian town can be compared with Tlemcen in this respect.

Besides the imposing remains of the old ramparts around Agáîr, Túrgrárt and Manšíra, and the numerous mausoleums of Muslim saints, the following may be mentioned as worthy of the attention of the archaeologist and lover of Muslim art: the great mosque (viith [xiith] century), with its minaret of the viith [xiith] century, the minaret of the great mosque of Agáîr (viith [xiith] century), rising on the site of the old mosque founded by Idris in the second (eighth) century which is no longer in existence; the mosque of Sidí Bel-Hasan (viith [xiith] century) with its graceful mihrab, its elegant minaret and the lovely lacework of its fretted and carved plaster, its floors of cedar in geometrical patterns (this building houses the Museum of Muslim archaeology). The mosque of the Usâr al-Inâm (beginning of the viith [xiith] century) stood beside the Madrassa al-Kadima which has disappeared. In the town (intra muros) one can still admire the Badhwar, a fortified palace built in the viith [xiith] century in the highest part of the town by the first 'Abdaláwíd ruler of Tlemcen. Next we may mention for their art, the mosque and sanctuary of Sidí Bráhim, the mosque of Sidí Sanátî and of Sidí al-Banna.

In the faubourg (extra muros) are to be found further treasures of Muslim art and architecture:
1. the ruins of Manšíra, this Tlemcen of the west built by the Martínids of Fas at the end of the viith [xiith] and beginning of the viith [xiith] century when laying siege to the 'Abdaláwídís, their relatives and rivals, besides the imposing remains of the flanking towers and of a part of the surrounding walls 4,000 yards in circumference, the ruins of an ancient royal palace, we are particularly struck by the remains of the outer wall and majestic minaret in hewn stone of the vast huge mosque; what still remains, some 120 feet high of this minaret of the beginning of the viith [xiith] century recalls by its vigour, beauty of decoration, coated with polychrome faïences, Almohad works like the Giralda of Seville, the tower of Hassan at Rabat and the Kutubiyya of Marrakesh.

2. To the E.S.E. of the town in the Muslim village of al-Usbûd still stands in perfect preservation the Mosque of Sidí Bû Madyan founded by Abu 'l-Hasan, the Marinid lord of Tlemcen for several years; it is dated 1339 A.D.; with the memorial porch of its main entrance, the swinging doors of cedar wood studded with carved bronze work, its halls of prayer with the walls covered with floral and epigraphic arabesques, its ceilings ornamented with protruding bricks, the dome lit by panes of many coloured glass in front of the mihrab, the minaret patterns traced on its sides in protruding bricks with the remains of paintings and faïences in delicate enamels, this monument, which is exactly dated, is a valuable document for the Muslim art of this period and country. Beside this mosque which the ruler built in honour of the saint whose name it bears, Abu 'l-Hasan erected a number of subsidiary buildings; a madrasa (1345 A.D.) quite well preserved in spite of the fact that some of the outer covering of plaster and faïence has disappeared, latrines and lavatories, a hamam, a palace now much decayed but whose splendour is recalled by the remains of its walls richly adorned with plaster and faïence. It was here between the mosque and the ruins of the palace that there was buried at the end of the viith [xiith] century the famous mystic, patron saint of Tlemcen, Sidí Bû Madyan; his mausoleum — an object of pilgrimage for every Muslim passing through Tlemcen — is a building on a square plan covered by a dome in 12 sections surmounted by a roof of green tiles; inside, the walls are covered at the bottom with Italian faïence of the xvith century and at the top with molded and painted plaster work. Many princes have adorned with some new decoration this hall which the faithful have filled with their gifts. The framework of the arch of the door is ornamented with arabesques in plaster of the Turkish period; a well with a border of onyx and four pillars of onyx with capitals supporting the roof stands in front of the mausoleum.

3. To the north of the town at the very foot of the walls in the centre of the Muslim faubourg of Sidí 'l-Halwî (the name of another great Andalusian mystic) rises another Marinid mosque, the work of Abu 'l-Inâ, son and successor of the sovereign Abu 'l-Hasan. This very well preserved building which, like the other mosques still standing at Tlemcen except that of Sidí Bel-Hasan (now a museum), is still used for worship, is another monument of Marinid art of the viith [xiith] century (1353). In the technique of its interior decoration (plaster covering of the walls, ceilings of cedar wood in compartments covered with geometrical patterns, columns and capitals of onyx which support
the principal hall of prayer and some from Manṣūra); this mosque may be compared with the madrasa of Bū Ḥanīfa in Fāṣ, founded by the same ruler at the same time. In the one as in the other of these two monuments we can clearly see signs of the decadence of the Muslim architectural art of Barbary. It is the period when Muslim culture is beginning to lose its hold on Tiemcen as on the rest of the Maghrib. This is not the place to examine the causes. But in the domain of minor arts (weaving, embroidery of gold and silver, ornamentation of articles of copper and wool, wood and metals) Tiemcen long retained an honourable place among the great cities of Islam in North Africa. Its countless artisans in these minor arts and industries are still renowned; they still hold the first place for embroidering in gold or silver thread on leather, especially the ornamentation of harness and saddle-cloths for horses for state occasions.

The population. One can easily understand that in this old metropolis of Islām, the native population (Muslim and Jewish) always very conservative, has preserved its original character in spite of the material and intellectual development produced by a long contact with Europeans, especially the French.

The Muslim population (agriculturalists, artisans, traders, workmen, clerks and minor officials) is the most numerous; it is formed of elements of diverse origins: the Ḥaḍar (lit. "citizens") or Moors are the result of the intermarriage of the former Berber occupants of the land with the Arabs; among them are also descendants of the Moors driven from Spain in the viith (xvith) century and ixth (xvith) century; the negroes, not numerous, are descendants of former slaves who came from Tust and the Sudān; the Kulglish, since the Turkish occupation. To these may be added an element in the rural suburbs, which are known as ġāna, whence their name of ḡandī. The whole forms the Muslim community of Tiemcen united by one faith, the same beliefs, a common family law, but deeply divided by racial jeff and family feuds.

Early converted to Islām and having probably adopted the Arabic language in the Idrisid period, the people of Tiemcen and its suburbs have always shown themselves greatly devoted to the cult of saints and the practice of magic.

The Jewish population has for some centuries been an important community here which, for long oppressed, has preserved its habit of close combination against the foreign and non-Jewish elements around it. The Jews themselves are for the most part of Berber origin belonging to the district or to Morocco. To these have been added from time to time foreign Jews especially Spanish at the emigrations. The old costume is no longer worn except by the old men; the younger generation educated in the French schools has adopted European costume and shown an aptitude and willingness to study. All however have remained faithful to their ancestral customs and beliefs, sufficiently close to those of the Muslims, in the belief in spirits and occult powers, in magic, in the sacred calendar, in the cult of saints and even for usages of family. However, in all the North Africa the Jews speak an Arabic dialect, it here strongly influenced by Moroccan and clearly different in phonetics, morphology, and even lexicography, from the Arabic dialect of the people of Tiemcen and that of the rural districts around it.

To sum up: then, Tiemcen, an ancient Berber city converted to Islām in the viith—viiith century using the Arabic language since the third (ixth) century, has since then remained Mālikī (no other Sunni school or Muslim sect has representatives in Tiemcen). During the middle ages it was an important provincial capital, then the royal capital of a Muslim Berber dynasty of the viith (xvith) to the xth (xvith) century. From the period of its glory it has retained intact precious monuments and numerous remains of buildings of great interest, traditions and customs, testifying to an established culture of its own.

The coming of the Turks, practically without influence from the cultural point of view, was of importance ethnically. The Kulglish (Turkish) element however has been absorbed by the natives so far as customs and religion are concerned but remains distinct from the social point of view and is hostile to the proper native element or ḍārī. Kulglishs and ḍārī do not intermarry or very rarely and are readily distinguishable by intellectual as well as physical features.

Next in order of numerical importance to the Muslim group, which is by far the largest, comes the Jewish group, then the French and other Europeans. No more here than in the rest of North Africa is there any fusion between the three great groups by marriage. Religion which for Muslims and Jews decides customs, family life and mental outlook, has established between these two groups and between them and the European element an impassable barrier to reciprocal penetration.

Leading their daily lives side by side, on terms of unrestricted and friendly intercourse bound by common interests of business, these three groups of the Tiemcen population are clearly separated by profound differences in upbringing and private life. If it happens that an individual of the Muslim or Jewish group joins one of the two other groups through change of religion or simply by marriage he becomes to some extent excommunicated and banned from the society to which he formerly belonged and may even be cut off by his own family.

being grown. The population consisted of the Afer, descended from the intermarriage of Romans and Berbers, and of Arabs descended from the soldiers of the garrison settled in the region. These two elements were however often at loggerheads and the first had the support of the people of Seif and the second of those of Biskra. The Hiáilt invasion dealt a decisive blow to the prosperity of Tobna. Sacked in 1064, after the defeat of the Hamáildís by the Arabs, Tobna rapidly declined. Its importance declined in favour of Biskra and it was not long in disappearing completely.


(G. Yver)

TOJIBIDS. [See TOJIB.]

TODMIR, the name given to the province (kūra) of al-Andalus, of which Murcia was the capital down to the time of the breaking up of the Omayyad caliphate. If we may believe the Arab authors, the word is an Arabic transcription of the name of the Visigoth governor Theodonir, who, at the time of the conquest of Spain by the Arabs, was the representative in Murcia of Roderick, king of Toledo. He is particularly known for the treaty which he made with Músà b. Nūqáir [q.v.], the Arabic text of which has been preserved by 'Abd al-Dabbī and Ibn 'Abd al-Mun'im al-Ḥimyarī. It was first published by Casiri, Bibliotheca Hispana, vol. ii., p. 106 and has been the subject of an elaborate study by Gaspar Ramiro, Historia de Murcia musulmana, p. 11–37.

The kūra of Todmir, according to the Arab geographers, was adjacent to those of Jæn and Elvira and its principal towns were Lorca, Orihuela, Alicante, Cartagena and Murcia. For the history of this part of al-Andalus during the Muslim period see the article MURCIA.


(E. LEVI-PROVENÇAL)

TOGHSA TIMUR. [See TOGHA TIMUR.]

TOGRUL. [See TOGHRIL.]

TOGHUZHGUZH, a Turkish people. The name was variously written and pronounced. The Arabic notices of the settlements of the Toghuzghuz correspond to the Chinese and later Muslim accounts of those of the Uighur; according to Chinese sources, the Uighurs were divided into nine tribes; according to Rashid al-Din (text in Travert, Oeuv. Ott. Arch. Oth., viii, 161), the Uighurs were divided into two main groups, the Oa-Uighur (ten-Uighur) and the Tokus-Uighur (nine-Uighur). It was on these facts that Grigoryev based his formerly generally accepted view (Vestn. Turkestan, v. 2, St. Petersburg 1873, p. 203) that for Toghuzghuz one should read Toghuughur, which
was a contraction from Toghuz-Uighur. This view was disseminated in western Europe by M. Th. Houtsmûl in his article "Türks" in the Encyclopædia Britannica; he was followed by M. J. de Goeje de Minn van Gog en Magog, Amsterdam 1880 = Mededelingen K. Ak. Wet. Sect. 3, v. 36—122). In the first five volumes of the R. G. A., de Goeje adopted the reading Toghuzghuz; in vol. vi. (1889) Toghuzghuz is used throughout and in vii. he went back to Toghurghuz. In the preface to this volume a few extracts are given from a letter from Th. Nöldeke, quoting Pahlavi Texts, i. 329 (Sacred Books of the East, xviii). Nöldeke observes that in the book by the Persian high priest Münßchir written in 881 d. (cf. now G. J. Pfa, ii. 104 where the form is Münßchir) we find Toghurghuz "in absolutely clear Pārsī script; (but and therefore not Uighur is the form in it)". A few years later, the name Toghurz-Ughuz was found in the newly discovered Orkhon inscriptions. The form Toghurghuz is perfectly certain; it is equally certain that it contains the name of the Ghuz (Oghuz); nevertheless the view has been recently upheld by several scholars that by Toghurghuz the Arabs meant the Uighur and no one else. J. Marquart (Ostasienstische und ostasiatische Streifzüge, Leipzig 1903, p. 300) lays stress on the fact that the first edition of Ibn Khurṭibīhī, said to have been written about 232 (846—847), already has the Toghurghuz in the district to which the Uighur did not come till 866. As the identity of the Toghurghuz with the Uighur seemed doubtful to him, Marquart thought the explanation was that we really had a recension of the book prepared not earlier than 272 d. Apart from the references given under the title, in which the Toghurghuz appear much farther west than usual (cf. also Makritz, Kultur, i. 313 on the title of the father of Ahmad b. Ṭūlūn [q. v.]), who came from the people of the Toghurghuz, the Toghurghuz are also still mentioned: in the east in the first half of the ninth century A. D. Muḥammad b. Mūsī al-Khwārizmī identifies the two Sefthias of Ptolemy with the land of the Turks and the land of the Toghurghuz (Bibl. arab. Historiker und Geographen, iii. 105, No. 1600 and 1601). Even the text of Dīghī (d. 369 A. D.) quoted by Marquart, op. cit., p. 91 shows that the Toghurghuz were regarded as having long been neighbours of the Khurṭibīhī. As Reinaud (Relation des Voyages etc., Paris 1845, Discours préliminaire, p. cxxvii. 399) has shown, what we are told in Arabic sources (e. g. in Masʿūdī, Murṣīfī, i. 288 and 365) about the doings of the Toghurghuz in China refers not to the Uighur but to the Turkish, i.e. Uighur, Sha-tu (on this tribe, cf. now also E. Chavannes, Documents sur les Turcs occidentaux, St. Petersburg 1903, p. 96 and 272). In spite of the Chinese references to the nine Uighur tribes, the expression Togush-Ughuz has not yet been found in sources of the pre-Mongol period; the Uighur Khân of the viii century of whom an inscription has been published by Ram- stadt, Zwei türkisch-inscrption aus der Nord-Mongolei, Helsingfors 1913, p. 13, calls his people On-Uighur Togush-Oghuz.

The name Toghurghuz, which properly belonged to the predecessors of the Uighur, the Sha-tu Turks, seems to have been transferred by the Arabs to the Uighur. The Arabs apparently did not know that the Sha-tu had been driven away by the Tibetans and the latter in turn supplanted by the Uighur. From what sources the Arab notices of the Toghurghuz are taken and to what date they refer has not yet been established; nor is anything known about the date of the journey mentioned by Yākūt (Muṣlamī, i. 840 supra) made by Tāhmi b. Bakr al-Muḥāwati to the "Khuṭbih of the Toghurghuz". The best sources, the account in the anonymous Ḥudud al-ʿĀlam and in Gazīzī have been in part used by Marquart (op. cit., Index under "Toguras, Uighuren"). The account in Idrīsī (transl. Janhert, i. 401) is quite different. It is important to note that the only Arab author who writes on Central Asia, not from books but from his own experiences, knows nothing of the Toghurghuz; on the other hand we find in him the Uighur (without a numeral) hitherto quite unknown to his Arab predecessors. Later writers quoting literary sources again mention the Toghurghuz in place of the Uighur; cf. the note by Fākhr al-Dīn Muḥābrī Shāh al-Marwānī (beg. of the vii [seventh] century) on his ancient city Tughdūgh and Toghurghuz (Adjāb-Nāme, A Volume of Oriental Studies presented to E. G. Browne, Cambridge 1922, p. 405 sqq., p. 407 wrong vocalisation: Togurghuz). It was only, when during the Mongol period more accurate information became available about Central Asia and especially about the Uighur, that the name Toghurghuz for a people disappeared from Muslim geographical literature; in the Nuzūk al-Kulāh of Ḥumād Allāh Ḫawwīn (printed in 740 = 1339—1440) it does not occur.

Bibliography: given in the text.

(W. BARTHOLOM)

TOKAT, a town in Asia Minor, situated in the northern part of Cappadocia, to the south of the middle course of the Tonzülflu, the ancient Iry. The town is situated on both sides of a mountain valley opening to the north and between the town and the river there is a beautiful plain. In a northeastern direction, facing the river, lay in ancient times the well-known town of Comana Pontica, the name of which still survives in the village of Gümenek; the site of Tokat was occupied by a fortress called Dairoman (on this identification cf. Ramsay, The Historical Geography of Asia Minor, London 1890, p. 349 sqq.). This fortress must have gained in importance during the frontier wars of the Byzantine Empire. The name Tokat, however, which occurs in the Muḥammadan geographers since Vāqī (Ṭīkā, Vāqī, i. 895; Abū Tāfīlād, ed. Reinaud, Paris 1840, p. 834—85), is said to have been derived from the Armenian form of the name Eudokia (St. Martin, Mémoire sur l'Arménie, i. 188), but this identification still presents difficulties. Ewliya Čelebi gives a number of other etymologies. After the Seljuk invasion, Tokat kept its strategic importance and was occasionally a princey or residence; during the Mongol invasion, the Seljūk sultan tried to put his possessions in safety in the citadel, and resided there, when the Karaman Oglu had taken possession of Konya in 1275 (Ibn Bibi, Rev. de textes rel. à l'hist. des Seljouques, ii. 352). Afterwards Tokat belonged to the states of the Eretma Oglu and of Kûfi Burhān al-Dīn of Siwa (vide "Aṭṭī Ibn Ardashīr Astarābādī, Bāmūn-ārānān, ed. Constantinople 1928") from him the Ottoman Sultan Bayazid II took the town in 1392. Timur is said to have been unable to take this stronghold (Ewliya Čelebi, v. 55); and, after his withdrawal, the Ottomans were soon again
mastery of the town. Under Mahammad II Topkâr was devastated by the army of Uzun Hasan, during the Karaman wars, in 1471, but after that time it does not play an important role in Turkish history; occasionally its prison in the citadel, called Cartaj-i Badawi, was used for political offenders. It remained, however, an important town, as it lay on the main caravan and army road from Constantinople to the East; by this road it was linked to Amasya in the north and Siwâs in the south. Other roads also converged to Topkâr, so that, in the XVIth century, it was the chief crossing point of trade roads in those regions (Traveller).

Topkâr has also traditions in religious history; in the XVIIIth century it was invaded by the adherents of Baba Ishâk (Ibn Bibî), p. 239) and Ewliya tells a probably legendary story about the attempts of Hâjîlîy Bektâsh to win the town from the infidels in the time of Erçogul.

Until the sixth century, Topkâr was a fazî in the sanjak of Siwâs, belonging to the eyalet of Siwâs. The legislation of 1804 made it the chief town of the sanjak Topkâr in the vilayet of Siwâs, while, under the Turkish Republic, Topkâr has become the capital of a vilayet with six fazîs: Topkâr, Zile, Arbaa, Nîskâr, Kehâdîye, Artîk Owa. Towards the end of the sixteenth century, the population was about 30,000 inhabitants, 17,500 of whom were Mahammadans (Cuienit). The chief industries were the manufacture of copper utensils and yellow leather, the copper being imported from the mines of Kebân Maskûn and Arghana Maskûn.

**Bibliography:** Ewliya Celebi, Siyâhet-nâmâ, v. 34-71; Hâjîlîy Khalbâ, Dîrikân-nâmâ, p. 628; Sâmî, Kamûs al-Asâm, iii. 1691-93; Türkiye Dîrikân-nâmâ, Sâhinî, 1927-29, p. 732; Ritter, Erdkunde, xviii, 111 sqq.; V. Cuienit, La Turquie d’Asie, i. 703-37; F. Taeschner, Das astroloîgie RomaîEEK, Leipzig 1924, i. 212; ii. 19. (J. H. Kramers)

**TOKHÂRÍSTAN,** also written TOHKHÂRÍSTAN and TOHKHÂRSTAN, a district on the upper course of the Amû-Barâyân [q.v.]. It is the name of a district formed from that of its inhabitants (like Afganistan, Balûcistân etc.), but the question of the nationality and language of the Tokhârians was no significance in the Muslim period. With the exception of parts of the mention of Balkh as Malnut Tokhârâ in Baldhart, p. 408 there is nothing to show that anything was known in the Muslim period of the Tokhârians as a people, although as late as 630 A.D. the Chinese pilgrim Hsuan-Chang (or Yüan-Chang) mentions, in addition to the land of Tu-ho-lo on the Amû-Barâyân, another district of Tu-ho-lo, then a desert, east of Khotan (Humen-Thang, Memoires sur les contrées occidentales, transl. St. Julien, i. 23 and ii. 247). The land of the Tu-ho-lo on the Amû-Barâyân was in those days divided into 27 small principalities; the northern frontier formed the "Iron Gate", i.e. the Bugdala pass between the valleys of the Khashka-Barâyân and the Upper Amû-Barâyân. In the Muslim period also Topkâr was in the wider sense included all the highlands dependent on Balkh, right and left of the upper course of the Amû-Barâyân. According to Yâkût (Magâvân, iii. 518), there were two Topkâr, Upper (al-afu) and Lower (al-irân), but he does not seem to have had any exact idea of this division. Upper Topkâr was said to be east of Balkh and west (according to modern maps south) of the Djâbûn (Amû-Barâyân); Lower was also west of the Djâbûn but more to the east than Upper Topkâr. The latter is also mentioned in B. G. A., vii. and viii. and in Tabari. According to B. G. A., vii. 93 (Ibn Rusta) Upper Topkâr, as was to be expected from the physical features of the country, lay north of the Amû-Barâyân; on p. 292, s the high lying territory on both sides of the Upper Amû-Barâyân is included in Upper Topkâr along with Badakshân and Sughdistan. In B. G. A., vii. 34 on the other hand it is assumed, as in Yâkût, that Upper Topkâr lies east of Balkh and south of the Amû-Barâyân. In Tabari (ii. 1559 and 1612) the expression Upper Topkâr twice occurs without its situation being defined. In another passage (ii. 1150), we are told that the lands of the Şûmân and Akgârân (north of the Amû-Barâyân on the Upper Kânî-nîhân) were in Topkâr, without the qualification al-afâw. Yâkût, B. G. A., vii. 289 and 290 calls the district of the town of Bâmiyân [q.v.] "the first" (al-âla) or "the nearest" (al-dunyâ) Topkâr. Bâmiyân was the "first of the districts (mumabîl) in the nearest, western Tokhârâ". Ibn Khorâdâbîdî assumes that Topkâr extends as far as the northwest including Zamun, the modern Kerki (B. G. A., vii. 36) as well as to the south where the frontier lands (dagu) of Topkâr are said to be Zâbulistan (p. 35) and Kâbul (p. 37).

The frontiers of Topkâr were in the narrower sense are given most accurately by I斯塔khri (B. G. A., i. 270 sqq.); they were the lands east of Balkh, west of Badakshân, south of the Amû-Barâyân and north of the main ridge of the Hindûkush; the most important towns besides the capital Tâleqân or Tâyêkân were Warwâlî and Andarkar.

The Hâjît (pl. Hayûlûa) appear for the first time in Tabari’s history of the Sâsânians during the fighting for the Persian throne after the death of Yâzdegûr II (438). They had conquered Tokhârîstân shortly before (Tabari, i. 573, 41 Nöldeke, Geschichte der Perser und Araber, p. 119) from whom we are not told. During the Arab wars with the native princes, the last Sâsânians and the Turks for the possession of Topkâr a dâbi-ga (dâbi-ga, Tabari, ii. 1206) is mentioned as king (mawlî) of Topkâr; he was a prince of the Turkish people of the Kharlûk (Karluk); the expressions dâbi-ga al-Tokhâr (ii. 604 and 1612) and dâbi-ga al-Kharlûk (1612) are used promiscuously by Tabari, although in one passage (1591) he does make a distinction between Tokhârîstân and the land (arg) of the dâbi-ga. Shortly before 740 A.D. these wars were finally decided in favour of the Arabs. Tokhârîstân later appears as a part of the kingdom of the Ghurids [q.v.] and of that branch which had its capital in Bâmiyân. The name Topkârân as that of a district seems to have dropped out of use since the ninth (xiiith) century.


**TOKTAMÎSH,** also written TOKTAMISH (e.g. regularly in Russian annals), Khân of the Golden Horde. The reading Türkamish described as correct by E. G. Browne (Persian Literature under Tartar Domination, Cambridge 1920, p. 585
probably on the authority of the lines quoted on p. 328) is contradicted by the reading in many manuscripts and on the Uighur coins and documents; for example Ibn 'Arabshah (Egypt. ed., p. 14 and pass.) regularly writes Toktamish-Khan. The accounts of his origin vary a good deal. The name of his father (although it is often corrupted in manuscripts) was certainly Tuli-Khoja, who, according to the genealogy given by E. von Zambour (Manuel de Genealogie et de Chronologie pour l’histoire de Tichwin, Hanover 1927, Genealogy S) and to that given by Lame-Poole and others, was a brother of the Khans Urs and a descendant of Orda, the eldest son of Djiusted; but according to Abou l-Ghurair (ed. Desmazières, p. 178), he was descended from another son of Djiusted, Tugel-Timur-Khan. Our only source for the life of Tuli-Khoja and the early days of his son is the anonymous work compiled for Timur’s grandson Mirza Iskandar described by Rieu, Catalogue of Pers. MSS. in the British Museum, p. 1662 sqq., of which another copy is preserved in the Asiatic Museum in Leiden (cf. the end of the article LAM-BAZIYAR, iii, p. 46). According to this source (As. Mus. MS., fol. 242b) he was governor (khatam) of Man-gushak [q.v.] and executed by order of Khan Urs; his son Toktamish had once or twice taken to flight but had come back again; as he was still a minor he was pardoned. In the year of the Dragon (= 1379) he went to Timur and was received by him in Samarkand; according to Abul al-Razzaq Samarkandi (q.v.; MS. of the University of Leiden, fol. 70b) he had been shortly before defeated by Khan Beg-Pulad. Timur granted Toktamish the towns of Otrar, Sabran and Shiginak; there he was attacked by Khulugh-Bughsh, a son of Khan Urs; Khulugh Bughsh fell in the battle but Toktamish was nevertheless defeated and had to retire to Timur. The latter lent him assistance and he returned to Sabran but was soon afterwards defeated by Tokhtaa-Kiyaa, another son of Urs-Khan and had again to flee to Timur. Timur himself, according to the Zaifar-Nama (Ind. ed., i. 278), at the end of the same year of the Dragon (= beg. 1377) had to take the field with Toktamish against the Khan. The enemy was routed and Urs Khan died soon afterwards. He was succeeded by his sons, Tokhtaa-Kiyaa first and then Timur-Malik. Timur returned at the beginning of the year of the Snake (=1377) to his capital; Toktamish was thereupon defeated by Timur-Malik but at Timur’s desire proclaimed Khan in Shighnak (op. cit., p. 284). In the winter (1377–1378) Timur was told that Timur-Malik was continually drinking and thus had lost all prestige; Toktamish was told of this and in the same winter by a rapid campaign he put an end to Timur-Malik’s rule; in the following spring (1378) he undertook from Shighnak the conquest of the western part of the Golden Horde and successfully carried it through (op. cit., p. 290). The period of these successes can be more exactly ascertained from the Russian annals. On September 8, 1380 the ruler of the Golden Horde, Timur-Mamish (in the Zaifar-Nama: Mamish), was defeated by the Russians on the Don at Kalikowo and soon afterwards by Toktamish in the neighbourhood of the Sea of Azov; in the same year the Russians learned of the victory of the new Khan. When in 1381 the submission of the Russians demanded by Toktamish was refused, Russia was cruelly ravaged in the following year by him (1382); on Aug. 26, the capital Moscow was completely destroyed and sacked and Tatar rule re-established in Russia for another century.

According to Iskandar’s anonymous historian (Asiat. Mus., Ms. f. 245b), Toktamish was a just and vigorous ruler (he is also said to have been a handsome man); but as a result of his ingratitude to Timur, his abilities were of no avail. Very soon after his rule was established he came out as an enemy of Timur; Khazr’ism was conquered by Timur in 781 (1379) and by 785 (1383) we find coins struck there in the name of Toktamish. So far as we know, Timur on this occasion took no steps either against the Khazr’ism or against Toktamish; in the (Zaifar-Nama, i. 442), Toktamish’s first hostile act against Timur is said to be his campaign through Derbend to Adjum-bijidjan in 780 (year of the Harc = 1387). Toktamish in the previous winter had already sent an army against Tabriz [q.v.] (Zaifar-Nama, i. 392) but Timur had not yet reached it so that his rights were not directly challenged by the Khan’s expedition. Tabriz was laid waste in the most terrible fashion. Killing and plundering went on for 8 days (so the contemporary writer Zain al-Din Guri; for Timur-Timur). Even on this occasion Timur still showed great restraint towards his opponent; from his winter quarters in Karakhs he sent his son Mirzaan against the enemy with a division. After the latter’s victory, the prisoners were released and Toktamish was simply reproached and cautioned by Timur.

Towards the end of the same year (1387) when Timur was still in Persia, Toktamish sent his armies to attack the Hence Timur’s empire. On this occasion the armies of the Golden Horde were everywhere victorious and advanced as far as the Amu-Darya; Bukhara was besieged and the country round it laid waste (Zaifar-Nama, i. 443). Timur had to return hurriedly and left Persia about the end of Muharram 790 (beg. Feb. 1388). It was not till 1391 that Timur began his campaign of vengeance against the lands of the Golden Horde; at the beginning of this campaign an embassy arrived from Toktamish, which of course had no influence on the course of events. On Monday, 15th. Radjab 793 (June 19, 1391) Toktamish was defeated at Kanduzir. Timur advanced as far as the Volga, but returned to his kingdom without having subjected the kingdom of the Golden Horde. Toktamish had to abandon his throne for a short time but soon returned again. We find a letter from him to the Polish King Yagello, from Tana (Azov) of 8th Radjab 795 (May 20th 1393) in which these events are narrated from the Khan’s point of view. Timur, he said, had been summoned against him by the Khan’s enemies and the Khan only learned too late of this: at the beginning of the fighting these conspirators had abandoned the Khan, so that his kingdom was thrown into great confusion. Order was now entirely restored and Yagello had to hand over the arrears of tribute: his merchants could travel freely about (Zaifar-Nama, i. 3. 1393).

There is now open enmity between Timur and Toktamish. In 1385 ambassadors bearing gifts had been sent to Egypt by Toktamish (Tiesenhausen, Sbornik materialov otzovomaybycha iistorii Zeletov Ordyl, St. Petersburg 1884, p. 427 sq.) but nothing was said about joint military undertakings on this
occasion; on the other hand the missions of 1394 and 1395 had the specific purpose of an alliance between Egypt and the Kingdom of the Golden Horde against Timūr (op. cit., p. 428, 445 and 450). It was the time of Timūr's "Five Years' War" against the west (1392-1396). In 1393 Timūr had sent an embassy from Baghdad to Egypt (Zafar-nāma, i. 642 sq.); by order of Sultan Barqūk [q.v.] the ambassador was murdered at Raḥba, the frontier town on the Euphrates (loc. cit., ii. 275). In 1394 Timūr wanted to go to Syria, but abandoned this idea and went instead to Northern Mesopotamia (Iskandar's anonymous historian, MS. in the Asiatic Mus., fol. 291b); according to an Egyptian source (Ibn Ḥadjar al-Asqalānī in Tiesenhansen, op. cit., p. 450), the reason for this was the news of a raid by Toqṭamših into Timūr's territory. Adharbāḏjān with the lands north of it as far as Derbend had been under the rule of Timūr's son Miranšāh since 1392 (cf. Tarkiz); Derbend and Shīrwān had previously been expressly claimed by Toqṭamših and coins had been struck there in his name from 790 (1388) till 792 (1390); but there is no reference to danger threatening from there in the year following. Timūr was delayed for a considerable time by fighting in Armenia and Georgia. It was not till towards the end of 1394 that Timūr in Shāki heard from Shīrwān that the country had been invaded by the army of the Golden Horde; they were easily repelled and Timūr took up his quarters for the winter in Maḥmūdābād (Zafar-nāma, i. 732 sq.). From here in the spring of 1395 he undertook his main campaign against Toqṭamših. Before the opening of the campaign Shīmān al-Dīn Alwalighī was sent as an envoy to Toqṭamših; his reply was awaited on the Shāmān (south of Derbend); when it proved unsatisfactory, the campaign took its course. The decisive battle was fought on the Terek on Wednesday the 23rd Dżumādā II, 797 = April 14, 1395 (Zafar-nāma, i. 745 sq.). Toqṭamših had once more to disappear from the scene for a time. Timūr never, as the Zafar-nāma, i. 761 says, reached Moscow but only came to the Velez, where according to Russian annals, he turned on Aug. 26, 1395. Soon afterwards Azāk (Asov) and in the winter Ḥādji Ṭarkhzān (Astrakhān) and Sarāyī [q.v.] were sacked with much bloodshed; in the spring of 798 (1396) Timūr returned via Derbend to Adharbāḏjān, once more without establishing his rule or that of one of his protégés over the lands of the Golden Horde. Toqṭamših was able to return to his throne once more; according to Ibn Ḥadjar al-Asqalānī, in 799 (Oct. 1396-Sept. 1397) he fought against the "Genoese Franks" (Tiesenhansen, op. cit., p. 451). On the 3rd Dhu 'l-Ḥejjah 800 (Aug. 17, 1398) Timūr received an ambassador from the rival and successor of Toqṭamših, Timūr-Ḵutluḡ, son of Timūr-Malik (Zafar-nāma, ii. 35; the date in the original source, Tkhātī po ilišerī Srobyń Aqźi, St. Petersburg 1915, p. 54). Toqṭamših fled to Witwott, the prince of Lithuania, who took up his cause but was defeated by the Tatars on Aug. 12, 1399 on the Workska. Henceforth Toqṭamših led the life of an adventurer. Shortly before his death Timūr received an embassy from Toqṭamših in Otkar, which he had reached on Wednesday the 12th Rajab (Jan. 14, 1405), bringing the assurance of his penitence and an appeal for protection. Timūr promised to come after his return from the campaign to China, to the land of the Golden Horde again and restore his throne to Toqṭamših (Zafar-nāma, ii. 646 sqq.). According to Russian sources, Toqṭamših fell in 1406 at Tāmān in Siberia fighting against a force of Khaṅ Shādī's (802-810 = 1399/1400-1407/1408); according to Iskandar's anonymous historian (Asiat. Mus., fol. 243b) he died a natural death.

**Bibliography:** given in the text itself. The earlier European accounts of Toqṭamših (especially Hammer-Purgstall, Geschichte der Goldenen Horde, and Howorth, History of the Mongols, part ii.) are no longer in keeping with our present knowledge of the sources. See also the article Timūr-ḵaṇ in: (W. Bartholomey, ed.) *Lexikon der Arab. Geographie.*

### TOLEDO (Ar. Ṭulajibula) Town in Spain

In the centre of the Iberian Peninsula 60 miles S. S. W. of Madrid. Built 2,000 feet above sea-level on a granite hill and surrounded on three sides by a bend in the Tagus, which has dug out its bed along the bottom of a deep fault, it commands in its immediate vicinity a fertile vega which runs to N. E. and N. W. along the river and beyond it is the plain of denudation of the Castilian plateau. Toledo has at the present day only some 25,000 inhabitants. It is the capital of the province of the same name and the see of the premier Archbishop of Spain. The old capital of the kings of Castile is now a little quiet town, but it has preserved a character of its own and is most attractive in a position of incomparable grandeur.

The Arab geographers who describe the Peninsula all give more or less long descriptions of Toledo. Idris puts it in the islim of al-Shārāt (las Sierras). In his time it had already been taken from the Muslims. He describes its excellent strategic position, its ramparts and the gardens which surround it, intersected by canals from which the water is raised for irrigation by means of norias. Abu 'l-Fidāʾ also praises the beauty of its orchards among the trees of which were pomegranates with enormous flowers. According to Yāḥṣī, the cereals grown around Toledo could be kept for 70 years without deterioration and its saffron was of excellent quality.

Livy (Hist., xxxvii. 7) is the first to mention the Iberian town of Toletum which was taken not without difficulty in 193 B.C. by the prosecutal M. Fulvius. It remained very little under Roman rule and when Christianity was introduced into Spain, it soon attained great importance as a centre of religion. In 400 a council of 19 bishops met there for the first time. Toledo was taken in 418 by the Visigoths and in the sixth century became the capital of their kingdom in the Peninsula. In 567 Athanasigis made it his capital and when the king Rekkare was converted to Christianity in 587, the Visigothic capital again became the religious metropolis of Iberia, on an even grander scale. The Roman Catholic clergy began to interfere in the political control of the country and to display their activity in numerous councils. It is in Toledo that is laid the scene of the legendary episode of King Rodrigo and Florinda, daughter of Count Julian of Centa, and in the town the spot is still pointed out on the bank of the Tagus where she was bathing when the Visigothic prince saw her and fell in love with her (Baños de la Casa). The invader Tārīq b. Ziyād [q. v.] took Toledo in 92 (714). He found it almost empty; only a few Jews had remained in it. Tārīq enrolled them in his army, which was
soon rejoined in Toledo by the forces he had sent to take Granada and Murcia. It is also in Toledo that the Muslim chroniclers locate the meeting of Tāriq and Muḥammad b. Nuṣair [q.v.]. The Arab leader only remained a short time there and continued his advance to the north of the Peninsula, going to Saragossa, which he seized.

The Arab writers, who deal with the history or geography of al-Andalus almost all record fascinating but legendary stories which circulated in the early centuries of the Hijra about the fabulous wealth which the Muslim invaders found in Toledo, when they took the city. The best known story is that of the "closed house of Toledo"; the sources which give it were studied by René Basset in 1898 (cf. the Bâbîl).

The name of Toledo recurs frequently in the chronicles of Muslim Spain in the period of the governors and especially after the establishment of the Umayyad emirate of Cordova. According to the accounts which they give, and which are confirmed by the Christian chroniclers, the town very soon became a hot-bed of sedition and a continual centre of rebellion against the government. It is certain that in spite of Muslim rule, the greater part of the people of Toledo never abandoned Roman Catholicism and remained Monarab. In spite of the great toleration shown by the conquerors, their rule was not accepted at all passively. The Toledoans never lost an opportunity of throwing off the yoke and, whenever a chance was given them, called to their assistance the ever turbulent Berbers, who were the governors of Spain or their successors, never able to exercise complete control. It was in Toledo that the great Berber rising of 122 (740) found most support and it was near it on the banks of the Wādī Saltî (Guzalete) that the forces were crushed by the troops sent from Cordova. It was again in Toledo a little later when 'Abd al-Raḥmān I deprived him of his governorship that Yaṣa'ūf al-Fihr sought refuge and he was killed near the town in 142 (759).

From the reign of the first Umayyad emir to that of 'Abd al-Raḥmān III al-Nasir there was not a ruler to whom Toledo was not a matter of care and anxiety, sometimes grave. In 147 (764) Hishām b. Uthmān rebelled there and 'Abd al-Raḥmān I had to send his two generals, Badr and Tammām b. 'Alkama, against the town. On the accession of Hishām I (172 = 788), his brother and rival Sulaimān had himself proclaimed in Toledo and the emir was forced next year to besiege the town from which he had to retire after two months without success. In 181 (797) soon after the accession of al-Hakam I, a new rebellion broke out in Toledo, stirred up by an individual named Ḫusayb b. Ḫusayb. But the Umayyad prince was not long in severely punishing the Toledoans for their habitual insubordination. Their spirit of rebellion at this time was being fanned by the verses of one of their townsmen, who was very popular with them, the poet Ghiribb. On the latter's death, al-Hakam appointed to the government of Toledo a renegade (muraḍ), a native of Huesca, named 'Amūrī who, by arrangement with the emir of Cordova, after gaining their confidence, hired the notables of the town into a trap in which they were all slain. This was the famous day of the ditch (waṣṭat al-hāfra) (191 = 807). But the brutality of this suppression did not prevent Toledo from rebelling less than ten years later. In 199 (814–815) the emir al-Hakam himself went against Toledo and by a stratagem succeeded in entering it and burned all the higher part of the town. In 214 (829) Toledo was again the starting point of a rebellion raised by a muraḍ named Ḥājjī al-Darrāz (the smith) and it took two years to suppress it. In the reign of 'Abd al-Raḥmān II, an expedition was sent against Toledo under prince Usayf in 219 (834). The next year the emir of Cordova laid siege to the town and it was taken by assault, after being invested for some months, in Radjab 222 (June 837). Toledo remained subject to the Umayyads, to whom it gave hostages, until 238 (852) but in this year, on the accession of the emir Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. al-Hakam, it rebelled once more. The intolerance of the emir had exasperated the Toledoans and the latter led, by one of their number, Sindola, depose the Arab governor and declared themselves free of Umayyad rule. Not only did they drive out of their town the representatives of the Cordovan government, but they organised an army which in Shawwāl 239 (May 854) defeated the troops of the emir Muḥammad near Andujar. Then in order to resist the force sent against them from Cordova, they made an alliance with the king of Leon, Ordoño I, who sent an army under Gato, Count of Bierzo, against them. But the resultant battle was disastrous for the Toledoans, who lost 20,000 men. In 244 (858) Muḥammad, giving the town no rest inflicted another disaster on it by mining the bridge over the Tagus; it collapsed when crowded with soldiers. Toledo had to beg for宽容 in the following year and Muḥammad appointed a governor there. From this time down to the reign of 'Abd Raḥmān III al-Nasir, the Arab historians hardly ever mention Toledo. We only know that in 873 its citizens obtained a treaty by which, if they agreed to pay tribute to Cordova, their political independence would be practically recognised.

The final subjection of Toledo was to be the work of the great Umayyad ruler al-Nasir. Before tackling it, he had to wait until all the hot-beds of rebellion in his dominions had been exterminated. Once Badajoz had been taken, the caliph in 318 (930) sent to Toledo a deputation of fakhs to make the citizens understand that their liberty was no longer compatible with the authority of the government of Cordova. This peaceful effort having failed, he at once laid siege to the town and came himself with a large army to direct operations. He pitched his camp on the heights of Charneca and made it clear that he would not withdraw his troops until Toledo was taken, by erecting some buildings and a bazaar which was given the name of Madīnak al-Fāṭījm (town of victory), opposite the invested city. The blockade was continued into 320 (932) and Toledo had finally to surrender. A strong Umayyad garrison was placed in the town and its capture had a great moral effect throughout Spain. Henceforth it was the capital of the Middle Frontier (al-tāhāyar al-mawṣūf) and the office of governor of Toledo was one of the most important military offices of the Umayyad atmāwīm. Among the principal holders of this office were Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāh b. Ḥudair, the ʾulamāʾ Abū Yaṯūr and, in the reign of al-Hakam II, the general Ghalib b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Nasir, the father-in-law of the famous ʾAbī al-Mansūr [q.v.] Ibn Abī 'Amīr.
During the period of troubles which ended in the fall of the caliphate of Cordova and in the dismemberment of the Umayyad empire in Spain, Toledo no longer played any more than a very minor part in politics. On several occasions it served as headquarters or as a refuge for rival rebels but it does not seem to have itself taken advantage of these occasions to rebel, as it had so often done before. It was for several years the base of operations of the general Wâdî and between his two reigns Muhammad b. Hishâm b. 'Abd al-Djâhîb found a refuge there. Soon afterwards when little Muslim kingdoms were founded in the Peninsula, it became the capital of an independent kingdom, that of the Banû Dhi l-'Nûn.

The Banû Dhi l-'Nûn [q. v.] were nobles of Berber origin, who in the reign of al-Manûzr Ibn Abî 'Amir had obtained certain military commands. They were settled in the region of Shantaberya (Santaver, the modern province of Cuencâ). It was to them that the Toledoans appealed when on the fall of the Cordovan caliphate they wished to give themselves a chief. 'Abd al-Rahîm Ibn Dhi l-'Nûn, lord of Shantaberya, sent them his son Ismîl who took command of the town and the territory belonging to it and appealed to the experience of a notable of Toledo, Abû Bakr b. al-Hâdî, to administer it for him. According to several Arabic chroniclers, Ismîl b. Dhi l-'Nûn was not the first king of Toledo but succeeded other chiefs of other families, Ibn Masârra, Muhammad b. Ya'sîr al-Asadî and his son Abû Bakr Ya'sîr; other names are mentioned, Sa'd b. Shâmir and his son Alâdîn, 'Abd al-Rahîm b. 'Abd al-Malik, and the new ruler of Toledo, the beginning of whose reign is usually put in 427 (1035-1036), took the honorific labab of al-Ẓâhir and was only a few years on the throne for he died in 435 (1043-1044).

His son Yahya succeeded him and took the title of al-Ma'mûn. On his long reign see the article on him (iii., p. 223, where the date of his accession should be corrected from 429 to 435; cf. Dozy, Recueils, vol. i., p. 238, note 1).

On the death of Yahya al-Ma'mûn at the end of 467 (1075) the kingdom of Toledo, considerably increased, passed into the hands of his grandson Yahya b. Ismîl b. Ya'hya who took the labab of al-Kâdir. The great incapacity of this prince brought a period in which decadence became more and more marked after the brilliant and prosperous long reign of al-Ma'mûn. Left to himself by the old Muslim allies of his grandfather, especially by the prince of Seville, he had to seek the alliance of the king of Castile and Leon, Alfonso VI. The latter granted him his protection, but in return demanded payment of tribute which became larger and larger. To meet his engagements, al-Kâdir had to oppress his subjects with taxation and the latter ended by rebelling. Al-Kâdir retired by more rigorous measures and had several notable of the town executed along with his first minister Ibn al-Hâdî. This only exasperated the Toledoans against him still more and he had to abandon his capital and seek refuge at Huete. The kingdom of Toledo was then offered to the Almohad kings of Badajos, al-Mutawakkil, who took in 472 (1077) possession of it. Alfonso VI retook Toledo soon afterwards for his Muslim ally but this was only a pretense: on 27th Muharram 478 (May 25, 1085) the king of Castile, after a treaty concluded between him and al-Kâdir, which the latter could not escape signing, entered Toledo on his own account, thus making an important step in the progress of the reconquest. The taking of Toledo had a great moral effect among Christians as well as Muslims. It, more than anything, determined the invasion of Spain by the Almoravids in the next year.

In spite of the successes, which, first Yûsuf b. Tâshîf, then the Almohads, won in the Iberian Peninsula, Toledo never again passed into Muslim hands. For a century, however, it remained one of the great objectives of their armies. It was twice besieged without success, once on the death of Alfonso VI, and again by the Almohad Abu Yûsuf Yâhî b. 'Abd al-Maqûf in 592 (1195) in the course of an expedition which won the towns of Calatrava, Guadalajara and Madrid for the Muslims in some years, and was distinguished by the victory of Alarcos. But the battle of Las Navas de Tolosa, on July 16, 1212, soon deprived the Muslims of all hope of retaking Toledo.

Becoming Christian again, and created the capital of their dominions by the kings of Castile, Toledo however long retained a markedly Muslim character. Islam continued to be practised by a certain number of the faithful. A town of Moors under Islam, it was a town of Moriscos for quite a long time after its return to Christianity.

There are very few traces left in Toledo of its long occupation by the Muslims. At most, the remains of the little mosque of Bih Mardûm (Cristo de la Loma), some parts of the palace of Las Tornerías and of the old gate of Visagra can be dated back to the period of the musulûn al-jawâfîf. On the other hand the egeo near the town, a considerable number of epitaphs of Muslims of Toledo have been found, mainly engraved on the shafts of columns.

In spite of its position as a frontier town with a population containing a large proportion of Christian elements, Toledo, especially at the end of the Umayyad caliphate and in the reign of al-Ma'mûn, was reckoned one of the intellectual centres of Muslim Spain. A large number of the articles in the collections on the biography of Muslim Spain are devoted to scholars and jurists of Toledo origin.


Monographs on Toledo: J. Amador de los Ríos, Toledo pintoresco, Madrid 1845; S. Ramón Parro, Toledo en la mano, Toledo 1857.
TOLEDO — TOPAL OTHMÂN PASHA

Agha. He first entered the navy and in 1839 as Rear-Admiral, along with the Kapudan Pasha (q.v.), Ahmed Fehmi Pasja surrendered the Ottoman fleet in the Dardanelles to Muhammad Ali Pasha of Egypt, on hearing that Khuwar Pasja (q.v., ii, p. 958) had been appointed grand vizier. He remained a refugee in Egypt for several years after the conclusion of peace where he enjoyed the Khedive's favour. When an amnesty was granted to the deserters he returned in 1258 (beg. Feb. 12, 1842) to Stambul and entered the civil service. He became Kâmil-makâm of Ismit, then Mustafağrîf of Karab (q.v.), in Divâni-i-Xâdâ-i 1265 (Sept. 1849) of Bigha (q.v.), in 1271 (beg. Sept. 24, 1854) of Cyprus. In 1273 (beg. Sept. 1, 1856), he was sent as commandant (âmil-i-sefâr) to Belgrade from which he went on 11th Radjab 1277 (Jan. 23, 1861) to Sarajevo (q.v.) as governor (valî) of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

His government may be described as a golden period in the history of Bosnia: under the Ottomans. He held the office for nine years, a period of prosperity before the incursions of other governor, namely Köşrew Pasha (q.v.). His great aim was to deprive the powerful bogs of their influence and thus to strengthen the power of the Ottoman government. His plan was to place Bosnian notables in public offices, where they soon lost their hereditary prestige and influence with the people. He also raised the status of the bourgeois, especially artisans and small traders, and played them off against the nobles; as the protector of the common people he soon attained enormous popularity and to this day the "glorious days of Ottoman Pasja" are almost proverbial in Bosnia. He devoted special attention to the education of the youth in schools, which under his administration assumed a development hitherto undreamt of. In Sarajevo, in addition to numerous public schools, he built a reading room (plib-i-hârâmî), a high school (rûhîlye) as well as a technical school for the training of officials (nicket-i-hekim). The object of these institutions was to "Stambulis" the people of Bosnia, i.e. to bring them up to be loyal Ottoman citizens. But the educational institutions of the non-Muslim creeds were also supported in all kinds of ways by Othman Pasja. He endowed the mosque of Ghiş (Khoswe (q.v.) with a splendid library (about 3,000 MSS. and books) and one of his great services was the institution of a printing-works for the will-yet in which were printed not only the official calendar (Sâhib-i Buon), but the weekly papers Buon (official Gazette) and the Gâlîhen-i Serîyî (in Turkish and also in Serbian as the Sarajevski Svetionik), schoolbooks. From 1853, Othman Pasja endeavoured to regulate the relations between the Muslim landowners and the, usually Christian, tenants. He established a certain degree of legal protection for the kметs against oppression by the landowners and thus gained the affection and reverence of the lower classes. His endeavours to abolish tithes and replace it by a direct tax on land failed against the opposition of the Porte.

Othman Pasja was continually making roads in his province and used all the available labour in the work. A number of important routes within his province and also connecting it with the outside world were his work (e.g. from Maglaj to Đonja Tuzla and Zvornik; from Bosnia-Gradiska-Banjaluca-Travnik-Livno and thence across the Prošlago into Dalmatia; the road from Sarajevo to Mostar
completed by the War Office in 1864; the road made in 1868 from Trebinje to Ragnja etc.

It was only natural that he should continually strive to beautify Sarajevo, which was his official residence. There he built a splendid country house, the Cengić-villa which still exists (called after its later owner Dervish Pascha Cengić, known as De-
daga, therefore also called by the natives Dedagini domaci). As a result of the intrigues of his numerous opponents in Stambul, 'Othmān Paša was removed from his governorship in Ramadan 1285 (beg. Dec. 16, 1668) and transferred as Wali to Sili-
stria (Donau-Wallis). Muşir Şafvet Paša was ap-
pointed to succeed him. Suddenly, however,
three changes were cancelled and 'Othmān Paša returned to Sarajevo amid the tumultulous enthui-
siasm of the populace. His new period of activity
was of short duration. His Stambul enemies were
able to persuade the credulous Sultan 'Abd al-
'Aziz that 'Othmān Paša had built himself a Seray
in Bosnia and that, as an old pupil of the rebel
Muhammed 'Ali Paša, he cherished the ambition to
make himself independent. The consequence was
that 'Othmān Paša was definitely recalled on the
15th Safer 1286 (May 27, 1669). He disposed of
his estates and his komak and retired on a very
modest pension to Stambul, where he lived in
complete retirement in a little house in the country
on the Bospors. He died there on the 14th Dji-
mis 1191 (July 26, 1874) and was buried in
Stambul behind the Arsenal (Toruńt). — One of
his sons is Re'af Paša.

Bibliography: Josef Koetsch, Osman Pa-
sha, der letzte grosse Weizer Bosnien, Sarajevo
1909; Fra. Giga Martić, Zapamćenja, p. 43 sqq.;
Slijepinći i Slijemlji, ili. 449. (F. Baringer)

TÖRGHUD, a Turkish tribe in Asia
Minor.

The Törgbud tribe appears alongside of the
Warask (the Başakusoğulları of the Byzantine historians, cf. the important passage in Chalkoydyles, p. 243 4), quite early in Ottoman history. Its origin is wrapped in obscurity; it is mentioned for the first time in
history at the end of the century A. M. when 'Ali al-Din of the Karanmuğlbaşı included the Törgbud among the tribes under his command. A century later they appear in the
army of Djaş Şelîm in his Anatolian campaign
against Sultan Bâyâsâd (cf. J. von Hammer, G.O.
R., ili. 256; 886 = 1481). About this time the
Törgbud and the Warask were living in the Cilician Taurus on the other side of the
Bagh Dar (cf. J. v. Hammer, G.O. R., ili. 294). Then and later they were in political independence on the
Karanmuğlbaşı, the enemies of the Ottomans. With the decline of the latter the Törgbud disappeared from history. They cannot be connected with the
place called Törgbud-lu in the sandjak of Sarajšan (q.v.), still less with the Kalmuck Töngös (Töng-
ütan).

(F. Baringer)

TÖRGHUD, a general and companion
in arms of 'Othmān I.

Törgbud, usually Törgbud-alp (alp as a personal
name, is Turkish for brave, fearless, warrior); cf.
Alp-Tekh, Alp-Arslân, and Aigbud-alp, Konur-alp
etc.), is mentioned among the companions of
'Othmān I and connected with the earliest Ottoman
conquests. He is said, for example, to have sur-
pried Angelokomata, the modern Aigneğol, in 699
(1299) with only seventy men and taken it (according
to Negšer, Idris Bitlis in J. v. Hammer, G.O. R.,
153 sq.). He remained the councillor of 'Othmān's
son Ürgân. On the latter's instructions he took
Edrenos on Olympus, the key to Brusa (1326).
Nothing is known of his later life. In the Byzantine
historians, like Chalkoydyles (cf. p. 65, 243,
244, 4 447, 491 sqq. appears as Topoğlou. (F. Baringer)

TÖRGHUD-EVIN, literally the land of Törg-
bud, is the district around Aineğol in
Asia Minor, which Törgbud-alp [q.v.] conquered
and received as a fief. According to Leonclavia
on this ili, xii, 102), the Arabic form Dhu 1-Kadr
is a corruption of this, which is very probable,
as it is almost certainly derived from some Turkish
proper name. The royal family of the Dhu
1-Kadr-oğlu [q.v.] would thus have to be con-
ected with the Turkoman tribe of Törgbud [q.v.].

Bibliography: cf. F. Baringer in ili, xii,
102. (F. Baringer)

TORTOSA, Arabic ترتوس (n. or Turtali),
a town in Spain on the left bank of the Ebro,
a few miles above the beginning of the delta of
this river, 115 miles from Valencia, 105 from
Barcelona and 60 from Tarragona. Tortosa which
now has 28,000 inhabitants, is the chief town of
a partido of the province of Tarragona and the
seat of a bishop.

The town is built on the site of the old Iberian
town of Dertosa which was succeeded by the
Roman colony of Julia Augusta. Its geographical
position has always given it considerable com-
mercial importance. It passed early under Muslim
rule and most of the Arab geographers who deal
with the Peninsula, give a description of it. According
to Idrisi, it was part of the al-ulm of al-Burast-
it was, he says, a large commercial town where
ships were built with the wood of the pine-trees
of remarkable quality which grew in the neigh-
bourhood. According to the historical and geogra-
phical dictionary of Ibn Abî al-Musîn al-Hamayti,
the Umayyad rulers built a wall around it of dressed
stone, with four gates. It had also a cathedral
mosque with five naves which was built in 345
(956-957), four public baths and several suburbs.
Its wharves for shipbuilding (dâr al-jiina') were
built in 333 (945) by order of the caliph 'Abd
al-Rahmân IV al-Nâsir; the foundation inscription
happens to have survived.

Information about the history of Tortosa in the
early centuries of Muslim rule is scanty and scattered.
We only know that it was besieged in 193 (809)
by Louis the Debonnaire, son of Charlemagne,
whose army was defeated by that sent against him
by the emir al-Yâkak I under his son 'Abd al-
Rahmân. This first siege, which ended in failure,
did not prevent Louis from taking Tortosa two
years later, but he only held it for a short time.
Later it appears that Tortosa, on account of its
position on the borders of Muslim Spain, was
used as place of compulsory residence for exiles
from the Cordovan court; for example, the secretary
'Abd al-Malik b. Idris al-Dżarrîl was detained there
by order of al-Manâṣr Ibn Abî 'Amir.

On the dismemberment of the Umayyad caliphate
and the formation of the kingdom of the Ifsîns,
Tortosa became the capital of a little principality
of 'Amirid "Slava" (al-islâmîa [q.v.]). The best known
of these individuals was a man called Nabit; he even
was able to take advantage of the anarchy prevail-
ing in the east of al-Andalus to seize Valencia,
The ancient city of Oea, one of the emporia of Sirtica, was first a Phoenician, then a Carthaginian colony; Roman influence began to prevail in the second century, during the Punic wars; direct Roman rule may be dated from the end of Carthage's rule (149 B.C.).

The ancient city lay mainly in the western part of the present city, round the still existing Arch of Marcus Aurelius, erected in 185 A.D. under the proconsul Cornelius Orfitus by C. Calpurnius Celsus, curator muneri et publicis muniarum, and dedicated to the Emperors M. Aurelius Antoninus and Lucius Verus. Oea however had no great political, military or economic importance, notwithstanding its harbour, protected by a barrier of rocks. The emporia of Sabrata and Leptis were then of greater military and economic consequence.

The first city wall may be attributed to the 5th century A.D., when the attacks of nomads from the interior became a menace. The Vandals, Procopius says, destroyed the walls of the African cities, but it is certain that the Byzantines hastened to reconstruct them; in Tripoli also the sections of walls still existing after the vicissitudes of ages, and partly demolished since the Italian occupation, preserve traces of Byzantine workmanship. The city was not surrounded by walls on the side overlooking the sea; the Arab invaders were thus able to enter it from the W., following the beach.

Occupied by the Vandals about 439, Tripoli remained under their rule up to 535, save for the expedition of Heracleius, sent by sea from Byzantium in 468. Belissarius, after having conquered the ancient province of Africa in 533, sent troops also to Tripoli, which from 535 may be considered subject to the Eastern Empire; the Catholic religion, troubled by the invasion of the Arian Vandals and by the rebellions of tribes in the interior, seemed to flourish anew in Tripoli for about a century.

Historians do not agree on the date of the Muslim occupation, which according to some happened in 22 (642-643), to others a year later. It may be that a first vanguard of the Arab conquerors of Egypt pushed as far as Tripoli in 22 A.H.; that a second expedition was led against it in 23.

It is well known that these first Muslim expeditions were raids, rather for the purpose of plunder than of conquest; neither the interior of Tripolitania, nor Tripoli itself, were firmly held at that time; as late as 26 (647-648) 'Abd alLāh b. Sa‘id with ‘Ukba b. Nāfi‘ passed through it; in 45-46 ‘Ukba b. Nāfi‘ pushed further the conquest of Ifriqiya; about that time a garrison (fuqara‘) was permanently established in Tripoli; the names of the city’s governors are not known.

'Tārāf al-Rājīm b. Ḥabīb, governor of Ifriqiya, after 126 A.H. marched against Tripoli in 131 (748-749), the two Tripolitans, 'Abd al-Dā‘ūd al-Ḥāfīz and al-Ḥāfiz, Berbers of the Ḥadītā school, and in 132 restored the city walls. Ibn Khaldūn records
that the city was then governed by Bakr b. Isâ al-Kasî, and that he was killed during the revolt. Throughout the second and third centuries, Tripoli and its environs were troubled by the political-religious revolt of the Ifâdîs. This sect had found many followers among the Hawwâra and Zanîta Berbers, who formed the predominant element in the population. About 410 (757–758), the Ifâdî imam Abu l-Šâhâb al-Maârîf set out from Tripoli, in the rising known as the revolt of the Waradîjuma, which seriously endangered Arab possession of North Africa, and was put down by Muhammâd b. al-Anfîs, sent by the caliph 'AbdAllâh, in the battle of Tawârîgha (145 = 760–761). In the following years further risings, due to the rebel Ibrâhîm, took place, and Tripoli was repeatedly besieged and attacked. We know that Hartama, governor of Ifrikia in the name of the 'Abbâsids in 179–180 (795–797), ordered the wall on the side next the sea to be built (al-Bakrî, transl. de Slane, p. 25; Ibn al-Azhîr, vi. 49; Ibn 'Ashîr, transl. Fagan, i. 107).

Tripoli remained under Aghlabid rule from 184 to 296 (800–900), but this century was not one of quiet; among many revolts, Ibn Khaldûn mentions that of 196 (811–812) against 'AbdAllâh, son of the Amir Ifrîhîm b. al-Aghlub, and against his successor Sufyân b. al-Madî; the latter were once again the Ibrâhîm Berbers, who had their centre of resistance in the Djebel Nefissa. Under the Aghlabid Amir 'Uzzâyat Allâh, Tripoli remained invadied by al-Aghlub, son of Ahmad b. Tûlîn, lord of Egypt; the governor of Tripoli, Muhammâd b. Kûlûh, was vanquished in 255 (868–869) by 'Abbâs at Labda, and besieged for 43 days in 501.

During the rule of the 'Abbâsids in Northern Africa, Tripoli was subject to them, and they appointed its governors; a revolt, put down by Abu l-Kâsim, is mentioned in 300 (912). When the 'Abbâsids transferred themselves to Egypt, Tripoli was at first ruled by the Zirîs, left as their lieutenants in Ifrikia, but not much later the independent rule of the Berber Banû Kharrûn, of the Zanîta stock, was established there (391–541 = 1000–1150).

The history of this period of a century and a half is not quite clear, notwithstanding the information furnished by Ibn 'Ashîr, Ibn Khaldîm, and Ibn al-Azhîr. Tripoli enjoyed a period of almost autonomous government, but it was ravaged by internal discord.

The invasion of the Banû Hilîl and the Banû Sulaim, an event which was to modify deeply the ethical and political formation of Northern Africa, swept away also the rule of the Banû Khazàran in Tripoli. For twelve years (1146–1158), the city was under the Normans; it was then conquered by the Almohâda, who held it for about a century, in the midst of raids and risings due to the adventurer Kârâkûsh and to the Banû Ghâniya.

The condition of Tripoli under the Ifâdîs is better known thanks to Ibn Khâldûn, al-Tîjânî and al-Zarkashî. The dependence of Tripoli upon the Almohâda ceased in 646 (1247–1248), when Muhammâd b. Isâ al-Hintâî was appointed governor of the city. Al-Tîjânî, who passed through Tripoli in 1305 A.D., found a 'Abbâsid governor, there living in a castle (Gezabe), probably on the site of the present castle; the city was administered by the governor and a council of 10 notable s (lûhîs), who used to meet in a sanctuary called 'Askâf al-Gezara. The traveller observed in Tripoli a fine bath (hammûn), broad, clean streets, mostly meeting at right angles; he admired the Arch of Marcus Aurelius, a Great Mosque (al-Asârî), a very large mosque (al-Damûr), several shrines, 'Ammâra (al-'Ammaârî), strong walls in good repair, with a moat in some parts. The city's intellectual life was flourishing at this time; cultivated people abounded.

A short time after al-Tîjânî's visit, Tripoli appears in the history of the internal rivalries in the 'Abbâsid family, at the time of al-Lîbiyân; later, notwithstanding the permanence of the 'Abbâsid rule, the city had a second, almost autonomous dynasty, that of the Banû Thâbit or Banû 'Amâr al-Mutâbirders (1324–1400 A.D.). In this period Tripoli was conquered for a few days by the Genoese Filippo Doria, who sacked it in 1354, and immediately sold it, for 50,000 marks d'or, to the Merchants. The 'Abbâsid Sultan Abu Fâris made his direct influence felt as far as Tripoli for a few decades longer; later the city was almost independent under its own rulers, until 1510, the date of the Spanish conquest.

Peter of Navarre, who had conquered Oran in 1509, and Bougie in January 1510, reached Tripoli with his Spanish troops in July 1510; the city was much damaged by the attack and the looting of Spaniards, who otherwise reconstructed the castle in the form it has preserved more or less up to this day; they also repaired the walls. Little is known of the 20 years of Spanish rule (1510–1530).

Already in 1524 the city had been visited by a committee of the Order later called of Malta, which had left Rhodes and had returned to Civitavecchia and Viterbo. In 1536, when the Mediterranean archipelago was conferred on the Order as a fief by the Emperor Charles V, Tripoli also went to the new rulers. The Knights of Malta maintained themselves at Tripoli from 1530 to 1551, holding out against the attacks of the rebel Arabs, who received help from the Barbary corsairs in alliance with the Porte. Khâir al-Dîn Barbarossa, who in 1533 had occupied Tunis, now threatened Tripoli; after him Murûd Aghâ, a corsair arrived from Constantinople, directed from Tâdîrûn the continual inroads on Tripoli by land and sea. The Order had in Tripoli a garrison of Knights and of Italian and Spanish mercenary troops, its authority was limited to the city and its immediate environs. On August 5th 1551, Sinâh Pâshâ, with Darghût Pâshâ and Murûd Aghâ, besieged the city, and took it on August 13th; the Governor-Commander Fra Gaspar de Valier was able to depart for Malta with the Knights of the garrison; most of the mercenaries were slaughtered. Murûd Aghâ became the new governor for the Porte, with the title of Beylerbeyt; his name is preserved by the large mosque in Tâdîrûn; about 1544 he was succeeded by Darghût Pâshâ, an important figure in Ottoman and Barbary history, and especially in that of Tripoli; he was killed in the siege of Malta (1565 A.D.) and was buried in the mosque he had founded at Tripoli. Spain and the Order of Malta tried many times to take the city from the Turks; the expedition of 1559–1560 ended in disaster at the island of Djerba; the attempt of 1590, in spite of an understanding with a rebel Murûtûbî, Yahya, was fruitless. Many times the galleys of Malta entered Tripoli's harbour, and burned its vessels.
Tripoli was the seat of the al-Jāhī of the same name, one of the three al-Jāhīs of the Janissaries in Barbary. Their chief, sent from Constantinople, bore the title of Pasha. However in Tripoli, as in Tunis and Algiers, owing to the distance and the decay of the central government, a domineering oligarchy was soon formed in the Janissaries’ quarter, and through marriages with the local population the al-Jāhīs’ ethno-religious class developed. Christian renegades were many and very powerful. Rule was wielded by the Pasha, assisted by the administrator; the administration was presided over by a Dey, the army by a Bey. Often Dey and Bey were the real masters of the city, the whole history of Tripoli in the 18th century and in the beginning of the 19th is full of these risings of Janissaries. While the central government grew weaker, and anarchy prevailed in the interior, the Consuls’ power increased, especially in the case of the consuls of France, England, and, later, of Sardinia.

A period of great power for Tripoli began with the rule of Mehemmed Pasha Qasim, of Chios, who reigned from 1642 to 1659 (1632–1649), and was succeeded by his son-in-law, Uthman Pasha, also of Chios (1649–1672). During these 60 years, within which fell the famous siege of Candia (1645–1669), the corsairs of Tripoli became more daring than in the past, and captured many prizes; Tripoli was enriched by new mosques and public baths. Under their successors, England in 1676 and France in 1685 broke the pirates’ overbearing pride with bombardments and threats. Internal struggles continued up to 1711, when Ahmad Karamehli (Caramani) succeeded, by slandering his opponent, in establishing a dynasty, which ruled, with the consent of Constantinople, for over a century (1711–1835). The rule of the Karamehli [q.v.] has left to this day many traces in Tripoli, in the part that remains of the Muslim and Barbary city; we shall therefore give a fuller account of its history.

Ahmad Karamehli (1711–1745), founder of the dynasty, was an energetic figure; in the 34 years of his rule Tripoli enjoyed comparative peace and economic prosperity; its power was felt more strongly than ever before, even in the interior of Tripolitania, as far as Fezzan and the territory of Barqa (Cyrenaica). Having unmasked, in 1723, the plot against his life, he secured, with his family and friends, the actual control of administration and government. An historian, Ibn Ghalibun, wrote about 1731–1732 the History of Tripoli, which is largely concerned with his reign: there were also poets who celebrated his exploits and his generosity. He was, however, cruel, a tyrant towards his enemies and all those who excelled his suspicion. He died blind in 1745. Among his acts, Ibn Ghalibun mentions many waqfs in favour of the city, the construction of an aqueduct which brought the water of a neighbouring spring, by means of a water-wheel, to the castle and the mosques, a fountain on the beach to supply sailors with water. But his best memorial is the mosque erected (1737–1738) on the side overlooking the castle, with its madrasa, which is still frequented, and enriched by many revenues, among them that of the neighbouring zârî. He also embellished the castle with new rooms and restored it. He had difficulties with the Powers and with the consuls on account of the damage to sea-trade suffered at the hands of his corsairs, but showed humanity and often generosity towards Christians, who from that time began to settle in larger numbers in the city and to ply their trades and crafts. The Franciscan mission was also kindly treated by him.

His son and successor, Mehemmed Pasha Karamehli (1745–1754), reigned too short a time to leave lasting memories; in 1751 the English defended with energy the rights of their citizens on the see. In 1752 he put down a revolt of Allama Muhammad ben Scheded, succeeded by his son Ali Pasha (1754–1793), whose period of rule is well known through abundant historical sources, printed and MSS. In 1765 he signed in Venice, through an ambassadour, a peace treaty with the Republic; in the following year, his promises having been broken, a Venetian fleet, commanded by the captain Giacomo Nani, obliged the Pasha to observe them. Under Ali Pasha the government was composed as follows: the Pasha, supreme head of the State, with almost regal authority, the Bey, commander of the troops, the Ağha, chief of Janissaries, the Khan, first civil authority and the Pasha’s counsellor, the Reis, commander of the corsair fleet, the Khansamâh, State Treasurer, one shâhâd, administrator of the city, a sort of mayor, a kadî, assisted by other clerks in the State Chancery. Important decisions were taken in the Divane of council composed of men who had been ambassadors to Europe or military commanders. It was said that Ali Pasha had begun to neglect consultations with the Divane.

In 1784–1785 Tripoli was ravaged by a terrible famine and by the plague: of the city’s 14,000 inhabitants one fourth is said to have perished. Ali Karamehli’s reign was unfortunate on account of family quarrels, due to the ambition of one of his sons, Yusuf Bey, who in 1790 went so far as to kill his brother Hasan Bey in the arms of his mother Lalla Hallâma. In 1793, while Yusuf Bey had become an outlaw and was waging war against his father, a certain Ali Borghi, formerly an official in Algiers, entered the harbour with a few ships and Greek mercenaries, and occupied the city during the night of July 30th. Ali Pasha took refuge in Tunis, whence he returned in 1795, with his children, thanks to the help of Hamuda Pasha of Tunis. Ali Borghi turned once more to the sea on the night of February 8th.

Ahmed II Pasha, son of Ali Pasha Karamehli, assumed the rule while his father, who died in 1796, still lived, but was unable to hold it against the jealousy of his brother Yusuf, who took his place in June 1795.

Yusuf Pasha Karamehli (1795–1832) possessed, together with courage and foresight, all the pernicious, wiles and cruelty of a Barbary sovereign. He carefully repaired the fortifications, and restored the city walls between the harbour and the castle, as is proved by an inscription of 1215 (1800–1801) in the neighbourhood of the zârî al-nâdîf (market of the carpenters). During the Napoleonic wars, in consequence of the Egyptian expedition and of the occupation of Malta, the Regency of Tripoli acquired international importance. It was to have been used as a base to invade Malta and to keep up relations with Egypt after the English had gained control of the sea, but this was not possible, as they had blockaded the harbour of Tripoli, and taken in charge the French
The period of Ottoman rule (1835–1912) was characterized by the progressive conquest of the interior, hindered by the ambitions and revolts of the tribes. The city however remained for 76 years entirely subject to the Ottoman; the conditions of the native population were practically unchanged; the city enjoyed a certain measure of progress thanks only to the foreign colonies, amongst which the Italian colony predominated as to numbers, influence, and private and financial enterprises. On October 5th 1911 Italian troops landed in Tripoli.

The city; monuments. In the historical summary we have already mentioned some of Tripoli’s monuments. Without describing the Roman and pre-Roman remains, like the necropolis to the NW. of the city and the Arch of Marcus Aurelius, we may mention among Muslim monuments, the Qasr al-’Ain (Qasr-nâga according to the local pronunciation), which is one of the most ancient, reconstructed by Saif al-Bezd in 1019 (1610-1611); Qasr Darghût or Qasr Shîb al-’Aiân, built in 1110 (1668-1669) by Mehemmed Pâshâ, called ‘Aznân al-’Azîn; Qasr ‘Ammâr, finished under Ahmad Pâshâ Karamânî, in 1550 (1737-1738); Qalâ‘i Gurdjî, already mentioned; Qasr ‘Ummân, in front of one of the city doors, recently restored on behalf of the Awtâ’i Direction, by Italian architects. Some mosques are attached to them tombes of great artistic and historical importance; worthy of mention are those connected with the mosques of Darghût, of Karamânî, the tomb of the madrasa of ‘Ummân Pâshâ, near the Arch of Marcus Aurelius. The ancient cemetery was outside the walls, on the NW. corner of the city; many gravestones had been built into the fortifications, and when the latter were demolished, were placed in the city museum, founded after the Italian occupation. There are now other cemeteries outside the city; the best known is that of Sidd Mînder (Musîndar, one of the Prophet’s Companions). The Ottoman occupation has no traces in the city monunents, except a few private buildings, and the military constructions outside the walls, especially in the Eastern plain and in the Mencis. The Italian government has but slightly modified the Muslim city’s aspect in its native quarters and in the Hârâ, the Jew’s ghetto; a lengthy portion of the walls, however, had to be demolished, part of them has been restored, and adapted to civic and sanitary requirements. The side of the city overlooking the sea has however been completely transformed by the construction of a modern harbour, piers and a large avenue along the beach (Langomare Volpi, from the name of the Governor for 1921–1925). The Castle (tiqâya of the Arabs), partly adapted to public offices by the Turks, has been restored in 1922–1923.

Administration. At present that part of the city’s affairs which is not directly conducted by the Government, is administered by a Municipality, presided over by a Mayor (ra‘î al-baladiya for the natives), and by Government commissioners. The administration of mosques and waqfûs is in the hands of an idārat al-waqfûs, composed of Muslims.

Public instruction. Muslim school organizations, with madrasas and kuttabûs for religious instruction, exist alongside of the Italian schools.

Libraries. There is a Government Library in the Castle; it contains a limited collection of works on Muslim history and religion, and some Arabic manuscripts. In the Castle the Ottoman Archives are also preserved; its most ancient documents go as far back as 1850 only. Of great importance for Tripoli’s history are the archives of the French and English consulates; the more recent ones of the Sardinian, Tuscan and Neapolitan consulates are preserved in the Government Library.

Private families possess small collections of books, containing also manuscripts. But the most important library is the so-called Library of the Awtâ’i (kutubkhâneh or maktabat al-awtâ‘î). The central nucleus of this collection was established by Mu‘âtha Khodja al-Miṣrî, first clerk at the time of ‘Ali Pâshâ Karamânî. The act (waqfûs) which founds a waqfûs the madrasa, the kutubû and the library annexed to them, together with a small annuity, is dated: beginning of Djumâdî II 1183 (October 1769). Successively various Muslims left books as a waqfûs to the library, which was enriched by part of the books left by the Tripoli historian Ahmad al-Nâîrî al-Ansâri, and in 1922 by a gift of printed books from the Governor Count G.
TRIPOLI — TUBU

Volpi. A systematic catalogue of this library has not yet been compiled, but an Arabic index-inventory is available. The books are arranged according to subject, following the traditional Muslim classification; printed and manuscript works are not separated; all the books, except a few Turkish ones, are in Arabic.

Bibliography: General. F. Minutilli, Bibliografia della Libia (Turin 1903); U. Ceccherrini, Bibliografia della Libia (Rome 1915); P. Romanelli, Bibliografia archeologica ed artistica della Tripolitania (Rome 1927).

History. The works of Ibn Khalduun, Ibn al-Akhir, al-Zarqushii, al-Bakri, al-Kairawani; al-Tijani, Rihi; al-Ayyubi, Ritha; Ibn al-Akhari; and many others are mentioned. Kithâ al-Mahnal al-Ashb fi Ta’rikh Tarabulus al-Gharbi (I, Constantinople 1317); Ibn Ghazzân, Kithâ al-Tijdhur fi man wa’ala Tarabulus wa kâna fiha min al-Ashb, Dastfar, ms. of Fâhith Hasân family of Tripoli; Mehmed Behêjî al-Dîn, Turkish abridged translation of Ibn Ghazzân and continuation, Constantinople 1284; L. Caetani, Annali dell’Islam; Fournel, Les Berbères; M. Amari, Storia dei Musulmani di Sicilia; A. Vassallo, Storia di Malta (Malta 1854); Bosio, Istoria della S. Religione gerosceliana; C. Bergua, La Missione francese in Libia (Tripoli 1924); Id., Tripoli dal 1550 al 1850 (Tripoli 1925); S. Aurigemma, Le fortificazioni di Tripoli, in Notiziario Arch. del Min. delle Colonte, li.; Id., Il Castello di Tripoli, in Riv. Coloniale, 1925; C. Manfroni, Tripoli nella storia marina di Tetà (Padua 1912); E. Rossì, Il dominio dei Cavalieri di Malta a Tripoli (Malta 1924); Id., Corrispondenza tra i Gran Maestri dell’Ordine di S. Giovanni a Malta e il Rey di Tripoli dal 1714 al 1728, in R.S.O., X (1925); Fàrsaid, Annales Tripolitaines, in the R.A. (1883); Id., Annales Tripolitaines, edited by A. Bernard, Tunisi and Paris 1927; G. A. Krause, Zur Geschichte von Fezzan und Tripoli in Afrika, in the Zeitschr. der Gesell. für Erdkunde; P. Romanelli, Lède (Roma 1925); S. Aurigemma, La moschea di Ahma al-Qumândî in Tripoli (Dudal, 1927, p. 492—513); S. Aurigemma, La moschea di Gârgi a Tripoli (Africa Italiana, 1928, p. 257—285); F. Cunent, Les antiquités de la Tripolitania au XVIIIe siècle (Riv. della Tripolitania, ii., 1925—1926); various articles in the volume: La rimarchia della Tripolitania (Rome 1926).

ETTORE ROSSI

TUBU, a people of the Eastern Sahara.

The Tubu are distributed over an immense territory lying between the Libyan desert on the east and the Haqar on the west, Fezzan in the north and the region of Tchad in the south. In Fezzan, they constitute the greater part of the district of Gartûn; they are found in Kfûm; they occupy Tibestî, Borkû, Bodele, the northern port of Wadai, the valley of the Bahr al-Ghasal; they are very numerous in Kanem and in the oasis of Kawar. The name Tubu or Tibbu was given by Europeans to all these people but the various groups call themselves by particular names, Tubû is applied more particularly to the natives of Tibestî; in the Kanuri language it means the people of Tû; the latter call themselves Têda; in the same way are Amângare the Amma Borkû (Borkû), the Kreda, Norsu, Cheenafulde in Wadai, the Koéreth in the Bahr al-Ghasal. From the linguistic point of view, two groups may be recognised, speaking dialects very different in vocabulary: the Têda of Tibestî and the Darâgâa settled in the southern districts. The Arabs give the latter the name of Gouran.

The Tibû are very distinct from the black Sudanese on the one side, and the Arâm and Berbers on the other. They are as a rule of small stature, with a lean and thin body, dark skin, straight nose, sometimes aquiline, thin lips, and smooth hair. These physical characteristics are particularly strongly defined in the Têda, who have remained isolated in their mountains. They are found scattered through the Darâgâa, who are more or less mixed with negro blood. The poverty of their country dooms them to a wretched existence. Some are nomads, others sedentary. The main supplies come from the cultivation of the palm and cereals in the "emendi" or moist valleys, the rearing of goats in Tibestî and of cattle in the Tchad region. The Têda also make some money by hiring out their camels: they act as guides to caravans but are particularly given to brigandage whenever an occasion arises. This mode of life develops in them an extraordinary power of resistance to fatigue and privations, but also makes them treacherous and cruel robbers, as European travellers from Nachtigal, who was the first to study them, onwards, are all agreed. — The settled Tîbû are found in groups, not as a rule large. They either dwell in little stone houses, covered with palm-branches, or in huts of wattle with roofs of thatch, or even in caves roughly furnished. The gardens adjoining the huts are cultivated by slaves while the Tibû themselves fight and herd the flocks.

The Tubu are divided into two classes: the nobles or "maina" and the common people. Among the Têda, the tribes are divided into a superior and a lower class. The former are three in number, the Tômâgâhers, the Gûndâ, who have almost all emigrated to Fezzan and the Turaga. The Sulûf of Tibestî, or Drarî, who rules the country with the help of a council of nobles is compulsorily elected among the Tômâgâhers. Among the Tibû, on the other hand, as among the Sudanese peoples, the Hâddâd (smiths and fishermen and hunters) form a distinct caste, regarded as inferior and despised by all. From the religious point of view the Tibû are Muslims but, it seems, only recent converts. The Arâm treat their shepherds as dogs and regard them as infidels. They have actually retained fetishistic superstitions and practices, and their own customs which are on many points in contradiction with the Kur'anic law. For example, they do not take the diya or pecuniary compensation in case of murder nor do they observe the prohibition relative to fermented liquors. The Tibû are none the less fanatic Muslims, especially in Tibestî, Borkû and Bahr al-Ghasal; they are very much under the influence of the Sâmâyûsh, of the Sâwiya of Waï, of Anigala, etc. and have opposed a resistance to European penetration.

We have only incomplete and fragmentary notes on the history of the Tubu. The Arab authors down to Maâkriti make no mention of them. Relying on a passage in this author reproduced by Leo Africanus, they were for long regarded as Berbers and they have been identified with the Baralus, mentioned by both these geographers. But we tried to reconcile this view with the facts ascertained by him of the affinity of the Tubu and Kanari languages. On the other hand it is now agreed,
that the Tübù originally lived in the Sudán and were then driven into the Sahara. In any case, they seem to have played a fairly important role in the history of Kanem. Some of their clans took part with the Kanembou in the foundation of this kingdom. Down to the end of the xviith century the sufi district of Kanem kept up the custom of marrying wives from the Tübù. A certain number of Tübù had settled in Kanem, which the tribes who had remained in Tibeis came to attack in the xivth century. Sultan Dünâne II was forced into a seven years' war with them, out of which he emerged victorious but, with the resources of his kingdom exhausted. In the xivth century the Tübù were the allies of the Bulaba and helped the latter to conquer Kanem. Settled in the lands around Lake Chad, they shared the fortunes of their neighbours [cf. the articles BORNU, KANEM].

As to the Tübù of Tibeis, nothing precise is known about them till the xviiith and xviiiith centuries. In this period they were frequently raiding Bornù and Fersan. A defeat which they suffered in 1788 forced them to cease their raids into the latter country but in the second half of the xixth century, they had in their turn to defend themselves against the repeated attacks of the Whid Sliman and the Tihar.


(G. VYER)

TUDELA, Ar. TUBILA, a little town in Spain, with about 9,500 inhabitants, 860 feet above sea-level and 50 miles N.W. of Saragossa, on the right bank of the Ebro and the left bank of a tributary of the latter, the Queles (Ar. Kalâta). According to the Arab geographers, it was founded by the Umayyads in the reign of the emir al-Hakam I (850—860 = 796—822). In this period and on several other occasions, it was the headquarters of rebel Muslim leaders: for example in 849 (843—844) the emir 'Abd al-Rahmân II laid siege to it and in 855 (877—878) al-Munãhir. It was several times taken by the Christians and retaken by the Muslims. 'Abd al-Rahmân III made it his base on one of his expeditions to the north of the Peninsula in 928 (920—921). The general al-Hamid b. Basîl had to recapture it three years later for the same sovereign. The Arab historians do not tell us at what period Tudela finally passed into Christian hands.


(T. LEVI-PROVENÇAL)

TUDJIB (BANû), the name of an Arab family several members of which attained distinction during Muslim rule in Spain as well as under the Omayan caliphs. The family became divided into two branches, the Banû Hâkim of Saragossa and the Banû Šumâdi of Almeria. The family of the Banû Tudjib had settled in Aragon at the conquest. In the reign of the emir Muhammad I (239—273 = 852—886), its head was 'Abd al-Rahmân b. 'Abd al-Azîz al-Tudjib and his authority over his fellow-tribesmen was recognised by the ruler of Cordova, who thus tried to put an end to the power of another family in Aragon, of Visigothic origin, the Banû Kasî. On the Banû Tudjib, who were later vassals of Cordova, and then of the independent rulers (Banû Hâkim) of Saragossa down to the time they were submerged in favour of the Banû Hidr, cf. above, XV. SARA-GOSA.

The other Tudjibid branch, that of the Banû Šumâdi, had early been driven out of Aragon by the descendants of 'Abd al-Rahmân al-Tudjib. In the first half of the fifth century A.H., Abu 'l-Ashagh Ma'n [q.v.] b. Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Šumâdi al-Tudjib, the head of the second branch, succeeded in gaining possession of the little principality of Almeria, founded in 1025 by the two *Slaves* Kfishân and Zuhair. On his death in 433 (1052) his son Abu Yahyâ Muhammad succeeded him with the last al-Mu'asim. He was then only 14 years of age and for three years his uncle Šumâdi b. Muhammad acted as regent. Al-Mu'min remained ruler of Almeria till his death in 484 (1094) and his long reign was very brilliant and prosperous, if we may believe the Arab chroniclers. His son, Ahmad Mu'izz al-Dawla, succeeded him but soon after his accession, he retired before the Almoravids and when the latter seized Seville he went to Bougie, where he ended his life in obscurity as did his sons.


TUFAILI, "parasite, sponge". This is the meaning given to the word in the majority of the European dictionaries of Arabic, Persian and Turkish, e.g. Belot, Châfîrî, Şâmi-bey, etc. But this does not render the exact shade of meaning of the word, which was first of all applied to an individual who goes to a feast without being invited or accompanies a person invited. A little lower class of parasite is called in everyday Persian juftâl.
the term applied to "hangers on of the tufaili.
According to the Arabic dictionaries, Liddi al-'Arab, xiii, p. 429, 'Tafq al-'Arab, etc., p. 418 the word tufaili comes from a native of Kafa, Tafq al-'Arab, "Tufail the feeder," who used to attend all the feasts without having been invited and was wont to express his delight that Kafa was like a bowl, nothing in the interior of which escaped his eye. From this name Tufail comes the Arabic verb tafaal on tatafafa: "to act like Tufail." The latter lived in the time of the Umayyad caliphs and belonged to the Banu 'Abd Allâh b. Bâsa'nân. His story is told as early as Ibn al-Sikkit (d. 244 = 858).
In the form tufail, the word (in Persian) has the special meaning of "complement, thing thrown into the bargain, thing one gives up," which says in one of his odes: "all human beings and the pârsî are corollaries (tufail) of the existence of love." In Hindustani (cf. Shakespeare, A. Dicht. Hind. and Eng., p. 1436), tufai is used adverbially in the sense of "by means of, through, for the sake of,"

**Tufân. [See Nîrû.]**

**Tugh** (T.), a yak's tail (tufair), later replaced by a horse's tail attached to a pole, sometimes surmounted by a crescent and used as a standard and rallying point for troops. It was also used as a badge of military rank in the early Ottoman empire: the mir-lîwâd and sunnîyab-ây had one, the haydâr-ây two, the vâzir three, the grand vâzir five and the Sulânî in time of war seven or nine tails. When a Fâghî was dismissed from office he was deprived of this badge. It was abolished by Sultan Mahmûd II along with the other badges of the janissaries. — In Central Asia the bearer of this standard was called tugâ Beri.

**Bibliography:** Ahmad Rasim, Târîkh, Constantiopolis 1326—1328, iv. 5; Wâsif, in Dâvud-ây, Ettat militaire ottoman, Paris, 1882, l. 181 (album, pi. 5, fig. 105, 106); Tavernier, Nouvelles relations du Serrail (Voyage, part vi.), p. 15—44; H. Hugon, Les Emblèmes des série de Tumis, p. 82; Ahmad Rûfî, Lugtâr-î tahih-kârî, mandaqeh-farm, Constantinople, 1909, i. 288; Reddick, Optik, iii. 1499; Sulaimân Efrînî, Lugtâr-i Dâvud-ây, p. 140. (Cl. Haury)

**Tugh Timûr,** a Mongol Khân, whose dynasty ruled in Djurdjan for a century before 808 (1405).

The Name. The Khân's name may be read Tugh or Togh. The Zafar-nâmâ transcribes it Tugh (Tughai); on a coin published by Frehmel it is spelled Toghan (in Mongol character; cf. Howorth, cf. cit., iii. 718).

**Family.** Tugh Timûr b. Suri (Sorukûr) b. Babâ Bahâdur was a descendant in the sixth generation from a brother of Chingîs-Khân (Djudi-Usârî, Shi'asfar, p. 315, misunderstood by Miles). In 705 (1305) Babâ Bahâdur arrived in Khorâsân with his nâmâ (10,000 families) and entered the service of Uljâï-Khân. In 715 (1315) he made a raid into Khârim. On the complaint of Özbek, Khân of the Easen, Khân, Uljâï executed Babâ and his son Suri (Shi'asfar, p. 311, 330; d'Ohason, Hist. des Mongols, iv. 1572—5). The tribe of Babâ remained in Mâsândarân (at this period, Nusht al-Kalâh, p. 159, this term included Djurdjan and the eastern part of Tagharistan).

After the death of the Hûsîn Abî Sa'id (736), anarchy broke out in Persia. The Djâlyer Hasan Buzurg put the pretender Muhammad on the

As a result of a quarrel among the amirs of Hasan Buzurg, a number of them, like the Ughâr Igraði (Miles, op. cit., p. 315, 320, wrongly Akarunf) with the help of the amirs of Khurâsân (Shâkih 'Abî b. 'Ali Kâsîhî, 'Ali Dîfîr, Arghun-Shah) went to Tugh Timûr whom they proclaimed Khân in 737 (1337). Tugh Timûr, accompanied by his amirs, marched on Adharbâijân where he was rejoined by the other claimant Mâsî supported by the Qâyats. Tugh Timûr and Mâsî proposed to Persia, but on the 6th Dhu-l-Hijjah 737 they were defeated by Hasan Buzurg on the Garmâtir (west of Miyân); Schâfâfar, p. 316; d'Ohason, iv. 276). Tugh Timûr withdrew to Sistân where he ruled over Mâsândarân (in the sense above mentioned) and Khurâsân. At the same time the exactions of the minions of Khodja 'Ali al-Dîn Muhammed, viceroy of Khurâsân, provoked a rising and the coming to power of the Sardâbîs (q.v.). The expansion of their power considerably cut down that of Tugh Timûr. With the Kât dynasty of Herât, Tugh Timûr was on friendly terms, for his daughter Sultan-Khân Khâtî had married Mirza al-Dîn Kât (Zafar-nâmâ, l. 320).

In 739 (1338) Hasan Buzurg himself invited Tugh Timûr to come to the 'Irâq. He went there to see the Amir Arghun-Shah, son of Nawzâ and grandson of the celebrated Arghun-Shah; cf. Dâwud, ii. 251 (this family held Nishân, Tûs and Kâhî; it is known by the Mongol name of Liqân al-Dîn Khâribân (in Persia Liqân-Kurštânî). Hasan Buzurg went to see Tugh Timûr at Sâwà but on the one hand Khodja 'Ali al-Dîn Muhammed, who had control of the financial administration, appealed the inhabitants and on the other the Khân himself entered into negotiations with the Çâbânî Hasan Küçük. The latter seized the opportunity to compromise the Khân with Hasan Buzurg. Disgusted by his intrigues, the simple Mongol that very night broke his camp at Marâqî and returned to Khurâsân (Shâfâfar, p. 327; d'Ohason, iv. 732).

In 741 (1341) Tugh Timûr for the third time invaded the 'Irâq. He was supported by the princes Nishân, daughter of Ujdâstân-Khân, and by Shîrbûrgân, her son by the amir Çobân, but the army of Tugh Timûr commanded by his brother Ali Gâwûn was defeated at Ahib by the troops of Hasan Küçük.

Khurâsân very soon passed under the rule of the Sardâbîs who drove Arghun-Shah, lord of Nishân and Tûs, out of it. The Sardâbî Wâlîsh Shah al-Dîn Mâsûd defeated the Khân's troops on the Atrak, slew 'Ali Gâwûn and even held Djurdjan for a time. According to Dâwul-Shah, p. 236—37, Tugh Timûr had to be content with nominal power (mîm-nâma-isurl) over the Sardâbîs who appeared once a year at the Khân's court to pay homage as vassals (mîu'ilat-n mân-jadbî'at tâbî). During one of these visits the Khân was assassinated at Sûlân-duvîn (between Gürât and the Kûrmân) by the Sardâbî Yahya Karbût. The chronicle, composed by the poet Asfî, gives the date of this event as the 16th Dhu-l-Ka'da 754 (Dec. 1353).

According to Dâwul-Shah, Tugh Timûr expelled the Sardâbîs in his democratic tendencies; he encouraged people of modest origin and distrusted the nobles. He spent the summer at Râdûk and the winter on the Gûrât. He built a fine 'Imârât at Mashhad. Coins in name of Tugh Timûr were struck not only at Amlû, Mashhad,
keep on good terms with the sainyid-walls of Sârî and Anûl (ibid., p. 387, 391).

During the campaign of 1394 (1399) the ruler of Anûrâbâd was 4. Pîr [or Pîrâk] Pâhâlj, son of Lu'dîmân Pâhâlj (= Pâhâlj; Zafar-nâma, i. 570) whom Timûr had installed there. After the death of his father, Pîr Pâhâlj entertained Timûr lavishly and procured him ships for the conquest of Mahânsar (4 farsâkhs from Anûl). His loyal services are also mentioned in 536 (1404) on the occasion of Timûr's expedition against Iskandar Calkî in Mazândarân (ibid., li. 591). At the beginning of the reign of Shâhrûkh, Sultân 'Ali of Saljûzvarî having collected a body of Sarbadâr rebels in Khorâsân. Pîr Pâhâlj appeared suddenly in Rumân and joined Sultân 'Ali, but the allies were defeated by Sâyiyd Khodja sent by Shâhrûkh (Mat'âl al-Sâdîn, N. E., 1843, p. 26). Sultân 'Ali with his allies sought refuge with Mirân-shâh, who had come from Aqbarâbâd, but the latter handed him over to Sâyiyd Khodja. On this occasion several sons of Pîr Pâhâlj fell into the hands of Sâyiyd Khodja (ibid., p. 54; 80). In 824 Shâhrûkh placed Pîr Pâhâlj that he would be safe and summoned him to his court. Sâyiyd Khodja, however, over-whelmed with tokens of gratitude by Shâhrûkh, conceived ambitious projects, entered into negotiations with Iskandar (of Fân) and finally rose in rebellion. From Kâlât he had to seek refuge with Pîr Pâhâlj. This provoked Shâhrûkh's expedition against Mâzândarân (509 = 1406). Pîr Pâhâlj had considerable forces under him; but lost the battle. He fled to Khârûzîm and Sâyiyd Khodja went to Shîrâz. Shâhrûkh set prince 'Omar Bahâdâr up in Mâzândarân but he soon rebelled and was replaced by Ulûgh-beg. In 810 the latter informed his father Shâhrûkh of Pîr Pâhâlj's new preparations. For a second time Shâhrûkh set out for Mâzândarân and the news of his advance forced Pîr Pâhâlj to seek refuge with the Badâkshânî Kayûmâr b. Bâûûtîn. Without striking a blow Shâhrûkh re-established his authority at Anûrâbâd and Shâksâm.

In 812, the son of Pîr Pâhâlj, 5. Sultân 'Ali came to Shâhrûkh and took part in the expedition to Sâtûn but on the news of his death fled to Rostâmîr. There he obtained the support of the amir Kayûmâr and collected his father's forces. On the departure of Shâhrûkh for Transoxiana Sultân 'Ali tried to take Anûrâbâd but was defeated and slain by the governor. His head was sent to Harât (Mat'âl al-Sâdîn, in Dorn, Ausûl, p. 195).

TUGHRA (Ottoman and Seldjuk Turkish), cipher or calligraphic emblem of the Oghus, later Seldjuk and then Ottoman rulers, which in course of time became the coat of arms or escutcheon of the state, and was placed by the ruler not only on inscriptions and firmans but on title-deeds of property, coins, official monuments, ships-of-war and in more modern times on documents of identification, passports, postage-stamps, sheets of stamped paper, goldsmith's marks etc.

Lexicon. The word tughra was synonymous with the Persian mishun, nishan or mishan (whence the Arabic plural majyûn) "sign" and with the Arabic tsawib [q.v.] "cipher, signature" and in the concluding formula of firmans the tughra is called u'ammt. All these words have a wider meaning than tughra, and it came about, in Egypt for example, that the tughra was only a part or a particular aspect of the u'ammt. Tughra has passed into Persian (cf. the examples from Hakim-i Khalîkilân and Mir Nagmî, in T.O.E.M., No. 43, p. 56) and Ibn Khallîkilân (Wafâyât al-Ayûn, i. 202), even thought the word was of Persian origin. According to Ibn Khallîkilân, it was in Persian that the orthography in Arabic characters became fixed as تGROUND_1 Ground_2 (tughra) with âf âf majûra.

This is why it has been taken by Turkish literary usage for an elative Arabic feminine fu'tâ, and declined, according to Turco-Persian syntax, with feminine adjectives: tughrib-i gharrâz "the illustrious or brilliant tughra". Some western writers also put it in the feminine ("die Tughra").

Arabic has for some time used the verb tugghara, "to place the tughra upon" (Ma'ktrî, Khabî, Cairo 1270, ii. 211). Popular Arabic has confounded tughra with tarra ša钤 border of a piece of cloth or the upper border of a document" and this last name is given to the tughra in Djibartt (iv. 95, s) and in present day usage in Egypt. This confusion, easily explained from the place in the document where the tughra was put (cf. below), is fairly old (cf. Ibn Khallîkilân, op. cit.; cf. also Quatremére, Memleket, 17. Nov. 308, note).

In dialects, tughra is pronounced tarra and tawa, for example in Gagauz (Radloff, Freben, x; Moschkoft, p. 98) and thus becomes a homonym of a word, which means in Turkish "stick or swoon used for playing on a large drum, a twisted handchief used in a game to strike someone in the hollow of the hand" (the Arabic tarra, already mentioned, is also found with this meaning: cf. also Arabic or Persian, tarra, dere, darre, derr, dere, serve").

In spite of all these attempts at assimilation by foreign languages, the word tughra must be considered as purely Turkish origin. From valuable notes in Kâshghârî (L. 388), we know that it comes from the Oghus tugghrâ (تغتّر) which meant:

1. "asal (âsîh) and cipher (tawib) of the Oghus ruler (malik), but the (settled) Turks do not know it";
2. "any horse provisionally lent to the army for the days of a royal review or for the duration of a war (it is probable that this comes from the royal mark stamped upon the horse)".

Kâshghârî also gives (l. 217) the verb tugghrâl, "to receive the tugghra" referring to a document or to a page (Turk. ogâlan, Ar. al-fâ'il). The change tughhrâl > tughra is explained by the dropping, regular in Osmâli of the final guttural گ of the Oghus. We have many other examples of the same phenomenon.

Like other Turkish and Persian words ending in and borrowed by the Arabic, tughra in the latter language was given the termination -mašr in the plural: tughrâwânt (cf. Kâshghârî, xii. 163) like âsgânt, alâfânt, sâwânt, astâwânt, dawânt, etc.

On the other hand, the existence of the old form tughhrât enables us to dispose of a number of rash etymologies proposed for tughra, like that of Zekerî who sees in it, with metathesis, the optative târ-ghal-yâ "let it be so" or that of Tychsen, who sees in it the word doghra "truth" (Introduction in rer nummarium Musulmonianorum, Rostock 1794, quoted in the Description de l'Egypte, xi. 338-345).

The theory which connects tughra with the name of the fabulous bird tughrâ descures more space.

The writers who have maintained it, Ahmad Midhat Efendi, Ahmad Wefik Pasha, Ziya Gûk Alp (M. T.M., No. 3, p. 404, 445) and Colonel 'Ali (T.E.M., No. 43 and 44 of the year 1334), say that this bird was the badge (Ziya Gûk Alp says "petum") or onyx (عورة, عورة) of the great Kâshghâr of the Oghus and that each of the 24 tribes under him and each of the 4 khanîs who commanded them in groups of six had their onyx. Unfortunately not one of these authors gives their authority for their statements. The quotations from Rashîd ad-Din and Mahmût Kâshghârî only contain descriptions of this fabulous bird (we may add that it is mentioned in the Shâhânam, ed. Mohî, in folio, v. 619, 821; the Kâshghâr makes a present of this bird to Bahram Gûr).

Kâshghârî, although better placed than us to discuss the etymology of tughra, only says: "we do not know its origin".

History of the tughra. Unfortunately we do not know the pattern of the tughra used by the Oghus or the Seldjûks, who were of the same race. The title of the tughrâ-yi or official appointed by the latter to draw the tughra has been preserved through the name of one of them, who was viceroy of Malîk Shâh and Ma'sud and author of the Lîâyât- al-âdâm, d. in 514 according to some, 513 according to others [see the art. AL-TUGHRÂ]. His biograph (Ibn Khallîkilân, ed. de Slane, i. 462; Ibn-al-Wâsî, Cairo 1285, i. 131; Ibn al-Athir, Recueil des Histoires, i. 347) all say that tughrâ-yi is the official who draws the tughra. M. Bâhânî also mentions a râdâ' al-dîwân al-âlî (or tughrâ-yi) from the Malîk al-Balâdîrî al-Musawir (Cairo 1300, 118), while work by 'Ali al-Din 'Ali b. 'Abdallâh al-Bâhî', d. in 815 (1413).

We again find the tughra among the Malîk Sultanîs of Egypt, who no doubt borrowed it from the Seldjûks (through the Ayyûbids). According to Kâshghârî, it was only used down to the reign of Shâhân b. Husain (1352-1376). This statement is confirmed by Maktrî, Khabî, loc. cit., who says the tughra was no longer in use in his
TUGHRĀ
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taken from the alif’s in the name of the prince and his father. The words “Emir Sulaimān” are surrounded by “ṣūḥa”, in turn surrounded by Bāyārīd. In a tughrā of Mehmēd (Ibn) Bāyārīd (Mehmed I; cf. Khalīl Edhem, Mīrzā Ḥusayn Muṣṭafā Ḥarūn, Constantinople 1534, i. 31), there are 4 verticals but this number is exceptional and is only found, for the sultāns, at a comparatively remote period.

2. The oval or elliptical curves, not closed, to the number of two, which meet in the lower part of the name of the prince and which turning first to the left, ascend, then turn to the right to cut the verticals in their upper parts and then disappear on the right. Exceptionally, we find one or three curves. The number two at quite an early period became sacred for the sultān’s figure. These curves seem originally to have been prolongations of the letters šīn, which occur in the word (Ibn and in the name of the prince of his father or in the tughrā of prince Sulaimān, in that of Murūd I (according to Colonel ‘Alt), in that of Mehmēd I, where the second šīn is supplied by the word sultān (cf. Khalīl Edhem, loc. cit.) or in the later tughrā in which, according to Fekete, the šīn of the word šīn and chān have been prolonged. It is true that they are found very early, even when the names do not supply a second šīn; cf. the tughrās, incomplete it is true, given by Khalīl Edhem, p. 44, 48, 55, 65, 67 and 68.

At first the names and the patronymic were placed in the escutcheon, circumscribed by the curves but in the later development of the tughrā this space was left party vacant. At first only the name of the sultān was left there; the name of his father and later the two names were placed quite at the bottom of the verticals where they formed a crowded group of intersecting lines, forming a more or less geometrical figure called are which means “the little palm, space between the finger and the thumb” (properly “spreading out” = gerundive of the verb are-are; cf. the saying are-are šēr-e, šēl šaresh; the word is found with the same meaning in Kirghiz, cf. Radloff, Wörterbuch, iv. 458).

Between the are and the escutcheon is inserted the word al-maghafar “victorious” with the addition of dāʾima “always”, which is placed in the form of a very conventional seal in the centre of the escutcheon. The final alif of the word dāʾima (dāʾima) is lengthened and, turning sharply round to the left, cuts through the curves. These words appeared for the first time according to I. Ghaṭīl Edhem (Catalogue, p. 3 and 206 note) on the coins of Ibrāhīm II, whose reign began in 1069 A. H.

The two extremities to the right of the curves are given an elongated and more elegant form. They have become one more characteristic feature of the modern tughrā of which they form the arms (tughrā gharaf). From the tops of the three verticals descend three broken lines like floating flames. As to the word Khān; after having figured at the end of the name of the sovereign’s father, it was added to that of the sovereign from the time of Muhāmed I (1730–1754).

In the field to the right of the tughrā, was frequently placed a flower. In the same place the sultāns later put their title of gāzi when they had the right to it (Muhāmed II put his poetic

time, i.e. between 766 and 845 (1364–1442).

Kālkhāndī (xii. 162–166) gives details of the tughrā (ṣūḥa) which the sultāns of Egypt placed upon muṣṭafā (q.v.; plur. muṣṭafāʾ) or rescripts addressed to the chiefs of a 1,000 and to the emir (ṣāḥib al-khansā').

It was the duty of a special official to prepare these tughrās on rectangular pieces of paper. The scribes then inserted these rectangles in the spaces left blank for them in the tahrīr or “upper part of the document” (cf. the hārām, cf. also Quenemère, Sultans Mamlouks, Hil. 2 (308–309).

The tughrā was formed of the šīn of the sultān, written on one line. The text of the tughrā of Sultan al-Malik al-Nāṣir Muḥammad b. Kālkhān was al-Sultān al-Malik al-Nāṣir, Nāṣir al-dīn wa-l-din Muḥammad b. al-Sultān al-Malik al-Manṣūr Saif al-Dīn al-Kālkhān (fig. 1).

The uprights (muṣṭafāʾ) of all the vertical letters like alif, dāl, lām, b, p, which number 33 in this tughrā, are considerably elongated isotropic uprights alternating with groups of two (Kālkhāndī gives the exact measurements of the spaces left between the verticals). To secure this regular arrangement, some letters were displaced; this was the case with the alif of al-malik, which was inserted between the two šīns of al-sultān. Under the line of titles were the words khālid al-ʾīlām sulṭānakht which were written, not by the official of the tughrā, but by the scribe who wrote out the muṣṭafāʾ itself on which this formula encroaches a little (perhaps intentionally).

The size of this tughrā, according to al-Kālkhāndī, was “a half ġīrā al-ʾīlām al-adhīrā” in width and height. The size of the characters or of the šālam varied according to the number of uprights.

We refer to the same work for a description of fig. 2. In it we have 45 uprights (or 47 vertical letters), which are arranged in pairs with their extremities horizontal. But the most striking peculiarity here is the fact that at the bottom of the verticals (traced in the šālam al-ʾīlām al-adhīrā) is written the name of the sultān, Shāhānshāh b. Ḥusain (in later characters or šālam al-jumār).

We may call attention to the peculiar features of the emblematic words as depicted by the words Shāhān and (Ibn) which are in the centre. It is probable that this is the junction of the two curves to be mentioned below.

The Ottoman tughrā, although derived in all probability from the same model (Saljūq), differs markedly, in appearance at least, from the Egyptian tughrā.

The oldest Ottoman tughrā known to me is found on the coins of the emir Sulaimān (806–816 = 1405–1416). All that von Hammer says on the subject of tughrās dating from Murūd I or his father Orkham does not seem to be based on anything tangible. Fekete, it is true, according to Khalīl Edhem, who gives no definite reference, speaks of coins of Murūd I with the tughrā, but this author’s Catalogue does not mention these coins. Colonel ‘Alt (p. 110–111) also gives the scheme of the graphic evolution of the tughrā from Murūd I but without saying whence he had taken it.

It should be noted that the tughrā of the emir Sulaimān already contains the principal elements of this cipher, i.e.

1. The verticals to the number of 3, which are
The form of tughra which we have just described has often been imitated by private individuals who used to substitute for the name of the sultan religious formularies to make it giba or calligraphic plaques to hang up in mosques, libraries, cafes or private houses. In Egypt we even find tradesmen's signs of this kind, but they are now disappearing and it was quite recently allowable to order a ḍabīrī or a maker of stationery to make a tughra in one's own name (cf. fig. 12, 13).

The official use of the tughra ceased in Turkey with the deposition of the last sultan (law of Ankara from Nov. 1, 1922).

If we now compare the Omani tughra with the Manūbī tughra, we ascertain that the graphic element which is common to both, we find that this element reduces itself to the uprights of the vertical letters. We are thus led to conclude quite naturally that the essential feature of the tughra is a certain number—not fixed—of upright strokes.

Writers have talked of a tughra formed on the model of the Murād II (Am, p. 413; Khalīl Edhem, loc. cit.) made simply of oval curves but I do not think we really have a tughra here. At least it is an incomplete one. We have seen that if in some Manūbī tughras there were lines analogous to these curves, they were not an indispensable element.

Although supplied later by the method of writing the words, the decorative motif represented by the verticals must be older than the use of the Arabic script among the Turks.

The symbol of the tughra. If we suppose the tughra is not simply a conventional mode of writing, what symbol does it represent?

We have already mentioned that some see in it the figure of a bird. Others have gone so far as to see in it a horseman galloping at full speed (Tychsen) but the most popular theory is that which owes its name to v. Hammer (Hist. de l'Emp. Ottom., 1851) 211. According to him, the tughra would be the imitation of the mark left by the hand of sultan Murād I, who not being able to write, dipped his hand in ink (!) and stamped it instead of a signature on the treaty concluded with the Ragusaus. This explanation, which seems to overlook the fact that the sultan in question had a chancellor, is taken by v. Hammer from Engel (Gesch. des Freystaates Ragusa, Vienna 1807, p. 141), who does not give any authority. It is not known in the east and is clearly a legend, which originated no doubt in Ragusa itself. It nevertheless has had a great vogue: Barbier de Meynard accepted it (Rec. des Hist. des Croisades, iv. 158 note) and it was defended quite recently by arguments taken from the antiquity of the use of finger prints.

Looking at the primitive form of the tughra (cf. above) all the hypotheses which we have just given, fall to the ground at once. It is interesting to note that Fekete came to the same negative result, starting from the design of the Ottoman tughra, which however is more complicated. Later interpretations being based on more elaborate forms of the tughra are of little importance.

This is why the fact that the tughra or the ḍabīrī, which is the imitation of it, is sometimes given the form of a bird in Turkish decorative art (a specimen of the year 1881 A.H. is given in figure 14). Similarly the fact that ḍabīrī means "claw" and sīrīz "palm" is not an argument in favour of von Hammer's theory, who however did not think of quoting it. (The French word "griffes" is used also with the meaning of "stamp for a signature".)

In thus simplifying the problem, one is led to ask if the books of which we have spoken have not some symbolic significance. Our question arises which we put forward with all reserve: do not these verticals represent the tughra, a word which we know was applied by the Turks to the horsemen's yokes floating on the end of a pole, or earlier to the pole itself? In general? The main argument that can be produced against the suggestion is the unity of the denominative verbal suffix -śa, from which we should have to derive -śuγ (in tughra) by a formation parallel to the well known suffixes -a (aqīş) We have however called attention to this suffix in our Grammaire de la langue turque and more especially in L'Anthropologie, xxxii. (1923), p. 174. The fate of this hypothesis can only be decided by a more profound study, which has still to be undertaken, of this suffix.

As to the argument that one might be tempted to draw from the flames floating at the top of the tughra or from the fact that in the ḍabīrī the custom became established of very often drawing two verticals for the ḍabīrī of two tails and three for the ḍabīrī of three tails or waris, these are all interpretations a posteriori which prove no more than those we have rejected above (as a curiosity we give as fig. 15 a signature in which the words bi-allaḥu ḍabīrī are arranged in three verticals: although they refer to a woman). It has also to be noted that sumissimatics sometimes seem to take the word tughra in the larger meaning of "motif of decoration by letters" (J.R.A.S., 1848).

Nīghāndī. We have seen that the Salājūk or Manūbī rulers had officials whose particular duty it was to draw the tughra (in Turkish tughra lēkem, in Persian tughra kirēh) It was the same among the Ottomans, who had officials for this purpose called nīghāndī and nīghānī.

The nīghāndī was with the three ḍabīrīs and the dīfar amīl, one of the five high officials of the court of the class of the ḍabīrīs (Mouradja d'Ohsouan, iii. 359; von Hammer, xvii. 54). Apart from his special office he had, at least at first, certain quite important legislative duties and he was to be called maṣūfī fi nīghānī, "jurisconsult of secular law", in contrast to the maṣūr fi nīghānī, "jurisconsult of religious law". In his house the façades were prepared. The text was checked by his master and the nīghāndī himself then drew the tughra upon it. It may be further noted that the majority of the façades that have come down to us were prepared by nīghāndīs.

These officials had also at first the right to examine and control all documents presented to him to be marked with the Sultan's monogram, which gave them a kind of supervision over the departments which sent them up (Mouradja d'Ohsouan, loc. cit.)

According to the Kāmān-nāme of the ṭirāfī (nīghāndī), "Abd al-Raḥmān (of 1085, M. T. M. p. 515), the following were the formalities to be gone through: When a firman is promulgated re-
Fig. 3
Taghra of the emir Sulaiman (1405-1413).

Fig. 4
Taghra of Mehmed III (1595-1603).

Fig. 5
Taghra of Ibrahim I (1640-1648).

Fig. 6
Taghra of Mahmud I (1730-1754).

Fig. 7
Taghra of Mustafa III (1757-1773).

Fig. 8
Taghra of Mahmud II (1808-1839).

Fig. 9
Taghra of Abdul-Aziz (1861-1876).

Fig. 10
Taghra of Sultan Suleyman II (III) to Ibrahim on a firman of the first ten days of Zil-Ka'ba 1099 = of 28th August to 6th September 1688.
Fig. 11
Tughra of Sultan Almad II b. Ibrahim on a firman of the second ten days of Djamalâddin II 1104 = of 16th to 25th February 1693

Fig. 12
A merchant’s name arranged in a tughra

Fig. 13
Karmala tughra in a menu of restaurant in Cairo

Fig. 14
Owner's mark on a signboard from Mar’ash
Fig. 30
Dâmitâl Hasan Paşa 24th Zil-Hijja 1120 = 6th March 1709

Fig. 31
Abd-ur-Rahmân Paşa 10th Rabî' II. 1189 = 1st June 1678

Fig. 32
Sadre-i Sahîlî Nishânîji Mehemed Paşa 14th Shaban 1137 = 28th April 1725

Fig. 33
Boynuçeyri Hasan-Pasha-Zade 'Abdullah Paşa 15th Zil-Ka'da 1165 = 24th September 1752
quiring official authorization (nağihî ferman), the law required that the tughras should be executed by the grand vizier himself. On receiving this ferman, the mishâdji inscribed on the reverse the words defter gecik "let its register be brought" (in which is the precedent to be examined) and sends it to the defter rimâni. The latter at once sends back the ferman with the required register through the bânsûr (official in charge of the registers) of the archives (defter-immam). After finding the required reference, the mishâdji verifies it and keeps the ferman ordering it.

He also receives in a sealed bag (mumhär hânî) the defter issued by the bânsûr, writes on the register opposite the names of the beneficiaries of these defters the word qâlî "verified, seen, approved," again seals the bag and sends it by its kâdîâr to the âkîrîtân entîlî (who collects the chancellery dues). According to the hânsûr of Mehmed II, the nihâdjis had to be recruited from the mûderris of the grade of dâ'îlî and jâmi'î. The lists of defterlers (evidently on account of the qualifications demanded by these as regards legislation) and also from the defterler and the reis al-'âlîrîtâb. The early defterler ranked on this occasion as equal to the kâdirîyâ'îs, the early reis al-'âlîrîtâb only ranked equal to the sanââ'îtîb-heyî.

The reis al-'âlîrîtâb became more important and the nihâdjis gradually saw their functions reduced to the calligraphy of the tughras. Among their duties, however, they retained the control of the registration of transfers of timar (q.v. 'âdâsnî, kâhiyâ) and of the wa'îf villages (kânim-nâme of Mehmed II, edited by Mehmed Xirîf in 1330, p. 14, note 5, suppl. to T. O. E. M.).

According to the same kânim-nâme, in the âdânî-î adâsîyân, the nihâdjis occupied the place of honour (zâde) along with the wa'îf, the bânsûr, and the defterler. Precedence was arranged as follows: the wa'îf has precedence, then the nihâdjis, then the bânsûr, followed by the defterler, and on the other the nihâdjis. If a nihâdji had the rank of a vizier or heylîberîyâ (which gave him the title of paşa) he had precedence of the defterler; if he was only a sanââ'îtîb or emir rivâ (which only gave him the title of bey) he came after the defterler, but before the kâdiyâ'îs of the old and present capitals of the empire. The nihâdjis and the defterler had the same clerical title (âlisî; cf. Mângâlî-î Pardîn Bey, p. 9). The nihâdjis, having the rank of vizier, had the same privileges as the other viziers (kânim-nâme of Abd al-Rahîm). According to Mouradja d'Ossioon (iii. 373) the nihâdjis received a state salary of 6,000 piastres. Other details may be found in the same kânim-nâme of the ceremonial of the dâ'îlî as far as the nihâdjis were concerned. Like the other dâ'îlî kâdirîyâ'îs, they wore the ceremonial turban called musâhirwene. An eri or over-garment of wool, a kaftân or under-garment of kevâmât bûshî. According to v. Hammer (xxviii. 54), the robes of the nihâdjis were red, while those of the other kâdirîyâ'îs were violet. Their horses had a covering (zâbîrî) and harness (râkûtî) of the second class (orîtu). Their kâhiyâ was a little over 4 yîk (400,000 aspers).

Tughra kek. With the extension of the empire, the nihâdjis found themselves obliged to call in the help of other officials and the kânim-nâme of Mehmed II contains the following provision tughrâ-

The name meşâ'-î tughrâ "exercised (or penned) of the tughrâ" was given to the favour which the sultan granted to those he wished to distinguish by entrusting them with the task of preparing the tughras. (It was done with a brush or kâhiyâ).

The work of the nihâdjis was somewhat lightened by the fact that the orders of the Porte destined for the capital did not have a tughrâ; only the sultans sent to the provinces were tughrâlî ("supplied with a tughrâ") (Mouradja d'Ossioon, Biauschi and Kieffer, under the word تغریه). Cf. above however on the tughras of the Âhihî ferman.

In conclusion, we may add that the highest officials and even the governors of the second class in tracing their genealogy frequently gave it a form very like that of the tughras. I have photographs of orders issued by the four main waifs of Egypt (fig. 16-19) in which the genealogy resembles the sultan's tughrâ. In stead of (in the genealogy: 1061 and 1062 side by side) muqarrar two, and later three, elliptic circles are found. With the three shafts they form letters which apparently are a posteriorior reminiscence of the initial of the word kâhlî.

In stead of dâ'îlî, kâhiyâ is found. In stead of being at the top of the document, they were put on the margin of the right side and perpendicular to it. (I do not see why some writers will not admit that this peculiarity was dictated by feelings of deference to the sultan.)

When the nihâdji disappeared at the return, officials called tughrâkeh were kept to draw the tughras.

In the adâasî (official year-book) of the Ottoman empire of the year 1324 (1918), p. 123, is found the name of a tughrâkeh of the rank of sâmiyê (shûâbi) who belonged to the adâsnî-î adâsîyân (heylî-î alâisî). In the earlier annuals (e.g. 1302 = 1886, 1323 = 1907, 1324 = 1908), there are two tughrâkeh, known respectively as evessi and sâmi (shûâbi) who are mentioned as forming part of the mûsulmân adâsî, after the other officials i.e. the bânsûr kâhiyâ (later mûderris), müsâhirwîs (later), miftâh, mûderris (earlier), and two muqarrar. They had the rank of miftâh, sâmiyê and sâmiyê.

The earliest year-book of the Ottoman empire for the year 1265 (1847) does not mention the nihâdji, who however no longer existed nor the tughrâkeh, who was no doubt considered not of sufficient importance: the list of officials was less complete in this volume than in the others (cf. "J. A., Sept. 1847.
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J. Decy

TUGHRA, MULLâ TUGHRA-i MAHMUD, a Persian literary man, was born in Maghâd (the date is not known) and went to India towards the end of the reign of Dâjmâh. After spending some time in the Deccan, he became munshi to Prince Mûrâd Bâkhsh in the reign of Shah Jâhân. He accompanied the latter on his expedition to Bâlkh. The conquest of the latter town and of Bakhshâna by this prince (1555–1557 = 1645–1647) was celebrated by him in a prose work (rûšâlâ). This rûšâlâ called Mrûsîr al-Fârîûh was later imitated by a certain Ghulâm Muhamîd al-Dîn who in 1135 (1722–1733) wrote a panegyric biography of a high military officer of the Mughal Empire, Saif al-Dawla Abd al-Samad (d. 1150 = 1737–1738) entitled Fârîûh-i-nâmâ-i Samâd.

Tughra later went to Isfâhân in the train of the Divâna (Privy Councilor) Mûsâ Awa Tâkî. Here he spent the last years of his life and died before 1078 (1667–1668). He is mentioned as already dead in a book written in this year (Rieu, p. 742). The year 1150 (1717–1718) in which, according to Pertsch (Die persischen Handschriften der ... Bibliothek zu Gotha, p. 24), a work by Tughrâ was completed, according to the colophon in the Gotha MS. No. 9, is to be referred to the copyist and not to the author of the text. Ch. Stewart (Catalogue of MSS, p. 64) gives 1323 a.d. as the year of Tughra's death; I cannot suggest how such an error arose.

Tughrâ wrote poems as well as prose (rûšîlî). Among his poetical works was the prose poem of Sâfîâ-nâmâ, a comprehensive Mawlawî in imitation of a work of the same name of an earlier poet Šâhârî (d. 1025 = 1616); Tâbīî-i Khâshâh, a description of Kashmir in Mawlawî form. Here also he imitated an earlier poet, Hâkim Zaîhil (d. 1026 = 1617). Tughrâ also wrote a preface to the works of this poet (cf. E. Châfis, Catalogue of the Pers. MSS, in the India Office Library, p. 316, 319). The Tâbîî was apparently composed in Kashmir i.e. after the poet had left the Mughal court. Tughrâ, like almost all Persian poets, also wrote ghâzals, rûšîlîs, muqâţâ'at etc. His rûšîlîs, written in very affected, pompous prose seem however to have enjoyed greater popularity than his poems. They exist in a number of MSS, while those of the poems are less numerous (in Europe at least). Tughrâ wrote about 25 of them, a list of them extent in MSS, will be found in the books quoted below in the Bibliography.——-

Here it is sufficient to mention in addition to the

Mîrâsîr al-Fârîûh, Mîrûsîr al-Idrîsh, an essay on the Divan of Hâfiz, Firdawsiyya and Tâbîî-i Khâshâh, two descriptions of Kashmir in prose; Tughrâ-i al-Asghâr, panegyrics on twelve contemporary scholars and poets of Kashmir; Mrûsîr al-Idrîsh, a satire on an emir of the court of Golkonda; Dînâyiszâ, a panegyric on Awarangzîb and Firdawsi, a panegyric on the Shâh of Persia 'Abdâbîl Shi. Lastly it may be mentioned Tughrâ's letters to various contemporaries, An edition of 18 of his rûšâlâ with the letters and commentary appeared (lit.) at Cawnpore in 1871 and Lucknow in 1885.


(V. F. Böckner)

AL-TUGHRA, MU'AIYYID AL-DIN FAKHR AL-KUTAYBI ABU 'ISMAIL AL-'HURAINI, ALI B. MUHAMMAD B. ABU AL-SAMAD AL-ISFAHANI, better known by the name of Tughrâ (so named after the scroll, consisting of the name of the sovereign and his titles, written at the top of official documents above the Basmala), an Arab poet, was born in 453 (1061) probably in Isfâhân. His early career is imperfectly known, but he appears to have first been engaged as secretary in Erbil. Then he entered the chancellory of the Saljuq Sultan and served during the reign of Malikshah and his son Muhammad. He was without equal as regards the beauty of his calligraphy, but according to the prolix statement of 'Imâd al-Dîn, his work was tedious slow. The vizier of Sultân Muhammad may have feared his rivalry was his enemy and should have liked to have him removed, but could find no cause. That Tughrâ's aspired to higher things is evident from the remark of the biographer that he spent money on bribes to obtain the position of vizier, but was not successful. His chance seemed to have come when Sultan Muhammad died, while he was with prince Mas'ud at Mawâqil, while the Wazîr al-Samairini was with prince Mahmûd at İsfaheen. In conjunction with other nobles they persuaded Mas'ud to throw off allegiance to Mahmûd, whom al-Samairini had proclaimed Sultan of the Western provinces of the Saljuq empire. Sultan Muhammad had died in 511 (1117–1118) and it was only in 513 that they tried to make a bid for the throne. An ill-equipped army accompanied by Mas'ud and Tughrâ, al-Mas'ud was at last vizier, marched to meet the army of Sultan Mahmûd. A battle was fought in the neighbourhood of Hamadân which
resulted in the complete defeat of Mas'ud. He himself was made a prisoner as also was Tughril who had thus fallen into the hands of his enemy. Mas'ud was pardoned, but Tughril's condemned to death, because he was declared a heretic. He was ordered to be shot with arrows by a company of soldiers, but some verses uttered by him as he was facing death caused the visier to defer the execution of the sentence. It was however carried out a later date, which is generally fixed in the year 512 (1216-1217). The chronology of these events is far from certain. Ibn al-Athir dates the battle in the year 514 and one account even gives 513 as the date of Tughril's execution. This latter date is certainly wrong, because al-Sumairi was murdered in the month of Safar 516 in Baghda as near the Ni'amatya Madrasa by a negro slave who was said to have belonged to Tughril's and committed the murder to avenge his master.

The reputation of Tughril rests principally upon his poem, the Lamiyat al-Adjam, composed in Baghda in 505 (1111-1112), in which he complains about the evil times in which he lives. This poem, published by Gallus with a Latin translation, was perhaps the earliest specimen of Arabic poetry accessible to wider circles in Europe and was several times reprinted and translated into other languages. It has also been the subject to a number of Arabic commentaries. The Dilmun, printed in Constantinople, was collected after the author's death and contains, in addition to the Lamiya, poems in praise of notables and princes, and the latest compositions are perhaps those in praise of his youthful master, prince Mas'ud.

There was another branch of study cultivated by Tughril, namely alchemy and in this pseudo-science he composed a number of works, which, as Dhahabi put it, were the cause of the waste of untold wealth, both by the author himself and by those who made use of his works. The language is these is abstruse with this class of literature. The following titles of his works are recorded and several of them exist in manuscript: 1. Dilmun al-Adjam (MS. in Goa?); 2. Tarikh al-Ammur (perhaps only part of the title of the first-named); 3. Hai'at al-Fatimihudat; 4. Kitab al-Khate al-Faw'id; 5. Kitab al-Rudda 'ala Ibn Sina fi Ruhul-Khulafa; 6. Ahrurrah al-Ilhama wa-Mu'attal al-Rahma; advanced students only (MS. Paris, No. 2514); in addition to these the Paris MS., No. 2067 claims to be a commentary of the Kitab al-Rahmah of Djibr b. Haiyans under the title Sir al-Hikma fi Sharh Kitab al-Rahma but the authorship is uncertain.

Editions of his poems: Dilmun, Constantinople 1300; Lamiya by Gallus, Leyden, 1629, reprinted by H. van der Sloot in Franeker 1769; E. Pocock, Oxford 1661 with Latin translation, reprinted in 1770 by J. Hirth in Institutiones Arabicarum, Jena; L. G. Parens, Utrecht, 1828, and A. Raux, Paris 1903 with French translation. English translations by J. D. Carlyle, Specimens of Arabic Poetry, Oxford 1796; reprinted by W. A. Clouston, Arabic Poets, Glasgow 1881; L. Chappelov, Cambridge 1758 (after Pocock's Latin version). French translation by B. Vattier, Paris 1650, after Gallus and the one by Raux mentioned above. Commentaries: Sulah al-Din al-Safadi, Ghazir al-Muwadridjan bil-Sharh Lamiyaat al-Adjam, also called Ghazir al-Adjam al-Safadi 'alawd us Salama, printed Cairo 1320 and 1305. This is a voluminous work and enlarges upon all subjects connected with the poem or otherwise. Several abbreviations exist of this commentary: one, called al-Kitab al-Arab al-Mu'addi 'ala al-Khadijat al-Mawdudi, by Abd al-Rahman al-Afwas, was printed Bahrutt 1290; another, much curtailed abridgment, with the title Kitab al-Arab fi Ghazir al-Adjam, was printed Bahrutt 1897.

Other commentaries found in manuscript are Nafir al-A'lam fi Sharh Lamiyaat al-Adjam by Muhammad b. 'Umar al-Hafrasmi (died 939) of which a number of copies are found in libraries; Naft al-Adjam 'an Lamiyaat al-Adjam composed in Constantinople in 962 by Djallal b. Khidr; the oldest commentary is perhaps that by Muhammad al-Din Abu 'l-Bakr 'Abd Allah b. al-Husain al-Ubkit (d. 616). The commentary by Kamal al-Dinami is also a mere extract from that of al-Safadi, and many more.

Biographies of Tughril are found in almost all historical works giving obituaries; all appear to draw upon the same sources: Ya'qub, Ittihad, iv. 50-60; Ibn Khallikan, ed. Cairo 1310, l. 159; Safadi, Ghazir, Cairo 1305, l. 6 sqq.; Ibn al-Athir, Kamil, passim; Bundarti, ed. Houtsma, Recueil, ii., passim. Verses of his are cited in all later anthologies.

Bibliography: given above.

(F. KEENOW)

TUGHRIL II 8. MUHAMMAD, a Seldjuk ruler in the Trak 526—529 = 1132—1134, b. 505 = 1109, had as his guardian (ahlubeg) the docile emir Shigrit and received as his fief a large part of the province of Dijbal with the towns of Swa, Kaswa, Abbar, Zandjin, Aflak, etc. On the death of his father (511 = 1118), the Atabeg Shigrit was thrown into prison and his place taken by the emir Kindoghli, who was on bad terms with Sultan Maliksh, Tughril's brother. With Kindoghli he took part in the unfortunate campaign against the Georgians in 515 (1121) and was in a serious position when his atabeg died in the same year and his relations with his brother never very good, became still worse. In these straits he was easily persuaded by the able and turbulent Arab Dibaj and Sadoqilt as [q.v.] that it would be easy to seize the province of al-Trak and get rid of the caliph and the sultan. The enterprise failed however and the two sought refuge with Sultan Sandjar, who took up their cause and began negotiations on their behalf with Maliksh in al-Ray (end of 522 = 1128). Some years later (524 = 1131) Maliksh died and his son Dizd was summoned to the throne temporarily until Sandjar had finally decided the succession. The latter declared for Tughril, but in the meanwhile another brother, Mas'ud, had claimed the throne and was approaching with considerable forces. In the battle that followed at Dimawar (526 = 1132) between Sandjar and Mas'ud the latter was defeated and sent back to his province of Ganda while Tughril was installed as sultan. Sandjar then departed and left his nephew to enforce his recognition upon his opponents. He was successful in routing Dizd's adherents but the latter himself escaped to Baghdad. Mas'ud was soon in power there and was able to persuade the caliph to mention him in the ikhsupa and designate Dizd as his successor (527 = 1132). Tughril was not a match for his brother and, after wandering about a great deal, sought refuge with the ispahbad of Tabaristan where he spent the whole of the winter of 1132—1133. In the
following year fortune was rather more favourable to him and he succeeded in again carrying the life granting him the throne. On arriving there, he fell ill of a cholera and died early in 529 (Oct.-Nov. 1134). }\textit{Biographies}, i. 174, wrongly gives 528. His widow later married Ildgut [q. v.], who raised Tughril’s son Aslan to the Seljuq throne (555 = 1160).

\textit{Bibliography}: Cf. the article \textit{Seljuqs}.

(M. T. HOUTSMAN)

\textbf{TUGHRIL II} k. ARSLAN, the last Seljuk Sultan in the \textit{Irak} 571—590 (1175—1194) was born in 564 (1168-1169) and when still a minor was raised to the throne by the Ayyubid Prince of Tughrilib. After his father had been poisoned to thwart his ambitious emblems he succeeded in escaping and seizing the Seljuq capital Hamadan. In order to remove the danger of dispossession by his powerful kinsmen, Khiw Arslan asked the caliph to send him troops from Baghdad while he himself advanced from Adharabjaban but the incapable leader of the Baghdad army, the vizier Ibn Uthman, attacked Tughrilib at Dayarg (584 = 1188) and suffered a terrible defeat from the impetuous bravery of his opponent. Little however was won thereby for Tughrilib’s cause, for Khw Arslan was coming nearer and the caliph was equipping a new army. To add to his troubles, the young Sultan quarrelled with his own people and on his return to Hamadan hanged several of his most promising supporters. The result was that he could not hold out in his capital, which was very soon taken by Khiw Arslan, spent some time ravaging the region of Urmia, Khoy and Salmas, and, in vain to win the caliph to his side, applied without success to several Muslim princes, including Salih al-Din, for help and had finally to surrender to Khiw Arslan, who imprisoned him in the castle of Kahriz near Tabriz in 586 (1190). Khiw Arslan then himself occupied the throne of the Seljuq and, when he was murdered next year at the instigation of the widow of his brother, Tughrilib succeeded in escaping and found an asylum with the Banu Kafkha, in Zandjan. The lack of unity among the sons of Pehlivan, now the rulers of Adharabjaban, gave him the opportunity of coming again to Hamadan and marrying Pehlivan’s widow, only however to put her to death. He also took Ishaq and al-Ra’i and sacked the stronghold of Tabarak near the latter town (Yakut, \textit{Majdian}, iii. 507 sq.) but this brought upon him the enmity of the powerful Khwarismahiz who only a short time before had taken al-Ra’i. He was not inclined to lose this city and sent troops there to take it from the Seljuk Sultan. The wise course would have been to avoid their superior numbers but Tughrilib felt it a point of honour to defend the Seljuk claims on the \textit{Irak} even at the cost of his life, namely awaited the approach of the enemy in spite of the advice of his friends, then threw himself with a few faithful followers on the fort and was immediately slain (29th Rabii’ I 590 = March 25, 1194).

\textit{Bibliography}: Cf. the article \textit{Seljuqs}.

(M. T. HOUTSMAN)

\textbf{TUGHRILBEG, RUKN AL-DIN AND TALIJUH MAMMUDDI NIKKIL}, the first Seljuk Sultan 429—450 (1033—1063). For the beginnings of Seljuk power, the rise of Tughrilibeg and of his brother Caghirilibeg, the reader may be referred to the article on the latter. Here we begin with the year 429 (1033) when Tughrilibeg entered Naishabur and his name was mentioned in the \textit{khamsa} there. Al-Baijaki, p. 691, gives interesting details of this. Ibn al-Athir and others say that as early as this he received an envoy from the Caliph, who complained of the robberies of the rude Ghuz which is very probably correct, for we know that the Seljuqs in their earliest document (Baijaki, p. 553) call themselves \textit{mawali} (clients) of the Commander of the Faithful and that there were from the first certain relations between the Seljuqs and the Caliph. Tughrilibeg had however very soon to abandon the town again on account of the Ghaznavids, and only after the defeat of Mansur at Dandanqan on 7th Rama’man 431 (May 22, 1040), were the latter forced to withdraw from Khorasan and leave this province to the Seljuqs. The leaders of the latter, among whom may be mentioned Tughrilibeg, Caghirilibeg, Ibrahim Inal and Kusam, had begun to extend their rule over the adjoining lands also, each for himself, although Tughrilibeg was conceded a certain pre-eminence. The first to submit to him were the Ziyarids of Qadjaran and Tabaristan on payment of an annual tribute in 433 (1041—1042). In the following year he assisted his brother Caghirilibeg in the conquest of Khwarizm; he then restored order in al-Ra’i, where the rudely Ghuz were laying waste the country under Ibrahim Inal, and conquered the Bujj Madjd al-Dawla, who had still been holding out in the stronghold of Tabarak. The rule of the Seljuqs was recognised in Khorasan and Hamadan also; Faridz and the lord of Ishaq, agreed to pay a sum of money. Through the intervention of the Caliph, who sent the celebrated jurist al-Mawardi to Tughrilibeg for this purpose (435), the Bujj Djalil al-Dawla sought to make peace with the Seljuqs but, as he died in the same year, the result desired was only attained under his successor Abu Kamilq in 439 (1047). Ibrahim Inal, who had ravaged Kusam with his Ghuz and was now on his way to Baghdad and had reached Huvan and Khanik, was therefore instructed to retire and seek another field for his activities. Thereupon turned against the Abkhaz and Byzantines, took the prince of the Abkhaz, Lipanites, prisoner and carried off such vast booty that 10,000 waggons were not sufficient to transport it (440 = 1048). A ...
had and in 492 (1050) besieged Isfahān whose ruler Farākār, according to circumstances, kept in the good graces of the Sulṭān of or the Būyids in turn. The siege of a fortified town was not a task for his rude warriors, so that it drugged on and Farākār was only forced to surrender for want of supplies in the following year. The town pleased him so well, that he decided to make it his residence and to give Karākār and Abarjūr in compensation. In 446 (1054) we find him, after a severe illness, in Ardabūlqishīn to receive the homage of the lords of Tabrīz and Garjū. A raid into Byzantine territory had so far not resulted, the siege of Mallakart had been abandoned (cf. Matth. of Edessa, ch. 78; Cebrenus, ed. Bonn, ii. 90). It is true that he was then busy with other schemes; in the autumn he collected his troops and had large supplies of munitions accumulated in Hamadān with the object of undertaking the great campaign against Baghdad. He was invited to do this by Ibn al-"Umarīs, vizier of the caliph, who had been conducting a secret correspondence with him, because the Būyids rule of Malik al-Rāhmīn, successor of Abū Kālidār after 440 (1048), which exercised by their military command in Baghdad al-Batrānī [q.v.] who had a secret arrangement with the Fātimids, was intolerable to him and the caliph. Tughrīlībīg did not hesitate to accede to this appeal and in Ramadān 447 (1055) reached Hulawī on his way to Baghdad where his arrival caused great dismay. Al-Malik al-Rahimīn, who was in Wāṣat, at once hastened to the capital: but al-Batrānī found it advisable to depart and seek refuge with the Masnadād of al-Hilī, Duhailī. There was now no obstacle to open negotiations with Tughrīlībīg. By Ramadān 448, 447, the caliph had his name mentioned in the Khāqān and three days later the sultan entered Baghdad. The presence of the rough Ghūrī however soon led to plundering and murdering and threatened to end in a regular street war with the citizens, so that Tughrīlībīg had at once to intervene to put an end to this state of affairs and, under the pretext that al-Malik al-Rāhmīn had brought it about, he had him arrested in spite of the Caliph’s intervention and the rule of the Būyids was ended for ever. The alliance with the caliph was cemented by his marriage with a daughter of Caghrībīg, but the sultan and caliph only met after the former had brought Duhailī and other rebellious Arabs to terms (end of 449 = beg. 1056). He was given the title of “King of the East and of the West”. Soon afterwards however a change set in; al-Batrānī had in the meanwhile been working actively for the Fātimids and even Ibrāhīm had been tempted to rebel against Tughrīlībīg, handed over his post in al-Mawjūd to al-Batrānī and himself went to Hamadān where many of the Sultan’s Ghūrī who were resting under the long period of inactivity in the Irāq joined him. Tughrīlībīg therefore set out from Baghdad with the troops that had remained faithful to him and when the sons of Caghrībīg came to his assistance with more troops, was able to take Ibrāhīm into prisoner at al-Ra‘īy and had him promptly executed. In the meanwhile al-Batrānī entered Baghdad, which was now empty of troops, and had the name of the Fātimid caliph al-Muqtadir inscribed in the statue of Dhūl-Kā‘īdā (450 = Dec. 27, 1058), while the Caliph and his vizier Ibn al-Muslimīn appealled for the to Kurāish b. Badrīn [q.v.] who was a friend of al-Batrānī’s. The latter succeeded in bringing the Caliph in safety to Hadīthā ‘Ama and landed over the vizier to the vengeance of al-Batrānī who inflicted a cruel death upon him. Exactly a year later Tughrīlībīg appeared on the scene, brought the caliph again into his capital and defeated the troops of al-Batrānī, who was himself slain in the battle (end of 451 = beg. 1060). The memory of these events was still kept alive in Yā‘qūb’s time in Baghādā by certain proverbial sayings (Mu‘āshīyān, iii. 595; 1096). Tughrīlībīg then went to Wāṣat, made peace with Duhailī and appointed farmers the collection of tribute in Wāṣat and Bayya. In 452 (1060) he was again back in Baghādā attending to a business which he had very much at heart, namely, the seeking of a daughter of the caliph in marriage, against which the pride of the ‘Abbasīs revolted. It was only when Tughrīlībīg’s vizier, al-Kandārī, threatened to confiscate the revenues of the caliph, that the latter yielded and the wedding took place during an absence of the Sulṭān in Armenia (454 = 1062). On his return to Baghādā, in the following year, however, he was only allowed to see his bride veiled, and he departed for al-Ra‘īy without the consummation of the marriage being mentioned. Moreover he was now an old man of 70 and his end was near, for he died in al-Ra‘īy on 8th Ramadān 455 (Sept. 4, 1063). On the death of his brother Caghrībīg, he had married one of his wives, as he was himself childless. He had designated her son Sulaimān as his successor but the latter was at once compelled to leave the field for another son of Caghrībīg’s, namely Alp Arūnī [q.v.].

Bibliography: See the article SKLEJST.

(M. Th. HOUTMÉN)

TUĞHTEĞIN P. 'ABD AL-LAH AMĪN AL-DIN ĀD-DWIṢ AL-MANŞĪ, FOUNDER OF THE DYNASTY OF THE BūRIDS. Tughteğin began his military career as a mamlik in the service of the Seljūq Sulṭān Tutuş [q.v.] who afterwards manumitted him, entrusted him with the education of his son Dūkāk and even gave him the latter’s mother Šafwat al-Malik as a wife. After Tutuş had fallen in battle with his nephew Barkīyashī (488 = 1095) Dūkāk was recognised as lord of Damascus. He showed the greatest respect for his stepfather and, following the example of so many other Atthebs, Tughteğin soon thrust himself into the position of actual ruler. On the death of Dūkāk in Ramadān 497 (June 1104) he had homage paid first to a son of the deceased named Tutuş, who was only a year old, and then to a brother of Dūkāk, the 12 year-old Artōş (or Bektāş). Artōş however was soon thrust aside and Tughteğin recognised as the ruler. The former thereupon entered into negotiations with king Baldwin I of Jerusalem. It was not long before Tughteğin came into conflict with the Franks. When the Fātimid vizier al-Malik al-Afdal sent a large army to Palestine, Tughteğin was persuaded to send forces to support him. In Dhū l-Hijdādīa 498 (Aug. 1105) however Baldwin inflicted a severe defeat on the Muslims near al-Ramlī. In Safar 499 (Oct. 1105) Tughteğin defeated a Frankish Count who had been harassing the district of Damascus by repeated raids and destroyed his fortress, only two days journey from the town. Soon afterwards — or according to another authority a little earlier —
he also took Rafiyya where a nephew of Count Raymond was in command. He was less successful when he tried to take the fortress of 'Irka N. E. of Tripolis, the commander of which had broken his allegiance to his lord, al-Kaššāl Ibn 'Amār (q.v.) of Tripolis, and sought the help of Tughtegin. The latter succeeded in taking several strongholds but on hearing of his success, Count William of Tripolis took the field and defeated the Damascans troops so thoroughly that they fled in disarray to Hims whereupon he took 'Irka (Sha'ban 502 — March 1169). In 504 (1110/1111) the Saljuqs Sulān Muḥammad (q.v.) at the request of the Syrian fugitives decided to intervene vigorously against the Franks, ordered the ruler of al-Mawqil to collect an army and take the field against the Franks and issued orders to all the vassals of the Saljuqs to join Mawḍū'ī's army. After a few successes, the Muslim leaders began to quarrel and on Rabī' I, 507 (Sept. 1113) Mawḍū'ī was murdered by an Assassin in Damascus. Several Muslim rulers including Tughtegin were suspected of complicity in this deed. But when Sulān Muḥammad appointed the police-prefect of Baghādād, Aḥ-Sonkor al-Baraʾī (q.v.), as Mawḍū'ī's successor, the Ortoqiẓīd Ighāṣī I (q.v.) rebelled as he felt himself insulted by this appointment. Tughtegin joined him, as he was regarded in Baghādād as the instigator of Mawḍū'ī's assassination and therefore feared the vengeance of the Sulānī. On the alliance of these two Muslim leaders with the Christians and the further course of the war, cf. the article Ṭūqṭūq. In Dhu'l-Qa'da 509 (March—April 1116) Tughtegin went to Baghādād and submitted to the Sulānī who gave him a friendly reception and even appointed him governor of Syria with the right to recruit levies and regulate taxation. Tughtegin after some time again joined Ighāṣī and they continued their joint war on the Franks (cf. Ṭūqṭūq). In course of time however Tyrre fell into the hands of the Christians. This important commercial town belonging politically to Egypt but in 506 (1111—1112) the citizens out of fear of the Franks had appealed for help to Tughtegin. The Ṭāṭābūn sent them a governor named Maṣūd who held his office for some years. The Tyrians then complained of his conduct to the Fātimid caliph who at once dismissed him and appointed another governor. When the Crusaders threatened to attack the town, the new governor appealed to Tughtegin. The latter could not force the besiegers to retreat and had to begin negotiations. The garrison and the inhabitants were given free passage with their portable possessions and in Dhu'mīdād I, 518 (July 1124) the Franks entered Tyrre. Tughtegin, "one of the most dreaded enemies of the Christians", died on the 8th Safar 522 (Feb. 12, 1128). He is described by the Oriental historians as an able and just ruler. In accordance with his wish, his eldest son Tāḏ al-Maḳākīr Būrī succeeded him as lord of Damascus.


TULAIQA b. KHWAILID b. NAWFAL AL-ASAD b. FĀQĀN, one of the tribal leaders who headed the ridda as prophets.

In 4 A.H., being in command of the Banū Asad with his brother Salama, he suffered defeat from the Muslims in the expedition of Kaṭān. The following year he took part in the siege of Maḏīna. Early in 9 A.H. Tulaiqa, as one of ten Asadas, probably representing only a section of the tribe, came to Maḏīna and submitted to Muḥammad. Sura 3:14—17 is said to rebuke their arrogance, but a tradition that only Tulaiqa embraced Islām, points to political submission rather than conversion, he alone being considered a convert only because the ridda was explained as religious apostasy. The whole story may have been invented as a parallel to Musa'llīna's visit to Maḏīna.

Tulaiqa rebelled in 10 A.H.; he concentrated his forces at Samra', assumed the role of prophet, and is said to have offered terms to Muḥammad, who sent Dirār b. al-Aṣwar to keep him in check. No encounter of any consequence followed until after Muḥammad's death, when Tulaiqa succeeded in gaining the support of the Banū Faṣār and an important portion of Ta'y, and joined the revolt in central Arabia, sending troops to the battle of Dhu'l-Qaṣrā.

In Rājdāb 11 Khālid b. al-Walīd marched against Tulaiqa, and with threats persuaded most of the Banū Ta'y to follow him. The battle took place at Buzākha; Tulaiqa's defeat is attributed to the defection of 'Uyaina b. Ḥisham, chief of the Banū Faṣār, disappointed, it is said, by his failure to obtain an encouraging revelation. Tulaiqa fled with his wife; many of his followers, refusing Islām, were burnt alive, and his mother sought death in the flames.

After Buzākha, Tulaiqa lived for a time in obscurity, near Ta'if or in Syria. He was eventually converted after the Asad, Ghaṭaṣān and 'Amir's submission; passing through Maḏīna on the 'umra some time later, his presence was denounced to Abī Bakr, who mercifully refused to molest the convert. On 'Umar's election, Tulaiqa went to do homage to him; the Caliph reproached him for slaying 'Ukkāsha b. Miḥṭan and Tāḥīt b. Aqṣam at Buzākha and asked him what was left of his divination. "One or two puffs of the bellows", Tulaiqa modestly answered.

His subsequent military career was long and creditable; he performed acts of valour at Kāḏīya, at the head of his tribesmen, led the Muslim infantry at Dijālāt, and the victory of Niḥāwān has been credited to his plan of attack. He is generally reported killed in this action (21 A.H.), but we find him mentioned in 24, one of 500 Muslims who garrisoned Kāwīn, and the date of his decease remains uncertain; 21 was probably fixed upon because it was the year in which Khālid, Nūr b. al-Maḳkātarr and 'Amr b. Ma'dikārī also died.

His real name was Ta'la; the diminutive is contemptuous (cf. Masālima—Musālima). Of his revelations, which he claimed to receive from an angel
(Gabriel or Dhu 'Nun), very little is known; one is a prophecy of conquest in Syria and 'Iraq, another mentions the millstone, a common metaphor for victorious military action. He appears rather as a soothsayer than a prophet, for his few known attestances concern actual events, and no religious system is discernible.

Tulaiha was a gallant warrior, considered the equal of a thousand horsemen, but he lacked the qualities of a leader, to judge from his short career as a rebel. 'Umar wrote to al-Nu'man b. al-Ma'qarin concerning him: "use him in action and consult him on military matters, but do not entrust any command to him". Mention is also made of his oratorical and poetical improvisations on the field; he appears to have been a perfect type of the pagan tribal leader, combining the offices of soothsayer, poet, orator and warrior.


al-TuIAlli, an ethnic which the learned Spaniard Abu l-K'asim S'Id b. Ahmad al-A'zami, commonly called "the Kadi S'Id", is sometimes known. Born at Almeria in 1420 (1029), S'Id began his studies at Cordoba and completed them there, then the capital of the dynasty of the Dhu 'Nunids [see this article] and the centre of a very brilliant intellectual activity. He very soon made a name for himself by his knowledge of law, mathematics, astronomy. Appointed Kadi of Toledo by the Dhu 'Nunids emir Vahy al-Ma'mun, he held this office till his death in Sawwail 462 (July 1970).

S'Id wrote a treatise on astronomy, a universal chronicle and a work in the style of the Kitab al-Nihai of Ibn Hazm, which now appears to be lost. At the present day, we only possess by this author a history of the sciences, called Kitab Tabakh al-'Unmay (ed. by Cheikho, Bairut 1912). This book is divided into two parts. In the first, the author treats of the peoples who do not cultivate the sciences, and confines himself to generalities. In the second, S'Id studies the eight nations who have been interested in the sciences namely the Hindus, the Persians, the Chaldauns, the Greeks, the Occidentals, the Egyptians, the Arabs and the Jews. At the present day, only the chapters on the Greeks, Arabs and the Jews deserve our attention. The brevity and the anecdotal form of the notices, the absence of any technical development, moreover, show clearly that S'Id had never intended to compose a profound treatise after the manner of the specialists but only a simple popular work. The Kitab Tabakh al-'Unmay unfortunately soon lost in the eyes of the public the character, which its author had given to it. Very soon from being a summary of the history of the sciences, it came to be regarded as a leading work dealing thoroughly with all human knowledge. Soon, and this is more serious, the work of S'Id was ever regarded, no longer as a compilation but as a first hand source of information. In the sixteenth century this error was definitely sanctioned by the Arab authors who wrote on the history of the sciences. Ibn al-Kifi borrowed largely from the Kitab Tabakh al-'Unmay and it can be estimated that the parts taken from this work form a good quarter of his Turkh al-'Hukumay. Even Ibn 'Abd Usaybin, in his great work called 'Uyun al-Anwa' fi Tabakh al-'Ashab al-Kabir, has reproduced several biographies of physicians, the text of which has been taken from S'Id's work. Finally the Christian Bar Hebraeus has taken from the same treatise the division of peoples into the friends and the enemies of science as well as the general sketch of each of the races studied in his Arabic chronicle, Muhkam al-
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TuIAlli, a Turkish noun meaning: 1. (obsolete) regular fireman; 2. (modern usage) volunteer or irregular fireman; 3. (figuratively) a badly brought-up person (R. Yonoun); a street rowdy, a ruffian (Red-house), derived from tulumba; "pump, hydraulic machine" (Menzinski, Thesaurus, 1680, p. 1355; cf. Relation de l'Ambassade de Mohamed I, Paris 1841, p. 52).

The word tulumba is for the Italian tromba with the same meaning, with change of r into t and epanthesis of the disjunctive vowel u between the two initial consonants. One also says yangi tulumbasi "fire-engine" to distinguish it from the other meanings of the word tulumba which are "sounding, pipette of the surgeon or douanier (istimara tulumbasi: wine-pipette); watertop in the sea". The word tulumba has become popularised in Turkey by its naval use, if one may judge from the common phrase qarga tulumba etmek, a transitive verb, which means "to work (cf. Venetian carico) the pump, i.e. for two or more people to carry some one — especially ill, wounded or dead — by taking him by the head and body" (Mehemet Djewdet, Akedal 'olker, p. 156; Husain Rahmi, Djan pasart, Hthime of the December 8, 1922). The Turkish tulumba (and the Italian tromba) may be compared with their synonyms, the old French trompe (Jul, Glos. Nautique), the Basque tromba (ibid), the modern Greek πυράμος ot πυράμος (Heseling, Les mots maritimes). The word tulumba has passed into most of the Balkan languages: Romanian (perimy, Danu), Bulgarian, Greek of Rumelia (P. Louis Romerovale). The Persian tulumba (Nicolas) and, in part at least, the Arabic of Syria and Egypt and the north coast of Africa turumba or tulumba must be borrowed from the Turkish.

One knows how frequent and violent are the Constantinople fires, especially in the past, A Turkish proverb says "if it were not for the fires in Constantinople, the thresholds of the houses would be of gold" (Istambulun yangi oltama, evlerin sikhity atldan ordu). Many things combined to make the old capital of Turkey perpetually threatened by fire and to keep away from it until quite recently even the most enterprising insurance companies.
The houses were almost all of wood (джагь) and painted with oil (тампак), in the time of Baron de Tott. Through laziness, as well as from fatalism and fear of earthquakes, of relatively rare occurrence, however, the Turks did not build of stone. The government, which, it was said, was afraid to allow any places of any strength in which rioters might hold out, was very reluctant to grant permission to build houses of stone (джагь, popularly джагь), джагь, джагь, джагь, джагь). Apart from Pera, where hewn stone appears relatively early, there were only the mosques, fountains, khamis, public baths, mekteb (markets, covered in and closed at night for valuable merchandise) and a few houses of the Fatamiys, some ancient monuments, like the aqueduct of Valens, which might escape the action of the fire and sometimes even served to bar the advance of the flames.

It should also be noted that the lead melted from the domes of some of these buildings during a fire ran into the street and made approach to them dangerous. There were also places for shelter built of masonry in the better class houses. Called джагь, they were excellence, and strengthened by iron doors, they were regular strong-boxes for articles of value. They were fire-proof, but one had to wait some weeks to open them after a fire, for fear that a premature draught might carry the flames inside. As, in the case of a fire, nothing was left but these cells, the chimneys and the foundations of stone, the debris was easily cleared away and the town was rapidly rebuilt, but this was only an illusory advantage for it sometimes happened that an afflicted quarter was burned down again, even before it had been completely rebuilt.

The streets were narrow and the landlords were able to prevent the government from widening them (as was the case, for example in the reign of Оghмщ III).

3. Rises in the wind are frequent on the shores of the Bosporus, where the breeze from the sea frequently changes its direction. It is said that there is a recurrence of fires, when aubergines (патлла) are in season, when the breeze which bears the same name (патлла мелать) blows on the kitchens.

4. The older Turks used to be exceedingly careless in the use of tobacco-pipes (тбак) and тандир (or тандур for томур), a kind of heating box for the winter.

5. Attempts by incendiaries (къндаб) were not rare. They used to throw into the houses dolls made of inflammable material (къндаб, a word of Greek origin) either for political reasons, or simply out of vengeance. It may be said that every crisis in domestic politics was accompanied by violent fires, the people adopting this simple method of manifesting their discontent. The firemen were sometimes their accomplices and fed the fire instead of extinguishing it. Among the best known cases of incendiarism are those which occurred during the rule of the unpoetic chief enunach, Beshtr Agha under Mahмуд I (according to Jouanni, Turquie, p. 343, this was the first occasion on which къндаб was used), during the occupation of Egypt by the French and on the accession of Mahмуд II. As to fires started out of personal vengeance, they were very frequently the work of negro slaves dissatisfied with their masters (according to Basili).

It would take too long to enumerate the fires recorded in Turkish annals. We shall mention only those which were of particular violence of the period from 1750 to 1756 (principally from v. Hammer, Histoire, xiv., p. 290 sq.). In 1750: on February 31st, a fire which lasted 36 hours and burned up 6,667 houses and the Porte of the Agha of the Janissaries; 18 days later: a fire which destroyed the house of the multi among others (started out of malevolence), two months later the market for arms. In 1751: 2,000 houses destroyed at the same time as the exi oldar or "old barracks" of the Janissaries. In 1752: several fires directed against Beshtr Agha (cf. above). In 1754: four great fires. In 1755, reign of Оghмщ III: on 12th July, 16 hours after sunset, 2,000 houses; 3 months later, a fire of 36 hours which consumed a large number of houses, notably the Sublime Porte or Porte of the grand vizier and that of the джанисар. Finally in 1756 on July 6th, there broke out the greatest fire recorded since the conquest of Constantinople: 3,000 houses were destroyed (Théophile Gautier writes 80,000). Fanned by the wind, after being temporarily checked by Saint Sophia, the flames went in 13 directions and ultimately combined to form one vast conflagration. This catastrophe has been described by de Tott.

Théophile Gautier noted 14 fires, most of them considerable, in one week during his sojourn in Constantinople. In his time, there were very few fires over 60 years old. In our own day the Fatih quarter has been completely destroyed. Thus in spite of Muslim fatalism, the outbreak of fire was no trifle. Watchmen, usually musicians (mekhter), were stationed in the tops of the towers of Galata, and later on those of the Sancakart, and announced outbreaks by beating drums and by hanging from the towers baskets during the day and lanterns during the night, varying in number according to the quarter to be indicated: Stambul, Galata, Scutari.

The night watchmen (пеби or пасуда for пасл) used to utter their cry of йсамомлы (or Galatada) yangin var! which travellers have made well-known (de Amicius used it as the title of a chapter of his Constantinopolis). As soon as the alarm was given, the grand vizier, the падишах паша and the Agha of the Janissaries sometimes the sultan himself, went to the spot and each official had to pay a kind of fine to his superior, if he allowed the latter to reach it before him. Th. Gautier particularly noticed the local colour provided by the odalisque dressed in red, whose duty it was to warn by his mere appearance the sultan, who was in his harem (cf. Robert de Piers, Vers l'Orient, p. 362).

The institution of firemen in Turkey is however of relatively recent date. Ewliya Celebi (xviith century), who gives a long and varied list of trades including the very humblest, does not mention any particular organisation for fighting fires. They were content to limit the area affected by demolishing houses with the help of long poles with hooks on the end (къндаб) and the destruction was completed with axes. Castellani also mentions the chains which were tied round walls in order to pull them down, and Basili talks of sheets sewn together and soaked with water, to protect the houses adjoining the centre of the conflagration.
According to the historian Râshîd (1st ed., vol. iii, fol. 111v—112v), it was in Ramadân 1134 (June—July 1232) in the reign of Ahmad III and in the viceroyalty of Dâmid by-kham Pâsha, who was fond of innovations, that pumps were used for the first time, made and directed by the renegade Gerêck Dâwûd (of French origin, according to Mouradja d’Ohsson). The results were so encouraging that a body of firemen was established with Dâwûd as commandant (tulumbâbî bâshî). He was given quarters in the recraria’s barracks (adami edarâ) situated near the new barracks or yelî edarê in the Shabâs-dire bâshî quarter. This body of picked men was recruited at first from the Janissaries and the other regiments (ojâk). It enjoyed special pay and various privileges. The office was hereditary, according to Thalasso. As to precedence, they ranked next to the Janissaries and before the Khânî or army service corps. Gradually however, they lost their military character, just as the sfâdan did. A connection with the different ojâks survived, however, in this way that each corps of soldiers had its own firemen, but, except for those of the ojâk of the bostangî who were regarded as regular Janissaries, the others were young artisans (ojâm delikanllîlar), who only remotely resembled soldiers. The corps of Turkish firemen seems however to have very soon degenerated. Less than thirty years after their creation, they were holding to ransom and extorting money from people whose houses had been burned, or who had asked them to protect threatened houses, and sometimes, de Tott says, gave themselves up to such pleantries as turning the hose on the spectators.

They wore a plated (galîstî) helmet (tari) without a visor, held in horror in Muslim lands, a head-dress which, according to Castellani, was surmounted by a spike and resembled, according to him, the kifûn of the Saltan priests, while Latî Efendi, more prosaically, compares it to a cop- toreem (levha tari). On it was the badge (khânas) of the erta, to which the fireman belonged. The helmet of the tulumbâbî bâshî was of solid silver. The firemen turned out to fires with arms, legs and chests bare. At other times they wore huge turbans (tarbîn) and red cloaks (kafip) called kastal hamat (for hamat) i.e. eagle’s wings. On their bare feet they wore yemini, also red.

The pumps were quite small and two men were able to carry them. They were a little improved in 1754 by the adoption of hose of more pliable leather. The number of pumps was increased shortly afterwards, in the reign of 0thmn III, and they were distributed among the watchmen, instead of, as previously, storing them with the chiefs of the different quarters (v. Hammer, Hist. p. 657).

The destruction of the Janissaries in 1826 precipitated the break-up of the corps of firemen. There only remained the pumps of the War Ministry (gâhî ser’üsér) who served by a collection of vagabonds (derme bahamun). A little later in 1243 (1827—1828), müdîr or “directors” were appointed to each engine and new firemen were enrolled (hâriyên merêf at tahrîrî), especially among the Armenians, a nation considered, however, according to Basili, as not of very active physique. There was nevertheless a certain improvement in the service, according to the same Basili. This improvement does not seem to have been maintained if we may judge by the depths to which the institution soon sank. The tulumbâbî became regular brigands, who took advantage of the fires to plunder and as they pleased: as to their habit of blackmail, we have seen above that they were only keeping up an older tradition. Recruited from among the porters (hamsâmî) and the boaters (hoxdil), the most turbulent corporations in Turkey, they formed a body of 20,000 men ready for anything. From the fear which they inspired in a feeble government they succeeded in maintaining their positions, even after the institution of a regular fire brigade, to be discussed below, and according to Thalasso, they continued to draw rations of bread. Their jailbirds figures were to be seen running through the streets preceded by a grotesque courier or herald. He alone seems to have retained the helmet; he was clothed in fiery red, had a hatchet at his side and in the right hand a pike with which he beat dogs and people not prompt enough at getting out of the way. This courier was called fara bulak (black ear) i.e. “lynx”, because according to legend, this animal performs a similar duty for the lion, whom he precedes on his hunts. Sometimes they had violent fights with the regular firemen. These latter were never at peace among themselves, and the Muslim companies fought with those consisting of Armenian or Greek Christians.

The tiny pumps, holding only three or four gallons, were painted in bright colours, surmounted, as the case might be, with the crescent or the cross and bearing the names of the different quarters or, what comes to the same thing, of the different mosques or churches. The firemen, who lived by preference beside the fountains (içâmeh) to be able to fill their pumps more quickly, had the latter opened to them during the night by the cami (Öüsü), the latter also having to assist at putting out fires. Some writers (e.g. Ducrot) have paid a tribute to the skill and courage of the tulumbâbî but criticisms like those of von Hammer are more frequent. The least one can say is that the corps lacked discipline.

The modern regular fireman (ifîdîyê). The modern fire-brigade was created after the conflagration of June 5, 1870 (the greatest since that of 1831 in the same quarter; it was described by de Amicis from oral information). Its organisation was entrusted to the Hungarian Count Edmund Széchenyi (Sertë Pâsha), who had previously been in command of the Budapest Fire Brigade. The first battalion began its duties on January 3, 1876 and in the course of its first year extinguished 77 fires, some very serious. It had a staff of 550 men, a large horse-drawn pumps, 8 small pumps, a first aid wagon, a water-wagon (with 16 buckets) and a waggon for the engines. This equipment was later improved. Three other units were added later: there was one of two battalions in Pera (Taşkâmi: the headquarters of the corps was also at Pera), Stamhul (Seraskeriat), Scutari in Asia and at the Admiraity. There were also naval firemen and a battalion of sappers. All these units together formed the regiment of firemen (ifîdîyê alyê) which formed part of the chief army corps or of the Imperial Guard (hâhîs ordu- hamûkâyên). Each of the battalions was commanded by a khânîbî and Count Széchenyi ranked as a general of division (ferdî). Details of the cadres of this regiment are given in the Turkish military yearbooks (ulûnmên ’azîbê).
Caliph Mu'ādh (279 = 892), the possession of Egypt, Syria, Cilicia, and Mesopotamia (excluding Mουα) was made over to Khumārawaith and his heirs for a period of thirty years, in return for an annual tribute of 300,000 dinārs (which was the sum formerly remitted by Ahmad b. 'Uthman to the Caliph Mu'āmad in respect of Egypt alone). This treaty marks the apogee of the power of the dynasty; the subsequent weakening of their position led to the revision of its terms in 286 (899), by which their dominions were restricted to Egypt and Syria, and the annual tribute raised to 450,000 dinārs. The breakdown of their administration in Syria in face of the Karmaṭians supplied a pretext for the sending of imperial troops to Damascus in 289, at the instigation (according to Taliz, iii. 2227, 2279, of the Syrmians themselves. Thence the victorious general Muhammad b. Sulaiman, organised, with the aid of the fleet of Tālib, a combined military and naval expedition into Egypt, and meeting with comparatively little opposition, captured, on 20th Rabī' 1 292 (14th January 905). The city was plundered, its inhabitants subjected to barbarous ill-treatment, the military suburbs of al-Katā'ī, founded by Ahmad, was razed to the ground, and the surviving males of the house of Tūlūth were carried in chains to Baghdađ and there kept in confinement.

The power of the Tūlūnids was based entirely on the army, created by Ahmad, the core of which consisted of Turkish, Greek, and Sudāni slaves, and probably also Greek mercenaries. With the local levies the army numbered more than 100,000 men. The most severe discipline was imposed upon the regular troops, and enforced by provost-marshal, probably one for each corps. In 288, according to Yaqūbī (ii. 524), an oath of personal allegiance to Ahmad was administered to all the troops; from this time also begins the building of al-Katā'ī and the other military works in Egypt. Though the conquest of Syria in 264 added to his army not only new militia forces but also the private troops of the former Turkish governors, it imposed on him a greater strain in maintaining his authority intact over such heterogeneous forces, bound to him by only the weakest of ties. The revolt of his son al-'Abbās (265 = 268) — in reality a rebellion of a number of his own officers — followed by the defection of Lūṭ′, constituted a serious menace to the stability of his position, from which he had hardly recovered at the time of his death. By the personal courage of Khumārawaith, after an insidious beginning, the danger of disruption was averted for the time being; and the numbers of the standing army even increased by fresh purchases in Central Asia. Nevertheless, it was mainly by lavish expenditure, and some relaxation of Ahmad's iron rule, that Khumārawaith succeeded in holding the army together; the annual cost of its upkeep in his reign amounted to 900,000 dinārs. Owing to his extravagance, moreover, the treasury was exhausted, and already on the accession of Djālīyah a section of the army refused to acknowledge him owing to his lack of funds. The gross incapacity of Djālīyah further alienated the principal Turkish generals, who escaped to Baghdađ, and were received with princely honours by the Caliph Mu'ādh. During the reign of Hārūn the central government lost almost all direct control of the army, in which the Greek element now predominated. The principal commanders in Egypt, Bady, Šalī, and Fātih,
each obtained control of a portion of the troops, and drew on the revenues of the State for their upkeep; in Syria, the general Ṭahḥal b. Dījāff (the father of the future Ikhshād) was practically independent at Damascus. The mutual rivalries of the generals go far to explain the disasters suffered by the Egyptian armies in Syria during the Kar-
mażān outbreak, which in turn further weakened the resources of the Tūlūnids. The disintegration was accentuated by rivalries among the members of the dynasty and by the growing estrangement between Hārūn and his amirs. On the appearance of Muḥammad b. Sulaimān at Damascus, he was joined not only by Ṭahḥal, but also by Bāḍr and Fūlah with all their troops. Of the remainder of the army, the greater part deserted during the operations which led up to the capture of Fustāğ, largely owing to Hārūn's inability to pay them.

In addition to creating an army, Ahmad b. Tūlūn also gave his attention to the strengthening of the fleet, and to the provision of naval defences and stations, partly in order to maintain his hold on Syria, where he created a naval base at 'Akka (see also Yāsūr, Mufliṣī, iii. 707-708). The fleet was kept up by his successors, but was destroyed at Tumam by naval forces from Tarāsūs, commanded by Dawkānī, who accompanied the expedition of Muḥammad b. Sulaimān al-Ḍairī.

The details of the reforms which Ahmad b. Tūlūn effected in the financial administration of Egypt are rather obscure. All the sources quote the statements that the revenue from ʿ flattān, which under his predecessors had yielded only 800,000 dinārs, rose at the end of his reign to 4,300,000 dinārs, and that he left accumulated savings which amounted to ten million dinārs. In addition to the income from ʿ flattān (which included the rent paid by the amirs for their estates), the treasury received an annual rent from the royal domains (al- ṣāma), which were administered in the name of the nieces of Egypt, at this time Iṭjār al-Mufawwad, son and heir of the Caliph Muḥammad (P. E. R. C., No. 850); the supervision of these occupied a separate department of the administrative staff (Saḥīd, p. 67). The transmission of detailed information by later writers was probably rendered impossible by the destruction of the divān after Muḥammad's removal to Baghdad (I. 345, 35). It is agreed, however, that, so far from laying additional burdens on the country, the increase of revenue was accompanied by the reformation of abuses, the suppression of oppressive imposts, and the establishment of a strict supervision over the amirs and the finance officials. These measures, helped by a series of uniformly high food prices, together with the fact that the sums which had hitherto been drained away to Baghdād were now spent within the country, resulted in an outburst of great prosperity. A somewhat obscure narrative (Ibn Saḥīd, p. 38) hints at an attempt to create a lax monopoly, which was afterwards given up, but it is indicated also by the same authority (I. 67) that in the last years of his reign Ahmad made other experiments of the same nature. It is certain that Egyptian commerce must have expanded greatly, but no data bearing on this aspect have to be preserved. During the reign of Khumārwašā the financial administration probably began to deteriorate. Details are again lacking, but the fact of a decline may be inferred from the reckless expenditure characteristic of his reign and his easygoing attitude to the amirs, which allowed them a free hand in the management of their estates. The loss of Ahmad b. Muḥammad al-Ḍairī, who had been Ahmad's right-hand man in financial matters, must also have affected the efficiency of the administration. At the death of Khumārwašā the treasury was completely empty, and the virtual abdication of the central government to the amirs unadvisedly revealed in the reintroduction of the familiar abuses into the financial system. The ruler Hārūn was a mere child (he was only twenty-two years old at his death) and the conduct of affairs was left in the hands of Abū Dijāfīr b. Abīlis, under whom things went from bad to worse, while the final disaster was aggravated by an exceptionally low Nile in the year 291.

In the general domain of administration Ahmad's reign also marks a considerable advance. The chancery (divān al-ṣawāṣir) was organised on the model of the divān at the court of the Caliphs, and the ruler held regular public sessions for the hearing of complaints (ṣulūṭ). A papyrus document (P. E. R. C., No. 855) seems to indicate that a general survey of Egypt was made between 258 and 261. Jews and Christians suffered, as a whole, no detriment under Ahmad, and many of Ahmad's decrees for native Egyptian officials were probably extensively employed in the administration. On the other hand, the country was frequently disturbed during Ahmad's reign by risings and private wars. The 'Alids in the Sa'dīd gave constant trouble, which even Ahmad's wholesale deportations of them to al-Ma'dina could not stop; the Arabs in the Delta were so turbulent that in order to divert them from their customary brigandage and violence, Khumārwašā (following the example set by the former finance minister Ahmad b. Mūsābhir) enrolled a picked body of their young men as his bodyguard, with the name of al-Muḥāširāt. Arabs from Bahṣa formed, together with Berbers, the forces of Hārūn's rebel uncle Rabī'a. To meet these disorders Ahmad adopted severe measures; in addition to wholesale executions during his lifetime, he is said to have had 138 people lying in his prison at the time of his death. The difficulties of the Tūlūnids were increased by a certain tension with the theologian class, in spite of their efforts to conciliate the latter by lavish almsgiving and other marks of respect to religious feeling. During the breach between the Tūlūnids and the Caliphate, the theologians apparently sided with the latter, and regarded Ahmad and Khumārwašā as usurpers. Ahmad's chief ṣāḥib, Abū Bakra Bakālī, is not above suspicion of having privately abetted his rebel son al-ʿAbīt, and was imprisoned for refusing to sign the fatwa against al-Mawāfīs. Among other significant indications of this conflict is the fact that the list of ṣāḥins of Egypt is full of gaps between 270 and 277, and between 283 and 288.

The majority of the public works erected by the Tūlūnids were dictated by their military policy and the needs of the new city of al-Kaṭāt. The first Tūlūn's mosque was built because of the overcrowding of the mosque of 'Amr by the troops of the vast military camp. Such other works as the aqueduct and the hospital were scarcely less military in purpose. His restoration and endowment of the tomb of Muṣawwa in 270, however, has the obvious air of a political manoeuvre, to enlist the sympathy of the Egyptian anti-Shīhites and the Syr in his side against the Caliphate. On the other hand,
Ahmad, who had received an unusually liberal education, showed himself a keen patron of learning and the arts, and there is every reason to suppose that he encouraged the spread of education in Egypt. It is possible that a trace of his activities is preserved in a document relating to the endowments of a mosque school at Üçmînâ (P.E. R., N.P. 773). Khunarawâ’s interest in music, painting, and even sculpture, together with the general luxury of the period, must have contributed to the development of local arts and crafts, to which also Maḥrûz’s account of the bazaars in al-Ḳasr’si bears indirect witness. Like all enlightened despot, Ahmad and his son took care not only to humour the people by free distribution of food, magnificent spectacles, and lavish generosity, but also, by the alleviation of hardships and by practical measures for the improvement of their economic condition, to secure their interest on behalf of the dynasty and at the same time raise their capacity as revenue-producers. In spite of a foreign domination, therefore, and its militarist basis, the Tûnmân was one of marked material prosperity and progress for the mass of the Egyptian population, and was in afterdays recalled as a golden age; ēnâdî mi nî gharîr l’adnîn wa-ṣâqîn kum min maḥṣûn tâjûn, “They were numbered among the most brilliant of dynasties, and their days among the most beneficial of days”.

Biography: See under Ahmad b. Tûlun and Khunarawâ; also al-Kindî, Governments and Judges of Egypt (ed. Khunîn Guest), p. 212-228, and 477-480 of the supplement, and W. Björkmann, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Staatswissenschaften im islamischen Ägypten (Hamburg 1928), p. 18.—The relevant sections in the encyclopaedia of Nuwâ’î (Nîkâyât al’Avâl) have not yet been published. For the mosque and other public works of the Tûnmân see now K. A. C. Creswell, Early Muslim Architecture, volume i.

Tûman, original (Turkish) pronunciation túmân, usually written tûmân; at first used vaguely for “very many”, later the numeral for “ten thousand”. The Turkish numeral was first explained by G Ramstedt (J. S. F. Ch., xxiv. 22) from the Chinese, later by N. Mironov (Zdp., xix., p. xxiv) from the Togrâkian (tæma or tæma, “ten thousand”). Mahmûd Kâshâî (4337) still knows the Turkish word only in its indefinite meaning; according to him tûmân tâlûk means “very varied”, ṭûmân munîg not 10,000 × 1,000 = 10,000,000,000,000,000,000,000. The word seems to be first found with the meaning “ten thousand” in the Mongol period. As an army division, the tîmûn consisted of 10,000 soldiers (N. E., xiv/f. 280); sometimes the word tûmûn is also used with the meaning of lî (tribe); as a territorial unit, the tûmûn was said to be the area that produced 10,000 fighting men (e.g., in Ibn ‘Arabîn, Fihrist al-Maḥfûr, Cairo 1285, p. 17), which can hardly be right as the tûmûn was the smallest administrative or taxation area. Every province (wilâyêt) of any size was divided into a number of tûmûns, e.g., that of Samarkand into seven; it can hardly be supposed that this wilâyêt alone could have had 70,000 men in the field. With this meaning (the name of the smallest administrative unit) the word tûmûn was used in the period of Mongol rule in Persia (the Persian tûmûn, for example, was divided into 9 tûmûns: G. M. S., xxii/f. 47) and also in what is now Russian Turkestan with the exception of Farghânâ (q.v.). In Turkestan this usage (tûmûn sometimes also stands for wilâyêt) survived even in the first two decades of Russian rule, in the kingdom of the Khân of Bukhârâ (q.v.), and later even after the revolution of 1920 in the Bukhârâ republic. The whole village population liable to pay taxes is sometimes called tûmûn (Tâyirkh-i Khâtûbî, trans. Ross, p. 501). The dwellers among the mountains, who live under different conditions, are sometimes distinguished from the villagers; for example the Wûkhânâmâ distinguishes between the students (fullâh) from the tûmûn and the students from the mountains (abbâsînî) in the medrese built in Samarkand by Shâhâbîn Khân (q.v.).

As a money of account the tûmûn or tûman in the period of Mongol domination was 10,000 dinârs. In all three Mâmmâdân states that arose out of the Mongol empire—Persia, the Golden Horde and the line of Chaghatî—small (dirhem in Persia under Ghânsân Khân (q.v.), 2-1/2 dinârs = 33.1 grains, later smaller) and large (dirhem = 6 dinârs = 180 grains) tûmûns were issued and the sums calculated in dinârs of 10,000 dinârs or 60,000 dirhems; cf. the conversion given by Hakîm Allâh Khâzînî (G. M. S., xxii/f. 29); 128,000,000 dinârs = rather more than 2,133 tûmûns (fuller details in W. Barthold, Persepolto náqî’iî na sîrîlî Avâzî Mêзнания, St. Petersburg 1911, p. 15 sqq.). Calculations were also made in the trade of Timur and the Timurîs in tûmûns of 10,000 dinârs; in Turkestan these dinârs were called tâbîl after Kobek Khân (N. E., xiv/f. 74; cf. also under Qâhîhâ Khân). At a later date, for a time, only copper coins were in use in Turkestan and these as well were calculated in dinârs and tûmûns; for example according to Babur (faces of Beveridge, p. 56), the cost of feeding the troops of the province of Hishr was estimated at 1,000 tûmûns of copper coins (fullî). According to the Wûkhânî-nâmâ, already quoted, 6 copper coins were equal to one dinăr; 26 of the dinârs were exchanged for one thulûk (about 66.3 grains = 4.3 grains) of silver.

In Persia the word tûman in the xviith century meant a much smaller sum than at an earlier date. About 1660 Raphael du Mans gave the value of the tûman as 40 French francs (P. E. V. o., ser. ii., vol. xx., p. 183). Sir Thomas Herbert (1650) and Fryer (1677) give the value as £ 3.6.8 in English money. The tûman as a gold coin was first struck by Fath ‘Ali Shah Khân (q.v.) in 1212 (1797), at first weighing 95 grains (6.16 grammes), later reduced to 70 (4.5) and again to 53 grains (3.4 grammes). Under Nâṣir al-Dîn, who struck a few large gold ten tûman pieces, the tûmûn was worth ten ka’ns or 10,000 dinârs, the dirhem, now of course, being not a coin but a very small money of account. The tûmûn continued to be the standard gold coin down to the reign of ’Abd al-Sâ”d but was abolished by the new dynasty, its place being taken by a pahlâmî of 29 grains (1.88 grammes).

Biography: In addition to the literature quoted in the article, cf. the dictionaries (Freytag, Vullers, Radloff) s. v., which are however very defective in this connection.

Tûmânbâi II, al-Malîk al-Asrâr (mîn Kâšîb al-Qâtîrî) was the last of the Mamlûk

(W. Barthold)
Sultan. He reigned from 14th Ramadán 922 (17th October, 1516) to 21st Rabí‘ 1 923 (15th September, 1517). He was bought as a slave by the emir Kásîrî, afterwards the Sultan Kâsîrî al-Ghûrî [q.v.], to whom he was related, and given to Sultan Kâsîrî ibn Quraysh [q.v.]. The latter had him trained in the class of clerical Mamlûks (al-khatÎbîyya). He was manumitted by Sultan Muâmmâd al-Nâhirî II probably in the beginning of the year 923 (1516) and promoted to be ḍârîrâr [q.v.]; a little later he entered the Sultan’s bodyguard. There he remained till the accession of his native, Sultan Kâsîrî al-Ghûrî, who made him an emir of 10, in 910 (1504) on the death of the heir to the throne, he became ēmir fâtâkhûnî and chief butler, in 913 he became ḍârîrâr kâsîrî [q.v.], and was usual in the last period of the Mamlûk dynasty, Major-domo (turâkîrî) and Superintendent of the domains (kâbîlîr al-kabîrî); he thus had: attained the highest civilian post. He became deputy in the absence of the Sultan (wâlî al-qâdî) when the latter went to Syria against Sultan Selim. On the defeat and death of Sultan Ghûrî he checked the rout among the retreating troops and emirs and restored order as far as possible so that the emirs and people had confidence in him. He was unanimously elected Sultan and with much reluctance finally accepted the choice although he well understood the difficulties of the position; the want of money in the first place was serious, for the Turks had captured several million dinars from Sultan Ghûrî. Some of which, he had with him in camp and some in his fortresses. Besides this the army was exhausted and the great emirs could not be trusted. The question was decided for him by a learned šâhid Abû Sa‘îd al-Dîjrî, a quarter near old Cairo still bears his name) who made the emirs swear fealty to him. The caliph was a prisoner with Sultan Selim, but his father wrote the diploma of appointment and paid homage to the new Sultan. Tîmânbâhî granted the highest offices to the emirs returning from Syria. An appeal for assistance came from Ghâza and troops were very soon sent thither. About this time Selim sent an offer of peace. Tîmânbâhî was to recognise him as caliph. The Sultan was ready to make peace but the emirs were disinclined to do so and managed to get the envoy put to death, which made the continuation of the war inevitable. The troops sent by the Sultan under the emir Eljanbîl were defeated at Ghâza by Sinân Pâshâ [q.v.] and returned to Cairo. Selim thereupon crossed the desert and although harassed by the Beduins reached Egypt with his forces in good order. Tîmânbâhî wished to attack him at Sâlîhîyâ immediately on his arrival there but the emirs decided to await him before Cairo between Mâṣrîyâ and Dîjrîl Aqûma at Râcidînîya. The guns were put in position in the sand to bar the Turkish advance. The plan was betrayed however to the Ottomans and a portion of the army went round the Egyptian position and attacked it on the flank. In an hour the mobile, cleverly planned artillery of the Turks mowed down the greater part of the Mamlûk army. The walls of Sultan Tîmânbâhî at all by a small body fought his way to Sultan Selim’s tent and cut down the emirs there in the belief that Selim was among them. Returning safely he saw the flight of the Egyptian and followed them to the Nile where he rallied the scanty remnants of his army. The Turks took and plundered Cairo and slew all the Mamlûks who fell into their hands. Tîmânbâhî once more succeeded in taking the city and held out there for two days. He then had to take flight across the Nile to Upper Egypt. From there he negotiated with Selim, who promised to retire if his name was put on the coins and mentioned in the Friday service. Tîmânbâhî was ready to accede to his emirs prevented him and slew the Sultan’s envoy. Selim therefore put to death the emirs and Mamlûks taken in Cairo and ordered troops to be sent across the Nile, but as they landed in small bodies they were cut down by Tîmânbâhî’s superior forces. Selim therefore decided to bring his artillery into action. He placed guns on the bank of the Nile and bombarded the enemy who suffered terribly and took to flight. The Turkish forces could now cross undisturbed. Tîmânbâhî again collected an army. whereupon Selim sent an envoy to negotiate with him. The latter, a former Mamlûk of Tîmânbâhî’s, however began to use insulting language and was wounded during the parley and sent back. In the night indecisive fighting took place. On the next day Tîmânbâhî challenged his former follower Eljanbîl to a single combat which ended in the Sultan’s victory. But in spite of the bravery displayed by the Mamlûks, they were routed by the superior forces of the Turks and the Beduins who had joined them. Tîmânbâhî fled to a Beduin chief, who was under a band of gratitude to him, but he was compelled by his people to betray his hiding place. Selim had him taken prisoner and brought to his camp where he overwhelmed him with reproaches for the murder of his ambassadors. Tîmânbâhî’s noble bearing made a good impression on the Sultan; he was inclined to give him his life but on the advice of the emirs, who had gone over to him, he had him hanged a week later at Bâb Zuwaila. Thus died the last Mamlûk Sultan. The causes of his defeat were the corrupt state of Egypt, the eternal feuds among the Mamlûks, the lack of funds, but the main reason as must again be emphasised, was the superiority of the Turkish artillery. The brave Mamlûks did not care to use firearms and did not realise their full importance as they believed that the deciding factor should be personal valor.

Bibliography: Weh, Geschichte der Chalif., v., Stuttgart 1862 (which gives Arabic sources still in MS., see introd., p. 15); v. Hamer, G.O.R., Pest 1847 (with list of sources); Ibn Iyâs, Budayr al-Zâhirî, Bâbâk 1311 and for those who do not know Arabic the translation of part 3 of this work by Lieut.-Col. W. H. Salmon, London 1921, in Oriental Translation Fund, N.S., xxv. In addition to Iyâs Zundbul’s history of the conquest of Egypt by Sultan Selim it is very important, s. Brockelmann, G.A.L., ii. 43 and 298. Of indirect use for this period is H. Jansky, Beiträge zur aßen. Geschichte, ii. 173 sqq., where the Turkish sources are given (M. S. OBERHEIM)

TUNIS (in Arabic Tûnus or Tûnîs), in 36° 47' 39" North Lat., and 10° 10' East Long. (Greenw.), capital of the regency of the same name. Tunisia at the present day consists of two adjoining, but very different cities, with two quite distinct forms of town life: a native but not exclusively Muslim town, an almost unchangeable survival from past
centuries, and a European town of recent origin and completely modern appearance, still steady and rapidly growing; the old town is about three quarters of a mile from the end of the lagoon called the Lake of Tunis or Bahira (al-Bahira); this town rises gradually from east to west till it overlooks the shallow, generally dry salt lagoon known as the Sabkhat al-Saljum; on this side however, the highest point of the Manouliya, which has extensive views, lies outside the ramparts. To the southeast and close at hand rise the heights of Sidi Belhassen and of the Djbal Djallil, farther away the hills of Bir Kassa; to the north the heights of the Belvedères and of Ras-Tabia and beyond them the Djbal Aghmar and the Djbal Nabelli. These slight undulations do not prevent Tunis from communicating easily with the plain of Monast and the valley of the wad Miliane on the one hand, and on the other with the plain of the Manbaca and the valley of the Medjerda, also by the north bank of the lagoon with Goulette and Carthage. The natural defences are good without being excellent (Tunis has been taken frequently without much difficulty); except for cisterns, all drinking-water has to be led in from a distance. But from the economic point of view, the position is very advantageous, at the exits from Central Tunisia, in a fairly fertile region, and sufficiently near the sea to give rapid connection with the nearest European coasts.

We need not spend time over the attempts of Arab writers to explain the name Tunis from an Arabic root. They claim with equal facility, following one another, to identify the original town with the Biblical Tarshish. A plausible etymology has yet to be found; but the name is said, like the town itself, to go back to Punic times, if not beyond them. Tunisia is mentioned by Diodorus and Polybius as a considerable town built behind fortifications, no doubt concentrated around the present Kasba at some distance from the lagoon, then perfectly navigable. It was besieged and taken successively by the Libyans, who rebelled at the beginning of the fourth century B.C., by Agathocles, and by Regulae. The headquarters of the mutinous mercenaries, it later fell into the hands of Scipio Africanus. It was perhaps destroyed by Scipio Emilianus (cf. Gsell, Hist. anc. de l'Afri., du Nord, vol. i., ii., iii., pass.).

Was Tunisia — the future Tunis — which is not to be confounded with another Tunis (called the "white", on Cape Bon), as Tissot has said "one of the principal centres of the aboriginal race..., the Libycon city par excellence, in contrast to the Phoenician colony" which was Carthage?

In any case it was for long eclipsed by its illustrious rival and it was only much later that it became a city of the first rank. It was of no particular note in the Roman, Vandal and Byzantine periods. A Roman road connected it with Carthage; a few references in geographical or ecclesiastical works alone remind us from time to time of its existence. Are we to take as history or legend the life of St. Olive, of the Vandal period, who is said to have given her name to the great mosque (Qâbare el-Zafti), and whose remains were officially claimed in 1402 by King Martin of Aragon? With the Muslim conquest, Tunis suddenly emerges from the shadow; and it comes into history as a Muslim city, the heir to some extent of Carthage and soon to rival Kairouan. When Hassan b. al-

Nu'man in 698 had taken and destroyed Carthage, the old capital, his first care was to turn the little town at the end of the lagoon into a naval base, from which fleets could set out on more distant expeditions, but where on the other hand he was sheltered from the possibility of a sudden attack by the Byzantine navy. He gave Tunis an arsenal (darr al-akhiyar) and he probably brought from Egypt a thousand Copt families to supply this new naval dockyard with experienced workmen. Of the town itself we do not yet learn anything very definite; we can only venture a vague surmise as to the nature of various elements that migrated thither: at first undoubtedly, Christian merchants and officials, but soon increasing numbers of native converts to Islam, with Arab soldiers, arrogant, greedy and turbulent. The first great truly Muslim foundation of a religious nature, the Great Mosque, for centuries the spiritual centre of the city, is attributed by tradition to the Umayyad governor Ibn al-Habib (built in 184 = 732) who also rebuilt the arsenal. But we do not know who built the ramparts, of which al-Ya'kubī tells us they were of clay (lit) and unskilled brick (littir), except in the part near the lake which was built of dressed stone (al-qabur). To sum up there was not in the case of Tunis, as at Kairouan, a regular creation but rather a sudden development, a political and religious transformation, of great importance, an adaptation, — perhaps more gradual than one thinks at first — to the new role assigned to it by circumstances and the far-reaching will of the conqueror.

During the eighth and ninth centuries, Tunis begins to develop its commercial possibilities, but it is still particularly renowned as a centre of legal and religious teaching. Before the fame of Kairouan was definitely established, Tunis already possessed celebrated teachers who by their teaching contributed to the Islamisation of the whole country: e.g. the traditionsists Ali b. Ziyad and 'Abbâs b. al-Walid al-Fârisi. At the beginning of the Fâtimid period, Abu 'l-'Arab al-Tamimî compiled a useful account of these early generations of Tunisian savants (Kitâb Tabîbî al-Ulum). Tunis, ed. and trans. by M. Ben Chenas, edited the "Lists of Savants of Ifrikiya"). The Great Mosque was now a number of necessary additions made to it and was embellished in various ways. Some important alterations were no doubt due to the Aghlabid Ahmad, the great builder; an inscription in the name of the Aghlabid caliph dates to 350 (864) the dome which is in front of the mihrâb. Stone and marble were in any case easy to procure here for all buildings, civil or religious. Carthage is near at hand and its ruins were ready to be plundered and to provide in abundance building material, columns and capitals.

In politics, Tunis seems to be the focus of opposition, the centre of resistance to the central authority exercised by Kairouan; the Tanitân ghâfiq rather than its walls was an element of disunion and a source of strife. The town took part in most of the risings, which were put down by the Umayyads, and was annexed and later by the Aghlabid emirs. It was implicated in the great rebellion of Mâmûr al-Tun Ziibî, and the troops of Ziyaâd Allah I took it by assault and destroyed its ramparts in 318 (833). After one of these risings, Ibn Khânîr II punished it severely and thought to control it by transferring his court
and seat of government there in 281 (894); for these he had erected a number of buildings, including the Kasbah (al-kasbah). But two years later, he went back to Kairouan and when his son Abdallah II made a second attempt to settle in Tunis, he was killed in 290 (903) in a palace which he had just built for himself. His two assassins were put to death, one at the al-Djazira Gate (of the Fenmarkets, i.e. Cape Ross), the other at the Kairouan Gate. Tunis was not yet ready to become the capital of Ifriqiya.

The Fātimids and their Ṣanḥājja successors, whose capital was at Kairouan or Mahdiya, founded by them, deliberately neglected Tunisia which seems to have remained faithful to orthodoxy. It is a fact of no little significance that the greatest of its saints, its patron saint, still greatly venerated, lived in the first half of the tenth century, just in a period when official Shi'a and rebel Khurādīd were fiercely contesting the dominion of Ifriqiya; Ṣidi Mahriṣ (Mahriz b. Khalfān) who was the inspirer and the recipient of the famous Niqāl of Ibn Abī Zayd (in 347 = 959), the classic précis of the Mālikism of North Africa (cf. Ibn Nādirī, Mīṣār al-Mīriṣa, iii. 138). It was he who after the short but disastrous occupation of the town by Abu Yazīd in 332 (944) restored the courage of the inhabitants, urged them to build a solid wall around the town and stimulated them to take up commerce on better organised lines. The old court of the silk-merchants (Fumukha al-Haraṣṣa) almost opposite his zāwiyah, a little beyond one of the main gates of the city, may go back to him and the same is probably true of the little market, which has given its name to this gate: Bāb Souika (Bāb al-Sawāki). Unanimous tradition further attributes to Ṣidi Mahriz the foundation of the Jewish quarter, the Ḥārā, at some distance from his zāwiyah in the direction of the Great Mosque: a measure evidently intended to retain there a people particularly skilled in commerce, which was a source of prosperity for the town.

The flourishing situation of Tunis is attested in the tenth century by Ibn Ḥawkal, who extols the abundance of its products, the pleasantness of its climate, its situation and the wealth of its citizens. He mentions especially the potteries, and the system of irrigating the gardens around the towns by water-wheels. Further details are given in the next century by al-Naḥḥār: the ramparts and ditch; the five gates namely: Bāb al-Djazīra in the south, the gate which opened on the harbour (Bāb al-Bāṣrā) and Bāb Ṣaqqāda (of Carthage) on the east, Bāb al-Ṣaqqāda (Gate of the water-carriers; evidently the same as Bāb Souika) in the north and Bāb Arja in the west. The harbour, the entrance to which could be closed by a chain, was defended on the north by a wall and in the south by a stone castle: the Castle of the Chain (Djar al-Sūbiga). Al-Naḥḥār admires the Great Mosque, the entrance staircase of which (east side) had, at the present day, twelve flights, the many and well filled arāqī, the hammams of which there were fifteen, and the abundance of provisions (fruit and fish); he too mentions the potteries. Passing to another sphere he notes the success of the teaching of fiqh among the Tunisians.

Tunis therefore seems to have enjoyed peace and prosperity for about a hundred years, until the terrible event in the middle of the eleventh century which upset completely the economic and political conditions of the whole country: the invasion by the Hārārīs. While the helplessness of the Zirids, overwhelmed by the new conquerors, shut themselves up in Mahdiya, Tunis fell for a time into the hands of the Ṣanḥājja chief 'Abd b. Abī 'l-Ghāthil in 446 (1054). But to secure protection, it placed itself a little later under al-Nādirī, the Ḥusaynī of al-Kal’a, who sent it a governor in 451 (1059), the Ṣanḥājja ‘Abd al-Ḥaṣb b. Khurāsān. The latter soon declared himself independent and in this way was founded the first dynasty of Tunis, which except for an interruption of 20 years (1128—1148) maintained itself till the Almohad conquest, exactly a century later.

At first oppressed by the Ṣanḥājja Banū ‘Ali, who were established in Carthage in the Māṣalaga (La Malga), Tunis came to terms with them to secure herself from their raids; in return for an annual tribute, they promised to spare the district and its inhabitants; they even soon began to attend the markets of Tunis, both as buyers and sellers. The town survived the attempts made on it by the Zirids of Mahdiya, and by the Normans of Sicily; but it was disturbed by civil troubles, rival political parties, riots and fighting among the sufs, rivalry between the different quarters. It was nevertheless in this most disturbed period that its sea-trade began to develop on a large scale; trade with Italy was organised and developed; the business relations which were increasingly entertained with the Christians offered unexpected prospects. The Banū Khurāsān themselves did a great deal to promote the prosperity of Tunis. The greatest of them, Almārīd, fortified it in the first half of the thirteenth century; he built the earthworks mentioned by al-Idrīsī. He was also he who built the citadel (al-ḥarir) to which the present mosque of El-Karaï may originally have been attached. It is in this quarter, near the street of Abū Bou Krišān, which seems very soon to preserve their name in a corrupt form, that there still exists the cemetery of the Banū Khurāsān, which was probably originally joined up with that of al-Sitīla (on the site of the Sadiq Hospital). The principal door of the Great Mosque dates from the same dynasty. With the two great suburbs of Bāb Souika and Bāb al-Djazīra, which are already extending to the north and to the south of the city proper (al-Malika), Tunis has now a fairly definitive configuration. Its now considerably increased importance made it henceforth the capital of Ifriqiya. It was to be so from the time of ‘Abd al-Malik (554—1159) to the present day, and its political history is henceforth merged in that of Tunisia.

After the terrible alarms caused by the unsuccessful attacks of Ibn ‘Abd al-Karim al-Raghibī in 955 (1059), then by the ephemeral rule in 1203—1204 of the last Almoravid Vabīš b. Ghaniya, it was reserved for the Hafsids to restore to Tunis the feeling of security and to add to its monuments and make it a capital worthy of the name. Abū Muhammad b. Abī Hafs, who was still ruling in the name of the caliphs of Marrakesh, built in the Bāb Souika quarter (in the street El-Halifiouine) a Djami, which bears his name, corrupted, it is true, into Bāb-Muhammad. But it was the first independent ruler of this dynasty, the devout Abū Zakariyyā, whose buildings mark most clearly that a new era had begun in the town. In 1230 he built outside the town, towards the southwest, the
fortified Musalla (Qamari al-Sultan) which Ibn Baṭṭaṭ notes in the next century; he then proceeded to rebuild the Kašba or Kasbah completely and flanked it by a mosque for his private use. The Mosque of the Almohads or of the Kašba or Kasbah, the minaret of which, in pure Almohad style, is dated 630 (March 1233) in a beautiful inscription outside it (cf. O. Houssas and R. Basset, Mission scientifique en Tunisie, Algiers 1882, p. 5). He formed a fine library, which was scattered by one of his successors, Ibn al-Līhābi. He introduced to Tunis the modrana of the east: the Shamāllīya, near the old Sīkh al-Shamālīn (now Sīkh El-Nejhdjīn), later completely restored, was the first medersa in North Africa. It was he also who sheltered the three daughters of Yahya b. Qāmila in the palace thereafter known as Kašr al-Bānti. Lastly it was he who organised the quarter of the slaves immediately around the Great Mosque and built the Sīkh al-Āṭfārīn (of the merchants of oils and perfumes) and perhaps also the Sīkh al-Kumās (Sīkh for textiles).

In place of this interest in commercial and religious matters his son al-Mustānṣir bllah, a calliph fond of display, had a taste for luxury and splendour. He built a hall of audience, Kesba Anīrār, in 1253 in the court of the Kašba or Kasbah, pleasure gardens in the adjoining suburbs at Ra’s-al-Tabīya (Ras-Tabia), on the road to Bardo and at Abū Fīhr (site uncertain in spite of the identification with al-Baṭṭam proposed by Ibn Abī Dinar; H. Aḥujwah places it in the Džabal al-Aqmar, near al-Ārīna, ed. of Ibn Faḍlallāh, p. 12, n. 1) of which Ibn Ḥakīm gives a glowing account, both connected with the Kašba or Kasbah by a private road to enable the ladies to go there without being seen. In 665 (1267) al-Mustanṣir completed the restoration, celebrated in verse by Ibn Ḥazin, of the old aqueduct of Carthage (al-Honbar): he also brought water to the great pond of Abū Fīhr and thence to the Great Mosque.

His mother ʿAfī, the worthy widow of a pious ruler, built a second medersa, the Tawfiqīyya attached to the Džamī al-Tawfiq or al-Havžā, which is of the same period. The first century of the Hafsids produced two other mosques: the Džamī al-Zātīnā al-Berūnī (in 1283) outside the Bāb al-Bahār, built by order of the false al-Faṣīrī to take the place of a fundūk, where wine was sold, and the Džamī al-Hilāk (of the Kings) in the same quarter as the Musalla. A third medersa, Madrasat al-Mawṣiq (of the Remains-you) built by Abū Zakariya, son of Sulṭan Abū Iṣḥāk in the Sīkh al-Kutubiyun (of the book-sellers) - it too was built as an expropriatory work on the site of a fundūk, frequented by wine-drinkers - has disappeared without leaving a trace. Finally the ramparts were rebuilt, in parts at least, with the Bāb Ljadvīl (New Gate), Bāb al-Mandara (Gate of the Beacon) and probably also the Bāb al-Baṭṭam which no longer exists.

The Tunis of about 1300 is already very like the native town of to-day. The Ma’āni, which stretches from north to south is shut in between the Kašba or Kasbah on the west - the fortified dwelling of the ruler who commands both the town and the plain of La Manouba - and on the east, in the lowest lying part, the Bāb al-Bahār which gives access to the arsenal and thence to the lagoon. Halfway up and in the very centre the Great Mosque opens its doors directly on the new sīk which surround it; the name Bāb al-Bahār is attested for the northern gate, but was the western one already called Bāb al-Sajīf? Each sīk, by a custom still maintained, closes its doors at nightfall; the Bāb el-Rafīn near the sīk of the same name is, as at the present day, the southern exit to this quarter. Around the Madina and outside the main gates are grouped certain manual trades. In the Bāb al-Djaʿma we have the dyers, at the Bāb Ḫalīl, the smiths, at the Bāb al-Manāra, the tailors, in the Bāb al-Bahār there were no doubt several foundries allotted to Christian merchants but the latter, requiring more space, soon began to build outside the gate a little quarter or suburb of their own, the first sketch of a European quarter. The houses of the city were closely built together; no open spaces were left, no room for markets or assemblies; the Bātālā of Ibn Mardim cannot have been anything more than a cross-roads.

In the outer quarters however, more modern and less crowded, large open spaces serve as markets: for pottery and alfa grass (Place des Potiers and El-Halfouâine) in the Bāb Soukta quarter, those for animals: al-Marrāq (for sheep: Raqqebat al-Qāmūm) and perhaps also the cattle market (Place du Marché au Bîl) in the Bāb el-Djaʿma quarter. Each of these quarters is protected by an outer wall which ends at the Kašba or Kasbah; the gates of this first line of fortifications are for the southern quarter (Raqqebat): Bāb Khālid (originally no doubt Bāb al-Manāra) in the west, Bāb el-Djasirīn in the south, Bāb el-Falāq (outside of which is a Karia) and Bāb ʿĪlāwa (Bāb Alelson) in the S.E.; for the northern quarter, in the N.E. Bāb al-Khairāt, in the N.W. Bāb [Abī] Sadiq, and in the west Bāb al-Qāmūm (of the Arcades) perhaps identical with Bāb al-Falāq (Bāb El-Alloucha) the first mention of which is later. It is beside the last gate that we should like to locate the raiḥan of the “ulūd called “raṭātān”, Christian mercenaries in the pay of the sovereigns of Tunisia, if Leo Africanus did not expressly locate it outside the Bāb al-Manāra. As to the Kašba or Kasbah itself, of its two gates one opened on to the country, Bāb abel-Dīri (of Disloyalty), the other into the city, Bāb Intisām (cf. the Bāb Intisām of Temcen; cf. Būyāṭ al-Rawwāl, ed. Belh. i. 34).

Between the Bāb ʿĪlāwa and the Bāb al-Khairāt, a whole series of open drains (khadnātā) into which the gutters run, flowed eastwards into the lake. The cemeteries lay around the town; in time they were built up to and pushed farther out by the expansion of the suburbs; to the south-west the vast Djalās (al-Zalāqā), more isolated, preserves the memory of the mystic Abu ʿl-Hasan al-Shābdīl (Sidi Belhassen), the founder of the Shābdīlīya brotherhood, who lived there in the first half of the 13th century. Close to the Bāb al-Djasirīn, beside a cemetery of the Hintsāta (al-Mamūthuq al-Hintsīrta), lie the tombs of many “ma’ārīn” (records of their miraculous powers) for the most part unpublished, contain useful information for Tunisian topography of the Hafsids period, supplementing that given by Abī Zakariya or Ibn al-Shābdīl. The famous Lalla Mannūṭya (cf. J. A. 1899, P. 485—494; and Kiṭb Maṣūḥ al-Sawāja wa al-Manūṣīya, Tunisia 1344), d. 1267, has given her name to a village overlooking the town in the S.W. (La
As even greater source of pride to Tunis than these marabouts, whose political influence however is undeniable, as in the case of Abū Muḥammad al-Munṣūfī, the tutor of the future caliph Aḥmad, were its increasing numbers of lawyers, men of letters and students. Religious sciences flourished there, as al-Abdārī notes (1280). We may mention four of the most illustrious of the 13th century the chief kāfīr Ibn Ṣa‘īd Ibn al-Zaytūnī. To this development in the study of belles-lettres and of Maṭrīkī law, the Muslim refugees from Spain made valuable contributions: Ibn al-Abbār and the chief kāfīr Ibn al-Ghasmī came from Valencia; from Seville came the Banū ʿAṣfūr and also the Banū Khaldūn, ancestors of the most celebrated historian of North Africa (born in 1333).

The fourteenth century, to the great admittance of the traveller Khālid al-Balawī (1335–1340), is the golden age of legists and commentators; among these may be mentioned the chief kāfīr Ibn Abī al-Qāfi, Ibn Abī al-Salām, Ibn al-Ǧubrānī, the chief kāfīr Ibn Rasūl al-Salāt, the mufti Ibn Hurayrān and particularly the illustrious imām Ibn Ṭārānīf in the fields of politics we have nothing but weakness in the rulers, unrest and insecurity. The nomad Arabs threatened the capital without difficulty; the Marinids twice occupied Tunis. The development of the city to the west and southwest, so vigorous in the preceding century, was suspended by the weight of lawless immigration, not to say decline. We may however note the foundation of two madrasas, one in 1334–1342 by the sister of the caliph Abū Yāḥya Abī Bakr, the ʿUnaḥiya (restored later; now Onq al-Dīn), the other in 1348, by the chamberlain Ibn Ṭārānīf (han Sīlīyīn). But it was a sign of the times that military demands had first claim on the architect: the Marinid Abu ʾl-Hassān after his defeat at Kairawān in 1348, restored the ramparts of Tunis and dug a ditch around them; Ibn Ṭārānīf considerably strengthened the outside walls and formed considerable kūhāt for their future maintenance.

We have to come down to 1400 and the xvth century to find, with a more stable political situation, a marked revival in building activity; but nothing on a really grand scale. During their long reigns, Aḥmad Fāris and his grandson Abū ʿUmar Ummānī only founded two libraries and a few madrasas; their interests lay more in charitable works; these are the earliest Muḥammas hospital (mawṣilīs) of Tuniṣīs, finished in 825 (1420) and in the suburbs numerous zāwiya offering shelter by day or night; or in water-works, inspired also by a sense of religious duty: a great cistern (mawṣilīs) in the Masqūlī, a hall for abortions (miṣārīs) in the Sīk al-ʿAṭārīn in 834 (1430), drinking-troughs (ṣīḥā) and the kind of public fountain where one drinks by sucking a narrow pipe called “sucker” (mawṣilīs). The whole reflects a somewhat aesthetic piety, incapable of great energy, a religion gradually passing more and more under the control of marabouts and brotherhoods. The families of Kaldānī and Banū al-Raqīṣ are mentioned in this period as artists of standing; in 1451 Tuniṣ had an eighth kūhāt in the fanoub of Bab Souika; but the dominating figure of this period were Sīdī b. ʿArīs (cf. his Menāṭik, Tuniṣ 1393) who came from Morocco, and was buried in his zāwiya in 1463, the founder of the brotherhood of the "Arabīya;"
on for several centuries, suddenly assumed vast proportions when in 1609 the dey ʿOthman welcomed the Moriscos expelled by Philip III. Those who had been used to a town life settled at Tunis in two localised groups: in the street of the Spaniards (S.W. of the Madina) and in the Quarters of the Spaniards (Qawwat al-Andalus, near the Place Hafsaouine). To these Muslims from Spain is due the industry of making red caps or ẓāshiyat, which according to Peyssonnel in 1724 produced 40,000 dozen per annum and engaged over 15,000 people. These Spanish Muslims, with the Ḥanafi Turks from the east and the important part played by renegades of European origin and the corsairs, combined to give Tunis its peculiar character in the xviiith century. The dey Yūsuf I was the first to make a name by public works, a list of which is given by Iīm Abī Dinār: the creation of a commercial quarter around the Bāb al-Banāṭ and the restoration in the same neighbourhood of a ʿākīf for woolen yarn (al-ghebat); the building of a ʿākīf for merchants from Djibra, improvement of several other ʿākīfs, and the continuation of the Ḥafṣīd ʿākīfs to the north: Sāk al-Baqṣāmīyiya (makers of Turkish trowers, street of Sidi B. Ziyād), Sāk al-Birka for the sale of black slaves and Sāk al-Turk (El-Trouch) for Turkish tailors; the installation of a café; water conduits to various points in the town, such as the Great Mosque and above the Sāk al-Turk. There his favourite Ali Thābit built the pretty niżāla (in 1620) which at present adorns the Belvedere; the latter also restored the old mosque of the fanoub of Bāb al-Dżafira. Probably the rebuilding of the eastern door of the Great Mosque ought to be dated to the same time (Bāb al-Dżamīʿ, Gate of the Interments). Yūsuf built in the street of Sidi B. Ziyād a Ḥanafi medersa (in 1622) and a mosque of the same rite with an octagonal minaret, beside which is his tomb. After his time the power of the dynasty began to wane: they no longer undertook great works. Ahmad Khodja (1640–1647) was content to rebuild the al-Shaṣṣāmiyya and al-Unkiyya medersas; Muhammad Līs to build in 1649 the curious minaret of the mosque of al-Kaṣr or El-Kaṣr; at his death in 1653 a mausoleum (niżāla) for him and his family was built in the square of the Kaṣba or Kasbah. The Mālikī beys built a great deal; in the same style as the mosque of Yūsuf Dey and in a street quite near it, Ḥamādīdī built the Ḥanafi mosque of Sidi b. Arīb (finished in 1654) with a family mausoleum beside it. He also rebuilt the minaret of the Great Mosque; he built a mañira in the street El-Afafsane and began to rebuild the Aqueduct. His son Marād built the Medersa al-Muraddiya (in 1673), in the Sīk for Tunis, and while his second son Muhammad al-Ḥaʃīd founded the Sīk of the Shaṣṣiyas, his grandson Muhammad gave the town the original mosque of Sidi Mahīr (after 1675). The French architect Daviler is said to have supplied the plan for the dome. About 1666 we have an excellent description of Tunis in the memoirs of the Chevalier d’Arvieux (Paris, vol. iv., 1735). The Kaṣba or Kasbah, at first the residence of the pashas before the collapse of their authority, comprised two main buildings: the first housed the day’s guards, officers and their families; the other behind it contained a long hall (al-saṣṣa) in which the dey gave audience to the soldiery and in the remotest part were his private apartments. The Dżamīʿ, where the Aqṣa presided over the council of the soldiery, was a large oblong court (cf. also a detailed description by La Condamine in 1741, K. T., 1858, p. 86); the religious tribunal of the Charba (al-kherb) still sits here. The district west and north-west of the madina (especially the Rue du Pacha) formed the aristocratic quarter, the real Turkish quarter. The sumptuous houses of the beys and the other high personages were adorned with marbles; the central court, which was, a regular feature, was ornamented sometimes with a kiosk or a little pool of water; the furniture and the decoration already showed an unfortunate tendency to imitate Italian work of poor quality. With the extraordinary development of the activities of the corsairs the number of Christian slaves increased (6,000 in 1654; on their life cf. Figoon, K. T., 1930, p. 18 sq.); whence the multiplication of those strange prisons called by the name of the Saint to whom was dedicated the chapel contained in them. Father Dan gives 9 in 1635; there were very soon 13. If we must, with P. Grandchamp (La France en Tunisie au XVIIe siècle, Avant-propos de VI et VII, Tunis 1928–1929) regard as legend the story of St. Vincent de Paul’s capture at Tunis from 1605–1607, special importance on the other hand should be attached to the mission of the Lazarist Julien Guebri (1645 to 1648) who succeeded in converting Muhammad Shalabi, the celebrated Don Philip, son of the dey Ahmad Khodja, and to the work of another missionary, Jean le Vacher, consul of France for 1648 to 1653 and 1657 to 1666 (cf. R. Gleizes, Jean le Vacher, Paris 1914 and in Revue des questions historiques, July 1928). It was in his time that the first public chapel was built at the consulate and dedicated to St. Louis; it was he who raised from its ruins the church of St. Antony, in the centre of the Roman Catholic cemetery around which he built high walls, outside the Bāb al-Baḥr (on the site of the present Cathedral); it was he who organised worship in the chapels of the prisons; it was he again who obtained from the Dīwan a site and permission to build a new French consulate or “foundé de l’Açif” finished in 1661 (run de l’Ancienne-Douane; Grandchamp, op. cit., vi., p. xxii., xxxxi.). From 1672 the Italian Capucins were in charge of the missions: their house is described about 1730 by St. Gervais (Mémoires historiques, Paris 1736, p. 86) as well as the Greek Church and the richly endowed Hospital of the Trinitarians. Protestants were buried outside the Bāb Karṣājin in the cemetery of St. George where the English church now stands. In spite of consular protection, the Christian merchants never seem to have been very numerous. The French nation for long numbered only six merchantmen. Foreign trade was mainly in the hands of the Jews, among whom the fugitives from Spain or Portugal (expelled in 1492 and 1496), who had come either directly or through Italy, were distinguished from the Tunisians of old stock (ţibṭa); the “Portuguese” or “Livournese” (Grénois) ultimately formed a separate community: they gave the name to the Sīk el-Grénois. The Jewish cemetery was outside the walls, to the east of the Bāb Souika quarter in the vicinity of the present Rue Sidi Silīfane; then it expanded southwards. In the political troubles which mark the end of the xviiith century and the beginning of the xviiiith, Tunis was twice occupied by the Algerians (in
1686 and 1694) with bloody disorders. The ramparts could not resist a serious attack; they followed "no rule of fortification, for one cannot consider as fortifications the square towers attached to the walls at intervals". Again, even under the Hassansids, Tunisia was at the mercy of the Algerians; pillaged by the latter in 1735, it was vain that in 1756 the Tunisians tried to withstand them with the help of defensive works hurriedly thrown up by "Ali Pasha" and his son Muhammed: an arched joinment with loopholes and a ditch between the two recently built forts on the Djebel Djellâa and the Mannâlîya, a fortified redoubt behind the Kabâba or Kasbah. At this period two other forts are mentioned: crowning the slight eminences on the N.W. These are no doubt the Bârîjî al-Sêmâwâr or Tahâmât al-Rîbî (of the Windmill; it is the fort of the Spaniards) and the Bârîjî al-Râbîa (of the sultans of the Bey); this is the Râbah, itself skirled at a little distance by the little Bârîjî Filîfî (cf. Pirantet, Corresp. . . . . Tunis, ii. 501; and for the year 1829: Monachecurt, Relations inédites. . . . . Filîfî, . . . p. 47 and 91).

In the intervals of peace the town was also enriched with other buildings. It was great grand-daughter of the Dey Uthman, died in 1710 and was buried near the Medersa al-Shammâ'îya. Many charitable and pious institutions benefited from her bountiful gifts. Hussein, himself a great builder, built in Tunis (cf. al-Masâ'ûdî, al-Malabî, R.T., 1895, p. 328-329) in the southern quarter of the Medersa, the Dîwâ'î al-Diwdî or "Mosque of the Dyers" with an octagonal minaret. He planned out the streets and buildings which adjoin the Sâk al-Sabâbîdîn (of the harness-makers); it was in his reign that the Mausoleum of the Dey Kara Mustafâ was built beside the mosque of the Ksar; it was he who moved the seat of the government to the Bardo. In the decline of the decline in religious teaching acknowledged in the preceding century by Ibn Abî Dinâr (p. 399; transi. p. 506), he showed a real interest in building medersas: Mâdrasat al-Nâhâbî (of the palm-tree), the Medersas al-Husainîya and al-Diwdî. His immediate successor "Ali Pasha, following his example, built four: al-Râbîaî, in the Sûk of the booksellers; al-Salâmîya, in memory of his dead son Sulaymân, Mâdr. Bîr al-Hajjîâ, Mâdr. Hamûstî Âghâ; and a little later "Ali Bîy founded another Dîwâ'î. It is to this same "Ali Bîy that we owe the mausoleum of the Hâssânsid (Turbat al-Bîy) not far from the Mosque of the Dyers, and (built in 1775) the home for aged poor called al-Tâkhy (the Tekka). About the year 1800 the famous minister Vasûf Şâhîb al-Tâhâ, keeper of the sultans seal, built in the Halfâmoun square the mosque that bears his name, probably, as the raised outer gallery shows, on the site of the Mustâfîd al-Mâlîhî (al-Muâlîhî) al-Halîfî of which Ibn Nakî mentions in the sixth century (iv. 149); in the same quarter he set up the Halfâmoun fountain (in 1804), inside the Bâb Sûtîl 'Ahd al-Salâm and at the other end of the town a large watering-trough inside the Bâbl Alwaâs.

His sovereign hammerbâ Khanîsh, who finished the Dîr al-Bîy (Caroline of Brunswick stayed there in 1816) a little above the Kasbah or Kasbah, devoted all his energies to military works and to fortifications. To defend Tunis, particularly against the Algerians, he had the outer ramparts rebuilt by a Dutch engineer. This work, which took from 1797 to 1804 according to the inscriptions on the bastions adjoining the gates, was never completed on the south side (cf. H. Hugon, R.T., 1905, p. 377; and G. Dolot, R.T., 1905, p. 298). On this side they were satisfied with the advanced entrenchment made by "Ali Pasha and the outer walls of the houses which formed an almost continuous line of defence. Hammâmîa built barracks (in 1798) alongside of his magnificent villa at al-Mamouba, and others in 1814 at the close of his life, in the middle of the Sûk al-Astârin (it now houses the Bibliothèque Publique and the Direction des Antiquités; cf. M. Houdas, Note sur trois inscriptions de Tunis, in Bull. Archéol., 1911). In the same period many other barracks were built in the Madina: Rue de la Caserne (al-Sâkha; now the Société Française de Bienfaisance), Rue de l'Église (now the Administration of the Habits), Rue des Moniquettes, Rue Stîl B. Ziyâd; but by far the largest, that of the "First Regiment" (Birslâmî Allîy; now the Caserne Sausier); it was built near the MurâdhÎy, on the site of the former maqâllîy, by the Bey Húsain b. Mâhmîd, then by his brother Mustafâ (in 1835-1836). An artillery depot (now the Caserne Beyriguel) was built outside the town in 1839 by Abûmî it Bây, the creator of the "Tunisian army". While "Ali Pasha had been content to send on two occasions (1743 and 1744) for a founder from Tonlon, who repaired several cannon in an emergency workshop, under Hammâmîa Pasha a regular foundry was established under the permanent charge of some Frenchmen in a wing of the Hafîzîya palace (the Hafiz; street of the same name). Lastly Abûmî it Bây organised the Dâbahîya (cf. N.T., 1922, p. 276), where the bread and oil required for the army was made (Rue Dâbahî, a little north of the Dîr al-Bîy and Rue des Teinturiers).

Just when these military undertakings seemed to be going to transform Tunis into a garrison town, the European colony, which was developing with greater freedom every day as a result of the French occupation of Algiers (1830) and the reforms made by the bey, gained a footing in the Madina. Shops were opened by the Christians. Religious edifices sprang up in addition to the old Church of the Holy Cross (Rue de la Kasbah; moved in 1853 to the old Hospital of the Trinitarians, Rue de l'Église), the registers of which are valuable for the history of Roman Catholicism in Tunisia. In 1831 the Italian school was opened at Sulema, the Jewish in 1840 at Morpurgo, in 1841 the Bourgade College in the Zone of Bâb el-Medina (Impasse du Missionnaire). The whole of the quarter of the Place de la Bourse (recently renamed Place du Cardinal Lavigerie) with the present Rue de l'Ancienne-Domaine, des Glacières and de la Commission became completely European. Outside the ramparts, the modern town began to spread towards the lake; thus the Consulat de France was moved in 1861 to the building which is now the Résidence Générale. Other consulates however are still within the city: those of Spain (rue Stîl el-Bâni), Great Britain (place du Cardinal Lavigerie), Italy (rue Zarkoun; this is soon to be moved).

European influence became so strong that the administration of the town itself was at length affected. Under the Hafîzîs each of the two fra-
hurges had its shaikh, probably under the khâlih al-madina: these three officials survived under the Turks; assisted by patrols of citizens taken in rotation (lawdûdîa) they saw that the town was policed at night after the closing of the gates. Below them the muḥarrar were heads of the quarters. The day police, under the Ḥusaini, was the business of the darvâlî, this destitute dey, who had under him 50 ḥâshâ and 55 ḥâšûflî (cf. E. Pellissier, Desc. de la régence de Tunis, Paris 1853, p. 52-53) and acted as police magistrate in the long-hall called Driba in the street of the Bâb I’Arûs. The Kasaba was administered separately under an ḥamî. In 1858, however, a municipal council was formed (a president, a vice-president, a secretary, and a dozen notables) the budget for which was provided by a tax on wines and spirits. In 1860 the darvâlî was replaced by a general of division (farîf) who had under him “zaptîs” (dâḥîflîa). Vigorous steps were taken to bring the city up to date; a telegraph line was laid to Algiers and a railway to La Goulette; a drainage system was laid out and water brought from Zaghouan by the French engineer Colin. The water-tanks took the place of the covered reservoir (khâmnà) which stood in the preceding century beside the gate of the outer ramparts, Bâb Thub Aflâth, adjoining the Kasaba or Kasbah.

Preoccupation with such modern works left little time for any great religious buildings; one may however mention the imposing zawiya of Stîr Ibrâhîm al-Riyâhi (d. 1850; cf. R.T., 1918, p. 124, and on the jirhsh of the Ḥusaini period: al-Sântîs, Maktabât al-Zarîf, Tunis n. d.) who enjoyed a veneration which shows no signs of decreasing. In 1875 the Sâdîkî College was founded (in the barracks of the rue de l’Église) called after the bey Muhammed al-Sâdîkî. In 1880, the Sâdîkî Hospital was built. Among the mansions, the Zarrîch palace (rue des Juges) was at first the residence of the deys. The Dâr Husain (now the Palais de la Division) built in the xviii century by a minister of the bey, was restored in 1876; the Khair al-Din palace, an enlargement of the old Ḥâshîya, was the court of justice for a time at the beginning of the protectorate (rue du Tribunal); the Palace of Muṣâfî b. Ismâ’il was in the rue du Pacha; that of the Khânâmî (Place Hâflîwîn, rue du Palais) became the Jewish Hospital, but has not been used for some time now. It may be noted that after the rising of the sons of Ḥusain b. ‘Ali against ‘Ali Pacha in the middle of the preceding century, the Hâflîwîn quarter, inhabited by faithful *Husainîya*, enjoyed the favour of the bey to the detriment of the quarter of Bâb al-Djazira, the stronghold of the jâf opposed to the *Râhîya* (cf. R. T., 1918, p. 124).

The French occupation (from 1881) has produced tremendous developments in Tunis which are still going on. The European town stretches from the Porte de France (the old Bâb al-Bahr) to the lagoon, where the quays are; it stretches from the Belvedere to the Djellâs, then, in the south of the southern quarter, within and without the walls, it covers the heights of *Montferrât*. The outer wall is still standing. That of the Madîna has almost completely disappeared except for a few gates. The Kasaba or Kasbah, entirely preserved, is used as barracks. The Dâr al-Bây houses the Direction de l’Intérieur; the other offices with the new Sâdîkî College (1897) and the Palais de Justice are modern buildings stretching along the Boulevard Bâb Benât from the Place de la Kasaba. An electric tramway runs round the Madîna but does not enter it. An attempt has been made to retain the original character of the city itself. A number of buildings are now used for other than their original purpose: the general appearance of the city is just what it was fifty years ago. Religious instruction remains centralised in the Great Mosque, the minaret of which was entirely rebuilt in 1864; in 1896 the resident Millet founded the Khâlîflîyà in the Sâdîkî, to instruct young Muslims in the elements of modern sciences. The Sîkhs continue to group the native trades in guilds each under an âsî; some of them are visited by large numbers of tourists and a busy trade is done with them in "Oriental" articles, perfumes, carpets and leather goods; public criers offer for sale books and jewellery in the Sîk of the Booksellers and Sîk al-Berka. The wretched Jewish quarter, abandoned by those of its inhabitants who have acquired sufficient to enable them to live beside the Place des Frères or in the European town, will shortly be replaced by modern buildings and broad streets.

The Muslims on the other hand live in the native town, except a few rich families who have villas at the end of the Avenue de Paris and the few antus of the houses in the new village of al-Omran (S. W. of the Belvedere). Finally we must mention the growing population of the remoter suburbs (Raûdes and Hammâm-Lit, or Carthage La Mara) European, Muslim and Jewish, which really now form one with Tunis.

The Municipal Council was reorganized by decree of Oct. 31, 1883; supplemented by the decrees of 1888 and 1914 relating to the communes of the Regency. It consists of a President, two Vice-Presidents (French) and 17 members appointed by decree (8 European, 8 Muslim and 1 Tunisian Jew). At the last census (1926) the population of Tunis had risen to 185,996 divided as follows: French 27,922, other Europeans 51,214, native Muslims 82,729, Tunisian Jews 24,131.

Bibliography: Saladin, Tunisi et Kairouan, Paris 1908 (statements should be verified); Descript (in collaboration), Histoire de la ville de Tunis, Algiers 1924 (the only useful chapter is that which deals with Europeans in Tunis in the xixe century before the occupation); C. Marquis, Manuel d’art musulman, L’Architecture, vol. 2, Paris 1926-1927 (excellent descriptions of the principal monuments; s. p. 871-875, a study of the architecture of the Muslim palaces of Tunis). — Cf. also the references in the text, and in the article TUNISIA.

(Robert Brunschwig)

AL-TUNISI, MUHAMMAD B. ‘OMAR E. SALAMÂN, an Arabic author of the xixe century. He belonged to a Tunisian family devoted to learning, especially to theological studies. His grandfather Salamân was a copyst of books and, when he set out on a pilgrimage to Mecca, left his three sons behind under the guardianship of his maternal uncle Ahmad b. Salamân al-Azhari, a learned theologian. On completing his pilgrimage, Salamân, as he had lost all his property, did not return to Tunis, but stayed first of all in Djedda where he made a living by copying books. There he became acquainted with some people from Senégâr and on their advice went to their land. The ruler gave him a hearty welcome, assigned
him a house and other property and allotted him a regular income. Sulaimân then married a woman of Sennâr who bore him a son (Ahmad Zarrûk) and a daughter.

When 'Omar, the second son of Sulaimân by his first marriage in Tunis, had grown up, he went with his grand-uncle on the pilgrimage to Mecca and on the way met by accident his father Sulaimân, who was on his way to Cairo on business with a caravan from Sennâr. From Mecca, where his grand-uncle died, 'Omar returned to Cairo in order to study at al-Azhar. Later he visited his father in Sennâr, resumed his studies at al-Azhar and in 1201 (1786) married. Two years later he returned to his native city of Tunis where a son Muhammad (al-Tunisi) was born in 1204 (1789). 'Omar stayed only three years in Tunis and then went with his family back to Cairo to devote himself once more to study at al-Azhar. There he soon obtained the office of nāšib al-rîwāt (cf. L, p. 535), being appointed grand-uncle of the fraternity of Mughâl students. In 1209 ('Omar) learned of the death of his father from his step-brother in Sennâr and of their poor circumstances. He at once went there and never again returned to his own family. Fortunately for the latter, in the same year Tahir, 'Omar's younger brother, came to Cairo on business, intending afterwards to go on the pilgrimage to Mecca. He adopted his brother's family and sent the young Muhammad, who at the age of 7 had already read the Qur'an through, to study at al-Azhar. When, after Tahir's departure for Mecca, Muhammad's means of subsistence gradually came to an end, he decided to seek his father in the Sudan as news had reached Cairo that soon after his arrival in Sennâr he had gone on to Dâr Fûr. Among the members of a caravan which had reached Cairo from Dâr Fûr he met a friend of his father, who at his request took him back with him to Dâr Fûr. This must have been 1218 (1803). In Dâr Fûr he met first his father's step-brother Ahmad Zarrûk who took him to Djilût (in the district of Abu-l-Djilût), where his father 'Omar lived. The latter had attained a position of great prestige at the court, become wealthy and prosperous and had also founded a new family. By order of the king 'Abd al-Rahmân b. Ahmad (d. 1214 = 1799; cf. the list of kings of Dâr Fûr, i, p. 917) 'Omar had composed commentaries on two theological and legal works (cf. Voyage au Dur-Four, p. 107; on the other literary activities of 'Omar, see p. 424). When Muhammad arrived in Dâr Fûr, a certain Muhammad Kufrî (Nachtigal, Sahâra und Sudan, iii., Berlin 1879, p. 387, calls him Abû Shaïkh Kufrî) was acting as regent for the infant ruler Muhammad al-Fâṣî; he later met his death in a rebellion. Muhammad received a kindly welcome from Kufrî to whom he was introduced by Ahmad Zarrûk. Kufrî also enabled 'Omar to make a journey to Tunisia to visit his relations on his promising to return. For the period of his absence 'Omar left his estate at Djilût in the hands of his son Muhammad.

'Omar went first to Wâdâ' where he stayed some years; for he managed to attain a very high position at the court of the local Sâbûn sultan, being appointed a vizier and getting land in the village of Abali. But after awaiting his son there in vain, he decided to go on to Tunis.

Muhammad stayed some seven and a half years in Dâr Fûr after the departure of his father and became thoroughly acquainted with the land and its people. It was only after the conclusion of a war between Dâr Fûr and Wâdâ' that he was able to go to the latter country on an embassy from the sultan of Dâr Fûr. He came first to Wâra, the then residence of Sultan Sâbûn who showed him much kindness, as he had done to his father. Muhammad was thus likewise detained a considerable period in Wâdâ'. But his position became more and more difficult, in the first place because his uncle Ahmad Zarrûk who had followed 'Omar to Wâdâ' and on the latter's departure had been entrusted with the care of his children and house in Abali took full possession of 'Omar's property and only gave his son the minimum necessities of life. A second difficulty was the ill-feeling that developed with Ahmad al-Fâ'sî (on him cf. Voyage au Ouadây, p. 66 sq., 497 sqq., 508) who had been appointed 'Omar's successor in the vizierate on his suggestion. He slandered Muhammad to Sâbûn so that the latter became suspicious and ceased to show him favour. 'Omar, who came to Wâdâ' at his son's request, was able, it is true, to get Ahmad al-Fâ'sî dismissed, but on his ('Omar's) departure he regained his old rank. In these circumstances Muhammad readily took advantage of the Sultan's permission to leave Wâdâ' after eighteen months there. He joined a caravan going to Fesân with which he travelled through the land of the Tûbû (Tibesti) to Murzûk, the capital of Fesân. Here he stayed three months, during which the ruler there, Muntâm, died. From Murzûk he continued his journey to Tripoli and finally reached Tunis via Sfâqes (Sfax) about 1225 (1813) about ten years after leaving Cairo for the Sudan.

Muhammad at first settled in Tunis; later however, he moved to Cairo and there entered the service of the viceroy Muhammad 'Ali. When in 1824 the latter sent an army to the Moeur under his stepson Ibrahim Pâshî, Muhammad went through the campaign as chaplain (ma'âkip) to an infantry regiment (cf. Voyage au Darfou, p. 6). An incident of the siege of Missolonghi (1825-1826) is related by him in his Voyage au Ouadây, p. 634-635.

At the end of the war, Muhammad acted as reviser of the Arabic translation of European medical, especially pharmacological, works in the veterinary college founded by Muhammad 'Ali in Abû Za'bal (N. E. of Cairo). There Dr. Perron became acquainted with him and his arrival in Egypt, took Arabic lessons from him and induced him to write down his memoirs of his travels in the Sudan, fortunately for Arabic reading lessons. Written in 1839 Perron became director of the Kârî al-Âin medical school in Cairo, on his recommendation Muhammad was appointed chief reviser there. A. v. Kremer, who came to Egypt for the first time in 1850, mentions Muhammad as one of his teachers whom he esteemed highly (cf. A. v. Kremer, ed. cit; cf. Bâlle). As he further tells us, Muhammad also devoted himself to the editing of important works of the earlier Arabic literature, for example the Masâbmus al-Hârî (q.v.) and the Masâbmus al-Mahbûbî (q.v.), this is probably the Bekhî edition of 1278 = 1856. According to Comand (cf. Voyage au Darfou, p. x), Muhammad was also appointed to undertake, for an edition of the Arabic lexicon al-Kâmî.
of Frisåladi [q.v.], a revision of the Calcutta edition of 1230 (1857) for which purpose he corrected the text of the latter with the help of seven or eight manuscripts. The new edition was printed in 1274 (1857). In his later years Shaik Muhammad was engaged at the request of the Zain al-Abidin to lecture every Friday on the Hadith in the Zainab mosque. He died in Cairo in 1274 (1857) and was buried in Kempten [cf. cit.].

The many observations and enquiries made by Muhammad al-Tunisi in his long sojourn in the Sudan about the ways and people of the districts visited by him were written down, in his own experiences, at Perron's instigation in two comprehensive works, which Perron translated into French. They are:

1. **Voyage au Darfour par le Cheikh Mohammed Ebn Omar et Towany [Tunisi, popular nisha for Tunisi; cf. Stumme, Gramm. des tamenisch. Arabisch, Leipzig 1896, p. 66]**. *Réviseur en chef à l'Ecole de Médecine du Caïr, traduit de l'Arabe par Dr. Perron, Directeur de l'Ecole de Médecine du Caïr, Paris 1845 (lxxxviii. 492 pp. in 8°, with map).* The *Préface* to this book by Jomard (p.i.—lxxxviii) also appeared separately under the title: *Observation sur le Voyage au Darfour suivies d'un Vocabulaire de la Langue des Habitations et de Remarques sur le Nil-Blanc supérieur*, Paris 1845 (lxxxviii. 277 pp.).


Perron published the Arabic text of the first part of the Darfur-journey under the title: *Ta'likh al-Ashar bi-difaf Bilad al-Abar wa-l-Sudan* (= *L'Aisancement de l'Empire par le Voyage au Soudan et parmi les Arabes*) in 1859 in Paris in autograph (310 pp. in 4^°, with 4 pp. in French of introduction, emendations and additions to the translation).

2. **Voyage au Ouadda par le Cheikh Mohammed Ebn Omar et Towany**, traduit de l'Arabe par Dr. Perron, Paris 1851 (lxxvii. 756 pp. in 8°, with map and 9 plates with pictures). Jomard added to this book also a long preface (p.i—lxxvii) with historical and geographical observations. Perron himself in the introduction (p. 1—35) deals particularly with the divisions of the Sudan.

The Arabic text of the second work, which Perron (loc. cit., p. 34) intended to publish, never appeared. The manuscript was probably in his possession but where it went after Perron's death in 1876 in Paris, to which he returned in 1850, I do not know.

Muhammad al-Tunisi is the first to give us full and reliable information about important parts of the Sudan. On Darfur, he had before his time only the scanty notes of the explorer W. G. Browne and on Wadai a little information gleaned by Burckhardt. It was not until several decades later that H. Barth and J. Nachtigal were able to visit these lands and describe them in more detail in their books. There is no reason to doubt al-Tunisi's reliability; Perron checked his statements with the help of a number of people from Darfur and Wadai settled in Cairo and obtained complete confirmation of them. It cannot however be denied that there are certain defects in the Shaikh's description. A certain lack of order in the arrangement of the material, the lack of any approach to a regular system, a fondness for digression and a disposition to believe much too readily statements about the popular fictions of the country (e.g. especially about the size of the cities) are not such serious defects as the fact that he gives no exact geographical, topographical, statistical and meteorological data (cf. thereon the criticisms by Barth, in *Reisen und Entdeckungen in Nord- und Centralafrika*, iii., Berlin 1859, p. 529 sqq. and Nachtigal, in *Petermanns Geogr. Mitt.* (in. 1757, p. 176 and in *Studien und Reisen*, iii., p. viii.). Nevertheless Tunisi's two works form an important and still too little appreciated source for the ethnographical, cultural, and political conditions in the Sudan lands through which he travelled. In conclusion it should be emphasized that the Shaikh's two books supplement one another; the much larger work on Wadai also contains a good deal of information about Darfur.

As an appendix we may give a brief account of a countryman of Muhammad al-Tunisi who resembled him in many ways, the Tunisian Shaikh Zain al-Abidin. The latter, an educated, well-read man, who had studied at Fezzan and grown up in constant intercourse with Europeans, in 1818 or 1819, when at a mature age went out for the Sudan where (like Tunisi) seems to have spent about ten years, to some extent as a missionary and adventurer learned in religious matters. He went first to Senaïr and Kordofan, then stayed a considerable time in Darfur and Wadai; making his living by teaching. After over three years in Wadai he returned via Fezzan to Tunis. His experiences and observations there he recorded in an Arabic book of no great length which was published (when and where?) It was translated into Turkish and printed at Stambul in 1802 (1846) (cf. Z.D. M.C.G., ii. 482). This Turkish version was translated by G. Rosen as *Das Buch des Sudan oder Reisen der Schacht Zain al-Abidin in Nigritien*, Leipzig 1847.

The importance of this book lies in the description of the state of civilization and organization of society in Darfur and Wadai. We are told of the court life, of the soldiers—a campaign, the natives, slaves and negroes, of trade, superstitions, a wedding etc. These interesting notes are an important supplement to the far fuller description of Muhammad al-Tunisi. Noteworthy is an account of excavations made by Zain al-Abidin with the permission of the Sultan of Wadai's in ruins near the capital (p. 47—49, 61—75). Zain al-Abidin left Wadai just as a change on the throne took place; the name 'Abd al-Asir given in Rosen's translation to the new ruler (p. 108) should be amended to 'Abd al-Asy [cf. Nachtigal, op. cit., iii. 284, where an 'Abd al-Asy, grandson of Sidi, is mentioned].

Bibliography: The main source for the life of Muhammad al-Tunisi and his family are the two books of travel, especially the autobiography in the introductory chapter to the *Voyage au Darfour* (p. i—27) and a number of references like *op. cit.*, p. 48—49 and in the *Voyage au Ouadda* p. 37—39, 50, 62, 66—67, 129, 199, 211 sqq., 215, 497—499, 508, 512 sqq., 643—645. The biographical sketch by Jomard (*Voyage au Darfour*, p. viii.—x.) should be consulted for errors and omissions; cf. also Perron's notes (*Voyage au Darfour*, p. lxxi.—lxxiii.) and A. v. Krenz's *Agypten*, Leipzig 1865, ii. 324. Cf. also, in addition to the references.
in the article, Wüstenfeld in Lüttke’s Zeitschr., für vorglück. Erdkunde, i. (Magdeburg 1842), p. 67 and Brockelmann, G. A. L. ii. 491 (where the book on Wadis is not given!)

M. Struck

TUNISIA. Tunisia consists of the eastern declivity of Barbary; it corresponds approximately to the Ifrikiya of the middle ages. Since 1831, Tunisia or the Regency of Tunis has been a French protectorate.

I. GEOGRAPHY.

With its present frontiers, Tunisia, which lies between 30° and 11° E. Long. and 32° and 37° N. Lat., has an area of 115,180 sq. km. Along its western frontier it is bounded by Algeria (département of Constantine), on the south by the Sahara and, far to the southeast, by Italian Libya (Tripolitania). The Mediterranean washes its shores, which are usually low-lying, on the north and east. The climate is on the whole moderately warm; but the rainfall varies greatly with districts and even with years, and being influenced by the proximity of the sea and also of the Sahara, it varies very much with latitude and still more with altitude. The relief is very varied although the average height above sea-level is not great; the mountain-ranges, which are the continuation and end of those of Algeria, run generally from S.W. to N.E.

In the northwest, the mountains of Krummiria and of the Mogods, of chalk and sandstone, rarely exceed 3,000 feet, towards Algeria; subjected to a heavy rainfall, covered with oaks and bruschwood, they contain mines of zinc and iron (Dauria). They run along the coast where in turn we have, with the little port of Talbara, the dunes of Nefza, Cape Nègre and the little peninsula of Cape Serrat. In the east, they gradually diminish in height down to the hills which surround the alluvial plains of Jerba and of Mater, both well watered and growing great crops of wheat. The lagoon of Bizerta, which communicates with the sea by a narrow strait, forms an excellent roadstead with deep water opposite Sicily, which is not a great distance away. The plain of Mater, now almost entirely covered with soil except for a number of marshes still existing, is dominated by the curious massif of the Djerif Achkeul. Further east, the Ra’s Shit ‘Ali al-Makki above Porto-Farina (Ghān al-Makki) bounds the Gulf of Tunis on the north, which is being filled up by deposit brought down by the Medjerda and the Wād Milliane: Utica, a port in the Roman period, is now 6 miles from the sea; the peninsula of Carthage, formerly an island, is connected to the mainland by an isthmus, which separates the Sebkha el-Raizana from the lagoon of Tunis; the lagoon, at the end of which stands Tunis, the capital, communicates with the sea by the strait of Le Goulette (Hatik al-Wādī). The district of Tunis, which has not a great rainfall, is less suited for cereals than for the vine and fruit-trees.

The Medjerda, which runs through northern Tunisia from west to east, is the only real river in Tunisia and its level is very low in summer; from November to April it is flooded and very turbid. Its lower course (Medjerja el-Bah, Tébourba) is separated by the gorges of Testur from its middle course, where it drains the great alluvial depression of Dakhla (the region of Suk el-Arba and Suk el-Khemis) as rich in cereals and pasturage as the adjacent chalk-hills of Beja. Its valley is bordered on the north by the limestone hills of Bejawa and Teboursk, while to the south the very undulating relief of the centre and west of Tunisia present an alternation of rounded hills of limestone and great plains, the prolongation of the Saharan Atlas of Algeria: this High Tell (districts of Teboursk, of Kef, Sers, Elha-Ksar, Thala) covered with natural woods of Aleppo pines, and tall shrubs and great pastures, enables wheat to be cultivated, except in the drier part of the southwest, which has to be content with barley. This, especially towards the eastern frontier, is the part of Tunisia which is richest in mines (iron at Djerissa and Slatat, phosphates at Kalaat-Djerdja and Kalaat es-Sekkâs). The rivers, tributaries of the Medjerda (W. Mellégu, W. Tessa, W. Sillana) and W. Milliane (plains of Fahs and Mornag), flow directly into the Gulf of Tunis.

To the south of the High Tell rises the most marked mountain barrier. The "backbone of Tunisia" runs from the neighbourhood of Tebessa to the Djerif Zaghwan (4,300 feet high, 30 miles from Tunis) and to the Djerif Raïs and Bu Kearnâin; it includes the highest peaks: Shambî (5,150 feet) and Semarîn in the Byazzene range, the massif of Maatar, Serdîf, Bargoun, Kirîne and the chain of Zeguitania. But it permits communication to be maintained easily with the south, through several passes or defiles, notably the great corridor of Ksar-Sbibla. On the other hand, the watercourses on the southern slopes, like the W. Merguellîl, Zerad, El-Haiab (which waters the plain of Gamuda) which flow irregularly and even intermittently, lose themselves when they flow at all—in the saline hollows called Sebkhas: e.g. S. Kelbia and S. Sidi el-Hani in the plain of Kairawan. These are in the region of the great steppes, the land of the camel, which stretches to Tebessa, only interrupted by a few limestone-hills of no great height; covered in the west with alfa or white artemisia, and jujube-trees towards the east, where it gradually slopes down to the olive-groves of the hinterland of Safx, it nevertheless contains extensive agricultural land and areas suitable for cattle rearing. The only towns in it, besides Kairawan, are at the outlet of the passes of the "backbone"; Sellala, Kasserîn, Ferlana. But it becomes more and more desert-like in character towards the south as a result of a decrease in rainfall, and ends, beyond Gafsa and the rich deposits of phosphates at Metlawa and Redeyef, in the depression of the Shotts (Sh. el-Chârha, 500 feet below sea-level, Sh. el-Djerîld, Sh. el-Fedjîl: enclosed by the Djerif Sherb and Djerif Teboga), in the oases of Djerid (Medjerda, Nefza) and those of Nefsa (Kerbîl, Dong), which produce dates; here the Sahara begins. More to the S.E. the Djerif Dahar (1,300—2,000 feet), of limestone and chalk, with the massif of the Matmata, is only the eastern border of a great basin in the Sahara.

On the N. E. coast of the Regency, where prosperous farms have been established, the important peninsula of Cape Four, in the prolongations of the "backbone", lies between the gulfs of Tunis and of Hammamet, the coastal plains of which are connected by the passes of Zaghwan (Pum el-Kharrîbta) and of Grombalia. Then to the south of the orange-groves of Nabeul and Hammamet, the Sahel of Sissa, with its valleys, is still sufficiently well watered to support by its olives and
other crops a dense population which lives in large fortified villages: Kalaa-Kbira, Kalaa-Ssira, Msaken, Maknine; the regularity of the coastline is interrupted by the little peninsulas of Monastir and Mahdia.

Beginning at Ras Kapudia, roughly on the level of el-Djerir, the coast turns inwards and leaves out in the bay of Sfax the islands of Kerkennah, which are separated by shallows from the shore, and then runs along the Gulf of Gabes (the ancient Little Syrtis) where sponge fishing forms a source of revenue. At the end of the Gulf rise the palm-trees of Gabes. Between them and the oasis of el-Hamma adjoining the Shells, lies the passage from the central or eastern plains of Tunisia to those on the extreme south coast: Arad, off which lies the large flat green island of Djéla, Léjara bordered by lagoons; a few olive-groves however flourish around Zirzis and Ben-Gandane.

Bibliography: Aug. Bernard and de Flotte de Rochefort, Atlas d'Algérie et de Tunisie (in course of publication); publications of the Directions générales de l' Agriculture and of the Travaux publics, and the Station Oceanographique of Salammbô; on geology, the works of Ph. Thomas and Pervinquière, and the recent works of B. Solognac; on the climate, the works of G. Gominos; on the fauna, the recent works of L. Lavandé; on the flora: R. Maire, Carte physiographique de l'Algérie et de la Tunisie, Algiers 1925.


2. HISTORY.

The conquest of what is now Tunisia cost the Arab invaders who came by land from the southwest at least half a century of fierce fighting with the native Berbers and with the Byzantine governors. In North Africa as in the East, Islam was bound to come into conflict with Byzantium, but in the middle of the seventh century the situation in the exarchate of Africa was eminently favourable to the prospects of the ultimate conquerors: religious dissensions, a distant but all too faithful echo of disputes provoked in the east by monotheliist doctrines were rending the Christian community of Carthage; and detaching from Byzantium the majority of those who were strictly attached to orthodoxy; the governors, less and less under the control of the Emperor, were aspiring to a state of independence which forced them to rely for support on the chiefs of the great native tribes, and the tribes, taking advantage of this, gradually cast off all Byzantine authority so completely that at the time of the Muslim conquest, all the south of Byzacene seemed to be practically independent of Carthage.

The two first invasions of the Arabs with an interval of 15 years between them, were only raids, razzias; but they prepared the way for better organised expeditions for the methodical conquest of the country. Besides, by a remarkable coincidence, on each occasion the invaders found Byzantine Africa in the throes of a political crisis: in 647, the patriarcus Gregory had just broken with the Emperor and settled himself in the midst of the Berbers, far from the coast, when 'Abd Allah b. Sard b. 'Abd Sarh, governor of Egypt, crushed him near Sheilla and proceeded to lay waste the Djérid; in 655, the people of Carthage were most unexpectedly open revolt against the empire, when Mu'ayya b. Hudayfi razged Byzacene and took the stronghold of Djérid.

Was the government of the Magrib added by 657 to that of Egypt? The real occupation only dates from the period 669–775, marked by the victories of 'Ukba b. Nafi al-Maghrib and the foundation of Kairouan: this was the period of the definitive occupation of Byzacene and the beginning of the conversion of the Berber tribes to Islam, but the most important event was the foundation of the new city, a Muslim town, an arsenal, caravaner, and market-place, which henceforth raised its mosque and its ramparts in the plains, facing the heights of central Tunisia which were still defended by a line of Byzantine forts.

After the governorship of Abu 'l-Muhadjar, of which little is known, 'Ukba returned in 658; but two years later on his way back from an imprudent raid which had taken him as far as Tingitana, he fell in the Zab before Tahdits, killed in a vigorous native rising against the invaders. This rising which began in the Auras, emerged Kairouan; its leader Kusaila, supported by the Byzantines, was for several years the head of a vast Berber state, which offered a desperate resistance to new Arab attacks. He himself fell fighting in 688 in the district of Shbou, whence Zahir b. Kais al-Bahawi is said to have come. It was however only in 693 when the position of the Umayyads at home permitted a policy of expansion to be resumed, that Hāsān b. al-Naṣrān was able to lead an army of 40,000 men to the invasion of Byzacene and advance swiftly northwards in an attempt to crush the Byzantines before turning back against the rude Berbers of the Auras. He took Carthage in 695, but two years later lost it again defeated by the patrician John, and again by the Berbers under the legendary figure of Kāhina [q. v.]. in the plains of Baghail. 'Ukba fell back on Barca and in the following year in a combined offensive by land and sea, he took Carthage finally. In 698, the Arabs had at last taken almost the whole of the modern Tunisia from the Berbers and Byzantines. Hāsān was able to "found" Tunis and his successor Mūsā b. Naṣir to take Zaghawa, then to lead the "Ifriqyia" Berbers themselves to the conquest of the west.

The greater part of the Byzantine colony had been able to escape by sea, mainly to Sicily and Malta. The majority of the inhabitants who remained in the country seems to have been very quickly converted to Islam, except for a few groups, Christian (of'arab) or Jewish. But even after they had entered Islam the Berbers of Ifriqiya, like those of other parts of North Africa,
tried on several occasions to regain their autonomy on the convenient pretext of religious heresies. The whole history of the eighth century is made up of risings, which in the name of socialist Kharidzism roused the natives against the Arab rulers, and also of mutinies by the Arab soldiers themselves, who readily broke the bonds of discipline.

Umayyad b. Ša'wān was able to put down the rising of the Ṣafīr 'Ukāsha, but he had to flee the east when the rebel 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Ḥabīb al-Tabari took Kairawān. After the last Umayyad had proved powerless to retain this distant province which was slipping from them, the 'Abbasid dynasty, seeing Spain cast off their suzerainty, were anxious at least to retain Ḥarrān, captured Kairawān, rebuilt its ramparts and installed themselves there as governor, but not for long. The Arab soldiers, dissatisfied with him, forced him to depart in 765. Not even his successor al-Ḥālib b. Ṣalīm al-Tamimi, an old companion in the east of the 'Abbasid propagandist Abū Muslim, was able to hold out against the rebel Muṣārūt; he fell in the rising in 767 and anarchy prevailed for five years.

From 772 to 794, Ḥarrān was ruled by a regular petty dynasty of officials of the caliphate, the Muhāllabids, Yemenis by origin, who succeeded for a time in securing some degree of peace and order in the country; Ya‘qūb b. Ḥasan of al-Ḥālib, with the help of 40,000 new troops, finally disposed of the Ḥālib b. Ḥarīm, rebuilt the Great Mosque of Kairawān (774) and organised the gilds of the capital; his son Dāwūd in 783 at Kef crushed the Berber confederation of the Wārāfūd, and his brother Rawḥ, governor in his turn, concluded with the Ḥālib of Tiaret, Ibn Rostum, an agreement which put an end to the spirit of rebellion among the Berbers in Ḥarrān.

Henceforth it was only the Arab soldiers who constituted a serious danger for the domestic peace of the country. After the death of the last Muhāllabid al-Ṣa‘līd an era of bloodshed and trouble begins again. The aged general Ḥarīm b. Ayyān sent for the purpose, restored the authority of the caliph of Baghdad and built the ribāṭ of Mounastir; but his successor Muṣārūt b. Muṣārūt al-‘Abbāsī was driven from his post by theTamimi soldiers of Tunisia whom his tactlessness had roused (Oct. 799). At this moment, Ibrāhīm b. al-‘Abbās, son of the governor killed in 767, suddenly appeared as an 'Abbāsid champion in his province of the Zāb. He brought Ibn Muṣārūt back to Kairawān. As a reward and to establish a stable government at last, Hārīn al-Raḍdī on the advice of his councillors decided to appoint him tributary 'emir' of Ḥarrān. Ibrāhīm received his diploma of appointment in July 800; the power was to remain for over a century in his family, down to 909, without interruption.

The dynasty of the Aḥhābīds [q.v.] left its mark deeply upon Tunisia. Under an outward submission to the caliph of the East, the country, practically independent and hereditary, pursued a policy of pacification, organisation and expansion. The hostility of the Tamimis, whose centre was Tunisia, was always active. Ibrāhīm, although a Tamimi himself, came into conflict with these warriors of Muṣārūt, who could ill endure the authority whether near or distant of the 'Abbāsīds, the friends of their ancient Yemeni rivals. He had to rely on a military which contained many non-Arabs from Khurāsān, but he relied mainly for his personal security on a recently formed negro guard and on the fortifications of Kaff al-Kadim (or al-Abbasaya) which he built in 801 a league to the south of Kairawān. It was probably there that he received the ambassadors of Charlemagne. In 802 he had to deal with a rebellion in Tunisia, in 807 with one in Tripoli, 810–811 with the mutiny of his own, general Imrān b. Muḥḥammad who even laid siege to Kairawān. It was in his reign that the frontiers on the east coast began to be covered with the little military posts called ṭamāris. When he died in 812, Tripoli was again in full insurrection.

His son Ẓiyādat Allah (817–838) who has left the reputation of an energetic, but cruel and violent man, had a powerful opponent to deal with. Mansūr al-Tunbaḍī was within an ace of destroying him, and for several years the whole of the north, including Tunis, was completely lost to the emir; but by a stroke of genius, Ẓiyādat Allah diverted to a holy war against Sicily the ardour and applause of the most turbulent soldiers, who embarked at Sūs in 827, full of enthusiasm under the leadership of the illustrious Kaff Asad b. al-Parṣūn. Palermo was taken in 831; Messina fell the following year later. Ẓiyādat Allah, who in 831 had built the ribāṭ of Sūs, was unable to devote his attention to works of a more peaceful nature, like the building of the Great Mosque of Kairawān. His architectural activity was followed on a great scale by his successor. In 850 the Great Mosques of Sūs and Sfax were built; the Emir Ahmad in particular, about 860, erected ramparts around these two cities and built the famous 'reservoir of the Aḥhābīds', a great reservoir to supply Kairawān.

In 874, Ibrāhīm II, the last great prince of the dynasty, succeeded his brother Muḥammad, whose passion for hunting cranes earned him the name Abu l-Gharān. Ḥarrān was abandoned for a new residential town with the government offices. Raqqādah, the site of which is still known 5 miles south of Kairawān; but from 894, after Tunisia, which had rebelled, had been taken by assault, the emir frequently removed his court to the reconquered city, on which he wished to keep a close watch. The foreign policy of the reign is marked by important events. At first in the southeast there was the disturbing exploit of al-‘Abbās b. Ahmad, the son of the first Tūnīd, who, in spite of his father, led a force from Egypt against Tripoli in 880 in an attempt to conquer Ḥarrān. Tripoli was saved by the Nafīsī Berbers; Ibrāhīm arrived in time to seize a treasury of Tūnīd dinars, which served to improve the financial condition of his state; the improvement was of a short duration, however, for it was not sufficient to refill the coffers, emptied at the beginning of the century by the civil troubles and later by the heavy expenditure. The terrible rising of 893 was provoked simply by a brutal requisitioning of slaves and horses in the plain of Gamuda for the benefit of the needy government. On the other hand, the conquest of Sicily was completed with the capture of Syracuse in 878 and of Taormina in 901; and when Ibrāhīm, on the complaint of the always hostile Tunisians, had agreed to abide in favour of his son al-‘Abbās in obedience to an order sent by his caliph, it was as a muṭṭalib before Cosenza. In Cabala he died on Oct. 25 of the same year.
In the meantime the religious revolution which was to overwhelm Iršiya was preparing in the west. In the ninth century the whole of the Berber south (Warrā, Lawā'st, Mīnās) was ‘ābdī from the Awdūs to Tiferra and Tripoli, the Nafīsā in particular, who in the south of Gabès barred the road to the east, before Ḥorāṭmū II had massacred them in 896. But Kharīdjūm had not been able to prevent orthodoxy from gaining the upper hand in the greater part of the country and from producing illustrious men, like the Kādāb ’Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ziyād, the companion of Ibn al-Aṣbāḥ and the ascetic Buhūlī, popular and very influential, in the eighth century; in the Aghlabid period, the golden age of the discussions on points of law, which were contemporaneous with the foundation of the various schools, and the gathering of the principal collections of traditions, two pupils of the famous Mālikī jurist of Egypt, Ibn Kāsim: Ṣādiq b. al-Fārābī, of a Kharāṣī family, d. in Sicily in 828, and his pupil Ṣaḥīḥ (Ibn Sa’d al-Taniḥkī), born in Syria and son of a mercenary, who in 850 as Kādāb of Kairūn brought about the triumph of Mālikism, which was threatened by the Ḥanafism of several teachers; his Madīnah is still a classic, and Mālikism, in spite of apparent eclipses, is still the maqāmah par excellence of Tunisia. The eastern origin of the more notable teachers and doctrines is a remarkable fact; it was also from the east that the propagandist (wj) ’Alī ’Abd Allāh came in 893 to the Kūṭum Kabyt of Idrīs (Little Kabylia east of Rabors) to convert them to the cause of the Shī ’ Mahdī Ḥabīdālādī. An Aghlabid expedition sent in 902 against the Kūṭum barely reached its objective, and in the reign of Ziyā detached Allāh III, who in 903, had murdered his father, the Mumālīt ’Abd Allāh, the Shī ’s danger became pressing; in 905 while the Mahdī was hastening from Syria to North Africa to await Siqīliyā, the proper moment to appear, his faithful wj was cutting the emir’s troops to pieces. Events then began to move rapidly: Ziyā detached Allāh had in vain had the Shī ’s condemned by an assembly of jurists at Tunis and sought the aid of the Aḥbāsī; in the spring of 907, Baghā fell; in March 909, after the fall of Libūna, Ziyā detached Allāh fled to Baghā and the wj entered Raḥkā in spite of the mute hostility of the orthodox teachers. Finally in December of the same year, the Mahdī in person received the homage of the people of Kairouan. In this way was founded Iršiya, solely through the efforts of the Kabyl infantry of the Kūṭum, the heretical caliphate of the Fīṭḥi mīdīs (Ubṣī līdīs) which was to transform the political conditions of the whole of North Africa, before returning to its original home in the east.

From the first, the new dynasty had its eyes on Egypt, and down to the day when it was able to install itself there definitely, never ceased to send out military expeditions to prepare the way for conquest. In January 910, ’Uthman Allāh had ’Alī ’Abd Allāh, to whom he owed the throne, put to death just as the Aḥbāsī al-Mamūrī had disposed of his own propagandist Abū Muslim. In 913 an army led by his eldest son invaded the Fayūm while another took Alexandria; and it was only after the check to this first attempt at eastern expansion that the Mahdī decided to found a capital in Iršiya, but on the sea: the strong town of Mahdiyya (qv.), a starting point for fleets against the east, and a refuge against the expected attacks of the Berbers of the interior (916–918), but in 919 a second expedition again seized Alexandria and held it for a short time. In the west, the successes were overwhelming: Sicily which had rebelled was brought to obedience, and when ’Abd Allāh died at the beginning of 924, the whole of the Maghrib, where the Shī ’ state of Tariq, the Idrīsid of Faz and the Shī ’ of Kairouan had collapsed, recognised the suzerainty of the Mahdiyya. ’Abu ’l-Kāsim Niṣār (al-Kāsim b.-Amr Allāh) maintained with difficulty his authority over the great empire he had inherited. His fleet, if true, was able to plunder Genoese in 925, but it was a raid of no more importance than that of the Tunisian on Carthage under Bouniface of Lucca in 828. On the other hand, he all succumbed to the formidable rising led by the Nakkārī Abī Yarīd b. Kāsidī, the Firanī, the “man with the axe” (gāhī al-imār), who proclaimed himself Ṣaḥīḥ al-muṣīmin and under the mask of religion led the Hāwūrā of the eastern Awrā to attack the towns of Iršiya. The Kharīdjī Berbers sacked Beja, Lorbeu, Kairawān (in 944) and Sīsā, seized Tunis and with their ranks swollen by volunteers from the Zāb and Nafīsā, invested the caliph in his headquarters at Mahdiyya (in 945). At the most critical moment, ’Abu ’l-Kāsim died in 946. His son Isma’il (al-Mamūrī), supported by the people exasperated by the excesses of the invaders, re-established the situation with the help of the faithful Kūṭum. Defeated in a series of bloody battles, Abū Yarīd saw his partisans scattered and he himself fell mortally wounded into the hands of his enemies at a place where in time the Kūfī of the B. Hāmmād was to be built (947).

This troubled period was succeeded by one of calm and prosperity. Al-Mamūrī at once displayed his power by founding the luxurious town of Saḥra (al-Maṣṣṣirya) which was to eclipse its neighbour Kairawān (947). Commerce and industry flourished, and at sea the Kabīr Raḥīk was the terror of the Christians. Under al-Mu’izzī, who came to the throne in 953, the long awaited hour arrived: in spite of occasional outbursts of rebellion in support of the Omayyads of Cordova, the Maghrib as a whole seemed subdued; the raids of Spanish Muslims on the coasts of Sīsā and Tabarka in 956 were more reprisals and not indications of a real danger. Hopes of conquering Egypt, weakened by the death of the Ikhaṣṣīd Kāfīr, seemed to be just fulfilled. In July 969, the freedman Dajjar at the head of the Kīṭum occupied Fustānt on behalf of al-Mu’izzī just as Abū ’l-Abd Allāh had taken Kairawān for his master, the Mahdī. The following year his troops entered Damascan. Then when he had built the town of Cairo for his sovereign, who was still in the west, he urged him to rejoin him, to oppose the threatening progress of the Karmātians. After the last Zenātī rebel had been crushed in the Maghrib, the Fāṣīmid, who now wore a crown in the eastern fashion, began his preparations for departure in August 792. On June 10, 973, he reached Cairo, the new capital of his dynasty. Before leaving Iršiya for ever, al-Mu’izzī had entrusted his government (excluding Sicily) to one of his most valued helpers, the Berber emir Bologgin (Bulūkkin), whose father Zīrīr, the Mamūrī, a great enemy of the turbulent Zenātī, had always placed his Ṣanḥādji of the region of Titteri
and Meden at the service of the ‘Uthmānid Dynasty. This plan of ruling the country by a line of Berber princes was a complete success. Under the Zirids (q.v.), who regularly received their investiture from Cairo, Ḫīrīṣīya enjoyed happy days of material prosperity and an abundance of the necessities of life due to the development of agriculture and native industries (carpets, cloth and pottery) and trade with the outer world; there was an extravagant splendour about the great official ceremonies. Law and medicine, which under the Fāṭimid Dynasty had already produced such famous men as Ibn Abī Ḥusayn b. Sulaimān b. ʿAbd al-Jalīl b. ʿAbd al-Dżazār, flourished; literature produced the poet Ibn al-Raṣīk. The Jewish colony of Kairawān attracted and produced celebrated Talmudists.

The brilliance of this period had been hardly affected by the defections, more and more serious, of the Zenīta of the west, who proclaimed allegiance to Cordova, nor by the accession of Ḥammād who, in the reign of his nephew Bādis b. al-Muṣrī (995–1010), founded an independent dynasty in his famous Ka‘ba (in 1007). On the contrary, it was under al-Muṣrī b. Bādis in the first half of the 10th century that it seems to have reached its zenith. But this al-Muṣrī, ostentatious to excess, held in great honour by the caliphs of Cairo, respected throughout the Magrib, committed the fatal mistake of awakening the old religious hatreds in the name of which the north Africans used to rebel against their eastern rulers. Rallying around him the ‘Alītīt townsmen of Kairawān, who under his eyes one day proceeded to a general massacre of the Shī‘a, he transferred his harem to the ‘Abbāsid of ‘Utsayd and ended by breaking openly with the Fāṭimids, through a series of steps covering the period down to 1050.

The revenge of the sīyāṣīn whom he had cast off was terrible; the Egyptian wāṣir al-Ḥāfsūṯ, who felt personally insulted, sent against the rebel vassal marauding bands of nomad Hilālī Arabs who were quartered in the Sa‘dīd, to the east of the Nile. The year 1051, when the first Hilālī, the B. Rīḥāŷ, arrived in Ḫīrīṣīya, marks a turning point in the history of Tunisia. Al-Muṣrī was twice defeated at Kairawān which he vainly undertook; in 1052, overwhelmed by the nomads who ravaged all the lowlying country, he secretly moved to Mahdiya under the escort of an Arab emir whom he had been forced to take as son-in-law. The invaders, hundreds of thousands in number, profusely altered the appearance of North Africa, economically, ethnographically and politically: the Berbers were driven back, the country arabised, nomadic life and insecurity introduced, agriculture ruined and central power broken up. The chief towns fell into the hands of the Arabs or rather because autonomous little states under local chiefs or governors who proclaimed themselves independent; some even paid homage to the Ḥammādīd of the Ka‘ba, whose protection they desired. In this way were established in Tunis the B. Khurṭasānī, in Bizerta the B. al-Ward, at Gabes the B. Dijā@js, at Gafsa the B. al-Rand; in the centre there was anarchy.

In the midst of countless difficulties, the Zirids held out at Mahdiya, from which they now held only the coast between Sfaxia and Gabes. Tamīn (1063–1108), son and successor of al-Muṣrī, vainly tried to regain some lost ground; he made peace with the B. Ḥammād but did not succeed against Tunis and, shut up in Mahdiya, had to withstand the attacks of the Arabs and also of a new enemy in the Christians. In 1087 Mahdiya was taken at the instigation of the Pope by the Pisana and Genoese under Pantaleon of Amalfi; Tamīn had to pay an indemnity and admit the merchandise of the victors without duties. Yahyā b. Tamīn, who died, probably murdered, in 1110, then his son ʿAll, who died in 1111, had recognised the superiority of the caliph of Cairo, obtained the support of the Arab tribes, and won some successes by land and sea, when an unexpected adversary overwhelmed them. The Normans, who had already conquered Sicily and Malta, now intervened in the affairs of Ḫīrīṣīya; in 1118, a rupture occurred with the Zirids, who appealed to the Almoravids of the distant west. Al-Ḥasan b. ʿAll, at first forced to make terms and accept the protection of Roger of Sicily against the threat from the Ḥammādīd of Bougie, could not prevent the Sicilian admiral George of Antioch from driving him out of Mahdiya in 1148. Roger II, then William I, lords of Djerba and the coast towns from Sīsa to Tripoli, organised a kind of tolerant protectorate there, the objects of which were mainly commercial. But this was of short duration; the inhabitants, rising against the Christians, very soon regained their freedom; Sfaxia and Mahdiya alone had to wait till 1150–1156 before being cleared out from the indefatigable Almohads Abū al-Muṣirīn who coming from the supreme Magribi defeated at Setif in 1151 the Arabs of Ḫīrīṣīya, united under the Rīḥāŷīd emir Mahdī b. Ziyād, crushed all opposition, seized the fortresses, massacred Jews and Christians and restored for more than fifty years the political unity of North Africa.

In spite of the prestige of its new masters, the caliphs of Marrakesh, Ḫīrīṣīya did not yet know peace. Almohad authority was not felt directly but through the intermediary of a governor settled in Tunis; this representative of the ruling power, usually a near relative of the sovereign, very soon proved incapable of restoring order to the province, where to the continual threat from the Arabs there was added from 1158 onwards the trouble caused by the Turkish bands of the Armenian adventurer Karakūsh and by the extreme Magribi of the B. Ghānīyā Almoravids, ʿAlī (d. in 1158) and his brother Yahyā. The coming of the caliphs in person, Vilāṣ in 1180 and Yaḥyā b. al-Muṣirī in 1187, at the head of their armies, was not enough to improve the situation. Yahyā was favoured by fortune: in 1200 he had disposed of his former ally Karakūsh, suppressed his rival Ibn Abū ʾAl-kartum al-Ragrāqī, the ‘alīṣīf’ of Mahdiya, and from his base of operations in the Djerid extended his rule over the whole of the modern Tunisia. It required the expedition of the caliph al-Nasir in 1205–1207 to put an end to the Almoravids by reducing Yahyā to a precarious position and to install a powerful provincial government, entrusted at first to the ‘Shaykh’ Abū al-Walīd b. Abī Ḥaṣaf (1207–1221), the hero of Alarco. Thus the Ḥādīdīs got their first grip on power.

This family of the Ḥāfṣīd Dynasty (q.v.), of which another member had been since 1184 governor in Tunis, was descended from a chief of the Ḥanīta Berbers (a Maqṣūdī tribe of the Makharat Atlas) who had played a very prominent part in the
mediate entourage of the Mahdi Ibn Tumart. They established themselves definitively in Irikiya in 1226 with the appointment as governor of Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh who was appointed two years later by his brother Abū Zakaryā (1228–1249). The latter, while gradually becoming independent, considered himself however with the title of emir and was the true founder of the great Tunisian dynasty which with various vicissitudes of fortune occupied the throne for three and a half centuries. In spite of their repudiation of Muʿāmmād suzerainty and the return to Mālikīm, the Ḥafṣids always proclaimed an unswerving fidelity to the Almohad tradition of which they liked to consider themselves the authentic representatives. The organisation of their government with a few slight changes reminds one of the early Almohad constitution.

Even when the second independent emir, the son of Abū Zakaryā, known as al-Mustanṣir, had been proclaimed caliph by Mecca about 1250, the sovereign remained surrounded by an important body of Almohads, the cornerstones of the political edifice and of the army, and the coins retained their Almohad character in type and weight. The government departments were collected into three great branches: the army, the treasury (al-ṣaqībār) and the chancellery. The governors of provinces were for long chosen preferably, indeed almost exclusively, from among the nearest relatives of the monarch. But it would be wrong to deny the part played in the higher administration, as in the intellectual life of the country, by the numerous Muslim refugees from Spain, ‘Andalus’ expelled at the “reconquest” of the xiiith century.

The Ḥafṣids in their desire to pacify Irikiya came continuously up against the Arab problem. The nomad B. Sulaim having driven back the B. Riyāṭ in 1268 they were masters of the interior; their factions, hostile to one another, subjected the country districts to regular contributions. Among them, the Kūnā, who were a Makḥzan tribe, frequently interfered in the dynastic disputes, threatening Tunis, supporting pretenders of their own choice, and driving the people of the towns to desperation. In 1268 they obtained from a sovereign who owed him a throne to them, a charter of ‘ādāb granting them the revenues of several cities; the rivalry of their two branches, Awlād Abū l-Lail and Awlād Muḥalhalh, was to have immediate repercussions on the central power in the course of the xivth century.

Due to the death of al-Mustanṣir in 1277, the dynasty had its brilliant periods. In spite of sporadic rebellions, its rule extended from Tripoli right into Algeria and was solidly established in the principal towns, Tunis, Constantine and Bougie. Its prestige extended beyond the limits of North Africa, attracting the attention of Spain and Christian Europe. This is the period when commercial relations were established on a regular basis with Barcelona, Marseilles, Genoa, Pisa, Sicily and Venice: treaties of commerce and navigation, Christian envoys at Tunis, the importance of the customs duties, which justified the tribute paid by Tunis to Sicily and later to Aragon. A body of Christian mercenaries was gathered round the Ḥafṣid, who was however seriously threatened by the attack on Carthage by St. Louis’ Crusaders in 1270.

To sum up, Irikiya enjoyed a more stable and more prosperous regime than in the preceding two centuries: the renaissance of legal studies and of architecture [cf. Tunis] is evidence of this. Unfortunatelately the successive revolutions provoked by the claim to the throne of princes of the blood true or alleged — as in the case of Ibn Abī ‘Umr in 1293 — rapidly weakened the authority of the Caliph and diminished, to the advantage of the Arabs, the by no means too secure cohesion of the two peoples. The direct line of al-Mustanṣir, after the forced abdication of his son Abī l-Wālid (in 1279), only produced one further ruler, Abū ‘Aṣīla (1295–1300), and he too was little used. It was the descendants of another son of Abū Zakaryā, Abū Isḥāq l-Idrīṣī (1279–1292), who — after the reign of a third son, Abū Hāṣ (1284–1295), then that of a cousin, Abū Yahya b. al-Lībyān (1311–1317) — finally held the power, beginning with Abū Yahya Abū Bakr (1318–1340).

Ḥafṣid unity, destroyed for a period by the succession of Bougie, which made itself an independent state, was reconstituted in Djerba, in the hands of the Christians since its conquest by Roger of Lorris in 1264, was taken from them in 1337; the Abī l-Wālid threat was averted by the alliance with the now powerful Marinids. But this alliance itself concealed a danger, since, profiting by the internal disorders, the ambitious Marinid sultan Abū l-Ḥasan, already lord of Tlemcen, did not hesitate in 1347 to invade Irikiya and to instal himself in Tunis with his jurists and his court. It required a victorious rising of the Arabs to bring about a Ḥafṣid restoration in 1350, and about seven years later the troops of the Marinid Abū Ḥanfī were able to occupy Tunis again, although only for a brief period. It was at this period, in the reign of Abū Isḥāq l-Idrīṣī (1350–1369), that the personality of the intriguing chamberlain Ibn Tafriğī (d. 1364) began to make itself felt; his efforts, however, did not succeed entirely in consolidating again all the lands of the empire. The south in particular gradually slipped away from the caliph; local dynasties established themselves there: the B. Yamlī at Toreur, B. al-Khīfā at Nefza, B. Makī at Gabes and the B. Thābit at Tripoli. But Abū l-Abās (1370–1394) who had begun his career at Constantine, restored the glory of the dynasty; by his continued expeditions he reduced the rebels in obedience; in his reign, a Franco-Genoese crusade, a rebellion against the excesses of the pirates, failed before Mahdia (in 1390).

His son Abī Fāris (1394–1434) encouraged the development of the navy, and even dispatched a fleet against Malta in 1428; but he had on the other hand to defend himself from the Catalans and Sicilians of Alfonso the Magnanimous who had taken the Kerkennah islands in 1424 and in 1432 made a great attack on Djerba. He built the forts of Ras Adar, Rrif and Hammamet against them. In 1424 he took Tlemcen and established his suzerainty there.

The Ḥafṣid fifteenth century, marked by the increasing numbers of the freedmen employed under the name of ḥādās "as governors and generals, was dominated by the figure of Abīl Abīmūs "Amr, the last great sovereign, who reigned from 1435 to 1485. In a broad, in spite of the activity of the Tunisian corsairs, there were friendly relations with Europe. Catalans and Genoese were given concessions of the coral fishing at Taharka and of the tuna fishing at Cape Bon. At home, maraboutism, coming from the west, extended its hold and agriculture developed as the result of a period of comparative quiet, in spite of the eternal source of disorders, the nomad Arabs.
On the death of Uthmān, things became rapidly worse; three caliphs succeeded one another in the space of a few years; and in the reign of Abū ʿAbdallāh (1504—1526) the empire, torn within by the rebelliousness of the tribes, began to collapse before the blows of the Spaniards who pursued the Turkish corsairs in these regions. In 1510 Pedro Navarro deprived it of Bougie and Tripoli, in 1520 Hugges de Moncade temporarily occupied Djerba. Finally in August 1534, the unfortunate al-Hassan, son and successor of Abū ʿAbdallāh, found himself driven from Tunis by the celebrated Khāir al-Dīn Barbarossa.

He did not return till July 1535, when the town was taken by Charles V, whose vassal he became; and he surrendered to the Spaniards the fortress of La Goulette in perpetuity. The conditions of the protectorate became still harsher in 1540 when Andrea Doria had taken Sfax, Sitra and Monastir. In 1542, after great Spanish reverses and the defection of his own troops in the struggle against the Kairawan rebel Sidi ʿAraf al-ʿArāf and against the rebellious marabout confederation of the Shībīnīs, which held the whole of Central Tunisia, the al-Hassan went to Europe to seek support but in his absence he was dethroned by his son Ahmad (Hamdā). The "cruel and brave" Hamdā endeavoured in vain to reconquer the kingdom of his fathers. A new champion, the Tunisian corsair Darghūlā, who had only been delivered out of the hands of the Genoese in return for the surrender of the island of Tabarka, was driven from Mahdiya by the Spaniards in 1550; but in the following April he was able to escape cleverly from Andrea Doria in the passes of Djerba, then from his base at Tripoli he occupied Gafsa at the end of 1556 and Kairawan at the beginning of 1558, where he left troops under the command of Haidar Pasha. In 1560 he inflicted a disastrous defeat on the expedition led against Djerba by the viceroy of Sicily, the Duke of Medina-Celi; but he fell at the siege of Malta in 1565.

The continual fighting between Hamdā and the Spanish governor of La Goulette, in spite of several treaties made between them, facilitated the occupation of Tunis at the end of 1569 by the lord of Algiers, ʿAli Pasha (Eulidi-ʿAli), who put a garrison in it. In the autumn of 1573, when Don John of Austria, the victor of Lepanto, had recaptured Tunis from the Turks, he restored Has̱̣̄fī power for the last time in the person of Muḥammad b. al-Hassan, to whom Serbelloni was appointed as adviser. In Aug.–Sept. 1574, Ottoman troops brought from Constantinople on Sinān Pasha's fleet seized La Goulette and Tunis, putting an end to the Spanish occupation, which had always been limited and precarious, and also to the old Has̱̣̄fī dynasty, the "mahdīyān" one no to speak, which after periods of glory had gradually sunk into helpless impotence; its last outburst of vitality was the return of Hamdā (in 1581), who held the Tunisian steppe and the Djerid for several years.

Before returning to Constantinople, Sinān made Tunisia a Turkish province under the rule of a pasha, at first under Algiers, from 1587 directly under the Porte. An ʿAšba was in command of the army of occupation of 4,000 men, each hundred of whom was under a dāy (dāri). But in 1591 the tyranny of the dīwān, the governing body consisting of the higher officials, provoked a bloody revolution, at the end of which one of the 40 days was given supreme power. Under the rule of the dāy elected by the Janissaries, the Pasha, the representative of the Sultan, had now only an honorary position. The Dīwān on the other hand was remodelled and enjoyed great influence, as did the corporation of the corsairs (ṣūrā of the rain). From the religious point of view, Ḥanāfīs enjoyed official precedence.

The regency owed its final organisation to the third day, Uthmān (1594—1610), who evolved under the name of mithnā a code of laws and maintained order in the country with the support of a bey whose task it was to collect the taxes in two annual circuits with armed forces (muhallā). Through the intermediary of the ḥāǧīʿ bābā, the state controlled piracy on the high seas and shared largely in its profits, which became considerable after a number of renegades, notably Ward, an Englishman, had developed its technique. Morisco expelled from Spain (in 1569) and settled in North Africa and Cape Bo (Soliman, Grombalia) and in other localities (e.g. Tebouiba, Medjej el-Bāb, Testour, Guellat el-Andleus) gave a great stimulus to market-gardening and to industry (hosiery and dyeing). Subordination to Turkey had relaxed to such an extent that France, who thanks to the Ottoman capitulations, enjoyed a privileged position throughout the Turkish empire and had established a consulate at Tunis in 1577, had in 1606 to send an ambassador S. de Brèves, to deal directly with the "Powers" of Tunis.

Under the son-in-law and successor of Uthmān, Yāṣaf (1610—1637), the Regency regained Djerba from the Pasha of Tripoli and what was something quite new, delimited its frontiers with Algeria as a result of Algerian attacks in 1614 and 1628. The next day, ʿAbd al-Mūsā (1637—1649), a Genoese renegade and old corsair, fortified Porto Farina which he populated with Spanish Moors. But already the authority of the Dāy was declining and there is no interest in detailing the 24 Dāys (Kbodja, Līs and others) who ruled from 1640 to 1702, generally as puppets in the hands of the Dāys, who had succeeded in supplanting them.

The Bāy Mūsā (1612—1631), originally a Corsican called Pasha, had in his lifetime handed over his office to his son Muḥammad (Hamūdā), thus creating a precedent which secured his family hereditary power. Hammūdā (1631—1663) made Pasha in his turn in 1659, relying on a corps of spahis (q.v. spāhī) which he distributed between Tunis, Kairawān, Za Kef and Beja, became the real master of the country. He was the founder of the line of the Murādūdīs—his sons Mūsā and Muḥammad al-Haṣī, his grandsons Awād and Shawkat, his great-grandson Muhammad, "Ali and Khamīlūn—whose power was constantly threatened by civil troubles (e.g. the rising of Muhammad b. Shawkat) which culminated in the assassination of his great-grandson Mūsā Pasha in 1702.

The first half of the xvii century is marked by a resumption of trade with Europe, particularly with Marseilles and Livorno, for which Christian and Jewish merchants from Spain and Italy were largely responsible. The Marseilles Mutasarrīf was established at Capo Negro or Bizerta competed with the Genoese of Tabarka for the trade in coral and gained profits from the exportation of leather and cereals. The foreign relations of the Regency were extended, including for example
Great Britain and the Low Countries; in the second half of the century, as a reprisal for pirate expeditions of the Knights of Malta, European squadrons several times bombarded the coast and demanded reparation. The position at home, at first fairly flourishing, as is seen from the public works and religious buildings erected throughout the country (mederassas, mosques at Tunis, Beja, Kairouan, including those of Sidi Sa'id); gradually became worse under the later Muradids, until in 1685-1686 and 1694 Algerian invasions were possible. The tribes, among whom the dreaded Awlad Sa'id, became subordinate; for a long time Le Kef was in the hands of the B. Sharif and Kalaat es-Sennam in those of the Hammada. The Daj Ouaslat was a hotbed of sedition. Frequent epidemics of plague decimated the people.

After the bloody reign of Ibrahim al-Sharif (1702-1705) who combined for the first time the titles of Bey, Dey, Pasha and Agib of the soldiers, Husain b. Ali Turk was proclaimed Bey on July 10, 1705 in the middle of a new Algerian invasion; the Husainid dynasty which still ruled was founded. Husain restored peace and did a great deal of building (e.g. at Kairouan); but having tried to establish a regular order of succession for the benefit of his direct descendants, he was dethroned by his nephew, 'Ali Pasha (1735-1756), supported by the Algerians; thus arose new troubles, aggravated by the revolt of Tunis, son of 'Ali, in 1752. Finally after further intervention by Algeria, Hussein's son Muhammad ascended the throne (1756-1759), and the reigns of 'Ali Bey (1759-1778), Muhammad's brother, and of his son Hammada (1782-1814) did much to heal the wounds of the state and to restore real prosperity to Tunisia.

Like agriculture, foreign trade made progress. Although the Bey had in 1741 destroyed the factories at Cape Negro and Tabarka, his relations with Christian powers became more numerous: many treaties were made, now signed in the name of the Regency by the Bey alone, who was a regular monarch. France, although on several occasions at war with Tunis, finally appointed a Consul-General there. A war with Venice lasted 8 years (1784-1792), 'Ali Bey, who had subdued and scattered the rebels of the Dj. Ouaslat in 1762, could not dispose of the Algerians, who still gave a great deal of trouble to Hammada. The latter, aided by the Sahib al-Jabba Yawuf, massacred the mutinous Janissaries in 1811 and reorganised the government.

The sixteenth century was to bring marked changes into the political situation of the Regency. First of all there was the suppression of the corsairs and piracy — one of the principal sources of the revenues of the state — forced upon Mahmiid (1814-1824) by the European powers, as a result of the congresses of Vienna and Aix. La Chapelle; there were further the incalculable consequences of the taking of Algiers by France in 1830, in the time of the Bey Hussein (1824-35). For half a century Tunisia made vain efforts to adapt herself to the new conditions by a domestic reorganisation and to steer a course between a slack and intermittent Ottoman suzerainty and the interference of the Christian nations in her affairs through their consuls. The suzerainty of the Porte, encouraged by Great Britain, disputed by France, was only manifested in a few firmans of investiture and in the sending of Tunisian troops to the Crimea (1855) against Russia. (A Tunisian squadron also cooperated with the Turkish fleet at Navarino in 1827). French, English and Italian influence on the other hand continued to increase steadily. It is true that the French plans for establishing Tunisian princes in Algeria did not succeed. On the other hand, Tunisia no longer levied the tribute which Christian states had formerly paid in return for the right of trading with her. The Bey Ahmad (1837-1855), a kind of 'enlightened despot', abolished slavery, granted liberties to the Jews, organised the "Tunisian army" on the European model with French instructors, and visited Louis Philippe in Paris in 1846. But his vast expenditure, further increased by the building of the arsenal of Porto Farina and the palaces of Mohammedi, emptied the coffers of the state, already very poorly supplied; new taxes had to be raised: waqf, haram on the olive-trees, monopolies.

His cousin Muhammad (1855-1859) introduced the mukata, a poll-tax of 36 piastres, from which the towns of Tunis, Sfax, Monastir, Sfax and Kairouan were exempted; but the most important event of his reign was that under pressure from the consuls in the "fundamental agreement" (tahdid al-amira: Sept. 9, 1857) which reproduced the khedifat shari'a [q.v.] of Gulkhan of 1839, he proclaimed the equality of all the inhabitants of Tunisia before the law and taxes, liberty of conscience, liberty to trade and to work, and the right of foreigners to acquire landed property. His brother Muhammad al-Sahib (1859-1862) on April 25, 1861 promulgated a constitution, which he had had approved by Napoleon III: executive power remained in the hands of the hereditary but responsible Bey (the throne passing to the eldest of the princes of the Husainid family), assisted by ministers chosen by him; legislative power was divided between the Bey and Grand Council of 60 nominated members. The judicial power was independent; the tribes followed a civil and penal Tunisian code; provincial administration was in the hands of the "hafla", assisted by elected "shakhs"; the Bey had only a civil list and the farming out of taxes etc. was abolished.

In spite of these reforms, the situation became rapidly worse; the disastrous financial policy of Mustafa Khaznadar (appointed minister in the reign of Ahmad Bey) which had recourse to loans and to the raising of the mukata taxes, provoked a rebellion of the tribes under 'Ali b. Ghadham in 1864 and the institution of an International Financial Commission (Tunisians, French, Italians, Maltese) in July 1865. In 1864 the constitution had been suspended. In Oct. 1873, the general Kheir al-Din succeeded to Khaznadar, who was dismissed; during his ministry, which lasted till July 1877 and was marked by intelligent reforms, there were a slight improvement. But the irregular resources of the country were so small and the debts so great that the Financial Commission came to nothing; the bad administration of Mustafa b. Isma'il (Sept. 1878) proved the last straw, while a bitter struggle for influence was going on between the French and Italian consuls, Roustan and Maccio, regarding the concession of public services. France, encouraged since the Congress of Berlin in 1878 by Great Britain and Germany, then inter-
ferred. As a result of raids by Khrumira into Algeria and various other incidents, the minister Jules-Ferry sent 50,000 men to invade Tunisia in April 1881. On May 12, in spite of Turkish protests, General Bratet, without having struck a blow, forced Saddik to sign the treaty of Kassar-Said (known as that of Bardo), which practically handed over to France the control of the military, foreign and financial affairs of the Regency. A French resident Minister, in the first place Roustan, was appointed, through whom all dealings of the Bey with the French government had to be conducted. Thus, although the word was not used, were laid the foundations of the “Protectorate”, which became effective and final when, after the rising in the centre and south (under ‘Ali b. Khalifa) and its rapid suppression by a second French expedition, the Bey agreed by the convention of La Marsa of June 8, 1883; to “proceed with such administrative, judicial and financial reforms as the French government” should consider useful.

The establishment of the Protectorate marks the beginning of a new era in the history of Tunisia. Never since the Muslim conquest had any political event had such a profound effect on the organisation of the country and the life of its inhabitants. The original feature of the rule, which in spite of criticism has now lasted for half a century, lay essentially in the outward maintenance of the old machinery of government, upon which a new framework and new institutions were merely superimposed.

H. H. the Bey remains in theory the sovereign of the Regency, the “lord” (nâhib) of the kingdom of Tunis; but the Resident Minister, since June 23, 1883, called the Resident-General, under the French Foreign Minister, and the plenipotentiary of the Republic in the Regency, is in practice the real ruler. Being both Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Bey (who can correspond with Paris only through him) and President of his Council, he countersigns the beylical decrees, a part of the population of which was made compulsory by a decree of Jan. 1883; he has also under his orders the commanders of all the forces on land and sea and all the administrative services. The military guard left to the Bey is exceedingly small (600 men); his subjects, forced to serve in the Tunisian army (beylical decree of Jan. 12, 1892 on recruiting), form in a way a part of the French army; over 10,000 fell for France in the war of 1914–1918.

On the council of ministers, aside from two later, three, native ministers, sit the “Directeurs” of French heads of departments, the number of whom has grown rapidly, as well as the general commanding the division of occupation and the naval commander of Bizerta who act as ministers of war and of the admiralty. Each of these high officials issues by-laws. The “Caidats” into which the tribes are divided have become territorial divisions; above the “caid” there is placed a French “commandeur civil”.

Tunisian legislation, which applies to Tunisia alone, is often quite original. Only questions relating to the Resident-General, to the commandeurs civils and to French justice have been settled by decree of the President of the Republic. The actual position in politics and administration and a juristic system which has gradually taken root seem to justify the recent view, which sees in Tunisia the existence of a “double sovereignty”, that of the Bey, traditional, and that of France, more recent and progressive.

The first great task of the protecting nation has been to eliminate as much as possible foreign interference in its two forms, financial and judicial. France having guaranteed the Tunisian debt, Great Britain and Italy agreed to the suppression of the Financial Commission, which was carried out in Oct. 1884.

Tunisia, given a regular system of financial administration and a normal budget, regained its economic stability. The Bey was given a civil list, for the upkeep of his family and his court. The French government still puts down officially in the budget certain expenses like an important subscription to the archbishopric of Carthage. Through the decree of July 4, 1891 the monetary unit is no longer the piastre but the franc.

The French law of April 10, 1883, having created French tribunals in the Regency, and the beylical decree of May 5 1883, having agreed that all those who formerly had the benefit of capitulations were amenable to the new courts, the foreign powers, one after the other, renounced (1883–1884) their consular jurisdictions, just as in 1896–1897 they had to abandon the customs privileges which they also held under the capitulations. Italy alone made reservations; and if at the expiration of her treaty of 1868 with Tunisia and immediately after her defeat at Adowa in Ethiopia, she had to recognise the fact of the Protectorate — which Turkey declined to recognise officially until the treaty of Sèvres in 1920 — she has nevertheless retained an advantageous position in the Regency which she does not cease to covet. Her subjects are entering in larger numbers than the French; she is developing her influence through the press (the daily Union), banking and especially cultural institutions (schools, societies) which by virtue of her agreements are not under French control; she complains however of certain steps which put her subjects at a disadvantage. In 1919, France recognised her ownership of the oases of Ghat and of Ghadames (the frontier with Tripolitania had been delimited in 1910) by an agreement, which is far from having put an end to the disturbing “Italian question” in Tunisia.

The Protectorate has enabled France to carry out in the Regency a remarkable work in the way of utilizing natural resources, and in supplying intellectual and social needs (hospitals, dispensaries, medical men, benevolent societies, various scientific and learned institutions). Modern implements and more rational knowledge and methods have produced encouraging economic results. Primarily a land of agriculture — cereals, the vine, olive, vegetables, fruits, and live stock, to which may be added cork and aifa grass — and cattle-rearing, Tunisia is becoming more and more an exporter of iron, lead and zinc but especially of phosphates (since the discoveries of Ph. Thomas in 1885). It imports fuel, tropical products and a quantity of manufactured objects.

Its foreign trade is about 3 milliards of francs. For a number of years, it is true, its balance of trade has shown a deficit; the revenue from tourists is not sufficient to balance this.

To facilitate European colonization and to modernise the administration of lands, Tunisia by decree of July 1, 1885 was given an important loi foncière based on the Acte Tourne: optional registration
of lands, on a favourable decision by a "Tribunal mixte" instituted for this purpose (at Tunis: French and 3 Muslim magistrates, at Sfax: 4 French and 2 Muslim); a decree of March 1924 also foreshadowed the establishment of a survey. In the early period of the occupation, colonisation by French agriculturalists was left almost entirely to individual initiative. An official policy of settling French citizens on the land has only been actively pursued since about 1900. The Domaine purchases lands to sell them later on a system of very easy payments to Frenchmen, e.g. former students of the École Coloniale d'Agriculture in Dakar. The Italians compete with the French, less by the size of their farms, than by the number of their farmers.

In default of a great immigration of French citizens, France has begun in Tunisia a policy of naturalisation by the decrees (the one presidential and the other beylical) of Nov. 8, 1921; but as a result of litigation begun in this connection by Great Britain before the Court of the Hague, they have been replaced by the French law of Dec. 20, 1923; naturalisation, considerably facilitated to foreigners and strangers who request it, becomes automatic (with however the power to decline it) in the second generation, obligatory in the third, for foreigners settled in the Regency. Great Britain has accepted in the main these regulations which concern chiefly her Maltese subjects. The Italians however by their agreements escape any forced naturalisation; but some of them become naturalised voluntarily. The "indigenes" among whom the Muslims do not number 2,000, while they include about 5,000 Jews, form over a quarter of the present French population.

The Jews, of whom several thousands of European origin have retained Italian nationality, remain for the most part subjects of the Bey under native authority and jurisdiction, except in personal matters in which they are dealt with by a "Tribunal Rabbinique" of Tunis (reorganised by decrees of Nov. 1898 and Nov. 1929) and by "notaires israélites" (decrees of Dec. 1918 and Apr. 1927). The Tunisian Jews do not perform military service and in general cannot become government officials. Their rapid development in European civilisation raises the problem of their obtaining in large numbers or en bloc French citizenship. The decree of Aug. 30, 1921, established, for all the Jews in the civil lists of Tunis, without distinction of nationality, a "Conseil de la Communauté" of 12 members elected for four years by suffrage of the second degree, with authority to deal with matters of relief and worship. The government appoints the administrators of the other Jewish communities; it also appoints the Chief Rabbi of Tunis. The practice of religion is declining, but Zionism on the other hand enjoys undeniable favour.

The government of the Protectorate has always tried to improve, without offending religious beliefs, the native administration and the economic and religious conditions of the Muslims (cf. above). If there are more problems to be solved, some of which are being studied, the work done so far is however quite appreciable. In spite of its resistance to the adoption of modern ways of living, the Muslim world of Tunisia is undergoing a radical transformation, of which it would be rash to predict the results. The Durtité movement (Tunisian constitutional party, desiring autonomy), which made progress in the years following the war, was skilfully checked by the Resident-General Lucien Saint. It looks at present as if the native population are satisfied with the nature of the reforms towards which, during the last ten years (1920—1930), the domestic policy of the Protectorate has been directed.

The liberal measures already taken, notably in 1922 and 1928 the creation of and reorganisation of the Grand Consul, follow two fundamental principles: an appeal to the more and more direct collaboration of the natives, and an extension of the powers of the elected assemblies. New rights are being given in the French colony: elected municipal councils, a greater liberty of the press and of combination.

At the time of writing, Tunisia is preparing to celebrate in tranquillity the jubilee of the Protectorate.

List of Bâys since the French Occupation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mouh. al-Sâdik ‘Ali</td>
<td>(1882—1902)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouh. al-Hâdi</td>
<td>(1902—1906)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouh. al-Nâjîr</td>
<td>(1906—1922)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouh. al-Habh</td>
<td>(1922—1929)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad</td>
<td>(1929—1934)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List of Resident-Generals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roustan</td>
<td>(1882)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Cambon</td>
<td>(1888)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massicault</td>
<td>(1886)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rouyer</td>
<td>(1893)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millet</td>
<td>(1894)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stéphane Pichon</td>
<td>(1901)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alapetite</td>
<td>(1905)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flandin</td>
<td>(1918)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucien Saint</td>
<td>(1921)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manceron</td>
<td>(1929)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bibliography: If we except the general histories of Islam ( Müller, Caenati, etc.) and of North Africa (Mercier, Faure-Biguet, etc.), the histories of Tunisia are very poor. Cf. however a good scholarly resume: ‘Abd al-Wahhāb, Khulāṣet Taqādum Tunis, Tunis 1844.

1. For the Middle Ages:


The documents edited by: Amari, l' diplome arabi del v. archivio forinnino, Florence 1863-1867; Mas-Latric, Traité de paix et de commerce... de l'Afrique septentrionale au moyendge, Paris 1866-1872; Marengo, Geneve e Tunisi (1638-1815), Rome 1901; Gimenez Soler, Épitaphes... relations entre la corona d'Aragò i Túnez, Inst. Est. Catalans Amuri 1908, Barcelona; do., Documents de Tunisie, ib., 1909-1910; Cerone, Alcuni documenti sulla seconda spedizione Araba nel 1171 contro l'Isola Gerba, lô; Ribera, Tratado de paz... entre Fernando IV... de Mâgīs y Almārīs Omein rey de Túnez, in Cent. Amuri, Palermo 1910.


The later Hafsids and the Spanish occupation:

b. Documents publ. by: Béguen, Notes et documents... histoire de la Tunisie, Paris-Toulouse 1901; Pouscard, Relation des dixi été de Ferrara et de Moderna ce qui a Tunisie, Modena 1881; Odoni e Amari, Lettere di Muley Hassan a Ferrante Gonzaga, Modena 1865; La Primaudaine, Documents inédits sur l’histoire de l’occupation espagnole en Afrique, R. A., 1875-1877; Grandchamp, Documents relatifs à la fin de l’occupation espagnole en Tunisie, R. T., 1914; Monichcort, La Tunisie et l’Europe. Quelques documents relatifs aux XVIe, XVIIIe et XVIIIe siècles, R. T., 1905; and also, passim the rich Col. de doc. inéd. pour la hist. de Espaha, Madrid.

c. Studies by: Motylinski, Expédition... contre Djerba (1510), in Actes XVIIe Congrès Océan., Algiers 1905; Munzi, Tunis et la expédition de Carlo F. Milan 1876; Cap. De Carvalho, A Africa relais gestis, Paris 1894; Medina, L’expédition de Charles Quint à Tunis, R. T., 1906; Monichcort, Essai sur les plans imprimes de Trimpoli, Djerba, Tunis-Goulette au XVIe siècle, R. A., 1925; do., Épisodes de la carrière tunisienne de Dragut, R. T., 1918; Charles, La conquête de Mahdīa (1551), Mač, 1921; Monichcort, L’expédition espagnole de 1560 contre l’île de Djerba, R. T., 1913-1914; Beaudel, Les Espagnols et l’Afrique du Nord de 1492 à 1577, R. A., 1928 (very full bibliography in the notes and in appendix, documents relating to Tunisie); Poinset et Lantier, Les gouvernons de La Goulte du during l’occupation espagnole R. T., 1930 (references to the sources given in the notes).

Dominic for the Turkish period:


c. European writers: Lanfredducci e Bosio, Cosa e discorsi di Barberia (1587), ed. and tr.
Tunisia

Monichcourt-Grandchamp, R. A., 1925; Barker, A true and certain report of... captain Ward, London 1600; Prévost de Beaumil-Person, Mémoires, ed. La Roncière, Paris 1913, p. 225—264; Pijnaar, De reys naar Afrika, Tunisi, Algeri... in den jare 1625, Haarlem 1650; Savary de Brèves, Relation de ses voyages... ans royaumes de Tunis et Alger, Paris 1628; Attardu, Relation de la guerre... de Alger et Tunisi... cet anno 1623, ed. Roy, R.T., 1917; Th. Arcos, Lettres inédites écrites de Tunis (1623—26), Algeris 1889; Dan, Histoire de Barbary, Paris 1867; Th. Demont, Voyage... Paris 1664—1674; Pagni, Lettres... de quelle egli vitta... apero in Tunisie, Florence 1839; D'Arvieux, Mémoires (vol. iv), Paris 1755 (voyage to Tunis in 1666); Dapper, Naukeurskriften... der Afrikakuste gelezen, Amsterdam 1668; Galland, Relation... d'un marchand Cassis à Tunis, ed. in the Magazin encyclopédique, Paris 1809; Coppin, Le bouclier de l'Europe, Lyon 1686; Histoire des royaumes de Barbary, Rouen 1703; Lucas, Voyage... Afrique (followed by a Mémoire pour servir à... l'histoire de Tunisie), Paris 1712; Langier de Tassy, Histoire des États barbaresques, Fr. tr., Paris 1757; Peynaud, Relation d'un voyage... sur les côtes de Barbary... en 1754, Paris 1758; Shaw, Travels (1727); Oxford 1738; Tollot, Nouveau voyage fait au Levant (1731), Paris 1742; La Cendrée, Voyage... au Levant (1751), fac. ed. R.T., 1868; Godfrey, Commen and La Motte, État des royaumes de Barbary, Rouen 1731; Hebenstreit, Voyage... à Alger, Tunis et Tripoli... en 1724, Berlin 1780; St. Gervais, Mémoires historiques... royaume de Tunis, Paris 1735; Letters on the history politique of the Tunisie de 1729 à 1740, ed. Gandolphe, R.T., 1924—26; Poiron, Mémoires concernant l'état présent du royaume de Tunis (1755), ed. Serres, Paris 1925; Desfontaines, Fragments d'un voyage... Tunis et Alger (1763—1782), Paris 1838; Stanley, Observations on the city of Tunis, London 1836; Poiret, Voyage en Barbary, Paris 1789; Nyssen, Mémoire sur Tunis (1788), ed. Monichcourt, R. Hist. Col. Fr., 1923; Caroni, Rappaggetto del viaggio... in Barbary, Milan 1805 (tr. Conder-Grandchamp, R. T., 1917; Chateaubriand, Histoire de Paris à Jérusalem (1807), Paris 1811; Maggill, An Account of Tunis, Glasgow 1811; Blaquie, Lettres from the Mediterranean, vol. 2, London 1813; Frank, Tunis (1816), in the Universe pittoriqve, vii, Paris 1850; Noah, Travels in... the Barbary States, New York 1819; Filippi, Fragments... sur la Régence de Tunis (1829), ed. Monichcourt, R. Hist. Col. Fr., 1924—1926; cf. also Bauer's correction, Relation de Afrique, vol. 3, Madrid 1892. — After 1830, in addition to numerous articles in magazines and journals (Le Travail du Monde, Revue de l'Orient, etc...), books multiply;

Grenville-Temple, Excursions in the Mediterranean, Algiers and Tunis (1823—27), London 1835; Calligaris, Notice sur Tunis (1834), ed. Monichcourt, R. Hist. Col. Fr., 1928; Esans, Reise... von Tunis (1835), Nürnberg 1837; Puckler-Muskau, Scéenl et mémoires en Afrique, Stuttgart 1838; Nicly, Documenti sulla storia di Tunis, Livornne 1838; Capitaine X., Une promenade à Tunis en 1849, Paris 1844; Kennedy, Algerien and Tunisie in 1848, London 1846; Barth, Wanderungen durch die Küstenländer des Mittelmeeres in 1845—47, Berlin 1849; Chassiron, Algérie pittorigue de la Régence de Tunis, Paris 1849; Pellissier, Description de la Régence de Tunis, Paris 1853 (Exposé scient, Algérie, xx; cf. also R. d. Deux Mondes, May 1856); Danzas, Quatre ans à Tunis, Algiers 1857; Finotti, La Régence de Tunis, Malte 1857; Dunant, Notice sur la Régence de Tunis, Geneva 1858; Guérin, Voyage archéologique dans la Régence de Tunis, Paris 1862; Fleur, La Régence de Tunis au XIXe siècle, Paris 1865; Français, Tunis et la Régence sous Mohammed et-Said Bey, Paris 1867; De Gubernatis, Lettres sur la Tunisie, Florence 1867; Michel, Tunis, Paris 1867; Malzan, Sittenbilder aus Tunis u. Algerien, Leipzig 1869; do, Reise in den Regentenhäusern Tunisi u. Tripolita, Leipzig 1870; Zaccagni, Notices sur la Régence de Tunis, Paris 1875; Rae, Barbary, Journey from Tripoli to... Kairouan, London 1877; Féraud, Notes sur un voyage en Tunisie et en Tripolitaine, R.T., 1877; Nachtigal, Tunis, Deutsche Rundschau, 1881; Pinchou, Ricordi di Tunisi, Turin 1881.


4. On the French Protectorate and Tunis since 1881, there is now a vast literature. The following are the principal works:


5. For non-Muslims, in addition to Darmon (see also under “Religion”):


Tunis 1915; Tibi, Le Statut personnel... des Israélites tunisiens, Tunis 1933; Slouschs, Un voyage d'études juives en Afrique, Paris 1909; du, Travels in North Africa, Philadelphia 1927.


3. Administration.

a. French administration. At the beginning of the Protectorate and by virtue of the beylical decree of Feb. 4, 1853, the Resident-General was immediately assisted by a “Secretary General of the government of Tunisia”, who had control of all the official correspondence and held the same position with the Prime Minister as the Resident did with the Bey. This office was abolished on July 14, 1922 and to some extent replaced by a “Delegate to the Residence General”, whose powers, fixed by presidential decree of Feb. 10, 1923, are very different and in practice not so considerable, although he is vice-president of the Council of Ministers, inspector des contrôles civils, and takes the place of the Resident when away or prevented from appearing. By virtue of a residential resolution of Nov. 10, 1926, the Resident is assisted by a civil cabinet and a military one.

This same resolution of 1926, supported by a number of beylical decrees of the same day, remodels the main government offices of the Regency and defines the activities of the principal services organised and directed by the French since the occupation: the “Direction Générale des Travaux Publics” created on Sept. 3, 1882, the “Direction Générale des Finances” on Nov. 4 of the same year, the “Direction Générale de l'Instruction publique et des Beaux-Arts” on May 6, 1883, the “Direction Générale de l'Agriculture, du Commerce et de la Colonisation” on Nov. 3, 1899, the “Direction Générale de l'Intérieur” (which includes the departments of public health and public assistance) and the “Direction de la Justice Tunisienne” of July 14, 1922 (the two latter were created as a result of the suppression of the office of Secretary General). We may add the “Office des Postes et Telegraphues”, which was created on June 11, 1888, and became an autonomous “Direction” by the decree of Nov. 18, 1927.

If we except the southern part, which is held to be a military zone (capital Médémine) and governed by a “Service des Affaires indigènes” (4 officers of higher rank, 20 captains or lieutenants, 11 military interpreters, paid out of the French budget), Tunisia is divided for administrative purposes since 1857 into 5 “regions” (Bizerta, Tunis, Le Kef, Sfax and Djerba) each of which is sub-divided into a certain number of “contrôles civils”; in all 160: Bizerta, Tabarka, Sidi el-Arba, Tunis, Zaghouan, Grombalia, Théboursouk, Le Kef, Maknassy, Medjes el-Habib, Susa, Kairouan, Thala, Sfax, Gabès, Gafsa, Tozeur, Djerba. The “contrôles civils”, French officials instituted by presidential decree of Oct. 4, 1854, are appointed by presidential decree on the nomination of the Minister of Foreign Affairs; their duties, defined by the residential circular of July 22, 1857, consists mainly in supervising the native administration and aiding in French colonisation; they have the title of vice-consuls and perform the duties of French consular agents. Their status was regulated by residential resolution of April 25, 1922.
French law is administered in the Regency by two tribunals of first instance, one at Tunis (4 chambres), the other at Sfax, and by 14 regular justices de paix to whom are to be added the justices forains, whose courts are itinerant. The tribunals are amenable to the Court of Appeal in Algiers. Penal law is administered, for offences and misdemeanours, by correctional tribunals, and in the same cases as in Algeria by judges de paix. Crimes are judged by criminal tribunals sitting at Tunis and Sfax, composed of 3 French professional judges and 6 assessors, whose appointment is regulated by the presidential decree of Nov. 22, 1893; their nationality depends on that of the accused; there is no jury. All the French magistrates, who are in every respect the same as in Algeria, are appointed by presidential decree on the nomination of the Garde des Sceaux.

France is responsible for the budget for the army and the navy. Bizerta is the headquarters of a naval prefecture which covers the whole of the shores of North Africa. The general commanding the "Division d'Occupation" assumed in 1926 the title of "Commandant supérieur des troupes de Tunisie".

To complete the list of the principal public services of Tunisia, mention must be made of the two companies which have concessions for the most important ports: that of Bizerta, founded in 1886, that of Tunis, Sfax and Sfax founded in 1894; and the 3 railway companies: a. the Company Bône-Guelma, called Compagnie Fernière as a result of the convention of July 22, 1922 (almost all the Tunisian system, which consists primarily of a long line following the coast, two lines Tunis-Algeria through the valley of the Medjerda and by the High Tell, a line from Sfax to the phosphate mines west of Gafsa through the steppes of Bettina and Periana); b. the Compagnie des phosphates de Gafsa (narrow gauge lines connecting Sfax with Gabes, Redeyef and Tozeur); c. the Tramway Company of Tunis (electric system in the suburbs: 2 lines Tunis-La Marsa, one via La Goulette and Carthage).

Beside the government departments, Tunisia has a certain number of deliberative assemblies, nominated or elected. The French alone are electors to the chambers of commerce and agriculture, elected for 6 years, one third retiring every two years; the chamber of commerce of Tunis, chamber of agriculture of Tunis, chamber of commerce and agriculture of Sfax, chamber of commerce and agriculture of Sfax, all four instituted in 1805, chamber of commerce of Bizerta, instituted in 1902. Women have the right of voting but cannot themselves be members. The chamber of mining interests which meets in Tunis, created by presidential resolutions of July 15, 1922, represents indiscriminately French or Tunisian owners, directors, managers or engineers of mines in Tunisia; its 12 members are elected for 6 years and half retire every 3 years.

60 places have been created municipalities. By virtue of the decrees of Jan. 14, 1914 and Jan. 1, 1924, the municipal councils appointed by decree for 3 years, on whose third only elected each year, consist of a native president, one or more French vice-presidents and a varying number of native or European councillors. Their deliberations, which are public, are subject to the approval of the prime minister.

The decree of July 13, 1922, replaced by that of March 27, 1925, instituted "regional councils" whose members, elected for 6 years, were at first representatives on the one hand of the native municipal councillors and of the (native) councils of the wilayat, and on the other of a slight majority of Frenchmen representing French municipal councillors or chambers of commerce and agriculture; they now also include a vice-president of the municipality of each capital of a region, the delegates to the Grand Council elected by universal suffrage, representatives of the chamber of mining interests and native chambers of commerce. The regional council, a consultative body on economic and financial questions, meets twice a year, for 6 days at most at each session, in the capital of the region under the presidency of a contrôleur civil, appointed by the Resident General, who has however no vote. The French members elect a vice-president and a secretary, another vice-president and another secretary are appointed by the native members.

The principal representative assembly, the "Grand Conseil", replaced on July 13, 1922 the "Conférence Consultative" of 1896, which had in the meanwhile been several times remodelled. A number of reports and resolutions of March 1928 regulate its composition and powers. It consists of a French and a native section which in principle deliberate separately. The French section, presided over by the Resident General, numbered 52-22 representatives of economic interests, 6 elected by the chamber of agriculture of Tunis, 2 by the chamber of commerce of Bizerta, 4 by that of Tunis, 4 by the mixed chamber of Sfax, 4 by that of Sfax, 2 by the chamber of mining interests, and 30 representatives of the French colony, elected regionally by all French inhabitants over 21 years of age and domiciled in Tunisia for at least two years, 6 for Bizerta, 10 for Tunis 4 for Le Kef, 5 for Sfax, 5 for Sfax and all the "territories militaires". The members of the Grand Council, aged at least 25, are elected for 6 years, half being elected every 3 years. The Council expends and votes the budget. It can also express its wishes, except on political or constitutional questions, give its opinion on questions submitted to it by the government, and ask questions to the government. France reserves the right to approve a decree dissolving the Grand Council or to overrule its decisions even on budget questions. The Grand Council meets once a year in ordinary session for a maximum period of 20 days; it may also be convoked for an extraordinary session. Each section elects its own officers and appoints two grand commissions: financial commission and commission for economic machinery. The French section sends 5 representatives of economic interests and 7 of the French colony. The plenary sittings of the Grand Council are not public. A "Commission Arbitrée", presided over by the Resident-General deliberates on all proposals, votes or motions, on which the two sections have held different opinions. Its 14 members are appointed half by the French section and half by the native section. In case of persistent disagreement, the Resident General takes part in the voting, as well as the ministers or directors present, i.e. the government has a casting vote between the two disputing sections.

A. Finance. The fiscal resources of Tunisia are composed, in decreasing proportion, of direct taxes: 1. the "taxe personnelle" (sittâia) which has replaced the old magâfût (cf. Barthès, Les imposts arabes en Tunisie, Algiers 1923) and is levied on every male inhabitant of Tunisia over 20 years of
A number of decrees and resolutions of 1922, modified in 1928, have instituted and organised (except in military territory) "councils of kaidates", whose purpose is to discuss the economic needs of the kaidates and to reply to government enquiries and elect representatives to the regional councils. Each shailkate sends 4 delegates, 1 or 2 principals, the others subsidiary, of at least 30 years of age, chosen from among themselves, subject to ministerial approval, by the notables, i.e. by the most distinguished taxpayers, over 25 years of age, living in or owning land in the shailkate outside the communes. The lists of notables drawn up by the kaid are revised by a commission on which sit along with him the civil comptroller and the hadd. Solicitors, officials or policemen cannot be delegates to the council. The sittings, which last 2 days, are quarterly. The elections take place every 6 years.

Native chambers of commerce and agriculture were created in 1920, reorganised in 1924 and 1928: the "chambre d'agriculture indigène du nord" which includes an agricultural section (1 member in each kaidate, chosen by the government from 2 candidates presented by the delegates of the shailkates) and a section for rural economy (2 members, matriculants or agricultural engineers, chosen by the government from 4 candidates presented by the delegates from the shailkates); the "Chambre de Commerce indigène du nord" which includes a commercial section (12 elected Muslims and 5 Jews) and a section for general economics (2 Muslim or Jewish members, chosen by the government from 4 candidates presented by the electors). The electors must be at least 25 years of age and the candidates 30.

Since 1928 it has been provided that these two assemblies should have joint meetings with the similar French bodies. There has also been founded, inside each "chambre mixte" of Susa and Sfax, a native section of 7 members.

We have already seen what share the natives take in the municipal councils and regional councils. In the Grand Council they form a distinct section of 26 members, 10 of whom represent the 5 regions (2 each), 3 the territories of the south, 4 the native chamber of commerce of the north, 4 the native chamber of agriculture of the north, 2 each of the native sections of the mixed chambers, 1 the Jewish community of Tunisia. This section of the Grand Council is usually presided over by the Delegate to the Residence General or a high French official of the protectorate nominated by the Resident, exceptionally by the Resident-general. The two sections may agree to deliberate in common; the votes are then considered as having been given by a single assembly.

Tunisian law, the statutes of which were settled by decree of Jan. 1928, carefully preserves the distinction between lay and religious jurisdiction. At the head of the first category, the tribunal of the "Ouzara" ("Uzara") at Tunis has comprised since 1921: a. a kind of court of appeal for all Tunis, the two courts of which (civil and penal) each sit with 3 magistrates; b. a criminal court which judges cases of first instance and without appeal; c. a court of arraignment; d. a commission des requêtes, a kind of court of appeal. The Ouzara is completed by the regional tribunals with 3 magistrates created at Sfax, Gébaa and Gafsa in 1896, at Susa and Kairouan in 1897, at Kef in
In 1906 "commissaires du gouvernement" were attached to them, i.e. French lawyers speaking Arabic. Parties can be represented by "oukis" (mâkil, pl. uktûs). In conclusion it may be noted that the regional tribunal of Tunis is still called Djéba, and that Tunis has also the tribunal of the "Ort" (ßîra), a kind of tribunal for trade and commerce on which sit the Shaikhs al-Malînà and ten assessors.

**Bibliography:** Zeyt, Cédé annuëlo de la Tunisie, 1901 (annual supplements down to 1912); Lagrange and Fontana, Cédé et côti de la Tunisie, Paris 1912 (supplements to 1928); Journal Officiel tunisien; A. Girault, Principes de colonisation et de législation coloniale (vol. v., La Tunisie et la Maroc), 5th ed., Paris 1928.

4. **Muslim Religion.**

With the exception of the island of Djerba, 4° of the inhabitants of which are Khâridjîs, Tunisia has for long adopted Malîkite sunnism. The descendants of the Turks or those who claim to be such profess to be Hânasîfis; they are a small, but aristocratic, minority, and privileged from the fact that they include the beylical family.

**a. Institutions.** — Shay. Under the Haçîfîs (q.v.) the highest religious functions were performed in Tunis by the "Kâfi of the community" (kâfi ûlâmûd) and the "Kâfi for marriages" (kâfi 'inânîd) appointed, like the chief mufût (q.v.) or Kâfi (q.v.) by the sovereign. Below them again there was a kâfi 'inânîd and a kâfi 'ukhlûs. The "Kâfi of the camp" (kâfi 'almaûlûs) accompanied the government troops in the field.

In Ahl Dinâr (p. 470; trans., p. 470) has pointed out how the Kâfi gradually allowed himself to come under the domination of the mufût to such an extent that they are associated in the tribunal of the "Chârdâ" (Shârâ); cf. Saint Gervais, p. 93-95), and that under the Turks the Hamâfî chief mufût (hâshîf-mufût) took the title of Shâhîk al-Islâm (q.v.), which he still retains; the Malîkî hâshîf-mufût, who occupies a position which is officially not high, has sometimes been honoured with the same title.

The "Chârdâ", exclusively applied in personal law (civil law, marriage, divorce, trusteeship, guardianship, inheritance), is formed in each town of the interior by a Malîkî madâjîs: one kâfi with one or more mufûts. In Tunis, a Hânasî fâdîs sits in the "Dîwân" alongside of a Malîkî one; both take cognisance of cases submitted to them by litigants from the interior or remitted to them by other kâfis.

The operation of these courts, formerly regulated by decrees of 1856 and 1875, is now fixed by that of Dec. 15, 1896, which defined the procedure of the mûsûmût by insisting that they should be recorded in a register kept by notaries. The decree of March 6, 1926 installed a system of legal assistance, which frees the natives from a tax of enrolment created on March 3 of the same year. In conclusion, registrars were appointed by decree of January 28, 1930.

**Notariats.** The native notaries (mâkil, pl. uktûs) are appointed by beylical decree. Their recruitment and method of practice have long been regulated by the decree of 30th Dhu 'l-Ka'da 1291 (Jan. 8, 1875); appointments were made on the nomination of the kâfi; former students who had received the diploma of the Great Mosque were almost automatically appointed notaries without necessarily practising. The decree of May 8, 1928 made appreciable modifications to the earlier statute; new regulations were again made by the decree of July 1, 1935, which came into operation on Jan. 4, 1931. In future, Muslim notaries must be at least 24 years of age, have spent two or three years in a notary's office, — most remarkable innovation — have passed an examination which demands a knowledge of Tunisian legislation. The diplomas of the Great Mosque confer the right to present oneself for the notariate examination of the "first category," which enables the recipient to practise in a large town; the notaries of the "second category," after a slightly different examination, can only practise in towns of less importance. The registers (daybook and minute-book), supplied and checked by the ministry of Justice, are subject to a regular and serious system of inspection.

**Habous.** The mûtûf (q.v.), properties in Tunisia are called "habous" (bûtûs). The public habous have been managed since Kâhir al-Dîn's time in 1874 by a central office (Djâmîya) reorganised by decree of March 19, 1924; at its head are a directeur and an administrative committee: it is divided into a certain number of offices, and has a representative (mouîbî) in each of the principal centres of the Regency who delegates the actual managing agents (mouküf). The decree of July 17, 1908 has placed the Djâmîya under the control of a "conseil supérieur des habous" directed by the Minister of the Pen and the Director-General of the Interior. The Djâmîya has the right to supervise the management of private habous.

The legislation relating to the habous has been cleverly got round with the help of the three following processes (cf. H. de Montety, Une téni expériece en Tunisie, Cahors 1927): a. the contract of "enzel" (inâsil) or transference of habous on payment of a rent in perpetuity (decree of May 26, 1886, frequently modified and supplemented; since 1905, the enzett debtor has been able to redeem the rent; the sale of land is by public auction except that the rights of the occupants of rural estates are safeguarded); b. exchange in kind or money (decrees of Jan. 11 and Nov. 13, 1898); c. long-term leases (Jan. 31, 1898).

The Baît al-Mal is under the Djâmîya. It gives grants for charitable purposes and receives estates for which there are no heirs.

**Brotherhoods.** It would be very risky to give definite figures about the Muslim religious brotherhoods of Tunisia (cf. Depont and Coppolani, Les confréries religieuses musulmanes, Algiers 1897, passim). We cannot adopt without reserve those given in the Annuaire du monde musulman. The total number of adherents is certainly much greater than the figure of 58,143 given there. According to an unpublished official enquiry made in 1924 by the Résidence Générale, the administrative district of Le Kef alone has 18,000 kâhir ou fâdîs, while the members of the brotherhoods form a third of the population in the district of Le Kef, which includes in all 66,000 Muslims. There are over 13,000 in the ammané of Tahtoua alone. The four orders most widely spread are: the Kâhirîs and the Kâhidîs, and the "Tunis" and the Tadjîfîs (q.v.); the Tahârûs are also quite numerous. Further, in addition to local groups like the Bûl-Alîys of Nefta, there are scattered groups of Mehendîs, Kâhidîs and Tadjîfîs. The administrative officials of Tabarka
and Thala agree in estimating in their areas the proportion of Bahamiaya and Kadiyya respectively at 50% and 40% of the total number of members; but this proportion is of course smaller elsewhere where rival orders have had more success. We may note the spread of the recently-formed sect of the 'Awdiya which originated in Mostaganem in Algeria, and seems to have its Tunisian centre at the Zawiyah of Kesh el-Medjouni near Monastir. While Tunis, Mentel bon-Zefla, and the Djebel are centres of important brotherhoods, Le Kef contains the most influential mother-zawiya. It is true that the political role of these organisations is practically nil and that even their religious influence is gradually declining.

The right of asylum of the zawiya was abolished on Feb. 6, 1883.

5. Education: The Kur'anic schools are called bastabs. At the top, the "medersas", directed by certificated former students of the Great Mosque, maintained by the Djamiya under the supervision of the Director of Public Instruction, are now practically nothing more than hostels for the students at the Great Mosque; at most they do a few tutorial lectures are given there. Only the medersas at Agadir remain muladabb or teachers for the bastabs.

The Great Mosque and the Turks, the Great Mosque gradually became the centre of all religious teaching; in our day, it has secured a monopoly of it and is attended by some 2,000 students, from Tunisia, Tripolitania, Algeria and even sometimes Morocco. The organisation of its courses, in what may be called the modern period, goes back to the edict (Ma'adba) of Ahmad Bay of Rama'dan 27, 1238 (Nov. 1, 1842) known as Al-Mu'aadha, because it was affixed to the Bab el-Shi'a gate of the Great Mosque. The principal arrangements were: 30 teachers (Alnia, pl. Alnana) of whom 15 are Muliki and 15 Hanafi, were each to give 2 lectures a day, except on Thursday and Friday, the days of the Two Festas and the month of Ramadaan; their pay was to be 2 piastres a day, except when absent without regular cause. The head scholars Al-Ishaa, Muliki and Hanafi, were appointed inspectors (mouqab) and were to receive 200 piastres a month; they were to inspect in their task by 2 or 3 kadd, or one of each rite, who drew 3 piastres a day. These four also audited the accounts of the administrators of the Bait el-Mal, from which the above salaries were paid. If the funds of the Bait el-Mal showed a substantial surplus, it was to be divided under certain conditions among the most diligent students. The appointments of teachers were to be made by beylidial decree (tabhir) on the advice of the inspectors and the two kadd.

But it is only from Khair el-Din's time that a more detailed organisation dates: the decree (aari 'ali) which he made Sadik Bay issue on 28th Juma al-Ka'da 1292 (Dec. 26, 1875) lays down in 67 articles the subjects to be taught, the lists of authors to be expounded, the privileges and duties of the students, teachers and supervisors, and regulations for theaternity. The number of partial modifications afterwards made caused this decree to be replaced by that of Sept. 16, 1912, of which the 81 articles with a few additions still govern the institution. In it we find, somewhat mixed up, alongside of pedagogical provisions of an old-fashioned type, strong recommendations in favour of correctness and good behaviour and, in article 19, the prohibition to doubt principles traditionally admitted by the 'Ilmals's.

The subjects taught, more numerous and more varied than the "eleven branches of learning" provided for in the Azhar by the regulation of 1872 are, in the order in which they are given in article 1: Kur'anic exegesis (tafsir), traditions relating to the Prophet (hadith), biographies (suyar), dogmatic theology (tasawwir), the reading and proper recitation of the Qur'an (firsat, taqaddum), technology (mu'tahid), judicial methodology (nil al-fiqh), jurisprudence (shia), the law of inheritance (sawa'idi), mysticism (tawawwur), the determination of the hours of prayer (mukhtalif), syntax (ma'qal), grammatical morphology (nafir), elocution and rhetoric (mu'tani, bayana), style, composition, literature (tabaq, inqalab, ada), history and geography (tarikh, maghrib), writing and calligraphy (rasm, khatt), verisa (sargas), logic (muqtasib), dialectic (tabl akhri), arithmetic (niha), geometry (kandahar), astronomy (khal), mensuration (mhikha). Of these subjects the latter are somewhat neglected. The rigidly traditionalists and the erudite methods of instruction used in the Great Mosque are obstacles to all progress in profane sciences, and to any liberalism in religious matters. Under history and geography the programme, in addition to a brief resume of Muslim history, gives only two books to be studied: the Ruzn al-Halal of Ibn al-Khatib and the Musnadima of Ibn Khaldun, both of the xvith century. The geometry is still Euclid, whose propositions are read in al-Tusi's version (xiiiith century).

The courses, which are free, are divided into three stages, and there are examinations to pass from one to the other. The following is a list of the works on religion and language expanded in the highest course (art. 4):

- tafsir, the commentary of the two Djallis; the Mushaf with commentary of al-Zarqani,
- ajd al-Bukhari with commentary of al-Kastallani,
- the Sehij of Muslim with commentary of al-Ubabi,
- the Skif of the Kadi 'Iyad with commentary of al-Shibli al-Khashqabi,
- the Mansif al-Tabdulayn of al-Kasalani with commentary of al-Zarqani,
- the Siria al-Islahiya; the commentary of al-Djurjani on the Mishaf of 'Adud al-Din al-Tafi,
- the commentary of al-Tahla on the 'Arif of 'Umar al-Nasafi,
- the Khabr of the Shibli al-Sanadi,
- the Taqrib of Sadi al-Shafi'i's Alhaid Allah al-Majadda,
- the commentary of 'Adud al-Din al-Tafi on the Majallar of Ibn al-Halajib,
- the commentary of al-Majadda on the Lajm al-Lajmouni of 'Abd al-Wahhab al-Sukkab;
- the Tahiy al-Haqqi of 'Ushman al-Zaila'i (commentary on the Kuts al-Da'idi of 'Abd Allah al-Nasafi),
- the Durar (commentary of the Ghurar),
- the commentary of Sadi 'Abd al-Baki on the Majallar of Khalif,
- the commentary of Sadi Muhammad al-Khitaih on the same;
The thirty original teachers along with a teacher of madrass$^2$ take the title of "teachers" (mawardis) of the first class; they are qualified for the higher course. For the middle course there are 12 teachers of the second class, half Maliki and half Hanafi, and also a teacher for tad$^1$wjd. The elementary course is conducted by "voluntary" teachers (muta"ab$^2$aru), certificated former pupils, who are unpaid (art. 9). The teachers have two months' leave a year, from the middle of July to the middle of September, and the month of Ramadan in addition; there is also a holiday every Friday, the days of the two feasts and the four days that follow each of them, the day of "Arafa and the two preceding days, the 10th Muharram, the 11th, 12th, 13th Rabi‘a I (art. 29); Thursday is expressly restored as a working day (art. 28). — Each student carries a roll book which the teachers endorse once a month (art. 32), and in which they certify that the course has been attended by the person concerned (art. 33). — Supervisors appointed by the inspectors secure that discipline is maintained (art. 40). The duties of these inspectors are carefully laid down in accordance with the regulations of the Mawlala$^a$ (art. 44 sqq.).

A complementary decree of the same date, in 11 articles, settles the conditions of the final examination which gives the right to the diploma of the tapus$^3$. Success in a written examination on the Fiqh admits to classes for two consecutive sessions (art. 6). The oral examination allows six hours of preparation with the assistance of the books in the library (art. 7). A special tapus$^3$ is provided for the reading and recitation of the Qur’an (art. 9).

Since 1928, 50 "auxiliary" teachers (muwa’$^2$ara ila $'$-sdris) have been appointed by competition from among the muwa’$^2$ara’u’n; they draw a fixed salary of 500 francs a month. From Jan. 1, 1931, the annual emoluments of the teachers of the second class are fixed at 13,000 francs, those of the first class at 16,000 francs. The budget of the Tunisian state has since 1924 included a subvention for the Great Mosque; being continually increased, it rose from 50,000 francs the first year to 250,000 in 1927 and to 770,000 in 1938.

The recent reorganisation of the Muslim notables has provoked vigorous protests on the part of the students who can no longer pass straight into their profession and whose studies at the Great Mosque do not enable them to pass without further preparation the new examination required of future notaries. The whole question of the reform of religious instruction has thus been raised, or at least that of the introduction of modern legal teaching into the Great Mosque. A commission appointed by the government in December 1929 is studying the possibilities of reform and painfully endeavouring to draw up a programme.

The Catalogue of the Library, which is in course of publication in Arabic, was published incompletely in French by B. Roy and Bel-Khodja (Tunis 1900).

Modem Education. In addition to the Sidi$^1$k College (417 pupils in 1928—1929) where the double system of teaching French and Arabic prepares for administrative careers, the young Muslims are attending in increasing numbers the French schools: primary establishments (among which are Franco-Arab schools and special schools for Muslim girls, cf. R. M. M., vi. 123—125) and secondary (open to all). In Dec. 31, 1928 (cf. Statistique gendarme de la Tunisie, ann6e 1928) the Muslim population was sending to the French primary schools of the Regency 25,876 boys and 2,936 girls (in addition to 67 boys and 617 girls in the private schools); to the Lycée Carnot of Tunis 359 pupils out of a total of 2,000, but only 28 at the girls’ Lycée out of over 1,200, and lastly 485 pupils in three other institutions in Tunis (Collège Alsous, École normale d’Institut- teurs, École professionnelle E. Louiet).

An "École supérieure de langue et littérature arabes" in Tunisia gives after examination a certificate in spoken Arabic to its European students, and a certificate in written Arabic and a higher diploma in Arabic to its pupils, whether Muslims or not.

Inaugurated under the influence of the Residency, the Muslim Society al-Kauthirus$^2$ organises for nearly 200 young members popular courses in Arabic on all kinds of subjects.

Finally the Department of Justice in Tunisia has courses of law given in Arabic to prepare natives for legal careers.


5. Population.

a. Ethnography. The population of the Regency includes, in addition to the native Muslims and Jews, an increasing number of Europeans, the result of a considerable immigration of Italians and of the French Protectorate. The census of 1926 gives a total of 2,159,708 (density 278 to the square kilometre) of whom 1,113,184, are Muslims and 54,243 Tunisian Jews (not including the Jews who have acquired a European nationality).

The 173,281 Europeans were distributed as follows: 71,020 French (41%), 89,216 Italians (51.5%), 8,396 Maltese (English subjects) (4.5%), 4,649 of various other nationalities (2.5%). The Italians, who come mainly from Sicily and Sulunia, are masons, miners (i.e. Keif), agricultural labourers and vine-growers on a small scale (Beja, Medjes el-Bah, Grombalba, Zaghouan). The French are principally officials, merchants or colonists.

The bulk of the Europeans are in the Tunis area (105,000 or 60%) and in some of the towns of the coast: about 6,700 in Bizerta, 4,150 at Ferryville, 3,000 at Sfax and as many at Sfax. The Tunisian Jews, of whom 28,141 (more than half) are in the Tunis area, are over 2,000 in Sfax and nearly 3,300 in Sfax. They are also fairly numerous in Bizerta, Beja and Nabeul, and there are very few in the interior (a few called Sakkias live in tents towards Sera), but there are groups of some size in the south, nearly 2,500 in Gabes, nearly 3,800 in Hount-Suk (Djerba) out of 4,654 inhabitants, and over 2,500 in the military territories.
Excluding Tunis the capital with 185,466 inhabitants, 12 other towns have over 10,000; these are

Siç, 27,723
Siç, 21,398
Kairaouâin, 20,593
Tunis, 16,246
Masqan, 16,620
Gadès, 15,119
Nefla, 13,250
Moknine, 13,101
Kal'a Kabira, 11,830
Tozeur, 11,056
Beja, 10,488

We may note that Masqan and Kal'a Kabira, both in the Sahel, are inhabited exclusively by Muslims.

A. Tribes. In the present state of our knowledge we cannot sketch with certainty the evolution of the present divisions of the Muslim population of Tunisia. Even if we set aside the urban centres and the more thickly populated areas (districts of Bizerta, Beja, Tunis and Siç) where very varied elements are found together and intermingled, the constituent elements of the great tribes, clearly defined and centralised at different periods in the history of the country, is far from being clear. We do not know the origin of many of them; even their disappearance is not always free from mystery.

For a long period the Arab soldiers were numerically insufficient to produce a real change in the old Berber bloc. But the great new factor was the invasion in the middle of the 19th century of the Hilâfi Arabs, followed in the 19th and 20th centuries by the Subaïms; they drove up into the highlands the greater part of the native Berbers, occupied the plains and completed the Arabisation of the country; it is true that, frequently fusing with bodies of natives, they completely subjected them to their influence, so that it is impossible to-day to discriminate at all between "Arab tribes" and "Berber tribes." We can only say that of all North Africa, Tunisia is on the whole the most Arabised region.

In the 19th century Ibn Khalâl gives us some information about the surviving Berbers. One group lived on the island of Djerba (Khaïridji Djerâba) and in the mountains of the south: Lawta (Hist. des Berbères, trans. 1. 235) to the south of Gabes in the Djebel which bears their name, Majûta (ibid., i. 240) in the district they still inhabit, Zanûta driven from Tripolitania, who had taken refuge in the Djebel Demmer, where the most important body was the confederation of the Warghamma (ibid., 2. 285). Other Zanûta, the B. Wardjâl (ibid., i. 204), maintained their independence in the oasis of al-Hamâma, while the Marzidja Frânde (ibid., i. 225-246), half agriculturalists, half cattle-rearers, between Tunis and Kairaouân, were exposed to the attacks of the Kaïb Arabes. A remnant of the Samitâ (ibid., i. 231) still exists near Kairaouân. But the most compact Berber group, formed of Harrwata (ibid., i. 278-279) in part nomads, occupied the region of the High Tell; Wanîf of Tebbessa at Marmadjâna (no doubt the present Bermdjâna), Kaïjar between Elba-Kour and Lorbeïn, Bouzala of Tebussat on the Djiougar. The Baçwa had, however, already incorporated a body of Riyaḥ Arabes who were neighbours of their relatives, the B. Hâbi, in the same way in the mountains of the north, Arabs of Maṭrâ, the B. Hûdâlî, had become fused with the Hawwârî tribe of the B. Sulaim.

Among the Arab invaders, the Hilâfi, pushing farther west, only left in Idrîsia a few of the Abî Zughbi near Tunis. The B. 'Awf of the Sulaim, on the other hand, is shown by the Rikâs of al-Tâjânî (in 1306-1309), occupied the whole of the eastern coast district: from Nabeul to Sûsa were the Dallâdîj, then up to el-Djene the Hâkim, who were later joined by the Tûrud (these latter were later moved on towards Wargla) then up to al-Mabârâka the B. 'Ali of the Hâjan. The hinterland was dominated by their Kaïb relatives and masters, of whom the two rival groups, Awâlî Muhâhalî and Awâlî 'Ali, were in Haçid politics that considerable role which has been well brought out by G. Marsâa. During spring and summer, the Mûrdis b. 'Awf, of whom a detached branch arrived near Beja, regularly replaced the Kaîb in their winter quarters, the Djebel. Finally, starting from al-Mabârâka, the southern plains were occupied by other Sulaim, the Dâblâ: these were, in the interior, the Aklâl, the B. Aklâl, which was the confederation of the B. Vânt (Sâba, Hamâna, Khârjūdja, Aşâla), the Sharâd and Zughbî on the coast, the Nâwîl, as far as Gabès, and the Maqâmî of the confederation of the Wargha, up to the present frontier of Tripolitania.

Some of these names reappear in the memoir published in 1536 by B. de Mendoza, in Les Arabes du royaume de Tunis (publ. by La Primadour). The B. 'Ali, the most powerful of all, mentioned by Les Africains, were at that time scattered along the coast from Bizerta to Djerba; the Awâlî 'Ali, in the district of Mateur and Beja. The Awâlî Muhâhalî who swallowed up the Awâlî 'Awîn between Kairaouân and Beja. But alongside of these appear the dreaded Awâlî Sa'd of obscure origin, who extended from Monastir to the interior of Cape Bon; the Awâlî Vâhîs in the region of Tebess and near Tebessa, probably of Hawwârî stock; the Hanâsha whose chief exercised political influence from their citadel of Kaîal el-Sînîn (cf. Fréraud, Les Harîr ... R. Afr., 1874).

In spite of the considerable alteration and wastage of the tribes, their old names have frequently survived. In the south, where the Berber element is flourishing, we still have the troglodyte Matmâ and the Warghamma, the tribes of which have reconquered the plains: Akhârî of Zarrîs who live in tents from February to June to harvest the barley and pasture their flocks and herds, Twâm, who, formerly nomads, now tend to settle in the gardening country of Modernine and Ben-Gardane the Djâbâlaya who inhabit villages in the highlands of the south of Tebessa, and the Wâlarna, partly settled and partly nomad. Two shajâhîs, bear the name of the Lawta, in the kaidâts of W. 'Awîn and Bizerta. In the High Tell towards Algeria, the Wânîf[a] group comprises several tribes among whom are the Wargha (cf. this name in the Hist. des Berbères, trans., i. 275). The Wâghîta, now in the country round Beja and Suk el-Ârba, are not unknown to Ibn Khalâl (ibid.), like the Nafrî (i. 282 and 290) settled in our days on the northern coast.

The names of the mediaeval tribes of Arab origin are fairly well preserved in the south; the Nâwîl
and the Mahbūba, it is true, were driven into Tripoli, but the counter-offensive of the War-ghams, but the berberish Dālāsh form a shāhikāte in the annexe of Tafara, and the important B. Zdī (iz-Yaṣid), a section of whom still call themselves Khādīja, still lead a nomadic life with the Ḥamārina near Gabes. We also find scattered and in diminishing numbers giving names to shāhikātes the Hedīl or B. Ḥafṣah (kaidate of Ain-Draham), the Tūfī (Bizerta), the Ḥakim (Suq el-Āris), the Awlād Muhāhal (O. Ayār), the Kašīl Awlād al-Rūḍājī (Ajlas; cf. Hist. des Berb., transl. i. 143). Several of the O. Bélīl or Awlād Abī l-Laini survive in the plain of Beja, and of the Rīyāḥ near Zagwan. It was only in the sixteenth century that the Kūmnī or Khumna settled in the mountains of the northwest, not far from the Moguds or Mūqīl, whose name at least has an Arab sound, and in the Sers and around it, as a Maḥsān tribe, the Dīrī or Durānī, a branch of the B. Aḥmadīy b. Hīlī, who were for a period the police of the Algerian frontier. The Naftājah in the hinterland of Matmāta are mentioned as Arabs by Ibn Khaldūn (Hist. des Berb., transl. ii. 101 and 290).

Among the groups mentioned under the later Ḥafṣah, some Awlād Vābah are surviving in the kaidate of Telbursak, the Awlād Saʿūd are very scattered but their chief centre is the town of Enfīs, the O. Aww or Awlād Aww formed a whole kaidate around Sīslīna, N. E. of Maktar.

Finally, in the present mosaic of the tribes of Tunisia, some of quite uncertain origin, if it is not maraboutic, are of sufficient importance to be mentioned: not far from the coast, to the south of el-Djem up to the north of Gabes, the Māḥsūt, Agātī and Māḥsūb; in the interior, occupying the steppes, the Swāt, Dījān, Frājus, Ṣawar, Māḏjir and Hamāma, who form the same number of kaidates; in the High Tell, the Jūqī, the Ayyār or Awlād Ayyār, the Swātīn; in the Neftāwān and Tunisian Sahara, the Gharīb, Māḏṣgī, the Ādārā, and the Awlād Ya ṣūf. c. Native Life. Nomadism is clearly dying in Tunisia; there are no longer migrations of considerable extent nor in large bodies ("esmalas") except in very bad years. Usually the tribe remains stationary and a few herdsmen take the flocks away. It is the flocks only which move; the cattle pass the winter in the steppes and the summer in the Tell; the route most frequently traversed is the contoir Shiba-Le Kef; the migrants like to spend some time in the plain of Gomouha. The Māḥsūt alone go in summer as far as Bizerta and the Dījāl and Swātī as far as the neighbourhood of Beja. The Neftāwān and the Tunisian Sahara are of course still peopled by nomads.

The government of the Protectorate actively pursues a policy of leading the natives to adopt a settled life by making it easy for them to acquire land and directing their energies towards agriculture. Alongside of the old contract of Mūkhāra, regulated by the Ḫāniṣ al-Filhāsa of Khair el-Dīn in 1291 A. H. (cf. Bill. in W. Merg, Taubmaison, p. 252), the sale on credit by the Domains of the "salines" (around Sfax for a radius of about 50 miles), and of the naft of Sharrāla (near Kairouan) suitable for growing olives (decrees of 1892 and 1905), has been the occasion of putting into practice the contract known as Mūlāhāran: the native farmer, who contracts to plant with olive-trees the whole extent of a piece of ground granted to him, becomes the owner of half the ground when the trees begin to bear. The new legislation dealing with kaimes estates has made it possible to settle on the land a number of native families, by establishing their rights as "occupants" in a legal and definite form (most recent decree: that of July 17, 1926). In the midst of the terrains collectivistes of the tribes, the law of purchase laid down by the decree of Dec. 23, 1918, modified in 1926; each collectivité or group of land forms a unit and is represented by a council of notables; the deputation of each kaidate sits a council (conseil de tutelle locale) which has local authority and whose decisions can be revised by a central council in Tunis. The authority of one of these bodies being always required when land changes hands, or is let on a long lease, or similar occasions, the native ownership is safeguarded. Finally, besides the technical progress made since the occupation, the Tunisian agriculturist owes the Protectorate his powers to form irrigation companies (decrees of May 25, 1920), the distribution of lands for cultivation to native farmers, the creation of the native chambers for agriculture and the institution of an "Office public de crédit agricole" for the natives (decree of June 10, 1923).

In 1928, the number of animals belonging to natives and Europeans respectively was as follows: horses 77,000 and 10,500, asses 157,000 and 2,500, oxen 28,500 and 41,500, cattle 430,000 and 55,000, sheep 2,000,000 and 103,500, goats 1,350,000 and 30,500, pigs 6,000 and 13,000, camels 151,500 and 300. The natives own about 9,000,000 taxable olive-trees (the Europeans 878,000) and 4,500,000 untaxed (the Europeans 1,100,000). We may note that several thousand natives live by fishing.

Throughout the Regency the tent is disappearing before the gourbi, a sure sign that the people are becoming settled, or even before the house. In the south we find two peculiar types of habitation: the subterranean dwellings of the troglodytes, over 7,500 in the districts of the Maṣṣāṣ, Medenine and Tatahouine, and the ghurfas "kauris" (kauri) (cub-shaped buildings with curved sides, long, narrow and low used as storehouses) of which the most remarkable are Medenine and Metamur. The number of town-dwellers is relatively large among the natives, for it reaches 18.9%; Tunisia has always been remarkable for the development of urban life. In Tunisia, the foreign Muslim elements (kabriyya) are grouped in several separate communities.

Native commerce is becoming more and more modernised; one of its most striking achievements is the organisation of co-operative buying by the Jberian grocers who are established in large numbers in Tunis. As to the local industries, they have been suffering for a considerable time from the fierce competition of European produce; it is true that the government does its best to support it, especially as regards native works of artistic interest; regular training courses have been instituted for the purpose, and attention is being devoted to the improvement of technical or artistic methods in manufacture. Besides milling, the manufacture of oil and soap, the main old-established industries of the Regency are dying, now threatened by the infinite dyes imported from France, the manufacture of wool (in various districts; blankets at Djerba, Gafsa and in the Djerid), of cotton (at Tunis), of silk (in Tunis and Kasser-El-Hall), of goat and camel hairs (in the south), the weaving of carpets (by
TUNISIA

women, especially at Kairouān), and of "sha'as" (at Tunis with a fulling-mill at El-Bathin and of ceramics (at Nabeul). We may also mention the manufacture of sieves (at Tunis, Kairouān and Sousse), of mats, baskets and esparto (at Nabeul), tanners, and shoemakers (at Tunis, Kairouān and Nabeul); saddlers (at Tunis), cutters, metal-work, stone- and woodwork. The tinsmiths are all Jews, as are some shoemakers, many tailors and almost all the jewelers.

The trade-gilds, of which the most important in Tunis is that of the manufacturers of shashiyas (ganoûds) of Spanish origin, are regulated by byzical decrees; they may admit Jews but the avâd is always a Muslim. The shashiyas have a common reserve fund; their trade mark (mihrâb) has to be approved by byzical decrees. In spite of the competition of importants (from France, Austria and Czechoslovakia) and the disappearance of the Turkish market, the production of shashiyas is still much the same as it was 25 or 30 years ago, i.e. about 50,000 kg. of which about half are exported.

According to statistics, not yet published, compiled by the Direction de l'Agriculture, the gilds of Tunis are constituted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>Workmen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Makers of shashiyas</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makers of burnous</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millers</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silkweavers</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton spinners</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyers</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddlers and leatherworkers</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewellers and goldsmiths</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiths</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painters and decorators</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanners</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Masters and workmen combined only number about 4,630.

Bibliography: Nomenclature et répartition des tribus de la Tunisie, Châlons/Saône 1907; Notes sur les tribus de la Régence, R.T., 1902; Statistique générale de la Tunisie An. 1928, Tunis 1935; Bertholon and Chantre, Recherches anthropologiques dans la Berbère orientale, Lyon 1913; Abdoulhâbieh, Compte d'â son général sur les accidents ethniques étrangers en Tunisie, R. T., 1917; Eudel, L'espérance algerienne et tunisienne, Algiers 1903; Alger, Les corporations tunisiennes, Paris 1909; Bernard and Lacroix, L'évolution du nomadisme en Algérie (passim), Algiers–Paris 1906; Decker-David, L'agriculture indigène en Tunisie, Tunis 1912; Messaïl, L'évolution économique de la Tunisie, Tunis 1921; and Bernard, Enquête sur l'habitation rurale des indigènes de la Tunisie, Tunis 1924; Sultan, Essai sur la police féodale en Tunisie, Paris 1930.


Berber. Berber dialects have almost entirely disappeared from Tunisia. Berber speakers are now only found in the region of Séned (kaidate of Gaâa), the dialect of which has been studied by Provotelle, at Tamezret among the Majmûta and in the island of Djerba, where the women in particular preserve the old idiom.

Spoken Arabic. The linguistic arabisation of Tunis is thus practically complete but it has proceeded along lines of which we do not know the details. W. Marçais would allow, at least for the Sâhîl, that it has been more rapid than is usually thought. Since before the coming of the Hilîl and Sulaim (sixth–seventh centuries), the "urban centres, those permanent foci of arabisation", Susa, Monastir and Mahdiya, have been disseminating among the peasants of the surrounding country their own town-language which, gradually transformed by a rural population, has given birth to various rustic dialects. In their consonant system and their grammar the Beduin dialects differ, as Ibn Khaldûn noted, from the Arabic of the towns and therefore from that of the Sâhîl.

Von Maltzan has pointed out (E.Z.D.M.G., xxiii. 655–656) that the Arabic spoken in Tunis has retained the classical consonant system more perfectly than any in the Maghrib. We need only note the fusion of the š and š, both pronounced like an emphatic sonant interdental spirant; the š is pronounced as a postpalatal sonant (g) in borrowed words (e.g. agärū, amgūrū), or influenced by Beduin dialects (e.g. bāqrū, bāqrū); ṣīm, postpalatal (French j), is treated after the article as a solar letter and has a tendency to pass into s in words which already contain this sound (e.g. qawāṣ > sûs). The confusion which appears in the use of the liquids l, n, and ẓ affects borrowed words almost exclusively.

The "unation" has disappeared except in some rare formulae; it has left traces in certain adverbial accusatives where the vowel of the old termination has survived, sometimes even lengthened (e.g. a₂̣iṃ > lim₂̣, dā₂̣ṃ). The careful observations of W. Marçais for the dialect spoken at Tâhirina still constitute the only satisfactory record of the Tunisian vowel system. Although the dropping and weakening of vowels is far from being so serious as in the extreme Maghrib, it is a broken down vowel system. Sometimes to facilitate pronunciation, transitional sounds are developed, secondary ultra-short vowels, notably before a laryngal preceded by t or ð (cf. the pittâ kâdf of Hebrew). It will be remembered that in Tunis the women have preserved the old diphthongs ai and au while the men have reduced them to i and û; the Beduin dialects in general bring them back to t and to û, but some of them make a false diphthong with an ultra-short second element: û, û. With some nomads the inālā û > ẑ open is forced in certain positions into a very much closed ẑ. Educated people read the hara of the classical language as ẑ in an open syllable, but almost like the French s in a closed syllable.

H. Stumm's to whom we owe a detailed morphology of Tunisian Arabic, has laid down the following rules for accentuation: If the word ends in two consonants or with a consonant preceded by a long vowel, the accent is on the last syllable; in the other cases, it falls on the penultimate syllable, if the latter is long or closed, if not it goes back to the first syllable of the word; exceptions: the verbal form jāfūlarna (for jūfûlarna) and jūfl (for jīfl: a type at once verbal and nominal. The accent goes back from the last syllable to the penultimate when the first syllable of the following word is accented.

The conjugation naturally reveals the essential features of all the Maghribi dialects: the alternation sg. nafla, pl. naflala in the first persons of the
The vocabulary has made borrowings from Turkisch and Italian; it is every day taking more from the French. But French is affecting Judaeo-Arabic much more, and it will perhaps die out without being studied.

2. The native press. For a long time the publication of newspapers was forbidden in Tunisia; even printing and bookselling were not unrestricted but subject to an administrative control regulated in 1875 by the decree relating to teaching in the Great Mosque. From 1859 the "Journal Officiel" (al-Rūdidd al-arṣalī al-Tunīsī) gave a certain amount of information, mainly relating to administration, but it also accepted other articles. The press decree of Oct. 14, 1884 and particularly the more liberal one of Aug. 16, 1887, modified however several times later, permitted the establishment in the Regency of a press in French, Italian and Arabic.

In 1888—1889 the daily papers al-Haḍīra belonging to Bil Shāhā and al-Zahraa belonging to Shāshāh appeared in Arabic. The Zobara still exists and is now regarded as conservative although in its early days it was thought to be very advanced. Alongside of it, the principal newspaper in al-Nahāma appears every day except Monday. The majority of the present Arabic jounals are weekly: al-Zamūn (liberal), Liṭām al-Shāh and al-Sawād (both nationalist in tendency, especially the former), al-Naṣrīn (literary, satirical, much appreciated); also the humorous al-Zahrā, which admits to its columns the popular daily, Al-Wastir, in theory a monthly as is al-Mustaqīm which is very irregular. Recently an illustrated monthly magazine has appeared dealing with history and literature: al-Adām al-adābī; but the most widely circulated Arabic magazines in Tunisia come from Egypt, notably al-Siyāsah. The "Journal Officiel" which has also had a French edition since 1885, confines itself to publishing twice a week documents of an official nature. Lastly a kind of almanac al-Dirūm al-Tunīsī, which appeared from 1899 to 1921, has been replaced by an annual, almost exclusively administrative: Taḥwīl al-Tunīsī.

It is interesting to note the unsuccessful attempts to create a local Arabic press, which have been made at Sfax with al-Sayr al-dā‘ī and at Kairouan with al-Kuttabī. On the other hand, a little weekly in French edited by Muslims has been a success in Sfax; the Tunisie Nouvelle belonging to Zahir Ayâlî; in Tunis also where Bâb Hôna and Le Tunisien was already established about 1910, Shâshâ Khâir Allîh edits the Feis du Tunisien, which in very recently succeeded the Liberal; since August 1930, Abd al-‘Azîz Lazouli has been publishing the Croissant. Those organs show a Tunisian nationalist spirit, which is exclusively Muslim.

The Jews, who used to have a fairly abundant literature and press in Judaeo-Arabic (in Hebrew characters), of which E. Vassil wrote a history down to 1907 (La Littérature populaire des Israélites tunisiens, 1905—1907), no longer publish in this dialect, which is disappearing before French, except the intermittent and poor al-Šalāb. Their three weeklies are in French: the conservative Egālī, the Justice ("samatimlat") and the best known, the Rivolul Juif (Zionist) founded in 1924 at Sfax by Félix Allouche and recently transferred to Tunis.

Al-Tūr

Sulṭān Ināl, Khunṣādām and Ka‘lībey (Moritz, op. cit., p. 25 sqq.). They mainly dealt with the protection of the Christian monks from the raids of the manuring Beduins of the country round, but seem to have been regarded by the latter as empty threats, as their frequent renewal shows (Moritz issued no fewer than 22 firmanās for the monastery during the 30 years of his reign!). The monastery was frequently stormed, set on fire, its gardens robbed and pilgrims and merchants plundered; sometimes the monks even had to seek refuge in the monastery of the village of al-Tūr (see below) (Moritz, op. cit., p. 28).

Within the monastery "between the church and the dwellings on the northern part of the buildings", there is still a mosque, the pulpit of which was, according to an inscription, presented by Abū 'Ali al-Manṣūr Anāštakūn al-Amīr in Rahīl' 1 of 500 (Nov. 1106) in the reign of the caliph 'Amīr b. Aḥīkal Allāh (Moritz, p. 50-52). The monastery of Sinai in this inscription is called "the upper monastery" (ṣurur al-ḥill) to distinguish it from monasteries in al-Tūr (Psche) and Fārān. According to another inscription, this same Anāštakūn found three maqṣūḍā (places for prayer) on the Munṣūdā Mūšā, a mountain on the hill of the monastery of Fārān and another below Fārān al-Ḍajadda, and a lighthouse on the shore of the coast (al-Ṣahlī). By Munṣūdā Mūšā is certainly meant the traditional Sinai, now Dījāl Mūšā (Moritz, op. cit., p. 54); it was only in the sixth century that the name was transferred to a smaller hill east of the monastery of St. Catherine, which is now called (like a hill near Fārān) Dījāl Munṣūdā. Of the three maqṣūḍā only two could have been on the top of Dījāl al-Tūr, namely the Christian church built in 364 A.D. by St. Julian and a small mosque, also mentioned by al-Idrisī; the third place of prayer no doubt lay on a small plateau 500 feet below the summit on which now stands a chapel of Elijah erected at a later date. The mosque on the "hill of the monastery of Fārān" is perhaps to be sought on the Dījāl al-Muḥarrat, that of al-Fārān in the coasts of Fārān in the gardens of which the inhabitants of the "city of the Amalekites" Fārān later settled (Maḥṣūr, Kīḥāṭ, Bilāl, i. 155; Moritz, op. cit., p. 56). Moritz supposes the lighthouse (op. cit., p. 57) to have stood at that point on the coast where the Wādī Fārān enters the sea and there is a poor anchorage.

In a Syrian description of the seven climes of the ixth century A.D. the monasteries of Sinai (Ṭūrī al-Sīnā?) forms the centre of the crescent-shaped map in the second clime (Chabot, Notice sur une mappomonde syriaque, in Bulletin de géogr. hist. et descrpt., 1897, p. 104 and pl. lv.).

The tradition that Selim I visited Sinai on his Egyptian expedition is an invention; neither his journal nor Ibn Iyās make any mention of it (Moritz, op. cit., p. 5; note 1).

The little town of al-Tūr lies S.W. of the Dījāl Mūšā on the Gulf of Suez, about 50 miles from Rās Muḥammād, the most southern point of the Sinai peninsula. It is in regular caravan communication with the monastery of St. Catherine, some of the monks of which usually stay there (Weill, La presqu'île du Sinai, 1908, p. 82). It lies at the only spot on the west coast of the peninsula which is completely free from coral reefs and has therefore an anchorage. As al-Tūr is further excellently supplied with water, and has large palm-groves in the vicinity, it has always been the most important harbour in the peninsula. In ancient times it was called Moraṭīd (Agatharchides in Strabo, xvi. 776 and Diodorus, ill. 42) and later (from the Arab tribe of the Pasqe) Pasqī (Pasqe in Suidas); probably the monastery there dated from the pre-Arab period.

Kaškānshī already knows al-Tūr as the most important Egyptian harbour for the ships of the pilgrims to Mecca, until about 450 (1047) A.D. and took their place. It was not till 1780 (1378-1379) that the harbour of al-Tūr was restored and the pilgrims henceforth again took the northern route (Weill, op. cit., p. 92-94). After the discovery of the sea-route to India by the Portuguese al-Tūr gradually lost its importance and sank to be a mere fishing-village, until in the second half of the xvth century a quarantine station was put there for pilgrims returning from Mecca and the place began to flourish once more. Sulṭān Murād built the fort of Kaft al-Tūr near the old monastery but both are now completely in ruins.


2. The Zatāt of Dījāl Zatāt, the Mount of Olives, east of Jerusalem (see Al-Kuds, ii. 104 sqq.) is still called Dījāl al-Tūr. According to tradition, 70,000 prophets died there of starvation and are buried there. The Ascension of Jesus, according to an old tradition, took place from the Mount of Olives. Between it and the town ran the Wādī Dījānamm (vale of Cedron, now Wādī Sittī Maryam with the well of Siloam, Arabic 'Ain Sulaym) over which ran the bridge of al-Sūr. The village of Kaft al-Tūr now stands on the hill.
in vain to recapture it in 614 (1217). Ballhore in Djamah II 661 (1263) used the fortress as a base of operations for his raids against Akka.


4. Al-Tūr, the hill of Gerizim (3,000 feet) above Nablus, the sacred mountain of the Samaritans. Jewish tradition makes it the scene of the sacrifice of Isaac. The hill is still called Djabal al-Tur or Djabal al-Khibī to distinguish it from the Djabal al-Shamāl of Isāmiyya (Ezul) to the north of the town.

**Bibliography:** Vâkıfı, Meşhur, ed. Wüstenfeld, ii. 557; Saifi al-Din, Mərəşəd al-İşkəş, ed. Juyaboli, ii. 214; Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, p. 74.

5. Tûr Hārin, the hill of H̄ārin (3,000 feet) west of Petra, called after Aaron, who according to an old tradition, is buried there (Josephus, Archel., iv. 4, 7). When the children of Israel accused Moses of having slain him, he showed them on the top of the hill the tree on which Aaron lay. In al-Masādi the hill is called Djabal Māsād in the district of al-Šarāb; he also mentions the caves in the mountain. On the eastern peak (3,000 feet) of the Djabal al-Nabi H̄ārin is Aaron's grave (Kabir H̄ārin) which is still a place of pilgrimage for the Beduains.


(E. Hormann)

**Tûr Ābdin,** the name of a mountainous plateau in northern Mesopotamia. It stretches roughly from Mārān in the west to Džanar (q. v.) in the east. The Tigris forms the eastern and northern boundary, from Džanar up to the point where it is joined by the Tigris. A line drawn from the confluence of the two rivers to Mārān would roughly mark the western boundary of the area known as Tûr Ābdin, while the Koros-Daggh, which lies in the northern part of this western boundary is also to be regarded as belonging entirely to Tûr Ābdin, as an outlying portion of it. In the south the frontier is very well marked, for there the rocks of this old tableland slope steeply, often precipitously, to the Mesopotamian plain and seen from the latter look like a well-built wall. The road, in constant use from the earliest times, which goes from Mārān via Našṭun to Džanar, runs a short distance from the southern edge of Tûr Ābdin. With the latter are usually included the mountains in the centre of which is the town of Mārān (hence sometimes called after it; cf. also the Turkish name Mūrān-dagh; see Schlööf, op. cit., p. 48). It stretches — west of Mārān part of it is called Djabal al-Āf — roughly up to 40° 15' east long. (N. lat.) and is separated by a very marked depression from the gigantic basaltic ridge of the Kardżja-Daggh. The average height of Tûr Ābdin is in its central portion about 3,000—3,500 feet above sea-level. In the district between Mārān and Jūr (q. v.) on the Tigris (cf. î, p. 320) and in the mountains of Mārān, individual peaks reach 4,300 feet. In general however, Tûr Ābdin lacks any marked heights and looks everywhere like an undulating plain which is cut by deep and broad wadis. The largest of these is the Wadi Khātfin, which flows into the Tigris at Finik (N. W. of Džanar).

Tûr Ābdin consists almost entirely of limestone, often with beds of marl. In places however we find angular basalt blocks scattered, which are of volcanic origin. Such outcrops of basalt are found especially in the east, towards Džanar, where the basaltic Eblīs-dagh rises as a continuation of the southern wall of limestone of Tûr Ābdin, and also west of Mārān where the lava from the Kardżja-Daggh flowed out. To the nature of the rock composing it, Tûr Ābdin owes its many wadis, which are often, as in ancient times, used as dwellings. Such caves are numerous, for example in the region of Mīdāy (mentioned as early as the Assyrian inscriptions), and mentioned as a hunting place by Kašān, which is the regular trophy capital. Cf. thenon Lehman-Haupt, op. cit. (see Bihk) p. 370 sq.; Streck, in Z.D.M.G., lxxvi. 310 and in Pauyl-Wissowa, Realencycl. d. Islam. Altertumswiss., viii. 2457 (Art. Hārin); see also above, î, p. 320.

The eastern and western part of Tûr Ābdin is in general characterised by an absence of trees, but in its central east of Mīdāy, a strip of forest runs from north to south. Here we have many small hills overgrown with stunted trees (dwa'r' oaks) and shrubs. As a result of the scarcity of forests and the fact that most of the rainfall sinks into the porous limestone, there is a serious scarcity of water in a large part of Tûr Ābdin. For watering the cattle, water is collected in cisterns, often very old, and large ponds. The south has the most plentiful supply of water; there we find numerous springs and countless little streams running southwards through the hills, usually to disappear in the sands of the Mesopotamian plain at no great distance from the foot of the mountains. These streams that flow from the southern side of Tûr Ābdin enter the river Dja gə dja gə, which divides into two arms above Našṭun. The southern slopes of the Karadağ, as well as the Mārān mountains, are drained by the Khātf (q. v.) which receives the waters of the Džangulagh at Hesaka (36° 25' N. lat.).

In spite of many barren patches and the generally unfavourable irrigation conditions, there are many stretches of ground which grow cereals well and excellent pastures, especially in the hollows which hold the fertile reddish-brown earth, and on the slopes of the little hills, which are preferably used for the vine. At all the monasteries we find well cared for vineyards. Terraces to which the soil has been carried have also been built to grow the vine and produce fruit. The people are exceedingly skilled in irrigating their fields. In addition to cereals (usually barley) and their vines, cotton and all kinds of fruits (especially very fine apricots) are grown. In the wooded portions of Tûr Ābdin gall-apples and manna resin are gathered, and are found in large quantities. A ridge west of Mārān, the already mentioned Djabal al-Āf, takes its name from the plentifullness of gall-apples there (sīf). On the vines and other products of the

Tūr 'Abdin was already known to the Assyrians. They call it the ḫaššāri mountains; it is found under this name as early as the inscriptions of the early Assyrian King Assur-nāṣir-pār I (c. 1300—1270 A.D.) and Assurbanīpāl I (c. 1270—1240); see the pertinent texts in Altoriental. Bibliothek, vol. i. (= Ebeling—Meissner—Weidler, Die Inschriften der assyris. Könige, Leipzig 1926, p. 58 sq., p. 118 sq.). The ḫaššāri are still mentioned in the documents of the later kings of Assyria. Tūr 'Abdin—Kashari corresponds fairly well to the Maššū (Μασσά) in the Latin, a term found in the later Greek writers (Arrian, Ptolemy); cf. Delitzsch, Wer war der Parthus?, Leipzig 1881, p. 259; Streck, in Z.A., xii. 1897, p. 169; Streck, Anmerkungen etc. (= Forschungen. Bibliothek, vol. vii., p. 790; R. Kiepert, in Formae orbis antiqui, Heft v. (Mesopotamia etc.), 1909, p. 8. The view put forward by Lehmann-Haupt (s. Z.A., xiv. 371; Kloe, ix., 1909, p. 409 and Aramäisches rind und jetzt, vol. i., Berlin 1910, p. 368 sq., p. 510, 513) hardly seems to us tenable; that, Kashari and Maššū represent a wider geographical conception than that of Tūr 'Abdin and mean: the whole eastern or southern part of the Tanur of the ancients i.e. include the Karādža Dagh and the Harar Daghliari to the north of Malyafrīkān (Farkūn).

In the cuneiform inscriptions we find besides Kashari two other names which apparently also refer to parts only of Tūr 'Abdin: Nīrbu, probably used for the centre of this plateau (see Streck, in Z.A., xii. 34; xiv. 169) and Isita, in all appearance a special name for the western strip of Tūr 'Abdin and particularly for the district of Mārīn (prob. the modern, already mentioned, Marān, a tributary of the Khābūr (q. v.)). Rises in Tūr 'Abdin. We may also mention that the Arab geographers (see B.G.A., ii. 73, and Abu 'l-Farid, Taqāṣīm al-Dustūr, ed. Paris, 1828) also have the special name Dījasāl Mārīn (Mārīn Hills) (cf. above) for the southern borders of Tūr 'Abdin, the district of Naṣīrīn and Dārā. The modern Syrian pronunciation of Tūr 'Abdin (one also hears Tūr al-'Abdīn) is Tūr al-'Abdīn. The name Tūr 'Abdin is locally not unknown, especially in Christian circles, but belongs to the literary rather than to the spoken language. At the present day in Syria, this hill-country is usually Tūr or in Arabic al-Tūr, also al-Dījasāl and Dījasāl Tūr, or Dījasāl al-Tūr; cf. Prym and Socin, op. cit., p. 1390; and Socin, in Z.D.M.G., xxxv. 238; G. Hoffmann, Aussage aus syriscchen Akten persischer Mäzīrez, Leipzig 1850, p. 179 sq.

As to the Aramaic name Tūr 'Abdin = "Mount of the Servants" (of God)—cf. the analogouos place-name ḫaššāri 'Abdin in Wright's Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum, London 1871, No. 950, 267—, it is of course of Christian origin and belongs to the period when the region had through the number of its monasteries become a great centre of eastern monachism. The name Tūr 'Abdin is in a Syrian Lives of Saints of the time of the emperor Julian, i.e. about the middle of the fourth century; see Wright, op. cit., No. 960, p. 1136 and Socin, in Z.D.M.G., xxxv. 239.

Of great topographical importance for the Tūr 'Abdin region is the Descriptio orbis Romanii of Georgius Cyprius of the first decade of the seventh century, because it gives a whole list of forts in this area; see the edition by Gelen, Leipzig 1890, p. 46, l. 913—938. There we find Kāṣṭor Maššū (= Mārīn) followed immediately by Kāṣṭor Tūrādān (l. 914); it is very natural to amend this name with Hoffmann in Gelen (p. 159—159) to Tespādān = Tūr 'Abdin. Here we may point out that of the Roman forts of Mesopotamia one group were near the Tigris and the others on Tūr 'Abdin; cf. V. Chapot, La frontière de l’Euphrate, Paris 1907, p. 322. In the Syriac Lives of Saints above mentioned the time of Julian there is a reference to the building of two large fortresses in the region of Tūr 'Abdin.

In the chronicle of Pseudo-Moses of Choreone, which at the earliest was compiled at the end of the seventh century, we also find the name Tūr 'Abdin (see Marquart, Einleit. Nachr. d. Göt. Ges. der Wissenschaft, Berlin 1904, p. 141, 158); but here it apparently denotes a smaller area, the southern border (= Isita?).

In the Arab authors of the middle ages we also find the term Tūr 'Abdin. For the pre-Islamic period we have it in verses of the poet Abī Dunṣ al-Ḫaḍr, which tell us that the legendary founder of the kingdom of al-Ḫaḍr (q. v.), Sīṣīla, also ruled the land of Tūr 'Abdin (see B.G.A., ed. de Goeje, vi. 95, 96—= Yākūt, Muṣṭafā, ed. Wüstenfeld, iii. 559, 2 and cf. also Yākūt, ii. 284, 37—). Tūr 'Abdin is also mentioned in a poem the subject of which is Khusraw and Sīṣīla: see B.G.A., v. 159, 36 sq. (Masudi, B.G.A., viii. 34, 4) mentions that in Tūr 'Abdin remnants of the Aramaeans still survive. Ibn Rūta (B.G.A., vii. 90, 3 and Baladhūrī (ed. de Goeje, p. 175, 11) point out that the Ḥirānaeus (the modern, already mentioned, Ḥajābān), a tributary of the Khābūr (q. v.), rises in Tūr 'Abdin. We may also mention that the Arab geographers (see B.G.A., ii. 73, and Abu 'l-Farid, Taqāṣīm al-Dustūr, ed. Paris, 1828) also have the special name Dījasāl Mārīn (= Mārīn Hills) (cf. above) for the southern borders of Tūr 'Abdin, the district of Naṣīrīn and Dārā. The modern Syrian pronunciation of Tūr 'Abdin (one also hears Tūr al-'Abdīn) is Tūr al-'Abdīn. The name Tūr 'Abdin is locally not unknown, especially in Christian circles, but belongs to the literary rather than to the spoken language. At the present day in Syria, this hill-country is usually Tūr or in Arabic al-Tūr, also al-Dījasāl and Dījasāl Tūr, or Dījasāl al-Tūr; cf. Prym and Socin, op. cit., p. 1390; and Socin, in Z.D.M.G., xxxv. 238; G. Hoffmann, Aussage aus syriscchen Akten persischer Mäzīrez, Leipzig 1850, p. 179 sq.

As to the Aramaic name Tūr 'Abdin = "Mount of the Servants" (of God)—cf. the analogous place-name ḫaššāri 'Abdin in Wright's Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum, London 1871, No. 950, 267—, it is of course of Christian origin and belongs to the period when the region had through the number of its monasteries become a great centre of eastern monachism. The name Tūr 'Abdin is in a Syrian Lives of Saints of the time of the emperor Julian, i.e. about the middle of the fourth century; see Wright, op. cit., No. 960, p. 1136 and Socin, in Z.D.M.G., xxxv. 239.

Of great topographical importance for the Tūr 'Abdin region is the Descriptio orbis Romanii of Georgius Cyprius of the first decade of the seventh century, because it gives a whole list of forts in this area; see the edition by Gelen, Leipzig 1890, p. 46, l. 913—938. There we find Kāṣṭor Maššū (= Mārīn) followed immediately by Kāṣṭor Tūrādān (l. 914); it is very natural to amend this name with Hoffmann in Gelen (p. 159—159) to Tespādān = Tūr 'Abdin. Here we may point out that of the Roman forts of Mesopotamia one group were near the Tigris and the others on Tūr 'Abdin; cf. V. Chapot, La frontière de l’Euphrate, Paris 1907, p. 322. In the Syriac Lives of Saints above mentioned the time of Julian there is a reference to the building of two large fortresses in the region of Tūr 'Abdin.
the history of Tür 'Abdin in the xvi. century, especially for the period of Timur's campaigns, is contained in a continuation of the Chronicon Syriacum (of profane history) of Barhebræus (Aham 7-Eragd) by anonymous monks (one of whom belonged to a monastery in BIasa)hin); see the edition by O. Behnisch, in Revue d'histoire des religions, ed.: O. Behnisch, Berlin 1858; cf. also Beuastar, Gesch. der syrisch. Literatur, Berne 1822, p. 338. In the middle ages and down to the present day the history of the Kunday tribes in Tür 'Abdin and the country round it is of importance. The history of the Kunday dynasties of Djastrat b. 'Omar and Hisn Kaïfa is of special importance in this connexion; cf. the account based on the Kunday chronicle (Makarmona) by Barth, in Stud. u. k. wis., vol. xxx., (1859), p. 217 sq.; see also the article KZ. In the redistribution of territory which followed the War, Tür 'Abdin was left to the Turks. In the administrative division of the Turkish empire as it existed down to the War, Tür 'Abdin belonged to the vilayet of Distubazar and to the sanjak of Mardin, which was divided into five kaşas: Mardin, Djiata, Midyat, 'Awine, and Nazifel; see Cünet, op. cit., p. 412, 496 sq. For the administrative division since 1921 and 1927 cf. 'Abd al-Kadir Sa'di, Yeni Turkiye Meclisleri Dijijah- 
nyus, Istanbul 1927, p. 174. In the early middle ages and the first centuries of Islam, Tür 'Abdin was probably inhabited almost entirely by Christian Syrians and Arabs. Later, more and more Muslims (mainly Kurds) settled there, so that with the gradual decline in the numbers of Christians, the result of frequent persecutions by the Muslims, the proportion increased more and more in favour of the latter down to the War. According to Cünet's statistics, not however, as reliable (op. cit., p. 412, 496 sq.), the sanjak of Mardin which in area is at least larger than Türk 'Abdin in the wider sense, had in 1890 in all 349,572 inhabitants, viz. 122,322 Muslims, 67,070 Christians, 1,500 Jews. 1,500 gypsies and 580 Jews; the Christians were thus a third of the whole population. In the two kaşas which are almost entirely within Türk 'Abdin, the kaşas of Midyat and that of 'Awine, Cünet (op. cit., p. 513, 517 sq.) gives the population in 1890 as 31,920 Christians and 37,712 Muslims. In the cašas of Midyat, the numbers were about equally balanced: 22,632 Muslims and 22,126 Christians. The present distribution of nationalities and creeds within Türk 'Abdin is not known. Ma'munian are however certain in an overwhelming majority, since the Christians suffered severely during and after the War; in particular many Armenians had to leave the country. When in a new persecution in 1924, the Patriarch of the Jacobite Church Ignatius Elias III., was driven from his residence in Dair Za'farun (east of Mardin), the bulk of his followers (3,000 migrated) with him to Syria; cf. H. C. Lake, Mevle und its Minorities, London 1925, p. 113. Christianity spread in Türk 'Abdin at a very early date. Edessa, which is quite near. At the Council of Chalcedon (451) among the six Mesopotamian bishops we find only one of Hisn Kaïfa, but not one of Isla as Noldeke assumed (Z. D. M. G., xxxvi., 219, note 2) on the authority of Manaf's statements in Concilior. . . . collectio, vol. 403; here Insula = Isla is, as the new edition in Schult- 

hess, Die syr. Kanaan im Syriam von Nisias bis Chalcedon (= Abh. d. G. Gesellschaft d. Wiss., N. Folge, vol. x., Nr. 2), p. 135, shows, a wrong reading. Since the time of the Christological quarrels, Türk 'Abdin has been the citadel of the Jacobites; nowhere do or did they exist in such solid masses as in these highlands and in Mardin and its vicinity. Türk 'Abdin proper originally seems to have been a single Jacobite bishopric; about 1089 it was divided into two dioceses, the bishops of which lived in Karpin and Hîh respectively. Later, in the xii. century, other sees were created in the chief towns of the district. In the middle of the xii. century, differences between the patriarchate of Mardin and the bishop of Safak (i.e. a bishop north of Mardin) led to a schism, in the course of which the bishops of Türk 'Abdin cast off the authority of the patriarch and chose the bishop of Safak as patriarch of Türk 'Abdin and Hisn Kaïfa. This split lasted for over a century, cf. theon Pogonon, op. cit., p. 45, 52-53, 73. Lists of the bishops of Hîh, Hisn Kaïfa and Karpin may be found e.g. in Wright, op. cit. (476), p. 132, 125 sq. In addition to Jacobites there were also in Türk 'Abdin in the middle ages, and even later, communities of Nestorians. The oldest monastery there, that of Mur Awez, was for long in their possession (see Pogonon, op. cit., p. 109). These Nestorians were won over to Rome in the xvi. and xvii. century and henceforth called themselves Chaldaens (Kaldans), as a religious community with their own ritual. The members of this so-called Chaldaen church settled in Türk 'Abdin have at their head two bishops (in Mardin and Djiata); according to a native Chaldaen cleric, they numbered in 1914, 5,000 souls; cf. Annuaire Pontificale Catholique, xvii. (1914), p. 502-511 and based on it Labeck, in Histor. polit. Blätter für das katholische Deutschland, vol. 154, Munich 1914, p. 92, 101-102. According to Cünet, there were in 1890 in Türk 'Abdin about 4,000 Syrians (Suryani), i.e. Jacobites in union with Rome, who were under Patriarch of Mardin and a bishop of Djiata. According to Cünet there were in the administrative district of Mardin also 28,666 Armenians, of whom the one half professed (i.e. converts to the Orthodox Church, the other in fairly equal proportions to the Roman Catholic and to the Protestant churches. The Armenian Protestant community is a creation of the activity of American missions. The prosperity caused by the civilising influence of the American missionaries, who had their main centres in Mardin and Midyat, spread practically over the whole of Türk 'Abdin but has ceased since the War; cf. on this American mission: Souchon, Révis etc., p. 404, 418, 424, 422-423. Finally Cünet gives from about 1890 as further Christian inhabitants of the sanjak of Mardin 6,730 Greeks (who had to leave the Turkish territory after the War) and 380 Jews. We may assume with certainty that before the War the Jacobites were the largest in numbers of the Christian communities in Türk 'Abdin proper, but we have no material available to enable us to make an approximate relative estimate of their numbers. Cünet's estimate (for the sanjak of Mardin!) which puts the Jacobites at 15,754 only half of that of the settled Armenians, is obviously based on incorrect premises and seems unreliable. In 1838 Southgate (see op. cit., li. 268, 275) estimated the number of Jacobites (from information given him by the Patriarch of the day) at 6,000 families.
or 60—70 villages with populations of 50—69 families. In the mountains, i.e. in Tür 'Abdin proper, according to him there were 30,000 Jacobites, to which were to be added 5,000 settlers in the vicinity of the monasteries; in Mardin there were 2,000, Jacobite Christians in the immediate neighborhood of Mardin and in the plain of Sinjar 6,000. Badger who visited Tür 'Abdin in 1850 put the number of Jacobite villages there at 150 (see Badger, The Nestorians etc., l. 63). That the number of Jacobites of Tür 'Abdin from the time of Badger and Southgate till the beginning of the War steadily if slowly decreased there is no reason to doubt.

The Muslim part of the population of Tür 'Abdin consists mainly of Kurdu. They have spread more and more widely in the heart of Tür 'Abdin in recent centuries and the Christian peasants with whom they are constantly warring are being driven more and more from the southern slopes of the mountains towards the plains. On the constant state of civil war among the people of the villages of Tür 'Abdin see Poggen's observations, op. cit., p. 110-111. For Kurdu tribes or families settling within the region of Tür 'Abdin cf. Niebuhr, op. cit., ii. 358; Lersch, Forschungen über die Kurden und iranischen Nordchaldäer, St. Petersburg 1857-1858, vol. ii. (Glossary); Schlaffi, op. cit., p. 49-51. Lists of tribes in Prym and Socin, Der neue-sozialeische Dialekt des Tür 'Abdin, ii. 416-418 and Prym and Socin, Kurdische Sammlungen, ii. 275-284; Sachau, Reise, p. 387; Sykes, op. cit., p. 578 (under No. 15); see also above, vol. ii. 1132, 1141, 1144. The followers of the Yazidi religion in Tür 'Abdin are also Kurds but their numbers are insignificant. The most important Yazidi tribe there is called Djuokit (Teftekit); see Niebuhr, op. cit.; Prym and Socin, Dialekten des Tür 'Abdin, ii. 379; Sachau, Reise etc., p. 387; Mentzel in Grothe, Meine Vorderasiatischen Expedition, Leipzig 1911, I, p. cxvi.

Arab Beduins also encamp occasionally in Tür 'Abdin especially on its southern outskirts; for the names of some of them see Taylor, op. cit., p. 54-55 and M. v. Oppenheim, op. cit., ii. 68. A special position is occupied by the large tribe of the Melkibilin (Muhamelentsa) whom we find as early as the already mentioned anonymous continuation of the Chronicles of Barhebraeus (year 1407); see Behnsch's edition, p. 6, 9-10.

The result of the intermarriage of Arabs and Kurds (with Arab influence predominant) and are said to have renounced Christianity over 300 years ago. They dwell mainly in the kaşaf of Awine, the part of Tür 'Abdin running west of Mardin to the Tigris; on this see Niebuhr, loc. cit.; Z.D.M.G., i., 591; Sachau, Reise, p. 421; Sykes, op. cit., p. 356, 378.

Three languages are spoken in Tür 'Abdin: Kurdish, Syriac and Arabic. They have all strongly influenced each other. The most widely influenced is Kurdish, which all the Christians also understand and speak in addition to Syriac. The Kurdist dialect spoken in the northern and western branch of the Kurdist dialect, which is now better known from the investigations of Lersch, Prym and Socin, and Makas (see above; p. 1152).

See especially Prym and Socin, Kurdische Forschungen, Erzählungen und Lieder im Dialekte des Tür 'Abdin und der Behdin, 2 parts (text and transl.), St. Petersburg 1857-1890. The Jacobites, like most of the other Christians of Tür 'Abdin (especially the Kadzhit), use among themselves a peculiar Syriac dialect, usually called briefly Törani, "The language of Tör". It differs very much from the modern Syriac idiom spoken in the east (in the district of Urmiia and Miskel and in eastern Kurdistan) by the Nestorians and Chaldeans (Kadzhit). The Jacobite modern Syriac (or modern Jacobite) is much closer than this dialect to Eddessene, i.e. to the Syriac literary language. It cannot however be said to be derived from this without further enquiry, but is to be traced to an older form of the language which was closely related to Eddessene. Törani texts of importance for our knowledge of the language have been collected by Prym and Socin and also by Kaufmann. On texts taken down by Prym and Socin in 1869 from the mouth of a Midyat man see Prym and Socin, Der neusyr. Dialekt des Tür 'Abdin, 2 parts (text and transl.), Göttingen 1881; cf. thereon the important review by Noldeke, in: Z.D.M.G., xxxvi. 218-235. Sachau through the intermediacy of the American mission got specimens taken down in Törani by a Syrian priest; this MSS. material is now in the Berlin State Library, see Sachau, Katalog der syrischen Handschriften, p. 812-816 (No. 278-292). Of these so far only one text (No. 290, the story of the wise Hallcar) has been published, namely by Lähnatski, in Die neusyrischen Handschriften der Kgl. Bibliothek zu Berlin, Leipzig 1896, vol. i., p. 1-77 (text) and vol. ii., p. 1-41 (transl.). The Arabic texts collected by Parisot in 1867 from Tür 'Abdin (A. Parisot, Contribution à l'étude du dialecte norvegien du Tour Abdin, in Act. du 1er Congrès Int. des Orientalistes, Paris 1897, vol. iv., p. 179-198) differ in language considerably from those collected by Sachau and Prym and Socin. Do we perhaps have here another modern Syriac local dialect? A. Siegel has prepared an excellent Laut- und Formenlehre des norweh. Dialektes des Tür 'Abdin, Hannover 1925, based mainly on the texts published by Prym and Socin; cf. thereon Littmann's review in: O.L.E.Z., xxix., 1925, col. 1003-1008. Of other works, the grammatical and lexicographical sketch of Törani given by Noldeke, in Z.D.M.G., xxxvi. 218 ff., should also be noted; cf. also Guild's observations, op. cit., xxvii. 294-301. On the boundaries within which the modern Jacobite dialect is spoken cf. Prym and Socin, Der Neusyr. Dialekten des Tür 'Abdin, vol. i., p. vi.-vii.; ibid., p. vii. (repeated in Z.D.M.G., xxxvi. 255), and Socau, Reise, p. 412-413 a list is given of the localities in which at the present day (or rather 1870 and 1880) Törani is still spoken. There are also Syrian villages in Tür 'Abdin where Aramaic is no longer spoken but only Kurdish.

Araiche is understood by the majority of the inhabitants of the larger villages. It is more frequently spoken in the south towards the Mesopotamian plains and particularly in the region of Mardin. The dialect of Mardin, which shows many peculiarities, belongs to the Tigris groups of the dialects of Mesopotamia (cf. above p. 539). It is closely related to the Arable spoken around Mysel. Cf. Socin, Der arab. Dialekten von Mysel und Mardin (a collection of texts), in Z.D.M.G., xxxvi., 1882, p. 1-53, 328-377; xxvii., 1883, p. 188-222 (also separately, Leipzig 1904).

The number of villages is the sandjak of Mardin, which however includes territory not in Tür 'Abdin, is given by Cuihn (p. 412, 496) as
1,052; of these 410 are in the ηαδή of Μίδιατ and 97 in that of 'Awnta. A manuscript Syrian chronicle (according to Frym and Socin, De narratione, Dict. etc., i. p. iii.) estimates the number of villages in Tür 'Abdin at 243. In Z. D. M. G., xxv, 258—269, Socin gives a list of 168 names; cf. also the list of places in Frym and Socin, op. cit., ii. 416—418 and in Frym and Socin, Kreuzige Sammung, ii. 275—284. One should also consult the geographical indices and to the catalogues of the Syriac manuscripts, especially Wright, Catalog of the Syrian Manuscripts in the British Museum, London 1870, p. 1239 sq.; Sachau, Vorlesungen über die syrisch. Hist. der Kgl. Bibliothek in Berlin, Berlin 1889, p. 923 sq.; Payne Smith, Catalog. codic. bibl. Bodleiana, vol. vi., Oxford 1864, p. 664 sq. and Zoltenberg, Catal. des mss. syriques... de la Bibliothèque nationale, Paris 1874, p. 230 sq. The number of Syrian villages in Tür 'Abdin has already been mentioned; most places have a mixture of nationalities and religions, i.e. have Musulim (Kurd) as well as Christian (Jacobite, Aramian etc.) elements in their population. In earlier times Tür 'Abdin must have been better cultivated and more thickly populated; this is shown by the numerous ruins that exist.

For the larger towns on the edge of Tür 'Abdin like Märdin (Märdlin), Hîjn Kâfî, Djazîrâb, Omar and Naqûf see the special articles. The capital of (inner) Tür 'Abdin proper is Mîdîyat (Syriac: Midyat), which lies practically in the centre in a beautiful plain surrounded by hills (4,400 feet above sea-level) and about 41° 25' E. Long. and 37° 25' N. Lat. This very old place, already mentioned in the early Assyrian inscriptions (at Malatîya; see Streck, Z.A., xiii. 98; xiv. 169; xiv. 249) lies at the intersection of two great roads which cross Tür 'Abdin from North to South (Naqûf—Hîjn Kâfî) and from east to west (Djazîrâb—Märdin). Before the War, Mîdîyat is said to have had an exclusively Christian (mainly Jacobite) population of about 5,000.

Of the other larger places in Tür 'Abdin may be mentioned: Szawr (15 miles N.E. of Märdin), the capital of the ηαδή of 'Awnta (see above). East of it lies the village of Kûllûti and somewhat S.E. of the latter Erbbî (Kurdish: Habbî); cf. above ii. p. 533 and Frym and Socin, Kreuzige Sammung, ii. 206, 207; North of Mîdîyat, halfway between it and Hîjn Kâfî, is Kefr Dîbûz (Kurdish: Kandîs), a fairly large Kurd village, in the neighbourhood of which is the Muslim place of pilgrimage Tell 'Abîd (Ab-, which Rawlinson wished to identify with the old Armenian royal city of Tigranocerta (see Sachau, Reise, p. 415 sq.; Lehmann-Haupt, op. cit., i. 372—373, 375 sq.) Twelve miles north of Mîdîyat is the village of Hibgi with many ruins, which testify to its former importance. We may also mention Zâr and 'Arâs, both N.W. of Hâb, one and a half and three hours' journey respectively, and twelve miles S.E. of Hâb, the large village of Mîdîd. Two hours west of the latter is the large Christian village of Bășebrîna (Old Syriac: Bâšî-Sûbîrna) which plays an important part in the ecclesiastical history of Tür 'Abdin, one miles S.E. of Märdin on the S.W. spurs of Tür 'Abdin lie the great and impressive ruins of the town of Dâtî-ibuilt by Anastasius I (491—518) and later refounded by Justinius I (527—565) (also called from its founder Anastasopolis); its name is still borne by an adjoining village. On the ruins of Dâtî cf. Suchau, Reise, p. 294—295, and especially Fresnay, op. cit., p. 44—49 (with plates 53—61).

Tür 'Abdin plays a very important part in the history of eastern monachism. According to a tradition in Nestorian circles, St. Eugenius came from Egypt in the fourth century and founded a monastery in the southern part of Tür 'Abdin, and thus laid the foundation of the monastic system which developed to such an extent in Mesopotamia. St. Eugenius, who had many followers, is said after his death in 363 to have been buried in the monastery built by him. This is not the place to go into the question of the truth of the Syriac legend of St. Eugenius; it may be sufficient to refer to the serious objections raised to it by Labourt, in Le Christianisme dans l'empire perse sous la dynastie Sassanide, Paris 1904, p. 302 sq.; cf. also Baumstark, Gesch. d. syrisch. Liter., Bonn 1922, p. 235—236. In any case, it is certain that in the middle ages Tür 'Abdin became a regular monastic citadel like an ancient Mount Athos. When Neubauer (loc. cit.) is told that there are over 70 ruined monasteries in this mountain land one need not think this is an exaggeration. At the present day, Tür 'Abdin is still full of remains of old monasteries. Only a few are in good repair and still inhabited by monks. Great churches, for the most part of the fifth—seventh centuries, are still to be seen. These monuments of the mediæval ecclesiastical architecture of the east are of considerable importance for the history of Christian art. They have been studied recently by different investigators, notably Pognon, G. L. Bell, Fresnay and Guéry; for the literature see the Bibl. Pognon has earned special praise for collecting the numerous Syrian inscriptions on the churches and monasteries visited by him.

Strzygowski, Guéry and Herrfeld have devoted special attention to the dates and appreciation as documents of the history of art of the buildings of Tür 'Abdin; cf. M. v. Berchem and Strzygowski, Anst. Heidelberg 1910, p. 269—273, 293; Guéry, in Rept. d. Kommission für Vereinigung, xxvii., 1916, p. 215—221, and in Sarre-Herfeld, op. cit., i. (4. Bibl.), ii. 45—336; Herrfeld, in L. Z. v., 1911, p. 402 sq., iv. 415 and in Sarre-Herfeld, op. cit., ii. 277, 296, 298—299, 336, 345. Strzygowski's thesis that the art of the Mesopotamian monasteries is older than that of Syria and that Mesopotamia, especially Tür 'Abdin, and not Egypt, is the cradle of monasticism, has been rejected, in my view on good grounds, by Guéry and Herrfeld, who champion the later date of the Mesopotamian buildings compared with the older Syrian; cf. also Becker's remarks (Jl., iii. 396) against the assumption of priority of Mesopotamian monarchism.

The mother-house of all the Mesopotamian monasteries of Tür 'Abdin, the already mentioned Mar Awqün (Kurd.: Marîbek), is 18 miles N.E. of Märdin, i.e. 30° 30' E. Long. and 30° 37' N. Lat. (cf. the cliffs of the southern declivities of the plateau. In the middle ages it was the headquarters of the western Nestorians and is now inhabited by Jacobite monks. Half-an-hour's journey from Mar Awqün is another old monastery, Mrî Yûhannî, founded by a disciple of St. Eugenius and bearing his name (cf. him the cf. the work by Vigh, Stud. no. 2 quoted above ii., p. 304).

In the middle ages one of the most important monasteries of Tür 'Abdin was the Monastery of
Abraham, frequently referred to in Syrian literature briefly as "the great monastery (on Mount Ila);" cf. e.g. the indices to Chabot's edition of 'Al-Bidayat's work just mentioned. Its founder was the celebrated creator of definitely Nestorian monasticism, Abraham of Kaskar (d. 588); on him see vol. II, p. 301a. G. Hoffmann (op. cit., p. 170 sq.) wished to identify this monastery with the monastery in ruins at Mar Bakal (= Mar Bish, 3 miles S. W. of Mar Awgen) mentioned by Taylor. This is not possible: we must rather identify the monastery of Abraham with Der Mar Braham, visited by Hinrichs on his journey in 1911; see his notes in Bell, Churches and Monasteries of 'Urb 'Abdin, Heidelberg 1913, p. 49-50 or p. 105-106.

At the present day the principal monastery of 'Urb 'Abdin and the greatest centre of pilgrimage for the Jacobites is now the monastery of Karmin (Old Syr.: Karjamn), about twelve miles S.E. of Midyat. This coenobium, perhaps the most celebrated of the monasteries in Asia, was in the middle ages one of the richest and most venerated in the whole of the East. In its greatest days it held 350 monks, while at the present day there are only about a dozen there. It is said to have been founded in 599 under Arcadian; its founders are said to have been St. Samuel (c. 406) and Simeon (d. 433). It is still usually called among Syrians Mar Gabriel after its great Abbot, St. Gabriel (d. 667). The Muslims and Greeks usually call it Der 'Amr (in travellers we also find Der Amar and quite wrongly also Der el-Amr) = Dalr 'Umur, the monastery of Omar. The caliph Omar at the time of the Arab invasion is said to have given the Abbot rights of jurisdiction over all Christians in the country. In Karmin are three churches, i.e. two, in addition to the principal called after St. Gabriel, which are dedicated to the Virgin and to the Forty Martyrs. The structure of the church of St. Gabriel, perhaps the oldest in the country, is typical of the monastic churches of 'Urb 'Abdin. The village of Karmin is built around the site of another monastery, that of St. Simeon. For the history of Karmin cf. the essay by Nau, in Acta XLIII Congr. Internat. des Orient., vol. II., Paris 1906, p. 72 sq. and the Syrian chronicler discussed by Baumstark, op. cit., p. 273 sq.

Among the oldest churches in 'Urb 'Abdin is that of Mar Kyriakos in Arnà and that of Mar 'Azzariel in Kaf Zeh (1½ hours S.E. of Arnà) stylistically they are closely connected. According to Geyer, the village of Ilbû is the archaeological centre of 'Urb 'Abdin. In it are two very interesting old churches: Mar Sàvâ (Sàlìkh) and that of the Virgin, the al-'Adnà, which is very rich in ornament, and has come down to us practically uninjured from the time it was built. Among the latest of the mediaeval churches is that of Mar Yûghîb in Sàlìkh; this monastery became one of the most important in the country when it became the residence of a separate patriarch for 'Urb 'Abdin.

We may further mention that ruins of monasteries and churches, e.g. op. cit., p. 116 mention twenty -- are particularly numerous in Bashêrin (cf. above); but they are mainly of more recent origin. In conclusion we may just mention the famous monastery of Der el-Za'n-fàrûn (one hour east of Marûn) which till 1924 was the residence of the Jacobite patriarch; he now lives in Aleppo; cf. on it especially Petermann, op. cit., ii. 343 sq.; Sachau, Reiss, p. 405 sq.; Parry (who stayed six months in it), op. cit., p. 153-154 and Preusser, op. cit., p. 49-53 (with plates 62-65).

As already mentioned, there was in the area of 'Urb 'Abdin in Roman Byzantine times a large number of forts which were mainly intended to defend the Roman frontier against Persia. Ruins of such citadels may be seen in several places, for example the Palaces of Byzantine writers is probably identical with the modern Kafat 'Uldûm 'Taiî (about three hours' journey south of Bâsebirna); cf. Weisbach in Pauly-Wissowa, op. cit., 2nd ser., i. 13. Another citadel frequently mentioned in the classics, Sarbân (the forms Sírûa and Sírûnúma also handed down are probably corruptions), is probably to be located on the site of the modern Sûnûma (cf. Weisbach, op. cit., 2nd ser., i. 2435). On other celebrated citadels, like the "new citadel" (Arab. al-Kafû al-Djâlid) apparently the modern Kafat 'Uldûm 'Taiî, and the citadel of Halûmûn (Syr. Husûn al-Halûmûn), often mentioned in Syrian or Arabic sources, which must have stood near Bâsebirna, see Geyer in Petersmann's Mittell., vol. 62 (1916), p. 297. On the citadel of Fînik on the north bank of the Tigris (above Diabîra) which is mentioned as early as late classical writers (as Théod., Phoenice), and has played a notable part in the history of the Kurds (cf. above, i., p. 1130) see Tuch, in Z.D.M.G., i. 57-61; M. Hartmann, op. cit. (see Bihn.), Index (v. E.).

TUR 'ABDIN — TURKAHAN BEG.

On cartography cf. the notes by R. Kiærup in M. v. Oppenheim, Von Mittelalter zum Fr"uhesten Gek, Berlin 1900, II. 410—411. The map of 'Tur 'Abdin by H. Kreyberg appended to Socin's article in the Z. d. G. M. is now practically obsolete and we have much fuller and better material available. The best maps of this district now are: R. Kiærup (1893), Karte von Syrien und Mesopotamien (1:850,000), east sheet prepared by R. Kiærup in 1893 which accompanies M. v. Oppenheim's book; R. Kiærup, Karte von Kleinasien (1:400,000), Berlin 1914, sheet Diarbekir and Néstön. Maassouli's map: Eastern Turkey in Asia (1:250,000), London, War Office (1903), sheet 25 (Mardin) and 26 (Bohban-Jeair) should also be mentioned. A special map of the Umgebung von Mardin und Néstön (1:200,000) was prepared in 1918 by the Kartographische Abteilung der preussischen Landesaufnahme in Berlin. (M. Steck).

TURKAHAN BEG, an Ottoman general, conqueror of Thessaly and warden of the marches. The hitherto obscure origin of Turkahin Beg is now explained in his last will and testament of Djamal'din 1850 = August 1446 (in a certificate of Greek translation in Epam. G. Pharaklisde, Il. d'Adam, Voi. 1926, p. 250, where he calls himself son of the famous Paş trava Vigit Beg ("("7evv 2ev a6xé rpa6v Xadr Bep). Accordingly, his father was the well known Paş trava Vigit Beg (called by the Serbs and Italians Passythus, Bassilus etc.; cf. C. J. Jireček, Staats- und Gesell- schaft im mittelalterlichen Serbien, iv. 7, note 5) who conquered Ustik (Skopje, on June 6, 1392) and governed a part of Bosnia after 1391 (1390) in the modern southern Serbia as Ottoman warden of the marches and must have died about 1415 in Ustik. There his tomb is still shown (tubre; cf. Gliska Elemeri, Torski spomenici u Skoplj, Skopje 1927, p. 5 with a picture). There is no support for the statement of the Sadi'il-i seghlini, i. 57 that he did not die till 835 (1431); nor for the statement that the grand vizier Işah Paşa had been his "slave" (hale). This is obviously due to confusion with Işah Beg, the first governor of Bosnia, whose "lord" (rimesli) he is called in a curious ghazal in the Altipan, anonymous Chan, ed. F. Giese, p. 28, 3 (which is probably followed by Şokoldah, T'ra (h) p. 52). Nor was Vigit Beg the son of Işah Beg, as has been stated in C. J. Jireček, Geschichte der Serben, ii. 127 (probably following Lennelius, Hist. Mus., Turc., p. 315, 13), but obviously his father, as is evident beyond doubt from the Arabic inscription on the mosque of Ghard Işah Beg at Skopje of the year 842 (1438—1439) (cf. the text in Elemeri, op. cit., p. 11 infra). When then Işah Beg appears in C. Trubelba, Turke-slovenski spomenici duhovnike arhivarje (Sarajevo 1911), p. 200, as the son of Paşa Vigit Beg ("Pašati- beg"), this is quite correct although his epithet there, Hrančić, is an unnecessary slavisation (cf. p. 11 infra). It is therefore evident that Işah Beg and Turkahin Beg were sons of Paşa Vigit Beg, i.e. were brothers. We do not know when and where Turkahin was born. The meaning of the name also is uncertain, if it is not to be connected with Türkahin (cf. in Astrakhan) mentioned in Ili Bajilli, II. 410; its pronunciation is assured by the Byzantine form Tawatak, G. Phrnatzes, Duca, Chalcocodyles, in the Chronicon breve.
Nothing is known of the early career of Turakhān Beg. His name is found for the first time in May 1423, when he appeared in command of the cavalry in the Peloponnese, broke through the ruined trenches of the Isthmus at Hexamilia, took most of the defences recently restored by Emperor Manuel on this tongue of land and, meeting no resistance, ravaged the interior of the country. He attacked a number of Byzantine towns like Mistra, Leonidai, Gardikli, Dahi (cf. Chronicon breve, in the Bonn edition of Ducas, p. 199) and subdued the Peloponnese for the Ottomans as far as the lands held by the Venetians. This whole campaign (cf. Phrantzes, p. 177; Chalcocodyles, p. 235) was most probably intended as a reconnoissance against Venice. Soon afterwards Turakhān appeared, if Ducas reports correctly, with his cavalry on the Black Sea (p. 50, 4). He also took the field against the Albanians and inflicted a decisive defeat on them (cf. Chalcocodyles, p. 239, 252, 4) and reappeared in the Peloponnese, where from Naupaktos he prevented the despot Constantine from taking the town of Patras (Phrantzes, p. 150, 3). At the end of 1431 he again destroyed the walls of the Isthmus of Corinth, besieged Thebes in the summer of 1435 and conquered it in a few days (cf. Phrantzes, p. 157, 12 and 159, 17). At this time the Byzantine historian Georgios Phrantzes made his acquaintance in Thebes (p. 160, 3 97). In the beginning of Nov. 1443, Turakhān Beg commanded one of the Ottoman corps in the battle against John Hunyadi. His peculiar conduct in the battle of Issád (cf. Atthaman, Chron., ed. Giese, p. 58, transal. p. 90) was held to be responsible for the defeat (cf. Kata, xiii. 253: Turakhān; Chalcocodyles, p. 315) and he was sent in custody to the state prison of Bedrewi Çarşı at Ṭozāt. Nothing is recorded of the next ten years of his life. In the early days of October 1453, Sultan Muḥammad II sent Turakhān with his two sons Ahmad and ʿOmar with a large force to the Peloponnese, where he again took the outer defences of the Isthmus, invaded Arcadia, plundering and burning, and ravaged and burned the whole Gulf of Messene passing via Ithóme (i.e. Messene). When the difficulties of communication made it necessary to divide his army, his son Ahmad was captured in the pass of Derenaziki between Myrcane and Corinth by the brother-in-law of Mattheus Azanès, the despot Demetrius of Sparta (cf. Phrantzes, p. 235 and W. Miller, The Latin in the Levant, London 1908, p. 426), but was liberated in December 1454 by his brother ʿOmar (ibid., p. 383, 15 97). In October 1455 Turakhān appeared with his sons in Adrianople (Phrantzes, p. 385, 1 97). He died in the middle of 1456, probably at a great age (Phrantzes, p. 386, 7). His official residence as governor was at Larisa in Thessaly (Turkish: Vehşeh-ı Fanar; q.v.), the lands of which he held as a fief. There he built a mosque and numerous other buildings for charitable purposes; even a Christian church, in Tirnovo (Greek Tyrnavos) not far from Larisa, which is still standing, was built by him. His tomb, a chapel-like türbe, is in Larisa on the north-east edge of the town. The cemetery around it with a monastery has now disappeared. Turakhān Beg had two sons, Ahmad and ʿOmar, who accompanied his father on his campaigns. ʿOmar, who appears as Ottoman warden of the marches in the Peloponnese, while his brother Ahmad succeeded his father in Thessaly, was left in 1456 by Muḥammad II in the Peloponnese with an army (Phrantzes, p. 388, 6197); in 1452 and 1456 captured the country round Naupaktos and in 1457 after an initial reverse inflicted a defeat on the Venetians (Phrantzes, p. 425, 2); a fuller account of ʿOmar, ʿAkāqē (Phrantzes always writes ʿAkāqē, is given by Chalcocodyles, cf. the Index s.v. Omorēs). On the other life of the two brothers, of whom Ahmad, like his father, had made the pilgrimage,
not much is known. Omar seems to have been the more active of the two. In 1477 he fought
on the Isoro against the Venetians (cf. J. von
Hammer, G. O. R., ii. 351), next year defeated the
Albanians (ibid., ii. 157), and was still alive in
1484, as his will dated Muḥarram 889 (February
1484), shows (cf. E. G. Pharmacides, op. cit.,
p. 287—303 or 307—310). Omar Beg had two
sons, one of whom, called Haṣān Beg, is known
from his will written in Shawwāl 397 (May 1531; cf.
Pharmacides, p. 310 seq.), while the other, Idrīs
Beg, made a name in his day as a poet and ex-
tcellent translator of Hāfīz's Shāhāna w Sīraha
and Ladih w-Maqīnā into Turkish (cf. Seht, Tashkirt,
p. 36 seq.). The family of Turkanān-oghlu, which
was established around Larisa and owned extensive
estates until quite modern times, later played no
important part in history. A certain Fakhr Pasha,
recorded as a late descendant of Turkanān Beg,
by his exertions as governor of Rum-eli made his
name hated; he was beheaded in the court of the
Serai in Stambohl at the age of 70 in March
1643 (cf. J. von Hammer, G. O. R., p. 322 from Naṅγu,
in 1842 saw "at the chief mosque of Larisa a
biography of Turkanān-Beg preserved there" (cf.
Fragmente aus dem Orient, 1877, p. 351 seq.)
but this seems to have since disappeared (like the
MS. biography of the Ereucos-oghlu [q.v.]
mentioned by Bejournj, Tableau du commerce de
la Grèce, i. 117). The genealogical table on p. 877
gives a conspectus of the descendants of Paça
Yigıt Beg, the real founder of this Ottoman noble
family.

Bibliography: D. Ursuhr, Spirit of the
East, London 1858, vol. 1.; cf. the German
transl. by F. G. Buck, Stuttgart and Tubingen
1839, i. 226 seq., from an Arabic biography
of T. and his family preserved in the public library
at Tyrnacos in Thessaly. (F. BADEKIN)

Turān (or Tabarān), the old name of a
district in Balūchestān.

According to Tabari, i. 890, the kings of Turān
and of Makhūn (Makrūn) submitted to the Sasanian
Ardašir (224—241). The Parkinson inscription only
mentions the Makrūn-ghāz. Hosh ended, Parkinson
p. 38, thinks that these princes at first owned the
suzerainty of the Sāskas and their submission to
Ardašir was the result of the conquest of Sabastān
(=Satan) by this monarch.

Balūchir does not mention al-Turān. According
to one of his sources, Ḥosaynî [q.v.] appointed
Ṣeht b. Aslam to Makrūn and "all (that) frontier",
Ispāhān, p. 171, and Ibn Hawkal, p. 226, among
the inhabited places in Turān mention Moḩānī (?),
Kūshkān, Sūra (Shura) and Kuṣhtar (or Kuṣhtar).
Bibliotheca Isippiana, p. 322, says that Turān is a valley
with a fortified town (ṣaḥrā) also called al-Turān
and in its centre is a fortress (baṣm) commanded
by an ignorant Baytān. Ibn Hawkal, p. 232—233,
maintains Kuṭār separately from the ṣaḥrā of the
same name. Kuṭār was the town (commercial ?)
of Turān possessing a district and several towns.
A certain Mughir (or Muṭṭən b. Ḍahmān) had seized
Kuṭār and only recognised the direct authority
of the Aḥṣafid caliph.

The statements in Idris, i. 166, 177, confuse
the situation, for he gives the name al-Tubārān to
the station in Makrūn which Ibn Khurṣidībhīlī,
p. 55, calls al-Tubārān [ten farakhah S. E. of Fakhrāj],
on the river which is now called Sardas and flows

into the sea near Gwatūr, but then associates
Kūshkān and Kuṭār (towns in the district of
Kūshk) with this Ṭabārān. On the other hand,
he places Turān 4 days' journey from Kuṭār, in
the direction of Masmāl, i.e., to the north. At the
site of Kuṭār [q.v.] is known (85 miles S. of Kalāt,
at a height of 2,200 feet; cf. the article Baha'dīrān);
Ṭabārān (the town) must be located at Kalāt.
The town of Kuṭār, six farakhahs (more accurately 5
marghal from Kuṭār), is outside of Turān and
The state of Kuṭār, is the capital of the district of the Turān
is a ford of the river, at the site of Kuṭār, the road to the north
is a height of 314 feet above sea level.

The position of Kuṭār, the residence of the
already mentioned Muṭṭ̣ən b. Ḍahmān (chief of Turān
according to Ispāhān, or of Kuṭār, according
to Ibn Hawkal), is unknown. Marmar, op. cit., p. 109,
275—276, connects Kūshkān with Kuṭār (cf.
Baha'dīrān, p. 432) and seeks it at Kalāt. In this case,
Kūshkān = the ṣaḥrā of al-Turān. The land between
Kūshkān and Kuṭār, inhabited by Badshahs and
possessing vines, bore the name of its chief Ayīl
(or Ulū)?

Ṭabārān, iii. 557, reckons Ṭabārān (the ṣaḥrā of
which is Kuṭār and which has several ṣaḥarī̄
among the Timūrids of Mard). He also mentions
a ṣaḥrā of Turān in Māzān and a village of
Ṭabārān belonging to Harāz.

The Arabs write Turān with Ṭ, which may
represent some local assimilation of ṭ. In principle
there is nothing to object to in the connection of
Turān with Turān but it would be unwise to go
beyond stating the similarity of the names. The
connection is still weaker if we connect Turān with
Ṭabārān and Tabarān.

Bibliography: Tousmeh, Zur. hist.
Topp. Persien I. 56, thinks the name Turān
may come from the Iranian term Turān, which
means "enemy, non-Iranian countries"; Marmar,
Baha'dīrān, p. 31—33, 187, 190; Le Strange, The
Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 332; Hsenig,
Völkerchroniken in Iran, Mitt. d. Anntk. Geol.
Wien, xxxvii., 1916, p. 200, seeks the real Turān
not in Turkestan but in Turān of Kuṭār (inhabited
by the ancestors of the Baha'dīrī of our
day). (V. MARMAR)

Turān, an Iranian term applied to the
country to the north-east of Iran. The
form of the name is not earlier than the Middle
Persian period. The suffix -ša is used to form
both patronymics (Paštāna) and the names of
countries (Gēlān, Dailamān) (cf. Grundr. d. Iran.
Fah., i, ii, p. 176; Solmaxan, ibid., i, p. 280
expresses doubts as to whether Ṭar is from the
geografic plural -šan).

Three questions are raised by the name Turān: 1. its origin, 2. its later acceptance, which identifies
Turān with the "land of the Turān", 3. its modern
geographical, linguistic and political applications.

The Turān. In the Iranian sphere, the element
Ṭar of Turān has analogies in the Avestan Turān
(Tur). In the parts preserved of the Avesta, we
have 1. Turān, the father of two pious individuals,
who bear the Iranian names of Arāyāshān and
Thrītān but of whom nothing more is known (Yaqūt,
113—123), 2. the people called Turān or Turān,
probably nomads (Yaqūt, xvii, 55: "aus-aspā "having
swift steeds") [The adjective from Turān, with
euphony, is Māzān].
The Tûrans are several times represented as enemies of the Iranians and of the true religion. (cf. Yaghî, xvili. 55 where they pursue Ashî waqfîl). A subdivision (I) of the Tûrans is called Dûn (Yaghî, xvili. 55—56), which may be connected with the Sanskrit dûnant "demon". A particularly hateful figure is that of the "Tûryan brigand" Fûranas (= Afûnasbi), whose fruitless attempts to seize the royal power (aravâna) are related at length in Yaghî, xix. 56—64. But the same Yaghî, xix. 93, admits that the aravâna had once been in the possession of Fûranas, when he played the part of defender of Iran against the tyrant Zainig. The hostility to Fûranas might therefore have political roots.

Quite a number of passages reveal that there were pious people among the Tûra. The family of the Tûryan Frûnna is particularly praised in a very early passage in the Gâthas (Yâna, xvi. 12). The passage in Yaghî, xiii. 143 is very well known: "we sacrifice to the frûnasbi of the pious men and the pious women of the Aryan (Iranian), Tûra, Sainînya, Sînînya and Dâhîna lands." An indirect indication of the Tûra is in Yaghî, xvi. 57, where the descendents of Yâvasaka, lieutenant of Fûranas (Shâh-šmûn), ed. Vuillers, i. 248, 264: Wêsa), are located at the pass of Xvêlîh-sûka, situated "very high" in Kânsa (= Bûkhârâ; cf. Marqart, Kommen, p. 196; in Chinese: Kâng = Samarqand). On the other hand, the name of the canton Tur, which the Armenian translator of Ptolemys mentions in Kfhûrîm (ed. Soukry, § 34; cf. below), is very significant.

Several hypotheses have been put forward regarding the ethnic character of the Tûra. Geiger, Ostv. Kultur, p. 194, thought that this term referred to all the peoples of the steppes without distinction of race ("eine Kollektivbezeichnung... der keine ethnographische Trennung bedeutet, sondern die Steppenvolker der Ebenen vom Kaspiischen bis zu den सर und darüber hinaus umfasst""). Geiger thought it possible that there were Tûra elements among the Tûra ("Überreste einer altrussischen Urbewahrung")! It should however be evident from Geigers attempt (p. 198) to find the Hunns among the Tûra is now rejected (huma, *son, descendant*; Bartholomae, Alter. Wörterb., col. 1831).

The term dûn (cf. above) may also have a non-ethnic significance and mean the non-Mazdaean Tûra ("demon") [Christensen (1928) has revived Geigers thesis; he supposes that Tûra was "originally the designation of the nomad peoples, whether they were of Iranian race or not"). On the other hand, Blochet, in his article "Le nom des Turks dans l'Avesta" supports the popular etymology Tûra = Turk and seeks to explain the names of the Tûryan Dûn, Kara Abyana and Vara Abyana, by the Turkish words hara "black" and gür (?) "clever": "the name Turk, or at least the root from which it comes [sic!], was in existence at a quite long before the sixth century". In this connection it may be recalled that whatever may be the etymology of the name Turk (cf. òrk-örük, "force, power"; F. W. K. Müller, Ugarita, ii. 101: òrkömen, "family"); Kashghar, l. 308), the name Tûra is rapidly explained in Iranian as "courageous", "brave"; cf. òrî in Persian and in Kurdish and the significant allusion of Firdawsi to the character of Tûr, son of Farûnî. It is true that the etymology of Kara and Vara is still obscure and that, ac-
other in the east, apanages in conformity with the political divisions of the period (Šēhēnian i). The west was thus identified with Rūm (Byzantine empire) and the east with the Turks, neighbours of the Persians since the defeat of the Hephthalites under Khosrow I (ca. 557).

The ancient legend of the :tripartition of the world among the sons of Tharaštana symbolized the relationship of the ancient peoples of whom they were the eponyms. In the time of Firdawsi, the legend was totally deprived of ethnical foundation and the contradictions had to be concealed by playing upon words. In the Šēhēnān, Faradīn gives his sons the name of Salm, Tūr and Īrād only after subjecting them to a test to reveal their characters. The eldest, who has escaped the danger without scathe (išāmat) receives the lands in the west (Khos-ōn-e-čāvar) with the title Xwar-khān. To the dashing second son (Tīr-e ūrovānis) is given Tūrān and he becomes Tūrān-khān, or Šīl-i Īrād, "lord of the Turks and the Chinese" (Türk wa-CN); cf. ed. Vullers, reissue of Faradīn, verses 400 and 295). The youngest, as brave as he is wise, receives inān and the plain of the heroes (or perhaps the king of the Khāns; cf. ibid., verses 296, 300 and 321) with the title tūr-khān. In the Arabic writers (cf. Tabari, i. 236) the name of the eldest son still has the form Tārakān or Sairima. But as the Pahlavi alphabet does not distinguish r and l, Firdawsi (as well as the Muqarnās al-Tawārīkh) preferred the variant Salm, which lent itself to a play on the Arabic root s-l-m [Modi's attempt: Azatū Pardā, Bombay, 1905, p. 244, and loc. cit. "Revue d'Or. Christien", 1925, xxv, p. 431, to connect Salim directly with Rome (aRīm, cf. Armen. kRom) is wild in every respect]. That the connection of Salim with the west is still very slight is evident from the fact that the two brothers Salm and Tūr fight east of the Caspian Sea (Thāˈlibī makes the scene of war to Aghāshīḏānja and hold there jointly a vast stronghold Alkhān-dī (Dīmastānān, on the Cape of Qanān-khâl; on which see Barthold, K. ištār-i vr̩os̲n̲ašān-n-i Turānšāh, St. Petersburg, 1914, p. 33). The name of the Alkhān (ancestors of the Ossetes and descendants of the Saqaromites = Sinairima) in these regions can relate only to a period about the first century B.C., when the Iranians still ruled around the Caspian (Marquart, Komanon, p. 108).

The name Tūr (Firdawsi and Muqarnās al-Tawārīkh) appears in the Dīmartih, xlii. 13 as Tīr and this form predominates in the Arabic sources: Ibn Khurāndihī, p. 115: Tūdā or Tīr; Dinawarī, p. 11 (the sons of Nīrībār: Irād, Salm and Tūr); Tabarī, i. 245; Fīrūzštī, p. 12; Māsūmitti, Murādjī, ii. 116; Brīst, al-Aṣrāf al-bābīya, p. 102; Thaˈlibī, ed. Zotenberg, p. 41 (Tūr, Tūr). In any case the form Tūr chosen by Firdawsi to explain Tūrān as the apanage of the bearer of this name differs from the forms found in the Pahlavi and Arabic sources. According to Marquart, Beiträge, Z.D.M.G., 1895, p. 662-7, Tūr < Tavārīkh (from Tūr); according to Christianen, Tūr is from Tūr + či = "of Turyan origin".

Tūrān as a geographical term. The term Tūrān, formed from the name of the people Tūr, which is derived from that of its eponym Tūr/Tūr, and ultimately applied to the country of the Turks, ought to be found in the Sassanian Kān-wūn-šān, the source used by the Arab historians and by Firdawsi. It is true that the Bundāstik, xii. 15, 39, etc. uses only the term Turkustān [while Salmūn, "land of Salm"; ibid. xx. 12, there designates the country from which the Turugs come], but we find Tūrān in the Dīmartih and in the fragments from Tūrān (F. W. K. Müller, ii. 87).

For Firdawsi, Tūrān, land of the Turks and of the Chinese, is separated from Iran by the Oxus (Šēhēnān, ed. Vullers, reissue of Faradīn, verses 295, 309, 322, 456, 459, 542, 792, reissue of Nawādīr verses 131; ed. Mohb., v. 680, reissue of Bahram Gūr). On the other hand in the account of the defeat of Afrikaštāh, the beginning of his domains seems to be extended to "Kībštāt", Marquart, Komanon, p. 110, from the manuscripts, enunciates this name to Kočča (Kībšt) and identifies it with the encampment of the Karšah [q.v. 5] faraḵhs beyond Tārā (q.v.); cf. Ibn Khurāndihī, p. 24: Ksīr-e bān. In the same way the capital of Afrikaštāh, Kang-dū, is located by Firdawsi somewhere near China, without any connection with the country of Kang (bākhāstāt) (ed. Vullers, verse 1351; cf. Bartholomew, col. 437; Marquart, Komanon, p. 109). These details may record the early stages in the western movements of the Turks. As to the Chinese, subjects of the kings of Tūrān, Firdawsi may have substituted their name for that of the real Avar people Sinairima, already assimilated to the Chinese in the Bundāstik (Darmesteter, Le Zend Avesta, ii. 554).

The Muslim writers, Arabic, Persian and Turkish, have not been logical in the use of the term Tūrān. But since for the Arab geographers, the land of the Turks began only to the east of the Sir Darya and did not include Transoxiana (cf. Barthold, Turkestân, I. M. Mem. Ser., p. 64), it seems that there was a tendency to identify Tūrān with Transoxiana, i.e. with the lands between the Amīl-Darya and the Sir Darya. According to Kharīmī, Mumtāz al-Ultim, p. 114, the Persians call the land beside the Oxus, Marz-i Tūrān. For Ya区政府, i. 822, Tūrān is the country of Ma warz al-Nahr (Transoxiana); after the tripartition of the world by Afriðūn, the Turks called their land Tūrān after their king Tūdā (Ya区政府 also mentions a village of Tūrān near Harrān). Very curious is the archaistic reference in Dīmarshī, Cosmographie (ca. 1250), ed. St. Petersburg, p. 114, according to which the Sayyān (Sir-Darya) forms the frontier between Transoxiana, i.e. the land of the Hayatiya called Tūrān (= Tūrān) and the land of Turkestān which is called Farghāna (on Haipal = Transoxiana, cf. also Erānšahr, p. 307). Much more vague is the use in the term the Mumtāz al-Al-Qur (sixth century) where the Volga is called Nahr-Tūrān and the summer camps of the old kings of Tūrān (the former Khūn of Kīpčak; Marquart, Komanon, p. 135) are located at Arīk-tagh (?), identified by Quatremère and Marquart with the Ural Mountains.

In the Zafar-nāma (sixth century), Tūrān is only used for poetical comparisons (i. 34, 624: "the heroes of Tūrān in Iran"). Abu l-Qādis (seventh century) sometimes uses it as a mythological term (ed. Deems, p. 2, 129, 149), sometimes identifies it with western Siberia (p. 177), sometimes seems vaguely to regard the lands of Muhammad Kharīmī as situated between Iran and Tūrān (Iran birān Tūrān varā; p. 96).

The term Tūrān became known in Europe from Herbelot's Bibliothèque Orientale, Paris 1697,
p. 63, where we are told that Afrasiyab, a Turk by birth but a descendant of Thir, son of Faridun, was king of all the country which lies beyond the river Oxus... to the east and north; this country used to be called Turan but it has since received the name of Turkestan." This last term is already found in the maps of Orellius and Mercator in the xvth century (Oberhammer). The term Turan became naturalised in Europe only in the sixteenth century. Its vague character has earned it a certain degree of popularity as applied to ideas where accuracy of definition is out of the question.


Turanian languages. The inventor of this term seems to have been the historian Bunsen (1842) who applied it to all the languages of Asia, the Near East, and Europe, which are neither Indo-European nor Semitic. The real popularisation of the term was by Max Müller, The Languages of the Scat of War in the East, with a Survey of Three Families of Languages, Semite, Arian and Turanian, London 1855, who includes in this group (for he avoids the term "family") of agglutinative languages not only Finno-Ugrian and Altaic but also Siamese, Tibetan, Malay, etc. Lenormant, La Magie chez les Chaldéens et les origines ascendantes, Paris 1874, extended the term to include Samerian. J. Oppert, in Les Peuples et la Langue des Medes, Paris 1889, wrongly taking the language of the second column of the Achaemenian inscriptions (the Neo-Elamite) for Median concluded that the Medes were "Turanian," Turanian became a regular dumping ground for all languages awaiting classification. But already Castrén (1842) pointed out the proper line of criticism. He insisted that all listed the quintuple group of "Ural-Altaic" languages with its branches, Finno-Ugrian, Samoyed, Turko-Tatar, Mongol and Tungus. Later researches have brought further restrictions by separating the first two of these from the last three, which form the Altaic group. G. Ramstedt, the founder of the comparative gram-
ment... of Solomon the Magnificent, Cambridge Mass. 1913, p. 51—56). The theory of the Isnin-Enofa excluded the possibility of preferring the Turkish elements to the other Muslim subjects of the empire. Even in the sixteenth century the word Türk had in the Ottoman empire the definite meaning of “peasant, rustic, yokel” (cf. the popular proverb). In this connection the poem by Mehmed Emin Bey, written during the war with Greece in 1897, marks the date of the complete change of meaning of the word: 

Ben bir Türk-îm, dinsim ilâ-udur: “I am a Turk, my religion and my race are exalted.”

Several factors have determined the development of the “Turkist” movement, sometimes called Türkanism.

4. The formation in the sixteenth century of numerous national movements (Greek, German, Italian, Slav, Armenian, Arab) several of which were directed against the Ottoman empire.

5. The reverses suffered by the Ottoman empire, which deprived it of its possessions in the Balkans, in Africa and finally in Asia also (Syria, Arabia, Mesopotamia, Mawjil). With each diminution of Ottoman territory the Turkish element of Anatolia gained in importance, not only as regards numerical proportion but also from the point of view of the only sure and stable basis upon which the state could be established.

6. The progress made by Turcology, which has drawn up an inventory of the Turkish peoples, established the affinity of their languages and thrown light upon the early history of the Turks. More direct has been the influence of the romantic work by L. Cahuz, *Introduction à l’histoire de l’Ottoman*, Paris 1896 (Turkish adaptation by Nefijsi ‘Aina). Among the earlier works which have exerted an influence on these lines Ziya Gök Alp mentions of Guigues, *Histoire générale des Turcs, des Mongols et des Huns*, Paris 1759—1758 and Lusley Davids, *Turkisch Grammar*, London 1832 and 1836. Here also we should mention the sketches of national movements published by the *E. M. M. M.* and the work of R. Hartmann tending to establish a bond of union among Turkish peoples.

7. The formation in Russia of a Muslim intelligentsia, primarily Turko-Tatar, and the impetus given to the Turkish press in Russia by the events of 1905. The emigrés from Russia, like ‘Ali Husain-zade (Rashid), Yusuf Ak-çura (Kazan) and Ahmad Agha-oghlu (Karnbğûh) have been the driving forces in the movement and even had to overcome considerable opposition emanating from the Turks of Turkey.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, three political theses were to the front in Turkey: Pan-Islamism, Ottomanism and Pan-Turkism. An open discussion of these was instituted (1902—1903) in the journal *Türk* published in Cairo. The Pan-Turkist point of view was championed by Yusuf Ak-çura-oghlu whose article *El cürsi ezâkât* (reprinted at Stambul in 1327 H.) has played an important part in the elaboration of the programme of the movement. Ak-çura criticised Ottomanism as tending to diminish the privileges of the Turks and contrary to Islam which recognises equal rights for all believers. On the other hand, Pan-Islamism would exacerbate the non-Muslims and meet resistance from certain European powers. The author then declared for Pan-Turkism, thinking it would overcome the greatest obstacle, represented by Russia, with the help of other governments (R. M. M., xxxii, p. 179-221).

In the same journal Türk, Ak-çura’s thesis was criticised by the liberal Ali Kemal, in the name of Ottomanism, and by Ahmed Ferid on grounds of possibility, for pan-Islamism seemed to him unrealisable and pan-Turkism so far non-existent.

In the early days of the revolution of July 1908, Ottomanism (= equal Ottoman citizenship for all ethnic elements) triumphed officially but before a year had passed the Committee of Union and Progress had reluctantly to recognise there were irreconcilable tendencies among the nations that composed the Ottoman empire. The Turkist movement was growing rapidly.

On Dec. 24, 1908, the Turkish Assembly (*Türk Derneği*) was founded at Stambul with the object of studying the situation and the activities (eşâkînee va-âfâl) of all Turkish peoples. In practice, the interest of this body has been confined to questions of language, which have been discussed in the reviews *Yieli-lüm*; *Gendi balemer* etc. In 1911 the Turkanî Society for the propagation of knowledge (*Türkan nezârî mîrâfet dijmâsîyi*) was created and in December appeared No. 1 of the periodical *Türk-yurâni* edited by Y. Ak-çura. On May 25, 1912, the *Türk selâhiîleri* (Turkish Heartths) were founded, circles for the study of Turkish culture.

At the same time the great theorist of Türkism, Ziya Gök Alp [q.v.], elected in 1910 a member of the Central Committee of Union and Progress, began his activity first at Saloniki (1909) and later at Stambul (1912). In a series of poetical works he aroused the memories dormant in the blood of the Turks and sang the Turkish ideal as personified in the mysterious land of Türkan: “The children of Oghuz-kûln will never forget this country which is called Türkan.” (‘Türükîl, 1911). This land is associated with Attila, Farsîti, Ulugh Beg, Ibn Sîni (the Turkish origins of the latter [q.v.] are not by any means proved), “The fatherland of the Turks is neither Turkey, nor Turkmenistan, their fatherland is the great eternal land of Türkan” (‘Türkiye, 1914).

The teaching of Ziya Gök Alp was summed up in the formula “Turkicise yourself (from the point of view of culture, sarî), Islamise yourself, modernise yourself (from the point of view of civilisation, modernise)”.

The systematic exposition of the theories of this writer will be found in *Türkîliyâniœ esâtîlî*, *The foundations of Türkism*, published at Angora in 1339 (1923) a year before the author’s death. In this work, the idea of Türkan is a little more practical. Ziya Gök Alp defines the nation as a group of individuals connected by language, religion, ethics and aesthetics. Türkan is not a mixture of Turks, Mongols, Tungus, Finns and Hungarians. “The word Türkan is a name covering the Turk tribes exclusively”. The reunion of the Turks can only be brought about by stages. The immediate ideal of Türkism is the cultural union of the Oghuz-Turks, i.e. the Turks of Turkey and the Turkomans of Kâharbadjûa, of Persia and Kâhîrûm. Their political union is not at present envisaged but one cannot foretell the future. On the other hand, if the Tatars, the Özeghs and the Kirghises succeed in creating civilisations of their own and in forming separate nations, they will retain their respective names, but in that case “Türkan” will serve as a common term
Turkan romanticism has had various repercussions in the purely literary field in the works of Ahmad Hikmat (Allah ola), Khalide Edib Khanım (Yezî Türkân, 1913), Ağa Günüz (Mustârem Kâmil, a drama produced in 1914 whose subject is a Turkish rising in the Caucasus), Müfide Ferîd Khanım (Ay Demir, a Turkish rising in Central Asia). On literary Turkanism during the War, cf. M. Hartmann, M.S.O.S., 1918, xi., p. 19–22.

During the War of 1914, the Young Turks (Committee of Union and Progress) governing the Ottoman empire officially professed Ottomanism, at least so far as Muslims were concerned, but in fact the deportations of Armenians in 1915 were realizing the programme of the Turkification of Turkey.

Expansion towards the East. The war of 1914 had drawn a curtain between the Turks of Turkey and their kinmen. The Russian revolution of 1917 entirely modified the situation. By the clause added at the last minute to the treaty of Brest-Litovsk, Turkey obtained the return to the frontier of 1877 in Transcaucasia (surrender by Russia of Batum, Kars and Ardahan). The refusal of the Turks of Adharbajdân to resist the Ottomans put an end to the Transcaucasian confederation (April 22, 1918), which was replaced by three independent republics (Adharbajdân, Georgia and Armenia). Under the command of Emuer Pâshâ’s brother, the Turks advanced as far as Petrovsk on the Caspian Sea but the armistice of Modros (Oct. 30, 1918) forced them to turn back. The English then occupied and later withdrew from Transcaucasia. While in the capital, occupied by the Allies, Dûmûd Ferîd Pâshâ’s government in extremis was making a last attempt to unfold a programme of Ottomanism, the nationalist government was formed in Asia Minor (summer of 1919) and by energetic measures was able to retain the ground gained by the Young Turks at Brest-Litovsk. The republic of Armenia was conquered (Peace of Alexandropol of Dec. 3, 1920). Georgia declared its neutrality and submitted to the ultimatum (of Feb. 23, 1921) which demanded the evacuation of Artvin and Ardahan. On March 16, 1921, the Turkish-Soviet treaty was signed at Moscow and on Oct. 13 confirmed at Kars, with the participation of the three Caucasian republics (now Soviets). Turkey withdrew her claim to Batum but, what was not in the Brest-Litovsk treaty, received the district of Iğdır on the Araxes (which Persia had ceded to Russia in 1828) and thus enabled her territory to be contiguous to that of Nakhichewan, which had been created as a dependency of the Soviet republic of Adharbajdân.

The government of Angora thus secured considerable gains in Transcaucasia, but publicly disowned Emuer Pâshâ’s achievements, who had at first allied himself with the Soviet government but finally raised the standard of revolt in Turkestan where he dreamed of founding a Turkish empire. He fell in a skirmish in eastern Bukhûr on Aug. 4, 1923 (“as a martyr to Türkism” as his colleague Dr. Nâzim said at the trial of the Young Turks in August 1926); cf. Castagnè, Les derniers combats, Paris 1927.

Cultural Movement. The old leaders of the Turkanian movement had early rallied to the government of Angora. (The poet Mehmed Emin and Aş-ûrâ Oğlu arrived at Angora in April 1921). From April 13, 1924 the Turkish Hearths (Türk ogâhları) resumed their activity in Angora under the leadership of Hamdullah Subbû. Their first k碾alsı meht at Angora on March 28, 1926. In 1928 Yûsuf Aş-ûrâ produced at Stambul the annual Türk yill (The Turkish Year) with summaries of the doings of Turks abroad. As a result of the Russian revolution of 1917 a new wave of emigration swept over Turkey. The supporters of the old nationalist governments overthrown by the Soviets established the review Yezî Keskâyi (1924) which was succeeded in March 1929 by the Odûl Yûrû “Land of Fire” (= Adharbajdân). These organs of Turkish solidarity have not however linked up with the local Turkish press.

As regards the Turks in what was the Russian empire, since the revolution of 1917, they have realized and even gone beyond their old programme of establishing their own civilisation and autonomy. But alongside of this natural evolution, the Turks of the U. R. S. S. have actively and passively taken part in all the phases of the Soviet revolution. For the moment (1930) is impossible to separate the results of the particular and general factors and to say what point the tendencies of all the peoples of Turkish origin are converging.

The communications and discussions at the first Turcological congress at Bûklû from Feb. 26 to March 6, 1926 (131 delegates, Soviet and foreign, including two from Turkey) were of great interest (see the shorthand reports published in Russian, Bûklû 1926, and Menzel’s detailed analysis in Der islam, 1918). The decision of the congress regarding the optional adoption of the Roman alphabet (compulsory since 1928) had a great influence on the introduction of the new alphabet into Turkey (1928) (cf. H. Duda, Die neue Latein-schrift in d. Türkii, O.L.Z., June 1929, col. 444–453; E. Rossâ, Il nuovo alfabeto, Oriento Moderno, Jan. 1929, p. 23–48).

It is difficult to foretell the future of the Pan-Turkish movement. The cultural attraction of Angora, this great centre of Turkism, is legitimate and inevitable. But Angora is now a lay capital entirely free from the Islamic prestige of the old Stambul. The intensity of its influence will therefore depend primarily on the worth of the Turkish culture (barth) which will be developed there. Even the bringing of all Turks “descended from Oghus” under one culture according to ziya Gök Alp’s idea would not be easy, because, for example, the Persian Turks, the immediate neighbours of Turkey, are very much under the influence of Persian culture, the persistence of which is a moral fact. As to the political union of the Turkish peoples, account must be taken of the very different conditions under which they live. Their lands are very scattered. They are separated by the Caspian Sea and the desert. In Transcaucasia the corridor between Georgia and Armenia on the one side and Persia on the other is very narrow and is of no importance, unless a complete reversal of the situation in Transcaucasia and in Persia should take place simultaneously, which is quite beyond the programme of Turkism pure and simple.
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TURANSHAH. A. AYUB AL-MAQRUZ A.-ZAM SHAMS AL-DINWAFAH AYUB A. AL-MAQRUZ A.-ZAM SHAMS AL-DINWAFAH AYUB A.
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the name al-Mansûr, founded the dynasty of the Rasûlid, which ruled the land for over two centuries as a native Yemen dynasty, after the foreign rule of the Ayyubids had prevailed for only half a century.


(R. Struthmann)

**Turban, the headdress of males in the Muslim east, consisting of a cap with a length of cloth wound round it. The name turban is found in this form in European languages only (English turban, turban; French turban, turban; German Turban; Italian, Spanish and Portuguese, turbanate; Dutch tulband; Rumanian tulipan; all going back to older forms with o: toli/tihab, tuli-pan, tolopan, tourban, tourbanate, turbanate) and is usually traced to the Persian dulband, from which is also said to be derived the word tulip (cf. Meyer-Lübke, Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, Heidelberg 1911, p. 682, where also is cited from the Krima de Langue Romane, iii., 54 the Spaniard's name for the turban (tubul, tubulan). It should be remembered however that the word dulband is by no means so widely disseminated in the east as one would have expected from the general use of the word turban in Europe, but is limited to the Persian (and to a smaller extent Turkish) speaking area and even there is not the only name in use. The commonest word in Arabic is ƛumâma, which properly means only the cloth wound round the cap and then comes to be used for the whole headdress, and in Turkish ƛâhâ is the usual name for the turban. Besides these however, there are a large number of other names for what we loosely call turban and for its parts in different Muslim countries; these are given in a preliminary list at the end of the article.

The origin of this form of headdress ought probably to be sought in the ancient east; a turban-like cap seems to be found represented on certain Achaemenid and Egyptian monuments (cf. Krippel, Geschichte der babylonischen und assyrischen Kleidung, p. 40; Josef von Karabacek, Abendländische Künstler zu Konstantinopel, Denkm. Ak. Wien, lxii., 1878, p. 87 sq. and von Hammer, G. O. R., vii. 268 und Staatverfassung, p. 441). In Arabia the pre-Muslim Beduins are said to have worn turbans, and it has been supposed that the high cap and the cloth wound round it the true Arab element of the turban (Jacob, Altertumliches Beduinenleben, p. 44. 237).

In Islam in course of time the turban has developed a threefold significance, a national for the Arabs, a religious for the Muslims and a professional for civic professions (later divided into religious and administrative offices ƛawâfî d'inâm wa-d'ârâiyâ) in contrast to the military.

Many details about the Prophet's turban have been handed down by tradition but most of these hadiths bear obvious traces of a late date. They therefore prove nothing for the time of the Prophet but only show what later ages wanted to believe. To the latter the turban, as succinctly expressed in a hadith, signified "dignity for the believer and strength for the Arab", wañâfî li-μuслиm wa

'izî H. 'l-'Arab and the Prophet to them is the owner of the turban par excellence (sâhîh al-îmân). The makers of turbans in Turkey (dulûndâ'yân) have actually chosen the Prophet as their patron saint, for he is said to have traded in turbans in Syria before his call and to have exported them from Mecca to Bojîr (Ewliyyî, i. 590). The only reliable hadith is negative: the muhîm is not allowed to wear the turban, nor hamîn, sâwînh, etc. This hadith is also found in Bûkhârî in the Sab al-îmân (Lîbîz, bbt 13) contrasted with the following, mostly weak, hadiths. According to one, for example, Adam is said to have worn a turban which Gabriel wound round his head on his expulsions from Paradise; previously he wore a crown (tâdî). The next was Alexander Dhu 'l-Karnân who wore a turban to conceal his horns. A much quoted hadith runs "turbans are the crowns of the Arabs" (al-îmân/t多方 tâbîn al-'Arab), which is variously explained to mean, either that turbans are as rare among the Turks as crowns among other peoples for most Beduins only wear caps (kâ'âm) or no headdress at all, or that the Arabs wear turbans as the Persians, so that the Persian has a similar hadith runs "wear turbans and thus be different from earlier peoples" (.Raw卒 kâ'âm hâlhab). Still more numerous are the hadiths which describe the turban as a badge of Muslims to distinguish them from the unbelievers; turbans are a mark of Islam (al-îmân is mín al-Îlm), the turban divides the believers from the unbelievers (al-îmâná gâyûsîna baal al-kâfîr wa 'lmâna wa baal al-Mu'minîn wa 'lmâna al-muhrûkin); the distinction between us and the unbelievers is the turban (farj mân bâ'înuma wa-bail al-muhrûkin al-'imân), and the prophecy: my community will never decay so long as they wear turbans over their caps (fâxin ummat 'ala 'l-farj, mân bâ'înu 'l-'imân), and on the day of judgment a man will receive light for every winding of the turban (katwûrâ) round his head or round his cap. Thus "to put on the turban" means "to adopt Islam". Nevertheless the stage was never reached where it was a religious duty (farj) to wear the turban; it is however recommended (mustâfâh, summa, muwâdî) and a general recommendation runs: "wear turbans and increase your nobility" (Raw卒 hâlhab hâlma).

Especially at the ƛâlît and on going to the mosque or tomb is the wearing of the turban recommended and it is said: two rakas (or one rak's, or the ƛâlît) with a turban are better than seventy without; for it is not proper to appear before one's king with head uncovered. Or: God and the angels bless him who wears a turban on Fridays. In great heat and after the prayer however, it is permitted to take off the turban, but not during the prayer itself, on the other hand the want of a turban is no reason for abandoning oneself from prayer. At other times also — in great heat or at home or while washing — the turban may be removed, and as a rule the Arabs always wore the turban "until the ascension of the Pleiadum", i.e. until the beginning of the great heat. Even in later times the turban played an important rôle in the spreading of Islam, e.g. in the Sudan (cf. A. Bras, in Isl., x. 22, 27, 30; M.S. O.S. Ac., vi. 191 sq.). It has not always been the custom in Islam for
none but Muslims to wear turbans. The later regulations for dress demand, it is true, that only believers may wear turbans while unbelievers are only to wear a cap (ṭupāninwā). But in earlier times unbelievers were only to wear turbans of another colour or with some distinguishing mark. Rulers who were not generally well disposed to members of other faiths were always distinguished by strict regulations about dress; but with a change of attitude the observation of the prescriptions became slacker until it again became necessary to enforce them more strictly. In later days appeal was frequently made to an alleged dress regulation by 'Omar I, which is however probably a later invention and was probably transferred from 'Omar II to 'Omar I. The latter is said to have been the first to forbid Christians to wear the turban or dress resembling that of the Muslim (cf. now Tritton, Islam and the protected religions, J.R.A.S., 1927, p. 479—484). Further laws about dress are attributed to Hārūn al-Rashīd, like 'Omar II, is said to have issued a general order forbidding Christians to wear the same dress as Muslims. Mutawakkil is said to have prescribed yellow turbans for the unbelievers, including the turbans if they wore any, and the Fātimid Ǧāḥīm black because this was the colour of the hated Ǧābdūs. At one time Christians were forbidden to wear red, at another any one who wore white was to be punished by death. In Egypt and Syria in the eighth century A.D. Christians wore blue or yellow and the Sāmir red and they might also wear silk, turbans, and neck-veil (harīr, 'ināma, ṣādalan) of these colours (Kalkashandi, Ṣuhb al-Asbāb, xii. 364).

Turkey has had a whole series of dress regulations of its own: the earliest was enforced by 'Alī al-Dīn Paša (d. 732 = 1331) in the reign of Orkhan (cf. above, p. 477). He introduced a cone-shaped cap of white felt but only for officials in the Sultan's service; other subjects apparently had freedom of choice in their dress. In the reign of Mehmed the Conqueror (Fatih), further laws about rank, titles and dress of the officials were issued. Under Sulaimān the Legislator, ranks and professions were carefully graded as described in the Shami 'Ilimān al-Ālī Orkhan of Lūghān b. Saiyid Ḥusayn about 1580 (v. Hammer, G. O. E., iii. 17; Karabacak, p. 4). Sulaimān also regulated the use of the turban, hitherto apparently quite arbitrary, and issued regulations about the trade of turban-makers, varābmin (v. Hammer, Staatsverfassung, i. 443). Unbelievers were given red, yellow and black, while white was restricted to the Ottomans. About 1683 in the reign of Mūtād IV, only the Stambul Turks were permitted turbans, the Arabs in Egypt various colours, the people of Barbary, white with gold. Jews and Christians in the cast in those days wore blue (Voyage d'Henri Vernet en Orient, ed. M. Gupi, Fesquet, Paris 1839—1840) and according to Niebuhr, Kriezbeschreibung nach Arabien und den von der westlichen Welt nicht erreichenden Ländern (Copenhagen 1774), Christians wore a blue stripe on their caps so that the tax-collector could at once readily recognise them.

In other countries also the colour of the turban was not at all uniform and for every colour authority was given from alleged hadiths of the life of the Prophet, which of course are all weak. A pious Muslim like Kattān deduces from the contradictory description of the shape and colours of the Prophet's turban that he allowed himself considerable liberty and sometimes wore the turban without the cap and sometimes the cap without the turban, and sometimes both together; in the house or when visiting the sick he put on both, but never when addressing the community, when he wished to make an impression on the people.

The commonest colour for the turban is white. The Prophet is said to have been fond of this colour and it is considered the colour of Paradise. There is not actually a hadith telling us that the Prophet's turban was white, but probably only because white was the normal colour. The angels who helped the believers at Badr are said to have worn white turbans.

If now the following references speak of turbans of other colours, they are not in direct contradiction with white, for the colours in question are connected with the events and have therefore a special reason. For example another tradition says that to Badr the angels wore yellow turbans with the object of encouraging the fighting Muslims. According to another story, only Gabriel had a yellow turban of light, the other angels white, and others again reconcile the various statements about the angels at Badr by ascribing to some white, to others green, black, red etc. turbans. The Prophet is said to have at first liked the colour yellow but later found it too light.

The Prophet is said to have worn a black cloak and a black turban on entering Mecca and at the address at the gate of the Ka'ba, also on other occasions at addresses from the minbar, on the day of Hudaybiya and during his illness. In black there is said to be a subtle allusion to sovereignty (al-dān) and besides black is the foundation of all colours. The Ǧābdūs claimed that the black turban of the Prophet worn at the entry to Mecca had been handed down to them, and in a tenderacious hadith in which Gabriel prophesies the coming of the Ǧābdūs, he of course wears a black turban. Turbans of black silk (ṣuhāz) are said to have been at first permitted but later forbidden by the Prophet; the so-called 'arbaibīyā turbans are black (the derivation of the word is uncertain, according to Suyūṭī from ʿr-ḥā, to burn) and the Prophet is said to have worn them on his campaigns. Many great men in Islam are also said to have worn black turbans, such as Hassan al-Basri, Ibn al-Zahab, Mu'āwiyah etc. and Suyūṭī wrote a whole book on black dress (Thalādī al-Fawā'id fi Liht al-Ṣawād). Later writers often claim the black turban as the special badge of the ǧāthib and the ǧawām.

The Prophet is said to have at first liked to wear blue but then forbade it because the unbelievers wore it. On behalf of red, it is urged that the angels at Ubayd (or also at Ḥunain) wore red turbans. According to others, Gabriel wore red at Badr and on one occasion appeared to ʿAḥāsa in a red turban. The so-called ʿirfāya turban which the Prophet wore is also said to have been red. Sometimes also striped material has been used as turban cloth, e.g. yellow and red or green and red (Fesquet).

In the history of religion the green turban is important; as the well-known badge of the descendants of Muḥammad. Tradition is unanimous that the Prophet never wore a green turban, and there is no support for the colour green in law or tradition. But green is the colour of Paradise and it is also said to have been the Prophet's
favourite colour and some say that the angels at Ḥusnain (or also at Badr) had green turbans. The green turban as a badge of the sharifs is however of much later origin: the 'Abbasid al-Ma'mūn in Ramadhān 201 is said to have clothed the eighth Shī'ī Imām 'Alī al-Riḍā in green, when he designated him his successor; the latter died before he could succeed, the 'Abbasids went back to black and there were even persecutions to compel the 'Alids to wear black (cf. Ibn 'Abdūn, K. al-Wasāyir, ed. Mārk, p. 395 a.v.). They seem however for a period at least to have worn a piece of green cloth in the turban as a special badge (ṣaffāṣa) and to have been fond of wearing green, especially in times of liberty of conscience. In 773 A.H. the Mamlīk Sulṭān Qādir Shadūr ordered that the turban cloths (ḍaffūṭ ṣaffā'ī l-bashār) of the 'Alids should be green and from 1004-1005 A.H. the whole turban became green by order of the Ottoman governor of Egypt al-Sayyid Muḥammad al-Shārīf. This fashion spread from Egypt to other Muslim countries, at first regarded as a late innovation and sometimes disputed, but has now become generally approved. It is now regarded as a law that no non-'Alīd should wear the green turban nor strictly anyone who is only connected with the Prophet on the mother's side but this last point is frequently disregarded. A short essay has recently appeared on the green turban in the Baghdād monthly al-Murğūdī, ii. 6 (July 1927) Turākh Aṯwār al-Amīlīm, p. 229-232; cf. also al-Kaḥfūra Sāfūr Al Muḥammad by al-Sayyid Ḥibat al-Din al-Shahrūstānī, 1. 4 (March 1926), p. 106-108.

Not only the colour but other āṭāb of the turban are regulated by religion: 1. When should a boy be first given a turban? When his beard begins to grow, when he reaches maturity or at the age of say 7 to 10 years. One should go by the practice of the country; but in any case it shows shamelessness to wear a turban before one's beard begins to grow. 2. How should a turban be wound? Here again the answer is given by stories of how the Prophet wound his. It should be wound standing (trousers on the other hand are put on sitting), with the right hand, twisted to the right around the head and not simply laid upon it and in doing this, one should act according to the sunna, as regards pulling under the chin (tāḏīn) the loose end (tāḏāba) and the size of the turban. As in putting on any other garment, one should utter a badūlah while the āḥamal is only used for new articles of clothing. A new turban should if possible be put on for the first time on a Friday. It should be carefully done before a looking-glass but one should not spend too much time over it. People of position may have their turban wound by two servants. There are countless ways in which a turban may be wound; 66 are mentioned but these are not all. 3. The question whether gold and silver ornaments may be worn in the turban is usually answered in the negative. In the course of the development of the headdress, it was the women in particular who adorned their turban-like headdress in this way. Silk on the other hand is allowed with certain restrictions. 4. The turban has acquired considerable religious significance as a symbol of investiture, since there is no crown or coronation proper as symbols of sovereignty in the Muslim east. The prototype is again an act of Muḥammad; he is said to have put a turban on 'Alī at the pond of Ḥummān and again when in Ramadhān of the year 10 he appointed him governor of the Yemen; he is next said to have wound the turban on every governor in order to teach him fine manners (laẓizmu) and to give him dignity. Following this example, the caliphs, the successors of the Prophet, put the turban on their viziers and later on sultāns. For example Kalbāṣandānī, ii. 280 a.v. describes the investiture of the Egyptian Mamlūk Sulṭān Al-Shārīf al-Rūmī in 742 by the Egyptian 'Abbasid caliph Ḥākim II. The caliph wears a black neck-veil (fārṣa) with white stripes (māḥma ḥā l-bāyāf) and placed on the head of the sultān a black turban ('imāna sawdā′) with white stripes round the edge (māḥma ḥā l-tarāf, l-bāyāf). Then we have a description of the investiture of Nūṣr Fardūd by Mutawakkil in 801-802 A.H. where we are told 'imāna sawdā′ māḥma, fārṣa l-bāyāf sawdā′ māḥma. The turban is also an essential feature of the robe of honour (bādū′) which Muslim rulers used to bestow upon their viziers and emirs (there is a poetical description of a turban, for example, in Mīḥyar al-Dalālī, d. 428 = 1037), Dūlān, i. 243; a description of s. robe of honour of the Mamlūk period: Kalbāṣandānī, iv. 32 a.v.) and this is the origin of the differences in the turbans of the different classes, which were such that the initiated could at once tell an individual's position by his turban. In general it may be said that the largest turbans belonged to the highest and most respected ranks, especially of the clerical profession, and the differences in size of the turbans are, according to some, more important than those of colour. With this is connected the endeavour to give oneself as large a turban as possible and against this religion has had to fight: a warning is uttered against wearing too large a turban as it is an extravagance — but not among learned men; on the contrary, they ought to be recognizable at once by some external feature to attain success in their labours. Hence the dress of the scholar is not a censurable innovation (bādū′), although earlier men of learning did not wear it. All other statements about the sizes of turbans, including definite lengths like seven or ten ells, are again defended from the example of the Prophet.

To mention a few isolated examples, we have in Kalbāṣandānī, iii. 280 a.v. the description of the turban of the 'Abbasid kalīf Muḥta'īr, who in 815 was for a period independent Sulṭān of Egypt; his turban was round, of pleasing appearance (ṣaffa), with a tall hanging behind (raʃraf) 1/3 × 1/3 ells in length. (The Christian patriarch also had a larger and more regular shaped turban than the other priests). The dress of the Sulṭān of Morocco is described for example in the published portion of the Masālik al-‘Aqūl of Ibn Fāḍl Allāh al-‘Omarī (Wasl Sīra bi wa l-‘Aṣlād, ed. Ḥasan Ḥusnī ‘Abd al-Wahābī, Tunis about 1923), p. 31, as not too large with ṭaḥmān and ʿudhāba; cf. Kalbāṣandānī, v. 203: with a long narrow turban. The head-dress of the Ottoman Sulṭān is frequently described. The turbans of dead Sulṭāns were kept in their tombs, e.g. in the mausoleums in Brussa (v. Hammer, Staatsverfasung, i. 446) and in other places we find them modelled on a stone on the tomb.

The turban, generally speaking, has, as we have said, become the badge of the civilian profes-
Turban-wearers (zāhīb al-imāmā : Ibn Shihbūs, Muḥallīn al-Rābi'a, p. 34 or rābī al-imāmā) is synonymous with civilian and there is the expression: he abandoned the turban of men of the law and assumed in its stead the cap (shirbān) and the dress of the emirs (Makrīzī-Bloch, p. 335, note). Kālkhāndi often uses al-māsināmān in this sense, e.g. zār. 114: al-mā sin arshūk al-nāri'īw al-dāmīa wa 'dīnānāyāt al-m. dīnān arshūk al-nāri'ī.(1) To distinguish among the various officers, the officials in Turkey under the old régime had different badges on their turbans, clusters of feathers and egrets (ṣāāqa and bāqqā) and soldiers wore on them decorations awarded for bravery (ṣarāa ṣābīl 'alā tāleem ; v. Hammer, Staatsverfassung, i. 446). Forquet says that secretaries and scholars wore the turban high with many windings, merchants and artisans loose and broad and slaves very small.

It is on this point that we find the differences in the various countries and especially between the east (Syria, the 'Iraq, Egypt, Persia) and the west (Spain, North Africa). This is noticeable in the description of western dress in Kālkhāndi and in the Maṣālib al-Ālīq, and vice versa in the accounts of eastern customs as given by the Moroccan Kātibi. In Muslim Spain very few turbans were worn at all; they were not worn in the dress-revol (jiynās; Maṣālib, p. 42; Kālkhāndi, v. 71) was rather worn instead; the loose end ('alāqā) and the chinstrap (ṣāāliq) are, originally at least, apparently western fashions. In 1596 we find the Turks being struck by the narrow turban of striped silk worn by the Persian ambassador. (G. O. K., iv. 275).

In modern times there has arisen a movement against the turban, which is more or less apparent through the whole of the east. Men are reluctant to wear a turban and the young people and the women laugh at it and say al-daf'a hadir min al-ba'tīf, “the board for washing the dead is better than wearing a turban.” But the conservative classes vigorously attack the bid'a implied in this and declare that it is never (lā tangūf al-turāb) is essential to the turban that is heresy and unbeliever. Associated with this we often find abandonment of the old Muslim style of hair-dressing with clean upper lip and a beard on the chin. These two things are essential features of emancipation and are regarded by many as signs of the Day of Judgement (ṣāāla al-sāb'ī). The modern development is attacked in a number of special treatises on the turban mentioned below, notably the last one by Kattāni, and according to them, any one who succeeds in restoring the turban to a country, acquires the merit of reviving a good tradition (ṣāāla al-sāb'ī). The modern development however can hardly be checked, and in Turkey a hundred years ago the turban was officially replaced by the fez, which in its turn had to give way in 1925 to the modern European hat (ṣāāla) (cf. Gailm, Modem, v. 630 sq.), just as in modern Persia the turban has been driven out by the kūlāh. The turban could also be used for many purposes other than that for which it was primarily intended. We give a few examples: in Sa'dī, Bīdxīn, p. 156, a man in the desert giving a dog dying from thirst water uses his turban (kūlāh) to get water out of the well, and his turban-clot (destāb or maṭār) as a rope. The turban was often worn as a pocket, also as a rope to tie up criminals or to tie firmly in the saddle or to strange. In 1623, the rebel Turkish 'alāmā chose the turban of Shīkh al-Ārṣ Shams al-Dīn as their standard (G. O. K., iv. 590). In Mamlūk coats of arms (ṣāāla means the cross or long hair, in European heraldry a turban is the sign of a Crusader (Fayyūm al-ṣāāla, Rawārī, Ḥafīr, p. 372). Some musulls of the genera turban and ča'numān are called turban; Persian turban = tūbān či nmān; Phārah's turban = ča'numān Phārahī; Turkish turban = laša či nmān; (Grande Encykl., and Turkish loans used to be known as “turban stock”, and “turban lotteries” the shares of the Banque Ottomane, which were of very uncertain value.

As a survey of the many names for the turban and its parts we give below an alphabetical list with short notes. The merit of first making a classification possible is due to Dozy, who in his Dictionnaire des Vétérans et in his Supplement has collected ample material, which should generally be consulted. There are also some recent works by Karabacek, Brunot and Kattāni. 'Abāqās is the end of the turban-cloth which usually hangs behind from the turban “between the shoulders”. When this form of turban first came into use cannot be ascertained exactly; it is of course said to have been worn by the Prophet and by the angels at Badr and according to Ibn Taimyā, Muhammad had a dream in this connection in which God pointed to the place between the shoulders; but many orthodox people regard this dream as anthropomorphism. The leaving of one end hanging down is recommended and a turban without tails and ṣāāliq is said to be kūlāh. On the position and length of the tail there are differences of opinion; the most usual is four fingers long between the shoulders. The Ǧūfā wear the tail on the left because the heart is on that side; wearing the tail behind the right ear was a privilege of the Ǧāfārī sultans; the legists of the Ǧīmāna and Kattāni have left two tails hanging down, one before and one behind, the so-called Baghdādī turban had two tails. 'Abāqās VIII means: “to wind the turban leaving a tail hanging”.

'Ābdī, a cord of brown camel hair, which the Ǧāfārī wear instead of a turban cloth wound two or three times round their head-dress, which is called 'Iṣāfā. 'Amīmā, turban, another form of 'imāmā. According to the dictionaries, the pronunciation with a is wrong but according to Brunot, p. 121, this is the pronunciation in Algiers. It is there an unwound turban, and is also given as a present to the wall of the woman one wishes to marry.

'Arābīya, perspiration-cap, a little cap of some light material which is worn below the turban-cap, to collect the perspiration, and which often peeps out below. The Turks say garbī ārabīyi. The name marīxa is also found; some write ārabīyya and would connect the word with the 'Irāq (Brunot, p. 120; Kattāni, p. 33). In everyday language the word is said to mean ordnance cap (yākūf cap) and in earlier times in Syria it was a sugarcone-shaped cap adorned with pearls worn by women. 'Arābā (Arabic form of ārabī) says that the Prophet once wore a black ārabā. Among the Mamlūkū, ārabā was the double camel-humplike erection on the tūbān worn by men and women (Karabacek, p. 74), and in modern times it is a square black silk kerchief worn by women (Lane, Manners and Customs, p. 50 sq.). Ārabā (another form of ārabā) seems to be
a headdress with pearls and gold worn in Morocco and Egypt.

Beadel is properly an iron helm but, according to Kattani, p. 3, may also mean a turban.

Bâgbât or Bâgîtâ or Bâgbât from Bâgîtâk etc. may mean turban and especially: the high head-dress worn by Mongol princesses and ladies of rank, adorned with gold and pearls.

Bhurnar, barukis was in earlier times not a cloak but a high cap and in this sense it is used in Lakhari, Liibta, hâb 13. Of later writers, for example, Kâlkapzâdi, v. 264 still uses it in this sense: the Sultan of Morocco wears a white burnus. The corresponding verb is tuburny.

Burtül [f], a high cap, with the pronunciation burtul a low skull-cap; in modern language it means the tâbi of a bishop. The Persian has por-

Danniyâ (perhaps from dannia) the "pot-hat" of the kâdiri called thirf in Turkish.

Dastîr (Pers.) turban-cloths: dastîr hamîzî, the "head-cloth," the coverings, divânî, white turbans, kõrdî or kordâ, dervishes etc.

Dâmthâ, the term: âmthâh. This word seems to be used only in Egyptian writers. In the dress of the Fâjimid caliph and officials an end of the turban cloth is left hanging down with or without a thâbîf (cf. Ibn al-Safrî, Kâmûna, ed. Baghât, introduction). According to Kâlkapzâdi, iv. 43, the Sûfî Shâfiikhs have a small dâmthâ at the left ear. According to Sûyytî, Hâmîn al-Mubâhâra, ii. 226, scholars and dâmthâ wear a šálîh with ends hanging down between the shoulders.

Dubûnd (Pers.) is perhaps the original of our word turban; cf. von Hammer, Statzverfassung, p. 442; G. O. R., iii. 17. Dubûnd-thâbûn are the turban-wearers, Turkish dubûnd aqshâch, the keeper of the sultan's turbans.

Fârûlîya, a square kherchief worn by women who make a kind of rakhîa with this and the fahâya and parshâb. Two or three pieces of cloth used to be used, which formed a kind of small turban but quite distinct from the kind worn by men. The turban proper is distinctly a man's head-dress but the women have occasionally had similar fashions. The vigour with which theologians attack women who wear turbans or otherwise ape men's dress, quoting hadîthi to support their strictures, shows only too clearly the existence of such practices (cf. Kattani, p. 42, 112 sq.).

Fis [q.v.], the red cap originally belonging to Fis in Morocco, which was replaced in Turkey in 1925 by the European hat (gâhpâ), while it is still commonly used in use in example in Egypt.

Fûtâm, turban, also a mouth-veil worn by the Parati and a kind of mazzele for camels and oxen.

Fûshân seems to have been a head-dress worn by women in Cairo and Syria, gilt below and decked with pieces of silver.

Ghîsîra in early times was a kind of fahâya for men, a red cloth with which they protected their head from the sun and the heat. In Muslim Spain it was the name of a similar cap for men, who usually wore not turbans but ghîsîra of red or green wool, and Jews a yellow one. It would therefore perhaps correspond to the cap often called ghîsîya in the Maghrib which was worn under the turban.

Gulîra (Pers. pronunciation of the Arabic kallutâ) a cap worn by women and children.

Himâyin [French], a high head-dress worn by women in France and Burgundy, a xvith century fashion influenced by the east, which still survived in Germany in the xixth century. The form changed and was sometimes shaped like a sugar loaf or dome, sometimes like a roller or a truncated cone; sometimes it had two peaks, like the double hemin worn by Queen Isabel of Portugal (Karabacek, p. 11, 67 sqq., 84; there it is explained from the Arabic hâmîn tinkling, from the metal pendants on it) which occurs once in the Arabian Nights).

Hûrût is a name for the cap of the turban; cf. Brunot, p. 105.

Hûrût is a high-head-dress worn by women in Morocco, triangular in shape, made of linen, three inches long and broad and a span high, with silk and silver, the whole looking something like a camel's hump; cf. Kattani, p. 112 sq.

Hûnûma, the most general Arabic word for the turban cloth and also for the whole turban; other forms are awmân, sermon, pl. serâmîm and immân. The verb is "swm-, II, V, VIII, X. Details and variations according to colour, profession, and thus the countries in which they are mentioned above. Among special kinds may be mentioned immân Wârîs (q.v.), immân Sûfi from Sûs in Morocco.

Immân is properly the style of form of winding the turban, then the turban itself, Kattani, p. 4: hûmân al-immân = hûmân al-šâmîm.

Išâba, turban-cloth like 'asîb, in modern times also a head-dress for women, as in the Arabian Nights: 'asîbî muharbâhâyi of women and an 'asîbî al-hâs. The 'asîbî sulâfîya under the Ayyûbids and Mamlûks in Egypt (Kâlkapzâdi, iv. 46; Sûyytî, i. 110) were the flags of the Sultan in the public processions (mânâbîhî), for the flags envelop the head of the lance like a turban (Kâlkapzâdi, ii. 128; cf. Kattani, p. 12 sq., 36).

Kâlamûma [q.v.], a high head-dress.

Kâlri or kâlîrîwî old in Turkey was a state turban which was worn in Stambul by the Grand Vizier, the High Admiral (Kuçumdan Paşa) and the chief eunuchs (Fisâr, Fatih) and in the provinces by the pashas of three tails; cf. v. Hammer, Statzverfassung, i. 440, 444; do., G. O. R., iii. 17; vii. 268; viii. 191.

Kâlî, plur. kâlîfûtâ, a high cap, another form of kallutâ.

Kâlîwîta, kâlîta, plur. kâlîwît, a cap. The word is perhaps connected with the French colotê, Pers. gûlû(5,6),(995,991) and perhaps even with the Latin calotântica, calotântica, calotântica; in Syriac, kalâwû is found with the meaning of tiara, mitre. This name was particularly common under the Turkish dynasties of Egypt; under the Ayyûbîs, the sultan, the emirs and the soldiers wore yellow kallûtâ without turban (zâmîm) with ghânâmîth hanging down behind (Kâlkapzâdi, iv. 39; Makriî, ii. 98). In the reign of Asârîf Shâhân the kâlîwîta with gold were introduced (kâlîwîta al-mârîbâh; Makriî, op. cit.); according to another source (Kâlkapzâdi, op. cit.), they were red with zâmîm; from the time of Ashraf Shâbân they were worn larger. The emir Vêlîbâghî al-'Omarî introduced a special form, the so-called kâtûtî yelâbûgûshîn which were large, but under Zâhir Barkî still larger kallûtâ ferêshî appeared (Makriî, op. cit.). In those days a set of robes of honour included a kâtûtî wârîsh (Kâlkapzâdi, iv. 52 sq.).

Kâlîba [q.v.].

Kâna, a red cloth, adorned with pearls, which the Egyptian women twisted round their earbâgh.
Kurugsi, pl. Kurugsi, popular pronunciation of küfısı, Kufisi, qufis, a small white or red cloth cap, around which the turban can be twisted.

Kobusbati in old Turkey was the round turban worn by viziers and other officials, who were no longer in active service and therefore did not wear the muslin body (v. Hammer, Statuta Farasung, l. 444). According to d'Ohsson, ii. 135, 6 Othman I is said to have worn a cap of a red material, which was called kufisi, körbusbat and was worn by the Tatars and the Caghatai.

Kufisi, pl. Kufisi, also mikšaro(a), was a cloth, which women and men wound on the head, like the 'ribbon and the Küfısı. Sometimes it also seems to mean a woman's veil of silk embroidered with gold, then again to be the same as milka (Kattani, p. 12, 106). From al-kını came the Spanish alquimal. Bukhārī has a faḥ al-Turkamana.

Kibba, properly a general word for garment, is a piece of flannel worn by learned men in North Africa, around the body and head. In earlier times every one wore it and called it baž, which was the name for a woman's veil (cf. Brunot).

Konqal, a cap worn by women in Algiers and Tunis.

Kufi, pl. Kufi, was in Egypt the name for the innermost cap of the turban, which could be kept on, even when sleeping, while the turban proper was taken off and put on a special turban stand, kusari al-imimua; the kufi thus corresponds in a way to the modern fayla and arafla. The Egyptian texts of the Arabic Nights have baž for kubāri. Kufi's arafl is a similar cap of blue Chinese silk. According to Kattani, ii. 105, there was a market called sīh al-akfarzīnîn in Cairo. Küfisiye = Chalil, Kufî, Syr. Koča, Heb. קָפִי is also said to have been a kind of cap or turban, but it also means the capital of a column.

Kufiye, popularly kefıye, pl. kemisfi, is in Arabic probably a loanword from the Italian (per)uza, Lat. vith century colofa, Span. (ti)cofa, Port. colofa, Fr. coife, Engl. coif, to which the Turkish usfayie is also said to be related. It is a rectangular piece of cloth worn by the Bedouins and their women in Egypt, Arabia, and the Irāk on their heads, of linen or silk in various colours, almost a yard square. The cloth is folded diagonally, the ends hang down or are tied below the chin and above it the Bedouins sometimes, and townsmen usually, wind a turban. This form, which was already known in Egypt in the Mamluk period and is mentioned in the Arabian Nights, has in modern times come into prominence again as part of dress of the Wahhabis.

Küfı is a head-dress worn by women, along with an 'ribbon. The word is perhaps a corruption of sarafıd, searafl, which is said to mean a Tatar cap.

Kụba, a Persian word, is applied in Turkish to the plumed head-dress worn by the princes of Moldavia and Wallachia and by the Aghas of the Janissaries (cf. v. Hammer, Statuta Farasung, l. 444).

Kutil is the Persian general word for the cap, which replaced the turban in Persia. In old Turkey it meant more particularly the sugar-loaf-shaped head-dress of the cooks, confectioners and woodcutters of the Serail, and also a white felt head-dress worn by the Janissaries = kele and one of red cloth worn by the kusandijes = kusarisa. Scull

Kushân is the Persian name for the Shāfr Persians corresponding to the Turkish hâlbâkân; cf. Babinger, Islam, xi. 811.

Kulito (cf. kalwinta) means in Persian a veil worn by women or a child's kap = yulnās.

Kumma, yemma, plur. Kumma is a little tight-fitting cap; cf. Abu 'l-Fadl, iv. 332, 5; Kattani, p. 40 sq.

Kurysa, kürsye, kurysa. The word seems to be a loanword in Arabic and Berber and to come from the Persian; it is found mainly in the Maghrib and Spain and was there applied to a man's head-dress of white wool or strips of wool which the Berbers wound round their heads like a turban cloth. But now it seems to mean a cloak; cf. Brunot.

Lişa (supply yulnawma) means a small tight-fitting (fayl) cap, but is probably not a proper name for it; cf. Kattani, p. 37, 40, 41.

Lība, lībāda, a small cap of brown or white felt (lihbi) which the common people in Egypt wear under the feryān. The very poor wear it alone, without feryān and turban.

Lithām, a mouth-veil for men (q.v.).

Mandī, mendi, a loanword from the Latin mantile, is applied to cloths generally, but may also mean the turban, especially in Turkish and Persian. It is found in this sense also in Arabic authors, like Thālabī and Maqriti, but they probably get it from the Persian.

Mita, means in Persia the turban, probably derived from mitur, which however means a veil.

Mīr'ān, a parallel form for arafla, perspiration-cap.

Mīghur, also pronounced mīkšur, the helmet, is a network of iron wire to protect the head in battle under the cap (yulanuma): the Prophet is said to have worn one at the entry into Mecca. Soldiers wore a turban around the helmet, not only when fighting, but also in times of peace (Fris, Das Herrwerden der Araber, p. 59). Thus the Turkish mīgır Murad IV, who was continually in the field, used to wind his turban cloth around his helmet (v. Hammer, Statuta Farasung, l. 443). Hence the phrase (the article to allay the turban) = to live in peace and security (Kattani, p. 4) while "the turban on the neck" (fi 'urši mendi or imimua) is a sign of submission.

Nawzā is the same as nihe, a head-cloth but the former is usually smaller. The mavi of women is also called kafūra.

Mikawara, mikawara, is a word for turban and mawzawar thus came to mean the same as maqamīna, i.e. theologian, man of learning, and in Muslim Spain, the officials and jurists, because these alone wore the turban there.

Mishscudi, mishscudi, mishscudi, mishscudi are rarer words for turban.

Musulvania, Arabic, but apparently only found in Turkish, a barrel- or cylindrical-shaped cap, which was worn with the turban cloth from the time of Soliman's dress edict, as the proper court and state head-dress. Soliman is said to have been the first sultan to wear himself the Turban (v. Hammer, Statuta Farasung, l. 447; Pernot, i. 4. M. turban: the musulcan was previously the military cap, the red top of which peeped out from the turban cloth. The conqueror (Feth) Mehemmed II is said to have worn his turban over a spiral lihbi, like the musulvan of scholars, and the turban of his son Fatih II, like his father's, resembled the type worn by learned men (Karabacek, p. 15).

*Mukā 'a*, a large turban worn by learned men of unvarying shape, but also the head-dress of Copt priests with a long narrow band. *Mukā 'a* = "half the head", is a small helmet or cap worn by steamin the Maghribi; the name is also found in Egypt. In Morocco the *parbāk* is also called *nisf al-'orū'a* because it covers half the head, tightly fitting; cf. Brunot.

*Parbāk*, the "suitable turban", was the name of the turban worn by the common people in the reign of Soliman; G. O. R., iii. 17, Petole, Pers. pronunciation of *barfulla*.

*Rahā* of women consists of the *fābiya, parbāk* and *arwādīya*; together they make a kind of woman's turban, but it is very different from that worn by men.

*Rusā* is a small turban for young people in Morocco (cf. Brunot).

*Sadī* is a green or black *fābiya;* cf. Kattāni, p. 106.

*Salim*, a special variety of the kind of turban called *Yarni*, called after Sulān Selim I, who is said to have preferred it, as did Selim II also; G. O. R., iii. 17; vili. 268.

*Shāb*, * arbitrāg* pl. *sharābaq*; *sharābaq*; probably from the Persian *sarē* but the latter is a woman's head-dress. In Syria we found *sorfōl* in Bas Hrnnes. The *sharābaq* was the head-dress of the emirs under the Mamluks in Egypt; according to Makritti, ii. 99, it resembled the *tūgī*, was three-cornered, worn without a turban, and one formed part of a set of robes of honour. It had a markedly military character and the *sharābaq* of the emirs is contrasted to the turban of the jurists (Makritti-Blochet, p. 353). In Cairo in those days, there was a special market for sellers of *sharābaq*; in which however in Makritti's time only robes of honour were sold, and in Damascus there was a madrasa called al-Mudrasa al-Mulkiyya al-Sharabābīyya. Under the Circassian Mamluks, the sharābaq fell into disuse (and was replaced by the hairīrt *terkīya*).

*Sarfī* also *sarī*, a bandage, is the usual Turkish name for the turban. *Sarfīl* = turban-wearer c. *sarī, hagī* = clerk with the turban, *parbāk* = turban-maker; *parbāk* = *sadī*, the sultan's turban-keeper. The first rigid regulation of the turban-makers dates from Soliman's time, when their shops were first opened, and regulations about the wearing of turbans were drawn up (v. Hammer, Staatsverfassung, l. 443).

*Shāhb* [q. v.], the turban-cloth, then the whole turban, a name used particularly in North Africa and Egypt. The Egyptian texts of the Arabian Nights have *shāhb* for *imāna*. Sometimes *shāhb* was particularly the white and blue striped turban of the Copts, while that of the Muslims was called *shābī*; the *shābī* bahabakī was particularly well-known. The *shāhb* *fābiya al-khulaf at the court of the Fātimids was the office of the turban-winder to the Fātimid caliph; Kalllaghāndi, iii. 484.

*Skīl*. The word has passed into the languages of Europe, "shiw", etc., and means the turban-cloth or turban, especially in Egypt, sometimes also kerchief worn by women c. in Arabia and North Africa.

*Skīl* is the Turkish word for the modern European hat, which was introduced into Turkey by law in 1925. Only clerics already wearing turbans (parbāk hagī) were allowed to retain their turbans. A number of publications appeared at the time on this question (Alamī, mē'eselat). *Skīl* from which we get the English word "sash", meant the turban-cloth in Egypt, Syria, Arabia and Persia. Under the Ayyubids the kājī and learned men wore turbans with large *shābāːa*, some let a tail (shābāːa) hang down between the shoulders or wore the neck-veil in addition (fālāsan; Kallakshand, iv. 42; cf. Makritti, ii. 98 and Sayyuti, ii. 226). The *shāb* however also meant a cap (= *shāhīya*) and formed part of a set of robes of honour; e. g. Kallakshand, iv. 52 sq.: *shāb* *rafī", *mawzūl bīhi fārāfū min ḫūr al-yafū. From 780 we also find the *shāh* as part of a woman's dress; it is the cloth embroidered with gold and pearls, thrown over the double *fālāsār*; cf. Karbacaque, p. 67 sq.

*Shāhīya* in Egypt was a cap, around which the turban-cloth was wound; it was of silk and might be trimmed with pearls and gold. On the other hand, however, it was the name given to the paper cap, put upon criminals, and also to iron helmet-like turbans. To put on the *shāhīya* = *adopt Islam*. In modern Morocco, it is a black cap for young people in the form of the *parbāk* also a head-dress in the form of a sugar-loaf, which the Đeļka dervishes wear, in Algiers a woman's cap (Brunot), in the oasis of Siwa it is pronounced *shāba*. *Shāhīya* seems originally to have been the turban-cloth of *shāh* muslin; cf. Z.D.M.G., xxii. 161.

*Shemī* was in Turkey in the reign of Soliman a carelessly wound turban-cloth, worn by the common people (G. O. R., iii. 17). In North Africa it is a cloth, still sometimes wound over the turban (*imāna*); cf. Brunot.

*Shinīr* = Span. sombrero is the name given in Morocco to the European hat, sometimes also called *fīrār*; cf. Brunot.

*Sudāra* is a skull-cap like the *fābiya* worn under the *miknu* and *yạh*. *Sūkā*, the name for the Turkish dervish cap; cf. Jacob, Bekrādyya, p. 40.

*Sudās, sudās* is a green *fābiya* worn by women, especially in winter time as a protection from cold.

*Tūgī* [q. v.], "Crown", also turban.

*Taḥnīk* (al-*imāna*) is a special adjustment, in which the turban-cloth is brought under the chin as a protection against heat and cold or its two ends tied under the chin. This form is found particularly in the Maghribi and those who use it defend it intolerantly and describe all other forms of the turban as innovation (bild'ā), as the dress of the devil or of the Copts, or as a survival of the turbans of the followers of Līf (Kattāni, p. 70). The opposite of *taḥnīk* is *tālātī* or *tīyā* (even letting the ends hang down is also wrong in contrast to it) while other rare synonyms for the *taḥnīk* are *talākʰ* or *tīkʰ*. From the Maghribi, the Fātimids seem to have brought the *taḥnīk* to Egypt, and the *nsūkʰ* musulmaanīt̃ were the chief emirs (munuca) at the Fātimid court who held the highest offices in the personal service of the Fātimid caliph (Kallakshand, iii. 484; Iml al-Sairifī, Kīnān, ed. Bahgat, Introduction). Farther east also the *taḥnīk* was occasionally found; for example even al-Ṣallīl is said to have recommended it. But it is not *sunna* with the Shāhīya, while, for example, Iml Kâyim recommends it.

*Tūlāsān* [q. v.], neck-veil of the kājī.
Tub, a green *taqilin*, a name of very rare occurrence.

*Taşk*, a word, originally Persian, and in Persia was the turban or a high cap. French *fouque* and Spanish *falsa* are perhaps connected with it. The name seems to be first found in Mamluk Egypt in the sixteenth century, when it was a round cap with flat top in various colours, worn without the turban-cloth. Under Nasir Faradji it was extended in height from 1/8 to 1/4 zils and swollen out like a cupola (perhaps under the influence of old Egyptian models) and called the Circassian *fábiya*. Egyptian women are said to have imitated this for erotic or other reasons and this form then made its way to the east. The *fábiya* was also accepted with paper and in a Fāqimid cap, similar in shape, of the sixteenth century have been found fragments of papyrus with writing upon them. These headaddresses were quilted and had a rippled appearance. Other forms were evolved from them, such as the bottle, barrell-cone and the so-called unicorn (Maqrizi, ii. 104; Karabacek, p. 73; cf. *fartur*). In modern times *fábiya* is used as a synonym for *aračiya*; cf. Brunot; Kattâni, p. 98.

*Tali*, parallel form for *taša*. *

*Tarabih*, probably, like *tarabih*, going back to the Persian *sarab*, only found in Arabic from the eighteenth century, was a tight-fitting cap, in Egypt usually of red wool, with a tassel of black or blue silk. Around this cap, men of rank wore the turban-cloth and under it the small *farrar* or *aračiya*. In Syria and in the *Iraň* the *tarabih* has sometimes a peak, which hangs behind or at the side and is kept in position by a piece of cloth. In Egypt this cap used to be called *gaštah* (in Morocco we still find both terms in use side by side); in Spain *cartaga*. *Tarabih* is a name given in Morocco to a young man, who does not yet wear the turban (Brunot). The *tarabih* there is also imported from Europe; the *shabihya* on the other hand is made in the country itself. *

*Takš* is also a kind of *taša*.

*Taš* is a kind of *taša*.

*Tarar*, *tarar* (a), *fanara*, *fanura*, in Arabic a loanword of unknown origin (the Latin *turris*, tower-shaped, has been compared), a high cap which round the turban can be wound. *Tarar* seems to be found as early as a papyrus of the fifth century A.D. (Karabacek, p. 67), and in the fourth century A.D. it was a popular head-dress in Kairawân (Karabacek, p. 65). The *tarar* at a later date seems to have been a head-dress of the Bedouins (they wore by it, *wa-kabbi* *tarar*; there is a saying, *he fell at the first blow like the *tarar* of a Bedouin*) and to have gone out of fashion with the denizens of the towns. A *tarar* of paper used to be put on the heads of criminals and prisoners captured from the enemy, and it was worn also by the "prince of the New Year" (*waqar*) at a popular festival in Cairo, which was prohibited in the reign of Barsâk. The pointed *tarar* was in the sixteenth century, with or without the turban, the head-dress of the common people in Egypt and the countries adjoining it (Karabacek, p. 68); at a later date dervishes in Egypt wore sugar-loaf-shaped *tarar* with trimmings (*lana*, *Manars* etc.); in Turkey it was worn by the volunteer corps of the Delis, in Algiers by the Dey’s *çawashes*, in Morocco by the negro soldiery. The name is found wherever Arabic is spoken and *tarar* in Arabic seems to correspond to *çaf* in Turkish and Persian. About 780 A.H. the double *tarar* with two peaks like a camel’s hump, and the *çaf* above them, appears as a lady’s fashion in Egypt and was taken to Europe (Karabacek, p. 71) and in modern times we find among the Druze and Maronites of Lebanon a *tarur* plated with gold or covered with horn like the horn of a unicorn. In Fès, Algiers, and Tunis also, the name is given to certain forms of women’s head-dress (cf. Brunot, p. 119; Karabacek, p. 80).

*Ubrâf*, *ubhrâf*, a high cap common in the Maghrib, which could be made either quite simply or of valuable material. *Urf* was in old Turkey a large globe-or pad-shaped turban worn by learned men, corresponding to the Arabic Dimy³a and the Persian *bâlibi-shâfî*. Sultan Mehmed II was fond of wearing the *urf* embroidered with gold; cf. von Hammer, *Staatserfassung*, i. 444 sq.; do. G. O.R., vii. 268; viii. 191.

*Urça*, *urca*, *urça* is said to be a melon-shaped hat. *

*Ushâbi* also *ushâfiya*, from the Italian *schioppi* = Arabic *câbiya*, was a peaked cap embroidered with gold, which the officers of the Janissaries and some officers of the Serrâli like the Ballâsji wore, also called gašhâ. Sultan Mustafa Paşa, son of Orkhan, is said to have invented it; he is said to have introduced it out of affection for Djalal al-Din Rumi and even to have worn it. It came into general use in the reign of Murâd I and became a kind of ruler’s crown; cf. v. Hammer, *Staatserfassung*, i. 444 sq.; do. G. O.R., iii. 17.

*Yânfi*, *imnän* = *Yânfi* is an old name for the Turkish turban; it is said to have been originally invented by Joseph and to be called after him. Selim I and II wore these *Yânfi*, which were then called *Selims* after them; cf. v. Hammer, *Staatserfassung*, i. 442 sq.; do. G. O.R., iv. 17.

*Bibliography*: Arabic works dealing especially with the Turban:

4. Do. Taﬁ al-Lûtan an Dâmâm al-Tâli‘ahîn;
6. M. b. Yahya al-Bukhârî, Râsâli fi Fadlîl al-Imâmîn wa-Samânakî, d. 934 (1527), Berlin, No. 5459;
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Note 14 is the most detailed monograph on the Turfan and has been much used for the above article. Of other writings he mentions No. 1, 2, 3, 8, 10, 12, 13, but has himself only seen and used No. 8. In addition to No. 14 we have used No. 2 for some purposes.

European literature in addition to the works of Dörzi, Karabacek and Brunot cited above we may mention a few general works on costume: Rosenberg, Geschichte der Kleidung, 5 vols., plates with brief descriptions, pls. 297 on the Turfan; J. v. Falke, Kleidungsgeschichte der Kultusvölker; Albert Kretzschmer, Die Trachten der Völker, Katalog der Lipsius’schen Kostüm-bibliothek. – 15 forms of Turfan are illustrated by Fesquet, 1902, 44 different ones by Niebuhr, and no less than 286 are given by Michael Thalman, Elechna librorum or. loc., Vienna 1792, 23 vols. on Cod. turc., vii. Bologna (according to E. L., ii. 751); cf. Victor Rosen, Remarques sur les mus. orientaux de la Collection Marussi à Bologne (Atti della Reale Ac. dei Lincei, 281, 1893–1896), p. 182.

(W. BÖRKEMAN)

TURFAN, usually written Turfan, locally pronounced Turfan, a town in Chinese Turfan. The oasis, fertile although suffering from a scarcity of water, between the depression of Lukchun, which lies below the sea-level, and the ranges of the Thian-shan, has been of importance from ancient times not only for trade between China and the west but also politically; the settlements mentioned in ancient times and the early middle ages were however not on the site of the modern Turfan but west and east of it. In the second century B.C. the principality of Kuch was here; in the year 60 B.C. it was destroyed by the Chinese and eight small principalties took its place, including anterior Kuch in the region of Turfan; the capital of this was the little town called Kao-ho by the Chinese, the site of which is marked by the ruins about 4 miles west of Turfan called Yarkhoto by Klemens (Nachrichten über die von der Kaiserl. Akad. der Wiss. zu St. Petersburg im Jahre 1888 ausgeführte Expedition nach Turfan, St. Petersburg 1899, p. 44 ff.). Considerable importance was later attained by the Chinese settlement Kao-cang, called in Turki first Khōlo (Mahmut Kâshgharī, L. 103; Kâddil) later Kâr Kâddul, now the ruins of Idikut-shahrî, 20–25 miles east of Turfan. Immediately south of the modern Turfan lie the ruins called Oul Turfan by Klemens (op. cit., p. 28); according to S. Franke (Eine chinesische Tempelinschrift aus Idikutshahrî bei Turfan, Abh. österr. Akad. Wiss. Abt. für Abh. 1907, p. 35) these ruins mean date from ancient times and have been an unimportant place; but they occupy a rather larger area (3 square kilometres) than Idikut-shahrî.

Turfan is not mentioned in the Mongol period and not on the Chinese map of 1331 (E. Bretschneider, Medieval Researches from Eastern Asiatic Sources, vol. ii.). The only suggestion that there was perhaps a town of Turfan in ancient times also, is found in a Saka document found in Tan-Huang and published by Stem Konow (Oslo Etnografiske Muséums Skrifter: Publications of the India Institute, iii. 3. Oslo 1929, p. 137 and 148) where a town called Turfanja is mentioned. The first Chinese (in the Ming-shi) reference to Turfan (Chinese T’u-lia-fan) is in the year 1377; some foreign em-
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basesses on the way to China were robbed at Turfan and a Chinese army was sent against the king of Turfan as a reprisal (Med. Rei., ii. 193). To a somewhat later date belongs the first Muslim account of Turfan; according to the Tarikh-i Ragdoll, Khalil Khodja, Khan of Moghulistan (c. 1380-1399), undertook a campaign against “Karā Khodja and Turfan, two very important towns on the frontiers of China”; the inhabitants were forced to adopt Islam and the two towns were henceforth regarded as within the territory of Islam (Tarikh-i Ragdoll, transl. Ross, p. 52). When the celebrated embassy of the Timurid Shāhrukh (q. v.) passed through the country in 823 (1420) the inhabitants were, however, for the most part still idolators; there was a large temple of idols there and a great statue of Buddha Sakyamuni (Šāktimuni) and many other idols, some old, some of recent erection (N. E., xiv., p. 310 and the original text of Ḥāfṣi-ibn-Abū [q.v.] in Barthold, al-Muṣaf-fūrīya, p. 27). The present inhabitants of Turfan (Turfanī) know that Uighurs used to live there, but these Uighurs are now considered to have been Muslims; all Buddhist relics are ascribed to the Kalmucks (Klementz, op. cit., p. 29) or to Kalmouks (see q. k.). Turfan suffered in those days from want of water even more than it does now. In the reign of Wais Khan (1178-1428) agriculture was conducted in a very primitive and laborious fashion; the Khān had a deep well dug and out of this he himself and his slaves drew water for their fields in earthen vessels (kīna) (Tarikh-i Ragdoll, p. 57). Conditions seem to have improved later; towards the end of the xvith century the land of Čaflī (the modern Karagāh) obtained its corn from Turfan (Zāp-xv., 251) quoted by M. Hartmann, Der islamische Orient, i. 502). The present underground irrigation canals are said not to have been made till the xvith century (Sir A. Stein, in Geogr. Journ., x. 1916, Sept., p. 47).

Under the princes claiming descent from Čaghaṭāi Khān in the modern Chinese Turkestan (xvith–xvith century) Turfan is frequently mentioned as the residence of various Khāns; at a later date it was, like the rest of the country, subjected first to the Kalmucks, then after the destruction of the Kalmuck empire in 1758 to the Chinese. In 1765 the town of Uč (west of Aq-ūs, q. v.), which had rebelled against the Chinese, was destroyed and its population completely wiped out; in order to restore the town, inhabitants were imported from other towns, especially from Turfan. Uč was henceforth known as Uč-Turfan or Us-Turfan; to distinguish the two, Turfan proper was called Old Turfan (Khomē Turfan). In the time of Yaqub Beg (1866-1877) Turfan was the frontier town of his dominions in the east; in 1876 it was visited by a famine and in 1877 occupied by the Chinese without resistance. Turfan now belongs to the territory of the “king” (wang) of Lānkun. The first European to visit Turfan was Dr. A. Regel (see below) in 1789. The modern fort of Turfan is said by Regel to have been built by Yaqub Beg; east of it is the Chinese fort, which, according to Gram-Grimaldo (Opisanie patrastyhovy v Zapadny Kital, i. St. Petersburg 1836, p. 275), was not built till 1886; but it is already mentioned by Regel. Still farther to the east, according to Regel, lay the ruins of the Turfan of the last centuries “with numerous fine tomb-mosques and a beautiful minaret”. The minaret and the medrese, to which it belongs, have been several times illustrated (Klementz, op. cit., p. 49; O. Donner, Ross i Centralasien 1889, Helsingfors 1901, p. 120; A. le Coq, Auf Hellsen Spuren in Otranttien, Leipzig 1926, pl. 2). The minaret was not, as has been asserted, a Christian holy tower, but was only built in 1760 by a Wang of Lānkun. These ruins are probably identical with the Old Turfan of Klementz, which in this case would belong to a later date than Franks (see above) and Grünwedel (“a terribly ruined old town of the Uighur period”) have assumed; Klementz also (op. cit., p. 38) seeks to identify the Tu-lo-fan of the Ming geographers with the present Old Turfan, which lies S.E. of the modern Chinese Turfan. The ruins of most of the buildings of the old town seem to have been destroyed between 1879 and 1898, but, as Oldenburg established in 1909, more has survived than one would suppose from Klementz’s description. The modern town is of some importance as a commercial centre; the highest estimate of the number of inhabitants is about 20,000.


TURGAI, the name of a river system and of a small town in the steppes of Central Asia. The main river Turgaí is formed of the Karun-saddl Turgai, which receives the small Turgai, and the Karun-Turgai, all flows into Lake Durukā; north of it runs the Sarf Turgai, which is called Ukun-tamdi in its upper course and receives from the west the Maitil-Turgai and the Sarf-bai Turgai. The Sarf Turgai flows into Lake Sarf-Kopa. In Turkish turbghi or turgæ means "little bird" (Radloff, Wörterbuch, iii. 1584, 1457); Kärn Turgai is a name of the stalling. The fortifications of Orenburg are called Turgai Kala.

The modern town of Turgan on the river of the same name was built in 1845 by Major Tomlin as a fortress and one of the centres of Russian power among the Kirgis (q.v.) under the name of the Orenburg fortress (Orenburgskoe Ukreplesienie). In 1855 the territory of the Orenburg Kirgis was divided into two provinces (oblasti), the Ural and the Turgai. When the Turgai province in 1868 was divided into districts (uveli), the fortress was made the capital of the district and called Turgai. As there was no suitable centre in the province, itself, the Turgai province was administrated from Orenburg. The governor lived there and in it was published from 1887 the official gazette, Turgatskaya Oblastnaya Vedomosti. Among the four capitals of districts in this province, the town of Turgai only takes the third place and has never been important; the number of inhabitants according to the census of 1897 was only 866, to that of 1911, 1,557. The southern part of the province with the town of Turgai is less suitable for agriculture and Russian
colonisation than the north, on account of the scarcity of fertile areas, although in the sixties about 1,300 hectares were cultivated on the river Turgai alone. From Turgai, trade routes lead northwards to Orsk and Kustanai, and southwards to Irgiz and Perovsk (now called Kizil-Orda).

Before Russian rule the present Turgai territory was inhabited only by nomads and hardly mentioned in political history. An exception is Nasawi's account (ed. Houdas, p. 9 sq.) of the campaign of the Khwārizm-shah [q.v.] Muhammad in the year 612 (1215–1216) against the Kipchaks and his encounter with the Mongols; cf. Barthold, Turkestān etc. = G. M. S., N. S. v., p. 370 sqq.; J. Marquart, "Östtürkische Dialektstudien", Berlin 1914, p. 128 sqq. where on p. 133 a later date (midsummer 1219) is assumed.

Turgai now belongs to the autonomous republic of Kazakhstān. Instead of the earlier division into provinces and districts, the area is now divided into administrative regions (obrugs); the town of Turgai now belongs to the area Aktyubinsk, the most southerly part of the former Turgai province to the area of Kizil-Orda.


(W. Baktold)

**TURKISTĀN or TURKESTAN**, a Persian word meaning "the land of the Turks". To the Persians of course only the southern frontier of the land of the Turks, the frontier against Iran, was of importance and this frontier naturally depended on political conditions. On their first appearance in Central Asia in the sixth century A. D., the Turks reached the Oxus (cf. Ämule-Daryā). In the ecclesiastical administration of the Sasanians therefore the "land of the Turks" began immediately north of the Oxus: according to the story given in Tabari (i. 455 sq.) the Oxus was settled by an arrow-shot of Umar as the frontier between the Turks and the "territory (Camālu) of the Persians". According to the Armenian Sebōn (seventh century A. D.) the Vehrat, i.e. the Oxus, rises in the land of Turkāstān (Histoire d'Hiraclius par l'Évêque Sébōn, transl. by Fr. Macler, Paris, 1904, p. 49; J. Marquart, Érainlahir, p. 48); in another passage in the same work (p. 43; Marquart, p. 73) Turκ'astān is associated with Delhistan i.e. Dehistan (in the neighbourhood of the Caspian Sea, north of the Atrek [q.v.]).

By the victories of the Arabs, the Turks were driven far back to the north; for the Arab geographers of the third and fourth (tenth) centuries, Turkistān therefore began, not immediately north of the Oxus, but only north of the area now called the "lands beyond the river:" Mā warṣaʾ al-Nahr [q.v.]. Turkistān, the land of the Turks, was then regarded as the regions north and east of Mā warṣaʾ al-Nahr. [The town of Kūsān in Farghāna [q.v.] north of the Sir-Daryā [q.v.] was "where the land of Turkistān begins" (Yāḥūk, ii. 227).] The towns of Džand and Shahrkand on the lower course of the same river were in Turkistān (op. cit., ii. 137; iii. 344); in Turkistān lay the town of Khōtān (op. cit., ii. 403). From this use of the name it has been held (especially by M. Hartmann, Chinesisch-Turkestān, Halle 1908, p. 4) that the name "Turkestān" was first applied by the Russian conquerors of Central Asia quite arbitrarily to the land of Mā warṣaʾ al-Nahr. As a matter of fact, the name Turkistān had long regained its earlier significance as a result of the Turkic conquests, perhaps less in literature than in everyday usage. To the people of Persia and Afghanistān the "Turks in Turkistān" were their immediate neighbours on the north; thus in a hagyie taken down in Shirāz in 1886 we are told "Two Turks came from Turkistān, brought me to Hindūstān" (Y. Žukovskiy, Obruch peresildage narovago turysta, St. Petersburg, 1902, p. 169 sqq.). Through the Oxov conquests of the xviith century a new Turkistān arose south of the Ämt-Daryā. The corresponding province of Afghanistān still bears the name of Turkistān; as the southern frontiers of this Turkistān some travellers (R. Burnes, A Peep in Turkistān, London, 1846, p. 57 sqq.) give the pass of Aḵ Rahat north of Bāmiyān [q.v.]; others (J. Wood, A Journey to the Source of the River Oxus; [q.v.], new edition, London 1872, p. 130) the pass of Hadjikak, a little farther south, where the watershed between the basins of the Helmand [q.v.] and the Ämti Daryā is; farther west, in the region between the Monghāb and the Åbol Mainamān, the frontier of Turkistān is given as the range of Band (or Tīrband)-i-Turkistān. The name Turkistān was introduced into the scientific terminology of the xviith century, not by the Russians but by the English, probably under the influence of the Persian and Afghan usage.

In literature, especially in travellers' records, a distinction has usually been made between Russian, Chinese and Afghan Turkestān, although the word Turkestān (or Turkistān) had an administrativusignificance only in Russia and Afghanistān. Sometimes instead of these we find the terms West and East Turkistān. The governor-generalship of Turkistān was founded in 1867 by the Russians with Tashkent [q.v.] as its capital. The frontiers of this governor-generalship were sometimes contracted, sometimes extended. From 1882 to 1898 the province of Semireyeyeh, at one time included in Turkistān, belonged to the governor-generalship of the Steppes with Omak as its capital. In 1898 Semireyeyeh and the Transcaspian province (Turcomania) were incorporated in Turkistān.

In 1886 Prof. I. Mushtetow attempted to give the name "Turkestān" a definite geographical significance, independent of administrative conditions. Under the influence of A. Petzchoh's book Umschau im russischen Turkistān nicht einer allgemeinen Schilderung der Turkistänschen Reiche, Leipzig 1877, he proposed to give the name Turkistān or the Turkistān basin to the lands between the central mountains of Central Asia and the basin of the Caspian Sea, the Iranian plateau and the sea of ice. Mushtetow had no doubt that the frontier between Russia and England in the not distant future would be established on the Hindū-Kush [q.v.]. He proposed to replace the term "Chinese Turkestān" by the Chinese Han-hai (interpreted by European scholars since Richthofen as the "dry sea"). Mushtetow deals only with geographical facts and hypotheses, without regarding the etymological significance of the words or any ethnographical considerations.

Mainly on ethnographical grounds the word Turkistān has gradually dropped out of use
in Soviet Russia. After the revolution, a "Turkestan republic" lasted a few years with the old capital Tagh-kent. In comparison with the earlier governorship, the area of this republic was much smaller; in the north isolated parts were attached to the Kirgiz republic [cf. Kirghiz]. After the principle of nationality had been finally carried through in 1924, the common name of the land had to give way to terms formed of the names of the various peoples like Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan and Tajikistan. Only a few, mainly economic questions, are still settled in Tagh-kent for all the lands in question; for Turkestan in such cases the expression Central Asia (Sredneeaziya Aseyi) is used.

Turkestan was also the name in use under the Ozbek for a town on the middle course of the Sir Darya. From the accounts of the Arab geographers it may be asserted that in the fourth (tenth) century the town of Shāhvar (in Le Strange, Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, 2nd ed., Cambridge 1905, p. 485; Shāhvār) must have stood there; unfortunately no trace of it has been found. In the sixth century and probably as early as the ninth, the later Turkestan was called Yast and is mentioned as late as the history of Timur (Zafar-Nāma, Ind. ed., ii. 9) as a village (jāran). The importance of the town increased from the 11th — first known in the Mongol period — of the saint Ahmad Yesevi [q. v.], regarded as the convert of the Turks to Islam (on his period see also Barthold, in Der islam, xiv. 112), and especially after the splendid tomb had been erected there by Timur. The saint was regarded as the patron of the land of the Turks and was called Hadrat-î Turkestan, which probably explains the new name of the town. At the time of the Russian conquest the circumference of the town was about 2 miles, the population about 5,500, and in 1908 it had risen to 15,000.


**TURKMEN-CAI** (better C-Tayf), a village in the district of Garman in the province of Adjarabaidzhan. Turkmancai, "the river of the Turkmans," is really the name of the stream on which the village stands; it comes down from the Çitak pass (between Turkmancai and Sarh). It is one of the northern tributaries of the river of Miyana (Shähā-ārzai) which flows into the Kkudun (cf. the article Safadun). The village of Turkmancai marks a stage on the great Tashkent-Krasnovoroshtka-Tirman-Khafran road. The distances are Taliris-Turkmancai 60 miles; Turkmancai-Zandjan c. 80 miles. Handullah in the Nuhat al-Kullih, G. M. S., xxii. 183, puts these distances at 16 and 25 farakhs respectively. He calls the village Turkmancand; the word baxna = village, only used in Adjarabaidzhan and unknown elsewhere in Persia, is certainly of ancient Iranian origin (cf. Sogdian, bagn, town; cf. Barthold, "Istoriya Kul'turno, Zhitni Turkestana, Leningrad 1927, p. 34); the word must have been brought into Adjarabaidzhan by Turkish invaders. Handullah also says that at one time the village was a town, the Iranian name of which, Dib Kharran (several variants), he gives.

Clavijo, ed. Srezewski (St. Petersburg 1881, p. 172 and 354), calls Türgman-çai Tunelar and Tunqlar (evidently a corruption of Türk-çai) and says that it is inhabited by Turkmans.

Turkmancai is known in history from the treaty signed there between Russia and Persia on Feb. 10/22, 1828. This diplomatic document consists of two parts. I. By virtue of the political treaty, which was to take the place of the treaty of 1813, Russia annexed the Khanates of Erevan and Nakhichevan and received from Persia a contribution of 5,000,000 tinaris = 20,000,000 roubles, but this was later reduced. 2. A special agreement fixed at 3/4 ad valorem the customs duties between the two countries and regulated the personal status of Russian subjects in criminal cases they were to be tried by Russian courts, civil cases affecting foreigners were dealt with by Russo-Persian tribunals with the participation of the Russian consular representatives etc. This particular agreement of 1828 is the historical origin of the Persian capitulations. By the most favoured nation clause, all the states of Europe in time secured similar rights. On its accession to power in 1817 the Russian government renounced sua sponte all the old political and judicial privileges in Persia and this renunciation was sealed by the Persian-Russian treaty of Feb. 28, 1921. Since 1918 Persia has shown a desire to abrogate capitulations generally, but not till May 10, 1927 did she address a circular note to this effect to the powers, several of whom, from May 10, 1925, have made new treaties on a basis of equality.

The frontiers of 1828 between Russia and Persia (Little Ararat-Caspian Sea) still remained unchanged even after 1921.

**Bibliography:** Turkmancai is mentioned by all the travellers who have gone from Tabriz to Karvin, cf. Hommaire de Heil, Voyages, Paris 1854-1866, iii. 33-34 (the village has 200 houses), and the atlas p. 111 (room where the treaty was signed); Brugsch, Reise, Leipzig 1862-1864, i. 181; Lycklama a Nijhoff, Voyages, ii. 83; H. Schmiidler, Reisen, Zeitschr. Geolll. Erdk., 1883, p. 333 (100 houses, altitude 5,385 feet).


**TURKMANS,** a Turkish people in Central Asia. The name has been in use since the fifth (tenth) century, first in the Persian plural form Turkmānān, by the Persian historians Gardīz [q. v.] (cf. also now the printed edition by Mub. Nazim, E. G. Brown Mem., vol. i., Berlin 1928) and Abn 'I-qafi Balhaqī [q. v.] in the same sense as the Turkish Oghuz, Arab. Gharis [q. v.]. The Oghus of course used to live in Mongolia, where they are mentioned as early as the Orkhon.
Inscriptions of the eighth century. These Oghuz are, so far as we know, only called Turks, not Turkomans. The Turkomans are mentioned only in the west, first (in the transcription T'o-kü-Mäng) in the Chinese Encyclopaedia of the viith century a.d.; T'ang-tien, chap. 195 (F. Hirth in S. B. Bury, Achar наук, ii. 1899, p. 263 sq.). According to T'ang-tien T'o-kü-Mäng was another name for the land of Suk-tak i.e. the lower course of the Alans (see Allen and Wilson) which in the beginning of our era was stretched as far east as the lower course of the Sī Darya (q.v.), which in the fourth (tenth) century was the main centre of the Oghuz.

In the Arabic geographical literature the Turkomans (al-Turkman or al-Turkmāniya) are only mentioned by al-Mukaddasi (or al-Maqrizi, B. G. A., iii. 274 sq.) in the description of a number of towns N.W. and N.E. of Arbaqjāb or Sairān on the situation of which cannot be exactly defined. By the fifth (xiiith) century the origin of the word Turkomand had already been forgotten; the popular (Persian) etymology Türk mánamid "like Turks" is found as early as Maqmūd Kāshghāri (iii. 307). From his time onwards we often find "Turks and Turkomans" opposed to one another. The language and particularly the type of the Turkomans was influenced by their migration to the west so that only a "similarity" was allowed to exist between them and the rest of the Turks. The Turkomans living in Central Asia at the present day are particularly easy to recognize by their long heads (dolichocephalic); this formation of skull is partly produced by artificial deformation in the cradle, but is also explained by intermixture with Iranian nomadic peoples of Central Asia. Maqmūd Kāshghāri (i. 80 and 393) calls the Khārāj (q.v.) Turkomans as well as the Oghuz.

On the wide dissemination of Turkomans in western Asia as a result of the political events of the xiiith century see gizat and suqshigs. As a result of the political importance of the Seljuk dynasty, we possess full notaries of their people, the Turkomans, than of all other Turkish peoples of the middle ages. Rashid al-Din (text in Tract. Vint, ed. Arif Oghli, vii. 32 sq.) for example gives the names of the individual "Ghūru tribes". In a linguistically older form (e.g. Saqluhr for Salur, Yaqhrfr for Yadsr) we find these names in Maqmūd Kāshghāri (i. 56 sq.). Of the 24 names given by Rashid al-Din, 21 agree with the lists in Maqmūd Kāshghāri. Three names (Yaqhrfr, Karši and Karšk) are found only in Rashid al-Din and one (Djarqulugh or Carsulugh) only in Maqmūd. The total number of tribes according to Rashid al-Din was 24 (the same number occurs in many Turkish and Turkomans also, according to Maqmūd 22); but the latter also knows (iii. 307) that the original number was 26, but two tribes were said to have separated in the pre-Islamic period from the rest and formed the people of the Khaḍar (q.v.).

The name Oghuz was not ousted by that of Turkomans till the Mongol period; in the xiiith (xiiith) century the word Ghūru is found even in official documents (text in Barthold, Turkistan, i. 28 sq.). On the place of abode of the separate tribes nothing is said either by Rashid al-Din or by Maqmūd Kāshghāri. In the historical references (e.g. Zaf, ix. 303; Nesswi, ed. Houdas, p. 391; G. M. S., xvi. 120 and 122, where Tāl should be read for Tāl) the Yaqhrfr or Yadfr are the earliest (end of the viiiith and beginning of the viiiith = xiiith century) to be associated with a definite region — east of Balkhān (q.v.), where the fortress of Tal, later the town of Durūn, now a mined site near the railway station of Boharden, once stood. According to Hamd Allah Kāsawī (G. M. S., xvi. 159 supra; there and in the transl. ii. 155, wrongly al-Tāl) there was much corn there; the Yafzīr seem therefore to have taken to agriculture. At a later date the Yafzīr are called Karatashī or Karadāshi; it was only towards the end of the xviith and beginning of the xivith century that they were driven out of Ardal (see Ardal, Teke) by the tribe of Teke.

Among the Turkomans who migrated into western Asia the ethnic Turkomans gradually disappeared and has survived only in a few districts. Ibn Bahjīqī (q.v.) still calls even the Ottomans Turkomans (Voyage, ii. 324). In the ninth (xvith) century Khabīl al-Zahrī (G. M. S., ii. 135) gives a list of the Turkomans tribes living in the empire of the Mamluks (q.v.) from Ghaζ̣a (q.v.) to Djībq Bāk (q.v.). (P. E. L. O, Eij. vii. s. v. xvi. 105). Of the tribes mentioned there only that of Dalghāqī (see Dalghāqī) attained any political importance. The only really important Turkomans states in western Asia were the empires of the dynasties of the Kār-Kūynal (q.v.) and the Aq-Kūynal (q.v.). The still celebrated Turkomans carpets are first mentioned in the west (Abū 'l-Fida, ed. Reinhold, p. 379, from Ibn Si'il). The carpets were made by women, mainly by girls.

The Turkomans were among the few Turkish peoples of Central Asia, who retained their old ethnic even after the Mongol period. But very few of the old tribal names survived; the names of the most important and largest tribes of the present day (the Teke, Göklen, Yomut, Ersari, Sarık etc.) are not mentioned before the Mongol period. As with other nomads or semi-nomads, new formations were produced by the activity of single individuals; thus a clan of the Sarık still calls himself Bajiri, after a leader who fell in 1651 (year of the hare) (Abū 'l-Ghāzī, ed. Desmaisons, p. 324 sq.). The most information about the Turkomans in the xvith and xivith centuries is given by Abū 'l-Ghāzī (q.v.), in his larger work and also in his history of the Turkomans. Şahqurra-i Turākbuma (not mentioned in the Encyclopædia), which so far is only accessible in a Russian translation (Ağhabād 1897).

As the Turkomans were unable to form a state of their own, they dwelt in various kingdoms (Persia, Khwarazm, Bukhara, and also in the xvith century Afgānīstān) but as a matter of fact, the Turkomans usually succeeded in practice in maintaining their independence against these kingdoms; they frequently inflicted disastrous defeats on armies sent against them. The separate tribes were also frequently at war with one another. In the xivith century the Teke tribe especially distinguished itself by its victories over other Turkomans tribes. It was only in poetic literature that the Turkomans people felt itself united; they all regarded Makhīm Kull of the tribe of Göklen, who flourished in the second half of the xvith and first half of the xivith century, as their common national poet (his father Dawlat Mamul was writing in 1075—1175) (Zaf, xvi. 146). Towards the end of the xivith century a section of the Turkomans migrated from Manglāh (q.v.) and went north-
The written literature of the Turkomans consists of lyric poems and epics, poetry of a religious and didactic nature as well as popular romances, which were recited among the Turkomans by haşşη [q.w.v.], i.e., wandering musicians. In form and subject, these poems differ very little from those popularised in Adharbādzān and in Anatolia by the şeğil's. They are written in the syllabic metre and in the quatrains called şerb añış [cf. köşma]. Among the Turkomans this word is used in the general sense of poem. The popular anonymous romances deal with the same subjects as those of Adharbādzān and Anatolia, like the Fisher and his Companion (Şahīd ü Zehir), Ashok Ghōlī, Köprə Şah, Şirin Zehira, Şamīr and Eblīm, motives which belong originally to the Oghuz. We may also note the close relationship between the popular music of the Turkomans and Adheri music. These links between the different Oghuz Turk groups may be explained partly as a continuation of their common ancient culture and partly as a result of mutual influences of later date. Thus there are obvious connections between the famous romance Şamīr and Ablīm (which has also been adopted by the Šekh) and the book of Dilər Khusār which is a remnant of the ancient Oghuz epic. In addition the intercourse of the Turkomans with the centres of Turkish culture in Khorāsān, Kūstān and Turkestan have caused the Turkish literature of Central Asia to influence Turkoman literature. Among the Turkomans the Şahīd Adhīm poets like Nūshī and Fūsālī and the poems of the great Şaghātāi poet 'Ali Şir Nešā'ī are also studied and the memory of the last, as well as of his patron Şahīd Ebnī Baḵtār is still alive among the people. The influence of Ablīm Yeşewī and of his pupils is visible in the work of the best known Turkoman poet, Şahīd Şamīr (cf. Ilk Mütövvarfaris, p. 199).

We have as yet very little information about the early works of the Turkoman literature composed in the period of the now Turkomen-Subei 'l-Qāhīr in his Şahīd-I Tārīkh mentions a poetic work called Mu'min al-Ša'īrī, which, according to him, had been popular among the Turkomans down to his own time. But this work, written in 1313, although containing some references to nomad life, in reality originates among the Turks of Kūstān and has no connection with the Turkomans. Next comes the muḥżii: Rasūl al-Šīrāzī, attributed by tradition to Şahīd Yezidīr al-Šīrāzī, but Zekī al-Weli shall have shown that the work was composed in 889 (1484) by a poet named Wašī'ī. This book is still studied among the Turkomans; it is written in the 'arāf metre but has no literary value. Perhaps this Wašī'ī was one of the poets in the entourage of the Turkoman princes of Kūshārān of the time of Şahīd Isma'il Şafawi. We know however that as late as the Timurid period, poems in the Turkoman-Caghānī style were recited in Kūshārān and from the Tārīkh of Şamīr Şāh, [q.w.v.], and from the Tārīkh-i Şaghātāi, called Muşīmā al-Kūstānī, we know the poems of several Turkoman poets belonging to the 14th century (for the Muşīmā al-Kūstānī see: W. Pertz, Die türk. HSS. an Gotth. Nr. 169). These poems however were intended for town-dwellers and were not known among the nomads. A work which was known to the Turkomans is the Şahīd-I Tārīkhā of Abu 'l-Qāhīr (not mentioned in the article
The literary traditions of the Turkomans of the present day and the other sources available only help us for the xviiith and xixth centuries. Samoilovitch, the best authority, has been able to collect the names of about 20 poets belonging to Turkoman tribes. Their poems celebrate the battles and rivalries between the different tribes and are read, without exception, by all the Turkomans. The tribe of the Goklen, probably because it adopted a settled life before the others, produced most poets in the xvith and xixth centuries: in the first place the greatest poet Maghâdûm Kûli, his father Dewlet Muhammed Molla Arazî, then his son-in-law and pupil Dhalîfî, and lastly Sâyiûdî, the poet of the Erôtsh, who sought refuge among the Goklen. Dewlet Muhammed Molla Arazî in 1107 (1753) composed a methnâwî entitled Wa-fî Arazî in the 'arâf metre, a morallising poem showing the influence of Caghtâî literature. The same poet also wrote poems in the style of the akbârîs. Among the poets of the xixth century may also be mentioned Ma'âtûfî and She'idâyî. Another poet, a product like Azâdî of the medrese, of the xixth century is Abû al-Sattâr Kâdî of the tribe of the Teke, whose Liğnînînu was published by Samoilovitch in 1914. This methnâwî, written in the metre --- --- --- ---, is a historical poem describing an episode of a struggle between the Sumî Teke and the Shî' Persians. The work is not, however, a pure specimen of the popular language of the Turkomans.

Maghâmûm Kûlî received his education in the medresâ of Shîr 'Ali Khân in Khiristan but his real life has been much obscured by legends. His popularity has been so great that the works of many other poets have also been attributed to him; even although the maghâmûm of these poets are given at the end of the poems. Among the Turkomans of Khîwâ and even among the Ûrûbegs, the expression "to read Maghâmûm Kûlî" means "to read didactic poems in Turkoman". We do not know which of the 279 poems attributed to him are really his. Among them we find pieces of a religious and didactic nature as well as warlike poems inspired by the struggle with the Persians. These poems are our most important source for our knowledge of the Turkoman conception of life. The cheqekezâ of Dhalîfî and Sâyiûdî reflect this popular wisdom and are written in the 'arâf metre and in the form of mukhammas, munaddâs etc.

Since the Russian revolution of 1905, there has been a marked revival among the Turkomans but it is easy to see since 1915 that the movement has been a steady one. The centre of this renewed intellectual activity is 'Ashqabâd. Schoolbooks, periodicals and newspapers are published in the Turkoman dialect and an institue for Turkoman culture has been founded. Ethnography, music and popular literature are being studied and the foundations laid for a Marxist literature just as in the other lands belonging to the Union of Soviets. Although the products of this new literature are not yet of much literary value, several important works have been published, like the collected works of Sâyiûdî and Dhalîfî and the Sâyiûdî ile İmâmâ Hikâyâtî (by scholars like Yeldîyeff and Kulmehmedoff). These researches by learned Turkomans assisted by Russian orientalists will probably in the near future throw much light on unknown periods of this literature.

Bibliography: The earliest account of Turkoman poets and of Maghâmûm Kûlî is found in A. Chodzko, Scripta of the Popular Poetry of Persia, 1842. After him Bennin published several Turkoman poems in his Cœrætænæcæ, H. Vâmbéry in his Travels, London 1864 gives some information about Maghâmûm Kûlî in 1879, the same author published in Z.D.M.G., xxxii., 31 fragments of his poems. This article, however, as well as that of Ostrowski, publ. in 1907, contains many errors. The most important researches have been those of Samoilovitch in the following articles: 1. Türkmençen poëzîezerî Kât Mulla ile öüsînû in Russkâf (zigozûa Sâzma, suria XVI, St. Petersburg 1907, p. 215—23); 2. Furst. Otd. Imp. Russ. Arch. Obô, xviii., p. xviii.—xix.); 3. Po poezîâ inânâmî N. P. Ostrowskova "Svetîâ Islama" (Zag., xviii., 158—160); 4. Mëtâlîsî po Srosvanaatçicîc tew endurance literatur (Zag., xix., 1—30); 5. Ukhanatâ ile öznâmî Muhhamd-Kûlî (Zag., xix., 6); 6. Ulehîn Türkmenhásîe novelîa (Zag., xviii.); 7. Kûstâmî "Ukhanatâ ile öznâmî Muhhamd-Kûlî" (Zag., xix., p. 125); 8. Abû-Sattâr Gâyî, Kniga russkâv v bitva v tehnî Türkmenhásîe izerîsîâsî poëma XIX veka, St. Petersburg 1924.

H. Vâmbéry, Turc und Ahmed, Budapest 1911; this story has also been printed at Kazan in 1904; some sections have already been published by Vâmbéry in Cagaitâcîc Sprachstudien, Leipzig 1907, p. 35—36. On the Mûsülîn ilâlîlî of: Zekî Valdî, Kühdisâmî, Muhammedî Kûlî Etkisû, in Türkîyâ Meşgülâtâ, ii, 335—45. The various manuscripts of the Kovanî ilaâmî have been described by Samoilovitch (a new manuscript of the xixth century is in my private library); the work was printed for the first time at Kazan in 1850; in 1905 it was again published at Tashkent by Ostrowski. The Dvâm of Maghâmûm Kûlî publ. at Constantinople in 1940 by Sheikh Muhsîn Fâm contains more mistakes than Vâmbéry's edition. For a critical bibliography of the publication relating to Maghâmûm Kûlî see: Zekî Valdî, Türkîyâ Meşgülâtâ, ii, 465—474; Kül-Mehmedof, Sayîl Zikhlîlîsî, 'Ashqabâd 1926; do., Dhalîfî Zikhlîlîsî, 'Ashqabâd 1926; do., Sâyiûdî ile İmâmâ, 'Ashqabâd 1927. The last and most complete publication on Turkoman literature is the article by Samoilovitch, Özerle ilê ilôvî Türkmenâcî literaturî in the periodical Türkmenîya, vol. i, 1929, publ. by the Academy of Sciences of the Union of Soviets.
The word Türk (Chin. Tu-küe, Greek Τεχθά) first appears as the name of a nomad people in the sixth century A.D. In this century a powerful nomad empire was founded by the Turks, which stretched from Mongolia and the northern frontier of China to the Black Sea. The founder of the empire, called Ta-men by the Chinese (in the Turkish inscriptions: Bo-mla) died in 552; his brother Istamu (Chin. She-tâu-yu, Greek Διασήκης, Διάσηκηση and Διασήκησης; in al-Tahart, i. 895 and 896: Sindjib Rizkhan) by whom the conquests in the west were made, seems to have lived till 576. The two brothers seem to have been quite independent of each other. The Turkish empire in question were distinguished by the Chinese as the empires of the Northern Turks and of the Western Turks. In 581 under the influence of the Chinese dynasties of Sui, which had now risen to power, a final breach was made between the two kingdoms. In the next century both had to submit to the nominal suzerainty of the Tang dynasty (618—907), the Northern Turks about 630, the Western in 659. In 682, after 50 years of foreign rule, the Northern Turks succeeded in regaining their independence and outer power. To this new empire, which lasted till 744, belong the "Orchon inscriptions" (called after the river Orchon in Mongolia), the oldest monument of the Turkish language. From time to time, especially in 692 and 711, these rulers succeeded in bringing the Western Turks under their rule but could not subdue them permanently. Of the Western Turkish tribes the Tubürk were the most distinguished, whose chiefs in the last years of the viiith century assumed the powers of Khan. The kingdom of the Turugah was ended by the Arabs under Naṣr b. Saïr in 121 (739) (Tahart, ii. 1593 sqq., 1613, 1689 sqq.). Various views have been expressed regarding the relations of these, the oldest Turks, to their predecessors, the nomad peoples in the east and west. The attempt has been made to prove that in earlier centuries also there were Turkish languages, of course under other names, and to explain from the Turkish isolated words that have survived from the pre-Christian period. In the west it has been often assumed that the ancient nomad people par excellence, the Scythians, or at least a section of them, were related to the Turks. In Carth. vii., 7., in the history of Alexander the Great, Carthais, a brother of the king of the Scythians who dwelt beyond the Vaxartes (cf. Ἱεράρχα), is mentioned. Th. Nöldeke pointed out to A. Gutschmidt that this might be the Turkish Jär-
we do not know. E. Blochet (G.M.S., xii. 301) connects Sien-pi with Sibiir. In Byzantine and Armenian sources we find a people called Sabara mentioned for the first time in 463 and the last in 558 (cf. J. Marquart, Osteniatische und osteuropäische Bestattung, Leipzig 1903, index), but of migrations of the Sien-pi to the west nothing is known.

N. Poppe has recently dealt with the question of the origin and early history of the Turks from another standpoint, the linguistic. An Altaic primitive language (Ugrische) is presupposed, to which the primitive Turkish, the primitive Mongol and the primitive Tungus go back. The primitive Turkish was on the same level of development as the language of the Orkhon inscriptions; "the phonetic system of the Orkhon Turkish is completely in keeping with our ideas of the primitive Turkish phonetic system" (Ungerische Jahrhücher, vi. 88).

The writer of course does not assert that all modern Turkish languages are descended from the language of the Orkhon inscriptions; this would be impossible, if only because the inscriptions themselves mention several tribes of Turks; it was only an "archaic dialect". The period of primitive Turkish" must be placed "at the latest in the centuries just before the Christian era" (op. cit.). In general the Turkish languages are on a higher level than the Mongol ones; even the "modern Mongol of any district one likes to choose" in the Mongol world "is much more archaic than the oldest Turkish languages known to us". The Mongol of literature, not however the living dialects", is phonetically "almost at the same stage of development as the Altaic primitive language" (op. cit., p. 117).

Special attention is devoted by the author (op. cit.; cf. also Bulletin de l'Acad. etc., 1924, p. 259 sqq.; Annales, i. 755 sqq.; Kort i. Comptes-Ann. Archiv., ii. 65 sqq.; Ungerische Jahrhücher, vii. 155 sqq.) to the relation of the "Cauwasische" (his form) to the other Turkish languages. Cauwa does not go back to the primitive Turkish language but the latter and the oldest form of Cauwa both go back to a "Cauwa-Turkische primitive language" and these with the primitive Mongol go back to an "Altaic primitive language". The division in the Cauwa-Turkish original language is with caution brought into connection with the migrations of Hun tribes to the west. The Cauwas are descendants of the Western Huns; the Cauwa-Turkish primitive language was then the language of the Huns. The change characteristic of the Turkish language (unlike the Cauwas) of $s > s$ and $s > s$, did not take place as Ramstedt thought (J. S. F. Öst., xxxvii. 31) between the fourth and sixth century, but much earlier, perhaps about the beginning of the Christian era.

V. Thomsen (Z.D.M.G., lxxvii. 322) supposes the word "Turk" means "strength, power" (cf. also W. K. Müller, Úgvarka, ii. 92; ärk türk, "might and power"). As he also has been at first probably the name of a single tribe or more probably rather of a ruling family. In the inscriptions, the word türk seems to have a political rather than an ethnographical significance; the expression "my Turks, my people" (in Thomsen, i. 18; ii. 16; ii. 10) points in this direction. Alongside of the Turks, the Oghus or Toqšu ("nine"; from the number of their separate tribes or families) Oghus are frequently mentioned, sometimes as enemies of the Turks and their rulers, sometimes as the Khân's own people, esp. i. N. 45; ii. E. 30, where the Khân calls the Toqšu Oghus his "own people" and regards their rising against his rule as the dissolution of all order in heaven and earth. The Khân and his followers had probably belonged originally to the people of the Oghus; the Oghus hostile to the Khân dwelt to the north of his residence, which was near the mountains of Hörken (on this see also now also B. Vladimirov, in Comptes rendus de l'Acad. etc., 1929, p. 115 sqq.), according to Thomsen (Z.D.M.G., lxxviii. 123) "probably a part of the present range of Hungaer near the river-system of the Khörken in northern Mongolia". The people of the Uighur are also mentioned in northern Mongolia, on the Selenga river, although only in one passage (ii. E. 37). The Oghus enemies of the Turks had about 680 a Khân of their own, a vassal of the Chinese emperor; in the eighth century he is no longer mentioned. The leader of the Uighur bore the more modest title of an elţbur (e.g. ii. E. 38); in the inscriptions the expressions baghnta bagzun "people under a Khân" (e.g. i., E. 9; ii. E. 9) and elţbur-lijis bagzun "people under an elţbur" (e.g. ii. E. 38) are contrasted. In addition to the Turkish Khân in the east (according to the Chinese view in the north), there was also a Turkish Khân in the Kalgan of the Türgis or Törgesh in the west. From Arabic (Tabart, ii. 1553, where the town of Nawakten is mentioned; on its situation: B. G.A., vi., text, p. 209 and 206) and Chinese sources we know that his royal residence was on the river Chü (q.v.). His people is called oğh "ten arrows" town the number of their tribes. There was a third Turkish Khân, the Kalgan of the Kirje (q.v.) on the Yenisei; the Khân of the inscriptions claims to have himself given the ruler of the Kirje the title of a Kalgan (i., E. 20; ii., E. 17). The opinion that to begin with a Khân (Kalgan) the title had to be received from another Khân is also found in Muslim sources (Amft in Barthold, Turkestan in yezgöb mongolškago narodnosti, l. 96).

"East of the western Turks and into their territory between the Altai and the upper course of the Irtysh" (so Thomsen, Z.D.M.G., lxxviii. 172) lived the Karlik, a people of undoubted Turkish origin. In 766 the lands of the Western Turks passed into their possession; their ruler at that time, like the ruler of the Oghuz on the Sr-Darya, bore the Turkish (originally Toqšu: cf. Marquart, Erdväla, p. 204; W. Bang, in Ung. Jahresber., vi. 101, note 3) title of yuvqun, which is mentioned in the Orkhon inscriptions as the title of a prince. The only Turkish people at that time already leading a settled life (at least in the east) was the Basmil in Bighalki (q.v.); their ruler had the title of bals-šuł "shyly majesty" (ii., E. 25). The province of the Uighur in the same region had the same title in the 5th century, when its origin had already been forgotten (hence the attempts to explain it in Raqšid al-Din and Abu 1-Ghazzāl; cf. the passages given in Radloff, Kaddakhi 6ilq, part i., p. xxvii. and xxix.). A. Grünwedel seems to have heard the pronunciation idikbut in this very region; hence the name of the town of Idikbutari at Turfan (A. Grünwedel, Berichte über archäologische Arbeiten in Idikbutarih und Umgebung, Munich 1905). Thomsen (Z.D.M.G., lxxviii. 171) describes the Basmil as only "a tribe related to the Turks", that they were not a pure Turkish
people seems to be clear from the name. Aristov (Zemstvo v cinnomu sostave tyurubilsh plemen, St. Petersburg 1897, p. 91 sq.) has pointed out that according to Ducange (Glossarium ad scriptores medii et infimae graecitatis) the children of a French father and a Greek mother were called Basque or Gascoule in Byzantium. Even in the 16th century, in Malebud Khashghari (I. 30), the Basmen are mentioned among the peoples, who have a (non-Turkish) language of their own although they also know Turkish.

The other peoples mentioned in the inscriptions were probably not Turks, notably the Tartars, although Turkish numerals like vies (30) and toqas (9) are prefixed to their names. As Thomasen (Z. D. M. G., ixviii. 174) rightly points out, they were "undoubtedly the Mongols".

From the Oghus ("Turks") rule over Mongolia passed about 745 to the Uighurs, whose ruler, henceforth assumed the title of Khan. His dynasty lasted till 846. Of this period also we possess inscriptions, including one published by Ramstedt (J. F. G., xxx. 3), of the Khan who reigned from 746 to 759. The view, also shared by Thomasen (Z. D. M. G., ixviii. 128 sq.), that the Uighur appeared to the confederation of the Oghus and that there is only a slight difference of dialect between the forms Oghus and Uighur is not confirmed by this inscription; the Uighur appear as a separate confederation, distinct from the Oghus; the Khan calls himself ruler over the On (10) Uighur and Toqas Uighur, although according to Chinese sources, the Uighur also numbered nine tribes. Some of the Oghus appear to have remained in Mongolia under the rule of the Uighur, and others to have migrated west and south. Among the latter was the tribe of On (in Chinese transcription Ch'yu, in Chinese translation Cha-ko = sand desert) which belonged originally to the Western Turks. In the 8th century the Ch'yu lived on Lake Barkul (properly Barksu) where they were exposed to the attacks of the Tibetans, and at a later date (since 712) somewhat further west on Bishbalk. After 808 they were driven from there also by the Tibetans and had to go on over to Chinese territory. In the history of China, they are best known in connection with the suppression of the rebellion of Huang-Cao (877-883); in Muslim history this is ascribed to the people of Toqshu-ghus [q.v.]. In the tenth century, three short-lived dynasties were founded in the province of Ho-nan by the Cha-ko Uighurs (the Later Tang 943-956, the Later Tsin 977-947 and the Later Han 947-951).

In the Chinese inscription of Karabalgham, composed by the Uighur Khan who died in 821, the adoption of Manichaeanism by the Uighur is recorded. The Uighur had become acquainted with Manichaeanism in a campaign against China in 762 in the town of Lo-Yang (near Ho-nan), and four Manichaean missionaries were sent from there back to their land (Mongolians). "The land with barbaric customs and the smell of blood" was to be "changed into a land where men live on vegetables, the land where men slew one another, to a land where they exhorted to the good" (J. A., xi. 1, 104). Buddhism and Syrian (especially Nestorian) Christianity at this time developed a zealous missionary activity in China and among the Turks. The expeditions to Chinese Turkestan have found many Turkish fragments which testify to this activity; but the inscription of Karabalgham seems to be the only record that has survived about the conversion of a Turkish ruler to one of these religions. The Sogdians (cf. sogdiana) in particular seem to have spread Manichaeanism in China and among the Turks; besides the Chinese inscription, there is a short one formerly thought to be Uighur, now recognised as Sogdian by F. W. K. Müller (Ein iranisches Sprachdenkmal aus der nordlichen Mongolei, in S. B. Pr. Akh. W., 1909). According to R. Gauthiot (Essai de Grammaire sogdiene, Premier partie, Phonétique, Paris 1914-1923, xiii.), the language of this inscription is "somme toute, la tradition la plus vieille et la plus constante du sogdien". From the Sogdian script developed the Uighur which later, probably in the 12th century, was to drive out of use completely the oldest Turkish alphabet, that of the Orkans inscriptions. The Uighur alphabet was adopted by the Mongols in the 13th century; in the period of the Mongol empire, the Uighur alphabet was used in all countries from Mongolia to South Russia and Persia.

About 930 the Kirgiz put an end to the Uighur empire. Two new kingdoms were founded about the middle of the 10th century by the Uighurs driven out of Mongolia, one in Kan-wo (see KARES), better Kan-djou, the other in Bishbalk and Karakholja. Manichaeanism are mentioned in both in the tenth century as well as in Khotan (J. A., xi. 1, 265 sqq.).

The ruler of Bishbalk and Karakholja undertook the defence of his co-religionists against the Chinese Emperor (Mas'ud, Muradji, i. 300 sq) and the ruler of the Samaunds (Flavii, p. 337). In Bishbalk and Karakholja, Manichaeanism had probably already spread under the predecessors of the Uighurs, the Toqas-Uighurs. Tamim b. Bakr al-Mas'udwal, who is quoted by YAKUS (Ma'qarin, i. 840, supra) and was certainly utilised by the Khorasani also (B. G. A., vi, text, p. 30 sq), seems to have visited not the Uighur but the Toqshu-Uighur proper (Toqas-Uighur).

At that time Manichaeanism predominated, especially in the Khagan's (Khagan's) capital; in the country west of the capital there were Manichaeanism and also but the Zoroastrians were more numerous there. Whether, as Chavannes and Pelliot (J. A., xi. 260 sq) suppose, the turkisation of what is now Chinese Turkestan was for the most part ("en grande partie") first carried through by the Uighurs, is doubtful. This process may already have made considerable progress under the predecessors of the Uighur. Khashghar and all the lands east of it are from the very beginning regarded by the Arabs as purely Turkish areas.

Of the two Uighur kingdoms, one (in Kan-wo) was conquered by the Tanguts in 1028 and the second was still in existence in the Mongol period. In the year 934 the proposal was made to the Uighur in Kan-wo by the founder of the kingdom of the Ikitai (cf. KARKHITA) Apoaki, who had shortly before driven the Kirgis out of Mongolia, that they should return to their original homes on the Oloshin, but the Uighurs had already settled down to the conditions of their new home and did not wish to become nomads again (E. Bretschneider, Missionary Researches from Eastern Asiatic Sources, i. 214; J. Marguert, Gramm. der Uigur. Sprache i. die Beziehung der Uigurin, S. B. Pr. Akh. 1912). The victory of the Ikitai over the Kirgiz really marks the end of Turkish and the beginning of
Mongol rule in Mongolia. The Kirgiz were the last Turkish people to live in Mongolia and the only one whose memory has survived there to the present day. All the pre-Mongol tombs in Mongolia, including the Uighur, are called "Kirgiz tombs" (khiitg seri). The hills of Otkan mentioned in the Orkham inscriptions as Turkish country sar (şer) were according to Mehran Khoshbari (Dini sanatük al-Turk, l. 123) in the Tatar steppes.

Most references to the Turkish peoples are from this time found in Muslim sources. For the older period also the information in the Turkish inscriptions and in the Chinese annals is often supplemented by the western sources. From Byzantine sources we learn that Turks in 576 conquered the Taufic Besoporus, in 581 they were before the walls of Chersonesus, but their rule over the Taufic Peninsula was of short duration; by about 590 Byzantine rule had been restored there (A. Vasil’ev, in Inv. Acad. Mater. Kulturn, v., 185 sq.).

There are also Byzantine sources from 568 (Byzantine embassy under Zemarchos to the Turks) to 1640 (the letters of the Turkish Khaghan to the Emperor Mauricius; cf. the latest study of these sources in E. Chavannes, Document sur les Fém-kén [Turcs] occidentaux, St. Petersburg 1903, p. 233 sqq.).

Of the Byzantine envoys only the first, Zemarchos, crossed the Volga and visited the residence of the Khaghan of the Western Turks which, as Chavannes has shown, at this time was in the Ay Tagh ("White Mountains") north of the town of Kuka. There were, however, frequent negotiations for joint campaigns against the Sasanids, but no lasting alliance was made; in a few years the Turks were at war with the Byzantines as well as with the Persians. After the conquest of the Alans [cf. ALAN] by the Turks the kingdom of the Sasanids became bounded by the land of the Turks not only in Central Asia but also west of the Caspian Sea. It was probably these Turks that the walls of Darbend (q.v.) were built. The tradition that the Turkish nomad empire was continued by the Khazars, who became a great power in the seventh century [see Kutiar and Khazar], just as at a later date the Golden Horde carried on the traditions of the Chingis-Khan's (q.v.) empire. The language of the conquerors of the sixth century has left no more traces in Eastern Europe than the Mongol has in the lands of the Golden Horde. The language of the Bulghars and Khazar belonged to the above-mentioned older stratum of Turkish now represented only by the Cumans and the Turkish elements in Magyar; Turkish proper was brought to Europe only towards the end of the ninth century A.D. by the Pečenegs.

In the lands east of the Caspian Sea also, defences were erected by the Sasanids against their Turkish neighbours. A wall of brick was built to defend the province of Djurdjân [q.v.] but it was not able to prevent the victorious invasion of the Turks (Baladari, p. 350; B.G.A., vi, text, p. 261 aq.). The remains of this wall on the right bank of the river Gurgân are called Kaff-Alan at the present day (description e.g. by I. Poszewsky, in Prokezal Turk Kurşu Lyak. Arka, v. 185). The loss of the province of Djurdjân probably means the erection of another wall also of baked bricks on the frontier between Djurdjân and Tabariştan (q.v.) attributed to Khusraw Anšahrwân (B.G.A., vii, 150). During the fighting between the Arabs and Turks in the year 98 (716-717), the Turks of Dürjân were led by Ṣül, the Dihkân of Dihishtân (Tabari, ii. 1520). Sül here is certainly a Turkish proper name or title, probably for Turkish Čâr. In the history of the fighting against the Turks in the Sasanid period, the word Sül appears in one passage in Tabari as the name of a people, and on this J. Marquart (Erdeiak, p. 51 and 73) bases his views on the people or tribe Çul (see also above under ṢURDÂN). But this statement probably does not refer to the Gürgen region, as the Sül are mentioned along with the Alans (Tabari, i. 895). According to a late source (Khitab al-agrahin, ix. 21), the Turks on the Gürgen had adopted the language and religion of the Persians; they must therefore have already conquered this region under the Sasanids, probably as early as the sixth century, although in the Khitab al-agrahin, the same persons (Sül and his brother Fûrus) are mentioned as Turkish conquerors of the land and are fighting against the Arabs.

The fighting in the lands south of the Amu-Darya [q.v.] generally went in favour of the Turks; as Marquart (Erdeiak, p. 53 and elsewhere) and following him Chavannes (Document etc., p. 252) have shown, the northern boundary of the Sasanid empire at this time was the Murghâb. The Turks and with them their protégés, the last Sasanids, were less successful later in the same area, during their struggle with the Arabs. In the accounts of this fighting only the "Turks" are mentioned, not separate Turkish peoples; an exception is often the mention of the Qâhghân of the Karuv (the name of this people is written Kharûk in Arabic and Khalkh in Persian) in the year 119 = 737 (cf. Tabari, ii. 1612 in/fra); more frequently the same prince is called "Qahghân of Takhristân" [q.v.]. A portion of the Karuv had therefore by this date reached the lands south of the Amu-Darya, where they have survived to the present day (now regarded as an isolated family of the Dzereds). There were also Arab embassies sent on peaceful missions to the Turks: e.g. the caliph Hishâm (105-125 = 724-743) is said to have asked the "king of the Turks" to adopt Islam. Unfortunately in the only record we have of this mission (Yâkût, Muqâjam, i. 839; the source of Yâkût is Ibn al-Farîd) cf. Bulletin de l'Acad. etc., 1924, p. 241) we are not told where this king's capital was.

We get more detailed accounts of the separate Turkish peoples and their habits only from the Arab geographers of the third (ninth) and especially the fourth (tenth) century. In this geographical literature the word "Turk" is used only as the name of a group of peoples and branch of languages, not as in the Orkham inscriptions and the Chinese Annals of a single people or kingdom. Five peoples in particular are mentioned (B.G.A., i. 9) who spoke one language and could understand one another: the Tughruszgis [q.v.], the Khârizm (Kirgis), q.v.), the Kimak [cf. KIMAK], the Ghus (q.v.), i.e. the Oghuz, and the Kharûk, i.e. the Karuv [q.v.]. As at the present day, the lands on the Upper Yenisei were even then the extreme limits in the northeast of the land inhabited by Turks; they also marked the limits of the world as known to the Arabs; according to the Arab view, the lands of the Kirgis, then the extreme northeasterly of Turkish peoples, stretched to the Ocean. The Oghuz and Karuv were the immediate neighbours.
of the Muslim lands in Central Asia. The land of the Oguz, adjoined the Muslim lands of Djurdjua in the west as far as Färki (q.v.), and Ashdjab (the modern Sainian near Cimkent (q.v.)); in the east, still farther to the east, lived the Karlik. To go to China one had to travel through the lands of the Karlik and the Topghuzhuz, over 30 days from the eastern frontier of Farghona (q.v.) through the land of the Karlik to the frontier of the land of the Topghuzhuz, thence about two months through the land of the Topghuzhuz and through China to the shore of the Ocean (B.G.A., ii. 111; other descriptions vary). Two other names of people are mentioned by Ibn Khurdadbeh (B.G.A., vi. p. 28 sq.), not far from the winter quarters of the Karlik east of Tartar (at the modern Avilya-Ata, q.v.) were the winter quarters of the Khamáj (q.v.), where only the southern branch of this people is dealt with; for the Khamáj who migrated to Persia, see 584q.v.). Between the rivers Talas and Çen, nearer to the latter, was the town of the "Khabān of the Turchids". Further notices are given in the Persian sources in the Ēfīmd-ad-Ālam and in Gardizi (q.v.). The Turchids according to these were divided into the Tukkšt (so vocalised in Mahmud Kāshgari) and the Az; the Tukkšt lived on the Çen (q.v.); the town of Sīyāb was in their territory. East of them on the Isāk-Kul (q.v.) lived the Çigīl (the pronunciation is established by a story giving a popular etymology in Mahmud Kāshgari, i. 330). South of the river Narīn (see 564q.v.) lived the Jaghmī, a branch of the Topghuzhuz; their king was a descendant of the royal family of this people. The town of Kāshgār was in their territory. According to Mahmud Kāshgari (i. 85), the Jaghmī and the Tukkšt lived on the river III (q.v.) as did a part of the Çigīl. The term Tukkšt-Cigīl (i. 354) is also found. The Çigīl were divided into three parts: in addition to the Çigīl on the Çen there were Çigīl in villages near Kāshgār and is little town or stronghold called Çigīl near Tartar; this latter was near the land of the Oguz and was frequently besieged by them. The Oguz therefore called all the Turks from the Ēfīmd-ad-Ālam to China Çigīl. In this sense the word Çigīl is sometimes used by Kāshgār himself; it is recorded that the word Varālgī "edict", which implies a certain degree of culture, was unknown in the language of the Çigīl and of the Oguz (i1. 31). The Jaghmī were also called Kān Yaghmī ("black Y."); there was also a village of this name near Tarīk (i. 55 sq.). The name Turkman first occurs in the geographical literature in Makhaddas in two passages (B.C. A., iii. 274 sq.) with a not quite certain significance. On the Sarwarī below Savrān, that is in the land of the Oguz, are mentioned the towns of Bāldīd and Barakāt ("frontier forts against the Turkomans"), which had by that time already adopted Islam "out of fear". In another passage, in this region between the Talas and the Çen, i.e., in the land of the Karlik, is mentioned king of the Turkomans, from whom the lord of Ashdjab regularly received gifts. Kāshgār also says that not only the Oguz (i. 27 and 35; i. 504) but also the Karlik (i. 393) were Turkomans; the well-known popular etymology in Kaghd al-Dīn (Trūdīd Vest. Ort. Arābī. Okāhī. vii. 26, infra: Türk armesem "resembling the Turks") is found as early as Kāshgār (i. 307). As F. Hirth (S. B. Bayr. Akad., 1899, ii. 263, sq.) has told us, the word Turkoman, in Chinese transcription To-k'iu-móng, appears much earlier, in the eighth century A.D., in the Ts'ang-T'ien Encyclopaedia; there also it refers to the west, to the land of the Alan. It is possible that the Oguz or Turkomans (as early as the eleventh century we find the names used promiscuously) are descended from nomad Iranians who had become Turkicised and this explains their peculiar eponymology (dolichocephalic). Whether non-Turkish, perhaps Mongol, peoples wandered westwards with the Turks has still to be investigated. As one of the seven tribes of the Kinfā are mentioned the Tatars (Garden in Barthold, Ost, etc., p. 82), also called a tribe of the Topghuzhuz (q.v. cit., p. 54). A full account of the Turkish peoples, their lands, and dialects including also the not purely Turkish elements, is first given by Mahmūd Kāshgār, but he does not seem to be always reliable, even apart from the fact that the same Turk, as frequently elsewhere in Muslim literature, is sometimes given to non-Turkish peoples of Eastern Asia. According to one passage (i. 27 sq.) there were twenty Turkish peoples, who fell into two groups, a northern and a southern one, each of which, as follows, from east to west, the author tells us. The ten peoples of the northern group were the Beqjeneq, Kūšārā, Óghur, Yämšāk, Bašmīl, Kāy, Yabhāq, Tatab, Kīrūq; the ten peoples of the southern group were the Džūqīl, Tukkšt, Yaghmā, Ighrāq, Djarāq, Dżumul, Uğbār, Tankūt, Kīštāq, Tafghāt. This order for the northern group obviously cannot be the right one. As in Ėstakhīr (see above) the Kīrūq (the Kirghis on the Yenisei) are moved to the extreme northeast, although according to another passage (i. 123), the Tatars lived in Ótūkan (in little way on the Onkho), i.e., much farther east. The Yämšāk (Yemek), originally a tribe of the Kinfā (q.v., not mentioned by Kāshgār) lived on the Irīsh (i. 273). The Bašmīl (the Bashkirs, see 339q.v.) obviously could never have lived so far to the east (to what was already known of them, it may he said that Ibn Fadlān (q.v.) in 922 [309—310] met the first Bashkirs to the south of the Usha, much farther south than any other mention of them; see Bull. de l'Am. etc., 1924, p. 16). Of the northern peoples the Kāy, Yabhāq, Tatab, and Bašmīl had their own languages, although they could also speak good Turkish (on the Kāy cf. J. Marquart, in Osttürk. Dialektstudien, p. 53, where there is an erroneous association with the name of the Oguz family Kāy, in Mahmūd Kāshgār: Kaylīf; cf. there Kūprūlī Zāde, in Türkçṭ Millâm̀\kālî, i. 187 sqq.). The Yabhāq lived on the great river Uşār (i. 21), on the situation of which the author does not seem to have had any very clear idea; it was probably the Ob (still called by the Tatars Omar or Umor). The Uşār was crossed in the 5th (6th) century (the author had spoken with participants in the campaign) by a Muslim army under Arslān Tegh in the war against the Yabhāq under Bukt Bardin and their allies the Basmīl (on the war see especially I. 173 sq.; on various episodes other passages; on the crossing l. 5; cf. O. Brockelmann, in Hirth Anniversary Volume, p. 11). Of the ten peoples Džūqīl, Tukkšt, Yaghmā, Ighrāq; Djarāq, Dżumul (in other passages like I. 382: Dżumul), Uğbār, Tankūt, Kīštāq, i.e., Śīn,
TURKS

Tawghâj, i.e. Mâstn) of the southern group
the Djumal were one of the non-Turkish speaking
peoples, who nevertheless spoke Turkish quite
well. We are told by the Uighurs that they had
another language, in addition to their "pure
Turkish", in which they communicated with one
other. The Tankut (Tangut), like the inhabitants
of Khotan and Tabut (Tibet), were people with a
foreign language, who had settled in the land of
the Turks. Khotan had its own language and al-
phabet; they did not speak good Turkish there.
In Sin and Mâstn the inhabitants had a language
of their own but the people in the towns could
also speak Turkish well. Their letters to the Turks
were written in the Turkish alphabet. A wide
meaning is given to the word Sin in one passage
(l. 378); there were three Sinu, the upper of Taw-
ghâj (Mâstn), the central or Khotâi (Sin), and
the lower or Barâkhâ; this was also the name of a
fortress on a high hill near Kâshghar; there were
rich gold-mines there.

Of these peoples the Djerâk (probably to be
pronounced Carru or) lived in the town of Bârzhîj
(Barchu), the modern Maral-bâshî (l. 318); on the
site of Bârzhîj; cf. especially Vallinian, co numer-"s
p. 83 sq). This enables us to define roughly the
habitation of the not-originally Turkish Djumal
(east of Barâkhâ and west of the Uighur). During
the fighting on the Yânân, the Djumal were the
allies of the Yâlaqâ and had therefore presumably
not yet adopted Islam. In the land of the Uighur
there were five towns, among them Bâhîlânî and
Kûdîjî, i.e. Koro or Karâ-Khoja near Turfan.
The Uighurs were Buddhists and worshippers of
Bûrkhân (idols). The only evidence that there was
also Christianity among the Turks is the transla-
tion of the word bûrkhân (bânî) known also from
Manichaean texts (e.g. Chaustroem, App. to Aab.
Prema, tâh. 1910 P-39) by "Christian fast" (l. 345).

In other passages Mahmût Kâshghari mentions
other Turkish tribes, who are not included in the
list of the twenty Turkish peoples; e.g. the
Adkhis (l. 89), known from the geographical
literature also (e.g. B. G. A., vi. 31) and the
Kodjût (l. 208) settled in Khabârân and known
also to Bâhîlânî (ed. Morley, p. 91). Of the peoples
of Eastern Europe, in addition to those already
mentioned, the Bulghar and Swâr are called Turks;
The Kachar are not mentioned; they had probably
cashed by then to have a separate political
existence. In contrast to Iskûhri (B. G. A., l. 222
and 225) who says the Kachar and Bolghár had a
common language distinct from Turkish, Kâshghari includes
the dialects of the Balghârs, Swârs and Pečenek in
one group.

The dialects of the Kirgis, Kipçe, Oghuz,
Tuckhu, Yaghma, Çigîl, Ighrhâ and Carru were
pure Turkish. The dialects of the Yamek and
Bâshkirs were closely all to this language. The
language of the nomads from the Ili to the Yâmür
were generally purer than the language of the
(originally probably not Turkish) settled peoples,
such as the Arghu from Sairân to Ballâshûhîn
(in the towns there Soghadian had survived alongside
of Turkish) and the Kendjût (Kendjie) in the
villages near Kâshghar. Various phonetic peculi-
larities of the different dialects are discussed, including
words which are still of significance in Turkish,
like the interchange of r and g and k and ñ etc.

In the vocabulary Oghur (Turkoman) had already
the form still characteristic of the south Turkish
dialects. Turkoman was already so different from
the other Turkish languages in vocabulary that
Turkoman and Turk were contrasted like Oghur
and Çigîl (l. 37; l. 253 infra).

Although in the first centuries of the Hijra
campaigns were undertaken into Turkish territory,
in addition to the defensive fighting against Turkish
raiders, the successes of the Muslim arms had little
influence on the conversion of the Turks. The
principle laid down by the Prophet for the Abyss-
sinians was applied to the Turks: "Leave them
in peace so long as they leave you in peace" (see
Goldziher, Mab. Studien, t. 270; l. 127; in the
first passage translated: "Leave the Turks alone
as they have left thee"; in another sense and in
somewhat different form the hadîth is quoted in
B. G. A., v. 316; vi. 262; Yâbûk, Muğâmam, l. 857
infra). Islam was adopted by the Turks in the ivth
(8th) century of their own free will. In 291
(904) the last great inroad of heathen Turks into
the frontier lands of Islam, the Ósmanî kings,
was driven back (Tabari, ill. 227-249); in 38
(992) Muslim Turks invaded Russia probably for the
last time. Of even greater importance was the
conquest of Asia Minor by the Muslim Sâdîqis in
the fifth (eleventh) century. Other sayings about
the Turks are now ascribed to the Prophet. He
is said to have remarked: "Leave the language of
the Turks, for they are destined to long rule" (Kâshghari, l. 3). Allah said to the Prophet:
"I have a host which I have called "Turk" and
settled in the east; if any people shall arouse my
wrath, I shall give them into the power of this
host" (cp. cit., p. 264). On the story of the adop-
tion of Islam by a numerous (200,000 tens)
Turkish people see KâSHGHAR, where also is the
suggestion that this story is connected with the
rise of the dynasty of the Ilek-ölâns [q.v.] or the
"race of Afzîayû". No source tells us from
what people this dynasty came; they and their
people are always simply called "Turks". In Kâ-
shghari also these rulers are simply called "Khân
kings" (âl-mlûk, âl-ölbâhâns, l. 37 inftra, or
simply khânâns, e.g. l. 354 infra). Khân was
adopted in the early decades of the fifth (eleventh)
century by the Muslim rulers of Kâshghar but
nothing is known of the exact date or any details
of the campaign. According to Kâshghari, an em-
named Djenkîš was the cause of the conquest of
Khotan (ill. 279). This shows that there was a
story then known of the conquest which has not
come down to us. In Kâshghari's time, the frontier
towns of Islam in the modern Chinese Turkestan
were Kisen or Kûcî (l. 336) and east of it "between
Kûcî and Uighur" on the hill-fortress of Bâgîr
(l. 301) in the north, Çerên (in Kâshghari, l.
364; Dürâhân) in the south. At a later date the
Turks living farther west were converted to Islam.
According to Ibn al-Âdîr (ix. 335 sq.), a Turkish
people which had its winter home near Ballâshûhîn
and its summer pastures in the vicinity of the
land of the Balghârs i.e. probably in the Ural
Their name is not given; in spite of the great
area covered by them, they were less numerous
than the Turks in Central Asia converted in 950.
According to Ibn al-Âdîr, they had only 10,000
people, according to Abu 'l-Fida (Mab. Studien,
ed. Reiske-Adler, ill. 120) only 5,000.

Some alterations in the ethnographic conditions
of the Turks were produced by conditions of
the Kipchaq [q.v.] from the Iriltish to the southwest as far as the Sr-Daryä and in another direction towards Eastern Europe. Just as the migrations of the Oghus explain the formation of the present group of South Turks, so probably the migrations of the Kipchaq explain the formation of the group of Western Turks. On the Sr-Daryä in the viith (xiiith) century we find the Kipchaq mentioned along with the Kanghi, and the distinction between the two is left very vague (cf. also J. Marquart, Osttürk. Diaskritistik, p. 78 and 172). In the time of Mahmud Kâshghâri there was not yet a people called Kanghi; the word Kanghi is there quoted (iii, 280) only once in the course of a great man among the Kipchaq". In the second half of the sixth (twelfth) century the Kipchaq had not yet adopted Islam, even when living close to the Muslim lands on the Sr-Daryä; in a document in which the arrival of a prince of the Kipchaq in Djand [see Sr-Daryä] is recorded, the wish is expressed that God may convert him to Islam (rassuğana Allâh 'in al-İslâm: cf. W. Barthold, Türkistan etc., i. 79).

Most information about the Kipchaq in Eastern Europe and about their predecessors, the Peçenegs and Oghus (Greek Ογδοσ, probably the Russian Torki; the Russian annals also mention the Berendelt, probably the Oghus family of Babamur; cf. Mahmûd Kâshghâri, i. 55), is found in the Greek and Russian sources. From the middle of the viith century in the Russian annals all Turkish peoples of Eastern Europe with the exception of the Kipchaq (Polojevi) are included under the name Černi Klobunî ("black caps") (cf. on this: D. Razowsky, in Seminarum Kondakivianum, Prague 1927, i. 95 sq.). Whether, as might be thought from the identity of the names, the karakalpaks are descended from the Černi Klobukî, cannot yet be decided. It would also be in favour of the western origin of the Karakalpaks (first mentioned in the xiiiith century) that, unlike the people of Central Asia, they lived mainly by cattle-raising. Although Islam had already conducted successful propaganda among the Peçenegs (J. Marquart, Osteuropäische und osteuropäische Streifzüge, p. 73), it made little progress among the Turks of Eastern Europe before the Mongol period.

In Central Asia, the spread of Islam was not checked by the foundation of the empire of the non-Muslim Karâ Khîlati [q.v.] nor by the persecution of Islam in the beginning of the viith (xiiith) century. At the time of the foundation of the empire of the Karâ Khîlati (soon after 1130), the principality of the Khan of Bâltâqân was still the most northerly Muslim country in this region; when the empire broke up there were Muslim kingdoms more of the ill also, namely that of the Karâq [q.v.] in Kayalîjî, and that founded by a member of the same stock in Almâligh near the modern Kuldî [q.v.]. In the time of the Chinese traveller Câng Cûn (1154), the town of Cûng-büla-i, i.e. the Uighur capital Djanbalâ, already mentioned by Kâshghâri (i. 103), was the frontier town of the non-Muslim lands to the west (E. Bretschneider, Medizinsaal Forschungen, i. 67 sq.); according to the Armenian Hethum (journey in 1254), "Djanbalâkh" was immediately east of "Khotaspi", the Khotukhâni of the modern maps, immediately east of Mânas (ib. cit., i. 169). The region of the modern Mânas was therefore the limit of the spread of Islam in Central Asia at this date.

In contrast to the lands of the modern Chinese Turkestan, which had long been under Turkish influence, the Turkisation of Mânwî al-Nâhr and Kâhtîrî only seems to have made appreciable progress after the Mongol conquest; this is suggested by the appearance of geographical names of Turkish origin like Karâ Kül on the lower course of the Zarathshûr (Narshâkhî, ed. Schofer, p. 17) and Karâ Sî (Tabâhîz Nâşî, transl. Raverty, p. 474) or Sî Kâri (Din al-Atbîr, xii. 222) in Kâhtîrî. Turkish culture was brought to Asia Minor and Adjârásbîdjan by the Sâlçûks. The Turks were probably settled here at first to guard the frontier and to fight against the Byzan
tines and the growing power of the Georgian kingdom (cf. Georgia). Nothing is known of the gradual progress of Turkish culture in these countries now completely Turkish (in Southern Persia the Turks have for the most part remained nomads, by the ninth (ixth) century the process had been completed. Saladin brought bodies of Turkish troops to Egypt, whence some of them found their way to North Africa and Spain; on the Turks in Spain see especially "Abîl al-Wâlijî al-Marrâkushî, ed. Dory, p. 210. These soldiers were of no importance for the spread of Turkish culture.

The foundation of the Mongol empire was of much greater significance for the Turks than for the Mongols themselves. In spite of all attempts by later writers to prove the contrary, the view of Abel-Rémusat (Recherches sur les langues tatars, p. 240) must be upheld that the area inhabited by the Mongols had the same western frontier at the time of the rise of Cîngiz Khân as it has to-day (with the exception of the much later migrations of the Kalmucks [q.v.]). Of the descendants of the Mongols who came westwards in the time of Cîngiz Khân and his successors only the Moghol in Afghanistan, whose dialect has been investigated by G. Ramstedt (Mogholla, in J. S. O., xxiii. [1903], 4), have retained their Mongol speech to the present day. Their habitats have not yet been exactly defined. Dr. Emil Trinkler (Afghanistan, Gottha, 1928 = Pet. et. Mitr. supple. 196, p. 53 sq.) in spite of all his enquiries found no Mongol speaking people in Afghanistan. Most of the Mongols have been merged in the Turks and thus strengthened the latter numerically and especially politically. Of special importance in the political history of the Tatars since the conversion to Islam in the xviith century was the kingship of the Golden Horde. By the end of this century, this kingdom had become completely Turkicised; its documents were written in Turkish, and Cuvass, which had earlier been spoken on the Volga, had given way to a pure Turkish language. After the break up of this empire, three new "Tatar" kingdoms were formed in Kazîn [q.v.], Astrakhan and in the peninsula of Krîm [q.v.], which only came under Islam and Turkish influences in the Mongol period. A new "Tatar" kingdom also arose on the Iriltish [q.v.] in Siberia, at the modern Tobolsk; this land now became instead of Bâlgar the outpost of Islam in the north. The word Tatar, originally applied to the Mongols, became the name of a Turkish people and, especially in the Crimes, was used by themselves. In Russia the word "Tatar" was given a very wide meaning, although not quite so extensive as in China and in European Sinology (cf. the prefix to Abel-Rémusat, Recherches sur les langues tatars). Down to the second half of the xviith century (W. Radloff, Asi Sibirien,
in the empire of the Mamlûka (q.v.) from Dîjûr Bakr (q.v.) to Ghazra (q.v.); a list of them is given by Khalîl al-Zâhirî (Zâhidî 'Alî al-Mamûlî, ed. Rayâsî, Paris 1894, p. 105). Only the family of Dulgâdîr (Turkish pronunciation from Dhu 'l-Ḳadr, q.v.) attained some importance; in the xvth century they founded a little kingdom of their own, as vassals of the Mamlûka.

In Central Asia, the Turkomans were not merged, like so many of the Turkish peoples mentioned in the early Mongol period, into the new formations of the Mongol period, although among the Turkomans there were migrants from the kingdom of the Golden Horde; this is indicated in the xviith century by the name of the tribe Sayîn-Ḳânî on the Caspian Sea (Turkomeniya, vol. i., Leningrad 1929, p. 47 sq.). The Turkomans were never able to form a state of their own in Central Asia, but it was only in 1884 that an end was put to their independence by the advance of the Russians from the north and the Afghans from the south.

In the xvith and xviith centuries, the Turkomans, like other Turkish peoples of Central Asia, notably the Kazak and Kirghis, suffered a great deal from the attacks of the Kalmucks, the founders of the last great nomad empire in Central Asia. The Kazak and Kirghis were driven out of a part of their lands by the Kalmucks; it was only after the destruction of the Kalmuck empire that the conditions that had previously existed there were restored. A section of the Turkomans still live in the government of Stavropol, into which they had been driven by the Kalmucks towards the end of the xviith century from their earlier habitations on the peninsula of Mangîshlak (q.v.). At an earlier period, the Turkomans fought unsuccessfully for this peninsula with the Noghai and later with the Kazak. In contrast to the Kazak the Kirghis had not their own khans, either on the Yenisei or in Semireye; Kirghis, the Kirghis on the Yenisei attaining their highest development only after the beginning of the xviith century, have remained quite unaffected by Islam, as have the Turkish peoples living in the Yenisei area at the present day, who after the Russian revolution took the name of "Khakas" (in its origin a mistaken reading of the Chinese transcription for Kirghis). The mountain peoples in the Altai on the upper Ob are also non-Muslim Turks. The Altai people (Altai Kîth) were called "mountain Kalmucks" by the Russians, but after the Russian revolution took the name of "Oirat", which properly belongs to the Kalmucks; their land is now the "autonomous Oirat territory". Completely distinct, even in language, from the other Turks are the Yakuts (who call themselves Saka or Sakha, probably connected with the ethnie Sagai in the Yenisei area) who were driven out of the Yenisei territory, probably not before the xviith century, into the valley of the Lena. The language of the Yakuts shows, in vocabulary and grammatical structure marked divergences from Turkish, although this language, unlike Caspian, is directly descended from the primitive Turkish language.

In the first half of the xviith century, all the lands from the Balkan Peninsula and north shore of the Black Sea to the Chinese frontier were under the rule of Muslim Turks. The economic life of almost all these countries at this period
showed a considerable setback, compared with earlier periods; nomadic life had developed at the expense of agriculture and especially of the towns; the future of these lands had also been undermined by the fact that world trade had taken other routes. The Turks were neither economically nor intellectually fit to cope with the rising power of Russia. Through the conquest of the Volga territory by the Russians (Kazan 1552, Astrakhan 1554), the connection between the Turks of Central Asia and their relatives in the west was broken; it was restored by another route but only for a short period—during the rule of the Turks on the western shore of the Caspian Sea (1578—1603). As early as the 19th century, Russia had laid down the principle that all the lands of Northern Asia should be divided between Russia and China; but this process of settlement was only completed by the Treaty of St. Petersburg of Feb. 12—24, 1881.

Islam as a religion [cf. e.g. Sakha] and Turkish as a language have made no progress under Russian rule; in the Caucasus, as well as in Central Asia, Turkish as a lingua franca is much more widely disseminated than before; the level of civilization has also been raised by the influence of European culture introduced by Russia. After the Revolution of 1917, and especially after the principle of nationality had been put into practice in 1924, republics were formed in Soviet Russia among the Turkish peoples also on a national basis under their own government and following their own lines of development. The Özbek and the Turkmen Republics form separate parts of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics (U.S.S.R.), and the Adherbajdzhan Republic is a part of the Transcaspian alliance. Seven autonomous republics (the Krim-Tatar, Çuvas, Baskhir, Tatar, Kazak, Kirgis and Yakut republics) are members of the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic (R.S. F.S.R.), as are four autonomous territories (the Karakal, Balkar-Kabardin, Karakalpak and Uigur region) with preponderantly Turkish populations.

With the carrying through of the principle of nationality the names of certain peoples have received meanings which they did not possess before. At one time, many Turks in Central Asia, especially the town-dwellers, were content to describe themselves as Turkish-speaking Muslims and inhabitants of a particular town; the question with what Turkish people they should be numbered was a matter of indifference; names which originally did not refer to nationality, like the word Sari [q.v.], were also used. This word has now been driven out of use, and the term Özbek is now used in a much wider meaning than formerly; those who used to call themselves-Sari are now called Özbek. Names have also been invented (on the word Khakas see above): the Tarantul [q.v.], who belong to Kaghchirka, and the Kaghchirlik now call themselves Uighurs; a name which does not belong to them historically, Uighurs never came so far west. Most of the Turkish peoples in Soviet Russia have joined the movement to introduce the Roman alphabet; the Çuvas, Khakas and Uigur refuse to join it and adhere to the Russian alphabet.

An attempt to estimate the total number of Turks was made by N. Aristow, Zemležiti ok stoljeću sveta, 1920, p. 170. According to Aristow, in 1885 there were about 26,000,000 Turks, but even he thought the figure should be higher. At the present day, the number of Turks living in Soviet Russia alone is about 16,000,000; the total therefore is probably over 30,000,000. Much higher figures have been given by Turkish publicists and statesmen: Ahmed Agyev, 70—80,000,000 (A. Samoylovich, in M., 1914, p. 450); Mustafa Kemal Pasja, 100,000,000.


II. THE TURKISH LANGUAGES.

1. The Classification of the Turkish Languages and their geographical Distribution.

The Turkish languages are divided according to their general phonetic characteristics into two main unequal groups: the R-languages (tıbük = nine) and the Z-languages (tevən = nine). Among the old languages, Bulghur or one of its dialects belonged to the first group; among modern languages, the Cuvash alone; but we find sporadic cases of z corresponding to r in all the Turkish languages. To the second group, the Z-group, belong all the other Turkish languages, ancient and modern, including Yakut. The question of the ethnic and linguistic origin of the predominating nationality in the nomad union of the Huns as well as those of other ancient peoples of Central Asia and eastern Europe (Shangpi, Avars, Khazars) is still uncertain or insufficiently elucidated. The languages of the Z-group were formerly dispersed over the territory corresponding to modern Mongolia, southern Siberia and the steppes of the Altai and later gradually occupied all the modern habitats of the Turkish peoples, from the Sea of Osbottok to the Mediterranean, except the Cuvash region.

The Z-group is again divided into two groups: the D-languages (ədək or ədəğ = foot) and the Y-languages (əvək = foot). The D-languages existed as early as the 6th century by Mahmut Kâshghar, but is much older. To the D-language belonged the following ancient languages: the Kiktu, Turkish in the strict sense and Uighur. This group is at the present day represented by a limited number of languages and dialects in Eastern Siberia, Mongolia and China proper and is divided into three sections: the T-section or Yakut (ədək = foot), the D-section or the Tanu-tuwin dialect, or Soyote or Ucran-Khoy, and the Karaghas dialect, related to the latter (ədək = foot), and the Z-section composed of the Kamasins, Koybals, Saghys, Kafins, Belirs, Khils, Cilm-Kukers, Shor and Saltz-Uighur (əmək = foot). The dialects of the Z-section of the D-division which at the present day are found in the northwest part of the Turkish world, existed, according to Mahmut Kâshghar, in Eastern Europe in the 12th century. The philologists of the middle ages writing in Arabic included Bulghar in the Z-section. A trace of one of these dialects is still to be found in eastern Europe in the name of the Sea of Asov (əmək = the "foot", i.e. estuary of the Don). According to Mahmut Kâshghar, the Əpčak
and Oghuz languages, spoken in the west of Central Asia and in Eastern Europe, belonged in the xi-ith century to the Y-division of the second great group of Turkish languages (äqâş = boast). At this date the division is the largest, for it is found over large areas in Asia and Europe, from western Siberia and the Altai to the Mediterranean (excluding the Caucaxious), Mahmud Kâshghar in the xith century noted a criterion for the establishment of two sections in this Y-division: äqâşqan and bâlam (remained). The latter section includes the Oghuz of the xith century and their modern descendants, pure or mixed: the Turkomans, the Aghbarâdjiaks and the other Turks of Persia, Anatolia and the Balkans, the Gagans of Bessarabia and the Tatars of the Southern Crimea, i.e. the S.W. part of the Turkish world. The Oghuz section of the Turkish language is distinguished by this criterion, bâlam not only from the first section of the Y-division (äqâşqan) but also from all the other Turkish languages except Caucaxious. The first section — äqâşqan of the Y-division — is much larger than the second, and the peoples of all the central part of the Turkish world from Tobol to Baghchïerar and from Kâsin (q.v. in the province of İsfân) to Turfan speak its dialects. The äqâşqan section can be further divided. It includes two sub-sections: tawîl and taghîkh (highlander). The criterion fî connects the tawîl sub-section with the bâlam section (in both mây = yellow, in place of tawîl of the northern division and the tawîl of the taghîkh sub-section) and with the Caucaxious, whereas the criterion to connects it with the Caucaxious (tî) and Yakut (â). Korsâz considered the correspondence of mây and açî to be very old and thought that the Turkish languages were originally divisible into two groups, the northern (mây) and the southern (açî). But this correspondence has not yet been attested by any ancient document. The dialects of the tawîl sub-section are represented in the N.W. part of the Turkish world by the Teleut-Altai-Teleng group and the Kamanî and Lebed dialects in Altai, by the Kiî rises (q.), Kâzâk and Karakalpak (q.) dialects, by some of the purest Osîbeg dialects, by the dialects of the Tatars of Tobol-Tumene and of Kâsar, of the Khârsâ, Baghchîs, Nogârs (of Astarishân (q.), of Stavropol, etc.), of the Kêmî of Daghestan (q.), of the Bashkirs of the Northern Caucaxious, of the Tatars of the Crimean steppes, of the Kàrâîts (except those that have been organised) and the Kirmâshaks (the Turkish-speaking Jews of the Crimea). The dialects of the section that form a transition between the tawîl sub-section of the Y-division to D, are represented in Siberia by the Çàffîm, Aba, Cernî (îñsî) which have y instead of i, but açî in place of mây and açî in place of i (aqâş, taghîkh). The taghîkh sub-section of the äqâşqan section, which we have just mentioned, is represented in the southeastern part of the Turkish world by the dialects of the settled populations of Western and Eastern (Chinese) and in part of Afghan Turkistân, by the Osîbeg dialects (except the Khâsian and those of the tawîl type), the Târâncî and those of the Turks of the oases of Kâshghar (q.), Khotan (q.), Turfan (q.), etc. This sub-section sometimes called, not very happily, Caghatâi shows a mixture of the northwest tawîl sub-section with the northeast D-division. The Özbek and Sart (of the turkized Iranians; cf. sart) dialects of the former Khânate of Khiwa (Khiwîzîm, q.v.) form a transition between the dialects of the southwest and northwest; their criteria are âqâşqan and äqâşqan.

Bibliography: W. Radloff, Phonetik der nördlichen Türkischen, 1882, p. 280—91; do., Alt{textumlaut}tische Studien, iv. — v. (Boll. de l'Acad. de Sc.-St.-Pétersbourg, 1911); Korsâz, Klassifikaciya turîlskih pîlmen po iaxbakh (Etymologische Abhandlungen, 1910); A. Samiîîvîî, Niebownêr depelnêmi â klassifikaciya turîlskih iaxbakh (Petrograd 1922); do., K. sîrozam â klassifikaciya turîlskih iaxbakh (Bull. Or. Komissiî po oviva v Turkeleg. Sûretâ, 1926, No. 2).

2. General Sketch of the Turkish Languages.

The syntax of the Turkish languages is based on the following principles: the governing parts of a grammatical statement or of a group of statements follow the parts governed. This is the principal part of a statement — the attribute — is usually placed at the end, the completed parts follow the complement, and the qualified parts are placed after their qualification, the principal statements follow incidental ones. In keeping with this principle, the auxiliary morphological elements, which can historically be traced back to governing roots, follow the stems of the words to which they refer and cannot precede them. The auxiliary morphological elements represent a series of links starting from the post-positions which remain phonetically unchanged, to the formative and modificative prefixes, which unit with the preceding word to form a unit as regards accent and vowel harmony, which we shall discuss later. It is thought that the accent in Turkish languages originally fell on the first syllable, as is still the case in the Mongol languages. In modern Turkish languages, the principal accent usually falls on the last syllable but even now the first syllable still, particularly one with a broad vowel (a, e, o, ı, ü), retains a trace of the old accent in the form of a secondary accent, and is weaker in other dialects. By the existence at one time of an accent on the first syllable we can explain the fact of progressive vowel harmony which is of two kinds. First, by the law of assimilation, the posterior vowels (a, ı, ö and ı) are followed only by posterior vowels and the anterior vowels (e, o, ü, i) always by anterior; this assimilation was also extended to consonants, especially to ı, ı, ı: kâf stop âqâşqan, stopped; kîl, come, kîlgen, come (p.p.). In some dialects we see more or less weakening in this fundamental vowel harmony as a result of the influence of other languages, particularly Iranian (some Turkoman and Aghbarâdjiak dialects, the Turkish of Anatolia, and the iranized Osîbeg dialects). The harmony of the second kind is much less consistent than the harmony of the first kind: the assimilation between rounded vowels (ö, ü, ö, ü) or unrounded (a, e, o, i) are so rounded (ö, ü, a) remain unrounded. The non-rounded vowels are followed by un-rounded broad or narrow vowels: ı: know, ı: + ı: I knew; ı: + ı: + ı: ı: died; ı: + ı: + ı: ı: of five; ı: + ı: lake, ı: + ı: + ı: of lake.
TURKS

It is only in some dialects (e.g. the Kura-Kirghiz) that the vowel harmony of the second class is extended to all the broad vowels, while in others (e.g. in Kirghiz-Kazak) to the anterior broad vowels (ə, ə) only: bol = lake, bol = der = the lakes (in both dialects) but bol = hand, bol = der (Kirghiz-Kazak) and bol = der (Kara-Kirghiz). Harmony of this kind has attained its greatest development with regard to the narrow vowels in the Turkish and Staminal, in which, however, it does not affect the broad vowels.

In the Turkish language there are nine fundamental vowels: a, ä (open), e (closed), ə, æ, ê, i, u, ü. There used to be long vowels, which did not attract sufficient attention except in Ayak and Yuktan. In some languages (e.g. the Kazan-Tatar) the number of vowels is over nine and the series has undergone modifications (ør, ø, ø, ø, ø, ø, ø, ø).

The Turkish consonant system has not yet been sufficiently studied either; and sufficient attention has not been paid to the existence, in addition to mute and sonant consonants, of middle consonants (e.g. in Turkoman and Adjharabjadian).

The progressive assimilation of the sonant vowels with mutes and vice-versa is widespread: yaw + di, he has written; taw + ti, he has seized; kaw + da, in the eye; kaw + za, on the head.

There are other kinds of progressive assimilation of consonants. Cases of progressive dissimilation are features of certain dialects only (e.g. Kazak, Kirghiz, Altai): ata + tar, the fathers; bol + der, the lakes. A very distinctive feature of the Yakut language is the regressive assimilation of consonants: at + in, my horse; at + la, thy horse; but a + gor, to my horse; a + mat, from thy horse.

In the majority of the dialects the only initial sonant consonants are k, g, and exceptionally n and d; the sonants d, m, g are found initially in Turkoman, Adjharabjadian and in Anatolian Turkish and were found in the Oguz of the 14th century. Words cannot begin with the consonants r, l, s (the latter, except in loanwords, is only found initially in a few onomatopoeic words) nor with two consonants. Two consonants at the end of a word are only admissible in cases where the first of them is r, l, s.

This is why we find supplementary vowels in loanwords: árszalg < árszalg (Arb.), istáq < isteppe (Russ.), šibir < šibir (Arab.).

Morphological formations or modifications are, as we have already said, produced by the addition of one or more formative or modificative suffixes to the verbal or nominal roots and to stems, which, even without this accretion, have a certain definite meaning: the verbal stem, the 2nd pers. sg. with imperative meaning (top = find) and the nominal stem — that of the nominative, genitive, accusative and some other cases of the sing. or plur. (a dynam, apple, of apple, the apples). Cases of formation by analogy are also found: bér = one, bér + a = by one, and by analogy: bér = two, bér + dör = by two (Chaghatay); or bér = five, bér + a = by five, and by analogy: alt = six, alt + a = by six.

There are two fundamental grammatical categories: the noun and the verb. Nouns are divided into pronouns, numerals, and nouns in general; there are no special morphological features for the adjective. Nor can one make a sharp distinction between nouns and adjectives, e.g. teto = iron and of iron, teto = stone and of stone, in =

water and pertaining to water. The adjective forms with the noun it qualifies a grammatical whole; thus the suffixes of the plural and of the diminution are added only to a qualified noun while the adjective is un declined. The verbal forms are divided into: 1. finite verbs, very limited in number, 2. verbal nouns having the meaning of nouns of action or of agency and 3. verbal adverbs (gerundives).

The adverbs of nominal or verbal origin are very few in number and like the postpositions and interjections form a secondary grammatical category, in addition to the nouns and verbs.

The possessive suffixes in the nouns correspond to the possessive pronouns of the Indo-European languages: at + in = my horse, at + al = thy horse, at + if = his horse, ata + m = my father, ata + a = thy father, ata + if = his father, ata + in = our horse, at + in = your horse, ata + an = our father, ata + am = thy father. The same suffixes in certain verbal forms are used as personal endings: kelt + gu + m, I shall come, kelt + gu + a = thou wilt come, kelt + gu + if = he will come (Chaghati); kelt + al + m = I came, kelt + al + a = thou didst come, kelt + al + if = he came.

The predicative (enclitic) semi-suffixes, derived from personal pronouns are used in certain dialects, having been influenced by the possessive suffixes, in the nouns to the substantives of the Indo-European languages while the verbs take the most used personal endings: 1st pers. ben, men, bin, min, in, ion; 2nd pers. cen, sin, sin; pl. 1st pers. bis, us, is, mis; 2nd pers. sin, sin. Examples: ádghu-ber (bin, min, m) > úgipim 1 am good; yuwar-ber (m), men, min > yuar-ber (m) I write. In the old language the demonstrative pronoun o = was used in the third person of the substantive verb: ádghu + o, he is good; in the modern languages — the predicative semi-suffix atir (dit), from the verbal from tarur = he is erect.

The suffix of the plural fear, feur is used with nouns as well as with verbs: at + tar (at + tar) — the houses, at + if + tar — they have thrown.

The personal verbal forms are formed as follows: in the imperative from the pure verbal stem; in the other cases from the stems of one or other mood or case. In addition to the possessive and predicative suffixes, special suffixes are also used as personal endings, e.g. na, na, na, na, na, na, na, the 3rd pers. of the imperative, j, a, for the first pers. of the plural of the preterite and conditional in the modern dialects (kelt + al + j, we have come, kelt + an + j, if we had come). The latter suffix (j, a) is used in the Adjharabjadian dialects, in some Anatolian dialects and in the Gokkent dialect of Turkomian, instead of the predicative enclitic of the first pers. plur. of nouns and verbs.

In the majority of the modern Turkish languages there are five cases in declension with special terminations: genitive (nit, nit, nit, nit, nit), accusative (i, i, old g), dative (ka, a, a, yot, aor, aor), locative (oa), ablative (das, das, das, das), but in the old languages and in some modern ones there were also suffixes for the directive, instrumental and other cases.

Grammar as gender does not exist; there are only two numbers.

The differences in phonetics and vocabulary are more marked in the Turkish languages than those of morphology. Cuwash and Yakut occupy
a position apart; all the other Turkish languages may be regarded as dialects and variants of a single language.

The Turkish languages show considerable conservatism in the whole extent of their known history (from the viith century). The comparative historical study of the Turkish languages is still in its initial stages (the works of Radloff, Groenbeck, Thomesen, Melinrantski, Bang, Brockeckmann, Deny). As a result of the researches of Ramstedt, Gomboé, Németh and Poppe, it may be regarded as more or less proved that the Turkish languages are related to the Mongol and Cauwagh closely allied to both. A new light has been thrown on the past history of the Turkish by N. Marr, who has examined Cauwagh from the point of view of the Japhetic theory and places the Turkish languages in a group not any larger than that proposed by the earlier theories of the Turanists.

Bibliography: Boëthigier, Uber die Sprache der Jukuten, St. Petersburg 1854; Radloff, Vergleichende Grammatik der nördlichen Turktschrinen, 1, 2, 3, Leipzig 1852; V. Groenbeck, Vorstudien zii turkischen Kydhistorie, Copenhagen 1902; P. Melinrantski, Arab-Phileolog e in turcisch iszykh, St. Petersburg 1900; N. Kazanov, Opyt issledovania mri kihkkhiskh iszykh s vuzanim glizmikid rodstvennykh izerkhkq eg og d r u g i m iszykhm tierksi gornoj, Kazan 1903; Bang, Vem Kikishiiken iir Itorinidw, as well as his other works; Mahmad b. al-Hasan al-Kha’ghart, Dastur Lughat al-Turk, Istanbul; N. Marr, Cauwagh-isfirdy on Volige, Ceboksary 1936; N. Poppe, O rodstvennym omnomnikhm Iskakisskog i tierksi-taururskich iszykh, Ceboksary 1925; do., Istoria i sovremennoe polozenie vospota v maximum rodstvenn al’biskh iszykh (Stenografiiski otchet Pervo Turkoligikog Slezna v Baku, Baku 1930); M. Th. Houtman, Etno-turkisch-arabisches Glossar, Leyden 1894; Comen Geci, Kurn, Codex Cemanianus, Bulgaria 1880; Bang, Beiträge zur Kritik der Codex Communis (bull. de l’Acad. R. de Belgique, 1911) and his other works; C. Salesmann, Zur Kritik der Codex Communis (Bull. de l’Acad. des Sc. de St-Petersb., 1910); N. Ashmarn, Materiales dlia iszykhovskogo iszykh, Kazan 1898; do., Opyt iszykh Iskakisskx, Kazan 1903; Radloff, Proben der Volksschichten der türkischen Stämme, 1—x., St. Petersburg 1866—1904; Pekarsky, Obrazuy narodn. literatury, jakut, St. Petersburg 1907—1918.

3. Literary Scripts and Languages.

The oldest dated monuments of Turkish writing date from the eighth century. These are the inscriptions on the steles erected in honour of princes of the Turkish dynasty of the sixth—seventh centuries, Kük-Tegin and Bilge-Khan, found in 1869 by Radloff in the valley of the Orhon in Mongolia. Other inscriptions in the same script, large and small, are known in Mongolia, Siberia and Western Turkestan. The Siberian monuments were discovered in 1854 by Messerschmidt in the valley of the Venise. Manuscripts in the same hand, approximately of the ninth century, have recently been found in excavations in Chinese Turkestan. This script, deciphered in 1893 by the eminent Danish linguist V. Thomesen, was given by him the name of Turkish runes. Others have called it the Orkhon alphabet. The name "Kük-Turkisch" proposed by W. Bang for the Orkhon inscriptions has been rejected by Thomesen, Radloff and others. The Turkish runes are derived from the Arahamatic alphabet through the intermediary of the Old Boghdian alphabet; but some of them have an independent origin and are ideographic in character, e. g. v (f) = arrow, (v) j = moon, (v) 0 = house. Some documents in Turkish runes may be dated to the seventh or even the sixth century a.D.

The language of the Turkish runes, whether on stone or in manuscripts, is distinguished by a certain archaism in its phonetics (the sounds a, j, in morphology (by the directive and instrumental cases, genitive in -iš, ablative in -išt, verbal forms in -šar, -šna), and in vocabulary (šana = father, šag = mother).

The Uighur alphabet, which came into general use in the viith—ixth centuries among the Turkish people of the Uighurs, is derived from one of the northern Semitic alphabets, also through the intermediary of the Sogdian; it has been wrongly suggested that it is derived from the Estranghel. The Uighur literary language belongs to the same group as the Turkish of the Mongol monuments but with certain dialectic differences (genitive in -iš, ablative in -išt). The Uighur xylographic and manuscript literature, found by the English, Russian, French, German and Japanese expeditions, is very vast. In addition to the Uighur alphabet, the ancient Turces of Chinese Turkestan used Turkish runes, Manichaean, Syriac and Brahmi alphabets. Among the Turks of China, who did not adopt Islam, the Uighur alphabet remained in use down to the beginning of the xvith century. After the conversion to Islam of the Turks of Central Asia followed by the adoption of the Arabic alphabet (tenth—eleventh centuries), the Uighur alphabet remained in use as the court manuscript. It was used in the xith—xvith centuries among the Golden Horde and among the Timurids for the Kipchak and Chaghatay languages (Yarlik, works in prose and verse). At the beginning of the xivth century, there were still at Istanbul experts in writing Uighur (Abd al-Ra’ajjak Bakhsh). In Western Europe, Klareth, Rémusat and Joubert began to read the Uighur script in the first half of the xith century.

Founded on the literary Uighur of the pre-Islamic period, there developed in the lands of the Ilek-Khan (q.v.) or Karakhanids, converts to Islam, the Turkish literary language of Central Asia of the Muslim period written in the Arabic alphabet. It may be supposed that Arabic was the script of the original of the oldest document of this language known to us, the Kudagh-sh bigger ("the science of giving happiness"), a didactic poem of the eleventh century, composed by Yusuf Khudj Haidji (q.v.) at Bulghar and Kuchbahr. The language of this work, which has come down to us in two later copies in Arabic and one in Uighur script made at Herat in the xivth century, cannot be considered as pure Uighur. M. Krüppelhilde regards the language of the Kudagh-bigger as Karluck but it would be safer to call it Karakhnîid.

Data are lacking to enable us to decide if there was a literature in the Bulghar language in the Bulghar kingdom on the Kama where Islam was established in the tenth century. In any case Bul-
The development of the literary Turkish of Central Asia went on without interruption from the eleventh century but its centre changed from time to time. We may date to the sixteenth century the didactic work in quatrains by Edib Ahmed entitled 'Ahit "ul-Kh affili', the language of which is closely related to that of the Kuvait-bilg, without being identical with it. The absence of early manuscripts prevents us giving a definite name to the language of the Hikmet of Ahmed Ilemer (thirteenth century), the founder of Turkish mysticism, whom M. Köprüsüzade takes to have been a Karakahan Türk. Literary activity in the different parts of the Djibid kingdom or "Detshkêpiç", in Khwarizm which included the mouth of the Sir-Daryâ [q.v.], in the capital Saray [q.v.] and in the Crimea, had attained a considerable development by the beginning of the sixteenth century. A uniform literary language did not come into use in the Djibid state; in all the literary materials of this epoch which we possess, the different parts of the literary language of the Karakhanid period are combined with those of local dialects still living, Kipchak and Oghuz (Turkoman). The copy of the romance in verse of the sixteenth century in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, the Khârâv a-Marin of the poet Kûth, an imitation of the corresponding work of Nisâmî, dedicated to Tendik and his wife of the White Hordes, is a literary language very close to that of the Kuvait-bilg but showing also Kipchak (sinali village etc.) and Oghuz elements. Khârâvâ's poem Mezâhkeb-mawâns, written in the sixteenth century on the Sir-Daryâ and preserved in two copies of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in the British Museum, reveals far more Kipchak and Oghuz than Karakhanid linguistic elements.

In the sixteenth century in the Turkish Muslim world the different literary languages were not yet clearly separated from one another. The formation of the Mongol empire which embraced almost the whole Turkish world of the period created for a time an atmosphere favourable to the development of a uniform literary language for this part of the Muslim Turkish peoples. In its beginning literary activity in the Turks in the lands of the Sultân of Asia Minor was no doubt to some degree bound up with that of Central Asia and Eastern Europe. It would be very difficult to determine exactly where the romance in quatrains of the sixteenth century by a certain 'Ali entitled Kist-i Vüsurf was written; its language has much in common with the literature of the sixteenth century of the Golden Horde, in which the Oghuz-Turkoman shared, and it later became very popular in the region of the Volga. Differing from Brockelmann, who connects the Kist-i Vüsurf with the literary products of Anatolia, Merdijana, a Kazan scholar, thinks it is Bâlghar. The language of the prose work of the sixteenth century with passages in verse called Kışpi ul-Bulushi, written by Rahîb-i Oghuz, is closely related to the Karakhanid language. It would not be correct to call it language Kâ الولايات. The Syriac Christian Turkish inscriptions on the tombs of Semirzeh of the sixteenth centuries are in a language closely resembling the Karakhanid (if = bull, ven = horse, gërmânes = this world, atu = father, ana = mother).

We may date in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the beginning of the development — starting from the Central Asiatic Turkish literature which we may suppose to have been the only literature of the period — of the different literary languages of different parts of the Muslim Turkish world. The greatest development was that of the Ottoman Turkish and Câghištâ Türkili Turkish literary languages. The first goes back to Central Asiatic Turkish literature through the Anatolian Turkish literature of the Sultân period. Câghištâ Türkili represents the third, longest (sixteenth—seventeenth centuries), and most brilliant phase of the development of Central Asiatic Turkish literature and takes its rise directly out of the second phase, the Djebid. The Câghištâ Türkili language developed in the lands of the Timurids, which consisted of the second son of Čingiz Khân, Câghištâ [q.v.]. The Kipchak and Turkoman elements of the preceding phase of development of the literary Turkish of Central Asia were replaced in Câghištâ Türkili by living elements from the predominant Turkish dialects of the Câghištâ country. The emperor Bâsar says that the language of the most distinguished figure in Câghištâ Türkili literature, Mit 'Ali Shîr Nâsil, is identical with that of the dialect of the town of Anadilân. The Câghištâ Türkili poetical language was distinguished from that of prose by its morphology and its vocabulary.

Until lately some scholars have used the term Câghištâ [cf. Câghištâ Türkili literature] wrongly by applying it to the language of the literary monuments of the sixteenth century as well as to the living Turkish dialects of Western and Eastern Turkey. A renaissance in Câghištâ Türkili literature, prose and poetry, was observable in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries in the vizireys of Khâshkan and Khwa. At the present day in Osebegistan Câghištâ is giving way to the Asebeg Türkili language, the fourth phase of the development of Turkish Central Asiatic literature, the sphere of which has been considerably restricted by the coming into use in the seventeenth century of new literary languages by the peoples of Central Asia. Even in the seventeenth century, the historian Abu'l-Ghazî Khân wrote in Khwa in Osebeg and not in Câghištâ, contrary to the tradition of the time.

The Turkomans of Central Asia, who took part in the foundation of the literary language of Khwarizm in the time of the empire of Djebid, had in the centuries following their own literary language, especially for poetry, which after the sixteenth century came under Câghištâ influence and did not develop further. In our own day there is growing up in Turkmenistan a new literary language based purely on living Turkoman dialects (particularly Òkê and Yomun).

Ağharbâdâjî (Aser) developed among the Turks of Persia from the same stock as the language of the Sultân of Anatolia; after a short period in the sixteenth century under the patronage of the early Safavids [q.v.], it continued in existence in the following centuries, without being able to make progress against the influence on the one hand of Persian culture and on the other of Ottoman Turkish. The rehabilitation of Agharbâdâjî, which is closely related to the spoken dialect, began in the middle of the sixteenth century in Transcaucasia (Mîrîân Fâth 'Ali Akhîndowî). It became strongly influenced by Ottoman Turkish at the beginning of the seventeenth century and the result has been two rival currents which still exist at the present day.

In spite of the division of the division of the Golden Horde into different Khânates in the sixteenth century, the
Crimea retained a literary language based on Kipchak and known to the Ottomans as Crimean or Deaht (steppe), but the influence of Ottoman culture, felt especially in the historical literature and belles-lettres, interfered with its further development. The official language of the Khaan's chancelleries in the Crimea retained down to the xvith century the Djidid tradition to a great degree. At the end of the xixth and beginning of the xxth century Mizra Gasprinskii tried to establish a Pan-Turkish literary language in the Crimea, based on a simplified Ottoman and closely resembling the living dialect of the south of the Crimea. Gasprinskii's paper, the Torgijumun, circulated as far as Kâshgâr in the xixth century, as in Adjarbâidjân the struggle between two rival influences, Ottoman and local, still goes on in the literary language, and the situation is complicated by the fact that the living dialects of the Crimea belong to two different groups, southwest and northwest.

The Djidid literary language was also inherited by the khanate of Kazan where it was influenced by Çaghatay and old Ottoman and in the xixth century by modern Ottoman. In the second half of the xixth century, since Kayum Naşiri, there began among the Tatars of Kazan a movement to link up the literary language with the local dialect. The movement, in spite of the opposition of followers of Gasprinskii, has attained complete success. A barrier has now also been set up against infiltration of Russian influence into the Tatar literary language, which used to be very marked in certain places, not only in vocabulary but also in syntax. The Tatar of Kazan is used not only among the Tatars but also among the Mighars and the Noghais of Astarâkhân; before the foundation of the Bashkirk republic, it was also used by the Bashkirs and Tepters [cf. Tekvtar]. The Bashkirs at the present moment are creating for themselves a literary language of their own, but without completely avoiding the struggle between various tendencies of which the most powerful is one which takes a middle course and refuses to base the literary language on dialects having too pronounced peculiarities in phonetics and vocabulary. The Kazan-Tatar literary language is the most developed and most stabilised, next to the Turkish of Anatolia, and like it enjoys a popularity which reaches far beyond the boundaries of the Volga region.

Literary Turkish languages began to increase in number especially after the Russian Revolution of 1905 and still more after that of October 1917, with the awakening of national sentiment and the consciousness among the different nations of the Turkish world of possessing a culture of their own. The literary (Kîrghiz-)Kazâk language, young, but rich and flexible, developed considerably at the beginning of the xxth century. It is comparatively free from Arabic and Persian borrowings and, in close touch with the popular dialect, uses the Arabic alphabet ingeniously reformed by Baytursun. With the foundation of the Kîrghiz republic, the (Kara-)Kîrghiz have undertaken to create a literary language of their own, distinct from (Kîrghiz)-Kazâk.

In the northern Caucasus is being formed the Karaçal-Balkarian literary language, the development of which is hampered by the scanty population and the proximity of more developed languages, Crimean and Ajarbashânî. The latter shows its influence still more in Dagestân, where it is on the point of being recognised officially and is offering serious competition to the young local literary language, the Kumîl, which began to develop in the xixth century by outstripping Arabic, which was the language in every day use in Dagestân.

As to the alphabet, two forces are at present at work against one another in the Turkish Muslim world. One advocates the Arabic alphabet reformed to fit the Turkish phonetic system and has succeeded in giving new Arabic alphabets to the Kazan-Tatar, (Kîrghiz)-Kazâk, (Kara-)Kîrghiz, Õzbek, Turkoman and Crimean languages. The other is in favour of a Latin alphabet with additional letters for all the Turkish languages. It has been well received in Turkey itself, has gained a decisive victory in Ajarbashânî, where the movement started in the middle of the xxth century, and it is still making progress among the other Turkish peoples. The new Turkish uniform alphabet based on the Latin was formally adopted in 1927 by the Turkish Muslim peoples of the Soviet Republics.

The oldest Turkish writing found in the Runic alphabet had Semitic features and in many cases did not indicate the vowels (lguhn = bagban, yâh = yâh, ëlînhm = ëlînhinâh), the sound a being indicated in the first syllable only when it was long (t = at, horse; a = at, name). In the Uighir alphabet, the vowels were marked more frequently than in the Runic and more precisely than in the Arabic alphabet used later: to distinguish the sounds ë, ë from the e and a, to the latter was added the letter š: ë = ë, ë. Under the influence of the Arabic alphabet, this practice was dropped from the Uighir writing of the Muslim period. The notation of consonants in the older Uighir writing was more precise than in the later alphabet, which used the letters چ and ş indiscriminately and introduced other simplifications, which led Radloff to defend the erroneous Uighir consonant system, later corrected by Thomsen. Uighir orthography as regards vowels, with the exception of the special notations for ë and ș, was adopted in Central Asia at the time of the adoption of the Arabic alphabet and henceforth a distinction was made between Çaghatay and Ottoman orthography. In Asia Minor under the immediate influence of Arabic orthography a special Turkish orthography became established which was very characteristic of the old Ottoman writing (no indication of vowels, use of Arabic harakat's etc.). In later centuries, some of these Arabic orthographical peculiarities were, it is true, abandoned but to the present day Ottoman orthography is distinguished from Çaghatay by a considerable restriction in the indication of vowels (Ott. bt = Çag. bût; Ott. br = Çag. bûr) and the use of the Arabic characters ی and ئ to mark the sounds î and ô in words of Turkish origin, in combination with posterior vowels (m = water = Çag. mâ; ëç = mountain = Çag. them). The old Kazan-Tatar orthography was based on that of Central Asia but in some cases also it showed the influence of old Ottoman.

The movement for the reform of orthography in the form of the adoption of a phonetic script began to make itself felt in the Turkish Muslim world from the end of the xixth century. It has had most results, not in Turkey but among the Turkish peoples of Russia, and particularly among the (Kîrghiz)-Kazâk. The Turcological congress
of 1926 at Baku decided in favour of a mixed orthography—a combination of the phonetic with the cymological—for the establishment of which steps have now been taken with the help of the reformed Arabic alphabet and the new Turkish Latin alphabet.

The modern non-Muslim Turkish minorities, Çuwaan, Yakut, Turks of the Altai and Veniseli were, until quite recently, to be classed among the illiterate peoples, although the Yakuts preserve the tradition that they possessed an alphabet in olden times and although among the Turks of the Altai the Mongol alphabet as adapted to the Turkish language is still used, although to a very limited degree. All these peoples received from the Russians in the xviiiith and xixth centuries, the Russian alphabet, slightly adapted to their particular requirements. In 1917 the Yakuts replaced the Russian alphabet by a Latin one based on the international phonetic alphabet and prepared by a Yakut student, M. Novgorodov. The Tannau-Tuwa (Ouriangkhis or Soyots) are who are much under the influence of Mongol culture are at the moment trying to develop a national literary language and to choose themselves an alphabet.

The Greek alphabet used for the Turkish language from the ninth century in the Turk Bulghar kingdom on the Danube was quite recently in use among the turkicised Greeks of Anatolia and Samos. The turkicised Armenians have adapted the Armenian alphabet to the Turkish language. There are Adharabidjians manuscripts written in the Georgian alphabet. The Karaites who speak Turkish have from early times used the Hebrew alphabet.


4. Turkish Borrowings from neighbouring languages and vice versa.

In the pre-Muhammadan monuments of the Turkish languages we find words borrowed from Chinese, Sogdian, Sanskrit and the northern Semitic languages. Foreign influences may even be observed in the syntax of these manuscripts, especially in passages which are translations from other languages. In the modern dialects of Siberia and Mongolia, especially in Yakut, there are a number of Mongol elements which have come in by direct borrowing as well as through mixture of races. It is by the latter means that the paleo-Asiatic linguistic elements and other elements not yet elucidated have entered these dialects. The name of the river Venisei, Kram, known from the time of the Orkhon inscriptions, comes from the Kot language where it means "river" as in the modern dialect of the Soyot Turks. Finnish elements are found in the Turkish dialects of the Volga region. At the time of the foundation of the Mongol empire of Çinghis-Khan (q. v.), a certain number of borrowed Mongol words found their way into the majority of the Turkish languages. It was in this way that the old Turkish word yâlur "halter," preserved by the Yakuts, Soyots and the Turks of Anatolia as well in the women's language, was used in the Altai Turk, was gradually ousted in the xixth century by the Mongol word yâlur, which is now used in all the other Turkish languages including Çuwaan.

The Turkish dialects of the Ozbek, Turkomans, Adharabidjians and of the Turkish tribes of Persia show considerable Iranian influence as a result of the intermingling of races and cultures. As a result of the complicated mixture of the Turks with other races of Asia Minor and the Balkan Peninsula and of the cultural borrowings, we find in the language of the Turks of Anatolia and the Balkans, Greek, Slav—especially Serb—Armenian, Kurd, Italian, French and other elements in addition to Arabic and Persian. The mixture of the Turks with the natives of the Northern and Southern Caucasus has introduced into their dialects elements from the phonetics and the vocabulary of the Caucasian languages. The Turks who entered Syria and Egypt have been very strongly influenced by Arabic, as have the Khams of Dagestan, among whom, unlike other Muslim Turks, the names of the days of the week are Arabic and not Persian. In the other parts of the Turkish world, the adoption of Islam brought more Persian than Arabic words. The Arabic and Persian loanwords in the Turkish literary language are sometimes almost fifty, but they also found their way into the popular dialects of Turkish tribes but little influenced by Islam, like the Karak and the Kırklı (ten = body, lam = soul).

A certain number of Arabic and Persian words have also found their way among the non-Muslim Turks, not only among the Çuwaan, but also among the Turks of the Altai and Venisei and even through the intermediary of Russian among the Yakuts (omşar = omhår). The influence of Russian makes itself especially felt in the Turkish dialects of the Volga region and among them in Miphar in particular, but there are Russian loanwords in all the Turkish languages of the U. S. R.
The Turkish languages in their turn have from early times influenced the neighbouring languages, beginning with Chinese. There are Turkish words in the Mongol languages, in several Finnish languages (especially Ceremis and Magyar), in the Iranian languages, in modern Arabic, in Armenian, Georgian, Kurdish, Greek, Albanian, Rumanian, in the Slav languages of the Balkan Peninsula and of Eastern and Western Europe. History records fewer cases of the loss of their language by a Turkish people (the Bulgars in the Balkans, the Kuman in Hungary, the Tatars in Lithuania, the Dungan in China and the Turks in India) than of cases of the Turkicisation of other peoples: in Siberia, in Central Asia, in the Caucasus, in Asia Minor, in the Balkans and in Eastern Europe (the Magyars). We find Turkised gipsies in Turkey, Transcaucasia in the Crimea and in Turkistan.

Bibliography: The Dictionaries of Radloff, Fekarzili (Yakat) and Pusonm (Cwass); the articles by Kozh and Melioranski on Turkish languages in the Russian language (Russk. Ort. Russ. Tazyki i Izobrazheni A. Nauk. v. VII. xi); F. Miklosch, Die Türkischen Elemente in den südöst- und osteuropäischen Sprachen, Vienna 1884-1885; Vladimirov, Türkische elemente in mongolischen tazyki (Zap., xx, 1911); F. v. Kraeitel-Greyenhofen, Studien zum Armeenisch-Türkischen, Vienna 1912; Z. Gombocz, Die hungarisch-türkischen Lehnwörter in der ungarischen Sprache (M.S. F.O., xxx., 1912); Kowalski, W sprawie słońców tureńskich w języku polskim (Studia imprimatrum z Symbolec grammatice im honorem J. Rawiczowskiego, II, 1927); M. Bittner, Der Einfluss des Arabischen und Persischen auf das Türkische, 1900.

(A. Samoylovitch)

III. ÇAĞHATAI LITERATURE.

Under the influence of the brilliant development of Turkish literature in the Çaghātāi kingdom [cf. Şahbib Erzurumlu] during the rule of the Timūrids, this eastern Turkish literary language has been given the name "Çaghātai" in the east itself, as well as in European literature. In an anonymous Turkish work (probably written in India, Brit. Mus., Or. 1912; Rieu, Cilt. Türk. MSS., p. 268), all Turkish dialects are divided into two languages, Çaghātāi and Turkoman. Ibn Mahāниз (Turk. ed., p. 73; Melioranski, Arab. Belog, p. xx.) uses the word "Türkistinšah" in the same sense. The language of the Turks is said to have come from Turkistan just as Arabic came from the Hijāz. The "language of the Turks of our (presumably Persian) lands" is also contrasted to Türkistinšah as well as to Turkoman. In Radloff's Wörterbuch (iv. 15), the word Çaghātāi is quoted only in the form Daghātāi and as an Ottoman word; cf. also Şahīk Salāmān Bāģārī, Lughāt-i Çaghātāi wo-Turkī Əlbəltān, Istanbul 1297-1300; abbreviated edition with German translation by Dr. S. Kinos, Budapest 1902 (Publ. Scrit. Orient. 22 Sec. Ethn. Honr.).

Radloff (Zap., iii. 1 1901) presumes a purely eastern origin for the Çaghātāi literary language. The Uighar alphabet and literary language had survived from the pre-Muhammadan period among the Muslim Turks; through the adoption of many Arabic and Persian words the Uighar alphabet gradually fell into disuse; we have books written in "pure Uighur" language but in the Arabic alphabet, such as the Kitāb al-Amīrī of Rāghbūrī written in 710 (1310-1311) (Radloff in the introduction to his edition of the Kadibah-Bihār, p. 1xxvii. has tried to show that the "İlek-Khāns") in whose lands the earliest Muslim works in Turkish were written are "without a shadow of doubt to be regarded as Uighur rulers". In the period of the Mongols the Uighur alphabet and language were widely disseminated. Many "pure Uighur" words and grammatical forms were in this period driven out of use by borrowings from "Central Asian dialects"; but there are still in Çaghātāi words and forms of Uighur origin, which are only used in the literary language. As the Eastern Turks, unlike the southern Turks (Constantinople), had no common literary centre, the Çaghātāi literary language has been influenced in different districts by various local dialects.

In contrast to this view it has now been proved (notably by A. Samoylovitch in Mir-All-Shir, Leningrad 1928, p. 1 1928) that already in the pre-Mongol period in addition to the oldest Muslim centre of Turkish literary activity, Kāshghār [q. s.], there was a second literary centre in Khorāsān and on the lower course of the Sir-Daryā. This region retained its importance in the Mongol period under the rule of the Khāns of the Golden Horde. The literature of the Çaghātāi kingdom seems not to have arisen till later and to have been influenced by the literature of the Golden Horde. Dīmāl al-Kurāshī, the author of the Muḥājīl al-Tarīkh written in Kāshghār, made the acquaintance of the learned Shaikh al-Islām Hušām al-Dīn Abu 1-Māsamī Hindī b. ʿAṣīm al-ʿAṣīm al-Bārūtnī in 672 (1273-1274) in Bārūtīn (also called Bārūdn̄ and Bārūtn̄) on the lower course of the Sir-Daryā. In addition to theological works in Arabic, the Shaikh also wrote verses in the three literary languages of Islam (this is probably the first time we have them classed together like this); his Arabic verses were of beautiful form (fajāba), his Persian ingenious (maṭla) and his Turkish is keeping with the times (atāla). To the frequent recurring (as early as the Kādib Bāgātā of Ahmad b. Aḥā Tāfīṣār, ed. Keller, p. 158) contrast between the perfect form of Arabic writings and the ingenious ideas of the Persian is now added the truthfulness of Turkish; and indeed the works of the Çaghātāi poets by their simpler language and more simple train of thought give an impression of being more true to life than their Persian models (cf. E. Berthels, Nemūsāt ʿAffār, in Mir-All-Shir, p. 24 1947, esp. p. 80).

Among the works written in the kingdom of the Golden Horde, Khwārizmī's Muhābbat-Nāma (written in 754 = 1353 on the banks of the Sir-Daryā) had a direct influence on Çaghātāi literature. Besides the Brit. Mus. MS., Add. 7914, Rieu, Türk. Men., p. 284 sq. we also have the Muhābbat-Nāma in the Uighur manuscript written in Ragjāb and published in 835 (March-April 1430) in Yezd for the emir Djalal al-Dīn, Or. 8193 (Comptes Rendus de l'Acad. des Sciencies, 1924, p. 57 sq. ; J.R.A.S., 1928, p. 99 sqq.). The Tūṣhāhīm-Nāma of the Timūrid prince Sīdī Ahmad written in 839 (1435-1436) (in the same MS., Add. 7914) is modelled on the Mahābbat-Nāma.

A few Turkish poets who lived in the Çaghātāi kingdoms are known of the viith (xivth) century; Timūr's contemporary, the emir Saif al-Dīn, is said to have written five poems in Turkish and Persian
under the pen-name of Saiif (Dawlat-Shah, ed. Browne, p. 168). What has survived to us belongs to the
sixth (xviith) century, the period of Timur's immediate successors. Sakkalt was a panegyrist of Halil Sultan (1405–1409) and Ulughbeg (1409–
1449) (Brit. Mus., Or. 2070; Rieu, Turk. Man., p. 284). Ulughbeg is also mentioned by the poet
Lutfi, some of whose poems have been included in the Uighur MS., Or. 8193 (more fully on Lutfi: Rieu, Turk. Man., p. 285 and 287; Ahmad Zaki
Walidow, Daghansky poet Lutfi i ego disan, Kazan 1914). Both poets speak of themselves with
great pride. Sakkalt says to Ulughbeg: "It will be many years before such a Turkish poet as I
and such a learned prince as thou appear again". Lutfi says: "The Khán Ulughbeg knows how to
appropriate the services of Lutfi, whose brilliant poems are not inferior to those of Salmun" [q. v.]
(text in W. Barthold, Ulgخذ, St. Petersburg 1918, p. 112 sqq.). To the same period belongs
the panegyrist of another grandson of Timur, the prince of Fars, Iskandar Sultan (b. 817 = 1414).
Mr. Haldar Madjdilah (Dawlatshah, p. 371; Rieu, Cat. Turk. Man., p. 285; A. Pavet de Courteille, in
to the Malakm al-Azwar of Ni'mat (G. F. Fk., ii. 241 sqq.). Parts of it have been published by
Pavet de Courteille from a manuscript in Uighur
(now in Berlin). This poet also says that earth
and heaven have been filled with the echo of his
songs. Two other manuscripts written in Uighur
belong to the first half of the sixteenth (xvith)
century: the Bakhshyr-Nama, MS. of 838 (1435)
in Oxford (G. F. Fk., ii. 324), and the Mradd
Azwar, with a Turkish translation of the Tashkhirl
al-Anfal of Fargh-i Din Al'Afaaz [see 'Afaaz'],
manuscript said to be (the Turkish year does not
agree with the year of the cycle) of 1059 Djamad II,

In the second half of the sixteenth (xvith)
century Caghatâti literature reached its zenith in Mir 'Ali Shir
(b. 844 = 1440–41, d. Sunday, 11th Djamad II,
960 = Jan. 3, 1501). On the significance of his
career and literary interest cf. Belin, Notice biographe et litteraire sur Mir All Chir-Nejdi
(J. A., xvii, 1861, p. 175–256, 281–357); E. G. Browne, A History of Persian Literature under Timur
Dominion, Cambridge 1920, esp. p. 437 sqq., 505 sqq.; Mir All-Shir, Leningrad 1928. Like
the other Caghatâti poets, Mir 'Ali Shîr, in his
Divans as well as in his numerous other poems,
is simply an imitator of Persian poets, but he
does not follow their models slavishly; his poems
seem to have suited the taste of his time and
people perfectly and have enjoyed great popularity
down to the present day. Of importance is his last
work, finished in Djamad I, 905 (Dec. 1499)
Muhahamat al-Lughatan (Quatre mains, Ch.
stomatik en tave oriental, parts 1–2, Paris 1842);
the language and culture of the Turks are
compared with those of the Persians; the author
devours to show that the Turkish language is
no less suitable than the Persian for poetic efforts
and intellectual purposes generally. Mir 'Ali Shîr
is frequently described in European works as a
minister or vizier; but as a matter of fact he never
held such official position. His influence on
affairs of state and his activity as a patron of arts
and sciences were the result of his friendship (not
always unclouded) with his prince Sultan Husain
(1469–1506). Sultan Husain was himself a poet.
His Divans was published in Bakû in 1526. As
name of this Sultan, prince Shih Gharbi, whose
pen-name was Gharbi (in the Bakhshyr-Nama, ed.
Beveridge, G.M.S., i. 160, probably wrongly Gurbet),
has left a Persian (not known to Brockelmann)
and a Turkish Divans in the Hambourg Stadtbibliothek, No. 15 (Brockelmann, Katalog, No. 183 and 277), MS. dated Ramaqân 940 (March–April 1534). Buxur [q. v.], the founder of the
Timurid Empire in India, was the author of a
number of poems but is most celebrated for his
Memories (Bakhshyr-Nama also WafaZi or Wafa-i
Rahbiti; cf. TurkiA Rahbiti, transl. Ross, p. 173 sqq.); but Persian was almost exclusively used
at the Indian court.

The Timurids were driven out of Central Asia
and Eastern Persia by the Ozbeks. Under the
latter, especially in the early period, when they
had not yet completely adapted themselves to
Persian culture, a good deal of Turkish was
written both in verse and prose; but they stuck to
the old "Caghatâti" models without producing anything
new or original. Mir 'Ali Shîr remained the model
for poets in educated circles, and for the poets of
the masses Ahmad Yesevi [q. v.], in the modernised
form in which we now possess his Divans. The
historian Abu l'-Gharbi Bahadur Khan [q. v.]
stands alone, who endeavoured in his work
(ed. Desmons, p. 37) to avoid Persian and
Arabic as well as "Caghatâti Turkish" words and
to write so that "even a five-year-old child", could understand him. One of the most popular poets
(also used as a school text-book) of the Ozbek
period was the mystic Sufi Allâh Yâr (end of the
xvith and beginning of the xvith century). Later
in Bakhshyr, Turkish literature was almost
completely driven out by Persian (partly
influenced by the local Tadjik [q. v.]). In Khoshand [q. v.]
the Khiwa [see Khiwanism] Caghatâti literature
experienced a noteworthy revival in the xviith
century. Cf. especially M. Hartmann, M. S. O. S. A.,
vi. 87 sqq. (the expression "revive" [Nawakhâd],
p. 79); A. Samovolov, Zap., xix. 0198 sqq.

The Uighur alphabet was no longer used among
the Ozbeks as it still had often been under the
Timurids; but the influence of the Uighur script
can still be seen in the Arabic here (use of
vowels instead of the vowel signs prevailing
in South Turkish manuscripts). So far little attention
has been paid to the question how far Caghadâti
literature was influenced by the literature of
the oldest Kâshghar period. That, as M. Hartmann
thought (M. S. O. S. A., vii. 79), the Kuteged-Bîlik
(so to be written instead of Kadolf's Ku-
dukha Bîlik) "remained almost neglected in the
land itself and was taken to Egypt at an early
date", can hardly be held any longer. Samovolov
(Zap., xxxi. 037 sqq.) has established the fact that
the copy found in Sarakeli on the lower course
of the Ural in the xviith century, quotations are
given from the Kuteaged-Bîlik. Edition in the
Tavshir-î Khârimshâhî finished at the end of
Dhu l-Ka'da 1280 (May 1864) of Mullâ Bîthâ
Lîjân (the only knowu manuscript is in
Berlin, acquired in 1929, l. 9b); we have the verses
which sound exactly like a quotation from the Kuteaged-Bîlik (although not found in it): masir ebâs khatrami ni'sâmî ni'sâmî ofna'add tapashna bi'dâm ("call
the activity of the vizier should be directed to
order; where there is no order, justice cannot be carried out")).

The same Turkish literary language as was written in the land of the Özbegs is written to the present in Chinese Turkestān (Kāghgharija). Here also day Turkish culture has been influenced by Persian; the only work of importance from Kāghgharija, the Tūrkı̄ Sı̄rāh-ı ʿAthār of ʿAlāʾîd Mirzā [q.v.], is written in Persian; there are at least two Turkish translations of it (by Muḥammad Şadīk in the xviiith century; by an anonymous writer in Khotan dated 22nd Djamād-i I, 1293 = June 7, 1874). Even under Ismāʿīl Khān (1670–1682) Mirzā Šāh Muḥammad Cura (Zap., xxii. 313 sqq.) wrote his history in very bad Persian instead of in his own native Turkish. A little later (beginning of the xviiith century) the history in the Asiatic Museum in Leningrad (Zap., xv. 236 sqq.; M. Hartmann, Der islamische Orient, 1 Berlin 1899–1905, p. 291 sqq.; in addition to this manuscript, still is now a second, Petrovski 9, in the Asiatic Museum) was written in a pure and simple Turkish language. On the most recent historical works from Kāghghar in [e.g. Zap., xvii. 6188 sqq. on the Tūrkı̄-i Amanīya of Mullī Mātī Sāraḵ finished on the 11th Shāwwal 1321 (Dec. 17, 1903)]. In the xviith century a new Turkish literature has been founded among the Özbegs under European (directly under Russian and Tatar) influences; it is sometimes called "Modern Çaghatāi literature"; it includes dramatic works among its productions.


(W. BARTHOLD)

B. — I. OTTOMAN TURKS.

Language and Alphabets.

Ottoman Turkish has since the end of the xviith century been a language of literature and culture the forms of which have become securely established during the four centuries of its existence. Its evolution and the extension of its sphere of influence have been intimately connected with the political and cultural development of the Ottoman empire. It has therefore become one of the principal languages of the Muslim world, being next in importance to Arabic and Persian. After Ottoman culture had begun to spread to the west in the period of the Tanzimat [q.v.] in the xviith century and in a greater measure since the end of the Ottoman empire in 1922, this same literary language has assumed the character of a national language which in Turkey is now called anything but Turkish (türkçe). The influence of this language is still to be traced in the languages of those Muslim and Christian peoples who formerly formed part of the Ottoman empire.

Ottoman Turkish is a branch of the southwest or Turkoman group of Turkish languages (cf. Samoilović, Nekstoriya dopolneniya k klassifikatsii turckikh jazykov, Petrograd 1922, p. 5 sq.; this same group is called by Radloff, Phonetik der türkischen Türkoprochen, Leipzig 1853, p. 280, that of the dialects of the south). These were the dialects originally spoken by the Özbeg Türk. With the other "dialects" of this group, the Adıhe and Turkoman, Ottoman shares certain phonetic peculiarities like the dropping of the consonant g after another consonant (e.g. čalum compared with žalum of the other groups) and the form ol- instead of ožol- (with certain survivals in Turkoman) for the root of the verb "to be", and, from the morphological point of view, of a special paradigm for the present of the verb (gel一道). In the application of vowel harmony it distinguishes two groups of variable endings, that in which e alternates with a and that in which we have ı, i, u, u alternately with fairly frequent traces of an infection, which knew only the alternations a, u (V. Gröbebech, Forskudter til tyrkisk Leksisker, Copenhagen 1902, p. 18–19). Ottoman is distinguished from Adıhe and Turkoman particularly by the change of initial m to b (often in place of m). The conservative character that belongs to the Turkish language in general, due to the fact that the nominal and verbal roots hardly suffer any change, is the reason why the dialects of Ottoman differ very little among themselves (cf. below, iii.).

Turkish, as taught in the many grammars in European languages, is based, from the point of view of dialect, on the pronunciation which prevails in Constantinople, a pronunciation which is often characterised as light and melodious. This is due to the fact that the Constantinople dialect tends to make predominance, especially in the endings, terminations with "light" and unrounded vowels, while we do not have there the pronunciation ś in place of š, which prevails in the eastern dialects; it is probably also the great number of Arabic loanwords which has brought about the predominance of the "light" articulations.

The language taught in the grammars has rather a conventional character, which is seen notably in the great regularity which they represent as prevailing in the vowel system of the roots (the two series a, i, e, o and a, i, e, o) and in the rigorous application of the rules of vowel harmony. This regularity is far from being found in practice, although the language of the educated people tends to develop in this direction. The employment of the Arabic alphabet seems to have distracted the attention of the Turkish grammarians themselves from phonetic questions in general; the establishment of an orthography in the Latin alphabet will no doubt reveal gradually what are the tendencies of Turkish pronunciation.

The question of ascertaining which is the standard Ottoman dialect is however somewhat complicated. The opinion predominating in Turkey itself is that the best türkçe is that of Constantinople (Ziya Güm Alp, Türkçülükü Sembol, Ankara 1939, p. 97). This however is making the question much too simple. The population of Constantinople is composed of many heterogeneous elements and on doubt a large number of Ottoman dialects have contributed towards the evolution of the language of the ancient capital of the empire. The prevalent view has more real foundation if we apply it only to the language of the educated classes. As regards pronunciation M. Bergsträsser thinks he
can say it is more or less uniform among the educated classes of Constantinople (Z.D.M.G., lxxii. 236). There are however still considerable divergencies in the different classes of society, as regards pronunciation and vocabulary; many memories of ancient dialectal differences must have still survived. We owe to Vámbéry the interesting statement that the members of the dynasty of Othman had retained a mode of speech among themselves which differed from ordinary Turkish. We are however not at all well informed regarding the evolution of the language of the educated classes. For pronunciation, we possess of the xvirth century written texts in Latin characters (cf. especially Foy, M. S. O. S., iv.; and Babinger, in \r
\r
Lit![\text{eraturenbücher aus Ungarn's Türkischen}, Berlin and Leipzig 1927, p. 43]. But these very interesting documents rather reflect a dialectal pronunciation; later documents also like Holdermann's Turkish grammar of 1736 (cf. Babinger, \text{Stemmbücher Buchwesen}, Leipzig 1919, p. 14-15) show considerable divergencies compared with the Turkish of Constantinople of today, especially in the retention of endings with rounded vowels.

As to the vocabulary of the Turkish of the educated classes, we are in a position of still greater uncertainty, due to the fact that the ideal of what is good Turkish has considerably changed in course of time. This ideal down to the middle of the sixteenth century was strongly influenced by the literary language.

This written literary language developed from the first attempts at writing the Turkish spoken by the different Turkish groups who were established in Asia Minor in the xixeenth century (cf. below, iv.). It is therefore based on several dialects, which did not differ greatly from one another and still less when written in the Arabic alphabet. This Arabic alphabet even caused the disappearance of a number of peculiarities of the Adheri dialect, which was not without influence in the development of literary Ottoman. The literary language does not, strictly speaking, possess a real classic, which could serve as an ideal model of language and style, as Arabic has in the Kur'an and Persian in a more limited sense in the \text{Shah-nameh}. The epithet classical is usually given to the language of the great Ottoman poets of the xvith and xvirh centuries but the exaggerated artificiality of this language did not permit it a lasting influence.

The most prominent feature of the ancient literary language is the almost unlimited employment of words and expressions borrowed from literary Arabic and Persian. Like the other Turkish languages, whose speakers became Muslims, Ottoman Turkish shows from the first a number of words borrowed from Arabic and Persian belonging to the sphere of religion and culture. The linguistic character of the Turkish language offers no obstacle to the adoption en masse of foreign words which are not at all felt to be intolerable in the system of the language (cf. e.g. E. Sapir, \text{Language}, New York 1921, p. 210). This circumstance has given Turkish a great richness in possibilities of expression both in the noun and in the verb (by means of the auxiliary verbs \text{stemek}, \text{yalmek}, \text{almaş}, \text{olmaş} combined with Arabic \text{wadad}'s). And since Turkish literature for the most part began with translations from Persian, which has the same faculty for adoption from the Arabic, the literary language has drawn abundantly from this source to enlarge its powers of expression. Thus there arose an ideal of literary beauty which has brought about a wide breach as regards vocabulary between the written language and the spoken language which came to be known as \text{bach Türkçe}. There have always, it is true, been scholars who condemned this artificial language (on the \text{bakh Türkçe} movement see below, iv.; \text{Ottoman Literature}) but it was only in the middle of the sixth century that a reaction set in against the abundant use of Arabic and Persian loanwords in the literary language. This movement coincides with the ascendancy of European influence on Turkish literature.

But at the same time the influence of European civilization in general caused to be felt the want of new terms to express new ideas, technical, scientific, political etc., which came into Turkish civilization when it turned towards the west. In this difficulty, recourse was again had to the inexhaustible resources of the Arabic vocabulary and also to the morphological possibilities of Arabic. The result was that Turkish scholars and men of letters of the second half of the sixteenth century found themselves faced with an embarrassing wealth of foreign elements in the literary and learned language beneath which the Turkish element tended to be stifled. In spite of its faculty for adaptation, the Turkish language seemed to be supersaturated.

The study of the Arabic and Persian elements in Turkish presents much interest for the cultural evolution of the language and the people. The present pronunciation in many cases enables us to distinguish the words which have really passed into the language of the people, which can be seen from their more complete adaptation to the rules of vowel harmony, and those which remained the property of the scholar and man of letters only (cf. M. Bittner, \text{Die Einfluss des Arabischen und Persischen auf das Türkische}, St. Ak. Wien, cxxii./iii.; G. Bergstrasser, \text{Zur Phonèkt des Türkischen}, Z.D.M.G., lxxii.; and A. Schaefer, \text{Vokalismus der arabischen Fremdwörter im osmanischen Türkisch}, Festuhrift-Meinhof, p. 449 sqq.). The study of the meanings of these loanwords is equally important; many Arabic words have a different sense in Turkish from Arabic; in these cases the old lexicographers spoke of \text{garla-ta meghhûr}. Several works in Turkish are devoted to this subject.

To the generation of Turks of the period of the \text{Tampûd} the question presented itself as a problem of culture. It was quite naturally thought that the only means of escaping from the impasse to return to the language of the people in which the foreign element had always been lighter. Among the first to urge the use of a simpler language was Salâmân Pâsha (d. 1803), known from the Russo-Turkish war; he recommended the adoption of the simple language of the soldiers and published a Turkish grammar which he called \text{Şar fís türk}, avoiding the word \text{efma} which Ahmed Djewdet Pâsha [q.v.] had still used in the title of his grammar \text{Kamâlidê év efma} (Constantinople 1311). Another figure in the same period is Ahmed Wâfî Pâsha [q.v.] whose \text{Lehê-d efma} is a serious attempt to regularize the use of foreign words. The literature of this period, although employing more modern literary
forms, still mod the old literary languages which also prevailed in the newspapers and periodicals (school of Mu‘assim Nâdi‘). But in proportion to the extent of the Ottoman empire in the 16th century, the interest in the language increased more and more. At this period we also find a movement for extreme purism of language, conducted especially by the paper İhtimâl; the great promoter of the tuzkeye-giller was Fu‘ad Râfî‘ Bey. He simply preferred to banish all Persian and Arabic expressions from the language and to form new Turkish words, even borrowing them from other groups of Turkish languages, thus creating a language which Ziya Gök Alp calls “Turkish Esperanto”. Even the lexicographer Sâmt [q. v.] declares himself in theory a supporter of this school. Soon this purism gave way to a more reasonable purism, which was propagated for the first time by the periodical Genel Kalemli in Salonika (1910) and later by the Türk Yurdu in Constantinople. Some innovators like ‘Omar Saif al-Den Bey even thought that the reformation of the Turkish language ought to be the principal article in the Turkish cultural reformation (cf. Nevresî ‘iştâna, Constantinople 1330, p. 305). In 1917 the question was investigated by Djêlâl Nûrî in his brochure Türkîmân. After the War, the new programme of the reform of the language was expounded by Ziya Gök Alp in Türkçe–Yüzyıl Edebiyatı (Ankara 1339, p. 100 sq.). As a result of these new views on language, the literary idiom has also taken a direction which brings it closer to the spoken speech; as examples we may quote the language of the literary works of Khalîl Edib Khanum and Küçüng Eşref. On the other hand, knowledge of the written language has spread at the same time among much larger sections of the people. The introduction of the Latin alphabet will undoubtedly influence the mutual relations of the written and spoken language. Alongside of Arabic and Persian loanwords, Ottoman Turkish had a considerable number of words from other languages. Thus Italian has considerably enriched the terminology of navigation; then there are a fair number of words from Greek and Albanian. French made its influence felt in the sixteenth century, but almost exclusively in scientific and quasi-scientific literature. Indirectly the influence of the great languages of Europe, and especially of French, has been felt in the simplification of literary style, in the tendency to avoid the heavy interminable phrases of the old Turkish prose.

The alphabet used for writing Turkish was the Arabic from the earliest known Anatolian documents of the sixteenth century. The system of transcription differs from that followed in Çağhâtî in as much as Ottoman makes a larger use of the emphatic Arabic letters (notably the ‘a’ in roots with a heavy vowel, which corresponds to a real distinction in pronunciation; cf. the article quoted by Schade, p. 451) and uses the “scriptio defectiva” in the case with vowel i or e, the “scriptio continua” even often even for a. In 1727 printing was officially introduced into Turkey (cf. Bahnger, Stammbaum Buchweisen im XVIII. Jahrhundert, Leipzig 1919) but this innovation was far from having the cultural importance for Turkey that printing had for Europe at the time of the Renaissance. A perfect uniformity of orthography in Arabic characters was never attained and, especially after 1900, we find several attempts to make writing in the Arabic character clearer, e.g. by the use of the final form of the letter ă for the vowel ā but none of these attempts at reform met with general approval. The technique of Arabic calligraphy has been much cultivated in Turkey. Several scripts peculiar to Turkish have been evolved, like the dîvânî hand which was used for official documents issued by the sultan and high officials, the ornamental hand called chûlî and the rîf‘a which is a kind of cursive hand, that remained in use till quite recently. Arabic calligraphy (hâline–chîlî) in Turkey has at the same time maintained a higher level than in other Muslim countries (cf. the collection of biographies, Khatf–i Khatfîn by Habîb, Constantinople 1305). Other alphabets, which have been employed for Ottoman Turkish are the Greek by the Karamanlîs and Armenian by the Turkish-speaking Armenians (cf. e.g. E. Littmann, Ein türkisches Streitgedicht über die Ehr, in A. Vol. or Or. Stud. Jres. to E. G. Browne, Cambridge 1932, p. 269 sqq.). The Hebrew script has never been used for Ottoman Turkish.

In 1928 the Latin alphabet was officially introduced into Turkey to take the place of the Arabic. Since the Young Turkish Revolution there had been several attempts to simplify the Arabic alphabet for Turkish usage. The difficulty of Arabic orthography, requiring entirely different principles to write Turkish words and words borrowed from Arabic and Persian, was rightly regarded as a serious obstacle to the spread of the written language among the masses. Thus alongside of several attempts to reform Arabic orthography itself (cf. above), there appeared from time to time more radical proposals like the system which Enver Paşa tried to introduce into the army during the war. This system is based on the Arabic alphabet, but it does not join up the letters and has a consistent notation for all the vowels. But none of these systems gained any great success. On the other hand, the use of the Latin alphabet had always been resolutely opposed in religious circles, even for purely scientific purposes. After the restoration of the Nationalist Turkish state the question remained for some years in suspense. Clerical influence no longer counted and from time to time the position of the Latin alphabet was discussed in the press (brochure by A. Galanti, Türkîdèle zehre we-latin Happy we-latin Meclised, Constantinople 1925). The question was also influenced by the attitude of other Turkish peoples living in Russia, notably in Adharbiyadžan, and by the discussions at the Tuzcological Congress at Baku in Feb. and March 1926 (cf. Isâm, xvi. 173 sqq.) where Turkey was only poorly represented. Finally in 1928 the government, supported by the Nationalist party, decided to push the matter forward. A law of May 20 officially introduced the use of the European numerals. In the meanwhile the government had been studying the new alphabet and on Aug. 21, Mustafa Kemâl Paşa delivered his celebrated lecture on the new Latin alphabet in Constantinople. After a few modifications had been made in the first schemes, the new alphabet was at last introduced by a law of Nov. 1. This law orders the use of the Latin alphabet according to the rules elaborated by the Dil engîjmeni (Dil encememi) and the abolition of the Arabic alphabet, at the same time arranging the stages of the transition. It laid down June 1, 1930 as the final date at which the new alphabet must
be used in all kinds of published documents (cf. the text of the law in Oriental Modern, Jan., 1929, p. 41. 299. and the article by H. W. Duda, Die neue Lautenschrift in der Türkei, in O.L.Z., 1929, col. 441-452). The newspapers had begun to appear in the new alphabet from Jan. 1, 1928. At the same time steps were taken to have the new alphabet taught to all classes of the population by means of courses lasting four months (milliés müktebè).

The rapidity of the successive measures and the little resistance that seems to have been offered them show not only the strong position of the government but also the feasibility of such a radical reform. This is probably due to the fact that the percentage of the population seriously affected by the change was relatively small, on the other hand no one will deny that the Latin alphabet is much better fitted to render the phonetic character of Turkish than the Arabic alphabet. The time chosen to introduce the new alphabet was not inopportune but it was equally clear that the sacrifice of an alphabet which for centuries had been bound up with the religious, literary and cultural development of a people meant a cultural crisis which places a great responsibility upon the intellectual leaders of the people. The reform is still too recent to be able to judge of its effects.

The new alphabet shows several original features (like the use of ş for the sound š, of ğ for ğ and of i without dot for İ; ç for ç shows the influence of Rumanian orthography); it is not overloaded with discritical marks. We cannot yet speak of an established orthography but the rules given at the beginning by the Dil emjumemi have laid down the principle of an orthography as phonetic as possible, which applies even to words borrowed from other languages written in the Latin alphabet (e.g. federasyon for fedsoter). This often gives Arabic words a form which makes their identification difficult to those accustomed to the Arabic alphabet. In general, we can say that the new alphabet tends to be more suited to the spoken language than was possible with the Arabic alphabet; it has already been pointed out that this circumstance may facilitate in many points the scientific study of the Ottoman language.

(J. H. KRAMERS)

II. OTTOMAN-TURKISH DIALECTS. 1)

1. Area of Dispersion.

For the want of the necessary detailed surveys it is impossible as yet to define the exact frontiers of the areas in which the Ottoman Turkish language is spoken. It extends over territory in Europe as well as in Asia. In Europe in the Balkan peninsula, it is found in islets surrounded by other languages, which have very much broken the Turkish bloc. We may mention the following such Turkish speaking areas: 1. Eastern Thrace with the peninsula of Gallipoli, where the Turks form a solid body with a population of over a million. 2. Parts of Macedonia, namely a long stretch on the left bank of the Vardar, the land between Ibtip (Știp) and Radoviš (Radoviša), along the Aegean, roughly from Salonika to Dede-Aya, especially the country round the towns of Drama, Eskiše, Guzmilija (Gümüşhane). On these lands there is a rich literature of the period of the Balkan Wars, some of it politically biased; cf. especially: Cartis etnográfiques de la Macedonia du sud représentant la répartition ethnique à la veille de la guerre des Balkans, 1912, by L. Ivanov (scale 1:200,000), also Ethnografiska karta av området villaforn 1912 god. by L. Miletic (scale 1:750,000), Ethnografiska karta av Makedonien by the same (scale 1:1,500,000); cf. also Vasil Kazimb, Makedonija, etnografija i statistika, Sofia 1900. Since that time however the ethnic proportions have been very much altered. The exchange of population introduced by the treaty of Lausanne (1923) between Greece and Turkey brought about a considerable shrinkage in the number of Turkish speakers on the new Greek part of these lands, after Greece had sent over 400,000 Turks into Turkey. 3. Certain areas in Bulgaria, namely the districts of Deli-Orman, Tostuk and Gortovo in N.E. Bulgaria (cf. D. G. Gadzhanov, Verhëger Bericht über eine im Auftrag der Balkan-Kommision der k.a. Akademie d. Wiss. in Wien durch Nordost-Bulgarien unternommene Karte von Zwecke von türkischen Dialektstudien, Anz. Wiss. of 9th Feb. 1911 and do., Zweiter vorlühliger Bericht über die ergänzende Untersuchung der türkischen Elemente im nordöstl. Bulgarien in sprachlicher, kultureller und ethnograph. Beziehung, ebdl., 24th Jan. 1912. For the question of the settlement of the Turks see also L. Miletic, Srebro bulgarsko naseljeni v sverovestnoln. Bulgarija, Sofia 1902; the map in A. Ichirkoff, Das Bulgarien im der Balkanhalbinsel im jh. 1724, in Petermanns Geogr. Mitteilungen, Year 1915, is also very valuable, Plate 44 where the distribution of the islets of Turkish speakers is also given), also a considerable area in N.E. Bulgaria around the towns of Kyriayli and Mastanly. In addition, Turkish are found scattered throughout Bulgaria, in the territory round Philippolis (Floydv) in the Köfetan, Deli-Orman and elsewhere; cf. Dr. Constantin Jirešek, Das Fürstentum Bulgarien, Prag-Vienna-Leipzig 1891, p. 133-146 (out of date). 4. Turkish speakers are found scattered up and down the modern Jugoslavia, the bulk in Macedonia (cf. J. Cvičić, Etnografske Karte der Balkanhalbinsel nach aller vorhandenen Quellen und eigenen Beobachtungen, Petermanns Mitteilungen, March etc. 1913 and do., Rusperd bulhansko naroda, Glazni Serbog Geography Drutov, Belgrade 1913, p. 234-265). Isolated little bodies are found along the Danube, as far up as the interesting island of Adakale at Orsova (cf. the introduction to Vol. 1. of L. Kinos, Türkische Volksmärchen aus Adhabl). 5. The whole western and northwestern shores of the Black Sea show considerable Ottoman influence. In the towns and steppes of the Dobrudža a good deal of Ottoman Turkish is spoken today. St. Romansky, Le caractère ethnique de la Dobrudja, Sofia 1917, and do., Cartis etnográfiques de la nouvelle Dobrudja Romaine, Sofia 1915. Unfortunately we do not possess fuller information of the dialectal conditions there. It is important to note that the language of the Christian Gagauz is at bottom Ottoman Turkish. The Dobrudžan Gagauz whom I met north of Varna speak a dialect which is almost indistinguishable from the popular dialect of Constantinople. The language of the Besarabian Gagauz also which we know from

1) For practical considerations the author's system of transliteration is retained in this article. See note p. 9266.
Moskov’s rich collection (RADLOFFS, Proben der Volkslitteratur der türkischen Stämme, vol. xvi, Mundarten der kasarabischen Gauzaun, St. Petersburg 1904), is simply an Ottoman Turkish dialect. In spite of the fact that some students have regarded the Gagaus as descendants of the Kumans (C. JIREČEK, Einige Bemerkungen über die Überreste der Petischmungen und Kumans, sowie über die Völkerzweigen der sogenannten Gagausi und Sarguši im heutigen Bulgarien, Sitzungsber. d. böhm. Gesellschaft der Wiss., 1889), their present language contains in fact no Kuman elements.

Ottoman influence is very strongly marked on the south coast of the Crimea. The specimens recently published by O. Satskaja of the popular poetry of Boykoturai and Tuuk (near Akka) may be described simply as Ottoman Turkish (7th-9th April-June 1926, p. 341—360). The same must be said of many of the texts in RADLOFF, Die Mundarten der Krym (Proben der Volkslitteratur der nordl. türk. Stämme, vol. VII). The Crimean Tatar literary language does not differ very seriously from the Ottoman written language (SAMOLOVIČ, Opyt kratkogo krymsko-tatarskogo grammatiki, Petrograd 1916, p. 7 infra).

We have no accurate information about the present condition of the Turkish language in the islands of the Mediterranean, especially in Crete, Cyprus and the islands of the Aegean.

The Anatolian Turkish speaking area in north, west and south has well marked natural boundaries. In the northeast it gradually and apparently without a definite frontier passes into Aşağı İlgilendirm. Many linguistic peculiarities, which even FOY took to be specifically Aşağı İlgilendirm (Ausekbaničke Studije mit einer Charakteristik des Südtürkischen, M.S. O.P. d. V., VII, 191—265), are also found in Asia Minor dialects, as Giese (cf. above l., p. 531) has rightly pointed out. In the southeast, Ottoman meets the Arabic of northern Syria. In northern Mesopotamia it is much broken up by Kurdish and considerably influenced by Aşağı İlgilendirm from Persia.

In addition to the settled Turks, we find in Anatolia and even in the Balkan Peninsula nomads and semi-nomads. In Asia Minor their numbers are still considerable, while they are disappearing on European soil (cf. P. TRAEGER, Die Türken und Konjaren in Makedonien, Ziehr, für Ethnol., 1905, p. 198—206; on the Jürük and Konjars in Bulgaria: JIREČEK, Das Fürstenstaat Bulgarien, p. 139 seq.). In Anatolia, Turkish nomads are known under rather vague names like Atileretti ("ełan") Jürük, Turkomans, or by their own tribal names like Aviars (or Afars) etc. As a rule their language does not differ essentially from that of their settled neighbours.

The frontiers of the area of Ottoman Turkish are still being considerably altered. In the west, i.e. in the Balkans, it is constantly decreasing; while in the east, on the other hand, in places it is gaining ground.

2. Linguistic Minorities in the Ottoman-Turkish Area.

Steps taken by the present republican government have very much reduced the linguistic minorities within the frontiers of modern Turkey. Nevertheless the Ottoman Turkish speaking area is not yet by any means uniform and there are many other languages in it. The following are the principal minorities: Greeks, formerly very numerous, now, as a result of the exchange of population, practically found only in Constantinople, Armenians (also almost entirely confined to the Constantinople territory), Arabs (Muhammadan on the Syrian and Írāq frontier, Christian in Mersin and district), Kurds in the eastern wilayets, but also in isolated groups elsewhere in Asia Minor (after Sheikh Said’s rising in 1925, a considerable number were deported to the interior of Asia Minor as a punishment), Nestorian Syrians in the eastern wilayets (especially Hakkari), all kinds of Caucasian peoples (Laz, Georgians, Aghbas, Circassians), who are found scattered all over Asia Minor, most thickly in the N.E., less numerous Albanians (Arnauts), Gypsies, Spanish Jews, who live in the larger towns, etc.

Turkish minorities are also found in Asia Minor (e.g. the Kurm Tatar emigrants in and around Eski-Shehır) as well as in Rumelia (on the Dobrudja, on the Bulgarian Danube).

3. The mutual Influence of Ottoman Turkish and neighbouring Languages.

We are at present very imperfectly informed regarding the influence of Ottoman Turkish on its neighbours and vice versa. We can only indicate isolated phenomena: for example the disappearance of initial & (h): ab (= Ar. به), an (= Ar. ان), one (= Pers. واحد), ani (= hany, hany) etc., which is so characteristic of the Macedonian dialects (KOWALSKI, Zagadki Indowe turcysty, p. 11; cf. OE. Ostanisč-türkische Volksreden, W.Z.K.M., xxxiiii. 167—168), but is also found in Bosnian Turkish (Blau, Römisch-türkische Sprachdenkmäler, p. 27), to be ascribed to the influence of the Southern Slavonic languages. Similarly the variation in initial of, which is often noticed in Northern Bulgaria, may be attributed to Bulgarian influence. Possibly also the peculiar phenomena of palatalisation in the dialects of the Bassarabian Gagaus (Moskov, p. xvii. 49) are to be ascribed to Serbian influence.

Blau has studied the Turkish Serbian mixed language of Bosnia, but he devoted himself not to the spoken language but almost exclusively to manuscript material. On the Ottoman-Turkish language of the period of Turkish rule in Hungary cf. the valuable information in Literaturdenkmäler aus Ungarns Türkenseit (ed. by F. Babinger, R. Gragger, E. Mittwoch and J. H. Mordtmann, Berlin 1927).

That in the southeastern regions under the influence of Arabic, a greater variety of gutturals prevails than elsewhere in Ottoman and that in particular the Arabic ‘ain is pronounced there in Arabic loanwords has been noted by several observers (cf. M. HARTMANN, in K.-S., i. 154; Balkanoglou, Dialecτ αυτ της Κίλια, K.-S., ii. 253).

The interaction between Turkish and the neighbouring languages is best seen in the vast number of borrowings. So far, Turkish loanwords in non-Ottoman languages have received more attention than non-Turkish words in Ottoman. On the influence of Ottoman-Turkish on the languages of Southeast and Eastern Europe, see especially the work of F. MIKLOŠIČ (Die türkischen Elemente in den südost- und osteuropäischen Sprachen, Germanisch, Albanisch, Rumäniisch, Bulgärisch, Serbisch, Kleinrussisch, Großrussisch, Polnisch, Denkschriften d.
The situation we find in the present Ottoman speaking areas is the result of a very long and very complicated process of settlement and assimilation.

It is clear that the inhabitants of Turkey and the adjoining territories who now speak Ottoman Turkish are only to a very small degree descendants of the Turks who migrated hither but, on the contrary, are in the overwhelming majority descended from Turkicised native elements.

A history of the settlement of Asia Minor and the Turkish parts of the Balkan Peninsula has yet to be written. So far not even the necessary preliminary work has been undertaken. The process of Turkicising of the territories in question can be represented in general outlines as follows.

Isolated South Turkish groups settled in Byzantine territory even before the Seljuk invasion, both in Asia Minor and in the Balkans. In the latter area there must still have been also considerable bodies still in existence, surviving from the earlier North Turkish immigrations which came there by the north of the Black Sea. But it is not till the middle of the xth century that we have an immigration on a considerable scale, which may be called Seljuk and lasts till the end of the xiiith century. Towards the end of Seljuk dominion in Asia Minor, the process of Turkicising the native population must have been begun. This process continued during the rule of the petty principalities which arose out of the ruins of the Seljuk empire.

The immigration of the Ottoman Turks in the xiiith century seems to have at first played a very minor part in the settlement of Asia Minor, on account of the small numbers concerned. But the political power of the Ottoman state which then began its rapid development had no doubt a far-reaching influence on the process of Turkicisation. Only through the gradual unification of Asia Minor by the Ottomans and their great conquests in the Balkans were the preliminary conditions for the Turkicisation of these lands created. During the whole period of Ottoman rule we have to think of continual movements of population going on within its frontiers, sometimes large, sometimes small, and with a continual infiltration of Turkish elements sometimes slow, sometimes fast, from outside, especially from the east. Large areas in the Balkans were colonised, although thinly, by Turks from Asia Minor soon after their conquest. Under pressure from the government, great masses of the non-Turkish population adopted Islam and gradually became assimilated to the Turks even to the extent of exchanging their own language for Ottoman Turkish. The Turks of the Balkans still know in many cases whether they are descendants of Turkish immigrants from Asia Minor or
from converted Christians, who became in time quite türkisch.

The immigration of Turkish elements increased in strength after Russia had extended her power over lands with a Muslim Turkish population. Particularly after the annexation of the Crimea in 1783 and on the final subjection of the Caucasian lands in 1864 great bodies of Turkish immigrants poured over the whole Ottoman territory. The attainment of independence by the Balkan peoples on the other hand began the return of large bodies of Turks to Asia Minor, which is still going on. This latter process increased in strength after the World War and, as a result of the exchange of population with Greece, led to about half a million Turks being moved from the now Greek part of Turkey and distributed over almost the whole of Asia Minor.

That a linguistic area which had been formed in such a complicated fashion cannot be uniform as regards dialect is obvious and it is equally clear that the dialectal relations must be extremely complicated.

As regards language, the Oghuz tribes who migrated into Asia Minor must have been fairly uniform. From all that we know of it, the language of the Saldırgan Turks was barely distinguishable from what is known as Old Ottoman. There were of course dialectal nuances in the speech of the different tribes which in time sometimes became deeper and sometimes disappeared. As regards the mixture and levelling of dialects, it was much favoured, especially in Asia Minor, by the nomadic or at least semi-nomadic mode of life of the pure Turkish population which lasted for a long time and induced a mixture and levelling.

North Turkish elements (especially remnants of the Kuman), who were still to be found in the Balkan lands in the Byzantine period, almost entirely succumbed in time to Ottoman influence as regards language. Certain linguistic peculiarities which are observed in the dialects of the lands W. of the Black Sea (Deli Orman, Dobrudja, Bessarabia) and, which, it is interesting to note, have certain analogies in the adjoining parts of Asia Minor, may perhaps be regarded as the result of contact between north and south Turkish.

In the language of the türklericised masses, one must expect to have to deal with secondary alterations in Turkish sounds, the result of inherited modes of articulation by the peoples concerned. The mobility of the population, military service, and in recent times the school have however tended to introduce a certain uniformity. That the mixture and standardising of dialects have not gone further than we actually find, is due to the fact that new settlements do not as a rule merge completely into the old but exist alongside of them and that every settlement retains its own peculiarities for a long period unaltered.

Apart from the historical sources, which have not yet been fully utilised to write a history of the process of settlement by the Turks, we have in place-names a valuable auxiliary source for the study of the gradual settlement and türkisation of Asia Minor and Rumelia. Unfortunately very little progress has so far been made with such toponomastic studies. In recent years Turkish scholars have devoted some attention to Oghuz tribal names which have become place-names (cf.

Köprülässade Mehmed Fuad, Oegna etnolojisinin dar ilerme halleri, Türkiye'nin meşhur illeri, i. 185–211; II. Nihal and Ahdad Nüle, Anadolu'da Türkler 'A'di yer lemleri, ibid., ii. 243–259). The villages of emigrants of recent date usually have artificial names derived from personal names by means of the Arabic ending -je, like Ortamarı, Orgâne, Relâdiye, etc.

5. Sources of our knowledge of Ottoman Turkish dialects and their value.

The most important source for our knowledge of the present linguistic conditions on Ottoman territory is the observations made by European students. Relatively little has been done by Turks as yet in this connection.

If we were to mark on a map of Turkey the places about which we have a certain amount of dialectological information, we would at once see what an infinitesimal amount of work has so far been done and how far we are from an exact knowledge of the whole linguistic area.

The value of the observations upon which we have to rely is very unequal. To the majority of students, the folklore content of the texts taken down by them was the main thing while the linguistic interest was quite subsidiary. The localisation of linguistic phenomena found in the texts is often made difficult by the fact that the collectors neglect to give the place of origin of their authority. The fullest collection of material, that of I. Kuno, is not free from objection as regards method and has therefore to be used very critically.

Folksongs, so interesting from the folklore point of view, do not form specially suitable material for the study of dialects. For whole songs as well as their individual motivs wander with remarkable rapidity over wide areas and their language becomes adapted to the local dialect, not at once and even after a considerable period not completely. The songs therefore occasionally show dialectal forms transmitted from distant areas. We have also to reckon with an artificial language for songs, such as has often been noted among Turkish peoples. It is the same with riddles and proverbs, and with the products of folklore literature in general, which show a more or less rigid form.

Most texts have been taken down in the towns where the population is as a rule considerably more mixed than in the country and where dialectal conditions are not so clearly distinguishable. Texts taken down from the lips of villagers on the spot are exceedingly rare. It is no wonder that in such circumstances we cannot yet speak of a study of dialects on Ottoman-Turkish territory on a sound scientific basis.

6. Specimen of language taken down in various areas.

The texts so far published concern either considerable areas or only very limited smaller ones. To the former belong: I. Kuno, Mundarten der Osmanen, St. Petersburg 1899 (forms vol. viii. of the Studien der Volkskultur der türkischen Stämme, ed. by Radloff). The provenance of the separate specimens is not exactly given, so that the work is of little value for dialect studies (quoted below as Mund.). V. Gordovskij, Obractz Osmanova narodnogo tvorchestva, Moscow 1916; folklore texts mainly taken down in Constantinople,
some also from Asia Minor (especially at Nigde): Abbrev.: Gurd. T. Kowalski, Zagadki i domowe

The Danube Island of Adakale. I. Kú

For the separate areas we may mention:

1. The Danube Island of Adakale. I. Kú

2. Bessarabia. W. Moikor, Mundarten der Bessarabischen Gegenen, Text, St.-Petersburg 1904


5. Thrace and Constantinople. I. Kú

6. Western Asia Minor. I. Kú

7. Theoretical Division of Ottoman Turkish Territory.

The names which have hitherto been in use for Ottoman Turkish dialects, e.g., Kastamuni, Laz-Turkish, Karamanian, Kharpou, etc., are of no value as designations of dialects. They correspond simply to geographical or political administrative conceptions, the connection of which with the boundaries of the corresponding dialects would have first to be proved, if it exists at all.

Even the great division, often taken for granted, of Ottoman into the Rumelian and Anatolian, is of no value from the dialectological point of view and should be discarded as misleading, in view of the history of the settlement of European Turkey. We know positively that certain Rumelian districts were colonised from Asia Minor and as a result their dialects still show distinct traces of their Anatolian origin.

After all that has been said above it must be clear that we cannot yet expect in the immediate future a serious attempt at a scientific classification of Ottoman Turkish dialects. What has so far been
done is based rather on intuition and imagination than on established facts. This applies also to the attempt by Künoś to divide up Asia Minor according to dialects.

Kūnoś (Kūnos fürvá dialautzairi, Budapest 1896) distinguishes the following seven dialects: 1. Zelbeks in Western Anatolia between Snyrma and Brusa; 2. Kastamuni in the central littoral of the Black Sea; 3. Laz on the eastern coast of the Black Sea, towards the Caucasus; 4. Khar put in the east of Asia Minor, towards the Armenian highlands; 5. Karaman in southeastern Asia Minor between Mersin and Konya; 6. Angorans in the heart of Asia Minor in the valley of the Kyzyl Yürük; 7. Jürük Turkmans in use among the wandering tribes (aliyätter), which are scattered over a wide area of Asia Minor.

Zelbek, Angorans, and Jürük Turkmans are regarded by Kūnoś as unmixed dialects of the early Turkish immigrants. The Jürük in particular are taken to be the descendants of pre-Saljūq Turkmans and the Zelbeke of the Saljūq Turks. Angorans is said to be the survival of the language of the earliest Ottoman immigrants. The four other dialects are regarded by Kūnoś as dialects of the turcified original population of Asia Minor, which arose through the influence of the original languages of these peoples upon Turkish. According to him, Kastamuni was especially influenced by Greek, Kharput by Kurdish, Karaman by Armenian, Laz however by an "Indo-Germanic" (l) language, not more precisely defined.

This attempt to classify the dialects of Asia Minor has no scientific basis, although at first sight it appears very plausible.

The first serious attempt to collect the distinguishing features of the spoken Ottoman language is in Jacob's essay in the Z.D.M.G., lii. (1898), p. 665-729, Zur Grammatik des Valıgür-Türkischen. J. Deny, in Grammaire de la langue turque (dialekt romani), Paris 1900, draws the attention on certain dialectical peculiarities.

8. Dialects and the Written Language.

The written language has always exercised a levelling influence on the spoken dialects. It is based on the language of the educated classes of Constantinople, which has till now been regarded as a model and is disseminated generally by the schools.

Of this language we had till lately only a vague conception. It was only quite recently that Bergsträsser began a serious attempt to define more exactly the living written language of the educated classes at least from the phonetic side (G. Bergsträsser, Zur Phonik des Türkischen nach gebildeter Konstantinopeler Ausprache, Z. D. M. G., lxii. (1918), p. 233-262). It is proved that this is by no means uniform in its phonetics. Hence the conception of an educated Constantinople pronunciation is only to be used with great caution and with all kinds of limitations.

On the origin of the Ottoman written language (cf. above, il.) we unfortunately still know far too little. We can only suppose that it gradually developed out of the dialect of court circles in northern Anatolia. When the capital was removed to Adrianople and then to Constantinople, the course of development was probably influenced by the dialects predominating there, while it in turn strongly influenced the latter. In any case the written language is closer to the dialects of the parts of Thrace and Asia Minor adjoining the Bosphorus and Sea of Marmora than to the dialects of the districts farther west and east.

The earliest literary monuments not infrequently reveal dialectal peculiarities, which we can still trace in various living dialects. Unfortunately their systematic study has hardly been begun.


9. General Characteristics of the Ottoman Turkish Dialects.

The differences between the various dialects of Ottoman are as a rule not great. This is connected with the fact that there is not great differentiation among the Turkish languages in general. In the area over which Ottoman Turkish is spoken at the present day, it would hardly be possible to find two places the inhabitants of which would not understand one another.

The differences between the separate dialects consist mainly in slight differences in the articulation of certain sounds, in a few sound shiftings and in not inconsiderable differences of vocabulary. Morphological differences are as a rule very slight.

Many investigators have already pointed out that there is little uniformity within the separate dialects. It can be observed everywhere that there is considerable variation in the articulation of separate sounds as well as in the use of grammatical forms by one and the same person. Most of our records of the dialects are therefore full of inconsistencies which, although to some extent due to the carelessness of the recorders, in the main give a true picture of the actual conditions. This variation must be ascribed to an advanced stage of intermixture of dialects which is almost general.

It must be remembered that many elements of the Turkish people now settled were till quite recently nomadic and moved about over a very large area. A great body of emigrants (mühâçir) from all possible Turkish areas has long been breaking up the early linguistic map, especially in Asia Minor. In quite recent years Anatolia has had to receive large bodies of emigrants from the Balkans. The measures taken by the republican government aim at as great a uniformity as possible within the state as regards language also, which is being attained mainly through the schools and military service. It is obvious that this is breaking up and destroying the local dialects.

If we remember what has been said above about the historical developments, the present confusion in dialects must be regarded as natural.

To a certain degree, the variation in articulation of separate sounds is to be ascribed to a lack of precision in pronunciation, which is peculiar to the Turks. The place of articulation as well as the degree of opening and expanding of the organs of speech often show considerable latitude. I need only mention the very indolent and varying pronunciations of the r pronounced on the tip of the tongue (cf. Bergsträsser, op. cit., p. 251).
From cases of real inconsistency of pronunciation we must carefully distinguish those which are only due to defective notation by the recorders. Thus we often find a varying transcription of a sound which in itself is uniform, like the narrow e or i, which in sometimes written e or i, or the slightly labial a, sometimes transcribed u or y etc.


Since it is not possible to speak of dialects as such in the strictly scientific sense, we must for the present be content with an orderly arrangement of the linguistic records, mainly of a phonetic nature, which shows a variation from the written language and in different combinations characteristic of the different dialects. On the area of dispersion of most phenomena we are very poorly informed. It will have to be left to future systematic investigation to fill in accurate details in the map of the Ottoman speaking area.

Since we still know very little of the historical grammar of Ottoman Turkish, it seems advisable to collect and arrange the facts afforded by our collections of material without going into chronological questions.

Vowels 1).

Round Vowels.

§ 1. e and u have a very varying pronunciation in the dialects but with a distinct tendency to abandon the characteristic peculiarities of their pronunciation. For many, especially Asia Minor dialects, e and u pronounced slightly farther back are characteristic, which sound to the ear rather as o or u so that they have usually been written as o or u. These varieties of e, u are frequently found in the first (root) syllable, especially after initial g or k. According to Raa., the shifting from θ > o seems to be almost regular in N.E. Anatolia. Giese often noticed the change of θ > o and ο > u in texts from the Wilayet of Konya. It is also recorded by Théry for Kastamuni (Kast. 8). Occasionally also it is found on Rumelian territory, namely in Adaleke.

Examples: o, from Raa. Föy (bör 110;), Fovan (kümür 123, 5%), opefer' (öpferen 131, 3%), den (dömr 98, 4%).

From G. donup (döömr 17, 9%), Köle (köle 29, 18).

1) The following signs are used to indicate Ottoman Turkish sounds:

A. Vowels (the approximate mode of articulation is added in brackets according to Bell's vowel table): i (förn), i (förn), e (mfn), e (förn), a (mkn), e (merkn), o (merkn), o (mkn), o (mkn), i (between hörn and knn), o (between hörn and knn), u (ib), o (not syllable forming i), o (not syllable forming a).

B. Consonants: k, p, r, f, r, m, a, a, i, ı, ı (= i), s (= ë), s (= ë), s (= ë), m, r, s, g, g, r, r, h, r, l.

C. Special signs: - length, - palatalisation, - aspiration, - reduction of voicing, - stress (accent), - derived from θ > o has become.

Note: In round brackets are given the equivalents in the written language of the corresponding dialect form. They must not however be in any way regarded as the original or basic form of the word in question.
which, as we know, ů and ů otherwise never occur (cf. Deny, § 25), is doubtful.

Unrounded vowels.

§ 7. Ottoman dialects have two varieties of ŵ, a narrow (higher), here written ŵ, and a broad (lower) variety, written ū. In many districts, for example, there is a clear distinction between the people, strangers, and "hand." The narrow ŵ is found either primary or as the result of combination. The former appears in ġẹy (Rus. "guy, 146, 4), demek, ġẹy, ġẹm, etc., the latter in bejẹ (G. 83, 3) bẹjẹ, ẹ jẹ or fi jẹ (G. 63, 4) ẹ jẹ, fi jẹ, fi jẹ (G. 52, 18) etc. That ẹ in the immediate vicinity of ū, ū becomes narrow is a phenomenon also observed in the educated speech of Constantinople (Bergstrasser, Z. D. M. G., lxxi. 240; cf. Deny, § 189 and p. 1090).

§ 8. Most dialects distinguish between an i pronounced with the tip of the tongue and a y with the middle of the tongue. There are however also dialects in which there is no such difference and which have no pronounced y. The absence of a distinct y is characteristic of the Macedonian Turkish dialect of the district of Skoplye. At first sight of this dialect one is struck by the forms with final ẹ, i (from y and u) bejẹ (bejẹna, bejẹna, Max. P. 172, N. 1, 2), nọ (ụn, ụn, ụn "large", N. 3, 4, 5), ọjẹ (ọjẹ, ọjẹ, N. 5, 6), bagẹ (bagẹ, N. 4, 28).

In N.E. Anatolia also we find, at least to judge from Râssâneg's records, a similar phenomenon: ọjẹlẹ (ọjẹlẹa 67, 1), sẹtẹ (sẹtẹa 69, 2), ọkalẹm (71, 1).

§ 9. The position of the tongue in pronouncing final y in many dialects is considerably lower than usual so that the vowel articulated is similar to an a: ẹvẹkẹkyẹna (ęvę́kę́kę́nyẹ́, Hefning, it., xii. 235, N. 32), enyę́kę́kę́n (ęnę́kę́kę́nyę́, G. 87, 14), ẹrọmẹn (ęrọmę́nyę́, Râs., 38, 9), ọjọ́ra (ọjọ́rọ́nyę́, Râs. 43, 4), atumę́ a (atunya (atunya a, Râs. 209, 9).

The confusion of the dative with the accusative noticed in Tzolń (Bulgaria) (Gadžanov, ii. 4—5) is probably of purely phonetic origin and to be explained by this peculiarity of final y and its confusion with ə.

§ 10. Ottoman Turkish, as is well known, had originally no nasal vowels. But here and there we find the nasalisation of a vowel where a nasal consonant has disappeared: ona (onna or onya), ona (ọnụ, ọnụ, ọnụ) etc. In many districts also we find a kind of nasalisation of final vowels or formation of an indistinct ə-like consonant after final vowels, where there was no nasal vowel originally. This is especially frequent in careless articulation. Most recorders write this nasal element with ū: ẹsẹriyẹ karmarnaryn (for karmarnaryy) sẹwẹrẹ (G. 77, 3), demek ki (demel kî, G. 27, 3), ə kẹẹyẹ bahọy (for bahọy) demel ẹẹyẹ "the father of that girl said to the girl" (G. 30, 10—11), amiriyi ilinde bohọy ẹẹyẹ (for ẹẹyẹ < ẹẹyẹ) (G. 79, 5 below).

§ 11. Contraction of a diphthong from ə to ə, ə to ə is very common in dialects: The e and e which thus arise are, as indicated, distinctly longer than the usual ə and ə. Examples from G.: ẹ (ọjọ́, 18, 2), ọjọ́ (ọjọ́, 19, 2), ọjọ́ (ọjọ́, 32, 2), ọjọ́ (ọjọ́, 38, 11), ọjọ́ (ọjọ́, 51, 11), ọjọ́ (ọjọ́, 54, 11; ọjọ́, 83, 11) etc.

Consonants.

§ 12. y, ū, i.e. a voiced spirant pronounced with the middle or back of the tongue shows a remarkable gradation in the dialects. In addition to narrow varieties that differ very little and sound like carelessly articulated explosives, we have a broad, half vocalic variety of ū, here written ū.

ỹ appears entirely in many dialects, thus giving rise to diphthongs, long vowels and all kinds of contractions. This is especially the case in the Constantinople dialect. Examples from O.T.: ọlẹmọ (ọlẹmọ, l. 50, 1), ọlẹmọ (ọlẹhmọ, l. 45, 5), atumọ (atumọ, l. 41, 3), ẹsẹriyọ (ẹsẹriyọ, l. 45, 4), etc. But this phenomenon is frequently noted elsewhere as well.

To judge from Kînos' specimens, ū remains in all positions in the dialect of Adakale: ọmọmọ (140, 1), ọmọmọ (142, 1), ọmọmọ (89, 3), ọmọ (ọmọ, 50, 7, 64, 2, 1) etc.

In the district of Skoplye in Macedonia the dative in polysyllabic substantives in -e ends in -e: ọmọmọ (ọmọmọ, N. 5, 3), ọmọmọ (ọmọmọ, ọmọmọ, N. 4, 3) etc.

In the same dialect the group -e/ looks becomes -e/ - e/ - e/, e.g. dajie (dajie, dajie), dajie (dajie, dajie), ejike (ejike) etc. This phenomenon is also found in Selanik. In Macedonia, final -e/, -e/, -e/ becomes -e/ - e/ - e/ - e/ - e/, hardy (hardy), hardy (hardy), hardy (hardy), hardy (hardy), etc.

A variety of ū, pronounced with a vibration of the uvula, which in popular poetry rhymes as ū pronounced on the tip of the tongue is worth noting; cf. Giese, p. 57, note 2; p. 64, note 3; also Hefning, in Jl, XIII, 254. No. 27; ọjọ́ (ọjọ́dọ́)."
In the dialects the initial sound shows a series of peculiar phenomena. Initial vowels are usually pronounced without very definite clearness. The glottal stop is unusual at the beginning of a word; it is sometimes heard in Macedonia where it takes the place of Ĥ sounds which have disappeared: ľe (ľešvec), lič (lički), ličar (ličarstvo) etc. (cf. § 14 and 23).

In many dialects initial vowels, especially at the very beginning, are often introduced by a slight breathing (glottal spurt): koše (koša G 17), lisle (liša), štalc (štalcstvo G 56, i); cf. Gies (G 51, note 11: kače (<< Pers. ľak); Zag. N° 39 from Runel territory we find čišć, čišć, čišć (čišć) from Deli Orman; čišć is also the usual form in the dialects of the Serbo-Croatian Gagauz.

§ 31. In the dialects the initial sound shows a series of peculiar phenomena. Initial vowels are usually pronounced without very definite clearness. The glottal stop is unusual at the beginning of a word; it is sometimes heard in Macedonia where it takes the place of Ĥ sounds which have disappeared: ľe (ľešvec), lič (lički), ličar (ličarstvo) etc. (cf. § 14 and 23).

In many dialects initial vowels, especially at the very beginning, are often introduced by a slight breathing (glottal spurt): koše (koša G 17), lisle (liša), štalc (štalcstvo G 56, i); cf. Gies (G 51, note 11: koče (<< Pers. koč); Zag. N° 39 from Runel territory we find čišć, čišć, čišć (čišć) from Deli Orman; čišć is also the usual form in the dialects of the Serbo-Croatian Gagauz.

In the dialects the initial sound shows a series of peculiar phenomena. Initial vowels are usually pronounced without very definite clearness. The glottal stop is unusual at the beginning of a word; it is sometimes heard in Macedonia where it takes the place of Ĥ sounds which have disappeared: ľe (ľešvec), lič (lički), ličar (ličarstvo) etc. (cf. § 14 and 23).

In many dialects initial vowels, especially at the very beginning, are often introduced by a slight breathing (glottal spurt): koše (koša G 17), lisle (liša), štalc (štalcstvo G 56, i); cf. Gies (G 51, note 11: koče (<< Pers. koč); Zag. N° 39 from Runel territory we find čišć, čišć, čišć (čišć) from Deli Orman; čišć is also the usual form in the dialects of the Serbo-Croatian Gagauz.

In the dialects the initial sound shows a series of peculiar phenomena. Initial vowels are usually pronounced without very definite clearness. The glottal stop is unusual at the beginning of a word; it is sometimes heard in Macedonia where it takes the place of Ĥ sounds which have disappeared: ľe (ľešvec), lič (lički), ličar (ličarstvo) etc. (cf. § 14 and 23).

In many dialects initial vowels, especially at the very beginning, are often introduced by a slight breathing (glottal spurt): koše (koša G 17), lisle (liša), štalc (štalcstvo G 56, i); cf. Gies (G 51, note 11: koče (<< Pers. koč); Zag. N° 39 from Runel territory we find čišć, čišć, čišć (čišć) from Deli Orman; čišć is also the usual form in the dialects of the Serbo-Croatian Gagauz.

In the dialects the initial sound shows a series of peculiar phenomena. Initial vowels are usually pronounced without very definite clearness. The glottal stop is unusual at the beginning of a word; it is sometimes heard in Macedonia where it takes the place of Ĥ sounds which have disappeared: ľe (ľešvec), lič (lički), ličar (ličarstvo) etc. (cf. § 14 and 23).

In many dialects initial vowels, especially at the very beginning, are often introduced by a slight breathing (glottal spurt): koše (koša G 17), lisle (liša), štalc (štalcstvo G 56, i); cf. Gies (G 51, note 11: koče (<< Pers. koč); Zag. N° 39 from Runel territory we find čišć, čišć, čišć (čišć) from Deli Orman; čišć is also the usual form in the dialects of the Serbo-Croatian Gagauz.

In the dialects the initial sound shows a series of peculiar phenomena. Initial vowels are usually pronounced without very definite clearness. The glottal stop is unusual at the beginning of a word; it is sometimes heard in Macedonia where it takes the place of Ĥ sounds which have disappeared: ľe (ľešvec), lič (lički), ličar (ličarstvo) etc. (cf. § 14 and 23).

In many dialects initial vowels, especially at the very beginning, are often introduced by a slight breathing (glottal spurt): koše (koša G 17), lisle (liša), štalc (štalcstvo G 56, i); cf. Gies (G 51, note 11: koče (<< Pers. koč); Zag. N° 39 from Runel territory we find čišć, čišć, čišć (čišć) from Deli Orman; čišć is also the usual form in the dialects of the Serbo-Croatian Gagauz.

In the dialects the initial sound shows a series of peculiar phenomena. Initial vowels are usually pronounced without very definite clearness. The glottal stop is unusual at the beginning of a word; it is sometimes heard in Macedonia where it takes the place of Ĥ sounds which have disappeared: ľe (ľešvec), lič (lički), ličar (ličarstvo) etc. (cf. § 14 and 23).

In many dialects initial vowels, especially at the very beginning, are often introduced by a slight breathing (glottal spurt): koše (koša G 17), lisle (liša), štalc (štalcstvo G 56, i); cf. Gies (G 51, note 11: koče (<< Pers. koč); Zag. N° 39 from Runel territory we find čišć, čišć, čišć (čišć) from Deli Orman; čišć is also the usual form in the dialects of the Serbo-Croatian Gagauz.
These observations by Küno are to a great extent confirmed by Rasânef's notes. The voiced initial \( d \), \( g \), \( g \) appear in his work with partial or completely replaced voicing although not quite regularly: \( fır \) (p. 214, 19), in the same quadrain \( bər \), \( hęn \) (p. 217, 1), \( ʃəl \) (p. 181, 12), \( ʃəh \) (p. 211, 1), \( ʃənəl \) (p. 223, 1), \( ʃənəl \) (p. 223, 1), etc.

Similarly \( çədənənən \) (p. 244, 1), \( çədə \) (p. 246, 1), \( çənəs \) (p. 248, 1), \( çənərəf \) (p. 249, 1), etc., even \( çənə \) (p. 145, 2), \( çənə \) (p. 238, 2), \( çənə \) (p. 244, 1), \( çənə \) (p. 245, 1), \( çənə \) (p. 246, 1), etc.

To judge from Rasânef's records initial \( tənəs \) and \( mədəs \) are frequently not distinguished from one another in the dialect of Trâbzon: \( çələtən \) (p. 223, 1) and \( çim \) (p. 225, 1) are written initially with one and the same sign; also \( očë \) (p. 233, 1) and \( očë \) (p. 233, 1).

I have noticed unvoiced initial consonants which are voiced in the written language, in people from various regions of the former vilayet of Angora: \( çələt \) (vîlen, Bil-Tut near Çınıcy), \( çələt \) (p. 223, 1) and \( çim \) (p. 225, 1) are written initially with one and the same sign; also \( očë \) (p. 233, 1) and \( očë \) (p. 233, 1).

The frequent variation in our records of the spoken speech as regards voicing of initial consonants arouses the suspicion that there are no pure \( çiməs \) in this position. A final solution of the question will only be possible when we are accurately informed regarding the condition of voicing in the dialects, if possible by instrumental records.

Final Sounds.

§ 31. Final posterior-\( d \) (g) becomes \( x \) in the eastern dialects. The boundary between \( d \) and \( x \) may, broadly speaking, be said to be the Kızyl Yrmak and the central Salt Steppe, although \( x \) areas are also found on this side of the Kızyl Yrmak, notably the Kastamuni district. On the other hand, the change from \( d \rightarrow x \) is quite unknown, so far as I am aware, on Rumelian territory.

Examples: \( çənə \) (from Kâzık Çalı-Ayı) near Jozgad, \( çənə \) (ibid.), \( çənə \) (ibid.), \( çənə \) (Jozgad), \( çənə \) (Jozgad), \( çənə \) (Jozgad), \( çənə \) (Jojojë, village of Bojaljë near Kavara).

Similarly in \( çənə \) (Kâzık Çalı-Ayı) near Jozgad: \( çənə \) (ibid.), \( çənə \) (ibid.), \( çənə \) (ibid.), \( çənə \) (ibid.), \( çənə \) (ibid.) etc. On the other hand, the texts given by Rasânef from the coast of the Black Sea between Trabzon and Kize show almost regularly an unchanged final-\( f \). All the more remarkable then are the forms given by him like \( səhə \) (Telek, p. 284, 1), \( səhə \) (Telek, p. 284, 1), etc., in which final-\( f \) on the middle of the tongue becomes \( x \).

The change from \( f < x \) is found not only at the end of words but also at the end of stems and derivative syllables: \( çənə \) (Jojojë, Kast., p. 12, 16),

THE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF ISLAM, IV.
Vowel harmony is weakest with regard to labilisation. Attention has already been called to certain features in this connection above (§ 6).

To the very frequent cases of defective harmony belong those in which the final syllable of a word is distinguished in vowel harmony from the other syllables. We very often find the endings -a, -dun, -fer, -se after light stems and vice versa -e, -de, -den, -ler, -se after heavy stems: dedeına (dedeina, G. p. 60, 18), sinema (sinema, G. p. 62, 15), lähna (lähna, G. p. 82, 11), istanın (istanın, G. p. 60, 14), selma (selma, R. p. 209, 3), versin (versek, R. p. 83, 9), derler (derler, Miskov, p. 32, 19), sömmöller (sömmöller, G. p. 37, 9) and vice versa atalı (atalı, G. p. 60, 17), yakınçe (yakınçe, G. p. 51, 10), yulamın (yulamın, G. p. 91, 27), fidhre (fidhre, Miskov, G. p. 32, 19). Salm (salm, R. p. 6, 1, 19).

As the examples show, a vowel frequently occurs at the end of a word in place of the expected e. It is not only a real a but a very broad variety of a (ə) as the a in an open final syllable is generally pronounced very open in the language of educated people also (Hengstüser, Z. D. M. G., lixi. 239). Dimitrijev (J. A., April-June 1916, p. 343) calls attention to a similar phenomenon in the language of the Osmanified Krimer Turks.

On the other hand, we find in the dialects numerous cases of vowel harmony rigidly carried through, where it is not found in the written language. Loanwords form the most cases. The vowel attraction acts progressively or retrogressively according to circumstances.

Examples: a. progressive: mefen (meiden, Brun.-A., p. 125, N. 4, v. 3), coda (soda, G. p. 88, 16), mever (mezer, K. O., i. 345, N. 2, i), bilim (bilim, ibid., N. 6, 3), and (and, G. p. 36, 7), lahen (lahen, Pers. Mählin, G. p. 75, 14, 3, i),

b. retrogressive: alma (alma, Brun.-A., p. 121), olker (olker, K. O., i. 344, N. 51, 1), maraş (maraş), G. p. 17, 19, derer (derer, G. p. 17, 17), defe (defe, G. p. 23, 30) etc. -c. retrogressive and progressive: hahir (hahir, R. S., p. 19, 13).

Certain cases are worthy of special mention: a. -i and -en, progressively harmonised as -in, -en: ofornekn (ofornek, G. p. 37, 7), sarımkin (sarım, G. p. 37, 1), bolanınan (bolanın, G. p. 51, 11); cf. below § 76, bolanınan (bolanın, G. p. 51, 11) etc.
b. bare "a little" from bir as (G. p. 53, 26; cf. K. S., i. 189).
c. by vowel attraction acting retrogressively the demonstratives bu, in before light stems often become bu, in: bu: lü: büfen (bu gün, G. p. 29, 10), büfen (bu gün, O. T. i. 26, 12), 37, 95; i. 26, 10, lu: höle (lu k., O. T. i. 26 ult.), lu: güreșin (lu gürešin, O. T. i. 26 ult.), lu: renk (lu renk, O. T. i. 227, 12) etc.; cf. Hoy, in K. S., l. 187 spp.

Sound Change in Combination. Assimilation of Consonants.

§ 38. The dialects are characterised by a large number of peculiarities in assimilation. Most of these occur only sporadically. To define the areas

Vowel harmony.
in which they appear is not yet possible. Many of them also occur in the spoken language of the educated classes, especially when speaking more quickly than usual or with a certain amount of carelessness. These changes occur in the dialects all the more frequently as the speakers have not before their eyes the regulating influence of the written forms.

§ 39. Complete retrogressive assimilation occurs most frequently in the following cases:


b. $kt > Ht$ and $gt > Ht$: jilte (jiktte, jikde, R. O., ii. 205, from below, from Guneje), methup (mekhik), village of Naryjli in the district of Aijdya, anatator (anatutar, O. T., l. 192, s, 256, et al).

c. $tr > Hr$: cesis (settin, G., p. 67, in), iszisya (izitya, Brus.-A., p. 145, from below), kyyisam (kystdya, O. T., l. 218, y, isisam from tissi probably through tissi, O. T., l. 206, y).

d. $pt > Hs > H$ (after dropping gemination; cf. below § 53): isaszysii (isaszysii) (isaszysii), G., p. 37, 10.

e. $tr > H$: gassynnar (gasynnar, Brus.-A., p. 44, u), izmenn (izmenn, G., p. 60, s).

f. $tr > H$: tissi (tissi < tissi < Azin, G., p. 38, 6, 12, cf. § 36).

g. $tr > Hz$, unusually frequent: assuin (assain, G., p. 28, z), assay (aysap, G., p. 56, z), gessen, tayaw assin (gessen, tayaw, G., p. 51, s).

h. $rtr > Hz$: sawarn (sawaran, G., p. 18, s), lyxamas (lyxamas, G., p. 82, s).

i. $rtr > Hz$ (or $tr > Hz$, after dropping gemination): sotjarlar ... goqutarlar ... sevarlar ... sevarlar, Brus.-A., p. 121, goqutlar (goqutlar, op. cit.), tellikler (tellikler, O. T., l. 91, s), getikler (getikler, Gadan-yan, l. 7, below, from Dellorman, etc).

J. Adjectives: u>xu (xu “his forehead” from Tasaolik near Kyschier, K.)

k. $rtr > Hz$: anxious (anxious, R. O., p. 265, i).

l. $tr > Hz$: jesminen (jesminen, G., p. 20, m), samei (samei, G., p. 37, o), miyiduaneyi (miyiduaneyi, G., p. 75, s), Jesminen (jesminen, G., p. 37, o).

m. $tr > Hz$: émmanu (émmanu, G., p. 60, o), yoxammy (yoxammiy, G., p. 77, s).

§ 40. Complete retrogressive assimilation occurs mainly in the following cases:

a. $ns > Hz$, very frequent in sandhi: émmanuy (émmanuy, K. O., ii. 205, from below), yoxammy (yoxammiy, var., Zag., N° 92 from Azin in the district of Séd-Gazy, Jesminen-jarikin (jesminen varikin, G., p. 30, s), samei-mirdim (samei mirdim, G., p. 62, s), émmanuy (émmanuy, G., p. 71, s).

b. $m > Hz$ and $pt > Hz$: paysammi (paysammi, Zag., N° 102, Azin in the district of Séd-Gazy, humami (humami, G., p. 18, o), haizammi (haizammi, G., p. 18, o), yoxammi (yoxammi, G., p. 82, s).

c. $ns > Hz$: nemen (nemen, O. T., l. 25, 16), medamam (medamam, O. T., l. 134, 9), govat (govat, O. T., l. 217, s).

d. $yz > Hz$: yaranyu (yaranyu, G., p. 75, 14), derdigi (derdigi, G., p. 75, 15).

e. $yz > Hz$: ýarannen (ýarannen, G., p. 66, s).

§ 41. Partial retrogressive assimilation frequently occurs in the dialects in sandhi where a final - $s$ under the influence of a preceding - $n$, in the next word becomes: $bmam$ $bn$ (bmam $bn$, G., p. 78, s), bariym $baly$ (bariym $baly$, G., p. 85, s), umam $bajun$ (umam $bajun$, G., p. 88, s), bīriym $bajun$ (bīriym $bajun$, G., p. 56, ult), afànyn $bächik$ (afànyn $bächik$, G., p. 70, 13, s).

§ 42. Partial progressive assimilation $ms > Hz$: damen (damen, Zag., N° 97 from Azin near Séd-Gazy; dammen dammen got ef'se, Brus., p. 264, 4), almen (almen, Brus.-A., p. 154, 8), zannez (zanaza, Zag., N° 96 from Azin near Séd-Gazy) etc.

§ 43. Assimilation in regard to a sound which comes between the end of the stem and the beginning of the suffixed syllables, so far as we know, follows in the dialects the rules laid down by Bergstrasser for the language of the educated classes (Z. D. M. G., lxxvi, 1918, p. 261 sq).

§ 44. Progressive assimilation at a distance is often noticed in combinations of $ne$ “what” with forms of the verb ijelet “to select”: ijelet < ijelemin < ne ijelemin, Brus.-A., p. 224, 20, nejelem (ne ijelem, Brus., p. 270, 153), neharem (ne ijelem, G., p. 73, 12).

Influence of consonants on vowels.

§ 45. The labial or labio-dental consonants $b$, $m$, $w$, $f$ exercise to a greater degree than is the case in the written language a labilising influence on immediately adjoining vowels, both progressively and retrogressively: basafary (basafary, G., p. 86, s); the word $basa$ appears in many districts as $baba$ or $baba$: lula, Las., p. 287; Brus.-A., p. 127, 7; asewa, R., p. 223, 4; in this form I also know it from N. E. Bulgaria, bără (bără, Zag., N° 75 from Kučak in the district of Mayla), bără (bără, G., p. 62, 13), lotăbă (loțăbă, Zag., N° 11, 13), iezem (iezem, G., p. 19, 2), arăba (arăba, G., p. 39, 42), iezem (iezem, Zag., N° 75 from Kučak in the district of Mayla), iezem (iezem, G., p. 77, 16).

§ 46. The place of contact with vowels, especially with $a$, $u$, $o$, frequently cause a narrowing of the latter to $e$, $y$ (or at least to a y-like vowel), $u$.

Narrow $e$ before and after $y$, $j$, has already been discussed above (§ 7). Otherwise cf. tuzarny (tuzarny, R. O., p. 330 from the village of Dumanly near Ulaq, Naziantem (naziantem, G., p. 60, 4), cf. Deny, Grammatica, § 644, diarama (diarama, R. O., p. 46, 4), jonej (jonej, Zag., N° 120 from Tak, O'ak near Kyschier, Yonej (Yonej, G., p. 80, 15) etc.

Note: The new orthography in Latin characters has brought to light in the written language an $e$, or y-like pronunciation of $i$, or before an $i$: ijeleminy (ijelemi, G., p. 86, 13), gertnerijer (gertnerijer, G., p. 60, 14), gertnerijer (gertnerijer, G., p. 60, 14). Cf. Deny, § 627, note 2.

§ 47. On the influence of palatalised $l$, $ł$, $ł$ on vowels see above § 18. In Gagauz, $f$ regularly changes $a$, $o$, $u$ to $e$, $ë$, $u$, Moskv., p. xxvii: joki (Gagauz., p. 1, 10), ojiki (op. cit., p. 1, 10), jujaw (op. cit., p. 3, 6), induj (op. cit., p. 3, 12).

Influence of vowels on consonants.

§ 48. In all Turkish languages, in the Ottoman dialects also the articulation of consonants is dependent on the nature of the surrounding vowels. Under the influence of anterior vowels consonants are pronounced more forward, and farther back under the influence of middle and posterior vowels. In many consonants, especially $k$, $g$, $g$, $k$, $f$, the forward pronunciation is com-

In the willetys of Angora and adjoining districts I have frequently noted the same thing: eit (eii * bend") from Ta6-ol6uk near Kayssirih, peetne (peetne from Kuraji near Jassag), ky6ymdum (ky6ymduum, ibr.), peelmad (peelmad, ibr.), door (dear) from Denkremden etc).

The same phenomenon is recorded from To6Uuk in N.E. Bulgaria: 'bora, b6n, never (Gadzhanov, ii. 4).

§ 53. In most dialects an io sound has developed between two vowels coming together directly within a word. But sometimes we find a instead of io: svaklisl (swaklisl, swaklisl, G., p. 31, 3), to6p6-pilbl (to6p6-pilbl, G., p. 52, 80), timeless (tsim51, G., p. 57, 8c) etc.

Sentence Sandhi.

§ 56. When two words come together, of which the first ends with a vowel and the second begins with a vowel, in all dialects, as is frequently the case in Turkish languages, the first of the two vowels is usually dropped. Examples: Hamsiyov (Hamsiyoy, G., p. 87, 3), sulayrey tdindm (sulayrey tidinm, G., p. 86, 8c), gilr3 elnsal eif olurs (gilr3 olur, elnsal, G., p. 77, 8c), elii 66g6r6r6m (elii 66g6r6r6m, G., p. 82, 8c), elii atijoyy, G., p. 82, 8c (from below), del tesli (del tesli, G., p. 85, 8c), atif olur (atif olur, G., p. 67, 8c), hal olum (hal olum, G., p. 29 ust.).

Ne and the interrogative particle my deserve special mention (ilim6: ne elier, RO., ii. 204, 8 from below from Gine), ne6u (ne eli6u very common; cf. e.g. Ada6., p. 140 ust.), 6r6ff6y (ne ol6mas, G., p. 83, 8c) nap6mm (ne yap6mm, Brun.-A., p. 149, 8 from below); cf. also the forms given by K6no6 without references: nedd6nm = ne 6ed6kn6m, napp66s = ne 6appa66s, ned6kn6m = ne 6ed6kn6m, nap66sm = said to be ne 6app6sm (from above), ay6sfn6m (ay6sfn6m, G., p. 75, 4), ay6sfn6m (ay6sfn6m, G., p. 53, 11) etc.

In the combination of a to a the second vowel sometimes disappears: 6f6nm (6f6nm) pod6k6f6m (pod6k6f6m), to6l6m (to6l6m, G., p. 60, 18).

Reduction of Syllables.

§ 57. In words of three syllables, the central one, if it is open, is frequently reduced. This feature, also found in other Turkish languages, is much more common in all dialects than in the written language. It is connected with the accentuation of words of three syllables: a = a, or a = a, cf. W. Bang, Studien zur vergl. Grammatik der Turksprachen, S. B. Pr. Abh. W., xxxvii. (1916), p. 920; T. Kowalski, Zs studfum nad forma porzj5 ludou tureckou, p. 70, note 1.

Grammer.

§ 58. Declension. Declension offers no peculiarities of a local nature.

The "confusion of the accusative with the dative" noted in various Ottoman speaking districts (Gadzhanov, ii. 4-8) e.g. ab6ma ara6rim (for atnym ara6rum, Rus., p. 209, 8 from Kyranna, in the willety of Trebizond), is, as explained in § 9, due to a phonetic peculiarity.

Similarly the identity of the locative with the

1) M. Köprülü-Zade Pu'ud is wrong in thinking (K.C hive., ii. 37 on vv. 54), that a contraction like bud mufarjam = bud-ay mufar3 represents an archaic feature of the 16th century.

dative ending, which is frequently met with, is to be explained by phonetic changes (assimilation, with later dropping of the gemination, cf. § 49 and § 53): ku6m6ne ye kiu var *in your village there are three girls" (from ku6m6ne > ku6m6ne, Rus., p. 156, 8), i66 j6m6ma t'Cen (j6m6ma > j6m6ma) j6m6ma, Rus., p. 149, 8), j6m6m6 k66m6men den bir i6yn *on the meadow of the alpine pasture I was alone" (< cim6m6n < cim6m6n, Rus., p. 107, 8c) etc.

Nominative forms frequently met with in place of expected dative forms are probably to be explained as the result of contraction: mere (= mere: gi6ti6, helenni6 "he could not ascertain where the other had gone" (R.C., ii. 205, 8 from Gine), mere k66r6n on gider *whether (merc: thou dragest her, thither (mer: oraij) she will go)" (G., p. 66, 8o), indyn dere, j6m6ma "I went down to the valley (merc: to the river)" (Rus., p. 105, 8r). The (merc: why), "often found in dialects, is probably to be similarly explained.

The Pronoun.

§ 59. The personal pronoun of the 1st and 2nd person singular appears in the east and Anatolia in the forms heni, being, agreeing with the other cases, for hana (or hana), hana (or yana). I have heard them from a Turk from Ursa. The same forms are given by Balkanglu (K. Se., iii. 204) for the dialect of Kilis. Rausen notes them as heard from a woman from the willety of Ersemer: nene (R. 8., p. 16, 8; p. 23, 1). We must regard these forms as the result of Adharbasli influence.

Songs in Rausen from Trebizond and neighbourhood show a dative in h6a (alongside of hana), na:s: h6a (p. 176, 3), h6a (p. 205, 8), na:s (p. 263, 4) alongside however, we have: h6a (p. 134, 1), h6a (p. 133, 8).

The demonstrative pronoun hu appears in N. E. Anatolia strengthened by a prefixed ha (exclamative a with an aspirated anlani): hana (in Rausen, p. 159, 8; 215, 8; 250, 8; 256, 8). The same ha is added to the hu in hufar, huruy, hurudza: habu6man (Rus., p. 180, 8, 191, 8; 192, 8; 199, 8; 257, 8), habu6r6z (Rus., p. 258, 8), hab6jo6 (Rus., p. 164, 8).

Similarly we find prefixed ha in the demonstrative a, dialectal a (cf. § 4): ha:n (Rus., p. 240, 4).

Conjugation.

Personal Endings.

§ 60. 1st Pers. sing.

In the dialects we find a for -m at the end of forms in conjugation, as frequently in old Ottoman (Deny, § 551); cf. W. Bang, Studien zur vergleichenden Grammatik der Turksprachen, i., S. B. Pr. Abh. W., xxii. (1916), p. 534, note 1.

Examples from Asia Minor: japa66 (japa66, G., p. 17, 13), i66im (i66im, G., p. 85, 8c), o6man (o6man, G., p. 89, 8c), i6y6ran (i6y6ran, G., p. 79, 8c), e6men (e6men, ibr., p. 351, 4 from below), i6y6ran (i6y6ran, Zag., No. 33, from Mun6 in the district of Bali6e6t), i6f6jon, i6jo6jon, i6jo6jon (i6y6ran etc., Brun.-A., p. 134, 8), i6r6mon (i6r6mon, Thury, Kastl, p. 19).

So far as I know, a similar phenomenon is only found in Rumelian territory and in N. E. Bulgaria: hiktem, giltem (hiktem, giltem, Gadzhanov, i. 9), giltem, giltem (ibid.).

§ 61. 2nd Pers. sing.
bined with a more or less pronounced palatalisation. According to Rässenèn’s records, ā and ē are pronounced before e, e, o, u so far forward and so palatal that they almost become æ or œ’ (cf. § 20). This peculiarity seems to extend from the coast region of Trebizond and Rize nearly towards Erzerum.

In Gagauz, anterior vowels e, i, o, u cause a regular and pronounced palatalisation of all adjectival consonants (cf. Mokov, p. xxvi—xxvii).

Simplification of groups of consonants.

§ 49. In many cases the complete assimilation leads to the disappearance of a consonant, or the doubling of a consonant is dropped (cf. § 53). In the following cases we have the simplification of groups of three (or four) consonants:

1. t̨m > tm in atumy (atmly), G. p. 28, q. in a man from Isparja; 42. yu, in a jürük; O.T., l. 108, as from Constantinople, jişuçu (jiszusco), R. 19, 26, from Vezirhan. We also find 3t < ntl (G., p. 77, 82). Cf. K. O., l. 210, s, 99.

2. f t > ft in fštak (fštak, almost general "frontal" pronunciation of this word).

f t > ft in fštak (fštak, cf. O. T., l. 78, q. from below).

d. nɔλ > nnt; in gõllik (gõllik < gollúk, G., p. 56, 89; golluk, Dum., K. O., l. 343, Nt., 4, 3).

c. ry > rt in ulran (oršan, G., p. 38, q. and frequent elsewhere).

l. ṭu (≡ ṭu) > ṭu in ṭur cú (ṭurcu, G., p. 97, 84).

2. flashdata (kšt, ṭuš, ṭuša, G., p. 72, q.

Grouped consonants:

1. ṭl k > ṭl k (gštēkhrk, W.Z.K.K., p. 218, 89, from Macedonia).

2. e. ž > j, especially in diminutive forms, before the ending -ž, ż. The dropping of ž is also almost the rule in the written language, cf. Deny, § 111. Examples: žúlak (G., p. 78, 3), žūlužak (O. T., l. 304, § 72, 8; 305, 33; 333, 3); žafaržyn (žafaržyn, O. T., l. 334, 3; 334, 3); žafaržyn (G., p. 36, 84).

On the other hand we find: žūlak (żulač, žūlakūč, žūlakūč, R., p. 154, q).

Finally we may class here the often noted disappearance of a final ū after a, 3, l: abdas (abdast, K., p. 106), de (dest, G., p. 53, 81, ṭen (G., p. 71, 85), for w = w (cf. § 1); polu (polu, G., p. 59, 82, poluž (poluž, Max., W.Z.K.K., 311, l. 106, q. 35, q; cf. ibid., p. 224, q).

Interchange of sounds.

§ 50. r and l in contact with another consonant show a tendency to change place with the latter.

a. uččeti (uččeti, uččeti, G., p. 28, q.); točču (töčču, G., p. 31, 82); džččiv (duččiv, G., p. 29, q.); toččuž (töččuž, M., p. 59, 82); Belgrad (Biligrad, G., p. 57, Nt., 3, paas); toččuž (töččuž, etc).

b. ďččiu (ďččiu, Zag., Nt., 47; from Munur near Balykesir), ďččiv (ďččiv, Zag., Nt., 104; from Ayin near Sidi Gaz, tomáda (tomáda, G., p. 90, 84), yomččo (yomččo < Arab, yomččo, G., p. 89, 84), gõččž (gõččž, Brus.-A., p. 126, 84).

This feature is especially developed in Asia Minor.

Development of sounds.

§ 51. Before the explosives f, f, f, k, k, k, and the fricatives s, s, s, secondary nasal m, n, ñ are frequently developed. This phenomenon is, it is true, most frequently noticed in loanwords but it is also found in pure Turkish words: almku (aldu, Zag., Nt., 3; from Kaşgärden in Macedonia), pomper (pomper, Radovići in Macedonia), yurant, yurant (yurant, G., p. 36, note 2; p. 72, q; from Bogor; ibid., p. 69, 84; yurant, yurant (yurant, R., p. 4, 8; from Vezirhan), laşaf (laʃaf, Ar., K. N.), gõčču (gõčču, gõčču, from Damany near Kütahia), garmangaro (garmançaro, Thrý, K. R., p. 16), meččiti (meččiti, Zag., Nt., 103; from Ayin near Sidi Gaz, Brus.-A., p. 131, q.; Thrý, K. R., p. 16, q.)

Syllable Division.

§ 52. Simple consonants between two vowels frequently appear somewhat lengthened. They may even be pronounced long under the influence of stress. In this case the consonant is divided between the preceding and following syllables so that the division between the syllables divides the consonant which produces the effect of lengthening the consonant as a double one: defalalaj pronounced with emphasis sounds almost like def-falalaj. Examples: yuččjáy (yuććay), G., p. 77, 89, poluž (from polu “pluck, pull”, not from poluž “to send”, G., p. 80, 89); yorččuž (yorččuž, Brus., p. 267, Nt., 6); elččuž (elččuž, ibid., Nt., 25); gõččž (gõččž, ibid., p. 267, Nt., 88); elččiti (elččiti, R., p. 4, q); elččuž (elččuž, R., p. 31, q); elččiti (elččiti, R., p. 93, q).

§ 53. On the other hand, we do not find a pronounced double sound where it might be expected on etymological grounds. The result is taken with § 52, that e.g. the two last syllables in baby lajám “my (beloved) with the shawl covered head” and defalalaj “let us go around” are pronounced identically. Similarly bšbši elččuž and bšbši belččuž are practically indistinguishable in the usual pronunciation.

This enables us to understand forms like the following: ečči (origin: ečči, G., p. 17, q); bščči (bščči, G., p. 23, q); memlečč (memlečč [locative], G., p. 27, q); agmađčč (agmađčč, G., p. 30, q; cf. § 40); Býryžčč (Býryžčč, G., p. 61, q); žččuž (žččuž, G., p. 55, q).

§ 54. Many dialects allow two vowels to succeed one another directly within a word, where the cultured language and other dialects have an ž or γ sound. This is usually found where an original guttural has been lost. Most examples are found in Rässenèn’s text from N.E. Asia Minor: dalay žm, alyəžm (aždžym, alyəžm, R., p. 151, 82); gemižm (gemižm, R., p. 153, q); alyəžm (aždžym, p. 154, q); alyəžm (aždžym, etc.)
In the williêta of Angora and adjoining districts I have frequently noted the same thing: etal (*etil* "bend" from Taş-tak or near Kırche), *sümnca* (from Kuzlille near Jisrud), *çamymom* (Kymomurdu, ibid.), *çamly* (Keçistem, ibid.), doar (*döar* from Denikmen) etc.

The same phenomenon is recorded from Toğlak in N.E. Bulgaria: *buruç, boro, borë* (Gadžanov, li. 4). § 53. In most dialects an *a* sound has developed between two vowels coming directly together within a word. But sometimes we find *a* instead of *i*: *túuvala* (*túuvala, tuuvala*, G., p. 31, *túu-pólha* (*túu-pólha*, G., p. 32, *túu*) *súmcal* (*súmcal, G., p. 57, *súm*) etc.

**Sentence Sandhi.**


*Ne* and the interrogative particle *my* deserve special mention: *willije* (*willije*, R.O., li. 204, *willije* from below from Güne), *naa* (*naa* very common; cf. e.g. *Adak*, p. 140 ult.), *nuumbl* (*nuumbl*, G., p. 83, *nuumbl*), *numbl* (*numbl*, Boro-A., p. 149, *numbl* from below); cf. also the forms given by Kounos without references: *nedzg* (*nedzg*, *nedzg* (*nedzg*), *nedzg* (*nedzg*), *nedzg* (*nedzg*), *nedzg* (*nedzg*), *nedzg* (*nedzg*)

*Ala* (*Ala* from below), *ala* (*ala*, G., p. 75, *ala*), *ala* (*ala*, G., p. 53, *ala*), etc.

In the combination of *a*- and the second vowel sometimes disappears: *sým* (*sým*, G., p. 60, *sým*).

**Reduction of Syllables.**

§ 57. In words of three syllables, the central one, if it is open, is frequently reduced. This feature, also found in other Turkish languages, is much more common in all dialects than in the written language. It is connected with the accentuation of words of three syllables: *— — —* or *— — —;* cf. W. Bang, *Studien zur vergl. Grammatik der Türktsprachen*, S. B. Pr. Ak. W., xxxvii. (1916), p. 920; T. Kowalski, *Zu studien nach formen persiisch turkish*, p. 70, note 1.

**Grammar.**

§ 58. Declension.

Declension offers no peculiarities of a local nature. The "confusion of the accusative and the dative" noted in various Ottoman speaking districts (Gadžanov, li. 4-5), e.g. *çam* *apar* (*çam* *apar*), R., p. 200, *çam* (*çam*, G., p. 29, *çam*, Kysarina, in the williêta of Treföns), is, as explained in § 9, due to a phonetic peculiarity. Similarly the identity of the locative with the

---

1) M. Köprüli-Zade Fu'ât is wrong in thinking (K.C.A., li. 37 on v. 54), that a contraction like *bëd meşauri* < *bad-my afaynu* represents an archaic feature of the xiiith century.

dative ending, which is frequently met with, is to be explained by phonetic changes (assimilation, with latter dropping of the gemination, cf. § 49 and § 53); *këjïmâa û Rës xará "in your village there are three girls" (from *këjïmâa > këjïmâa*, R., p. 156, *jëdi* *këjïmâa* *te-çəm* (*këjïmâa* > *këjïmâa* > *këjïmâa*, R., p. 149, *jëdi* *këjïmâa* "on the meadow of the alpine pasture I was alone" (< *këjïmâa* < *këjïmâa*, R., p. 107, *jëdi* etc).

Nominative forms frequently met with in place of expected dative forms are probably to be explained as the result of contraction: *nïre* (= *merëji*; *gëlëni* *bëllëmmi* "he could not ascertain where (the other) had gone" (R.O., li. 205, *në* from *Güne*), *nëkëmen ûrë gîder* "whether (= *merëji*) thou druggest her, thither (= *orajia*) she will go" (G., p. 66, *në*), *indëph dërc* (*kërmpya* = "I went down to the valley (= *dëerci*) to the river" (R., p. 105, *në*). The *ne* (< *çëcë* "why") is often found in dialects, is probably to be similarly explained.

**The Pronoun.**

§ 59. The personal pronoun of the 1st and 2nd person singular appears in the east of Anatolia in the forms *senn, senn*, agreeing with the other cases, for *senna* (or *senn*), *senna* (or *sanna*). I have heard them from a Turc from Üzra. The same forms are given by Balkanoglu (K. Sc., iii. 264) for the dialect of Klis. Balkanoglu tells me that they come from a woman from the williêta of Erzum: *senn* (R., p. 16, *senn* from below, *senn*). We must regard these forms as the result of Azphâhâbîk influence.


The demonstrative pronoun *bu* appears in N.E. Anatolia strengthened by a prefixed *bu* (exclamative with an aspirated *bu*): *hëbu* (in Rësânên, p. 159, *hëbu* (*hëbu*), *hëbu* (*hëbu*), *hëbu* (*hëbu*), *hëbu* (*hëbu*).

The same *bu* is added to the *në* in *në* *hëbu* *bëvëri* *dëvëri* (*hëbu* (*hëbu*)), *hëbu* (*hëbu*), *hëbu* (*hëbu*), *hëbu* (*hëbu*).

Similarly we find prefixed *bu* in the demonstrative *a*, dialectal *a* (cf. § 4): *a* (*a*, R., p. 240, *a*).

**Conjugation.**

**Personal Endings.**

§ 60. 1st Pers. sing.


Similarly we find prefixed *bu* in the demonstrative *a*, dialectal *a* (cf. § 4): *a* (*a*, R., p. 240, *a*).
By confusion of the forms of conjugation in -sin, -sın, -sin (gelism, gelismen, ... gelisir) with that in -sin, -sin, -sin, -sin, -sin, or -sin; (gelism, gelismen, gelismen) in the Asia Minor dialects we very often find the personal ending of the 2nd pers. sing. -sini, where elsewhere we have -sini: gides, siniy (gelis, gelismen, K. St., l. 155 from North Syria), gelin (gelis, gelismen, ibid.), gelisim (gelisim, ibid.).

In keeping with this we find: sen... sodramamam (sedinim? for sediminim? G. p. 39, ed. C.)

§ 62. 1st Pers. plur.

As a result of a similar confusion of the two types of conjugation, the 1st pers. plur. of the opt., pres., acc., and fut. in many, especially East Anatolian dialects, ends in -sin (gelism), is: gelised (gelism from the district of Sivas), gelisedim (gelisedimin, from Kars), gelised (geliseden, K. St., l. 155 from North Syria), gelisedim (gelisedimin from Tatlyak, S. from Sivas), gelisedim (gelisedimin, ibid.), geliseden (gelisedeyen, R. p. 173, 3), alay (gellayi) is given by Bulkanoglu for Killis in North Syria, K. St., l. 264 etc.

Outside of the conjugation tables we also find -sin with the meaning “we are” (instead of the enclitic -[sini]: bes amelic we are workingmen) (I heard this in Amasia from labourers from Voyag).

This phenomenon is characteristic of the east of Asia Minor. While it is not found far east of Angora in northern Asia Minor, in southern Asia Minor it appears to extend much farther east. The case for the eastern part of Kusey-Ýama, I heard almost exclusively the forms in -sin (bes hem usi Remek, biz Kusin gelisden etc).

§ 63. 2nd Pers. plur.

Everywhere that we find in the 2nd pers. sing., for -sin we also have in the 2nd pers. plur. -sin, -sin etc. instead of -sin, -sin etc.: gelisesmen (gelisesmen, gelisesmenmen, gelisesmen), geliseden (geliseden, geliseden, gelisedenmen, gelisedenmen)

§ 64. Verbal forms ending in -er (3rd pers. sing. and acc. or pers, and acc): lose this -er in various dialects (cf. § 34): milhîye (i.e. müjûr, K. St., l. 204 from Gümüş), deker (derekim, ibid., p. 205, 3), alay (alayir, Thutry, Kast., p. 19), Kemiri (hemiri, K. St., l. 347, No. 15, 4), kalary (kalary, R. p. 70 from Borgotır etc.

After final -r of the form der (from dever) we sometimes find a vowel-like sound which is difficult to define, like der (cf. K. St., l. 206, 3).

In some Rumelian dialects (notably in the dialect of Adakale) the final -r of the nor. partic. almost regularly becomes: i: kazal (kusar), kalayir (kalayır), ulüri (ülürir) etc.

The Tomis.

§ 65. Present.

Besides the forms in -yör we find in dialects those in -yör, -yör, -yör with many slight gradations in the “quality” of the vowel. The half consonantal l may sometimes disappear so that the two vowels come together: the vowel of the corresponding gerundive form and the vowel of the ending -ar, -ar, -ar. The final -r also may disappear completely (cf. § 64).

Forms with the vowel a and i:* (yör, -yör, -yör, -yör, -yör, -yör, -yör, -yör, -yör)

-dr, or -yör, -yör are found in the two most northeasterly corners of the Ottoman speaking area: on the one side in the northeast on the coast of the Black Sea, towards the Caucasus, on the other in the northwest, in the N. E. of Bulgaria, in Dobrudja and Basarabia.

Examples from the N. E.: dülüşir (gelâsir, R. p. 68, f. from the willayet of Erzerûm), agâsir (abâyçir, R. p. 166, f. from Trebizond), cerd (çelir, R. p. 175, 9, ibid.), ceri (çeriçir, R. p. 194, f. from the willayet of Trebizond), demânsir (denânsir, R. p. 254, 9), bûssâne (bûssâncir, R. p. 245, 3: with very broad and low final i: cf. § 9), atûnlâsir (atûnlâsir, R. p. 319, 9) etc.

With Râsâden's statements, those of Khan for the district of Samsun-Trebizond agree: yörâsir (yörâsîr, R. p. 278, f. from below), yörâsir (yörâsîr, R. ibid., l. 17, from below), gelisir (gelisir, L. p. 251, 1, from below).

I have noticed forms in -dr (çer) even south of Sivas: dûdrâ, dûdrîsir, dûdrîsir, dûdrîsir: etc., all from the village of Tatlyak, between Sivas and Kâzâ-dîli.

Forms in -yör were noted by Thury in Kastumunian (p. 19): batani (bâtayçir (< batayçir, cf. § 49), bûCareer (bûsîçir (< bûsîçir), dûsîçir (< dûsîçir), dûsîçir (< dûsîçir), etc.

Forms ending in -yör and -yör are also characteristic of the dialect of the ottomanised Tatars of the Crimea: sâyîur (Satçaya, in J. A., 1926, p. 352, 4), paralasir (baçyçir (< baçyçir), sîyör (sîyör, itibid., p. 364, 7-9).

The forms in -yör and -yör seem to cover an area which begins with the willayet of Kastumun and stretches along the coast of the Black Sea far to the east and north. I do not know a single case of such forms from the southern half of the peninsula.

If we now turn to the western coast of the Black Sea we find very peculiar, complicated conditions which cannot yet be considered to have been quite cleared up.

Among the Bessarabian Gagaus, according to Mîov (Gagaus, xxviii, xxix), two forms of present are used alongside of each other: the one in -yör, the other in -yör (cf. e.g. yör, 3. 307; immediately following it yör). As forms like bûryçir (from the village of Þeëla in the circle of Ismail) show, -dr has arisen out of -yör.

Still more involved is the position in northern Bulgaria. The present forms there form one of the most important criteria for distinguishing the dialects of the different districts. According to Gudanow, whose statements I can generally confirm, we have the following forms of the present in conjugation:


b. Northern part of Gerovo (l. 7):

1) I cannot see why this present form should be entirely separated from that in -yör and "probably compared with the Cag. present in -yör" (M. Pâlo, K. C. A., l. 86).

2) Gudanow writes gelisîr: by f. he indicates that f is not f.
The forms above quoted from N.E. Bulgaria and the Dobrudja are exceedingly important for the explanation of the present in ľcor 2) as they represent an older stage of development than that preserved in the written language. The discussion of the question whether a form like ľovlerin is a combination with ľev- or a phonetic development from ľovlerix must remain undecided.

In the dialect of the island of Adakale the present has been completely ousted by an aorist form in -ā: ĕplaču, ĕplići, ĕplići (cf. § 64 and 66). But we also find forms in ľib, e. g. ľypsum (ľypsum, ľypsum, ľypsum, Adak., p. 260, a.)

Isolated forms in ľib are found in Macedonia: ľDig (W.Z.A.M., xxxii. 274, 2, Nr. 59, 2).

The present in ľib agreeing with the written language covers the whole of Rumelia especially, it was found in Thracia with Constantinople and the western and southern parts of Asia Minor. On Asia Minor territories ľib appears usually without final -ā: ľilliu (ne ľillušer, R.O., ii. 204 from Guine.), ľolome (belemečer, ibid., p. 205), ľegišum (lēgerom, ibid., p. 205, ao), ľolymi (ľolymi, ibid., p. 205, ao), ľelgišu ľelgišu, ľelgišu (M. Hartmann, K. S., l. 155 from North Syria; Hartmann’s remark, as if the forms were the 2nd pers. sing., is based on an error). The same form is given by Balkanoglu.

1) Unfortunately Gălătănoiu gives no further forms.


As to the conjugation of the present, two types can generally be distinguished, a fuller with the endings ĭavarn, ĭavarn, ĭavarn, ĭavarn, ĭavarn and a shortened with the endings ĭa, ĭa, ĭa, ĭa, ĭa (īavarn, ĭava, ĭavar, ĭavarn, ĭavarn, ĭavarn etc.).

In the former type belong among others the conjugation of the present in N.E. Asia Minor: ĭavarn (Rus., p. 100, a.), ĭavarn (ibid., p. 161, a.), ĭavarn (p. 247, a.), ĭavarn (p. 222, a.), ĭavarn (iavarn, p. 260, a.), ĭa, ĭava (iavarn, p. 258, a.) etc. N.E. Bulgaria also follows this type.

The second type is given by M. Hartmann and Balkanoglu for Northern Syria and Northern Mesopotamia. It is however also found in southern and western Asia Minor: ĭavarn (iavarn, Brus.-A., p. 134; cf. § 60), ĭavarn (iavarn, ibid., ĭa, ĭavarn (iavarn, Brus.-A., p. 133, a. from belki), ĭa, ĭa (iavarn, iavarn, ibid., P. 134-4) etc. While however the 1st pers. plur. in the east ends in ĭa, ĭa, ĭa, ĭa, ĭa (iavarn, K. S., l. 155; ĭavarn, K. S., iv. 125; cf. § 62), in the west it ends in ĭa: ĭavarn (iavarn, G, p. 19, 11).

Forms with the negation particle sa, e show no special features; only a, e usually become v, e, i under the influence of ś (cf. § 46). Gagauz forms like ĭavarnare (Gagauz, p. 2, 19), ĭavarnareticin (ibid., p. 5, 25) are present, not aorist forms.

In Delorman the 3rd pers. sing. is positive ĭavarn, but negative ĭavvar (from the village of Yunas Abad) north of Razgrad.

The Aorist.

§ 66. In the aorist participle the final -ā frequently disappears (cf. § 34 et 64); ĭavarn (iavarn, K. O., l. 347, Nr. 15, s.), ĭavarn, ĭavarn, ĭavarn, ĭavarn, ĭavarn (all from Brus.-A., p. 121), ĭavvar (iavvar, Kast., p. 19), ĭavvar (iavvar, G, p. 76). This form which is also the 2nd pers. sing., forms the starting point for a series of abbreviated forms: ĭavvar (iavvar, G, p. 32, 12), ĭavvar (iavvar, iavvar, Kast., p. 19), ĭavvar (iavvar, G, p. 89, 26); ĭavvar (Gagnoian, l. 9 from Toși in N.E. Bulgaria) etc.

There are also shortened negative forms: ĭavvar (iavvar, G, p. 69, 12), ĭavvar (iavvar, G, p. 65, 12) — in agreement with old Ottoman; cf. Deny, § 631, note.

§ 76. We usually find contracted forms which may be regarded as coming from the 1st pers. sing. (bašažum < bašažuyum) or from the 1st pers. pl. (bašažaž < bašažažy). The 1st pers. sing. frequently ends in -a (cf. § 60): amâšaž, anâšaž, ašušaž, ašušaž (ašašaž, G., p. 173, 4).

On the analogy of the former, the 2nd pers. sing. ends in -aš or -ašaž (ašašaž, G., p. 19, 6a), ašašaž (ašašaž, G., p. 22, 4), etc. Intervocalic, or: ašašaž, ašašaž (ašašaž, G., p. 16, 4). It also occurs in the phonetic signification: ašašaž (ašašaž, G., p. 18, 4), etc. (cf. § 61).

The 2nd pers. pl. ends in the east in -d (< -d (< -d in the west). It is also found in the Taurus territory: ašušaž, ašušaž, ašušaž (ašušaž, G., p. 173, 4).

The 2nd pers. pl. is also used as an adjective: šar-šušaž, šar-šušaž, šar-šušaž, šar-šušaž (ašašaž, G., p. 150, 4).

The imperative.

§ 69. The 1st pers. pl. of the imperative is ašašaž (ašašaž, G., p. 172, 4). It usually represents the 1st pers. pl. of the imperfect, in -išušaž, -išušaž, -išušaž (ašašaž, G., p. 60, 4).

In the 2nd pers. pl. of stems ending in vowels or in negative forms we frequently find the ending -aš added directly: ašašaž (ašašaž, G., p. 55, 6).
§ 74. Probably by contamination from -dilè and -dilè (or -diken) arise forms in -diken, which are found among the Bessarabian Gagauz as well as in Dilemar: doñës tituñdon ñam ylivis "after we have prepared (the boys) for the daily ceremony, we bring them (the boys) into a house" (from an account of the ceremonies of circumcision taken down by me in Kemenjar, Dilemar), to ñël (cf. § 24) gigiñdon xëp ylivmy uñamñar "even when one crosses, one finds nothing but red men" (Gagauz, p. 10, i) etc.

§ 75. In the construction in -diken in Macedonia, I also found a final -a (a): uñiñdon æh ylivmy uñamñar "when I freeze, draw the blankets over me" (W. Z. K. M., xxxii., p. 184, i), uñiñdon xög uñamñar ñiñi "when I thirst, put thy tongue in my mouth" (ibid., i. 6).

Iken etc.

§ 76. We find many dialectal peculiarities in the forms composed with iken:

- iken (from ðen) follows the rules of vowel harmony and after heavy stems becomes -am, in the eastern dialects -yan (§ 37). Both -ken and -yan combine with ablative -a, -a to -ken, -am. Examples: byppaym (byppken, Brus.-A., p. 122, 4 from below), bòlmybòna, ñeñeñbòna, gòbymayána (Gagauz, p. 51, 9, 6, 7); cf. Deny, p. 949, footnote 1.

On the other hand, we find in the dialect of Bessarabian Gagauz -am even after light stems: gòddìam (Gagauz, p. 1, i, 165, 13);

- kën, -kan frequently appears without final -a as -ka, -ka: gelórka (G., p. 50, 4, from below), bya yuña (bya ìkem, G., p. 65, 15), elórka (elòk, G., p. 72, 2), ñtärkè (W. Z. K. M., xxxiii., p. 216, 18) from Radoviç in Macedonia.

§ 77. When the subject of the form in -ëmáta ìken is a plural, in the dialects (as frequently also in the written language, see Deny, § 1358, p. 954) the plural termination -ar is added to the locative ending -a: gëmëpìm ñtärëmëñal-am ñtärëuler-àt (O. T., ii. 29, 30), ñsámnëmat-kam (G. T. ii. 51, 18), ñtärëmëñal-kam (O. T., ii. 48, 18) etc.

Note: The addition of the plural ending -ar to the locative ending is also noted elsewhere: gëmëppëlërej (for gëmëppëlëler, G., p. 33, 9). Ótër-madácar-kam (O. T., ii. 23, 1) is an isolated form; cf. A. Çt. A., i. 321.

On the use of the Participle in -an, -en etc.

§ 78. In the northeast as well as in the north west of the Ottoman speaking territory we find constructions with the participle in -en or -ën instead of with the verbal noun in -ik or the gerundive in -ine etc. (influence of Añ駹an): yëldëm ñëbân ñëdër "until the milk fills" (Rás., No. 197, a), ñëbân ñëdër ñëdër "til my husband comes" (ibid., v. 4), ñuñ aspèr ñëmënèr "every time I see thee" (Rás., No. 196, 3), ñëbân ñëdër ñëdër ñëdër ñëdër ñëdër "they live in comfort till their death" (Adak., p. 172, 4), ñëbân ñëbân ñëbân ñëbân ñëbân "in a moment" (Adak., p. 206, 15).

Vermek as an auxiliary Verb.

§ 79. Accelerative forms combined with vermek are used much more frequently in many dialects than in the written language. Their original significance seems to have become much weakened. According to Gadzanow, there are in Bulgaria (Dilemarov, Gerlovo) dialects which only have present forms combined with ver-; but it would have to be considered whether in the forms quoted by him the element -ver- is not perhaps, at least occasionally, a phonetic development from -jer- (cf. § 65). The people of South Gerlovo, who speak in this way are called by their neighbours geliniv (Gadzanow, ii. 6).

In Anatolia I heard this name given to the people of Konya among whom the accelerative forms in ver- are continually used; ver- appears in the dialects also in negative verbal stems: gelinnì-vi (gelinnì ver, cf. § 34, Brus.-A., p. 140, 10) gelinnìvërdì (G., p. 69, 4). Cf. Deny, § 824.

The Pasttenses.

§ 80. ëlë, ëlë is found in the dialects in many forms: ëlë, ëlë, ëlë, ëlë, ëlë, ëlë, ëlë; after heavy stems also harmonised: yëla, yëla, yëla, yëla, yëla, yëla, yëla "in summer and in autumn" (G., p. 79, 1, from below), gëla yjëmënu "with tears" (G., p. 59, 9), ñuñen ñamuy "with glory and prestige" (G., p. 54 ult.), ñapà yjëmënu "moon and stars" (G., p. 52, 2). gëlañ (tul ìk, Brus.-A., p. 130, 16), yëlañ (Rás., No. 151, 8), yëlañ (jëm-ëlañ; Rás., No. 3, 4) etc.; cf. Deny, § 876, note 2 and p. 924, middle.

§ 81. yjëla. Much more frequently than in the written language (cf. Deny, § 902) yjëla is used in the dialects as a postposition. Examples: ñpëjëla yjëla "close behind me" (Brus.-A., p. 127, 7, 147 ult.), ñpëjëlañar arla yjëla gëldën "let us go after the dragon" (Adak., p. 18, 26), arla yjëla yjëla "close behind her" (O. T., i. 110, 25, 147, 15), ñapì yjëla ñapì yjëla ñapì ñapì "takes him with him and goes away" (O. T., i. 127, 32), ñapì yjëla ñapì ñapì ñapì ñapì ñapì "he encircles him in front and behind" (O. T., i. 243, 24, 14.

§ 82. ñapidì. ñapidì appears in different forms in the dialects:

a. ñapidì (with voiced initial, § 296; and loss of the final -r, § 34) is noted by Thiry in Kastamonian, (p. 52, alongside of ñapidì, cf. also p. 18).

b. ñapidì (with nasalisation of the final, cf. § 10)
III. OTTOMAN TURKISH LITERATURE.

The literature to which the name of Ottoman is now generally given is really the literature of the Oghuz Turks, who settled in Asia Minor in the Seljuk period and later in the time of the Ottomans in Rum-Il, where they founded a powerful empire. This literature, which has had an uninterrupted development from the time of the Seljuks down to the present day, is based on the literatures of still older dialects and has remained in touch with these in all periods of its evolution. Especially since the xvth century, it has become the most important and richest branch of all the Turkish literatures and has exercised an influence on the literature of the other dialects. Here we shall only sketch the general evolution of this literature, noting its main genres and principal personalities. We shall deal not only with the classical literature which was confined to the upper classes, but also — in their general features — with the literature of the masses, that of the folk musicans (sax şairler) and the literature of the various mystic groups. We have felt the necessity of dwelling more fully on points which have hitherto been unsatisfactorily studied or which are not yet well known in the learned world, while, as regards better known aspects, we have not gone into details, confining ourselves to a synthetic exposition. For example the xivth and xvth centuries — the least known period of this literature — have been treated more fully in proportion to other centuries. This is necessary in order to be able to elucidate more fully unknown points and must not be considered disproportionate in this succinct résumé.

We divide Ottoman literature into three great periods, corresponding to the general development of the history of Turkey:

a. Muslim literature from the xivth century to the middle of the xivth, i.e. to the period of the Taqimül [x., v.]

b. The "European" literature from the period of the Taqimül to the development of the nationalist movement.

c. National literature, arising out of the nationalist movement.

We shall examine these three periods in chronological order, in order to avoid arbitrary distinctions.

a. Muslim Turkish Literature.

xivth Century.

After the Seljuk occupation in the xivth century, Anatolia had been gradually Turkishised and converted to Islam. In the xivth century however, Greeks and Armenians still formed a considerable proportion in the towns and villages of Asia Minor (Pauthier, Le Livre de Marco Polo, Paris 1865, p. 33—39). Among the Turks who settled in Asia Minor some belonged to one and others to other branches of the Turkish people. But as the Oghuz formed the majority, it was the Oghuz dialect...
that formed the foundation of the literary dialect that took shape in Asia Minor. The Oghuz dialect, which had separated from the other Turkish dialects well before the tenth century, had already a rich popular literature; we know of the existence of Oghuz poems in the Ghaznavid period (Köprüli Zade M. Fu'ad, Gขก h i m 1 1 r 1 d e T u r k i i 2 r a, Edebiyat Fonksiyonel Meşhurç, vol. vii., No. 2, p. 81—83).

The Oghuz who settled in Asia Minor had brought with them all these literary traditions. Beyond the literary products of other dialects also found their way in for different reasons (cf. on this: Köprüli Zade M. Fu'ad, Türk Edebiyatında ilk Mutatwaşf a, Constantinople 1919).

As a result of all these influences there gradually grew up in Asia Minor alongside of the popular literature, a written literature in Turkish; we do not know positively if this written literature had already begun before the xilth century or not. We do know that from the time of the Seljuk Sultan in the xilth century, Islamic culture had established itself in the large towns. Then, after the Seljuk Sultan had exterminated the Dânishmandids and disposed of the Crusaders, learning and literature attained a considerable development in Asia Minor. The products of this movement were written partly in Arabic, but mainly in Persian. We cannot therefore doubt that Anatolian Turkish had a long struggle with Arabic and Persian in order to become a literary language. We see clearly the predominance of Arabic, the language of religion and that used for teaching in the madrasses; it was the official language for the correspondence of the sultans with the 'Abbasid caliphs, the 'Ayyubids and the Mamluks and that used in the inscriptions and waṣf deeds of this century and also of the following centuries. The influence of Persian was still greater. We know that in the entourage of the sultans and of various scholars and princes, Persian was used and Persian poetry was constantly read. In the same way we find in some waṣf deeds of the Mongol period — although very rarely — phrases in Mongol, but written in the Uighur character. Nevertheless the predominant language in official transactions and state documents was Arabic.

The use of Turkish was probably confined to dealings with the people. In 1676 (1277) when the Wazir of the village Mehmed Bey had occupied Konya, he ordered that only Turkish should be used in the business of the chancellery; according to one tradition, he had a number of the old scribes put to death (cf. Sait yildiz, Djamîlî Ahmedî Ası-Salihe; J. W. L. Gage, Seyit Zekai, sa libre turque qui Oğuzanned inscription à ezot, Paris 1854, p. 13). According to Ibn Batî, the use of any language other than Turkish was forbidden not only in the business of the chancellery but also in private life (Sallât-nâme, Ayasofia MS. No. 2895). The importance given to Turkish during this brief reign does not of course prove that Turkish had already gained a predominance over the other languages. If we bear in mind that Turkish has come into general use in the religious tribunals of Asia Minor only since the xivth century, and that at Baghdad Persian was still employed in the registers of the chancellery in the xvth century, we can better understand this. It is however certain that Turkish began to gain in importance in state business from the end of the xiiith century (cf. T.O.E.M., No. 17—94, 1926). In this century the ayyâbat hand was used in the Seljuk chancellery and there was also a system of writing peculiar to the chancelleries. In documents written in Turkish on the other hand, vowels were never indicated by letters in the Arabic fashion, but only the vowel signs were used. This shows perhaps that among the Turks of Anatolia, the tradition of the old Uighur script has been quite forgotten.

It is as a result of all these conditions that we find Turkish literary works appearing in the course of the xilth century. A very small portion only of them has come down to us. Works which we no longer possess but of which we know of the existence from historical references are: the Shâhîkh Şâhîn in verse by an unknown author; the Sarîâl-nâmeh in verse and prose by a poet called Shiâyâd 'Izz, in which are described the combats of 'Ali with a demon called Şâlih; the Sarîâl-şamâl-nâmeh composed in 643 (1245) by Ibn 'Alî, secretary of the Seljuk Sultan, by order of the prince Malik 'Izz al-Din Kaïtûsu b. Ghiyâth al-Dîn. It is probable that the stories of Saiyid Bâjî, the existence of which is known in Egypt as early as the xilth century, were translated into Turkish in the xilth century. The Bâjî-nâmeh and the Sarîâl-şamâl-nâmeh, a work which grew up around the personality of Malik Dânishmand Ahmad Ghasî, a hero who came to Asia Minor in the period of the first Seljuk occupation and founded the Dânishmandid dynasty, is a product of the struggle between Muslims and Byzantines in Asia Minor.

The political and economic situation of Anatolia in the xilth century and particularly the material and moral crisis caused by the first Mongol invasions encouraged the expansion of mysticism in these regions. The Yeşewî and Hâzidari derivishes, coming from the east, brought to Asia Minor the mystic poems in Turkish of Aḩmad Yeşewî and his disciples. The Turkish mystics also, under the influence of Arabic and Persian mysticism, were forced to have recourse to Turkish as the language of the people in order to gather round them as many followers as possible. It was for this reason that Djaîalî al-Dîn Rûmi wrote a few Turkish verses, although very few, and that Sultan 'Abdu l's produced a certain number of Turkish poems in Turkey. These were until recently the only products of Seljuk literature known. We may also mention Aḩmad Faţîh of Konya who lived at the beginning of this century and wrote a fairly long mystical waṣf-nâmeh, which we still possess (cf. Köprüli Zade M. Fu'ad, Anatolische Dichter in der Seljukzeit, Körver Coema Archiv, ii.), and a little later Shiâyâd Hamâna (q.v.), whom we may regard as a disciple of Aḩmad Faţîh. These poets composed their works in the "arûf metre" and in imitation of the Persian mystics. But the mystical movement in Asia Minor was not confined to producing works of no originality. It also created a new kind of poetry, which was purely Turkish and original, in the language of the people, in syllabic metre and in forms suitable for a popular literature. Yeşewî and his pupils had a great influence on the genesis of this last poetry.

Vânis Emre was the greatest representative of this genre; he was still alive at the beginning of the xivth century. His art is essentially one of the people, i.e., it is Turkish. A Neo-Platonic
Muslim element can be distinguished in it, which does not differ at all from the mystic philosophy of, for example, Djalâl al-Dîn Rûmî, and a popular element which determines its language, style, form and rhythmic metre. It was through the mystical verses of Yûnus that there developed a tradition of writing poems in the language of the people and in the popular syllabic metre, which did not lose its power even in the periods when Persian influence was at its height. The mystics of the different orthodox and heterodox sects which are associated in Asia Minor in the following centuries wrote popular poetry in the style of Yûnus in order to exert an influence on the masses. Among the latter special mention may be made of the Bektaşî, Hurufî and Kütûfî-Bash poets who imitated Yûnus with great success.

In the xiii century we find a profane poetry beginning in Anatolia under the influence of Persian literature. It was encouraged by the luxurious life and freedom in the fullest sense of the word that prevailed among the upper classes. This movement became still stronger under the Mongols. It produced in the palaces of the Seldjûks a kind of profane poetry quite free from ascetic and didactic tendencies and inspired by Persian literature. The first representative of this school, the aims of which were purely artistic, is the poet Khâdîja Dâhânî. It is very probable that this branch of literature, which was practised among the eastern Turks as early as the xii century, had had representatives before him in Anatolia, for his poems were written in a perfectly perfect style and attained a high degree of perfection from the technical point of view. It is therefore a mistake for Turkish and European writers on the history of Ottoman literature to trace the development of Turkish profane poetry to the time of Bayázid Yildîrin at the earliest. Dâhânî, also wrote, by command of his sovereign, in the reign of 'Alî al-Dîn III a Şâhidîma of the Seldjûks, in Persian; he was a Turkoman of Kütûfî-Bash. From the dialectal point of view, this language shows all the peculiarities of the Oghuz dialect of Anatolia. A comparison between the works of Dâhânî and, for example, the Turkish works of his contemporary Sultan Weled, enables us to see with what success he could use the 'azrî metre. But nowhere in his works do we find any trace of mystic influence (cf. on Dâhânî my articles in Bayatî, Nô. 1 and 103).

It was natural that there should exist in this period in Anatolia among the masses and the nomadic tribes — just as was the case in the preceding centuries — a popular literature and that there should be bards of the people, whom the old Oghuz called evan. The latter, esogur in hand, went round the assemblies of the people, the nomads and the villages. They were also to be found in the armies of the Seldjûks. They recited and sang parts of the old Oghuz epics, like the stories of Dede Korkut. These products of the popular literature were, as a rule recited in the popular rhythm and in traditional forms going back to an ancient past. Sometimes the names of these forms show us ethnic origin like türkî (q. v.), turkâmî, waragîh; others, like ûzûma, dayâh, baya ûzî, reveal their popular character by their name or show that they were always accompanied by a melody. These popular poets usually employed the old Turkish musical instrument calledUXAM.

xivth Century.

We find the literary development begun in the xiiith century following the same lines in the xivth century. In spite of the political division of Asia Minor, the spread of Muslim and Turkish culture continued at the expense of the Armenians and Greeks. The Principality of the Ottomans founded at the western end of Anatolia reached the shores of the Sea of Marmara; towards the end of the century, it entirely subjugated a great part of Anatolia and reestablished the unity of the Turks once again; by its victories over Byzantium, the Serbs, the Bulgars and finally over the united forces of Europe at Nicopolis, it gave rise to a great and powerful empire.

A certain number of beys in Asia Minor had neither Persian or Arab culture, and this was the reason why the language of the people became important, why books were written in Turkish and also why a number of works were translated from Arabic and Persian into Turkish. Ibn Battuta gives some interesting notes on the importance of Turkish at the courts of the Turkoman beys and on poets writing in Turkish.

We know that books were written in Turkish in the xivth century at several centres like Konya, Nigde, Ladik, Kastamuni, Sinûbi, Siwân, Kîr-Shehir, Bursa and İranî. Many of the works of this period have been lost. On the other hand, the compilers of biographies of poets (nâserîn-ı şairvârîn), which begin to appear in the xivth century, give a very old period very little information and that for the most part inaccurate. The information we have been able to collect from the sources gives us the following works:

1. The İnandî Oğlulu in the region of Denizli and Ladik (1277—1365).

2. A Tâfitî on the Fatihî by an unknown author (manuscript in the library of the University of Stambül) and a Tâfitî on the Şirat al-Hâkitsî (MS. at Angora) very probably by the same author, written by command of Murâd Arslân Bey Ibn İnandî (d. before 763 A. H.). This dynasty had associations with the Mewlewîs and the author speaks very respectfully of Djalâl al-Dîn Rûmî.

3. We know also of a poet called Mûsarîf Ladîki who lived in this century at Ladik (Ibb. Mustafâ-zâf, p. 263) while Nakib Oğlulu, author of a story of Havan and Huvain in verse (Millet Kütükhînî, Nô. 1518), probably came from the same town. I think that Nakib Oğlulu Tâdî al-Dîn, mentioned in Elfit (Les Saints des Derwîches teuvânes, transl. Huart, ii. 329) as a contemporary of Čelebi Arîf (d. in 719), is the same person.

4. The Aidînî Oğlulu (1307—1403).

In the library of the Ulû Dînîî in Bursa (Nô. 21) there is a Fâtîma-i EvâƯîû of which the beginning is lost. From a complete manuscript recently acquired by the Maârîf Weckleiti we now know that the book was translated from the Arabic for Aidînî Oğlulu Meşîmî Bey (707—734 A. H.). The author's name is not known. Another work is a Kadîlî ve-Dînîvâ transl. by an author named Mûsadîr for the famous Umur Bey, son of Meşîmî Bey. This is dated before 734 A. H. (there is a MS. in the Bodleian among the Turkish manuscripts, Marsh. 180; another copy in the Lalêli library, Nô. 1897).

5. The Mentâşhî Oğlulu (1300—1435). Thanks to Hammer's publication (Falkenhorne),
we know a Bûnûmê translated from Persian by Maḥmûd b. Maḥmûd b. Sinan b. Muḥammad (in the Köprü Library, No. 253);
the Maḥmûna Wurûs wa-Gulshâh, written in 770 (1369) at Sişâv by the Mecmûwil Yûhsûf (in the Institute of Turcology);
the Maḥmûna entitled Hâkûyêt-i Kuvân wa-Sâmitûn, by 'Ali in my private library;
Tâshî, by Haydîli Pashâ (Pertsch, Dict. türk. Handwörterbuch, p. 97; there are many copies).

Maḥchakhsâb al-Shîfâ', written in 790 by Iṣâhâk b. Murâd (Pertsch, p. 99);
some ghanâs by 'Aflâkt, author of the Manûfût (Weled Çelebi, at the end of the Turkish verses of Sultan Weled);
translation in verse of Shahîl entitled Kâshî al-Mârûnî, written in 800 a.h. by Maḥmûd b. 'Aflâkt. Selmân al-Lâdîck and another work in verse on the Kurân by the same author (in my private library);
the Manûfût-nâmê written in 717 as well as a number of poems (Huq quwwatî, p. 378 sq.).
the Maḥmûna Siâshi al-Wuwa spoke written in 751 by Khâwâdî Mas'ûd and his nephew Iṣâ al-Dîn. Aḥmad (ed. J. H. Mordtmann, Hanover 1924);
translation of the Forâkûn-nâmê of Sa'dî, made in 735 a.h. by the same Khâwâdî Muhammad (Weled Çelebi, ed. Khâlîsh Rîfât, Stambul 1742; there is a manuscript in the Copenhagen Library; cf. on these two authors Köpr. Zade M. Fu'âd, Türkçî Müefnâncî, ii. 481–485).
A certain number of poems in eastern and western dialects were also written in the Mamûl empire, such as a Farâb-nâmê, a maṭnûna written in 789 at Tripoli in Syria by a poet named Kâmil Oghlu Isma'îl, a work which is in my private library.
We mention this work because it was also popular in Anatolia; 'Aflâkt Çelebi attributes it to Shahîl Oghlu and 'Ali to Aḥmad Dâ'î (cf. Gibb, Hist. Ott. Poetry, i. 256).
In a collection of poems entitled Maçuva al-Nâţirî composed in 840 a.h. by a poet named Umar b. Ma'ût (unique MS. in the University Library of Stambul), in the Dâmî al-Nâţirî written in 918 by Haydîli Kemalî of Egirdir and in some other collections we find the names of a great number of poets and books belonging to this century (cf. on these books and their bibliographical contents: Köpr. Zade M. Fu'âd, Millî Edebiyâtîlîcî Muhammedîler, 1928, p. 60–62).

The replacement of the Saldûş Sâltanî, who were much influenced by Persian culture, by simple Turkoman boys, knowing only their mother tongue, much encouraged the use of Turkish as a language of learning and of art. Many men of learning, şâhitdr, and poets to obtain the favour of the Turkoman boys and of the notables of their principalities — who were also equally uncultured — endeavoured to write books in Turkish and to translate into Turkish from Arabic and Persian. The princes themselves ordered the translation of religious and literary works which interested them. They began to translate into Turkish tafsîrs,

Ahmed b. Derișm, hâlifât of Menûma Sinân al-Dîn Aghshîrî (MS. in the Köprü Library, No. 253);
theological works, mystical works, legends of saints, books on medicine, books on hunting, books on the history of Islam and generally speaking the principal text-books used and esteemed in the madresses. As a result of the mystical movement and particularly of Mevlâvi mysticism, which was very influential in the palaces of the princes, we see in all these works the influence of Mevlâni and in part also of Sultan Walî. We can even say that in poetical works this influence was predominant and that many of the poets of this period were themselves Mevlâwis.

Prose literature in this period was mainly confined to didactic works. At the same time poetical literature assumed an extraordinary development; all kinds of works were composed from popular stories having a religious-epic character to works with a purely artistic ideal. The religious-epic stories show a considerable development in this period and include popular works describing the conquests and miracles of the Prophet and more especially the deeds of 'Ali. These works are written in the form of mağânûn and in a very simple style in the metre 'a-kûf-i bâsîn. 'Ali's historical character is usually lost in legend; supernatural events, demons, djinn, magical and miraculous elements give the work quite a fantastic character. Some of these epics, in which Muslim ideas predominate, are grouped round the personality of 'Abd al-Mâlik. Ibn Qâsim mentions as early as the end of the eleventh century the existence of a Hâsimî-nâmeh among the Turkomans of Syria (Minâhâl, al-Sunnah, iv. 12; cf. on the Hâsimî-nâmeh in Muslim literature: Köprülü Zâde M. Fuâd, Türkîcî Mevîl, i. 9). A third cycle of legends is that of 'Ali Muslim (cf. Köprülü Zâde M. Fuâd, Türkîcî Tarihî, i. 75). Among the heroic legends in which the influence of the Prophet is strong we may also mention the Bayrâm-nâmeh and the Dâîgânâmân-nâmeh.

Among the numerous works of this century based on Islamic ideas we may also mention the Carmen of Sîyâr, the works devoted to Fâtima, Hassan and Hussein, and the events of Kerbelâ, as well as the movâlûnu. Books dealing with the Prophet and the holy family were very popular in this Islamic milieu. There were in the palaces of the Mamlûks and even of Egypt men whose duty it was to recite to their books of Sîyâr. One of these was Darîr of Erzerûm, translator of the Fârîq al-Shâm of al-Wâkidî and author of a book of Sîyâr in Turkish, in verse and prose, written in the second half of the twelfth century and printed in 1786 (cf. Köprülü Zâde M. Fuâd, Füredi, Constantinople 1724, p. 97; 'Odânî, Muhiyyî, iii. 37; Rieu, Türkîcî MSS., p. 38). Its language belongs to the early period of the Âdîrî dialect — a period in which this eastern Oghuz dialect was not yet separated entirely from the western Oghuz dialect of Anatolia — but an account of the fame of the author in Anatolia we may mention him here. The language of this class of works was simple, easily understood and liked by the people. Authors even thought it unnecessary to mention their own names.

From the twelfth century we find the number of poets increasing, who wrote with purely artistic aims and took as their model classical Persian literature. Shaikh Ahmad Galâhshîrî of Kîr Shehri should be mentioned first of these, as much for his artistic merit as for his priority in time. He put into Turkish the Manzûk al-Ṭarih al-'Aţtar, expanding it with stories from various sources, notably the Manzûk of Kâmi, and with a number of other reflections relating to his own time. We also possess a number of isolated poems of his. Although a mystic, his literary aims were purely artistic. His Manzûk Karîmâtî Aţšî Ewurân, recently published by F. Tuschner (Ein Mezvïl Gâlâhshîrîs aus Aţšî Ewurân, 1930), which contains information about his life, is of no literary value. The fame of this great poet lasted down to the beginning of the sixteenth century but his reputation as a "great poet" disappeared after the sixteenth. In our têvberî his name is not found (two MSS. of his work are in the library of the Museum of Archaeology in Stambul). The town of Kîr Shehri produced other authors besides Khâdîja Galâhshîrî and seems to have been an important centre of culture; it also produced the well-known mystic poet Aşîkî Patxa (d. 737). His Qarîbî-nâmeh, written in 730, from the first attained great importance in Asia Minor and is found in many manuscripts. In our têvberî and chronicles Aşîkî Patxa is represented as a great mystic but as a poet he is a mere imitator of Mevlâni and Sultan Walî. His work is of a didactic character; as a poet he fell far below Galâhshîrî. The town of Kîr Shehri is not a number of detached îlâmîs in syllabic metre from the pen of Aşîkî Patxa, but they are far from showing the lyrical merit of Yûnus Ewurân (for the family of Aşîkî Patxa cf. the introduction to the edition of the Tarihî of Aşîkî Patxa Zâde by 'Ali Bey; on the influence which he has retained until recent years as a holy man cf. the article by V. Gordewski, Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Sciences de U. R. S. S., 1927, i. 25—28; on the language of Aşîkî Patxa see the researches of Brockelmann, Z. d. M. G., 1919, lxiii., p. 1—29).

The literary influence of Yûnus Ewurân is not confined to the mystic poems of Aşîkî Patxa. Many derivations composed îlâmî in the popular language and in syllabic metre: the most celebrated of them are Sâ'îd Ewurân and Kağûnush Abadî. Sâ'îd Ewurân was a pupil of the celebrated Khâdîja Sultân, one of the Khâlûs of Hâshîdî Bektaşi, and lived in the early years of the sixteenth century; he wrote a contemporary of Yûnus, Abadî, a number of poems of Sâ'îd Ewurân in the 'arîdî metre and in nezûrî on the Gâlînâmân of Abîdûlrahman, one of the disciples of Sâ'îd Ewurân (cf. Köprülü Zâde M. Fuâd, Ezvî, 1927, Nî. 43). Kağûnush Abadî, khâlîfâ of the Bektaşi dervîsh Abadî Mu'tâ, displays in his work a true lyric feeling, a deep sincerity and purity and a still freer and more vigorous command of language than that of Yûnus. The influence of Kağûnûh was very great in the development of the vast Bektaşi poetry in the following centuries (cf. Mütevâvîfî, p. 376).

In the second half of this century we find classical mystic poetry attaining high perfection in Nîsiîntî, equally famous in eastern and western Anatolia. His dialect connects him with the Adîrî group but on account of his great reputation in Asia Minor he belongs to the literature of this region. Nîsiîntî was one of the chief khâlûs of Fağlî Hârûlî, founder of the Hûrûfî sect (on the history of this sect, cf. Köprülü Zâde M. Fuâd, Anadolu'da İslâmîyet, Edîh, Fak. Mevîl, lii. 6, p. 464; on the sect itself cf. ûrîvî, Nîsiîntî plays a great part in the development of the Hûrûfî sect in Anatolia, and in 807 he was killed alive in Aleppo (on the date of his death, incorrectly given in all the sources, cf. Köprülü Zâde M. Fuâd, Ezvî, 1927,}
He was a great poet whose mystic lyrics are most impressive. His style is simple but full of power and harmony. Few poets have equaled him in the science and passionate expression of mystical love. Yet he observes all the rules of poetical style and uses classical forms with success. In his Divan we find hay'as, a form peculiar to Persian poetry and foreign to Persian literature (cf. on this form of poetry Köprülü Zade M. Fu'âd, Turkish Melimûdar, ii. 219-243).

In the fourteenth century also the subjects of romance and fables were taken from Persian literature, like the prose translation of Kultur ne-Dinîya [q.v.] by Mas'ûd, with verses intermingled, and the verse translation of the same work made for Marâdî I. The story of Sultan u-Newebahâr, however, written in verse by Mas'ûd b. Ahmad and his nephew 1Fax al-Dîn has more considerable literary value. This methbûne translated from an otherwise unknown Persian work is not, we believe, simply a translation but rather an expanded adaptation. Instead of the metre / unwr \(\text{v}c\)/ almost regularly employed in the methbûnîs of this period, we have the metre / unwr \(\text{v}c\)/ and here and there through it ghâses written in different metres. The eclectric translation of the Burûqan by Khwâdia Mas'ûd b. Ahmad is of much lesser literary value.

After Khwâdia Mas'ûd, Shâh Shâh Ogâlî Muştâfâ (born in 741) acquired the greatest reputation as a romantic poet. He was a pupil of Khwâdia Mas'ûd, and finished his Khurshd-nâmê in 789 (1387). Belonging to an influential family of Germâniyân, this poet was at first in the service of the Bey of Germâniyân, Sultanâmahâh, as mîkhâfî and defender; later he was in the suite of Bayrâzî Yildîrîm to whom he presented a second version of his Khurshd-nâmê [cf. on him and his Khurshd-nâmê the article SHAKEH-ŽDE]. We do not have a complete Divan of Shâh Shâh Ogâlî, but many of his poems are to be found in early mîkhâfîs. He has also left a work in prose entitled Kaws al-Kurârî. He finished it in 803 and dedicated it to Pasha âgha b. Khvâdia Pasha, an influential personage of this period (unique MS. in Kôprî, Zade M. Fu'âd's library). This work is occasionally embellished with passages in verse and also contains fragments of Yûsuf Meddûsh. Khâsî, Dâshkânî, Gûlshâhî, Khvâdia Mas'ûd and Elîwân Cîlê (cf. above; Khâsî is the only one of whom we know nothing). It is a kind of Sûyûk-nâmê and in this connection it is interesting for our knowledge of the social life of the period.

Alymedî [q.v.] must be regarded as the greatest poet of this period, with the exception of Nesmî. He is the author of the Ishandar-nâmê. This work, finished in 792 (1390), has always been famous and exists in numerous MSS. It has been studied in detail by Joseph Thury (Türkîc Nyelvelmekk a XIV. század végéig, Budapest 1903) and was later studied from the philological point of view by Broekelmann (Z.D.M.G., xxviii., i/2, 1919). The manuscripts of the Ishandar-nâmê show great differences. Alymedî took the subject of his work from a very common one in eastern and western literature — from Persian sources, but he added a long section dealing with the history of Asia Minor and especially with the 'Erfanîn princes. For this reason we may look upon him as the author of the first Turkish chronicle in verse. The Divan of Alymedî is undoubtedly more interesting from the artistic point of view. Among these poems, there are some which have a local interest from the description of the town of Bursa and the attacks on its inhabitants. In the works of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries we find evidence of his great reputation and many of his poems of this period were wrote on him. We know that the Ishandar-nâmê was read and admired in these days in Aytarûddîn, in Khurshdî and in Transoxiana, and that the poet Shâhâbî Khân, founder of the Shâhâbî dynasty, much appreciated it.

To complete the general picture of the sixteenth century we must mention Kâddî Burhân al-Dîn, although his works show the peculiarities of the A'dhari dialect. Kâddî Burhân al-Dîn belonged to the tribe of the Selûr and was sultan of Selûr; his stirring political life is well known (545-581 a.h. [cf. the article on him]). Besides important works in Arabic on jurisprudence and some Arabic and Persian poems, according to the historian Shâhîn, he left a Divan in Turkish, containing ghâses, rûqâs and tuwâraks. Although his language lacks refinement and correctness, the poems of Burhân al-Dîn have a note of sincerity and passion of their own.

It is evident from what we have said that Turkish literature developed greatly in the sixteenth century and that Turkish was successfully making its way against Arabic, the language of religion, and Persian, the literary language. In following the Persian model, a classical Turkish literature laid solid foundations. Its progress had not yet reached its limits, for official documents in various districts were still written in Persian. In inscriptions, legal documents, wa'îf deeds, Arabic was employed. Works on law and theology were still written in Arabic and books on mysticism in Arabic and Persian. Nevertheless we can see Turkish gaining in importance in official business as is the case in some edicts of Murâd I (Kraueltz, T.O.E. M., xxviii. 242-242). Many authors and poets, while saying that Turkish is not yet sufficiently polished, felt, under the influence of the general trend, the need of writing in Turkish or rather translating into Turkish. They imitate and translate Persian poets like Firdawsî, Nişâmî, 'Ajîrân, Sâ'dî, Mowâsâî, Salmân Sâwâjî and Kânîl Khâdîjî. The language gradually becomes filled with Persian and Arabic elements. The grammars of these languages gave Turkish a certain number of rules, which tended to affect the independance and natural beauty of the language. Prosody and metres were also borrowed from Persian; but Turkish words were still very largely used and the domination of Arabic and Persian which is found in the following centuries is not yet felt.

xvi. Century.

The invasion of Timür in the early years of this century retarded for a brief period the evolution of the Ottoman state in Asia Minor; on the other hand, it strengthened Turkish culture in Rûm-îlî, to which many educated Muslims migrated at this period.

The advance of Islam and Turkish culture continued throughout this century with increasing force, notably through the application of the demshîrîs. The progress was most marked in Rûm-îlî; on the turkisation of southern Anatolia we have the evidence of Bertrand de la Broquière (Le voyage d'Outremer, publ. by Ch. Scheler, Paris
1892, p. 100, 101). The earliest work written in Rüm-li is a poem on the death of Elżma written in 805 (1400) by Kahlil, imam of the mosque of Kafa Bala in Adrianople, which is in no way distinguishable from popular works of this kind of the sixteenth century (the only known MS. is in my private library).

At the same time Turkish increased in importance as a literary and official language. The only inscription of the Selçuk Yezid II of 814 (1411) is the first Turkish inscription of this kind (Kahlil Edhem, T.O.E.M., i. 116). There is a Turkish epitaph in verse of 843 (1439) at Angora and another rhymed inscription at Brusa composed by the poet Iqanadin in 570 (1465). All the official documents of the first period of the reign of Sulaymân al-Dîn are in Turkish (Ahmad Reşîf, T.O.E.M., index) and also a certain number of edicts (Arşâms) of this century, the earliest of which is dated 800 (1455) (V. von Kunelitz, Osmanische Urkunden in türkischer Sprache, Vienna 1924).

We also know from a work written in 828 (1425) by Dewtul of the Yezid of Balkh, that Turkish was used in the mosques, which can also assume with considerable probability for the sixteenth century. In official correspondence with other Muslims, Christian states and in lands inhabited by non-Turkish peoples, other languages continued to be used. The historian Kutbodî mentions a Greek secretary of Mehemî II.

In the first half of the sixteenth century there were three great princely families who were patrons of scholars and poets; the Karaman Oğlu at Konya, the Đjamâr Oğlu at Kastamonu and the Ottoman princes at Adrianople and Brusa. In this century Fâkhîzâd, Khâlija Fâhîz Karamanî, Hânum and Nâqiûn belong to the large Oğlu circle. Nâqiûn may be regarded as the rival of Ahmed Paşa of Rûmi. At the court of the Djâlam Oğlu were Mu'inîn b. Mûkîbî, an Andalusi, author of the medical work entitled Mifûd al-nûr wa-khamsa wa-ṣûrah (Bibl. Nat., Anc. Fonds, Turc, No. 172), and the unknown author of a commentary on the Kurân entitled Qâsidat al-madh (Cl. Haют, Un commentaire du Coran en dialecte turc de Costamomani, J. A., 1921, p. 201-216) which exists in several copies. It is wrong to regard this language as the dialect of Kastamonu. Isma'îl Beg, a member of this dynasty who reigned from 1443 to 1457, was a religious work in Turkish entitled Huṣn al-nûr wa-sûrat al-ṣûrah (cf. Rûmi, Cat. of Turk. MSS, p. 11). This same Isma'îl (on him of the translation of the Şãdârî, p. 121, 122, 139) had a book on şââdat written for him in Turkey by a certain Umâr b. Ahmed (MS. in the Miller Kütüphanesi at Constantinople). He also had a translation made of the Kişmîyi-ye Şatîde (in my private library).

The poets of the court of the Oğlu were Mehemî Şâhî, the servâr of Kastamonu; Hamdî, Kahlil, Thâmî and Dâvût were at the court of Lezîmî Bây (the two latter were later at the court of the Ottoman). There is also a Kahlil Bây al-Tûbi in Turkish, dedicated to Kâsim Bây (cf. Kahlil al-Tûbi of the same dynasty. Rustem Bây, son of the latter, composed a Divân). In the sixteenth century, the three Schönberg Pachas and Umûr belonged to this dynasty.

But the greatest literary development is found under the Ottomans. Poets like Ahmedî and Ahmed Şâh composed legal and official documents (Bibl. Nat., Anc. Fonds, Turc, No. 104) and a mehemî called Ti̇b-e-nâmê begun in 806 (1459) by a poet named Mehemî; this poem is an adaptation of a Hânedân amârînî in eastern Turkish and shows several remarkable features (Bibl. Nat., Suppl. Turc, No. 86). We also have a Rûmîye-nâmê, a theological work written in 809 (1462) by Hâkim b. Yûsûfî (Bibl. Nat., Suppl. Turc, No. 499). The following also belong to this period: a Qâsidat al-madh, a theological work written in 811 (1407) by Vâli el-Dîn, also a Turc (cf. Fûlîcîzâd, Ed. Littér.), a medical translation of the Muâmmârî Tâhirî's books, in 812 (1409) by Ahmed Oğlu (Tâlâm, Mehdî, ii. 194) and the Muâmmârî of Kastamonu (dated in 812 [1418]; cf. Osmanî, M. al-madfrîl, l. 1442).

It was Murad II who did most for the development of the Turkish language and literature. His court was the centre of scholars, poets and also musicians, for example he had a treatise on music composed by a certain Khîdî, "Abd Allâh (a MS. in the Bibl. Nat., Anc. Fonds, Turc, No. 150; another at Berlin); another author of this period, who wrote two works on music is Ahmed Oğlu Shânzâdî (cf. Al-Qâsim, Encyclopédie de l'islam, p. 997-98). The poets of this period: Iqanadin, Şâhî or Rûmî, Hâlimûn, Hamdî, Hamîd, Sâhoûnî, Khâlîfûn, Nûdîmûn, Nâzîlî and Dâvût. The names are found in the earlier registers. We have here the names of many poets, writers and translators whose works have not survived, like the Fâhîzâd Hânsâdî of the Oğlu, the translation of al-Ṭâhirî Tâhirî al-Šâfîî of Mehemî b. Umâr al-Hâfizî (Rûmi, Cat., p. 224; H. Vâmhârî, Byzantinische Sprachkritik, London 1919), the translation of the Koûnmîyi-ye Şatîde of the same author (in the library of Köprü Zâde M. Feridî), the translation of the Koûnmîyi-ye Maûlânî by Mehemî Akhmed, in 835 (1431; Bibl. Nat., Suppl. Turc, No. 530; Rûmi, p. 116; Persîd, Cat. der türk. Lit. in Berlin, p. 376), the translation of the Muâmmârî Tâhirî by Khâsim el-Mahmûd Kâramîlî, the translation of the Muâmmârî el-Mahmûdî by Muâmmârî b. Shânîzâdî, (Nîlî, Othmanîye, No. 999-90), the translation of the Muâmmârî of the Bây, made in 840 (1444) by Dewtul Oğlu Yûsuf (several manuscripts), the translation of the Koûnmîyi-ye Şatîde el-Mehmûdî el-Shânîzâdî in 840 (1446); an anonymous translation of the Muâmmârî of el-Djâlam b. Rûmî, made in 840 (1447); an anonymous translation of the Muâmmârî of el-Djâlam b. Rûmî (MS. at Cambridge); an anonymous translation of the Muâmmârî of the Bây, (MS. in Umpa); a Turkish commentary on the Kurân in the library of the Museum at Konya with interlinear translation; a Fâhîzî-ye-ye Naâmî presented in 829 (1426) by Khâlim Oğlu (cf. Türk. Mehdî, ii. 489-495); a Koûnmîyi-ye-ye Naâmî translated from the Persian in 833 (1430) by Humî el-Ahchî, the translator of the Koûnmîyi-ye Naâmî, translated from the Persian by Muâmmârî b. Mamûl (Bibl. Nat., Fâhîzî el-Âli Pachas, No. 283); a Koûnmîyi-ye-ye Naâmî of the Bây, by Shânîzâdî el-Safî; a translation of the Muâmmârî of the Bây, (MS. in Umpa); a Turkish commentary on the Kurân in the library of the Museum at Konya with interlinear translation; a Fâhîzî-ye-ye Naâmî presented in 829 (1426) by Khâlim Oğlu (cf. Türk. Mehdî, ii. 489-495); a Koûnmîyi-ye-ye Naâmî translated from the Persian in 833 (1430) by Humî el-Ahchî, the translator of the Koûnmîyi-ye Naâmî, translated from the Persian by Muâmmârî b. Mamûl (Bibl. Nat., Fâhîzî el-Âli Pachas, No. 283); a Koûnmîyi-ye-ye Naâmî of the Bây, by Shânîzâdî el-Safî; a translation of the Muâmmârî of the Bây, (MS. in Umpa); a Turkish commentary on the Kurân in the library of the Museum at Konya with interlinear translation; a Fâhîzî-ye-ye Naâmî presented in 829 (1426) by Khâlim Oğlu (cf. Türk. Mehdî, ii. 489-495); a Koûnmîyi-ye-ye Naâmî translated from the Persian in 833 (1430) by Humî el-Ahchî, the translator of the Koûnmîyi-ye Naâmî, translated from the Persian by Muâmmârî b. Mamûl (Bibl. Nat., Fâhîzî el-Âli Pachas, No. 283); a Koûnmîyi-ye-ye Naâmî of the Bây, by Shânîzâdî el-Safî; a translation of the Muâmmârî of the Bây, (MS. in Umpa); a Turkish commentary on the Kurân in the library of the Museum at Konya with interlinear translation; a Fâhîzî-ye-ye Naâmî presented in 829 (1426) by Khâlim Oğlu (cf. Türk. Mehdî, ii. 489-495);
Turks of Kazaan and the Bashkirs (cf. Kiviya Celbi, Stjbaa-nâme, vii, 822). This great poem is written in several metres in somewhat heavy language; the subject is taken from the best books of riyâr; it also betrays mystic obscurantism while retaining an essential orthodox system of ideas. The literary influence of this poem has been enormous and there are several editions printed at Constantinople and Kazan (cf. also A. Ams and 'Ali Rahim, Tatar Edebiati Türk, voi. i, part 2, p. 165—177).

One of the most remarkable mystical poets of this period is Kemaâl Ummî. He was a darvish of the Khalwets and his works reveal him as a true poet; his influence extended as far as the Turks of Kazaan, the Bashkirs and Osbeke. 'Abd Allâh b. Eshref b. Mejmûd (d. 1474—1486), founder of the Eshrefiyâ divinity of the mystical order of the Bahrâmiyya and known as Eshref Ughî, is equally famous. He is the author of a work entitled Musâl al-Nâfish and of a Dârâta.

The appearance of the great mystics and the foundation of new orders created a regular Turkish hagiography consisting of collections of legends of saints like Etmâl Sultan, Eshref Ughî and later, 'Hâjjî Bekîkhî, Kâhinbâm and 'Othîna, Baba. This literature is of great value from the sociological point of view; it becomes especially abundant from the xvith century.

Hürîfî literature, which began with Nesîmî, was continued by his pupil Râfi'î, who wrote in 812 (1409) his Bâchâr-nâme, by Farâshîbî Ughî (d. 854 =1489), author of an 'Eshref-nâme, and by Wîrânî, his biographer. Hürîfî propaganda even reached the court of Mejmûd II, and under Bayâsit II these heterodox thinkers were violently persecuted. Nevertheless Hürîfî poems were numerous in the xviith and xvith centuries; Tâcnamâtî of Kazîcî, Hâsun Kanî of Kara Feyva, Huseînî, Uşîfî of Yemîndî Paydar, Nebâtî, Tarîzî of Baghdad, Wahîdettî of Homsî, Penâtî of Tabriz and Mubîî. In the region in which the Arabic dialect was spoken we find among the members of this sect Shah Ismâ'îl Şaffî (cf. Etnaî), Laâlkârî, Tîfî and Habîbî, who later came to Constantinople.

To turn to the non-religious literature, the earliest representative is Abd Dâ'î, a poet who lived at the court of the Germiyân Ughî and of the 'Osmânil. In addition to some translations, we possess by him an Arabic-Persian-Turkish dictionary, the Uşâf al-Därâî'î. As a poet he imitates with great success Persians like Salâmî Siwâdi and Kamât Khudîwâdi. He did not however exercise any notable influence on the poetry of his time.

The most important poet of this period next to Ašmâdî and Nesîmî was Şâhîbî. He was the author of Dâshîbî and was patronised by the Sultan Mejmûd I and Mu'mîd II. His real name was Sinâm Germiyân but the date of his life as transmitted are in part contradictory (cf. Etnaî). The date of his death is unknown but must be after 832 (1429). He was buried at Dau'al Timur near Kâshâya (Kiviya Celbi, vol. i, x.). Sheikhî must be considered a great poet. His translation of the Kâhirîn-nâme which he dedicated to Mu'mîd II is a masterpiece of satire (cf. Küprî, Zâhibî M., in Yeqî Mejmûfî, 1917, No. 13). The influence of this poet remained great down to the xvith century. Poets like Nefîdî and
Khayat mention him with veneration so that he merits the title of Şahîk al-Shu’arâ’î. He was also respected in religious circles and even among the Turks of Egypt (Ibn Taghitri, ed. Popper, ii. 345, 29).

Next to Sheikh Tawfiq; of Brusa who possesses a Divan. His real name was Akhî Celebi and his epithet at Brusa is dated 841 (1437-1438). This poet was clearly influenced by Khayat but there is a pessimistic note in his poems. It was he who was the first to make use of proverbs in the şeâde. Another remarkable figure of this period is the painter Şâti of Brusa. His Divan contains şâde verses dedicated to Murad II, to the vizier Khaâtâ Paşa and other great personages. The biographer Sehit gives a few details of his life.

Other poets of the same period are Üluf of Brusa, İsmail bin of İnstî, author of a metahe: Bozâme (Bibl. Nat., Anc. fonsa turo, No. 304), dedicated to Khaâtâ Paşa, Ağâmed Rûmî of Gallipoli, Bahâ Nâdîmî, the poet of the Bektashis, Da’âr-i Şâh of Gallipoli, who described in verse the wars of Murad II. We may also mention Dîmâlî, who dedicated his books to Mehmed II and Bayzid II; all the sources confuse this Dâmarî with the poet Şâhiç Oğlu Mustafa of the viith century [cf. also the article ŞEHÎK-ŞÛGÂL]. Dâmarî wrote in 850 (1446) a metahe entitled Gûlhezân Ustâhâr for Murad II and another based on Hamûn, a Wonders for Mehmed II as well as a third called Mişâh al-Parâfâ (Pértsch, Kat. d. türk. Hst., su Brusa, p. 371). There is also a poem by him on the art of letters entitled al-Riśâla el-şâqîya fi l-Sûbâhîna l-Subâ’dâ (Ibrowned, Cat. of MSS. in Cambridge, 1900, p. 85). Şâfiî praises this poet. He also wrote several inscriptions in verse for buildings in Brusa (T.O.E.M., No. xxv).

The period of Fatih Mehmed II and Bayzid II, themselves poets, is marked by a great development in the language and literature of the Ottomans. After the disappearance of the Turkmen dynasties in Asia Minor, the court and entreague of the 12th century was only a refuge of poets and scholars. The great conquests carried Ottoman influence to the Crimea and the isles of the Aegean; they were accompanied by an increased movement for the spread of Turkish and Muslim culture. At the same time the economic prosperity of the empire reached a great height, while the legislation of Mehmed II adapted itself to the needs of the period. The medrese and the tehr and especially the heterodox mystic orders like the Bektashis contributed much to the spread of Islam; for the extent of the empire by continual translations of the bodies and subject of its subjects.

Mehmed II and his grand vizier Mahmut Paşa granted considerable pensions to poets and men of learning. Poets and musicians like Neđîmî, Fentî, Nurî, Fâlki, Khâfî, Da’î, Du’ârî, Kêdî, Kâtîbî, Naßerî, Wâbî and others received great rewards for their labours. Mehmed Melîbî, Birârâ Ahmed Paşa and others were continually with Mehmed II. Hayâtî, Şârîjâ Kumî and Enver enjoyed the special patronage of Mahmut Paşa. To the entourage of prince Dîâm belonged Şahî, Şahî, Muhammed Paşa, and others of his time. The vizier of the prince Bayzid II and his son kept up this tradition. In the period of Bayzid II over 30 poets were receiving allowances from the treasury. As the literary and learned activities of the second half of the xvth century are sufficiently well-known from various sources, we shall confine ourselves here to giving a general survey of the various forms cultivated and their most notable representatives.

The greatest poet of the period of Mehmed II was Ahmed Paşa (q.v.) of Brusa; although influenced by Nâsîrî, Şâfiî, 1’Âyi, and his master Melîbî (cf. Yebî Mejdînî, 1918, No. 31) he surpassed his contemporaries in the şeâde especially in the şâde. Next to Sheikh Tawfiq; he may be regarded as the greatest figure in Turkish poetry. His influence is obvious on the poets of his time: Şemîr, İtarî, Kandî, Wâbî, Nâdîmî of Konya, Şâtî (the vizier Di’Serî) Khânî Haşînî and Sohâmî Dîmî, and is felt even in İnşâtî, Fâtî and down to the xvth century. Like the other poets of his age, he was also under the influence of Persian poetry, which was majestically used as a reproach against him by some authors of şeâde verse like Di’Serî Celebi and Şâtî. On the other hand, the very widespread opinion (which we find for the first time in the Şeâdeh of Hasan Celebi) that Ahmed Paşa began his poetical career by making naşîrs on some poems of Newîlî is quite erroneous (cf. Türk Yurdu, 1927, No. 27). Ahmed Paşa collected and arranged his Divan under Bayzid II. In it we have satires, şeâde and notably very fine şûgâl.

Next to him the greatest poet of the xvth century is Neđîmî, particularly known for his şeâdeh and his şeâdeh. He owes his reputation notably to his frequent use of proverbs in his poems. His style, which calls him the Khraraw of Rûm and all writers regard him as the greatest Ottoman poet after Ahmed Paşa (cf. also Persch, Kat. d. türk. Hst., su Gotba, No. 168). His fame spread beyond the bounds of the empire. The influence of Neđîmî is traced in Sunî, Ta’rî, Şahît, Râbihet, Zebî, of Uskub, Şâtî of Fâlî, Şâtî, Korbî of İnşâtî, Wâbî, Wâbî and Newîlî, poets of the xvth and xviith centuries, and also in poets of his own time like Mihrî. Many composed naşîrs on his works and some of them like Wâbî of Tokat have an almost religious reverence for him.

Along with Neđîmî should be mentioned his contemporary Mestî (q.v.) famous for his Divan and his Şeâdeh-şeâdeh: his work reflects more of the life of his milieu. He also had some influence on Birî.

The metahe, which came into vogue in the xviith century, became very popular in this period. Among mystical works we may mention the Gûlhezân Ustâhâr of İbrahim Tanûrî (d. 887 = 1482), Khâtîjî of Shaikh Shenî al-Dîn, the Wûtâm-nâmeh of Abû al-Rahîm of Kara Hâşî (written in 865 = 1460), cf. Persch, Die türk. Hst. su Berlin, No. 375-376), the Mektebî of Rûstem-i Efînî of Ahdîn, a famous Sheikh of the Khalwettîyâ, d. at Tabriz in 912 (1487), the Fâlî-nâmeh, written in 876 (1471) by İnşâtî of Dîyâr Bektî [cf. Khallî]. The romantic subjects of these poems were taken from Persian literature; the best known are the Yebî-nâmeh of Âk Shenî al-Dîn, Zâde Hâmi [cf. Hâmi], the Khârûn-nâmeh of Ahi (on him cf. Yebî Mejdînî, 1918, No. 54), the Şeâdeh-nâmeh of Rewâîî and particularly the Rûmân-nâmeh, written in 899 (1493) by Di’Serî Celebi (q.v.). This last work is entirely original.
and the author shows himself a distinguished poet in whom imagination gains over sentiment. Towards the end of this century, the subjects of the Khamsa were also very popular. Nišāmī's Khamsa was several times translated.

A certain number of chronicles in verse also belong to this period. There is a mevlevi in 11,000 baits on the exploits of Kemal Reis, composed by Șafaii of Siouab, a poet skilled in military matters who lived in his têkke at Galata; also a mevlevi in 15,000 baits by Şahbayi of Edirne on the conquests of Sûleyman Pasha in Bosnia; a rhymed chronicle dedicated by Şarl Kemal to Bâyazid II entitled Selçûk-nâme; a Divân-nâme written in 869 (1466) for Mahmûd Pasha by Esmâwî; and Īni, mainly important for the history of the Ağal oglu (Turk Turkish Enğin paper, No. 15); lastly a chronicle in 15,000 baits on the conquests of Miḥâl Qâhlîn 'Ali Beg by Sûleyman Pasha. We may also mention the Kâtûb-nâme, dedicated to Bâyazid II, in which the poet Uxun Fırdawî describes the taking of the island of Midilli, and which is a valuable historical source. The same poet acquired fame from other works like the Silâhâr-nâme and the Sâlanâme-nâme.

Dervish developed considerably in this period. It was mainly an artistic prose that was cultivated; its most brilliant representative was Şînâ Pâsha [q.v.], author of the Taşâveri-nâme, as well as of a Kâtûb-leghî and a Taşâveri-Evelîk. The former is interpolated with poetry; he shows power as a writer of religious lyrics. His style is the same in the famous treatise by 'Abd Allâh Anârî, i.e. artistically elaborated yet natural and sincere. The principal representatives of artistic prose in this period are Şarî Kemâl, who translated the Turâkîh Mûlîâzîm; Ahi who adapted to Turkish the Hzüm-u Dil of Fethî Nâbiî; Meshtî, author of the Gûlu-pâble and Dîjîâtî Mehmedî. Other great stylists (mûnüllî) were the grand vizier Mâhîmûd Pâsha who wrote under the mehfeh of 'Adeî; the naghâmî Mehmed Pâsha (mehfehî: Nishkî) and Târsu Beg, known as Yâzîdî.

The writing of history in prose also began to develop, Turkish taking the place of Arabic and Persian. In the time of Bâyazid II we find many specimens of the anonymous Tâvârik-kî-Atî 'Oghânî-nâme, the prose of which is intermingled with poems taken from the İskandar-nâme of Ahmedî; they show us that there existed in the xvth century among the people and especially the soldiers, chronicles which were almost of the nature of epic. The historical works of Dervish, Ahmedî 'Ahiî, known as 'Ahiî Pâsha-žade and of Ürûqî-Beg do not differ much in point of style from the anonymous chronicles. The chronicles of Kâtîb Shewkî, Behîtî and Neshît belong to the same period. Works like the Turâkîh Abû 'U-l-Fâhî of Târsu Beg [q.v.] and the Lîmâ-yînî-îfâmî style of Bâyîtî, on the other hand, were written for the upper classes of society and are very different from these other chronicles. The work of Yâzîdî 'Ali, who wrote in the time of Murûd II a Selçûk-nâme, which contains among other things a synopsis of Rawendi and a translation of Ibn Bûlî is in a way a model for this second class of historiography. Several of these historical works, like that of Târsu Beg and the İsmâ'ilî Fêk-nâme of Dîjîfîrî Chelbi were written rather with the object of displaying a particular style and extensive literary ability, which has had a regrettable effect on some of the literary works in prose.

A fine specimen in unaffected prose of this period is the treatise by Dervîshî Lûtî which is one of the oldest works of humour (mênavî) in Turkish (publ. by O. Resche, Orientiâlistische Mecmillen, ii., 1926, p. 40–43; on the life of the author cf. Hayâtî, 1928, No. 100).

In this period we have also a number of works in the Turkish of Anatolia which were composed in Egypt and Syria. In Egypt the Circassian Makmîlî were Turkish by language and culture and under their régime works were composed in Eastern and Anatolian Turkish. To the latter category belongs the translation of Kâtûbî by the historian 'Aînî [q.v.]. Other works are: a Hâkem-nâme in verse written in 983 (1588) by İbrahîm b. Bâyîî, who dedicated it to Kâtîb Bâyîî; the Turkish poems of Kâşî İcčîîî, a translation of the İskandarînî written in 903 (1597) by a poet named Şerîf for Kânâmî İĉîîî (manuscript in the British Museum, at Upsala, Lenaqrad, in the library of İbrahîm Pasha in New-Şahrîî and in the Miller Kutübîkhânè in Constantinople). There is also a translation into Anatolian Turkish from the Eastern Turkish of 'Îkbîî Gûlâdî, by the hand of Mehmed b. Bâyîî, who is perhaps the same as the Ibrahim b. Bâyîî already mentioned. We also have a letter in Turkish written by Kânâmî to Selçûk I (publ. by Khâltî Edemî, in T. T. E. M., 1928, No. 19).

We thus see that Persian influence in Turkish prose and poetry had increased considerably in the xvth century, even to the extent of becoming a fashion. Mehmed II even had the Anatolian poet Şeyhcî write for him in Persian a İskandarînî of the 'Oğlanîînî and Bâyazid II also ordered the history of İdrîs Bîlitî to be written in Persian. Scholars and poets who belonged to Mesopotamia, Ajjharbâdîn, Persia and Kûrâkân visited the Ottoman court and were treated with honour and given handsome presents, which even caused Turkish poets to complain. A remarkable figure among the poets who came from the east is Hâmîdî (born in 834 = 1430) whose Dînâhî contains Turkish and Persian poems. He himself was of Turkish origin. After having lived at the court of İsmâ'il Beg of Kastanî, he enjoyed the favour of Mehmed II from 864 (1459). His İsmâîlîn is of considerable interest for the history of the period.

The court of Mehmed II and Bâyazid II was in very friendly relations with the court of Herât and with other Oriental courts, and the cultural and literary bonds which connected the Ottoman empire with the Muslim lands of the east and especially with Turkish lands remained close. Mehmed II and Bâyazid II as well as Mâhîmûd Pâsha had relations with poets like Khawâjî-i Dîjîhân, Dîjîâfî and Dîjîâlî-al-Dîn Rûmi (cf. e. g. Browne, A Literary History of Persia, iii, 422–423). In the same way the eastern poet 'Ali Shurî Newâîî was famous throughout Turkey at the end of this century. The persistence of the old Turkish tradition in the xvth century is further proved by the fact that the Uighur characters had not been entirely forgotten; there is in the Miller Kutübîkhânè a little work prepared to teach these letters to Bâyazid II as well as a copy of the Hâfîz al-Haşîîîîî, written in Uighur characters. Towards
the end of the century there was actually a reaction against the excessive use of Arab and Persian words and phrases. They tried to write poems in the *arzish* metre, while avoiding foreign words and expressions; one representative of the movement, called Türk-i Basit, is the poet Wiyâlî.

The literature of the people, of which the vehicles were the *esnâm* continued in this century as in the preceding ones and was still appreciated at the courts although the *esnâm* had become poor musicians alongside of the great "classical" poets. They retained their popularity however among the people. We know of the existence of *giab-lu* also called *zâhîn-tâlwâs* and *mehmîd* [cf. *Hikayâ*, *Kayâs* and *mehmâd*]. They used to recite the old Muslim epics and were beginning to borrow their subjects from the everyday life of their neighbourhood; the latter provided a coreness which separated them still further from the classical poetry. We have no longer any work of the popular literature of the period. We may presume that the theatre of Kârâ Gîz also developed in this century [cf. *Şaîr Gûz* and *Khâyâl-i Şüll*].

**xvith century.**

The xvith century is the period of the apogee of Ottoman might, in which the empire attained its greatest power in the reigns of Selim I and Süleyman the Magnificent. This was reflected also in the sphere of language and literature, which were fostered by the great centres of culture which had grown up with the foundation of schools, colleges, and universities. As Rûmî received the particular attention of the government, it is here that we find many poets appearing. It was also at this period that the Turkish language and the Greek and Slav languages had most influence on one another. By the conquests in the east, the Aqhafr dialect was predominant, the poets of these regions were led to use the Ottoman dialect. The Crimean also gradually returned to the fold of Turkish culture: it began to produce Ottoman poets among whom were several of the Khâns themselves (cf. *Ith Müttepostier*, p. 197). The same influence reached the Dere-beys in Kûrûfân. The intellectual classes of the non-Turkish populations were forced to learn Turkish and on the other hand, Stambul attracted learned men and poets from other Turkish and Muslim lands.

All the sultans and princes of the dynasty of *Qâshân* were patrons of art and learning and their viziers followed their example. Selim I [q.v.] wrote, in addition to a Persian *Divân*, poems in Ottoman Turkish and in *Câghâti*. Süleyman [q.v.] wrote poetry under the *mehmân* of Muhabîbi and from the very first recognised the extraordinary talent of the poet Bâkî. The grand vizier İbrahim Pasha, himself a poet, was the special patron of the poets *Khâyâl*, Lâmi and Râmi. Under Selim II, Murad III and Mehmed III, the same tendencies prevailed so that, in this century, Anatolian Turkish became a great vehicle of art and learning.

The influence of the Persian poet Dâmi and of the Eastern Turkish poet Newî, as made itself felt very markedly in the xvith century: many of their poems were translated into Ottoman Turkish. The poet Lâmi is sometimes called the *Bâkî* of Türk, on account of his translations. On the other hand, it became fashionable to write poems in *Câghâti*. Poets from the east like *Djâmî*, (his Câghâti *Divân*, containing only *mehmân* on Newî, is in the Museum of Top Kapû, No. 753) did much to spread the glory of Newî. Many Adhar poets sought refuge at the court of the Ottoman sultans: the most famous among them were *Tâhirî*, who left the court of Shah Ismaîl, and *Hâfiz* who had been a member of the court of the Ak-Koyunlu Sultan Ya'qub and of the Şâfa'i Ismaîl. Hâfiz was a precursor of Fuzûlî (cf. on Hâfiz: Köpr. *Zade* Fuzulî, *Akbâr Edebiyyatîn* *Veit Tâgbîlî*, Baku 1926), and a few other Adhar poets, like Bâsi and *Bâsi*, were also beginning to write in the Ottoman dialect. There is also a good deal of evidence that the cultural relations between the Ottoman court and those of the Şâfaï, Shâhînids and even of the Great Moghuls were quite close. There are interesting details of these relations in the narrative of the famous traveller Siyâzi Rûzî, who wrote under the mehmân of Kâtîbi [cf. *Cilî de Rûzî*].

Literature flourished not only at Stambul but also in Bagdad, Diyar Bâkî, Konya, Kastamuni, Brusa, Edirne, Yenidje-i Wardar and Üskûb. At Stambul the poets used to meet in various places, such as little shops where some poets plied their trade, gardens (the garden of Bakhtîar at Beshiktash), the famous cabarets (*mekhâmîn* of Galata, the *teka* of Bakharabâh at Süleymaniye) and the mansions *(kosha)* of rich men (among them poets like Nûrî and Zireği). After the introduction of coffee, the *bâkhar-hâmîn* also became important meeting-places, and the visitors belonged to all classes of society. This progress in literature goes parallel to the development of architecture, decoration (*mâşîk*), calligraphy, music and several branches of science. By the genius of the great poets like Râmi, Dâmi and Khâyâl, and especially Bâkî and Fuzûlî, there was created a Turkish classicism which was of no less merit than the Persian classicism which had been its model. It is wrong to deny an original character to Turkish literature: an intensive study enables one to discover in it the reflection of the ideas of the period and state of society, the results of the great military successes of the empire and of local conditions. In this connection we would especially call attention to the high importance of the different categories of prose and of the historical works.

In the xvith century, the literary language still makes borrowings from the Arabic and Persian. The activity of scholars like Surêt Südi, Ibn Kemâl and Riyâd produced philological commentaries, lexicographical and grammatical works. Books without number were translated into Turkish from Arabic and Persian. The borrowings from the two languages enabled Turkish poets to perfect the prosody and style of their poems according to the taste of the day. The product of the movement however was a beautiful but artificial language in which many of the natural qualities of Turkish were lost. On the other hand, we find poets who fill their poems — probably under the influence of Nâgî — with proverbs (like the *Pemîde*, or *Kâm al-Basti* of Gwâhî). Other poets like Derînî of Trabzon, Ağıteh of Yenidje-i Wardar, "Tâkî and Yestim fill their *fasâden* and *gazâhî* with terms taken from navigation. The movement known as Türk-i Bastî (cf. xvith century) has two representatives in this century in Mahtamî of Tatvâla (d. 942 = 1535), author of *Bastî-nâme*, and *Naşîn* of Edirne (d. after 962 =
The greatest figures in the gazelde and ghazal in the xvith century are in chronological order: Dāštī, Khayālī, Fustullī and Bāšī. Dāštī wrote besides gazelde and ghazal a large number of works in poetry and prose which are of very unequal value. In his early works the influence of Ay Meh Āqišī and particularly of Neqāt is evident. His imagination and his love of poetry made him very popular and he had a number of disciples. In the evolution of Turkish poetry his place is between Neqāt and Bāšī.

Khayālī [q.v.] began his poetical career when he was at the height of his fame, but as a poet he surpasses the latter and many others. The Tahkardī, ("Attār of Bākadvāda") calls him the "Hashr of Rūm". His Dāzm contains all his work and is said to have been arranged by a certain 'All Celebī, although the poet himself says in a gazelde addressed to Soğān Suleimān that he had arranged it himself. In his youth Khayālī had been under the influence of the mystics, notably Ujūlī, but mystical poems form only a small proportion of his work. His most original poems are his ghazals. He met Fustullī in Bākadvād and seems to have written majzīr on his poems. Fustullī must be regarded as the greatest poet of Turkish literature in general, although he was born in the neighbourhood of Bākadvād and used the Aḏhar dialect in his poems. He was of Turkish origin of the Bayat tribe. He composed a Dāzm and a mevhwe Leilah we-Mujāsim which have secured him a place in literary history. Love in his works is never entirely profane in character, thanks to the inspiration of his mysticism. Bāšī soon as he turns to the gazelde we find him falling into artificiality of no value. His Leilah we-Mujāsim must be regarded as an original work rather than an adaptation. No other poet except Nastān and Newālī has acquired a reputation like his throughout the whole Turkish world; he even exercised an influence on the musician-poets of the people (cf. Köpr. Zāde M. Faḍā, Introduction aux Káltiyāt de Fustullī, Constantinople 1342, p. 3-22; Türk Vişer Medīr, ii. 434-436).

Bāšī after the death of Khayālī was undoubtedly the greatest poet in Stambol. His reputation spread very rapidly throughout the empire and even as far as India. All the later poets down to the xviith century have praised him as their master. His ḫaṣīde, mārthīye and ghazal really do attain a high pitch of perfection. In spite of the fact that he was inspired by a number of predecessors, he retains all his own personality. In the expression of sentiment Bāšī is below Fustullī, but the musical charm and faultless ease of his poems have given him the reputation of an inimitable master of classicism.

The xviith century also produced a number of other great masters of the ghazal and ḫaṣīde. We may mention Huṣreṭī, a very original poet, who describes the towns of Rūm-ul and his amours; his friend Ḩādī Āqiśī; Khayāmī of Brusā, known from his translation of the Shāh-nāma (Persian) of Hīlalī and for his fine ghazals; Fīrūzī executed by order of İbrahim Faṣādī; his successor Muṣṭafā; Durrī Zāde Ulīwī of Stambol, author of remarkable ḫaṣīde. In the second half of the century, Emīr 'Ubeidis, Māʾrūshīn Hūdāyī and Newī' are masters of the ghazal. Newī' was at the same time a great scholar and stylist. We must also mention Ṣūfī of Baghādhd which Türkvbī only won him fame later. Then Fawār, Ḥanānī of Brusā and Selīṣī, who became known by their mārthīye and māsār. Hanī and the celebrated Kāraka Ṣafālī wrote rubāt in the style of Khayāmī. Šuṭrī, Šākhravānī, Rūyāzī and Ḥādī excelled in the kāfīw. Others like Hābirī, Gūsānī and Gūsānī, named Ḫalīl Ṣabīrī, wrote kāfīw, mārthīye (bantering poems; cf. Ḥaṣhrūlī and Köpr. Zāde M. Faḍā, Yehī Meşravvā, 1317, No. 15). Finally two forms very fashionable in the poetry of this period were the ṣawerān (enigma) and the ṣawerān (chronogram). The poet Emīr excelled in both of these.

As regards the meyhwe we find, alongside of numerous translations and imitations of Persian works, original poems on local subjects like the Sherk-engi, mystical poems and rhyued chronicles. The subject of Ṣūfī's Zalīkhā was very popular, especially one by Ḥanī. Many poets also wrote a Leilah we-Mujāsim, of which by far the finest was Fustullī. Other subjects were the Mihkār, (translated by Ṣafālī from the Persian, ʿEbdār-i Fīrūz and Bahārān-i Zāhīr, both of which were chosen by Fīrūz as subjects, and many others. The best known authors of meyhwe were Kāraka Fāṣālī [q.v.] of Stambol, author of Gūsā-kušt, Ṣabīrī, Bāyāzīq of Taḥbīghā and not quite so celebrated, Lāmī [q.v.]. Bāyāzīq's most celebrated poem is his mārthīye on the death of prince Ṣafā (1551); his mevhwe Shīkān-kuḏ, Gūfrān-kuḏ, Panīr-kuḏ, Gīhrān-kuḏ, Emīrī, Ṣabīrī and Zalīkhār are distinguished by a remarkable originality (cf. Bāyāzīq). We must also mention ʿĪṣārī Ṣafa (993-1585), author of a Nābi, Khayāmī and Muṣṭafā Dībānī of Brusā (1004-1506), who wrote Māshān al-ʿArār, Rāyād al-Dībānī and Ḫalīl al-Kaṣāfūr. Among descriptions of towns we have several descriptions of Brusā beginning with that of Lāmī, there are similar works on Edirne, Diyar Bahr, Stambol etc.; to the same class belongs the Roh̄ā-i Ṭarīṣī of ʿĀfīrī (d. 941 = 1534) of considerable historical value for its description of the various classes of society (cf. Köpr. Zāde M. Faḍā, Ḥayāt, 1921, No. 2). The ghazals of Ṣahālī of Brusā (d. 949 = 1542) are of equal interest, in which the poet describes young beauties belonging to the trade-gilds (cf. Köpr. Zāde M. Faḍā, Yehī Meşravvā, 1918, No. 63).

The meyhwe form was also still used for mystical works, lives of saints, collections of rules for the mystic orders, lexicographical works etc., most of which have little literary value. Several poets wrote Ḩādīkē am, imitation of Dībānī and Newālī. To this class also belongs the famous Ḫalīk of Khayāmī [q.v.] and the translations of the Ḥādīkē am by the same author. Encouraged by the fame of the Munīl of Suleimān Celebī, many poets, beginning with ʿĀṣ Shams al-Dīn Zāde Ḥanī took up the same subject but without attaining the same popularity. Lastly we may mention a Deb-meqrān, inspired by the Munīl al-Tawr of ʿAttār and dedicated in 919 (1512) to Selīm I by ʿAṣīmī.

As the mystic movement increased in strength in this century and new ṭerāt were everywhere opened, it is not surprising that poets belonging to the different orders should write didactic works,
mythic poems and collections of legends of saints, alongside of translations of Arabic and Persian mystical works. We may say that each paska had its own literature; among these literatures the more important belong to the heterodox groups. Thus the literature of the Bektâshis, begun in the eighteenth century by Nâdîmî, had representatives in Yâbûsî and Aşkerî, developers of the edeb of Sâyiş! Lâkûnî, while others are of great interest in the history of religion for the freedom with which they expressed their thoughts—which sometimes cost them their lives. Their heretical doctrines were not only disseminated among heterodox bodies like the Bektâshis and Hâritâs but also in orthodox orders like the Kâhalwet and Mevlevis, as we know from the historical sources. Other mystics wrote very simple poems, like Yaş Çifreti of Beşiktaş and others.

Finally a number of historical works were written in the form of meşâlîc. With the exception of the Ottoman history of Hâfidî, written in 1337 (1551), they always deal with a single event (the taking of Buda, or Debrecen), the Venetian, etc.) or with the victories of a sultan (particularly Selim II or a commander (like Kâtîr âl-Dîn Pascha Barharos, or Demir Oğlu 'Othman Pascha etc.).

Prose in this century assumes a heavier and more artificial form; exaggerating Persian models, it is completely artificial; these are expressed by the most complicated images to the detriment of the subject. This lack of taste is found in the greatest stylists of this period: Lâmiî, Kemâl Pascha Zâde, Djeâdel Zâde, Ferîdûn Beg, Asâmi, the translator of the Hâmiyyet-yenîme, 'Ali Celebi, Khatûn Zâde, 'Ali Celebi, Khârîda Sa'd ad-Dîn [q.v.] and others. This artificial tendency had a much more disastrous influence on prose than on poetry. Works written in simple language were despised by the educated classes. We find however that in very long works, it was only the preface that was written in this turgid and clumsy style. Many literary, historical, religious or moralising works of the period were in fact written in more simple language. The same applies to official correspondence and other state documents. In religious works intended for the people, every endeavor was made to write as simply as possible. The prose which we possess by Bahâ and Fâtûlî shows an elegant and comparatively simple language.

We shall begin with the historical works, a field in which great progress was made in this century, mainly on account of the interest taken by the educated classes in the military successes of the empire. Besides the thymed chronicles, in continuation of the Seldjûk tradition, we find from the time of Bayazid II and Selim I historical works in prose. The official Ottoman history written in Persian by Fâris Bîlit was translated into Turkish by his son. Other general histories were those of İbn Kemâl, Djeâdel Zâde Muşafa Celebi, entitled Tûbâbât al-Mawilî, of Muşafa al-Dîn Djeâdel of Lafti Paşâ, of Khârîda Sa'd ad-Dîn and of 'Ali. There are also a number of special histories, dealing with particular periods or certain events (the Fethânos) and biographical works (like the Da'ashîyên al-Mawilî relating to Şoûkî). At the same time the office of Seyyed-i Nâmâyîşî was maintained at the court. In the time of Selim II, it was filled by Feiz Allah 'Arif Celebi, whose successors included Aşkerî Şirvânî, Sâyiş! Lâkûnî and Ta'îlî.

Zade (d. 1013 = 1604). These were also Turkish poets, but tradition demanded that the official Seyyed-i Nâmâyîşî should be written in Persian in the mawâlikî metre, until Mehmed III ordered it to be written in Turkish. From the time of Ta'îlî Zade, prose began to appear scattered through the text. From the historical point of view, Seyyed-i Nâmâyîşî are naturally of less importance than the non-official chronicles. The works like the Tûbâbât al-Mawilî of Sa'd al-Dîn were regarded as models of style, the Ta'îlî both of Lâfî Paşâ [q.v.], whose style more resembles that of the old chronicles, and especially his Ta'îlî are very important for our knowledge of the social history of this period. The Ta'îlî of Selimî Muşafa Efendi shows how corrupt the administration was at the end of the century. We must regard 'Ali [q.v.] as the greatest historian of the time and his other works reveal him as a man of almost encyclopaedic learning. Not only his Kaşî al-Ahbar, but also his Nâfis-i Salâtî, Khatûnî, Ma'mûrî and Menâbi-i Hâmûvarîn show that the author was a severe critic, well informed about the conditions of life of his time. The style of his historical works is relatively simple (on his life and works cf. the introduction by İbn al-Amin Ma'mûl Kemâl to the Nûrûs-i Muvâlî, Istanbul 1926). To this century also belongs the Djeâdel Nâmâyîşî, written in Arabic by Ta'âbûrî Zade [q.v.] and translated into Turkish with the assistance of Mâbûdî of Edeâne and Khâki of Belgrad; also an extensive biographical literature among which the biographies of the Turkish mystic sheikhs are of considerable historical interest. A similar interest is contained in a few light works of hâmidî like the Nûsî of al-umr-i-vâreme of Lâmiî and of Nâsirî Zade (cf. Milî Tâthîbîsîr Mezâmeyî, N. 3).

Among historical works, those which deal with literary history occupy an important place. The first Ottoman tekhâres is the Hâmîyât, written by September 945 (1538) by Şehît, in imitation of the Ma'mûrî al-Nâmâyî of Newâlî. He was followed by Lâfî [q.v.], Aşkerî Celebi [q.v.], 'Akhî Salâmî, 'Ali Celebi, and Isâmî Celebi [q.v.]. 'Ali also gives important notices of poets in his Kaşî al-Ahbar. The compilation of collections of poems on poems of other poets, like the Da'ashîyên of Newâlî written in 948 (1542) by Hâfidî Kemâl, containing poems by 266 poets, and others, is a custom which is also found in the eighteenth century and has contributed greatly to our knowledge of Turkish poets.

It is in this century that we find geographical works and travels beginning to appear. In the eighteenth century we have only translations and excerpts from Kaswin and İbn al-Wardî as well as a translation from the Greek of Polemy. In the eighteenth century, these two works are again translated, as well as those of Alm 'L-Fida'î (by Siânî Zade) and İstakhrî (by Şerîf Efendi) and 'Ali Kushtîjî's work on mathematical geography, and geographical descriptions of Egypt. A Cîn Seyyed-i Nâmâyîşî written in Persian by the merchant 'Ali Eker Khatîrî was translated into Turkish for Mustad III. The celebrated Bahâiyyûn of Pirî Re'tî [q.v.] written in 935 (1529) was the result of the maritime policy of the Turkish empire. It is based in part on older cartographers like Şafîî and
on Italian maps. As a result of Sulaimān's campaigns by land we have Mīrābdīr Našīb's work, full of admirable little sketches. Seiyidī 'Ali Re'is wrote his Muṣāf as a result of his unfortunate exploit in the Indian Ocean, although the book is based entirely on earlier Arab works. The Mīrābdīr al-Mawālik by the same author is much more original. After it we have the Siyāhat-nāme in verse of the merchant b. Ibrāhīm, describing his voyage to India. The Mā'tūrīr al-Abwālīn of Māitched Agīk̲h of Trebizond is very important; based on the old Arab gothographies, it gives valuable new information about Ottoman lands. Finally we may mention Ta'rīkh-i Hindī Gharbī on the discovery of the New World, translated in 1530 (1582) from a European language by Māitched Vūsuf al-Hārewwī (on this literature cf. Tüsencher in the Z. D. M. G., lxvii, 1923).

Alongside of classical Turkish literature, we find the literature of the people increasing, the knowledge of which was spread by the bāci-yū, the maddāsh and the khorgāzī in the popular cafés and in the barracks of the janissaries. Many classical poets also wrote türkī [q.v.] intended for the masses. These türkī are in the 'arūf metre and in the form of mi成本′; later they were called qāri [q. v.]. This form of poem goes back to the earliest forms of verse among the Turks. But the works of uninstructed poets, like Enwerī, Thiyyālī, Rāyī, Rāhī, and others, written in imitation of the classical poets, were more of the taste of the people. In popular gatherings such themes as Abū Muṣlim, the Ḥama-nāme, Başgül Qudā, etc. were enthusiastically received. This encouraged Ḥāshim of Stambul to write the mevna: Başgül ve-Qudā taken from the Ḥama-nāme and inspired several authors and poets to write similar works. Sulaimān Sulaimān had the story of Fīrūzārā translated into Turkish in 8 vols. by Sālih Efcendi, translator of the Dīwān al-Hāzīrī. There were ḥaṣba-yū even in the palaces of the sultāns. Alongside of old Muslim and Iranian subjects we find also collections of stories of everyday life like the Baṛṣāl Kānasā 'Abd al-Reyāf Efcendi Ḥikayēsī by the poet Wāhīd, also called Awa Başgül Ḥikayēsī. The stories of everyday life by Muṣṭafā Dīnānat of Bruna in an unaffected style give us a valuable insight into different aspects of the life of the people in those days. Another poet of this kind is Mūrī, whose real name was Derwaţ Ḥasan, who was the mevna of Murād III (cf. Rieu, Cat. of Turk. MSS., p. 42).

In the xvith century we are a little better informed regarding the activities of the 'marān, although they are now generally known as 'ābīb or seiyidī. These wandering musicians were to be found wherever the people congregated and used to recite their poems in syllabic metres, love-songs, heroic tales, mevna and türkī. At the beginning of this century we have a portion of Baḵshī's epic on the Egyptian campaign of Selim I and at the end of the century we have the names of Kūl Meḥməd (d. 1605), Ḫosās Dede, Ḫayālī and Kūr Oglu, and, in the garrisons of the Maghrib, Čarpāntī, Ārmūdīn, Kūl Čalḫān, Ḫanmuş (cf. also Kūṛ, Zāde M. Frād, Turk. Sıāsātveleri, 1930). The influence of the various classes of society on one another had even the result that syllabic metre was sometimes used among the cultured classes (but especially in the hotel) and the 'arūf metre in popular poems, just as had been the case formerly for poems of a religious character. The mystic poets however, following the tradition of Yūnus Emre, wrote their izāhā in syllabic metre. We may note the names of Ummi Siānā (d. 958 = 1551), Aḥmed Serbān (d. 958 = 1553), Ḫidr Muḥtēsī (d. 1215) and Seiyidī Seifi Allāh Khāwīwī (d. 1010 = 1601). But the greatest successors of Yūnus and his fellow poets were found among the Bekāḵs and Kīlīshāhs', such as Kūl Himmet and his pāpī Ḩaṣān Ābdāl, a native of Siwān who was executed in 1600 by order of Khıdır Faddā (cf. Sa'd al-Dīn Nīshākī, Fīrūz Ābdāl, 1729). Other products of the popular literature of the period were Ḥasan Oqla Qārābokrūn Türkārī, Qara Qoban Türkārūn, Qobān Dījārīnī.

xvith Century.

In spite of the political decline of the empire we still find intellectual and literary life pursuing its normal course. The knowledge of the Ottoman literary language spread among the Musulmān classes generally and also through districts with a non-Turkish population or speaking a non-Ottoman Turkish dialect like eastern Anatolia (Ar FLASH dialect) and the Crimea. The Crimea began to produce a number of Ottoman poets, among them actually some of the Khāns. The influence of Turkish literature and culture is found as early as the xvith century in the use of Arabic characters by the Muḥammadan Hungarians and Croats (cf. Ungarische Bibliothek, 1927, No. 14). There is also a Turkish-Serbian dictionary in verse, called Pevur Šahbīltun, composed by Hāwīyā (Bull. de la Soc. scient. de Skopje, iii, 189–202), a similar Turkish-Bosnian vocabulary by Uṣkāfī and several rhymed Turco-Greek glossaries.

Stambul was always the centre to which men of letters and learning flocked from all parts of the empire and from beyond its frontiers. With the exception of Murād IV, no sultan took an interest in literature, and among statesmen there were relatively few poems of literature like İlyāş Pasā, Mūsāḥhī Başgül Pasā, Kāmī Pasā and the Şehsī al-Islām Yahyā and Behbāyī. In spite of this and of the decline in the medresses this century saw scholars of ability like Şart 'Abd Allāh [q. v.], İsmā'īl AnbaRéwī, İs hákh Khwādīzāī, Aḥmed Efcendi, and others. The various branches of religious learning and Arabic philology have however no great representatives in this century, and the conflict between the medresses and the tekke known as the "question of the Khān Zāde's" shows what a narrow point of view still prevailed in the medresses. The persecutions of the mystical orders, which sometimes had a political object also, did not however prevent these orders from continuing to prosper throughout the empire. The "classical" Turkish poetry of the xvith century was in no respect below the level of the Persian models. But the place of devoting themselves to imitations and translations the Turkish poets were now working on original subjects. It is true on the other hand that the influence of contemporary Persian and Indo-Persian poets is still felt. Neftī shows the inspiration of 'Urī, Nāḥī of Şāb and Nā'īlī-ḵādīm that of Şawkāt.
Nefti [q.v.] may be regarded as the greatest Turkish master of the hâfsa, or account of the power of his imagination, the richness of his language and the harmony of his style. His ğezehs and his hâfzîn on the other hand are less successful. The influence of Nefti was always great on his successors, although his period saw several eminent hâfsâ, like New'i Zade 'Atâyî, Kâf Zade Fa'îlî, Riyâdî, Şâbriti and Ridâyî. The greatest representative of the hâfsa is the Sheikh al-Èslâm Yahyâ [q.v.] who may be regarded as the successor of Bâkti, especially on account of his great power to express feelings and emotions. His fame likewise survived into the following centuries. Other representatives of the school of Bâkti and Yahyâ are the Sheikh al-Èslâm Behayî and Wedjîl. In contrast to the latter, the poets Fehim [q.v.], Nâ'îbi Kâdim [q.v.], Seyhârî, and even the poet Nefti [q.v.] were under the influence of contemporary Persian poetry, Nâ'îbi on whom can be noticed the influence of Sa'îd became renowned for his mihvû and his ğezehs. His poems are characterized by the preponderance of intellectual conceptions but this has not affected his popularity. In many of his poems he describes and criticizes the social life of his time. His young contemporary Tâhiti [q.v.] endeavours to show his originality by mingling proverbial expressions with his poetry. Among the masters of the hâfsa of the xviith century we may also mention Nâ'îbi Mewlewî, Djewîlî and Râmi Mehmîd Pasha. 'Atâyî Zade Halîetti [q.v.] excelled in all poetical genres and is best known for his rûhî. The hâfsa and the mu'ammât became very popular as did the tarîhî (chronogram). The hâfsa and mevlevî, composed in different forms, caused poets of the first rank to write very coarse things. Some products of this genre however can be appreciated, like the tejhîrî in the form of a mevlevî by Güfîî in which the author depicts contemporary poets; the hâfsa of Fehim and of Djewîlî, written in the form of mu'ammât, are curious because the text is scattered with passages in non-Turkish languages.

Some mevlevîs of the first half of the century show a remarkable perfection. The subjects of the old khânum are gradually replaced by more topical subjects. The greatest representative of the style is New'i Zade 'Atâyî [q.v.] who acquired his great reputation with his Khânum, the subjects of which are taken from the life of his time. This poet reveals the influence of his Turkish predecessors like Yahyâ of Tahîdji and Djemânî (cf. xvith century). After him we may note the following authors of mevlevîs: Kâf Zade Fa'îlî, Ghani Zade Nâ'diri and Riyâdî. It was mainly in this century that it became fashionable to write Şahî-nâ'îs in imitation of the Persian poet Šahî, although this genre is already found earlier, as is shown by the şahî-nâ'îs of Rehînî (xvith century). Among the Şahî-nâ'îs we may specially note those of 'Atâyî, Riyâdî and Halîetti; all are tinged with mysticism. The mevlevî thus served for all sorts of subjects taken from daily lifetexts, descriptions, speculative works, tales of actual events etc.

The number of religious and mystical works, lives of saints and didactic works connected with the different şehîs is very great in this century. Poetical forms were often used for them. Very well known is the Mihvî of Nâ'diri. They were panegyrics of the Prophet (nâ'î), translations in verse of the Hazrat-âr-sînâ of mawlawi etc. Among the mystic poets there were some who used the syllabic metre; we may note Nişârî Mîşrî, founder of the Mîşrîyya division of the Khâlâtîyya order, whose poems were long popular; the Bekâshî also numbered several poets in their ranks. There are also a large number of historical works in verse, Şahî-nâ'îs, Ghâshî-nâ'îs, etc., like the Şâhî-nâ'î of Nâ'diri of the time of Othman II and others. The Şahî-nâ'î written by Mûlhemî by order of Murad IV has only the preface in Turkish; the rest is Persian in keeping with the old tradition. It is in this century also that the custom begins of writing brief Ottoman histories in verse; we have the of Tâhîlî, written in 1017 (1608), of Nişârî (d. in 1017 = 1608) written for Mehemîd IV and the Şahî-nâ'î of Şahî-Bahârî, dedicated to Mehemîd IV by Şulak Zade Hemîdî, and continued by a series of poets down to Ziya Paşa in the xviith century. This kind of work has neither much historical nor literary value.

Literary prose follows the same lines as in the preceding century. The great stylists (mihvîsî) like Weisî, Nesrîî, Oğçu Zade and others carried affection of language to a still more advanced degree. A fine specimen is given by the official documents addressed to the Persian court and written by mihvîsî like Hûkî; this same style, devoid of any taste, was sometimes used even in private correspondence. The works which were considered to have no literary value in their day are those which are now most appreciated, like those of Kocî Beg, Kâfît Cebleî, Ewliyya Cebleî and Na'îma. Histories in this century also, take first place among prose works. There are several which have the character of semi-official chronicles like the Şahî-nâ'î written in prose by Tâshkhâr Pâşâ for Othman II. Murad IV appointed Kâfît as mevlevî for the Erivan campaign. In 1074 (1664) the mihvîsî 'Abîd al-Rahmân Pâsha was appointed by Mehemîd IV to chronicle events, as was Mehemîd Khalîfî of Findikli by Mustafa II. It is only later that Na'îma was appointed mevlevî of the court. The historical works of this century are translations of the general histories of Islam, original works on the same subject, general and special works and monographs on Ottoman history. From the historical point of view, the most important are the Dijâmî al-Dowla, written in Arabic by Mûnedjîmî Bahî, the菲尔îâ of Kâfît Cebleî, the Fârîhî of Pelewî and the best of Na'îma. The great encyclopaedist Kâfît Cebleî (cf. Kâfît Khâlimî) also reveals himself in his Misâv al-Rahî and Davûlt al-Amal as a historian of penetrating insight. Pelewî [q.v.], who made use of Christian sources, is also very valuable for his sound judgment and impartiality. Na'îma [q.v.] who possessed descriptive gifts of the first order, gives vivid psychological analyses of his historical characters. Kocî Beg [q.v.] examines in his celebrated Rihât the causes of the decline of the empire. Kârî Cebleî Zade is a mihvî rather than a historian. We must also mention chroniclers like Wedjîlî, Hasan Bey Zade and Şulak Zade, as well as the şahî by the Şahî-nâ'îs of mihvîsî by New'i Zade 'Atâyî and the continuation by Ustâshî Zade.

The tejhîrî is much below the level of the xviith century; the most notable is that of Riyâdî written in 1018 (1609). The Riyâdî of Şahîrî of
The period of Damiad Ibrahim Pasha [q. v.] is a very important one. Many works were written and translated by his orders or those of Sultan Ahmed III. Committees were appointed to translate important works rapidly. Among the poets of this period we may mention ?Olmam Zade Tâlib, who was called the king of poets, Seyid Wehbi, Sâmit, Râshid, Neill, Sâlim, Kâmil, of Edime, Durri, ?Abdellah ?Aref, ?Sâlim, ?Celbi, Zade ?Asim, and ?Yezid ?Ali Pasha. Navid [q. v.] in particular acquired a great reputation in the second half of the century and later. His ghazals and his ?ashr? recall the period of Sul?n-?âd and by his original subjects, rich imagination and harmonious language, he surpasses his predecessors and his contemporaries. In the ?ashr? he reached a level which neither ?âs?m before him nor Fâd?l ?End?r?n? t after him attained. It was also through the patronage of Damiad Ibrahim Pasha that Isk?m Muteferrika [q. v.] was able to inaugurate Turkish typography, but for several reasons printing remained confined to a very restricted sphere throughout this century and did not exercise any particular influence on intellectual or artistic life.

Among the great poets of this century we must also make special mention of ?Ozd? Râshid Pasha [q. v.], the greatest representative of the school of Sel? and Sheik ?Sel? [q. v.], the last great poet of the classical period. In the ?ashr? it was the influence of Neft? that dominated, while in the ghazal there was a rivalry between the disciples of Sel?m and S?m? on the one hand and admirers of Nabi on the other. But towards the end of the century a decline in both schools became apparent; poets like Fâd?l ?End?r?n? t [q. v.] and ?S?v?l ?Zade Wehbi [q. v.] are only mere imitators. The poets of this century practised all forms of poetry and special attention was devoted to genres characteristic of an epoch of decadence, like the ??ehf, the haj?l, the ?m?m?n? (enigma) and the ?r?h?h? (chronogram), while immorality and a general decline in good taste increased. On the other hand, true religious inspiration still continued as may be seen from the ?m?l? ?h? and the ?m?l? of Na?m, the M?y?n? of poets like ?Olmam ?D?de, Na?f? and ?End?r?n? t, and of Nabi. The me?r?s of this period are numerous but of little literary value, the old subjects of the ?m?m? are entirely dropped, with the exception of the ?m?l?h of Sheik ?Sel?, the last masterpiece of this piece. Finally, the rhymed historical works of this period and the mystic poems by initiates of the various orders are of little importance.

Literary prose tends to become gradually simpler, although we still find imitations of the style of Nergis and ?Ab? ?Zade. A well-known stylist like ?Olmam Zade Tâlib openly declared against exaggerated artificiality in prose. Historical works occupy the first place. Among authors serving as ?m?l?m?w? [q. v.] we may mention Râshid, ?Celbi, ?Zade ?Azm and ?Sel?, but none of them can be compared to their predecessors like Na?m, although hundreds of people were writing biographical and historical works. The political and military decline of the empire caused a large number of ?y?w ("memoirs") to be written investigating the causes. The most remarkable of these memoirs is that of ?Ozd? ?Sel?m B?l. From the point of view of geography we may note a number of important si?f?r?n-?m?m?n, of which
the Fransız Şefkat-nâmesi of Virmi Şehit Celalı Mehmâd Efendi is a typical example; these works were occasionally, although rarely, written in verse. The Sûr-nâmes written to celebrate the splendid festivals held by the sultans are important sources for sociological research. Those best known are the Sûr-nâmes of Selîdî Wehri and of Şahmet. The collections of biographies of poets are even more numerous than in the preceding century. We may mention the tezkires of Şafîyî and Şelîm and that of Bâli, the tezkire of Eşreî Dedë, specially devoted to Mowlewî poets; to this century belong also the Şehbîyû al-Fâyîlû of Şehîkî, which is the final continuation (âdikilî) of the Şahsûîî. Later the Tahfîzî âdikilî of Mustafâ Zade — whom we may regard as the greatest encyclopaedist of this century — is the most important source for the Muslim and Turkish calligraphers (khâtatî). In the field of geography we have only translations and excerpts from European works.

The meNdî, šarâqılı, and orqa aspâgî continued to enjoy the same popularity among all classes of society. The works of the musician-poets were also known everywhere; we may mention Kîmêli, Nûrî, Lâwîni, Khâba Şâkal Mehmâd and Fâqîlî, but the popularity of Gewherî and 'Îşkî Omer continued; some of these poets were of Armenian origin, like Dûmîni and Warzan, who lived at the beginning of the century. This influence of Turkish music-poets on the poems of the Armenian akîbî perhaps begins as early as the xvth century (cf. Köpr. Zade M. Fu'âd in Edelîyî Fikrî Nâmesî, 1922, No. 1, p. 1—32). The best example of the range in which the literary taste of the people had penetrated among the upper classes is the fact that the great poet Nâdim also wrote a turkû in the popular metre. This tendency became more marked as the century advanced.

Sixth century.

At the beginning of this century, Ottoman literature had sunk to a very low level which continued till the period of the "Tântâmî", Wâsîf Enderûnî [q.v.] and 'Îzet Mollâ [q.v.] alone show some originality. Wâsîf appeals to the popular taste and shows the influence of Nâdim as well as that of Fâqiî Enderûnî. 'Îzet Mollâ, while strongly influenced by Nâdim and Şehîkî Ghâlîh, is, however, a much greater poet than Wâsîf, especially as regards the purity of his language and his poetical technique; in addition to şîtâden and ghâshîs he wrote quite good meNdavîs; he is the last "master" of classical poetry before the "Tântâmî". It is true that even after the "Tântâmî", many poets wrote şîtâden and ghâshîs in the ancient style and among them the great advocates of literary innovations like Nâmîk Kemal and Zîyû Pâsha; to this period also belong Ghâlîh Bey of Leskofça, 'Awmî Bey and 'Arîf Hikmet Bey, all imitators of Nâ'îlî and Fehmî Kâsim. They had, however, no influence on the course of literary development. It was only natural that the old literary tradition could not disappear at once; Şehîkî and his school had to maintain a long and hard struggle against the old school.

The prose of the period before the "Tântâmî" is not of much value, although the production was not less than in preceding centuries. In history, the Türkî of Mâtersîmî 'Arîm is remarkable for its style and critical ability; the author uses even simpler language in his translation of the Türkîyû Sûrî and of Şeyhû. The meNdâmî Efendi, translator of the Maštîraf and author of the well-known Cûz-i Zafar on the extermination of the Janissaries, is far below 'Arîm, with his inaudible language and confused style. The same writer edited the Türkîyû-i Mevlâî and Sultan Mahmûd II reproached him with the obscurity of his language in an account of a journey of the sultan which he had drawn up in this capacity. On the other hand, in his translation of the Maštîraf, he recommends the use of Turkish instead of Arabic and Persian words and the simplification of literary style, which shows that to an extent the movement to simplify the language had made progress. Lastly we must not forget the celebrated poet and stylist 'Akîf Paşa [q.v.] who, in spite of several poems written in the popular metre and some works in simple verse, ought not to be regarded as the first to spread literary innovations. 'Akîf Paşa, indeed, remained entirely unaffected by European culture and is one of the last representatives of the old literature.

Among the representatives of the popular literature we have information about the maddânu Fê Emîn, Khâlîm Eme, Hüdî Vûdîlî Mû'tedînî, Kûrî Hâfîî and others, as well as of some writers of shadow-plays (kâyûsûlî) like Sherhûdî Emîn, Hûfîî of Kânî Pâsha, Muwâhidü Sa'îd Efendi; it is only towards the end of the century that Kâtîlî Şehîlî in breaking with the ancient tradition began to imitate the modern theatre.

The best known musician-poets of this century are Dûrûl Şûhî of Bajûrî and Emîr of Erzerûm, who acquired a great and well merited popularity in Asia Minor as well as in Constantinople among all classes (cf. Köpr. Z. M. Fu'âd, Erzurumlu Emîrâ, Istanbul 1929). Down to the end of the reign of 'Abd al-Âzîz these Şûhîs used to assemble in a café in Ta'rikh Pusûr. They had an organisation of their own, with a chief (âteh) at their head, recognised by the government. This organisation was broken up later on, but in the xth century we still find musician-poets in Asia Minor.

This classical Turkish literature and especially the poetry had lost almost all its vigour and originality by the time the Tântâmî began. Classical poetry had lost the ability to create anything new within its narrow limitations, and the poets could only produce imitations (nasîrî) of the great models of the past, or in their efforts to show a little originality fell into artificiality and platitude. As a result of continually repeating the same conceptions by the same limited means of expression, all the vitality of Turkish poetry was destroyed. Even great artists like Nâmîk Kemal and Şehîkî Ghâlîh had not been able to escape the rigid rules of the old models. On the other hand, the attempts to draw upon the language and literature of the people and to appeal more to popular taste and language, efforts such as we observe in Fâtûlî Enderûnî and Wâsîf, only resulted in vulgarity and banality. In spite of the political and economic connection with Europe which had existed for centuries, the social structure of the Ottoman people had never emerged from the frame of
Islamic civilization, which kept it imprisoned in a mediæval system of ideas. It is true that the continual military defeats and the gradual economic decline had impressed upon thinking people the material and technical superiority of Europe and that, as early as the xvith century, they had begun to take advantage of European skill to reorganize the army and the fleet. But it was much more difficult to admit the superiority of Europe in the field of culture. The medreses, which were in a very backward state compared with earlier centuries, still clung tenaciously to the mentality and tastes of the middle ages. Modern science was beginning to be introduced only in institutions founded for the army, like the Engineering School (muha misdemean-an) and the Medical School (tibb-khâne). These innovations owed a great deal to a few individuals, who had studied western languages and modern sciences, like Ebu Üthâd Efendi, Gelenbert and Shânî Zade. It was the need felt by Selim III and especially by Mahmut II to reorganize the army and navy and to establish a central administration to prevent the empire being parcelled out between feudal chiefs, that led them to consider, in spite of the opposition of the medreses, to the reform of the teaching of mathematics and natural sciences.

From the end of the xvith century, there were in Turkey men who knew French and recognized the cultural superiority of Europe. In bringing teachers from France and sending students to Europe, the movement of Europeanisation was encouraged in Turkey. It was natural then that as a result of all these needs, European influence began to show itself little by little, as in every branch of life, also in the field of thought and art.


The great industrial and capitalist development in Europe as well as the political expansion and rivalry of the imperialist Great Powers could not long ignore so vast and rich a field of exploitation as Turkey. At the same time the mediæval institutions of the empire had lost their power of resistance and the revolutionary movements in France had propagated the principle of nationality among the non-Muslim elements. All these circumstances made the urgent need felt of introducing reforms in the social and administrative institutions of the empire. These reforms were to meet with considerable resistance, not only among the lower classes but also among those members of the educated classes who had been educated in the medreses. It was due to Reşid Pasha and his little group of followers that the reforms were gradually introduced into the country. In Turkish history these reforms are known as "Tanîmîs" [q.v.].

The Tanîmîs were not confined to the fields of administration, justice and finance; with the object of securing the progress of education among the Muslim Turks, primary and secondary schools were opened and plans made to found a university. An Emnûmen-i Dânîsî was formed to prepare schoolbooks (1260 = 1853) and students were sent to Europe. The Emnûmen-i Dânîsî was soon replaced by the Liyce-i Ilmiyî-i ścihî adî (1277 = 1860), which began to publish its own organ; Medresen-i Fünnîn. In the following year, the Girls' School was opened and in 1279 (1862) University courses were begun. In 1282 (1865) was formed a Terzîmen Liyce-i, in 1284 (1867) the Civil School of Medicine (Tibb-i mâlîyye Mehmed) began its lectures, and in the following year, the Lycée of Galata Serây was opened, the curriculum of which was adapted from western secondary schools and French was used for teaching alongside of Turkish. The University (Dâr al-Fünûn) was opened in 1286 (1869) but the intrigues of the conservative elements forced it to be closed two years later. In 1287 (1870) the School of Law (Hâşık Mehmed) was opened and in 1294 (1877) a School of Political Sciences (Mekteb-i mâlîyye) at the same time museums and libraries were founded as well as technical schools like the engineering, agricultural and commercial schools. Thus, there was gradually created an educated class outside of the medreses. All this activity was accompanied by a gradual development of the daily press. In 1247 (1831) the official publication Taşkîn-i Venâhî began to appear which was followed by the Liyce-i Hâmédî in 1256 (1840), the Terzîmen-i Âbyâlî in 1276 (1859) and the Taşkîn-i Efîrî in 1278 (1861) [cf. Jairü]. These two last mark an important stage in the history of modern developments for it was through them that Shânî, founder of the new literary school, and his disciple Nâmîk Kemal addressed the public. Down to the period when the absolutism of Abd al-Hamid prevented any kind of publication, the Turkish press developed very rapidly. Many scientific and literary works were translated from European languages, especially from French, and the Turkish language began to be simplified, at the same time enriching itself with a large number of scientific expressions.

The three great figures of the new literature are Shânî [q.v.] who had been educated in France, his great disciple Nâmîk Kemal [cf. Kemal] and Ziya Pasha [q.v.], both of whom had lived in France as exiles. Through these circumstances the new school was imbued with the French literature of the xvith and xixth century, and the principles proclaimed during the political revolutions in France. The innovators wished to exterminate the old feudal literature and proclaim the ideas of "fatherland" (vatan), "liberty" (sâriyê), "democracy" (hâşıkîtê) and "constitutionalism" (mektebîyye); they aimed at creating a "bourgeois" literature. It was in this way that journalism, political and literary criticism, the theatre, the translation of western literary works, the novel and the philosophical and sociological essay began. Shânî was neither a brilliant stylist nor a great poet, but his programme was well defined; he wished to free himself from the trammels of the old unintelligible language; although he was not able to realise all this programme, his theories exercised a great influence on those around him. Ziya Pasha, by his translations of Rousseau and Moléare and by his literary and political criticism, gave great support to this movement. He was well versed in the classical literature, yet he went so far as to allege that this literature had no relation to the Turkish character; he upheld the thesis that one ought to follow nature, i.e. borrow from the popular language and literature. In reality Ziya Pasha had neither the strength nor the courage to put these theories into practice.

It was undoubtedly Nâmîk Kemal who assured
the definite success of the new school. He was a great artist, a keen fighter, a prolific author and a great patriot. For him art was a means of provoking a revival in the land and he contributed vigorously to the cultural and political revolution in Turkey by his political articles, his dramas, his novels, his patriotic poetry, his historical works, his critical essays and even by his private letters. He exercised a profound influence. The presentation of 

Wafat was a great political event in the country. He attacked the old literature even more bitterly than Ziya Paşa and thought that it was impossible to write Turkish poetry in the "āvâl" metre. However, not even Kemâl could cast off the old traditions entirely, nor could his friends. It is for this reason that Süleyman Paşa was able to write in 1897 (1886) in an anonymous article in the journal 

Wafat, that pupils should only be given literal translations of western works because the "new" writers had not been able to produce in reality any really new.

Ābdul-Hādâk Hamîd [q.v.], a pupil of Nâmîç Kemâl, brought about a great revolution in the field of poetry, which hitherto had not been able to free itself from ancient forms. This extremely prolific poet introduced into Turkish the lyric and the drama in which his models were Dante, Racine, Corneille and Shakespeare. Even Nâmîç Kemâl acknowledged that the new Turkish poetry begins with Hamîd. Other important figures were Riďâ' al-Żâde Ekrem [cf. Ekrem], and Sûnûl Paşa al-Żâde Seniz [q.v.], but in proportion as the pressure of despotism increased, the second generation of the period of the Tsâmid began more and more to pursue purely artistic ends.

Many other thinkers or writers have contributed to the cultural evolution of the country. We may mention the famous historian Ahmâd Dîewdît Paşa [q.v.], Ahmâd Weîfî Paşa [q.v.], Sulâyman Paşa, and the great writer and encyclopaedist Ahmâd Mişhât Efendi [q.v.], as well as the lexicographer Şânû al-Ḏâin Sûmî Bey [q.v.]. Dîewdît Paşa, well versed in oriental learning and author of a Turkish grammar in collaboration with Fa'îd Paşa, has written beautiful prose in Turkish. Ahmâd Weîfî, animated by western ideas, wished to revive national culture, and proclaimed the fact that the Turks of Anatolia were a branch of the great Turkish nation. He compiled the first dictionary of Anatolian Turkish, collected proverbs and translated the Gâfara-Turk of Abu 'l-Ċâib. By his adaptations of the comedies of Molîère he played a great part in the development of the Turkish theatre. Sulâyman Paşa, who reorganised the military schools, was a great patriot. He claimed that the language and literature should be called "Turkish" and not "Othmanî"; in his Teşkîl-ī Âlam he devoted a special chapter to the early Turks, taking his material from Degaîne and other sources.

Lastly Ahmâd Mişhât wrote and translated hundreds of volumes of a popular nature, beginning with books of the alphabet; he thus trained the people to read and contributed to raising the level of education, which was his only aim, for his books have no scientific or literary value. Sûmî Bey showed himself a worthy successor of Weîfî Paşa in his Kânûnî al-Ālûm and Kânûnî-ī Türkî.

At the end of the sixth century appeared Mu'âllâm Nâḏî [q.v.], who obtained great fame under the protection of Ahmâd Mişhât. Nâḏî was well versed in eastern culture and wrote ghâzâs in the classical style alongside of good poems in the new style. The followers of the old school expected from him almost a resurrection of classicism, although Nâḏî was not at all a champion of such a reaction, as is shown by his beautiful simple prose (as in "Osârin-i Teşkîlâtâr"). His quarrels with Ekrem Bey originated rather in personal reasons. At the same time Nâbi Zâde Našîm, who died very young, came to the front; his novel Zehur makes him a figure of first importance in literary history.

The most important event at the end of the sixth century is the literary movement begun by a group of youthful men of letters who had associated themselves, at the instigation of Riďâ' al-Żâde Ekrem, with the periodical Tharîm-ī Fûnûm; this movement marks the second and last stage of the Europeanisation of Turkish literature. It is dominated by the figures of Tevîhî Fikrî [q.v.] and Khâlid Ziya and is very much under the influence of the literary movements in France at the end of the sixth century. Started in a period of absolute despotism and having only a short life of five or six years, this movement produced new works of a neurotic and pessimistic sentimentality. Its motto was "art for art's sake". If we except Dîewdît Şânû al-Ḏâin, who acquired after the revolution the reputation of a great prose writer, Sulâyman Našîm who may be considered a pupil of Nâmîç Kemâl with an originality of his own, Fa'îk al-Ālûm, an imitator of "Abd al-Hâdâk Hamîd, and İsmîl Şâfi, an independent figure, who finds his subjects in everyday life, all the poets who wrote in the Tharîm-î Fûnûm were imitators of Tevîhî Fikrî. Khâlid Ziya, who has a very choice style, is the true founder of the literary novel in Turkish. He takes his subjects generally from the upper middle classes, but some of his short stories describe the life of the people. The latter group has been more successfully treated by the novelists Ahmâd Weîfî and Hâsîn ad-Dâshid, in more simple language. Meşhûd Reşûf is a novelist who makes excellent psychological analyses, but his language is incorrect. In the field of science, philosophy and criticism, the collaborators on the Tharîm-ī Fûnûm did no more than translate. But the severe censorship and the short life of the group did not enable them to show greater vitality.

While the school of Tevîhî Fikrî and Khâlid Ziya reflected only the life of the upper classes, Hûsîn Nişâzî [q.v.] depicted in his novels various aspects of the life of the people; and at the same time the notable publicist Ahmâd Râzîm [q.v.] was dealing in several of his works with the same subject. Among the poets of this period, we may further mention Rizî Tevîhî [q.v.] who has written the finest lyrics in the style of the Şâdî poets and Bektâshî, but in syllabic metre, the poetess Nişâzâl Hûsîn and lastly Meşhûd Emin Bey [q.v.] who suddenly became celebrated during the Turko-Greek war by his Türkî Şerîfier. Meşhûd Emin employed a very simple language in the syllabic metre and wished to render the people directly (şükûf du ğârû), although the existing popular literature with its mentality, tastes and traditional forms were entirely unknown to him.

As a man of letters he was entirely of the school
of Fikret; he was not however an individualist like his contemporaries but imbued with the democratic spirit (hidayetli) ([hidayet])*. This was the first occasion on which a Turkish poet had descended to the level of the people. Perhaps it is right to charge him with a lack of lyrical feeling, but this does not prevent us from regarding him as an interesting figure in literary history. At the same time the movement to simplify the language continued and even gave rise to an exaggerated purism. By the translation of the works of European scholars the early history and culture of the Turks became known, while the journalistic activities of the young Turks abroad began to envisage Turkish nationalism from the political point of view. These were the main elements in the cultural and literary life of Turkey before the Revolution of 1908.

xxth century.

The revolution of 1908, having brought about the abolition of the censorship, caused an extended literary activity. The patriotic pieces of Kemal and Hâmet appeared on the stage and a large number of works of a sociological, philosophical and historical nature were translated into Turkish. At the same time, great improvements were made in education and the relations with Europe raised the general cultural level to a height never before reached.

The most important literary organisation after the Revolution was "Fedâ-ı Hür", although it was a literary circle which lasted only a short time; its members began by following the school of Fikret and Khalîd Ziya, but the majority of them ended up as members of the national literary movement. Ahmed Hâşim alone continued to develop in the way he had first chosen. He never abandoned the *avud* metre, nor the conception of "art for art's sake" in its strictest form. Besides, he had ideas of his own on the relation between music and poetry (cf. H. Duda, Ahmed Hâşim in W. L. II, 1928, No. 3--4, p. 200--244). The poet Yahya Kemal, who had a great influence after 1912 had literary views entirely different from those of Ahmed Hâşim for he sought music rather in the external elements of his poems, while he retained the motto "art for art's sake". Another poet, who remained outside of the national literature is Mehmèd 'Akif, the advocate of Panislâmism and unrivalled master of the *avud* metre; in simple language he describes the life of the people in its most realistic aspects. 'Akif, whose lyrics sometimes rise to great heights, has remained quite uninfluenced by western poetry; he is a democratic poet, born of the people. In the work of these three poets, very different from one another, we see Turkish poetry striving for freedom from the too limited sphere of Tewfik Fikret and his school; but under the stimulus of the great development of the nationalist movement which manifested itself in the whole domain of art, poetry also has ended by entering on new paths.

a. The National Literature.

After the Revolution of 1908, it was the ideal of Ottomanism (oglaḵaḵâni) that animated the governing classes. But the political events which rapidly followed, soon proved that this ideal was a chimera, by the attitude of the Muslim elements no less than by that of the Christians. The Turkish element, which was dominant in the empire, thus needed a new ideal; this was the national ideal, which had already revealed itself in the period of the Taqīmat and which had existed through the Hamidiye period in a cultural form. After the revolution also, this movement began by assuming a cultural aspect. On December 28, 1908, the society Türk Dernegi was founded, the object of which was to study the past and present of the Turkish people, to simplify the Turkish language and to make it a language of science. This society had not much power, but in November 1911 the periodical Türk Yurdu began to appear and on March 12, 1912, the Türk Dergisi was founded. This movement was not confined to a few Turkish nationalists: associated with it were a number of Turkish intellectuals from other countries who had fled from the oppression of Turanism, like Ağa Oğlu Ahmed, Hüsain Zade Ale and Ağa Cura Oğlu Yavuz. The movement was violently opposed by the followers of a badly understood occidentalism (sharpesi) on the one side and by the partisans of Panislâmism (irîkdaḵ-î Islâm) on the other. At the same time, the periodical Genc & Kâtib, published at Salonika, again started, under a pretentious name, a campaign to purify the Turkish language, and Ziya Gök Alp, a member of the Committee of Union and Progress (irîkdaḵ-î terâfii), began his activities. With the transfer of the central office to Constantinople, Ziya Gök Alp joined the Türk Yurdu. Later, after the disastrous conclusion of the Balkan War, the younger generation also rallied to the national movement. The time was very opportune for the success of the national ideal; it only required a man capable of directing the national idea and laying down a programme and giving it a philosophical basis. It was Ziya Gök Alp who did this. He exercised a great influence on the youth by his university courses, by his lectures and by his articles and poems; all his life, from the time of the Balkan War to the Armistice, when he was exiled to Malta, and later during his sojourn in Diyarbakir and Ankarâ, he displayed an uninterrupted activity; the résumé of his teaching is contained in his book Türkfüsilâmi Edebiyat (Angora 1939--1923). His death, soon after, was a great cause of general mourning throughout the land.

As in all branches of life, the national movement made its influence felt in literature; the syllabic metre attained the dominant position in poetry; the language was simplified; the motto "art for art's sake" was replaced by "art for life"; writers began to borrow from popular literature and its traditional forms; literature began to reflect the life and characteristics of all branches of society. Philological and historical studies were made on the works of the musician-poets, on the popular literature, the music of the people. In brief, the science of Turkology was founded. It is to Kâprüfûl Zade Mehmèd Fuâd, the author of this article, that almost all the credit of these important studies is due. E.d.d.] All this contributed greatly to give a definite direction to the new literary movement.

Among the poets of this movement we may give first place to Fêrûd Nêfîdî, who in his last poems depicts the scenery of Anatolia, then Orkhan Seifi, Emir Behzîd, Yavuz, Ziya, Khalîd Fakhri, Nêdîb Faqîl. All these show the influence of Ziya Gök Alp and Yahya Kemal rather than of Mehmèd Emin. In prose, the
progress is still more marked and the writers in it have still greater force. The greatest figure of the period is Khālid Edīb Khānīm. After the stories of love and passion which are characteristic of her first period she wrote books in the style of Arzham Edīb Khānīm in which she describes the struggle of Anatolia for independence. 'Omēr Seifeddīn, who died young, has left a number of very good little stories, some of which, like Bomā, are masterpieces of national literature. Rešīf Khālid, who is perhaps the best writer of simple Turkish, describes in his Məmbelət Alifıkyerler l realistic scenes of Anatolian life, hitherto unknown to literature; his realism however is expressed in a merciless sarcasm, quite devoid of sympathy and feeling. Ya'qūb Șurtri, even in his novels, is still a stylist and a mystic poet and not a story-teller. Other well-known figures in the new prose are Fālīh Rifğ, who describes in Arzham Edīb Khānīm episodes of the war in Palestine and Rūshen Eşref. Among the novelists Resḥad Nūrī achieved fame by his novel Cəzā Kəzūn. The evolution of the Turkish theatre is being hampered by the interminable adaptations of worthless French vaudevilles. But the fact that the Turkish woman has appeared on the stage, that there are many good actors and that important western pieces are now being played gives good hope for the future.

By the foundation of the Turkish nationalist republic, nationalist principles have entered into the things of everyday life. The government is devoting much attention to the simplification of the language and to the creation of a scientific terminology in Turkish. The adoption of the Latin alphabet will contribute a great deal to the simplification of the language. But there is no resting. While the nationalist literature is still in its beginnings, we already see announced an internationalist literature. The young and vigorous Marxist poet Nāṣım Hikmet, who has returned to Turkey after a long stay in Russia, is endeavoring to create a proletarian literature, with poems without metre and without rhyme, at the same time launching his thunderbolts at the capitalists and the literary men who defend them. Several young poets and novelists have gathered round Nāṣım Hikmet, while others are trying to spread futurist ideas. It may be doubted if this new movement, brought by wild winds from beyond the Black Sea, will find a fertile soil in this country, where industry and capitalism are only beginning to develop. It is impossible to say if the young national literature will be capable of resisting these foreign influences. In any case, future developments will take a course parallel to that of the country's destiny.


b. Texts: The majority of the texts of the old literature are still in manuscript. Some have been printed at Cairo and Constantinople but not in critical editions. For the manuscripts, the catalogues of libraries in east and west may be consulted. Very few texts have been translated into European languages. For details, see this article and other articles relating to the subject.

c. Chrestomathies: The most important manuscript selections are mentioned in the following:

In Europe there have been published: E. J. W. Gibb, A History of Ottoman Poetry, vol. v, vi; W. D. Smirnoff, Münəsoölu Edīb Khānīm, St. Petersburg 1903; M. Wickerhaus, Wegzeiger zum Verständniss der türkischen Sprache, Vienna 1853; A. Fischer and Mahledi, Anthologie aus der menschlichen türkischen Literatur, 1. Leipzig-Berlin 1919. La Musée ottomane by Sévres de Sagny, publ. in 1855, gives translations in verse.

For the classical poetry we have Khrabak by Ziyā Pāchu (3 vol., 1291), and Münəsoölu Mir Nāsif (Bülkâk 1261). For prose: Eləziyə Təşń, Namüntəsi Edebiyyət Eşkiməni (6th ed., Constantinople 1930). Lastly there are a number of chrestomathies for Turkish schools; the most recent is Türk Edebiyyəti Münəsoölu by Hüfe Təşń, Haməməti Zāde İhsan and Hanan Əli (vol. i, Constantinople 1927).

d. Biographies of poets. The most important tekkhər-i şairər have been mentioned in the text. A large number are not yet printed. For bibliographical information see: the introduction to İbn al-ʿĀdin Mahmūd Kemāl, Şərʿe türk Edebiyyət-i (publ. by the T.T.E., vol. i, Constantinople 1930). There one will find information about old and new bibliographical works on literary history. In addition, there are important notices of the poets in all the historical sources, the cəzā cəzā, and books of legends (məmbelət alifıkyerler) etc.

e. General Works. There is not yet a literary history on really scientific lines, either in Turkey or Europe. J. von Hammer, Geschichte der osmanischen Dichtkunst (4 vols., 1836) is a collection of biographies taken from the tekkhər-i şairər which were known to the author. The works of Siuriń, Krymski and others are defective as regards the information and the judgment of their authors. For the bibliography of these works see Th. Menzel, Die türkische Literatur (in Kultur der Gegenwart), who has however omitted to mention Krymski, Təşn-i yəya literaturi, 2 vols., Moskow 1916. The most important work on the early poetry of Turkey is E. J. W. Gibb, A History of Ottoman Poetry, 6 vols., London 1900-1906. This work is still of great value, although the account of the xii-th-xvth century is very inadequate. It is rather a collection of biographies of poets, which is complete only down to the Tahmāt; also P. Horn, Geschichte der türkischen Moderne, Leipzig; M. Hartmann, Aus der neueren osmanischen Dichtung, M. S. O. S., xix.-xxi.; O. Hachtman, Die türkische Literatur des zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts, Leipzig. As to the value of the literary histories publ. in Turkey (cf. also Menzel, article here quoted), we may mention: Şəlhab al-Din Sulaiman, Təş'n-i Edebiyyət-i şəxisməni, Constantinople; Fâlīh Resḥad, Təş'n-i Edebiyyət Eşkiməni, Constantinople 1913; İnshāh Nətfi, Təş'n-i Edebiyyət Dəvərleri, 2 vol., Constantinople 1338-1341; İsmə'ıl Habib, Türk Edebiyyəti Edebiyyət-i Təş'n-i, Constantinople 1340; İsmə'ıl Hikmet, Türk Edebiyyəti Təş'n-i, 4 vols., Ankara 1925-1926. But these works are superficial in method and in information supplied. Köprülü Zāde Mehməd Fuğ, Türk Edebiyyəti Təş'n-i endeavours to gather together in a systematic fashion the literatures of the various Turkish peoples. So far only
the first volume has appeared (Constantinople, Dewlet Maşta'aşl, 1926-1928). The most important monographs on the different figures and subjects in the literary history of Turkey are mentioned in this article and in the special articles. (Köprülu Xizbi Meşmer Fişko)

IV. HISTORY.

1. General Features.

The Ottoman Empire is the largest and most lasting state that has been formed in Islamic times by the people of Turkish tongue. At the same time it is the largest state formed in the later centuries of Islamic history. Its original centre was Asia Minor, situated in the north-westernmost angle of the Islamic world, a country that had seen four centuries less of Islamic domination than most of the lands of the ancient Abbasid Caliphate. It was founded about A.D. 1300, at a time when everywhere in the Islamic world the earlier political traditions were broken and none of the existing governments seemed to give much guarantee of durability, while Muslim civilization itself was passing through a critical period of weakness.

These circumstances are not sufficient in themselves to account for the rising of a new strong Muslim empire. It is right, therefore, to seek the explanation of the rise of the birth and the part played by the Ottoman Empire in the general course of political events in the world history of the later Middle Ages. It has been observed that the rise of a new strong power in the Mediterranean world had only become possible after the extinction of the Abbasid Caliphate and its political traditions, in 1258, and after the excessive weakening of the Byzantine Empire by the Latin occupation of 1204 (cf. R. Tschudi, Von alterm Osmanischen Reich, Tübingen 1930). This enabled a new state, to come into existence that continued at the same time a somewhat changed Islamic tradition and a good deal of the already much easternized Byzantine civilization.

The process of interpenetration of these two cultural spheres had already been in action a long time before the nucleus of the Ottoman state was formed, during the epoch of the Seljuk empire of Rumi. Consequently the rapid conquests of the Ottomans in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were not the elementary invasions of a wild horde of barbarians, but the realisation of a scheme that may have been in some degree present to the mind of great conquerors like Bayezid I, Muhammad II, Suleiman I and some of their statesmen. The conquest spread at the time a type of civilisation that took its definite shape in the sixteenth century. As history advanced, this Ottoman civilisation came into an ever more pronounced contrast with its eastern Muslim neighbours, thus giving a new political meaning to the Sunni-Shi'a controversy; while the ancient relations with Turkish Transoxania gradually slackened. At the same time the gap between the Ottoman and the western European civilisation — which in the sixteenth century did not yet seem unbridgeable — became constantly wider, as Turkey did not join in the transition from the Middle Ages to modern times. All the more firmly was Ottoman civilisation rooted in the many countries that had been subjected to the rule of the Turkish sultans, and this Ottoman tradition became most perceptible at the very time of the weakening of the Ottoman political power; a very good example is Egypt (cf. Lindsay). It is a curious fact that, when after the revolution of 1908 the Young Turks tried for a brief period to make this Ottomanism once more a political reality, these endeavours proved to be a complete failure, owing to the political decomposition caused by the penetration from the west of nationalist feelings.

Born in a religious sphere that was far away from orthodox Islam, the Ottoman Empire soon took a definite turn towards official orthodoxy after the Hanafite madhhab, but with remnants of older tradition. The claim to the Islamic Caliphate, however, and to the hegemony of the Muslim world, as well as the pan-Islamic policy of Abd al-Hamid II do not belong to the primary features of the Ottoman Empire; they were more a part of its outward politics, especially towards Christian powers (cf. KHALIPA).

The influence of western civilisation began in the xviith century, at a time when the Ottoman Empire, having acquired its own cultural type, began to feel its political inferiority towards Europe. Ancient relations made France the first European country to provide Turkey with some technical (military) innovations; this tradition remained stable until the first part of the xixth century. The introduction of western reforms and institutions has never had a revolutionary character; it consisted chiefly in government measures and its programme was successfully carried out during the period of the Tanzimat [q. v.]. A more indirect result of western ideas was Turkish nationalism, which new ideal the war of 1914-1918 has enabled Turkey to realize in a most unexpected manner. Modern Turkey has become a state of much smaller territory than the Ottoman Empire, but continuing a great deal of the traditions of the Ottoman Empire.

2. Historical survey.

First period. The founding of the state and its first expansion until the temporary dissolution by the invasion of Timur.

Ottoman I 1399-1426
Orkhan (son of Ottoman I) 1426-1459
Murad I (son of Orkhan) 1459-1489
Bayezid I (son of Murad I) 1489-1502

The dates of Ottoman and Orkhan cannot be established beyond doubt. Bayezid's reign was closed by his capture in the battle of Angora (July 20, 1402); it was followed by no years, during which Bayezid's sons Fatih, Muhammad, Suleiman and Mustafa disputed for the other the crown. This period ended by Mehmed's victory over Must in July, 1413 at Çamlıca near Sofia.

Second period. The restoration of the state and its rapid growth until its greatest expansion.

Muhammad I (son of Bayezid I) 1403-1444
Murad II (son of Muhammad I) 1451-1474
Muhammad II Fatih (son of Murad II) 1451-1481
Bayezid II (son of Muhammad II) 1481-1512
Selim I (son of Bayezid II) 1512-1520
Suleiman I Kanuni (son of Selim I) 1520-1566

Third period, during which the state maintained its territory, until the loss of Hungary.

Selim II (son of Suleiman I) 1566-1574
Murad III (son of Selim II) 1574-1595
Mühsim I (son of Murad III) 1595–1603
Ağrıd I (son of Muhammad III) 1603–1617
Murad I (son of Muhammad III) 1617–1618
Osman II (son of Ağrıd I) 1618–1622
Murad I, 2nd time 1622–1623
Murad IV (son of Ağrıd I) 1623–1640
Ibrahim I (son of Ağrıd I) 1640–1648
Murad V (son of Ibrahim I) 1648–1657
Suleiman II (son of Ibrahim I) 1657–1691
Ağrıd II (son of Ibrahim I) 1691–1695
Mustafa II (son of Murad IV) 1695–1703

Fourth period, during which the state gradually loses its strength and is broken up at the hands of powerful vassals.

Ağrıd III (son of Muhammad IV) 1703–1739
Mahmud I (son of Mustafa II) 1730–1754
Osman III (son of Mustafa II) 1754–1757
Mustafa III (son of Ağrıd III) 1757–1774
'Abd al-Hamid I (son of Ahmad III) 1774–1789
Selim III (son of Mustafa III) 1789–1807
Mustafa IV (son of 'Abd al-Hamid I) 1807–1808
Mahmud II (son of 'Abd al-Hamid I) 1808–1839

Fifth period. Cultural and administrative renaissance of the state under the influence of western ideas.

'Abd al-Medjid (son of Mahmud II) 1839–1861
'Abd al-'Aziz (son of Mahmud II) 1861–1876
Murad V (son of 'Abd al-Medjid) 1876
'Abd al-Hamid II (son of 'Abd al-Medjid) 1876–1909
Mahmud V (son of 'Abd al-Medjid) 1909–1918
Mahmud VI (son of 'Abd al-Medjid) 1918–1922

The national Turkish state, since October 29, 1923 a republic under the presidency of Atatürk.

A good general view of the history of the Ottoman Empire is given in Khalil Edhem, Dînéerî Islâmîya, Istanbul 1927, p. 320 sqq.

3. Conditions in Asia Minor at the end of the xviith century.

The more recent researches on the subject of the founding of the Ottoman state have made clear many things that formerly had been seen mainly through the medium of Ottoman historical tradition as reflected in the sources belonging to the xvith century and later. Epigraphic and numismatic discoveries, combined with a critical study of older historical sources (the different versions of the chronicles of the Atil 'Othmân) and half-legendary sources (oynaht-sûnes and wehâyît-sûnes of mystic orders) have cleared up many historical relationships, hitherto unsuspected.

The nucleus of the state of the dynasty of 'Othmân was a far advanced outpost (hâjî) on the northwestern frontier of the territory once ruled by the Seljûk dynasty of Konya, which had gradually relapsed into anarchy after the victory of the Mongols over Kajıhwar Şîrîn in 1243. Asia Minor, at that time, had already been territcised to a large degree; the greater part of the Anatolian Turks belonged to the Oghuz tribes, who had been introduced during and after the Seljûk invasion; there were also groups of Christian Turks, who had come by way of the European part of the Byzantine Empire, besides Turkish elements from Russia. Moreover the Mongol conquests in the east had brought crowds of fugitives into the country, especially from the former Khwarizmian sultanate; many of these immigrants were Iranians. We do not know the relative strength of the grazed original population of Asia Minor; they probably were found chiefly in the towns. In Konya the original inhabitants no doubt were already considerably waslamized. But the Christian element was still largely represented in the areas under Byzantine rule in the west and in the northwest in the Empire of Trebizond, where many of the population were Lazae, in the mountains of central Armenia and in the Cilician Armenian Kingdom (1080–1375). It does not appear that, within the former frontiers of the Seljûk empire, there existed a sharp social controversy between Muhammadans and Christians. MUCH sharper, at any rate, has been the anathesis between the townpeople and the still nomadic Turkish tribes or Turkomans (târîkôr-î Aman), who were roving all through Asia Minor, as they did also in the adjacent territories of Syria, Mesopotamia and Persia. The Turkish tribes had still preserved many pre-Islamic religious traditions within the particular form of Islam they had adhered to. This form of Islam was the result of the preaching of wandering dervishes, known under the name of Kâlemlerîye and Halâjrîye, who spread from the xivith century all over northern Iran and Transoxania; their preaching was imbued with mystical doctrines containing a large amount of Shi'ite elements. After their immigration into Asia Minor the Turkomans had remained under the same influences and those who exercised religious authority amongst them, called kâbeb, had still much resemblance to the pre-Islamic Ṣoyîrîs. Under these religious leaders in 1239 the fearful revolt of the Bekeštâhs under Bâbâ Isâb was taken place. The government, at that time, had been able at last to suppress the revolt, but the heterodox opposition among the lower classes in Asia Minor has still deeply influenced the history of the first centuries of the Ottoman Empire. These Turkomans were indeed far more numerous than the governing classes and the townspeople, as is shown by the present geographical nomenclature of Asia Minor; the names of numerous villages, rivers and mountains are now pure Turkish and we meet among them ancient tribal names as such Kay, Salur, Bayat and Čepni (cf. Köprüli-Zade Fu'âd, Oğuz in Emneleşme Türkü Neftar, Türkçü Meşrûfatî, i, 185 sqq.). As far as the Turkoman tribes were militant, the best use that could be made of them was as frontier guards and as conquerors of new territory. After settling down, they may have mixed with a good deal of the original rural population and by this mixture is to be explained the curious religious, half-Christian, views and customs that are reported in later times as existing among the lower classes in Anatolia, and which are especially current among the mystic order of the Bekeštâhs in the time of the Ottoman Empire. The Bekeštâhs derive their name from Hadji Bektash Weli, who is reported to have been a disciple of the above mentioned Bābā Isâb (Köprüli, Z. Fu’âd, Les origines du Bektachisme, in Actes du Congrès International de l’Histoire des Religions, tome à Paris 1923).

The government and the higher classes of society had followed in Seljûk times the orthodox Islamic tradition, just like the other Seljûk dynasties, and this tradition is to be traced back to the times of the Seljûk empire in Khorasan and Transoxania. These were also the regions with
which the Turkish element in Asia Minor has been, since its immigration, in constant relations; in the Seljuk period, the higher culture of Asia Minor was mainly Iranian in character. These relations explain also how the Hāsāfī madākhāb became officially predominant in Anatolia and afterwards in the Ottoman Empire. But the upper classes of society were not free themselves from a strong mystic influence of a higher order. It had likewise its source in Khurāsān, whence had come ʿAbī al-Dīn Rūmī [q.v.] himself, who lived at the Seljuk court in Konya, and who influenced for centuries Ottoman-Turkish culture through the Mevlâni-order. So the townspeople were likewise familiar with formations of fraternities on mystic lines, entering within the category of the fiṭrānu [q.v.]; on the fraternity of the Akhī the we are now fairly well informed (F. Taeschner, in Islamischer, iv., 1929, fass. 1); a similar fraternity was formed by the Ghūrān. On this basis of religious and social controversy is to be understood the development of events since the end of the xiiith century. In the many small principalities that appeared (jauz bi-i mawāli) we see sometimes the influence of the orthodox element and sometimes of the heterodox Turkoman element predominant. This last was especially the case with the powerful principality of the Karaman Oghlu [q.v.], at least in the beginning.

As the date of the foundation of the state of ʿOğlanı in Bithynia the year 1299 is generally accepted. About the same time sprang up the principalities of the Karazi Oghlu [q.v.] in Myria, of the Saruhan Oghlu [q.v.] in Lydia, of the Aïdin Oghlu [q.v.] in Ionia, of the Menteşe Oghlu [q.v.] in Caria and of the Teke Oghlu [q.v.] in Lycia. All these dynasties had this in common with the ʿOğlanı Oghlu, that they held large parts of the western coast of the Peninsula; their territories were on the outskirts of the former Seljukian empire and the dynasties were the dependants of the chiefs of the Turkoman frontier guards (sad bi qeğeri); these regions were the most remote from the Islamic cultural centre of Anatolia; on the other hand they entertained relations with the Greeks of the coasts and with the Italian colonists on the islands; some of these principalities (Saruhān, Aïdin, Menteše) even had coins with images and Latin letters. But the most important feature of these principalities of the coast was the possession of fleets, by which they were able to undertake raids on the Greek isles and on the European continent from Morea as far as the Dobruja. Especially the Aïdin Oghlu. Umur Beg (died in 1348) is famous for his maritime expeditions as ally of the Byzantine emperor Cantacuzenos. It was this opportunity of westward expansion, which has been most favourable for the ʿOğlanı Oghlu and secured them in the end the superiority over the other principalities.

The east of the maritime principalities had risen at the same time the Germiyan Oghlu [q.v.] in Phrygia and the Hamīd Oghlu [q.v.] in Paphlagonia, together with the less important Fahrih Oghlu in Bey Shehir (later incorporated in the dominions of the Hamīd Oghlu) and the Defārhi Oghlu in Lalik (later incorporated in the territory of the Germiyan Oghlu). The important dynasty of the Djandjas Oghlu — later called Isfandiyar Oghlu [q.v.] — in Paphlagonia held the Black Sea with Sinlûb, but had less opportunity of maritime ex-

pansion, although these regions too were in relation with the European continent, especially the Dobruja. A similar position on the south coast was held by the Karaman Oghlu [q.v.], whose origin can be traced back to about 1256, and who, by their geographical position on the main road to Syria, were able to develop more power and stability than the other principalities (cf. Khatl Edhem, Dinar-i İslamîyet, p. 270 sqq.).

The regions enumerated can be said never to have been a part of the territory administered by the Mongols in the xivth century. The Mongol governors, appointed by Uuljiaat (1304—1316) and Abu Saḥīl (1316—1325), resided principally in Kastriye and governed the central plateau of Asia Minor as far as AnKarā. The last of these governors was Timur Tash, who, in 1327, had to fly to Egypt, leaving as his lieutenant Ertene. This Ertene made himself independent in 1325 and founded the dynasty of the Ertene Oghlu [q.v.]. About the same time, in 1391, originated in Mənaš and Elbistan the dynasty of the Dhi l-kadriye [q.v.]. In these southern-eastern parts of Asia Minor the Mamlık power of Egypt was at that time an important political factor and both, the Karaman Oghlu and the Dhi l-kadriye had many dealings, friendly and unfriendly, with state affairs. The social and religious conditions in all the principalities enumerated were much the same. The military power of the Beg or Emir depended on still more or less nomadic tribesmen, and to this class are to be reckoned the half religious and half military chiefs that in several regions bear the title of Paša [q.v.], as for instance with the ʿOğlanı Oghlu, Teke, Aïdin, Deñiš and Djamār Oghlu. In several regions we meet also with the qeşes; these apparently were akin to the more orthodox fiṭrānu-organizations of Seljük times. The court of the Beg became also a gathering place of more orthodox scholars and of literary men who now began to write their works in Turkish (cf. Literature, supra, p. 3). The bigger towns had often retained older social forms; this is especially known for AnKarā, situated at the extremity of the Mongolian territory; the government was here really in the hands of the corporation of the Akhī.

On the religious history of this pre-Ottoman period are to be consulted the works of Köpr. İzzeddin, "Ilk Muftanovvıst, Istanbul 1918, and Amidaülâ'da İslamîyet, Edibiyat Fakültesi Mecmii, 1922—1923.

4. The First Period (1399—1402).

The historical tradition of the Ottomans has preserved reminiscences of the Turkoman nomadic origin of the founders of the state. The father of ʿOğlanı, Ertoghurlı [q.v.], is said to have established himself with his little tribe in the neighbourhood of Sogā [q.v.] as an adi biq; the pedigree given for Ertoghurlı and his father Suleimâni Şah shows them as belonging to the Kāyî [q.v.], division of the Oghlu Turks. The various reports, however, about Ertoghurlı and his clan have a good deal of a legendary character and it is also the case with what is told about the youth and the first exploits of ʿOğlanı himself. The different sources allow a historical reconstruction according to which ʿOğlanı — or ʿOğlanı, as the oldest known form of the name is given — was not even a real son of Ertoghurlı, but rather belonged to the non-
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nomadic element of the population, with whom the orthodox Islamic tradition was stronger than with the Turkomans (J. H. Kramer, *Wor war Osmans*, in *A.O.,* v. 242). He was, at any rate, one of the *gülâşt-i Rûm* and, together with other *gülâsts* (Turkish *alâ*), he possessed, after Erkoghlul's death (about 1205), the leadership of the clan. He likewise was surrounded by people belonging to the fraternities of the *ahâl*, and it is clear that even Oghman's father-in-law, the Şâhî Khedibeh, whatever his extraction may have been, belonged to the same fraternity. As a result of the collaboration of these various elements the clan was transformed into a territorial state with the fortress Karsdag Hîsâr as centre; in this state gradually the more orthodox Islamic tradition became predominant, though the popular religious leaders (baba, dede, abdul) remained in high esteem.

During his reign and that of Orkhan the history of the small principality was not different from that of the contemporary Anatolian principalities. With the exception of the monuments on his personal relations, he succeeded in extending his territory, so that at his death, the Sâhârez was practically the eastern boundary of the state; to the south Oghman's power had probably reached Eski-Shehir. The Greek towns near or on the coast; however, Izniq, İrinlikdî (İzmid) and finally Brusa were only taken in the beginning of Orkhan's reign; forthwith Brusa became the capital. All these new territories had been conquered from the Byzantines, mostly local commanders of garrisons; the Turks were seldom (in 1301 and 1329) opposed by a regular Byzantine army. Under Orkhan there was also added other Turkomans territory to his dominions, namely the principality of the Karas Oghlu [q.v.]; by this territorial acquisition the Oghman Oghlu became at once the most prominent maritime power among the Anatolian principalities.

It is a noteworthy fact in the history of Oghman and Orkhan, that there apparently existed close relations with Christian chiefs and commanders in the neighbourhood. Kûse Nikhal, lord of the fortresses of Kirmendjik, is said to have been a constant friend to Oghman; and after the acquisition of the Karas principality, Orkhan was joined by Khâzî Ezrewus [q.v.], also of Christian descent. The descendants of both became afterwards notable feudal families in the Ottoman state.

This early collaboration with Christian Greek element makes it probable that in this way byzantine traditions and customs early entered the Ottoman state, in the same way as was the case in some other contemporary maritime principalities. Both the Christian and the Turkomans-nomadic element were gradually assimilated by the growing influence of the orthodox Muslim, often indicated in the older sources as *dâr-umâmînd*; some of these belonged to the *ahl-*circles, as is said of the Kâşi Djandari Kara Khalil, later vizier to Murad I under the name of Kâvir al-Din Paşa; many of them had also come from the more eastern parts of Asia Minor. To them may have belonged also "Alt" al-Din Paşa, Orkhan's vizier and, according to tradition, his elder brother.

So, during Orkhan's on the whole peaceful reigns, these very different elements contributed to the foundation of a typical form of administration and codification, from which the later development of the Ottoman state must be explained. The details are little known. The administration was a military one and probably followed Soldân tradition; the division of territory among feudal chiefs may have repolished on earlier institutions [cf. Timur]. Fields were given under Orkhan to the newly created cavalry called *muscellim*. During Orkhan's reign was also formed the new regular infantry called *yasa*, as the irregular force of the *sâziq*, originally composed of the Turkoman tribesmen, was no longer adequate. In this time also the title *paşa* ([q.v.]), originally peculiar to military desirers, began to be given to statesmen (e.g. Simâ Paşa under Orkhan) and military commanders.

The natural extension of the young state was towards the west, in keeping with the naval raids of the Şahsan Oghlu and Aflin Oghlu on the in-shore and on the Greek coast. Already under Orkhan there had been several military expeditions on the other side of the Hellespont, mostly in connection with his alliance with the emperor Constantine and the latter's civil wars. In 1353, however, begins the military occupation of towns on the European side by the famous expedition of Orkhan's son, Sulaiman Paşa, following the capture of Gallipoli. This was the prelude to the military operations of Murad I and Bayazid I, which took place nearly entirely in Rûm-ul. At first all the Byzantine territory to the west of Constantinople was taken; Adrianople (Edirne), conquered in 1361, became in 1365 the European capital of Murad. Then followed the wars against the Bulgarians and the Serbians, which assured the Ottomans the greater part of the present kingdom of Bulgaria. The Serbian power was crushed in the battle of Kossovo in 1389, where Murad I was killed, and Wallachia became tributary. Bayazid's military expeditions extended over a still wider range, including Hungary, Bosnia and southern Greece, but in these regions the Ottoman conquests were not yet permanent, notwithstanding the victory won at Nicopolis in 1396 over the allied Hungarian, French and German armies. Constantinople became a mere vassal town where the Ottoman sultan could exercise his influence as he pleased; it did not come yet to a direct occupation, although Bayazid's attitude towards the town was little less than a continious siege [cf. F. Giese, *Turkische und bulgarische Berichte zur Geschichte Sultans Bayezids I., Ephemerides Orientalis,* N. S. 34: April 1948]. The Ottoman policy in Asia Minor had another character. Ankara, in 1359, fell to them in a peaceful way; Murad acquired a large part of the Germîya Oghlu territory as a wedding present to his son and the country of the Hamid Öghlu by sale; even the expeditions against the Karaman Öghlu in 1336 and 1351 were conducted with much leniency, and it seems that the definite conquest of Konya, Siwis and Kastramuni in 1392 was a mere consequence of political necessity, felt perhaps through the conquests of Timur, who finally crushed the impetuosity of Bayazid in the battle of Ankara (1402). Many of Bayazid's conquests, indeed, were as ephemeral as those of Timur himself.

While the sultans conducted the military operations, the organisation was in the hands of their statesmen, among whom Djandari Kara Khalil, later known as Kâvir al-Din Paşa, is the most notable [cf. F. Taeschner, *P. Wissowa, Die Vaterfamilie der Grundherren und ihre Denkmäler, Die Islam, 1929*, p. 61 sqq.]. To him is attributed the institution of the janissaries in con-
section with the reservation of a fifth part of the war booty for the sultan. The Janissaries [q. v.] were taken from the captured Christians, and there is no indication that in the sixteenth century the devshirmes [q. v.] was already applied. Their organization on the lines of a fraternity after the model of the adab’s or the ghāṣṭa’s, and their connection in this respect with the devshirme-order of the Bekzadhi’s, shows again the influence of the peculiar religious tradition of the state.

The first begs of the ʿOthmān Oghlu, in the older sources generally bearing the title of ʿabunakir, had originally taken over some of the Sudanī custom and traditions, such as the bearing of lughāt’s composed with ʿānī and ṣanūqī, but from the time of Murād I this custom was abandoned. Murād is also the first to take the title sultan in inscriptions. These first rulers followed also the traditions of other Anatolian rulers by marrying high born Christian ladies; ʿOshshān was the first to take a Byzantine princess for his wife. On the other hand, the proper names of some of the first Sultans (Murād, Bayzād) have preserved older, in fact Syrian, traditions; to the same early time is to be traced back the investiture of the sultan by the girding on of a sword, which perhaps symbolized originally his admission to the order of the ghāṣṭa’s [cf. ʿghāṣṭa ʿalay]. An important fact of the first century of Ottoman history was the enforced migration of populations, which ancient oriental custom was particularly applied by Bayzād I, mostly from the east to the west. This general drift towards the west may have occasioned also the increasing estrangement between ʿOthmān Oghlu and Karamān Oghlu and, together with other influences, the religious opposition in Anatolia.


5. Second period.

When Timur left Asia Minor again, he left the peninsula as divided as it had been hundred years before; the principalities on the coast as well as ʿAsām, and Karamān, had been given back to their former owners, one of whom was replaced in 1403 by the enterprise İsmāʿīl ʿOgūlū Ėrmiş [q. v.]; two sons of Bayzād, ʿIṣā and Muḥammad, were residing at Brusa and at Amasia respectively. Although the European possessions, where Suleyman resided, had been left untouched by the Turks, in the restoration of the Ottoman state Bayzād again its centre in Anatolia, where Muḥammad had been able in a short time to establish himself as master of a considerable territory, including the old capital Brusa. After that his first move was the reconquest of the European possessions that were held first by ʿAsām and afterwards by ʿMāsā. Only after 1413 was Muḥammad I in a position to begin the gradual incorporation of the other Anatolian principalities into the newly restored state; this policy was followed by Murād II and by Muḥammad II. This time again the rounding off of the Anatolian territory was effected without much bloodshed, with the exception of the Karamān Oghlu state, the old rivals of the ʿOthmān Oghlu. But even here the Ottomans began by following a remarkably conciliatory policy. The descendants of those dynasties were generally granted high military posts in Europe. Muḥammad II finished the conquest of Anatolia proper by the conquest of the empire of Trebizond in 1461 and when, at last, the Karamān dynasty was extinguished in 1468, the Ottoman Empire stood face to face with the ʿĀṣ kūyuni dynasty in the north and the Egyptian state in the south-east. The dangerous aid of the ʿĀṣ kūyunlu Uzun ʿHasan, in 1472, had not, however, the disastrous consequences of Timur’s campaign, the Ottoman Empire being now more firmly established; under Bayzād II this neighbour was succeeded by the young Safawī dynasty of Persia; still, until the end of the reign of this Sultan, the Ottoman territory was not enlarged on the Asiatic front, though there were several inglorious frontier wars with the Manṣūrī forces in Syria.

All through the reigns from Muḥammad I to Bayzād II the chief military activity of the Ottomans was given to the establishing of the Ottoman power in Europe. The sultans themselves resided most of the time in Europe, where they led many campaigns in person. Already under Muḥammad I there broke out a conflict with Venice with the advance of the Turks in Albania and Morea, and under Murād II Hungary became the other chief Christian opponent, as a consequence of the Turkish raids and conquests in Serbia and Wallachia. These raids and conquests, as well as those in Albania and Morea, were of an indeterminate date; but they were undertaken by the frontier chiefs. The first results were more often the occupation of a few towns, where a ʿāṣārā or ʿāṣārā was appointed as chief of the garrison; most of the territory was left under the administration of the local rulers, who were responsible for the payment of the ḥāʾasha in the form of a tribute. Also Constantinople and the rest of the other Byzantine possessions kept for a long time their semi-independence in this way and succeeded even several times in defying a siege. Gradually these strongholds of Christian political and cultural independence were taken; the capture of Constantinople in 1453, which made such a profound impression among the Turks as well as in the Occident, was only the realisation of a part of the political scheme of Muḥammad II, of bringing the whole Balkan peninsula under the direct government of the Ottoman state; at his death this scheme had nearly become a reality. There were still Venetian enclaves in Morea and Albania, and in the north Belgrad was still held by the Hungarians, but even Bosnia was ruled by Turkish beys. The isles of the archipelago, except Rhodes, were incorporated in the same manner. Only the Danube principalties Wallachia and Moldavia and, since 1475, the Crimean Khanate had remained vassals.

During all this time the Christian powers had been scheming and planning crusades to expel the Turks from Europe, while trying also alliances with the Asiatic opponents of the Ottomans. But no really great enterprise was ever undertaken; only temporary damage was done by the Hungarian Hunyadı, the Wallachian Wlad ʿDrago, the Albanian Skander Beg [q. v.] and by some Venetian naval expeditions.

All these military successes in Europe would not have been possible without the strong base in Turkish Anatolia. Still more astonishing is per-
hapy the permanence of the Turkish occupation. The reason may be sought mainly in the lack of any sufficiently great political Christian power in the much divided Balkan peninsula.

After the relatively peaceful reign of Bâyâzîd II, there is no more question about Asia Minor or the Balkan Peninsula. The struggle continued in Albania and Morea, but had on the whole a local character. The empire was now strong enough to face its new Asiatic neighbours. The war waged against Persia by Selîm I was in a way a continuation on an international scale of the former internal struggle against the Şî'î opposition in Asia Minor itself. This war secured Turkey the temporary possession of Ağârîbâdîn and the lasting domination over Kurdistan and Northern Mesopotamia. Very soon afterwards the Egyptian state of the Mamlûks, with whom the Ottoman Empire had clashed under Bâyâzîd II in a rather unglorious way, was incorporated by Selîm in one single campaign. The consequence was the extension of Turkish overlordship to the cities of İskân and soon to Yaman. Finally, under Sulêimân I the Magnificent, the empire obtained its greatest extension by the conquest of the greater part of Hungary, one of the two great mediæval opponents in Europe; in the same campaign the Turks went even so far as to besiege Vienna. Only the other old rival, Venice, was not broken by the victorious empire. After Muhammad II's death, official wars with Venice had become rather an exception. The Ottoman empire never had acquired an absolute maritime superiority, and this weakness appeared almost immediately after: the great period of conquest was over, in the battle of Lepanto. Rhodes was conquered, but Malta has never been Turkish and the maritime exploits of Kemâl Re's [q. v.] under Bâyâzîd and those of Barbarossa Khair al-Dîn and others, which assured Turkey's political authority in the Sulêimânian era on the North coast of Africa and in the Indian Ocean, never wholly lost the character of piracy. On the Asiatic front the continuation of the conflict with Persia led for the time to the conquest of Baghîdâd and 'Irâq, so that the sultan was now in reality melân al-bârîn wa 'l-kafrâyân.

In the course of this second victorious period the inner religious and social evolution of the state had not been less astonishing than the enormous expansion of its territory. The originally somewhat dubious Islâmic orthodoxy had gradually converged towards an unimpeachable orthodox attitude of life among the higher classes; many Muhammedan jurists had found their way from eastern countries to the new cultural centres of the Ottomans and the jurists of Christian extraction (as e.g. Molla Khasraw) joined without reserve the leaders of the official form of Islam. Under this orthodoxy covered the sympathies for mystic organisations and doctrines continued to exist; the mystic orders and the dervishes were generally favoured and the ancient mystic traditions continued to be reflected in many points, such as the proper names of persons. Very probably we must see a reminiscence of the older influence of mystic religious leaders in the state in the remarkable institution of the Şâhid al-İslâm [q. v.] which first appears distinctly under Mustâd II and was gradually sanctioned by the şâhid. On the other hand, the controversy with the more extremist Şî'î under-current of mystic feelings, which existed of old in Asia Minor, has several times taken the form of open revolts against the government, such as the rebellion connected with the name of Simawna: Şâhid Ögîn Büçru Dîn (cf. IRN Şâhid Simawna and F. Baldinger, in Zü, xi.) in 1415, and the revolt of Şâhid Kuli or Şâhid Kuli and his Şâhid Bâsh under Bâyâzîd II. This last revolt was intimately connected with the contemporaneous political-religious movement that led to the establishment of the Sâfawî dynasty in Persia. For this reason the Şâhid Bâsh rebellion was also a grave danger to the existence of the Ottoman state itself, and this explains the ferocity with which under Selîm I the adherents of the Şî'î were persecuted. The attitude of the Muhammedan rulers towards the Christian and Jewish population followed the tolerant tradition; no one was compelled to embrace the Muhammedan faith, with the exception of the Christian children levied by the demâghûrî. It is true that many churches were converted into mosques — like Aya Sofâ —, but the constitution of the Greek-Orthodox and of the Jewish millet as autonomous communities, immediately after the capture of Constantinople, is the most famous example of a policy that was constantly applied. Muhammedan fanaticism began only in the end of the xvth century.

The overwhelming importance of the person of the sultan for the existence of the empire is still more accentuated during this period. This is shown by the menace of military revolts after the death of nearly every sultan and the artifices by which his death was kept secret until the arrival of his successor; also by the grave disturbances caused by pretenders [cf. DJEM] and the tradition of fratricide, inaugurated by Bâyâzîd I, which was the necessary consequence of it. The supporting of Ottoman pretenders was justly considered as one of the most effective means at the hands of the Christian enemies of the empire. For the Christian subjects the conquest made little difference; after Muhammed had taken the Byzantine capital, he had taken for them all the attributes of their legitimate 'insâliins'.

The wars of Timur had again caused great racial movements in Asia Minor, and in the times that followed it remained the policy of the sultans to transplant contingents of the population from one part of the empire to the other. In this way Constantinople — to which town now all the main military roads in Asia Minor were directed — was deliberately peopled with the population of different parts of Anatolia (İstanbul = Istanbul) and in the same way Adrianople had become an Islamic town. Amid the Turkish settlement population in Rûm-îli has always lived side by side with the Christians, the relative proportions varying considerably in the different territories. The Islamisation of large parts of the population in Bosnia and Albania had other causes.

Now it is especially this state of affairs in European Turkey that has been important for the development of the Ottoman political system that has found its highest achievement in the reign of Sulêimân I. The beginnings of this new inner evolution of the Ottoman civilisation are to be sought in the reign of Murât II, parallel with the consolidation of the Ottoman type of religious orthodoxy. The new leading men in the state and in the army were now for the greater part Christian renegades of Albanian, Slav, Greek or even more western origin; the older families that had
come from Asia Minor, such as the Mihâil Oğlu and the Evrenos Oğlu, receded to the second place as owners of large fiefs on the Danube and in Thrace; the high position of the Djindar Oğlu as vissiers ended, with the execution of Khalîl Pâsha shortly after the fall of Constantinople. The newly converted Christians served the state to their best, but the all-dominating authority of the sultan and perhaps also the democratic tradition of Islam prevented the formation of a hereditary nobility; statesmen and military commanders (as beglerbegs and sanjakbâshis) were the slaves (hâkû) of the sovereign and much less independent than they had been in a former century. Less dependent was the class of the scholars and jurists who provided the ecclesiastical hierarchy with the Şâhîh al-Islâm at the head; among them there are signs of an ecclesiastical nobility. So there was formed an Ottoman ruling class composed for the greater part of non-Turkish elements; they were continuously recruited from the ranks of the Christian renegades that were taken in war or by the dervish-me-levy. Under these circumstances it was inevitable that the administrative institutions should show the influence of Byzantine ideas, as was also the case with the court organisation. By Kâbul-nâmes, of which those of Muhammad II and Suleimân I are the best known, the hierarchy of officials was minutely regulated.

Besides the older troops of irregular askerîs and askashis, the army consisted chiefly of the sipahîs— whose organisation was intimately connected with the military administration of the territory (cf. tâmâş)— and of the Janissaries who, in the time of Murâd II, were for the first time (probably 1438) levied by the method of the dervish-me-levy (q.v.); guns were for the first time used during the siege of Constantinople by Muhammad II. The fleet (cf. Kaşfedan Pâsha) was mainly manned with askashis, besides Christian prisoners as galley-slaves, but had not by far the importance of the army.

The revenues of the state or rather of the sultan consisted for the most part of the constantly increasing askârî or levied on non-Muslim subjects and of the tributes paid by the semi-independent states. The different kinds of customes were equally considerable. Trade remained mainly in the hands of Greeks and, so far as foreign commerce was concerned, it was in the hands of the colonies of Venetian, Genoese and Florentine merchants. These colonies were treated in the same way as the indigenous non-Turkish communities; they were allowed considerable autonomy under their consuls, including consular jurisdiction. These privileges were granted by the sultans in the well-known form of capitulations, in which were prescribed also the commercial duties to be paid by the foreigners, who, in accordance with the principles of Muhammadan Law, were considered as m ashmun. On account of the various wars, those with Venice had to be renewed after each peace concluded (1454, 1479, 1502, 1540). Only afterwards the capitulations took on the character of bilateral international treaties. It was after the same model that the famous capitulation of 1535 was granted to France; but the political side of this instrument was much more important than in the capitulations with the Italian republics; it is the beginning of the normalisation of Turkey's international position in the following period.

The civilisation of the Ottoman Empire of the later Middle Ages was not yet separated from central and western Europe by the wide gap that became characteristic for later centuries. It has even been pointed out that the friendly relations between Muhammad II and Italian princes and artists and his liking for pictorial art enlivened him in a way to a place among the renaissance rulers of the time (Tischhuri, op. cit., p. 19). Soon afterwards, however, the Muhammadan attitude to life began to be again more predominant.

6. Third Period (1566—1699).

At the end of the reign of Suleimân I the Ottoman Empire found itself between two powerful continental neighbours: the Austrian monarchy in Europe and the Safavid empire in Asia. In Europe the Turkish provinces of Bosnia and Hungary were the bulwarks against Austria, while farther to the east the half independent principalities of Transylvania, Wallachia and Moldavia, and the Tatar Crimeans were allowed to exist; from the Turkish point of view also Poland with its Cossacks, and even Muscovy held similar intermediate positions between the two empires; during this period Turkey raised more than once claims to the suzerainty of the last-mentioned countries. In Asia the geographical situation did not allow for the existence of this intermediary kind of state, with the exception of Georgia which was invaded and brought under Turkish authority in 1578. In Asia, however, the Turkish feudal system left places for a number of petty local rulers who were given the title of Pasha. They were found on the Persian frontier in Kurdistan (the princes of Bitlis), but also in Syria (the Druze emirs). The shârîf of Mecca occupied likewise a vassal position, while Yemen, after its reconquest in 1568—1570, was again partly or a more direct Ottoman possession. After 1550 the Turks had even obtained a footing in Masâwî on the African coast and had begun to interfere with Abyssinian affairs; the opportunities here came to an end after the unlucky war of 1578. Egypt was at this time still somewhat under the control of the Turkish Pasha (cf. Mamûres); the Barbary states were nearly independent; the shârîf of Morocco recognised in 1580 the authority of the Turkish sultan.

This general political system of the empire was maintained throughout the third period, a kind of equilibrium being established between the Ottoman Empire and the great continental powers.

Under Selim II, or rather under the administration of Mehmed Sokollu Pasha, Cyprus was conquered (1570—1571), but this conquest occasioned immediately the naval defeat in the battle of Lepanto (q.v.) in 1571, considered to be the first great military blow inflicted on the Turks. The impossibility of further military expansion brought about an inner weakening of the Empire that was marked on the whole by unsuccessful campaigns against Austria (defeat of Kerestes in 1595) and against Persia (loss of Tabriz and Erivan in 1603 and 1604) and found its expression in the unfavourable peace treaty of Zâyttarok with Austria in 1666 and the peace of 1612 with Persia, then under the strong rule of Shah 'Abbâs the Great. In the last decade of the xvith century, Transylvania and the Rumanian principalities even made themselves for some time independent; from 1572
Poland also played often an active role in the complicated political and military course of events on these northern frontiers of the Turkish Empire. The raids of the Cossacks in the Crimea had not yet the dangerous aspect of a century later, when the Muscovite power began to appear on the horizon. A favourable circumstance for Turkey was the weakening of Central Europe by the Thirty Years War; among the west-European countries the already existing friendly relations with France, followed in 1580 by England and in 1605 by Holland were on the whole profitable for the Empire, while Spain had ceased since the end of the century to be a serious maritime danger. In view of the never very strong maritime position of Turkey, the relations with Venice remained subject to surprises on both sides, such as the annexation of Cyprus during the xviiith century this was followed by the not less astonishing conquest of Chios (1645-1666) and about 1655 by the important Venetian conquests in Morea and in the archipelago, so that for a moment even Constantinople was threatened. Still the relations with Venice were on the whole friendly, Turkey being the stronger power on account of its continental position. On the Asiatic frontier Turkey's weakness led temporarily to the loss of Bagdad in 1633 and a renewed Persian danger. But here the old position of the Empire was restored by the revival of its military strength under Murad IV; under his reign and after Shah 'Abbâs' death Persia was invaded by Ottoman troops, Erivan and Tabriz, and finally Bagdad reconquered (1638); in 1639 there began a long period of peace with Persia. After 1640 the stronger position of the Empire was used, as well as for the conquest of Crete, for strengthening the authority of the Porte in Transylvania and the Danubian principalities, and for a fortification of the frontier to the north of the Black Sea, where Aray was taken from the Cossacks, now under Muscovite authority, and fortified in 1660. In this same year the hostilities with the now recovered Austria began again and took at first a menacing character; even France was this time an ally of Austria (Turkish defeat of St. Gothard 1664). But this was only a prelude to the final struggle with Austria that began in 1683 with the unsuccessful siege of Vienna and finished in 1688 with the loss of the Ottoman province of Hungary, and the invasion of the Balkan peninsula by Austrian armies, followed at last by the peace of Carlowitz (1699) in which Turkey, considerably weakened again, had to give up nearly the whole of Hungary and its claim on Transylvania, while it had to recognize the authority of Venice in Morea.

The weakening of the Ottoman Empire at the beginning of this period was mainly due to domestic reasons. During the xvith century it had already been observed that the Empire in this form could only subsist by continuous warfare; it had to be adapted, now to peaceful conditions and this went beyond the possibilities of the personal rule of the sultan, which was based essentially on military conquest. The successors of Selim III the Great were not equal to the task of meeting these new conditions; it is true that Mahommed III, Othman II and Mahommed IV occasionally accompanied their armies, but Murad IV was the last sultan to revive the military traditions of his dynasty, the last real chief. So the sultans, whatever their personal qualities were, became less directly concerned in the administration of the state, though their personality remained surrounded with the traditional veneration. This did not prevent, however, the deposition and murder of Othman II in 1628, nor the deposition of Ibrahim in 1648 and of Mahommed IV in 1688. Instead of the sultans, the statesmen and generals became now more prominent, first in time and in importance Mehmed Soâkolî Pacha [q.v.] under Selim II, Sinuk Pacha [q.v.], the great enemy of the Austrians, under Mahommed III, Murad Pacha [q.v.], and Khosh Pacha [q.v.] under Ahmed I and Othman II; and in the second half of the century the great members of the Köprülî family: Mehmed Pacha, his son Ahmed Pacha and their cousin Mustafa Pacha, to the same period belonged also Nadir Pacha [q.v.], the besiger of Vienna in 1683. These military statesmen belonged to the numerically feeble renegade class and were supporters of the typical Ottoman government system as it had been perfected under Selim I, but they did not represent any considerable group of the strongly diverging population of the empire. There was not yet an Ottoman-Turkish nation. Several other groups were competing with them in the direction of the state affairs; the most formidable being the military corps of the Janissaries and the Sipâîî's, who, several times, especially after serious military defeats as at the time of the entrenchment of Murad IV in 1632 and of Mahommed IV's deposition in 1688, were masters of the political situation. The Janissaries were now even less recruited in the ancient way from the Christian populations, while many abuses had ruined the former discipline of their corps. Several grand viziers fell victims to their fury. Another powerful group, that made occasional use of these 'military' elements, was the court circle, led several times by a powerful Wallide Sul'tan or by a Kiflar Aga. Finally the 'ulama' with the Shahîk al-Islâm succeeded repeatedly in playing a decisive part in the direction of the state affairs (e.g. the munfi Sa'd al-Din under Mahommed III); the deposition of Sultan Ibrahim was sanctioned by fevûd of the Shahîk al-Islâm. These symptoms of decay were truly analysed in Köç Rey's [q.v.] famous Kitâb. Only Murad IV was able to suppress, often by violent means, the influence of these different groups; he succeeded even in raising a new military force (the Segbâns) alongside of the Janissaries. In the capital there were several times outbursts of religious fanaticism directed against the Christians, as happened under Ibrahim I, but it cannot be said that political events were influenced by them; the great statesmen showed on the contrary a remarkable tolerance.

The non-Muslim element, though excluded from all direct influence on the government, had adapted itself to the circumstances. A new Greek aristocracy had arisen in Constantinople, which by wealth and intrigue had powerful relations in Turkish circles, as well as in the leading circles of the Christian principalities on the Danube; the likewise were able to control the nomination of the Greek patriarchs. To this time belongs also the definite turn of the Ottoman Greeks towards Greek orthodoxy under the influence of the patriarch Cyril Lucaris (executed in 1658); the consequence was a decisive rupture with the Roman Christian world and indirectly a strengthening of the Ottoman Empire. The Ottoman Turks had still many religious traditions in common with the Greeks, and Christian
saints were also venerated in Turkish circles. Next to the Greeks the Jewish element, considerably strengthened since the arrival of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews under Beyazid I, played a great social role, chiefly as bankers; the best known representative of this group was Joseph Nassy, the favourite of Selim II.

The lower classes in Asia Minor participated as little in the direction of the state as those of European Turkey. Some dangerous revolts proved, however, that the old religious traditions of the xith and xivth century had not wholly disappeared. In 1599 began the movement of Kara Vazdf [q.v.] in Usfa; much more dangerous for the unity of the Empire was the revolt of Kalender Oghla in Sarukhân (1606), who ruled for some years independently over a great part of western Anatolia, until he was crushed by Murad Paşa. Soon afterwards, 1625—1628, took place the insurrection of Abāra [q.v.], the relentless persecutor of the Janissaries.

Farther to the east the movement for independence under the Kard Djanbalat [q.v.] in Northern Syria, like that of the Druze Fakhr al-Din [q.v.] in the Lebanon had to be tolerated to some extent. The inclination to mysticism and veneration for mystic shrines (such as Mahmid of Skutar, where several grand viziers found asylum under "Ommâhâ III) continued its hold on all classes of the population; several new mystic orders were founded during this period. The foreign trade remained as before in the hands of foreigners, Venetians and other Italians; of Italian origin were also many of the leading personalities of the Turkish navy that was rebuilt after the battle of Lepanto, such as Çigale Zade Sînâ Paşa [q.v.].

7. Fourth period (1699—1839).

During the xvith century the inevitable action of the elements of decay began to be felt more and more in the empire and brought about a situation that has been, too superficially, described as decadence. The causes of the decline were to be sought mainly within the body politic; they were still the consequences of the transition from a conquering state to a peaceful administration, for they were now ever more exploited by foreign powers. Among these Austria was in the beginning still a formidable opponent; after the war of 1716—1718 the peace of Passarowitz meant the loss of what had been left to Turkey of Hungary and Transylvania, and even of Belgrad, but the peace of Belgrad in 1739, in which this town itself was restored, proved that from the Austrian side the real danger had ceased. Moreover, in 1715, Morea had been reconquered from the Venetians by the grand vizier Djinm 'Ali Paşa, which success had shown that Venice also was no more to be feared. A new and formidable enemy had risen, however, in the form of the now much enlarged Russia, which, to the Orthodox Christians of Rumania and Servia, seemed a more welcome liberator than even Austria had ever been. The war of 1711 with Peter I, intimately connected with the coming of Charles XII of Sweden to Turkey, ended with a Turkish victory at Poltawa and brought back Azov to the Empire in 1712, and the war of 1732, equally successfully closed by the already mentioned treaty of Belgrad in 1739, was not yet disastrous for Turkey; Russian navigation in the Black Sea was even formally prohibited. After 1739 there followed a period of peace for the empire in Europe. The military and peaceful relations with Persia during this time were mainly influenced by the political events in that empire, by which the Turks sought to profit. The successes of Nidir Şeh in 1779 were for a moment threatening; they only occasioned the deposition of Ahmad III, but at last the peace of 1736 restored the frontiers of the time of Murad IV. The real military weakness of the Ottoman Empire was finally revealed in the conflict with Russia that had begun in 1768 with a Turkish declaration of war; this war brought the Russian armies deep into Bulgaria and was ended by the memorable treaty of Küçük Kaynarja in 1774, by which the Crimea became wholly independent (to be annexed in 1783 by Russia), while Turkey had to recognize the Russian protectorate in the Danube principalities. The right of religious protection accorded to the sultan with regard to the Mahommedans in the Crimea, was the beginning of the religious claims of Turkey, that were to acquire such importance in its international relations in the xixth century.

After an equally unhappy war with Kerim Khan in Persia (1776), in which Bâya was temporarily lost, the Ottoman Empire again suffered serious reverses to the Russians by the war of 1784—1792, closed by the peace of Jassy; this time the Dniepr became the frontier between the two Empires. Austria also had tried to profit by this war and occupied Bukarest, but in the separate peace of Zistova (1791) Austria did not gain the expected profits.

During all this time the friendly relations with the western countries, France, England and Holland, to which Sweden was added in 1737, Denmark in 1756 and Prussia in 1763, had often been of great value to Turkey by the services rendered by them as intermediaries in the peace negotiations; especially France, which obtained in 1740 its last known final capitulation, had considerable influence by its right to protect the Roman Catholics. At the end of the century, however, the Ottoman Empire began to be a factor in the new imperialistic schemes of the western powers, in connection with their colonial acquisitions and political influences in Southern Asia. These colonial interests did not show at that time any wish to possess Ottoman territory, but the rising colonial powers needed between themselves and their possessions a state over which they could exert control, since they saw the necessity of communicating with the Persian Gulf and India by a more direct way than the southern sea-route. The more immediate cause of the occupation of Egypt by the French in 1798 was the rivalry between France and England; this made for the moment England and even Russia allies of Turkey. But in 1802 peace with France was restored, to be followed some years later by a new war with Russia and hostilities with England (the English fleet before the capital in 1807). By the peace of Bukarest (1812) the Ottoman Empire again lost territory (Bessarabia) to Russia, while England, after the elimination of France's colonial power in India and the weakening of the Ottoman authority in Egypt, was for the moment satisfied. The Empire was again severely affected by the ups and downs of the Greek insurrection, that began in 1820 and ended in 1853 with the recognition of the Independence of Greece, not, however, before a disastrous war with Russia — that had played from the beginning an important part in the Greek
troubles — had obliged Turkey to conclude the peace of Adrianople (1829). Still, the action of the other European powers had prevented Russia from realizing its territorial aims; it had to be contented with a strong political ascendency over Turkey, as was proved in 1833 by the treaty of Hünkâr İskelesi, which, in a secret article, forced Turkey to become Russia's ally in the matter of the navigation in the Black Sea. This unnatural alliance with Russia was occasioned by the action of Meşmed ʻAli of Egypt (begun in 1831), who threatened for a moment to deprive the Empire of Egypt, Syria, and Cilicia, but who was checked and only to the recognition of Egypt as a privileged part of the Empire under a hereditary dynasty (1840). This time again the intervention of the European powers had been decisive for the territorial status of the empire. The existence of the Ottoman Empire was justly considered as a political necessity; already in 1759 there had been a treaty between Prussia and Austria to guarantee the northern frontiers of the Empire. About the year 1830, moreover, Turkey concluded several new treaties, on the lines of the capitulations, with the United States of America, Belgium, Portugal and Spain. The conquest of Algiers by France (1837—1839) could hardly be called a loss to the empire.

The administrative system of the empire remained much the same during this period; in every direction the central authority was however losing its influence. In the beginning of the xviiiith century this was not yet very perceptible. Constantinople was still the brilliant capital of a powerful empire, where the court of Ahmad III set the example of a luxurious life; to this time falls the curious passion for the cultivation of tulips, that makes the epoch known as "bulanı derevi". To this period also belongs the expansion of higher literary, specifically Ottoman, culture beyond the class of the "sâlimi"; a new class of literates came into existence, who were the precursors of the intellectual Turkish middle class that originated in the beginning of the xixe century. The beginning of Turkish printing in 1727 is likewise intimately connected with the new cultural orientation of the higher classes. Most of them served the government in higher or lower functions, and from this class have come forth great writers, such as Sânadı Türbâh and Râşîb Pâsha. This changed considerably the ancient military character of the government system; the home and foreign affairs of the empire were now treated in a more statesmanlike way by the Sublime Porte (Bâb-ʻAli), and the modest office of the Râhs al-Kuttâb [q.v.] now became more and more important since the holders began to act as competent ministers of foreign affairs; one of them, Ahmad Rasim, is well known as one of the first Ottoman ambassadors. Still this new class of functionaries was, according to tradition, the sultan's slaves; only under Meşmed II was his position regulated in a more liberal way. The new cultivated upper classes had manifold relations with the cultivated Greek Phanariots of their time, many of whom occupied high offices in the government service, especially as dragomans (as e.g. Nikusios and Maxevrordomos), there were no ties with the lower Müşûmsudan classes. Under these governing functionaries the Janissaries and Sipahis, now that their discipline was loosened, more than once interfered in a dangerous way. The Janissary rebellion under Patrosta Khusîli in 1730, which cost Ahmad III his throne, seems to have been directed mainly against this new aristocracy. After Meşmed III court life became much more sober. The ruling classes and most of the sultans with them had begun to realize the weakness of the empire and sought now a remedy in the introduction of military reforms, in which they were aided by several foreigners, of whom the Frenchman Bonneval (died in 1747) is the best known. Another French officer, de Tott, worked in the same direction under Muşafa III, but the Russian war that broke out under this sultan showed how little effective the measures had been. Selim III undertook to carry out reforms with much more energy, but even in his time very few leading people had real understanding for these things; the institution of the new corps (çanakkâr-şefiâ) provoked another formidable rebellion of the Janissaries, seconded by a large percentage of the ulama. Meşmed II, finally, took up the question of reforms with more deliberateness; this sultan finally concluded there was no other way of imposing the reforms than by the famous massacre of the Janissaries in Constantinople on June 16, 1826; at the same time the Bektashi derwigh order was persecuted. The events showed, however, that so far more destructive than constructive work had been done; still this sultan succeeded at least in subjecting a number of powerful semi-independent local dynasts. The weakening of the central authority had indeed been characteristic of the Ottoman Empire of the xviiith century. Algiers, Tunis and Tripoli were ruled by hereditary Beys; only Tripoli was brought by Meşmed II again under the direct authority of the Porte. Egypt had seen in 1767 the usurpation of ʻAli Bey. In Rûm-ı şerif some powerful powers had come forth from the ranks of the great timariots; they were called âli-bey. Under Selim III and Meşmed II the most noteworthy were ʻAli Paşâ of Yanina and Pasârâ Oghlu at Widdin. In Anatolia there had been in 1739 the dangerous insurrection of Şerif Beş Osmanu, after which the so-called dere-bey were as good as independent, as was also the case in Kurdistan. In Meso- potamia and Irâk the same conditions were prevalent; in 1706 was formed in Irâk the powerful Bedouin confederation of the Mûshâb, and under Selim III Baghdâd was ruled autocratically by Sulaiman Paşâ (died in 1810). In Syria the Druses of the Lebanon had their own emirs, and on the coast ruled, in Selim III's time, Djasrâ Paşâ [q.v.] of Akka. In Arabia the Wahhabis had taken Medina in 1803, and Yaman and ʻAstr could hardly be called parts of the Turkish empire. On the islands of the archipelago hardly any Turks were to be found; here as in Syria there was strong European influence. Still, although the Ottoman power had sunk everywhere, the Ottoman type of administration had put its seal on the cultural life of all these different regions; the great Ottoman tradition held them together and enabled Meşmed II and the statesmen who, after him, continued the centralisation of the Empire, to keep together their political unity for a century more to come.

8. Fifth period (1839—1922).

In this period the transition of the Ottoman Empire to a national Turkish state was completed, but in a way not intended by the Christian powers, nor expected by the Turkish ruling classes themselves. The new course followed in the admini-
by Austria. Then, after Tripoli had been lost in the war with Italy (1912, peace of Lausanne), the Balkan war of 1912–1913 reduced the territory of Turkey in Europe to Eastern Thrace, including Adrianople, which town had even been occupied for some time by the Bulgarians.

During the sixteenth century the relations with Persia had been on the whole peaceful; conflicts were only occasioned by frontier questions, such as the dispute about the authority over the Kurdish territory of Soleimântyê, which was settled in 1847 in favour of Turkey. The territory round the Persian Gulf had come more and more under the control of the British, but the territorial status in Asia remained for a long time unchanged. In the meantime Turkey had been drawn gradually into the economic expansion schemes of the German Empire as manifested by the project of the Baghdad railway; this diminished England's interest in the territorial integrity of the Ottoman State. So, when in the year of the world war, Turkey was not able to maintain its neutrality and joined the central powers, Russia and England co-operated for the first time to take away Turkish territories. The attempts of the Allies to enter the Dardanelles by sea and by land failed however during the war; but the combined action of the French and English troops in Palestine and Syria, and the different English campaigns in Iraq and Mesopotamia succeeded at last in conquering these provinces from the Ottoman armies. In Syria they were aided by forces of the Sharif of Mecca, who had made himself independent in 1917 as King of the Hijzâ. The Russians, in the meantime, had made considerable progress in north-eastern Anatolia, but from this side the danger came abruptly to an end with the Russian Revolution, and the peace of Rast-Litowits (August 3, 1918) gave back to Turkey the lost territory, besides Kars, Ardabîn and Batum. Soon afterwards the war with the other powers came to an end by the armistice of Mudros (October 30, 1918). Subsequently Constantinople was occupied by Allied troops; France occupied the west of the Ionian and Ionian, and Italian troops landed in Adâlia. Greece was allowed to occupy eastern Thrace and Smyrna in May 1915. All this the Constantinople government had to witness passively. The Turkish parliament, convoked in January 1920, took for a moment a firmer attitude by adopting the so-called National Pact (mîtkhâb-ı milî); but when in March the occupation of Constantinople was rendered more severe, the parliament was dissolved. Finally, in August, the Ottoman Government was compelled to sign the Treaty of Sèvres, by which large parts of the remaining Ottoman territory, including Constantinople and Smyrna, were brought under the control of one or more foreign powers. In the meantime another, interior, enemy had risen against the Ottoman Government as a result of the organized national opposition against the foreign occupations, especially the Greek' landing in Smyrna. In the course of 1920 the Constantinople government lost gradually all control over Anatolia and the measures undertaken with Allied help to restore its authority failed. Under the growing successes of the nationalists the authority of the Sultan's government dwindled down ever more, and the Great National Assembly of Angora was able at last to proclaim on November 1, 1922 the abolition of the Const-

TURKS
Moreover the Islamic sentiment found sympathy with the lower classes of the Turkish population, still strongly imbued with mystical traditions and with the non-Turkish Muhammadans of the Empire. 'Abd al-Hamid, while emphasizing his dignity as Khalifa, relied mainly on Islamic sentiment, though, in course of time, the persons who surrounded the ever more suspicious monarch came to be of the worst kind. Utterances of patriotism were opposed in the most drastic way, and many intellectuals had to take refuge abroad. The growing opposition against the *sütkâb* found at last a means of organizing itself in the province of Macedonia, since 1906 governed by a Turkish governor under European control. Saloniki became the centre of the new patriotic, more communal, Young Turkish movement, led by the Committee of Unity and Progress (*护身符 al-traghf*) and supported to a great extent by the army. Its influence obliged the sultan to promulgate again the constitution of Midhat Pasha on June 24, 1908 and to abolish at once the onerous system of censorship and espionage. In November the first Ottoman parliament came together, but in the troubled years that followed this parliament never had the opportunity to exert a real influence on the government. On April 13, 1909, followed an attempt to reestablish the Sultan's former authority; this time the Young Turkish cause could only be saved by the occupation of the capital by the Macedonian army and the deposition of the Sultan (April 27). Then, for a time, *Ottomanism* became the political ideal, meaning the equality of all Islamic and non-Islamic elements in the state. But it soon appeared that these elements were already too much estranged from each other, so that the foundation of a strong state on these principles became impossible. The Young Turks, under the influence of the ideas of Pan-Turkism, began now a policy with the final object of making the Ottoman Empire a state where the Turkish element should be predominant; they turned to the lower Turkish speaking classes, especially in Anatolia, to form a real Turkish nation. Pan-Islamism, too, was propagated again by several persons as a way of attending this aim, but this course was gradually abandoned, although used occasionally for outward political manifestations. The very unfavourable international development after the revolution, however, brought the Young Turkish rulers to measures that certainly were not originally on the programme, such as the Armenian massacres during the war and the severe government in Syria. And as a consequence of the final loss of nearly all non-Turkish territory in the war, Turkish nationalism was born at last, the simplest and at the same time the most effective form of Turkish patriotism, not hampered by any idea of religion or original racial connections.

The statesmen who had carried out the "Tanzimat" programme had been careful not to offend the religious scruples of the leaders of orthodox Islam. In spite of the remonstrances of foreign representatives, no measures were taken that were in direct conflict with the sharia, though the application in practice might have been changed. The sharia was also the basis of the new Civil Code or *Medjelle* (q.v.). In Midhat's constitution, Islam was declared the state religion and the Shahîk al-Islâm was given a rank as high as the grand vizier. This wise religious policy could not prevent, however, occasional religious outbursts of which
Christians were the victims, as in 1858 at Djidda and in 1860 at Damascus, both places situated outside the purely Turkish provinces. Under 'Abud al-Hamid religious activity was mainly under the influence of panislamism, shown in the various attempts to enter into relations with Mahomedans in all parts of the world. Even the Young Turkish government did not refrain from proclaiming the Holy War on its entering into the world war. In their inner administration the Young Turks clearly opposed the influence of the religious authorities, as was proved by their attempt in 1917 to bring the madresses under the administration of the Ministry of Public Instruction. Another break with the Islamic tradition was the reform of the calendar. In 1789 the Greek Julian calendar had already been introduced officially for the financial administration but by a curious compromise the era of the Hijira (zene-i milîyye) was preserved; and in 1917 the Gregorian calendar was adopted. The Christian era came gradually into use after the war.

It was also by the "Tauçma" that domestic administration was separated from the military by the laws concerning the millet. The chief occupation of the home department was still for a long time the tax-gathering. The Europeanisation and centralisation of the financial system proved to be one of the chief difficulties, as the reliable corps of functionaries had to be created at the same time. After the Crimean war, Turkey was able to conclude a number of foreign loans, but the money was not well administered nor well used. In 1876 a state bankruptcy had to be declared with foreign intervention as a consequence and the establishment of the service of the Public Debt, which was very much resented in all Turkish circles. A serious hindrance for the recovery of the finances was also the antiquated custom rules of the capitulations, although the original dues of 3% were several times raised. After the Revolution, however, the greatest difficulties seemed to have been overcome.

The new Turkish army created gradually by conscription, after the extinction of the Janissaries, had during this period many occasions to show its valour. It contributed considerably to the strengthening of the patriotic Turkish spirit and played an important role in the Revolution. After 1856 it was theoretically admitted that Christians and Jews also could be enlisted, but in practice they always liberated themselves by paying an exemption tax. It was only after the revolution that these non-Turkish elements also became Turkish soldiers.

9. The national Turkish state (since 1922).

The nucleus of the new Turkish state was the opposition to the foreign occupations after the armistice of Mudros. The organisation of the opposition began in 1919 under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal Pasha, who had gone at first to Asia Minor as army inspector. The first stage was the Congress of Ezerefin (July 23, 1919), followed by the Congress of Siwâs (September 11). Here the Representative Committee ( setbacks-i tanzîhîyye) was formed under the presidency of Kemal, and this Committee was charged with the execution of the new national programme; the armed opposition of the Kuveyîth milîyye against the occupation of Smyrna was supported and the landing of English troops in Samos, as well as the attack on Izmir from Constantinople were frustrated. In 1920, after the Constantinople parliament had been dissolved, many deputies escaped to Asia Minor, where in Ankarâ, on April 23, the Grand National Assembly of Turkey was convened by the Representative Committee. The Assembly gave itself legislative and executive powers and appointed a governing committee (hay'et-i welîî) under Kemal Pasha's presidency. In 1921 began the struggle with the Greek troops (battles of In Örû on January 11 and March 31), followed in July by a Greek advance as far as Eski Shehir. This advance was ended by a Greek defeat on September 13. In the meantime, the new national government had entered into relations with the Allies; by the treaty of November 20, 1921, France restored Cilicia. As other negotiations did not lead to definite results, the Ankarâ government decided in August 1922 on an attack on the Greek forces and gained a decisive victory at Dumlû Biflar; on September 9 Smyrna was restored and for a short time it seemed that Constantinople was threatened. By the armistice of Mudros (October 10) the national government obtained the right to occupy Thrace and Constantinople, which was effected in the following weeks. Thereafter the war was finished, and after difficult negotiations the peace treaty of Lausanne (July 23, 1923) established peaceful relations between the Allies and the new Turkey, this country being recognized as a completely independent state. The peace treaty had left undecided the question of the vilayet of Mîûslû, the restitution of which was claimed by the Turks; after great efforts of the League of Nations, Turkey and England came at last to an arrangement by which Mîûslû was left to 'Irak (June 5, 1926). The new Turkey had already concluded a consular treaty with Russia in November 1922; after the peace of Lausanne relations of friendship and commerce were successively renewed with other countries. The relations with England and Russia are now the most important in Turkish foreign policy.

Since the Turkish constitution of April 20, 1924, Turkey is a Republic. Cihat Muṣṭafa Kemal Pasha has been state president (sêî-i âdâmkerîyet) from the beginning. Constantinople has fallen from the rank of capital and has been replaced by Ankarâ, the Medina of the new Turkey. The Grand National Assembly has displayed since 1922 a considerable legislative activity in order to adapt the country to its new conditions and to modernise its institutions. In religious matters the new rulers have taken deliberately the way of laicisation, after the abolition of the Caliphate in March 1924. There is no longer a Şaitî al-Ilâmî and no Minister of Ewâfî.

In September 1925 the Tekkes of the mystic orders were closed and these orders themselves interdicted. These measures, directed against the traditional popular forms of religious persuasion, were a consequence of the great rebellion of the Kurds under Şaitî Sa'id; this rebellion began at the end of 1924. Similarly in September 1925 the fez was abolished as headgear; only the "ulamâ" were henceforth allowed to wear the turban. A noteworthy reform was the official introduction of the Latin alphabet and the abolition of the use of Arabic letters in 1928, which measure had also an anti-clerical aspect. The principal aim of these and other measures is, to raise the Turkish people to a higher cultural level;
their application has repeatedly provoked resistance in several parts of the country among circles attached to traditional institutions. Still the national evolution aimed at by the republican government has in any case more chances of success than ever before, as the large majority of the population is now really Turkish or turkised. Many ulema’s had returned already after the Balkan war to Asia Minor and the population exchanges with Greece have likewise increased the Turkish majority.

A comprehensive collection of the historical facts since 1918 is to be found in G. Jäschke and E. Pritsch, "Die Türkei seit dem Weltkriege, Geschichtskalender 1918—1928," in Die Welt des Islam, u. a., 1927—1929, containing also extensive bibliographical notes on the new Turkey. An independent survey of this period is contained in the article "Turkische Dümükkâyi", in Kâmil Esîhem, Ewâli-E Islâmî, Istanbul 1927, p. 331.

Bibliography Among the sources of Ottoman political history the historiographical literature of the Ottoman Turks themselves takes the first place. For this literature it is sufficient to refer to F. Bahinger, "Die Geschichtsschreibung der Osmanen und ihre Werke", Leipzig 1927. The study of documentary sources is still in its beginnings; historical documents have been published in various places, as in the T. O. E. M. (T. T. E. M.) and in the works of the Turkish historian Ahmed Reşî. Some of the Qâmilâhnamen have been published in T. O. E. M. and other Turkish publications. For the treaties of the Ottoman Empire a most valuable collection is to be found in Gabriel Effendi Noradonghanian, Recueil d'Actes Internationaux de l'Empire Ottoman, iv. vols., Paris 1897—1903. On the epigraphical sources there are important monographs, such as those of Kâmil Esîhem and the more recent publications of Mubârak Gâlîbî. The chief work on Ottoman Numismatics is still Ismaîl Gâlîbî, Tağvînî-i Mulkâtâb-ı Ottomanî, Constantinople 1937, besides other publications (such as Ahmed Reşî, "Ottomânî İmparatorluk-i Uluqânâmâhname"). British Museum Catalog. Oriental Coins, etc., 1905.

Of non-Turkish literature the Oriental ones have been partly studied by Bahinger in his bibliographical work. Among the Western sources the Byzantine historians are of extraordinary importance for the first centuries of the Ottoman Empire (Ephraim, Duca, Chalcocodyles, Critoibulos). Since the 17th century a very important place is also taken by the Reisâdâ of the Venetian bailo, to be consulted in the great publications of Albé (Florence 1830—1865) and Barozzi and Berchet (Venice 1856—1877). To them were added in course of time the reports of the representatives of other governments that entered into relations with the Ottoman Porte. To the same category may be reckoned the numerous descriptions of travels in the Ottoman Empire by European travellers, beginning in the 17th century. Not sharply separated from the travel literature are the many descriptions of the Turks and of the Ottoman Empire, of which the best known is d’Ohsson, Tablauv Général de l’Empire Ottoman, vol. i—iii, Paris 1787—1826. This kind of literature continued all through the sixteenth century (the important works of Ubicini) and the beginning of the eighteenth century.

The first great "universal work on Ottoman Turkish history was Josef von Hammer’s Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches, vol. i—x, Pest 1827—1855; zweite verbesserte Ausgabe, vol. i—iv, Pest 1834—1836 (French translation by J. J. Hellert, Histoire de l’Empire Ottoman, vol. i—ix, Paris 1835—1843). This work is for the greater part based on Turkish literary sources and ends with the peace of Kâşîf Kânârda in 1774; vol. x contains an extensive list of works concerning Ottoman History, that had appeared in Europe until 1774. A work of the same scope is J. W. Zinkisken, Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches in Europa, vol. i—xvii, (until 1912), Hamburg 1840 and Gotha 1854—1865; Zinkisken uses Western sources much more than von Hammer, but he does not draw directly from original Turkish sources. The same is the case with N. Jorge, Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches, vol. i—v, (until 1912), Gotha 1903—1913. The Histoire de l’Empire Ottoman, in vols., Amsterdam 1711—1724, is important for its historical treatment of the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the eighteenth century. Among the several works that treat only a certain period of Ottoman history may be mentioned G. Rosen, Geschichte der Türkei (1826—1856), Leipzig 1866. As a result of the greater interest in Turkish history after the war, there began to be published in 1922 the Mitteilungen zur Osmanischen Geschichte, by F. von Kraefft and F. W. Wittke; it is much to be regretted that this publication has had to cease after only six years.

Ottoman history has begun to be studied more and more in Turkey itself since the revolution of 1908. Since 1910 was published the "Ottoman Endûmâni Mevînîât" and the "Ottoman Endûmâni Mevînîât", the last number of which was changed, after the war, to "Türk Endûmâni Mevînîât"; the last number in Arabic script was No. 19 (96). This valuable publication contains a great number of historical contributions, but other publications are too (such as the Mevînîâvâ of the Literary Faculty and the Mevînîâ of the Mevînîâ, Istanbul 1925 and 1928) contain important articles on historical subjects. The "Türk Endûmâni" has made possible, moreover, the publication of considerable historical monographs in its series Kültîyat. A comprehensive survey of recent historical studies in Turkey is to be found in the series of articles by F. Wittke in O.L.Z., under the title Neuer wissenschaftliche Literatur in osmanisch-türkischer Sprache (since 1928). A complete new History of the Ottoman Empire has not yet been written in Turkey; there has already appeared, however, the first volume of an "Ottomânî ve Türkhi-i Nezîq" (Kapîz ve Meşhur "Arif, Istanbul 1335 (1917).

(J. H. Kramers)

TURKO is the usual name for the folk song in Ottoman Turkish. It is to be distinguished from mahtûf [q.v.] on the one hand and from şarîf, on the other. The distinction between türkû and mahtûf lies in the fact that the former are polyphonic and the latter monophonic. This distinction is not however always observed. In many districts of Ottoman Turkey the people know only the name türkû and use it without distinction in speaking of mono- or polyphonic songs. As to the distinction between türkû and şarîf, the
former are genuine folk-songs, the latter more artificial in character. The former go back to proto-Turkish models and have marked analogies among other Turkish peoples, while the latter belong to the sphere of Muslim culture and follows Arabic and Persian models. The language of the türcü is therefore as a rule much purer Turkish than that of the şair-i şer.

As to the form of the türcü it is written in a syllabic rhythm or accented syllable rhythm in rhymed strophes. The single lines contain 7 to 15 syllables; the seven (4–3, 3–4, rarely 2–3–2) and the eleven syllables (usually 4–4–3 and 6–5) are the most frequent. It is well worth noting that the nine syllable line form, so popular among the Kasan Tatars, is not found among the Ottomans. The rhyme is in the great majority of cases purely grammatical and owes its origin, as in Turkish generally, to the combination of two factors: the construction of the strophe in two parts and the linguistic condition of the Turkish language. The effect of the former was to cause the Turkish strophe to fall into two rigidly parallel sentences; of the latter that these sentences, especially towards the end, represent two series of grammatical forms corresponding to one another. With the agglutinative character of the Turkish language however such forms must rhyme with one another. Turkish rhyme is therefore as a rule polysyllabic. Rhymes extending over three or more final syllables are not at all rare. The strophes of the türcü number two, three or four lines; three lined strophes are the most common and are the most characteristic of Ottoman poetry in general. The three lined strophe with the same rhyme as throughout seems to have arisen out of the quartain common to all the Turkish languages rhyming a a a a by dropping the third unrhymed line. This as a rule destroys the bisyllable character of the strophe. The single separate lines are as a rule made up of similar strophes: the only exceptions are the refrain strophes so common in love-songs and the final strophes sometimes found in longer songs. In songs collected from the lips of the people we may often find marked corruptions of the poetical form, a circumstance which points to the gradual disintegration of long poems that have been handed down for a considerable time.

As regards the subject, the türcü are predominantly lyrical poems. They include love-songs, soldier-songs, religious hymns, Ramadān songs of the beki night-watchmen, which usually have a dash of humour in them, etc. Special mention may be made of one variety of love-songs, the poems in the popular romances, in so far as they are not artificial products (cf. D. Spies, Türkische Volksbücher, Leipzig 1896, p. 41 sqq.). The soldier-songs frequently contain allusions to historical events. We can observe how old songs are continually being adapted by slight alterations to new events as they crop up. In favourable circumstances one can trace these adaptations through many stages. The love-songs in the form of dialogue deserve special mention, such as for example, the ballad Türkmen Kılal ("The Turkoman maid") first made known by Künoğlu. It is not necessary to assume that this form arises out of the Persian dialogue-ghazal (Jacob, Die türkische Volksliteratur, p. 19). Such poems in the form of a dialogue between a young man and a maid, recited or sung, are common to all branches of the Turks. It is evident of their independence that this origin that they are found in lands where the influence of Muslim culture is very weak or does not exist at all (cf. Radloff, Ansichten über die türkischen Sagen von der Shan Turkei, Andernach 1871, p. 145). The türcü are true songs, i.e. they are intended to be sung to music. It often happens however that the texts do not at all fit the melodies with which they now appear associated. In these cases the number of syllables in the text has to be adapted to the number of notes in the melody by artificial means. As the lines are usually too short, the equation is usually done by inserting superfluous exclamations like oya oya, aman aman, vali vali, aman, etc. or by quite nonsensical explications like gam gam, tilla tilla, etc. The texts of the türcü are also often completely broken up by such parasitic intrusions.

Türcü songs are also accompanied by popular producions of trances.

Bibliography: G. Jacob, Die türkische Volksliteratur, Berlin 1901, p. 19 sqq.; T. Kowalski, Geschichte der türkischen Dichtung, i, Krakau 1923, p. 61–102; Ahmad Taš, Kısıl şairlerinin şeher ve nevü, Istanbul 1928, p. 32 sqq. (cf. thereon Arche Orientolii, ill. 503 sqq.); Mahmut Rüşhü, Anadolu türcüler ve müziği, Istanbul 1928. The fullest collections of Ottoman Turkish folk songs have been made by I. Kılıç. The following of his publications may be mentioned:

TURKU — TÜS

TURUSUN BEG, an Ottoman historian. Turusun Beg whose mabūḥ was Lübübek Ali and also possessed a zafet which soon passed to the son. Turusun Beg took part in the capture of Constantinople and the Kumanlian campaigns of Mehemmed II and we find him in the campaign against Trebizond as a clerk in the 1524 (year of the battle). He later became defterdar of Anatolia and finally of Kumanlia. He still held this office in the reign of Bayazid II. The date of his death is not known. Under the title Tūrīkī Edī'ī (1497), Turusun Beg wrote a history of the reign of Sultan Mehemmed II and of the first six years of Bayazid II. The work, composed between 903—905 (1497—1500), comes down to the year 953 (beg. Dec. 17, 1457). An edition of this Chronicle was published by Mehemmed Arif as a supplement to T. O. E. M., parts 26—38. On the MSS. cf. Babinger, G.O.W., p. 26 sq.

Bibliography: F. Babinger, G.O.W., p. 26 sq., where further references are given.

(T. BABINGER)

TURUSUN FAKHĪ, an Ottoman jurist. Turusun Fakхи was, like Sultan Oğuzhan the husband of Mahbūbe, a son-in-law of Sheikh Ede Bahl who died in 726 (1325) aged 120, and was buried in Bilecik. He succeeded him as muhterem and imām. In this capacity he accompanied Sultan Oğuzhan on his campaigns and preached the first Friday sermon in Kara Hanım in Oğuzhan's name and the first Bâirâm sermon in Eski Shehi. The Sefi in Şemseddin without any apparent reason gives Turusun in 1326 (733) as the year of his death. He must therefore have died practically at the same time as Ede Bahl and Sultan Oğuzhan.


(FRANZ BABINGER)


TUS (original Iranian form Tūs, in Arabic transcription Tus), a district in Khorasan.

In the historical period Tus was the name of a district containing several towns. The town of Nāwīkān flourished down to the end of the third (ninth) century. The name Nāwīkān is confirmed by the present name of the Meshhed quarter Noughān (where the diphthong ou corresponds to the old uwa u mağhūl, i.e. û). At a later date, the other town Tabarān became more important and was considerably extended so that the original Tabarān seems to have become one of the faubourgs of the new town (cf. Irītl), which then became generally known as Tūs. The name Meshhed, at first a simple sanctuary in the valley of Sāmkād, is already mentioned in Muḥaddass. Meshhed first of all encroached upon the adjoining town of Nāwīkān, the name of which disappears about 1330. In 1339 Tūs was destroyed and never rebuilt. The waters which supplied it were diverted to Meshhed. Under the Ṣafawids this, the sacred city of the Shīʿa, became the capital of the old district of Tūs (the valley of the Kahlāf-rūd) and of all Khorāsan.

Situation. Two ranges of mountains stretch
along the north of Khorasan. The one (Koestelagh etc.) rises in the north of Khorasan and runs through Transcaspia. The other (which is a continuation of the Alburz) is parallel to it in the south. To the south of Kucan, the two approach one another and this narrowing forms the watershed. By the corridor which opens towards the northwest the Arak descends to the Caspian. Through the plain in the southeast runs the river Kaghaf-rud "Tortoise river", a left bank tributary of the Hari-rud (river of Herat). The district of Tus lies on the upper part of it. The outer spurs of the southern range (Zerdan, with peaks of c. 2,500 feet) separate it from Nishapur, the waters of which lose themselves to the south in the central desert.

Origins. The nomenclature of the region seems to suggest the presence in Tus of old non-Aryan elements. Regarding the Kaghaf-rud, the Bundahisht says: "The river of Kans comes out of a ravine of the province of Tus and is there called the river of Kasp..." (transl. West, p. 51). Marquart (Untersuchungen zur Geschichte v. Eran, ii, 28) traces the names Kasp and Tabaran (town of Tus) to the lost peoples of the Kassag and Tarvak, of whom traces are found in many places. The Pehlevi list of the towns of Iran (transl. Blochet, in Recueil des travaux relatifs à la philol. et archéol. égypt. et assyriens, xvii, 1895, p. 165-176, §§ 14-15) relates in connection with Tus that the hero Tso, son of Nesar, was sipahkhat there for 900 years. In the Sakk-samme (ed. Mohl, iv, 255) Kai Khusraw when distributing封 فا حبب (or Khurfaqan) to Tus. Other more explicit stories (Nasihat al-Kulâd) attribute to Tus (Tus) only the rebuilding of the town of which the actual founder was Imanushid, which reflects the pre-Islamic date of Tus. According to San'ul-Dawla, i. 199, 377 and Sir F. M. Skyes, the ruins of the oldest inhabited place (or Kakhana) on the right bank of the Kaghaf-rud 4 miles S. E. (read S. W.) of Tus and 10 miles N. E. of Meghad. The ancient Tus has been connected (Spiegel, Eran Altert., ii, 539; Tomasek, Zur histor. Topogr. v. Persien, ii, 219; Marquart, Untersuch., ii, 65; Skyes, op. cit.) with Susia, a town in the province of Areia to which Alexander the Great went from Parthia (Arrian, Anabasis, xxv, ed. C. Muller, p. 84; Caesar, Rerar Acis). As the province of Areia (Old Pers. Huravba) was traversed by the Hari-rud (Kiepert, Lehrb. d. alt. Geogr., 1878, p. 59) we may be permitted to add to this Tus, situated on the tributary of the Hari-rud. On the other hand, the change in the original *Sos [Shos] to Tus would have parallel in Shushtar > Tuswar and perhaps in Shash > Kand. The identification of Susia with Zestan by Khanikow, Artocentric, in J.M.A., Aug. 1875, p. 235-242 is untenable.

[In his recent publication, Archéol. Mittel. aus Iran, 1930, i, 2, 199 and i, 3, 182, Herfeldt interprets the Avestan Tuwa asterismum as "T. of the cadet branch," and explains it from the fact that Vighatspa, father of Darius and ancestor of the younger line of the Achaemenids, lived there. According to the Iranian Bundahish, the mythical Vighatspa removed the fire Aturburzhmahir from Khvarizm to Mount Roshan in the land of the kanarang].

Sasanian period. In the Sasanian period we have very little information about Tus. Legend attributes the death of Yazdagird I (440) to a mortal kick given him by a horse which came from the spring of Sawa, near Lake Shabt (Shab-t-nûma, ed. Mohl, v, 519-523). Nödeke, Gesch. d. Perser und Araber, 1879, p. 77-78, thinks that the topographical details have been added by Firdawsi. We have therefore to ascertain what the latter actually meant. Sani' el-Dawla locates this spring at Naishuma-yi Gilâs (Gulas), one of the eastern sources of the Kaghaf-rud, but the Naqshat al-Kulûd, p. 241, more in keeping with Firdawsi, places it near Lake Naishuma-yi Satir, to the west in the mountains between Tus and Nishapûr (cf. Mo'la' al-Shams, i, 241).


According to the Armenian historian Sebistos, the general Smbat Bagratuni sent (c. 616-617) by Khosrow against the Khânsâns encamped in the district of Tus of the province of Aprash = Nishapur; cf. Marquart, Erânshahr, p. 65.

The Arabic sources are less explicit regarding the administration of Tus before the conquest.

The Arab conquest. According to a story given by Balâḏshâh, p. 334, c. 29 (649) the marzbân of Tus wrote simultaneously to the vassals of Kâta and Baṣra, inviting them to Khorasan, on condition that the conqueror should put him in possession of the province. Khorasan was conquered under 'Othâman (in 29-31 = 649-661) by the vâl of Baṣra, 'Abd Allah b. 'Amir b. Kuraiz. The marzbân of Nishapur after some resistance agreed to pay a tribute (wâzif) of 1,000,000 dirhems (another version 7,000,000 dirhems) while the Marzbân of Tus (Kâzâk; read Kanârân) appeared before 'Abd Allah and made peace by paying 600,000 dirhems (Balâḏshâh, p. 495). One would think that the two marzbâns were different individuals, and Ya'qûbi, Kišâl al-Baladân, p. 295; also speaks of a letter from the marzbân of Tus and of 'Abd Allah's reply which the descendants (nulâdât) of the marzbân still preserved in his time. According to Tabari, i. 2886, however, when 'Abd Allah had established himself in Nishapur, the other half of the province, i.e. Nasir and Tus, remained in the hands of Kanârân with whom 'Abd Allah had to make peace in order to be able to go on to Mars. As Marquart has shown, the title Kanârân (or Kanârâ, in Greek Kânârân) was probably descended from a pre-Sasanian dynasty (cf. Marquart, Erânshahr, p. 75; Christensen, L'espoir des Sassanides, p. 27). The intrigues to which Balâḏshâhi and Ya'qûbi allude and which were to facilitate the conquest may have originated with some member of the family of the Kanârân, a rival of the lord of Nishapur.

In the period of Arab rule Tus played no independent part but its name is however often mentioned in the records of civil wars. Under the Omayyad 'Abd el-Malik (65-86) the citadel of Tus was occupied by a body of Bani Tamim (Balâḏshâh, p. 415) who still held control in 725 (Tabari, ii. 1771). In 130, Kâhu'a, a liwanet of 'Abû Muslim, inflicted a decisive defeat on the
Omaiayd mali. Naṣr b. Sāyūr near Taṣ (Tabarit, ii. 2009; Ibn al-Athir, 1: 282, 292, 295). In 134 a. the news of Abu l-Khaṭṭab of Nusayr rebelled in Khurāsān and for a time seized Taṣ, Nishāpur etc. On the 20th Djamād-Il 134 (March 24, 809) Hārūn al-Rashīd, who was operating in Khurāsān against the rebel Rāfī b. Lāṭūr b. Naṣr b. Sāyūr, died at Taṣ (Tabarit, iii. 733). On the 1st Safar 203, the ‘Abī A‘īl b. ‘Abd al-Malik b. ‘Abd al-Rādād died in the village of Sanābād of Taṣ. According to Ibn al-Athir, vi. 203, al-Mu‘āmmil prayed to God for the deceased and interred him near the tomb of his father (“in the garden of Humayd b. Kaḥfaba”), following Mus‘ir b. Muḥallib quoted by Ya‘qūbī. Sanābād is the modern Māshqīd [q.v.]. The tomb of Hārūn al-Rashīd, now completely disappeared, was beside that of the ‘Abī A‘īl for, according to Ibn Ba ṭūṭa, used to kick the tomb of Hārūn (which however was still kept in good order in the 12th century).

According to his father’s wish, Muḥammad (read Nawāk) was to be taken to the Tahirīyya, but after the seizure of the capital the capital was moved to Nishāpur (between 252 and 253; cf. Ya‘qūbī). The historical sources state that in 250 (872) Taṣ was destroyed (nakhrabat), evidently as a result of the rebellion of Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Khadījastānī, an old servant of Muḥammad b. Tāhir who had seized Nishāpur in 245 (ibid., iii. 1931; Ibn al-Athir, vii. 227; cf. Debinsky, Memsirs, sur Ahmad, fils d’Abd Allāh, in J.A. [1845], 345-362). Ya‘qūbī (278 = 891) still mentions Nawāk as the principal town of Taṣ. In 283 the Sa‘ādīr ‘Amr b. Lāṭūr reported to the Caliph that his men had defeated Taṣ and the Amīr Rāfī b. Harṭahmān who had been asserting his independence in Khurāsān from 271 (884) (Tabarit, ii. 2160; Ibn al-Athir, vii. 334).

The Sāmānīids. In 309 Lāṭūr b. Mu‘āmmil, one of the generals of the ‘Abī A‘īl b. Ḥasan b. Kāsim, came to Nishāpur and had the ġāba‘a read there in the name of the Sāmānī b. Ḥusayn. By orders of the Sāmānī b. Ḥusayn b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Bakhrūr against Lāṭūr. He was at first defeated at Taṣ, but Lāṭūr later lost his life (Ibn al-Athir, viii. 91). In 336 (947) the governor of Taṣ and its dependencies, Abī Maḥmūd b. ‘Abd al-Kazzāk rebelled against b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Naṣr. The latter sent Abī Maḥmūd b. ‘Abd al-Kazzāk to Khurāsān. Muḥammad went from Nishāpur to Uṣūnaw (Kīčan). His brother b. Rāfī b. Harṭahmān was the chief of Uṣūnaw and the latter in the fort of Samuilān and later in the fort of Darak (3 farāks from Samuilān). Samuilān was dismantled but Rāfī succeeded in retaining what was left at Darak. Lastly in 339, Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Raṣṣāl, being paraded by b. Rāfī returned to Taṣ (Ibn al-Athir, viii. 355, 361). The personality of Abī Maḥmūd is particularly interesting on account of his friendship with Firdawṣī (cf. Shekh-nawma, ed. Mohl, l. 20, ed. Vulcini, l. 10–11). Abī Maḥmūd beautified the cathedral mosque of the town of Taṣbarīn which henceforth was the first in Taṣ (Muḥaddas, p. 319). In 349 Abī Maḥmūd was appointed sipahsālī but immediately dismissed in favour of Alp-tegin. The latter settled in Nishāpur and Abī Maḥmūd retired to his ex-fief of Taṣ. In 350 (961) after the accession of the Sāmānī b. Rāfī, Alp-tegin fell into disgrace. Abī Maḥmūd who had sent troops from Taṣbarīn and Nawāk toward Cāna (on the road from Nishāpur to Marw; cf. Ghūrā Maḥāra, G.M.S., p. 51) did not succeed in stopping Alp-tegin. Fearing the wrath of his master Abī Maḥmūd rebelled and was ultimately poisoned (Gardizi, Zain-al-‘Abūdīn, Berlin 1928, p. 41–44).

The Arab geographers to the end of the fourth (10th) century. Ibn Khurdabkh (323–346), p. 24 and Kudamā, p. 201, place the district of Taṣ on the Nishāpur–Sarqax road; Nishāpur–Sarqax 4 farāks (Ibn Rusta, p. 171; Faghṭi 4 farāks); al-Hamār 6 farāks (according to Ibn Rusta, the distance is 5 f.; this “red village”, so called from the colour of its walls, is situated in the mountains); al-Muḥākkah (Ibn Rusta: Barā‘a) belonging to Taṣ 5 f.; al-Nawāk 5 f.; Mundūrān al-Kabār 5 f.; Aqṭān (Aqwān) 3 f.; Sarqax 6 ½ f. This makes the distance between Nishāpur and Nawāk (= Mustagh) 20 f. Ya‘qūbī, 2 farāks; Ibn Hawqal, 3 farāks (which shows that the road ran round the south side of the mountains which separate Nishāpur from Taṣ, for Ibn Hawqal, p. 331, says that one can “ascend” in a single farāk from Nishāpur to Taṣ, 5 farāks before Nawāk the land of Taṣ begins which evidently means the whole district.

Ya‘qūbī’s figure of 891 (p. 277) says Nawāk is the largest town in Taṣ. Ibn Khurdabkh valued the kharābiyya of Taṣ at 740,000 dirhams. Ya‘qūbī says that the kharābiyya of this district (bahlā) is included in that of Nishāpur. The people of Taṣ were mainly Persians but there were also some Arabs (Tayy; cf. also p. 306).

Buldāht (the passage quoted by Muḥaddas, p. 331, is not found in the Futūh al-Hulayd, ed. de Goeye) already mentions Taṣ among the dependencies of Nishāpur (Irāqāshir, read: Abargāshir). Muḥaddas, author of the most complete description of Khurāsān, emphasizes the subordinate character of Taṣ. “If some said that Nishāpur has eclipsed Taṣ, one would reply that Taṣ has never been a town to be eclipsed!” Muḥaddas repeats several times that Taṣ, like Nishāpur and Abargāshir, is only a kāhānī (“grain depot”) of the kābīr of Nishāpur (p. 50, 295, 300, 3019). Among the towns of the district of Taṣ, Muḥaddas mentions al-Taṣbarīn, al-Nawāk, al-Rādīkān, Dūanbād, Usrānī, Trūḡhūl (the last three are uncertain). The largest of these at this time was Taṣbarīn (375 = 985). It had a citadel and from the distance resembled Medina. Muḥaddas mentions its busy market in which there was the cathedral mosque which Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Raṣṣāl had embellished (nakhrabat). The water ran in shallow subterranean canals; forests and firewood were abundant and the prices of merchandise moderate. In spite of all this, Taṣbarīn was a wretched little town (būlāzq) the outskirts of which were in ruins, the water bad and the climate cold. The inhabitants professed the Shī‘ite rite and were capable of being very troublesome in times of turmoil. Taṣ produced toasted or boiled cooking vessels (kūḏin), mats and wheat as well as striped materials and šīk (cords for supporting awnings) of good quality. Nawāk was below Taṣbarīn (piton, perhaps “lower down the river”). In Mustagh there was a citadel with houses and a market; the mosque built on the
where the Imam 'Ali was buried was uninjured. Ibn al-'Athir gives a list of individuals of note slain on this occasion.

The family of al-Mu'a'iyid. In 548 (1153) a slave of Suljân Sinjâr Ay-Abâ al-Mu'a'iyid carried out for himself a small kingdom including Nâhpûr, Tûs, Nasâ', Damghân etc. Sinjâr's successor, his nephew Mahmûd b. Muhammad (the Kara-Kânîd; cf. Barthold, Turkenstaeton, text, p. 27), had to be content with the payment of tribute by Mu'a'iyid. In 552 Mu'a'iyid's rival Aitulâh (Ay-tâk) devastated Tûs and its townships, after which the district was left waste (ibid., xi. 150). In 553 the Ghuzz, having defeated Mu'a'iyid near Marw followed him up and sacked Tûs. In the same period a quarrel broke out in Khurâsan between the leader of the Shahtûs Mu'a'iyid b. Husain and the 'Alawîs. The people of Tûs, Isfârâyîn and Djuwânî supported this other Mu'a'iyid but the 'Alawîs were vanquished. These internecine struggles brought about fresh devastation (ibid., xi. 155). In 555 Mu'a'iyid Ay-Abâ after a quarrel had a reconciliation with Mahmûd and as soon as he was reestablished in his post began to harass the 'Alawîs. In 560 the suzerain Mahmûd who was dependent on the Ghuzz quarreled with them. The Ghuzz sacked Tûs (nakham fâlikon) including Mesghid but did not touch the sanctuary. In 557 (1160) Mu'a'iyid blinded Suljân Mahmûd and had the khâtûb said in his own name (ibid., xi. 180; Barthold, op. cit., p. 335). He laid siege to the fortress of Waskarakh-Khûtî (which belonged to Tûs, where a certain Abû Bakr Qânîdî had installed himself. Mu'a'iyid took the fortress and Karastân (which also) in 558, Mu'a'iyid recognised the suzerainty of Suljân Arslân (of the 'Irât). Ibn al-'Athir gives a list of his lands which included Qâmîs, Nîzhî and Tûs and it extended from Nasâ' to Tabas-Kunkî (ibid.). In 568 Mu'a'iyid, who had taken the side of the Khâirimshâh Suljân Shâh Mahmûd, was taken and executed by the latter's brother Suljân Tâkâsh. Under Tâghan-Shâh, son and successor of Mu'a'iyid, his slave Kus-Kush in 568 took Tûs and Zâmî (Djâm; cf. Ibn al-'Athir, xi. 248; according to the Manûbîr al-Tadrîjât of Abu 'l-Haasan Bâläh). According to another source used by Ibn al-'Athir, xi. 253, the Khâirimshâh Tâkâsh (in 568) before his final struggle with Mu'a'iyid advanced as far as Tûs. In 576 (1181) Suljân-Shâh having received the support of the general of the Kara-Khanî Fûmî defeated Tâghan-Shâh and seized Sarakhs and Tûs. Tâghan-Shâh died in 581 (cf. Djuwânî, ii. 19-23; Barthold, op. cit., p. 339).

The geographers of the xith century. Samânî (d. 562 = 1166), G.M.S., p. 375, mentions in Tûs two towns (Tâbûran and Nâhpûran) and over 1,000 villages. Idrîsî (548-1154), transal. Jaubert, ii. 184 (= MS. f. 164) puts the distance between Tûs and Nâhpûran at a 4 days' journey (marzâ)'a). Tûs is a considerable town, well built and thickly populated. In the vicinity were a number of towns with minbars: Rûkân (sit.), Bright, Dûnûs, Mirhân (according to Ya'qûbî: town of Isfârâyîn) and Mûlân (sit.), "a most noteworthy town" with a good citadel and earthwork. On "the mountain of Mîlkân" there were quarries for stone out of which were made mortars and cauldrons (hirbûn), and also mines of silver, copper, iron, turquoise, dahamûs and rock crystal. A number of inaccuracies were inevitable in Idrîsî who was writing in Sicily.

THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM, IV.
The Khwārizmshāh and the Ghurids. In 594 Takaš, who had risen against the Ghurids with the help of the Kara-Khitai, went by Tūs to Harāt. In 597 the Ghurids Ghishār al-Dīn seized the lands of the Khwārizmshāh in Khurasān. Tūs surrendered after a siege of three days and was sacked (Djouwaini, ii, 48). In the next year, the Khwārizmshāh 'Alī al-Dīn Muḥammad reconquered Khurasān and laid siege to Harāt, but the Ghurids Shīkhār al-Dīn drove him back. Takaš before returning put to death the lord of Nūshāpūr, the amir Sanjar b. Tughān-Shir b. al-Mu'āliy, suspected of plotting against him. Shīkhār al-Dīn came to Tūs and spent the winter there (Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 59, 111; 118).

The Mongols. At the beginning of Rābi' al-akhir 617 (1220), the generals of Cingiz-Khān Yемеn (Djihe) and Subutai pursuing the Khwārizmshāh came to Nūshāpūr. Subutai left for Djam and Tūs. The eastern townships of “Tūs-Nawḵūn” were submitted but the inhabitants of the town (i.e. Tūs-Tābarān) did not give a satisfactory reply. Subutai ordered a general massacre (batt-i-bafrī) in the town and vicinity. Rādikān, the situation of which Subutai liked, was spared (Djouwaini, Qītānān-gūshā, G.M.S., i, 114-115). After the two generals had gone, the people were able to breathe again (ibid., p. 117). The chief of the militia of Tūs (ḥafr-i-raūst) was bold enough to kill the Mongol šoqān, but the Mongol general Kāšīnūrī, hastening from Ustānā (= Kaṭān) arrested the culprit and began to dismantle the fortifications. In the meanwhile, the advance guards of the army of Ťoluj (Tūj), son of Cingiz-Khān, had arrived in Khurasān. The last forts of Tūs were occupied. Nawḵūn (and Kār-i) resisted vigorously; but Nawḵūn was taken on the 28th Rābi' al-akhir 617. In the spring of 618 (1221), Toluj himself arrived from Marw. At one stroke the army occupied all places in the valley of Tūs and the last remnants of the population (nebāy-yi izzātār) were put to death (ibid., p. 130-135). The first sūkī of Khurasān appointed by the Mongols (under Ťogotai, 624—639) was the Kara-Khitai Khamdūrū (Qāsīnūrū), reading uncertain; cf. Rādikān al-Dīn, ed. Bl措et, p. 37). The citadel of Tūs was occupied by an advenutier, Tadj al-Dīn Fartānāh, who submitted to Kūlūnūt (= the one who was sent by Khāndūrū (Djouwaini, ii, 220). In 637 (1239) the Lakhwīr Buddhist Kūrūk ("the Long") was appointed to Khurasān and made Tūs his headquarters. In all the town (the old Tābarān), there were only 50 houses still inhabited. Kūrūk began to build government offices (iṣmārat). Contra the Mongol custom he built a solid treasury (khānāyā in the centre of the citadel (iṣṭūr). The town began to recover rapidly and the prices of municipal plots went up a hundredfold in a week (Djouwaini, ii, 255, 260).

Karākūs was succeeded by the famous amir Ovrat Arghūn. On returning from his journey to the erās in 643, he saw that the Masjūriya palace and the forts (ṣagār) were completely in ruins and gave orders to rebuild them (ibid., ii, 245, 247). Confirmed in office by Motke-Kaṭān (649) Arghūn entered the government of Nūshāpūr and Tūs to Malik Nasir al-Dīn 'Ali (ibid., p. 255). Arghūn then entered the service of Hulghū and in the reign of Aḥāba died in 673 (1275) at Kaṭān of Tūs (Rādikān al-Dīn, ed. Bl措et, p. 559). The place of death of Arghūn suggests that his own estates were in the district. The activities of his son Nawżūr (who converted Ghara to lāmūn but was executed by his orders at Harāt in 696 [1297], cf. d'Olsoum, iv, 190) were closely associated with Khurān and thus paved the way for the later successes of his family.

Christianity in Tūs. Traces of Christianity must have survived in Tūs from the Saffārīd period (cf. above). In the biography of Shaikh Abu Sa'id (1067—1049), Ahrūs al-Tanzūlī, ed. Zukowsky, p. 70, we have a curious story of his meeting with the child who was later to become Nūshāpūr al-Mulk (born in 1017—1018) at Tūs (= Tābarān) "at the beginning of the street of the Christians" (ari zar-ī kāwarī tavākūn). In the Mongol period the Christians enjoyed greater freedom. When in 1278 the future patriarch Nābhālārī was on his way from Mongolia to Jerusalem, he went to the monastery of Mār Šeybūn "near the town of Tūs" and there received the blessing of the bishop and of the monks. In the year 1350 of the Greeks (= 1279) the bishop of Tūs, Simeon, was ordained metropolitan of China (Bar Hebraeus, Chron. Enl., ii, 449).

The geographers of the XIII-XVII cent. Yākūt, iii, 500, gives few details about Tūs and only reproduces the fables of Mis'ār b. Muḥallā about a powerful stronghold on the road between Tūs and Nūshāpūr built by a Hindū king (tawāsīb). Under Tābarān (iii, 406) and Niḳūn (iv, 524) Yākūt says: "Tūs consists of two towns of which the larger is Tābarān." At Nawḵūn Yākūt mentions the manufacture of pots and caddrons of stone (cf. Lisān al-Arab, xiv, 311 on the stone pots which the pilgrims bring from Meḥshid). A village of Tābarān also existed at Khurān and there was a village of Nawḵūn at Nūshāpūr. Zakariyā Kāzvīnī, Akbars al-Bilād, p. 275, seems to have been the source of many confusions (cf, their excellent analysis in Samī al-Dawla, i, 190—199) by saying that Tūs was "a town of which the two parts (mahāllātāin) were Tābarān and Nawḵūn". In reality these two towns were separated by a distance of 4 farsakh, as ʻAbd Allāh Mustawīt (G.M.S., p. 151) rightly points out.

According to Ibn Bāḍīs, iii, 77, Tūs (= Tābarān), which he reached from Djam, was one of the largest towns in Khurasān. From Tūs he went to Meḥshid which at this time must have encroached upon Nawḵūn for of the latter the traveller says nothing and from this time the name disappears completely.

The Dīn-Ghorbān. These rulers were the direct descendants of Nawżūr b. Arghūn. Their name was probably that of one of the sections of the Mongol tribe of Ovrat (quwāṣhārān = the three [detachments] of the left [wing]), later given a Persian dress as Djam-Kurān (those who sacrifice their souls); cf. Dawlat-Shāh). After the extinction of the Mongol dynasty of Persia, the son of Nawżūr, called Arghūn-Shāh, won for himself a kingdom in Khurasān which, according to Hāfiz Abru (quoted in Barthold, Inter-geogr., ehre frasat, p. 769), included Tūs, Kaṭān, Kašān, Kūt, Ahūward, Naşā, and Marw. Dawlat-Shāh (Bombay edition 1887, p. 121) calls Arghūn-Shāh "ṣagārān of Nūshāpūr and Tūs", but in 738 Nūshāpūr was taken from him by the Sarbadār Mašūd. Arghūn-Shāh played a considerable part in the election of Tugh-Timur (q.v.). After the latter's death (754), his possessions were divided among the Sarbadārs, the Karts and Arghūn-Shāh, but the Sarbadār Karashī at some time took Tūs from
Argān-Shāh [cf. SARKARA; one of the gates of Kūrān named Dasrān-ta-ya Argāhwan-Shāh (sic) owes its origin to this prince rather than to the 14th-century Arghun who was never called Shay].

The successors of Argān-Shāh were his sons Muhammed-beg and Alī-beg. When at the beginning of 1383, Timūr came to Tūs, Aḥ-ī-beg went to pay homage to him but in the winter of 1381, he shut himself up in the fortress of Kūrān. After many vicissitudes, Aḥ-ī-beg surrendered to Shahīd 'Alī Bahādūr in 784. As a reward Timūr gave the latter Rādān. Aḥ-ī-beg was deported to Andijūn and executed there towards the end of the year. Others of the Dūr-Gorābīn were exiled to Tūshent (Zafar-nāma, i. 324, 335, 351, 385). But in 791 (1389) a rising took place in Kūrān, which was joined by the Sarbadārā, Ḥaḍjdī-beg (younger brother of Aḥ-ī-beg) and the troops of Kūrān and Tūs. The Zafar-nāma briefly records the suppression of the rising by Mirān-shāh (i. 468—469). A much more detailed account is quoted by Şanf al-Dawla (op. cit., p. 208—209). Timūr is said himself to have appointed Ḥaḍjdī-beg to Tūs (in 789) where he amassed great wealth. The rumours of Tokhtamish's successes turned Ḥaḍjdī-beg's head and he stopped the kūhā for Timūr and proclaimed his desire for independence. He fought for several months with the amir Aū-bāq-I who remained faithful to Timūr. On the arrival of Mirān-shāh, Ḥaḍjdī-beg fled but was captured and put to death.

The town was taken in Radja I 791 (1389): 10,000 men were killed and towers of skulls (mnāra) erected at the gate of the city. *No trace was left of Tūs.* In 807 again, Timūr had executed near Taškhabad (Asḥi Sabt) the Dūr-Gorābīn Aū-bāq-I and Kāra-būq-I, who had been plotting in his absence (Zafar-nāma, ii. 597). At the present day, the country north of Meshhed (from Colaykhan to Kalūya-Tūs) is inhabited by a tribe which is called the campament (yurut) of the Dūr-Gorābīn tribe (Şanf al-Dawla, op. cit., p. 197).

End of Tūs. Tūs (i.e. Tābārān) never was able to recover from the events of 791. It is true that Shahīdā after his accession to the throne of Kūrān in 807 sent to Tūs the amir Saiyid Khabādā with orders to rebuild the town. In 809, Tūs, Kūtān, Kūrān etc. were given to prince Ulugh-beg. In the period of the decline of Timūr's line, some members of it exercised more or less independent power at Tūs: in 822 Mirza Shah Ḷajmūd, in 905 Mirza Muḥammad Ḫusain (son of Şalāh Ḫusain Baikāra).

In 918 'Ubayd Allāh-khan Orbekh, having raised the siege of Harān, came to Tūs and Ifsarān but after some months evacuated Kūrān on the approach of Shah Ḳamīl. In 947 the Ḳahīr al-Siyar mentions a governor in Tūs of Meshhed*. Khānīkow found at Tūs a funerary inscription of a šah-i-bādī Ibrahim dated 983. The argument of the same traveller from the fact that the name Tūs does not disappear from Persian astrological till the sixteenth century A.D. is, by no means conclusive, for we know how tenacious geographical memories are in the East. Amin Ahmad Rāzī in the Hafiz-i-Nāla (Iblī, Nat. Paris, MS. suppl. Pers. 355 e., f. 264—274) no longer mentions Tūs; in speaking of Meshhed he says: *This will be at once called Tūs*. At the beginning of the sixteenth century, Zain al-Abidin Shīrānī, Rūṣūl al-Siyāh, Taḥerīn 1315, p. 354; says: *This was a well-known town in Kūrān. Destiny has so destroyed it that all that remains is a village of 30 houses*.

Two causes have contributed to the disappearance of Tābārān—Tūs: the weakness of its geographical situation in the plain, open to every invader, and the popularity of Meshhed which is protected by the renown and sanctity of its sanctuary, and attracts crowds of pilgrims. The Indian traveller Abū al-Karim who visited Meshhed with Nādir-Shāh in 1153 (1741) rightly observes that the splendour of this town caused the ruin of Tūs (transl. Langles, 1797, p. 74).

Antiquities. Fraser, Khanskiw, O'Donovan, Zakowsky, Jackson, Dier and notably Şanf al-Dawla and Sykes have described the ruins of Tūs, i.e. the town of Tābārān. They are situated on the left bank of the Kāsha-fūrūd about 15 miles (4 farsakhs) north of Meshhed (Nawākīn). The walls of the town are of brick and form an irregular circle a farsakh in circumference. Their thickness at the base is 5 dhār (about 15 feet). The remains of 106 towers and 9 gates can still be traced. The area occupied by the old town according to Sykes is about 2,300 yards each way.

On the north side of this area are the ruins of a square fortress each side of which measures 200 dhār (= yards). It has 12 towers. The ditch surrounding it is 15 dhār broad. In the middle of this arbān an artificial mound was a fort, oblong in shape 80 × 50 faces (measured).

It had 9 towers. Two little villages, each of 25 houses, lie at the foot of the wall inside: to the west lie the villages of Tūs-i Karim-khānī and to the east Tūs-i Bahādūr-khānī. To the N.E. outside the wall are the fields of a third village (maṣūra) Isfārsūa.

In spite of all the lack of attention on the part of the authorities, popular memory, even after the lapse of nine centuries, has not forgotten the site of Firdawsi's tomb. It is shown inside the town near the N.E. wall. Niṣām-i 'Arūsī, who visited the tomb in 1110 (1706) locates it in the garden which had belonged to Firdawsi "inside" the Rūḏīn gate (Cahār-mašā'ī, G.M.S., p. 51; darūn-i darvāsā. By a slip, Brown, A Litt. Hist. of Persia, i. 138, translates *outside* the gate*). As Sykes has shown, the village of Rūḏīn (modern pronunciation; Rūzān) still exists 9 miles N.E. of Tūs and the "Rūḏīn gate" corresponds to the one it ought therefore to be at the birthplace of Tūs-i Bahādūr-khānī. The Rūḏīrāh gate (cf. the story of Firdawsi) must have been at the opposite end of the town. The Nūḥat al-Kulīb, p. 151, moreover positively asserts that it was S.E. (dīnābī-bālā, i.e. opposite the great bridge over the Kāsha-fūrūd which still exists to-day. According to Sykes, Kūtānā was the name of a mountainous district between Tūs and Nāshāpur but Kūtānā may simply mean the part of the town near the river, i.e. the Kāsha-fūrūd. The village of Bāš, which Firdawsi owned, corresponds to the present village of Bāš (or Bāz) 4 miles S.E. of Rūḏīn (see the photograph in Sykes, A seventh journey, G.J., xiv. [1913], 305). The village of Bāš-i Tūs 2 parasakhs from the town of Tābārān is mentioned in the biography of Shaikh Abū Sa'ād (967—1049), Aṣrār al-Tamādūl, p. 68, which also mentions a place called Burārān, one parasakh from the town and the khānagāh of Ustād Abū Aḥmad in the town.

The village of Shālā, the birthplace of Firdawsi, also has been identified in the neighbourhood of Tūs (as I am informed by Taṣi-zade).
As to the tomb of the poet itself, Dawlatshah (852 = 1457), Bombay, ed. 1887, p. 39, says that it is beside the dome of Abab’i and is a place of pilgrimage, and Kashi Nuz Allah (end of the 12th [12th] century) in the Magżīl al-Ma’āniyya (Magżīl No. 12 on the Persian poets) claims to have himself visited it. He adds: "in spite of the ruin of its generally and the destruction of the tomb by order of 'Ubaid Allah Khán [its site] is well marked and obvious" (mawjud bād ma‘ma’ayin). [The contrary interpretation by Zukowsky, according to which 'Ubaid Allah Khán ordered the tomb of Firdawsi to be "put in order"], seems due to some misunderstanding of the MS. which he quotes, Univ. of St. Petersburg, No. 147, fol. 63. If we may believe Fraser, loc. cit., p. 319, a little building surrounded by a dome decorated with faience still existed in 1822. In 1838 Khanjoo could find no trace of it. In 1883 the Wali of Khurāsan, Aṣaf al-Dawla, having cleared away the mound (žālep) which had accumulated with the crumbling away of the old building (cf. Fraser) covering the tomb with brick and surrounded it by an earthen wall. His death stopped further work. The peasants told Zukowsky that the tombstone of Firdawsi had been taken away for the building of a bath but Zukowsky expresses doubts on this point. Under the Pahlavi régime and on the initiative of Anti Kāi-Khuṣraw, a Parāt deputy to the Persian medjīl, a building has been begun to mark in a worthy manner the resting-place of the author of the Žālp-žūma. [The doubts expressed regarding the site of the tomb by Sykes, F.R.A.S., 1910, p. 1120, seem exaggerated in view of the existence of an uninterrupted tradition and the statements of Zukowsky].

In the midst of the ruins of its stands a fine brick building (Sa’m al-Dawla, l. 180: hā’īs mawṣul "like a mausoleum") now dilapidated. According to Dīz, its plan is a parallelogram 18.6 × 25 metres and its walls are extremely thick (3.60 m. × 5.40 metres). The height of the walls to the foot of the dome is 18 m. (Sa’m al-Dawla). The building consists of three parts: 1. the entrance (žālp 8.70 × 3.20 m.); 2. the chamber under the dome (Kapheppale), 12 × 12 m. and 3. rooms of different sizes with vaulted roofs. Sa’m al-Dawla (l. 181) relying on the absence of covering for the walls had already suggested that the building had never been finished. A single inscription noticed by Sa’m al-Dawla is al-dunjī atat ("this world is but an hour"). There are no dates. Dīz (p. 59) alluding to the similarity of style with the mausoleum of Sulajin Šanḏar at Marw (1157) proposes tentatively to identify it with the tomb of Abū Šāفائ al-Qazālī (d. 595 = 1191). But the translations of the texts on which Dīz relies are inaccurate. Yāqūt says only that Qazālī was buried in his native town, Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, ii. 77, also continues himself to saying "and there (at Tūs) is his tomb (stayr)". It would be strange if the Maghribi traveler had not given some note on the mausoleum. Inside the mausoleum on the ground are the tombstones of a certain prince and descendant of the Prophet (Ṣāḥib-yūqūl, contrary to the translation quoted by Dīz, is not a name but a title) and of his daughter (the princess; shuyqūrat) Māhwaš Khānīn. These stones do not belong to the mausoleum but have been brought from outside. The tombstone (nāqebkīyeh) of the prince Ḳaḥīm (983) which Khanjoo, Oltīr, saw at Tūs likewise cannot be connected with this building.

As to the ruins of Nūḵān, they lie immediately to the east of Meshed as far as the villages of Hūrašūd and Mīhrābūd. Sykes found sepulchral inscriptions dating from 1360 (1539) to 1399 (1688). The quarters of Meshed adjoining the ruins is also called Nūḵān (Sykes, op. cit., p. 1116).


(Contrary citations.)

TŪS, according to Yāqūt, a village a farsakh from Marw al-Qāhīd (q.v.) In 1350 the Umayyad wilh Naṣr b. Sīyāk, a vizier on pressure from Abū Musa, was imprisoned on the river that, already appointed and Abu l-Dhaϊyāl to Tūs, the inhabitants of which were partitions of Abū Musa. Abū l-Dhaϊyāl was defeated at Tūs (cf. Ibn al-Antir, v. 282). (Y. Minorsky)

AL-TUSI NAṣIR AL-DIN, Abū DIYĀK MUHAMMAD B. MUHAMMAD B. AL-ḤASAN, astronomer, polymath and Shi’a politician of the period of the Mongol invasion, born at Tūs on the 11th Djamād al 1737 (Feb. 18, 1201), died at Baghdad on the 18th Dha’i (12) Hindji 672 (June 26, 1274).

Naṣir al-Din al-Tūsī began his career as astrologer to the Emir of the city of Nisār al-Din Abū al-Rāmi b. Abī Ṭasnīr, a vizier and supporter of Najīr al-Din’s court. After his attempt to transfer to the caliph’s court had been betrayed, he was kept under supervision in Serakht, and later in Alamut (q.v.) but allowed to retain his office and continue his researches unhindered. In 644 (1245) he played the Assassin leader Rukn al-Din Khwāshah into the hands of Hülagü (q.v.) then accompanied the latter on his trusted and now to the conquest of Baghdad, founded by his orders the observatory of Najīr al-Din, became vizier and supervisor of waqf estates and retained his influential position under Abī Ṭasnīr (q.v.) also without interruption until his death.
Tusil's political attitude was determined by his strong sympathy with the "Twelver," which made him with his talents and versatility a leader of the Iranian-Shi'a oligarchy on the Mongol side against the caliphate. It was through his influence that a certain degree of mercy was shown the Shi'a during the Mongol holocaust and their sanctuaries in Southern Mesopotamia were spared. Among his writings (see 56 titles in 4. A. E., i. 508 sqq.; cf. also Nallino, in Orientale Moderno, viii. 43 sq.) are two hand-books of dogmatics much esteemed by also-religious and several times commented upon: the Taqdir al-Asbah (Teheran n. d.) and Ruhul-Asbah (Teheran 1305 with the commentary of his pupil Ibn al-Mujahhar). The teaching of the Twelvers concerning the Imâms is clearly worked out and also in the metaphysics al-Fâsîl written in Persian (cf. the annotated Arabic edition in Berlin MS., No. 1770, fol. 1388 sqq.). Tusil's logic and philosophy is also occasionally expressed in his dogmatic writings as the formal preliminary to the dogmas, which are substantially derived from Shi'a tradition. It belongs to the school of Ibn Sinâ (q.v.). On the latter's al-Ishârât wa-l-Tanbihât he composed the commentary Hall Muhshârât al-Ishârât (Lucknow 1930). Here he defended Ibn Sinâ against Fâqîr al-Dîn al-Rāzî (q.v.) and further wrote against the latter's Muhaffalât al-Athâr fi al-Muhabbat al-Din (Teheran 1320), however much the fact of his Shi'ism and reverence even for al-Hallâdî distinguishes him from most of his co-religious. In Fîkh he wrote on the law of inheritance; of his occult works a Kitâb al-Râmî has survived (Munich, Arab MS., No. 880). While still in Sûrakhût he dedicated to his patron there the treatise Al-Dībāb Alkhâl-î Naqîrî still frequently reprinted (Lahore 1625; Bombay 1657 etc.) which shows the influence of Ibn Miskawwâl. His devotion to his own sect did not in any way cut him off from others. He discussed scientific matters with Dâllî al-Dîn Rûmî by letter and with Nâmî al-Dîn al-Khâtî (G.A.L., i. 466) orally. He worked with the brothers Liwwânî (q.v.). To one, the historian Allâh al-Dîn, he dedicated his Ta'ârîf Muhaqqal and to the other, the Sâhib Dîwân Shams al-Dîn, the Awâfî al-Ashâfî; and he owes his fame beyond Shi'a circles to his books and researches in the exact sciences: medicine, physics, mathematics and particularly astrology and astronomy.


Al-Tâsî's medical works are of no particular scientific importance. In Physics, as an astronomer, he was primarily interested in questions of optics, both geometrical and physiological. To this field belongs his Ta'ârîf Kitâb al-Manâqî, a version of the Optics of Euclid, and the Râ'hî al-`ilm al-`aswâr wa-l-`awzâhî. The industry is remarkable which al-Tâsî displayed in editing and improving the translations made by Thâhî b. Kûrâ, Kâkî b. Lûkâ and Ithâbî b. Hûnîn of Greek mathematicians and astronomers; we may mention among mathematicians, Euclid (Elements, Data, Phainomena), Apollonius (Conica), Archimedes (Dimension of the Circle, Sphere and Cylinder, Lemnata), among astronomers, Theodorus, Menelaus, Antolykos, Aristarchus, Hypsicles and Ptolemy. His most famous original work is the Kitâb Shâhîl al-`asfâh, a work on the principles of the transversal, from which he deduces relations of fundamental importance in spherical trigonometry. He also wrote a book on arithmetic, Muhammâd al-Dîwânî, al-Haithâm bi l-Tâhîr wa l-Tâhîb, which gives the principles of the field of astronomy. He owed the means to conduct his researches to the astrological interests of the Mongol Khâns, particularly his patron Hüllûq. The latter entrusted him with the building of a great observatory at Marâq, which was equipped with the best instruments, some of them constructed for the first time, and a large staff of observers. Tâsî was already 60 when the building was begun, but he was spared another 12 years to finish completely the task of calculating new planetary tables based on comprehensive observations. His calculations he recorded in the Tâhîb al-Manâqî. The first Mashâl deals with eras, the second with the movements of the planets; the third and fourth are devoted to astrological observations. Of further works we may mention the Kitâb al-Tâhîbîr al-Nâsirî, a survey of the whole field of astronomy, on which numerous later scholars wrote commentaries, and the astrological Kitâb al-Fa'îl.

AL-TŪSĪ, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. 'Alī, was born at Tūs in Ramāzān 385 (995). After receiving early education at his native place he came to Baghdaḍ in 408 (1017) and studied under al-Shāhīd al-Muḥāfīd (Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Baghdādī), who lived from 405 to 1022. On the latter's death, al-Tūsī associated himself with Sa‘īd b. Muḥammad and al-Muṣṭaṣir (Al-Tūsī, d. 436 = 1044) and was his companion and pupil for about twenty-three years. When the latter died he stayed on at Baghdaḍ for twelve years and tried his utmost to spread the doctrines of the Shi‘a sect. His enemies once complained to the Caliph al-Kā‘im (422-467 = 1031-1075) of his hatred of the first three orthodox Caliphs and supported their allegations by quoting passages from his book Kišāh al-Muṣīṣ. Summoned to the presence of the Caliph, he explained the passages in such a way that the Caliph became satisfied that no disrespect was meant to the Sunni doctrines and no action was taken against him. But the public agitation against him grew vehement and at last in 468 (1070), his residence was burnt to ashes. He left Baghdaḍ that year and came to Naḍasaf where he passed the rest of his life. He is the greatest doctor of the Shi‘a sect, and is popularly known as Shāhīd al-Tūsī or simply al-Shāhīd. He died in 566 (1170) and was buried in his native place. As a man of letters he has left behind him a very large number of books, among which are the following:

1. Kišāh Taḥdīḥ al-Āḍām, a work on Ḥudūd ascribed to al-Tūsī, printed in Tehran, 1321.
4. al-Ṭabīb, a compendium of Muḥammadan law according to the Shī‘a school, printed in Tehran, 1321.
5. Fikhrī Kutub al-Sахa, a list of Shī‘a books, printed in Tehran, 1326.
6. Dhāt al-Dīn Manṣūr al-Muḥāfīd (d. 468), another book on prayers ascribed to al-Imām Ali b. Abī Ṭālib (d. 468), from whom it is descended to the author. Lithographed in Tehran, 1328.

Important works of al-Tūsī include:

1. Kišāh al-ītībat fi‘ma kāhilna fī man al-Āḍām, a treatise on the fundamental dogmas of the Shi‘a creed. It avoided the term 'ulamā‘, which is not used in the Shi‘a sect.
2. al-Muṣīṣ al-Muṣīṣ, a book on the sciences and their application to the Shi‘a sect. It is a comprehensive commentary on the Muhadith of the Shi‘a sect.
3. al-Muṣīṣ al-Muṣīṣ, a work on the Shi‘a sect and its literature. It is a comprehensive commentary on the Muhadith of the Shi‘a sect.
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able to win over Ašḵoḵ, so that the latter refused to do anything against him and went home with his troops, when he was vigorously reproached by Tutuš for this step. Buḵān also did the same so that Tutuš was forced also to retire, when the sudden death of Malḵalḵād altered the whole situation in a moment. In view of the uncertainty regarding the succession, the two Turkish emirs were forced to pay homage to the claimant Tutuš and support him on his campaign to the east. Nisibis, Aram, Mālaḵūṯān and al-Mawṣil had submitted and in the first named town a fearful massacre was wrought by Tutuš. When it became known that Barkiyawūḏ was coming forward as his father's rightful heir, the emirs left Tutuš in the lurch and joined Barkiyawūḏ, so that Tutuš had to retire to Syria, firmly resolved to revenge himself on the emirs. He thereupon collected new forces to take the field against them while the emirs, who were supported by Kurbuḵa on behalf of Barkiyawūḏ, did the same. At Tell al-Sulṭān, six farsakhs south of Halab, the two sides met (487 = 1042). Tutuš was victorious; Ašḵoḵ was taken prisoner and at once executed. Kurbuḵa and Buḵān escaped to Halab but had finally also to surrender. Tutuš had the latter also executed and sent his head to Edessa to frighten the inhabitants into obedience. Every one now submitted to the victor, who at once entered the Iraḵ with his troops and came to Hamadḵān, while Barkiyawūḏ, who had only a small army at his disposal, had to flee before him to Iṣphān where he took small-pox. Nevertheless the Turkish emirs in the town hesitated to submit to Tutuš and when Barkiyawūḏ recovered from his illness, they pointed out to him that the claims of the two pretenders could only be settled by the sword. Barkiyawūḏ was then joined by troops from all sides so that he was able to attack Tutuš at a place called Daghla near al-Raṣay (17th Satar 488 = Feb. 26, 1005). Tutuš, abandoned by his soldiers, made a valiant stand but is said to have fallen at the hands of one of Ašḵoḵ's men who wished to avenge his master. Syria then passed to his sons Ridwān (q.v.) and Dukān.

**Bibliography:** Of the works mentioned in the article sedīqī some special mention may be made here of the historians of DAMASUS: Ibn al-Kallānī, ed. Amedroz, cf. index, and of Halab: Kamāl al-Din, Zublaṭ al-Talāb and Bāgika al-Talāb, especially the excerpts in Historia Orientalis des Croisades, iii. (p. 703-706 biography of Ašḵoḵ); Ibn Khallākūn, ed. Būlaq 1299, i. 168 sq.

**TUWAYS, ABU 'ABD AL-MUN'IM ILK R, AND ALLAH AL-DĪN** was the first great singer in the days of 1448. It is said that his real name was TAṬUS (peacock), but that when he became a muḥānnaṭ it was changed into Tuways (little peacock), and that 'Abd al-Mun'im was changed into 'Abd al-Nasīm. He was born on the day of the death of the Prophet Muhammad (June 8, 632), was weaned the day that Abū Bakr died, was circumcised the day that 'Umar was assassinated, was married the day when 'Uthmān was murdered, and his first son was born on the day when All passed away. These extraordinary coincidences gave rise to the proverb: "More unfortunate than Tuways". He belonged to Madīna and was a muḏaḏ of the Band Māḏkān, being in the service of Arwā, the mother of the Caliph 'Uthmān. He first attracted attention by singing certain melodies that he had learned from Persian slaves, and rose to fame as a musician in the reign of 'Uthmān (644-666). About this time a new style of music was introduced into Madīna which was known as the gāhī al-ṭaṭī or gāhī al-muṣṭakī, its special feature being the application of rhythm (rizā) to the melody (qāna) [see qāna]. He is said to have been the first to sing this "new music" in Madīna (Aḡhānī, iv. 385; al-Ḥār al-farād, iii. 187). What is attributed to him is given elsewhere in the Aḡhānī (ii. 170) only can be properly supposed to be in conjunction with the above, so that this must be read: Tuways was the first who sang [the gāhī al-muṣṭakī] in Arabic in Madīna. Like many other musicians in Madīna at this period, Tuways was a muḥānnaṭ (see my Hist. of Arabian music, p. 45) and the proverb arose: "More effeminate than Tuways". Indeed it was said that music (qāna) had its origin in Madīna among the muḥānnaṭūn (Aḡhānī, iv. 161) which is probably a canard started by the Ummānī. That Tuways was the first muḥānnaṭ in Madīna, as the author of the Aḡhānī says, can scarcely be correct (cf. al-Buhārī, iv. 32; al-Tirmīdī, l. 271; Und al-Ghāṣ, iv. 268). Whilst Abū 'Uṯmān b. Alphān was governor of Madīna, Tuways was favoured by the emirs, but when Muʿṣawīya I (661-680) became Caliph, and Marwān b. al-Hakam was appointed governor, the muḥānnaṭūn were suppressed, and Tuways fled to al-Suways, a two days' journey on the road to Syria. Here he remained until his death about 710-711. Some say that he died at Māṭaḍ, whilst others say elsewhere.

In spite of the fact that Tuways only used a square tambourine (daff), which he kept in a bag or in his cloak, to accompany himself when singing, yet he had so high a reputation in music, says Ibn Khallākūn, that his talent became proverbial and a poet of Madīna said, "Tuways, and after him Ibn Surādī, excelled [in singing], but preeminence belongs to Mas'ūd". Among his pupils were Ibn Surādī (q.v.), al-Dahlī Nāshī, Nawmā al-Duḥā and Fandī. Ibn Surādī said that Tuways was the finest singer of his day, and was considered the best exponent of the kanājī rhythm.

**Bibliography:** Aḡhānī, ed. Būlaq, ii. 170-176; iii. 39-39 and Gūǧīd's Index (Guidi registers two musicians bearing this name, but there is no doubt that they were one and the same); al-Ḥār al-farād, ed. Cairo 1887-1888, iii. 186; Ibn Khallākūn, Wafārīf, ed. Wüstenfeld, ii. 438; Māḏānī, Aṯālī, ed. Freytag, vii. 124; xii. 158; Ibn 'Aḏīnī, Commentaire hist. sur le prince d'Ibn Abūbān par Ibn Būrīm, ed. Dozy (1846), p. 64; Ibn Ḥutaibī, Kitāb al-Muṣṭāfīf, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 164; Kosegarten, Lib. cont. p. 11; J.A., 1873, p. 399-401; Farmer, Hist. of Arabian music, p. 50-53.

(H. G. Farmer)

**TUZER, A TOWN IN Southern Tunisa, 350 miles S.S.W. of Tunisa and 120 W. of Gabes in 33° 54' 48" N. Lat. and 8° 8' E. Long. (Greenwich).**

Tizer is the most important place on the isthmus which separates the Shott Gharsa in the N. from the Shott al-Djarid in the S. and in the immediate neighbourhood of the latter; it consists of a town and a few scattered villages in the oasis which runs southwards over an area of about four sq. miles. The principal town is quite regularly
built; the majority of the houses are built of bricks arranged in geometrical patterns; the dwellings in the oasis are usually only "gourbels" of trunks and branches of palm-trees. The people make carpets and woollen and silk blankets which are much esteemed, but they are mainly dependent on their gardens and palmgroves. The oasis, the richest in al-Djarid, owes its fertility to the numerous springs (1943) which rise to the west of the sand-dunes and unite to form a stream which runs towards the shoal. The water is distributed for irrigation purposes by a system described by al-Bakri (Manahil, trans. de Sagne, revised by Fagnan, p. 102) and still in active use. The palm-trees, numbering 228,000, supply dates of various kinds, notably the dālīl-nūr. Export has assumed considerable proportions since the railway was connected to Sfax and the rest of the Regency. The population are arabsised Berbers; Tûzer itself has 11,056 inhabitants of whom 10,723 are Muslims, 181 Jews, 152 Europeans (Census of 1926).

Tûzer (Thynauros of the Tab. Peut.; Thymuros of Ptolemy) is of very ancient origin. The Romans founded near the site of the village of Bīdāt al-Hāder, a township, remains of which can still be seen in the base of the minaret of the mosque, a well, shafts of columns, fragments of capitals etc. Taken by the Vandals, it was recaptured by the Byzantines; pillaged no doubt by the first Arab invaders, it finally fell to the Arabs at the end of the xiith century a.d. The population had to adopt Islam or go into exile. Those who migrated were probably very few, since al-Tidāymi (Rīhā, transl. p. 143) regards the people of Tûzer as descendants of the Rûm who were in Irkâyâ at the Muslim conquest.

During the centuries that followed, Tûzer seems to have enjoyed great prosperity. Ibn Hawṣbal (Dess... de l'Afrique, transl. de Slane, in J. A., 1842) calls this district Kasîlitya — al-Bakri (loc. cit.) and Ibn Idrīs agree in recording the importance of the trade here and the wealth of its palmgroves.

According to al-Bakri, 1,000 loads of dates were exported every day.

The history of Tûzer has been by no means without incident. Nominally subject to the various dynasties who ruled in Irkâyâ, the people of Tûzer endeavoured to retain their independence in practice. They showed their hostility to the Fātimids by supporting the rebel Abū Yâsîf. Under the Zirids, they had local chiefs of the families of the Bānū Fūqīya, then of that of the Bānū Waṣṣāf; cf. Djarid.

In the Almohad period, their town was pillaged by Alī b. Ghanîya, then reoccupied by the Caliph Abū Yāsîf. At the end of the xivith century, they threw off Hafsîsâ suzerainty and in the xixth recognised that of Ibn Yumiḥu b. Sulṭān Abū L'Abî-Abîs; had great difficulty in disposing of in 1379 a.d. Under the successors of this prince they continued to be distinguished for their insubordination and on several occasions forced the rulers of Tunes to resort to force to reduce them to obedience. The town was also disturbed by the fighting between the citizens and the Arab tribes of the neighbourhood (Leo Africanus, Bk. li., ed. Schefer, ill. 257). The position hardly changed in the Turkish period. The people of Tûzer took part in several risings in the xivth and xixth centuries; the boys had always difficulty in collecting the taxes. The quarrels of the Seff also contributed to disorders. In the xixth century two of these Seff, the Ḫâlafi and the Zebra, each occupied a quarter of the town and maintained a fierce warfare until the French occupation definitely established peace and tranquillity (1884).


(G. Yver)

U

'UBAID ZĀKĀMĪ (Nizām al-Dīn 'Ubaid Allāh), a Persian poet of the xivth century, born c. 700 (1300) at Kāzwin in the family of the Žakāmī, which took its name from a village in the neighbourhood, the seat of the Žakāmī dynasty, which from that date until the end of the xivth century was the seat of Žakāmī rule. He was a judge in Kāzwin, went to Baghdad where he died in poverty in 772 (1371). He was a satirical and erotic poet. A selection of his facetics was printed at Constantinople in 1305 (1885-1886) by M.H. Ferit and at Berlin 1343 (1924); it contains: Ākhārī al-Asrāfī ("Morals of the Aristocracy"); a satire written in 740 (1340); Rīhā-al-nūr ("Book of the Beard"); a dialogue between the poet and the beard regarded as a destroyer of youthful beauty; Šah Penda ("100 Counsels") in prose written in 750 (1335); Thrifāt ("Definitions"); and in prose; Rīhā-al-dīn-gūsâ ("Little book which discloses the heart"); Arabic and Persian anecdotes and facetiae; several obscene poems. This edition does not include the Užzhīnā-nūmā ("Book of Lovers"); Al-bāṣ ("Book of Prophecies"); etc. Mīnū dūgū-ba ("The Mouse and the Cat") has been libellous in Bombay, n.d. and Berlin.


"UBAID ALLĀH. [See AL-MANĪF 'UBAID ALLĀH.]"
UBAID ALLAH b. Ziyād, an Omayyad governor. Ubaïd Allah was the most distinguished of the sons of the favourite of Muawiya I, Ziyād b. Abīthu [q.v.], celebrated for his rigour, and severity, and was appointed governor of Khurasan at the age of five and twenty. According to the usual statement, this took place in 54 (673-674). Soon afterwards he crossed the Oxus with an Arab army and advanced as far as Bukhārā [q.v.]. But he did not remain long in Khurasan; in 55 (674-675) or according to others 56 (675-676) or the beginning of 57 (676-677) the governor of Bāṣra, Abīd Allah b. Amr b. Ḥattābil, was dismissed and the administration of the city entrusted to Ubaïd Allah who, temporarily appointed Aslam b. Zūrā' al-Kīhāni as his deputy in Khurasān and only later was relieved of his former office. After his arrival in Bāṣra, Ubaïd Allah at first endeavoured to win over the Khāridjīs there by kindness, but when his efforts failed, he had to use more vigorous means and exerted all his energy to bring the Bāṣrān Khāridjīs under his authority. In time he succeeded in restoring peace to Bāṣra. In the year 60 (679-680) he was appointed by the caliph Yazid governor of Kūfah, while retaining his post in Bāṣra. When Ḥusān b. Abī [q.v.] was persuaded to set out from Mecca to go to Kūfah, Ubaïd Allah sent troops against him and on the 10th Muḥarram 61 (Oct. 10, 680) the battle of Kerbelā was fought in which Ḥusain lost his life. With the death of Yazid 14th Rabi' I 64 (Nov. 10, 683) a troubled period began. Ubaïd Allah had homage paid to himself in Bāṣra but only provisionally. The Kūfīs however, were disappointed and he had to escape to Syria, and by 1st Dhu‘ al-‘Idhā I of the same year (Jan. 25, 684) Abīd Allah b. Ḥartī b. Naufal called Naufal was recognised as governor of Bāṣra. After the death of Mu‘awiya II Ubaïd Allah supported the Umayyad party and urged Marwān b. al-Ḥakam to come forward as a claimant to the throne. At the battle of Marj Dābit (end of 64 = 684) where al-Dhāhīb b. Ka‘ṣ [q.v.] fell, ‘Ubaïd Allah commanded Marwān’s left wing. In the following year he was sent with Ḥusain b. Numair al-Ṣab‘al [q.v.] by the caliph to Khartishmā in order to invade the ʿIrāq from there and to bring this unruly province to obedience once and for all. He is said to have been appointed in advance governor of all the country to be conquered by him. Soon after his arrival in Mesopotamia the news of Marwān’s death reached him; his son and successor Abīd al-Ma‘līk confirmed ‘Ubaïd Allah in all the offices and privileges which Marwān had given him. Abīd Allah spent the whole year in Mesopotamia continuously fighting with the enemies of the caliph. He then advanced on al-Mawṣil. An army, which al-Mukhtar b. Abī ‘Ubaïd [q.v.] sent against him in Dhu‘ al-Ḥijja 66 (July 686) put to flight the advance-guard of the Syrian army but did not dare attack the main body. Soon afterwards the Shī‘ leader ‘Āshur b. al-‘Ashur attacked the Syrians and on the ‘Ashur’ day 67 (Aug. 6, 686) a battle was fought on the river Kāshir in the vicinity of al-Mawṣil. One of ‘Ubaïd Allah’s subordinates, ‘Umar b. al-Ḥudhīb, is said to have gone over to the enemy. The Syrians suffered a disastrous defeat and both ‘Ubaïd Allah and Ḥusain b. Numair were killed.


(K. V. Zettersten)

'UD, the lute, is the most important musical instrument of Islamic peoples from the Atlantic to the Persian Gulf [cf. also TUNR, ṬITRA, ṬIHAṬA].

Arabic authors do not discriminate between the harabat and the 'ud, but they have generally been a fundamental distinction between them. The harabat has its sound-chest and neck constructed in one graduated piece, whereas in the 'ud proper the sound-chest and neck were separate. Al-Mas‘ūdī says (Mawardi, viii. 88) that the lute was "invented" by Lānuṣk (Lamucke of Genesius, iv.), but elsewhere (viii. 90) he tells us that it was generally acknowledged that the Greeks were the inventors. Pythagoras, Plato, Eucleid and Ptolemy are also given the credit of its invention, although in the Tanbih (B. G. A., viii. 129) al-Mas‘ūdī says that since Ptolemy does not mention the lute the Greeks evidently did not know of it. The instrument was certainly of ancient origin. Whether the terra cotta figure found at Goshen in Egypt, and attributed to the xixth—xxth dynasty, shows a lute or not (Petrie and Duncan, Ḥyknos and Israelite Cities, p. 38, pl. xxxvii. B), we see undoubted examples of it in India from the ibid century A. D. (sculpture from Bihār in the Indian Museum, Calcutta). For later Indian examples see J. Am. O. S., l. 244, 255; Burgess, Buddhist stupas of Anuradhapura and Jâgyagnâyâsita, fig. 7. It also occurs in a frieze from Afghanistan (1st cent. A. D.) presented to the British Museum by Maj. Gen. Cunningham.

We are told that the lute ('ūd) was known in Persia at the time of Ṣimarūr I (241—272 A. D.) during whose reign it is said to have been invented (Abū l-Firdaws, Ḥīstorīā anteislamīca, p. 82). It is more likely however that this instrument was the harabat, and that the reference is rather to an improvement, possibly the substitution of a holly of wood instead of skin. The Persians called the instrument the harabat because it resembled the breast (hor) of a duck (ḥat) (Ma‘fahīth al-‘Ilm, p. 335; cf. Lane, Lexicon). J. F. N. Land was of opinion that the Persian lute referred to by Arabic authors was actually a two-stringed fountain (Trans. IXth Congress of Orientalists, 1891, p. 154), but several specimens of Sasanian art (fifth—sixth century) have preserved designs of the Persian lute showing four strings (Dalton, Treasures of the Oxus, ed. 2, p. 211), and the number of strings is confirmed from other sources (J. E. A.S., 1899, p. 59). That a two-stringed lute ('ūd) existed at the end of the fifth century in al-‘Irāq we know.
from the 18th century (iii. 181), and the design of a two-stringed lute (barbat) of the 12th century has been preserved (Pézard, La céramique archéologique de l'Islam, pl. 67). The barbat was the chief instrument of the Arab Qaṣṣain in pre-Islamic times (Ağānš, xvi. 15) and also of the Syrians in early Islamic times (Ağānš, iii. 84). The Greek θάλαβος would appear to have been borrowed from the Orient (Athanasius, Deipn., iv. 14) and Strabo remarks on its barbaric name (Geog., xii. 17).

The Arabus of pre-Islamic times had certain types of the lute known as the miskar, kirsan and mawtaar. These would appear to be identical with the barbat but with skin bellies. The miskar is unanimously identified with the lute (sud) by the Arabic lexicographers (see also al-Mas'udî, Murūj, viii. 91: al-18d al-farîd, iii. 186). In the 12th century Glossarius Latino-Arabicus however, the miskar (p. 562) or miskar (p. 508) equates with symposium, and the modern miskar is a tambourine. Indeed, the identification by the older Arabic lexicographers is suspect. The praises of the miskar are sung by the 9th century poets Imru’r-1-Kais (al-Shalâhî, fol. 73) and Aḥlam (Mustâlee, text, p. 812). It was a great favourite with the Kurâsh, until al-Nadîr b. al-Hârîth (d. 624) introduced the 18d from al-3râq. The kirsan, according to al-Harîb (d. 808), was also a lute (sud), and this author says that it was called because it was placed [in playing] against the breast. This instrument is also mentioned by Imru’r-1-Kais (al-Shalâhî, fol. 73) under the name of mawtaar, which is referred to by Labût (d. 612) [v. v.] and is generally considered to be a lute (sud) (Lane, Lex., i. 126). About the close of the 12th century al-Nâsîr b. al-Hârîth, as mentioned above, introduced the 18d from al-3râq into Mecca (al-Mas’udî, Murūj, viii. 93-94), the probable special feature of the instrument being its wooden belly (18d = wood). Al-Khalîfî (d. 763) records (Ağānš, vii. 188) that the first to play the lute (18d) in Madīna was Shâbî Khâthîr (d. 685). About the year 684, Ibn Surâqî [v. v.] was playing on a lute (18d) constructed after the Persian manner (Ağānš, i. 98) (see the lute delineated in Heraclius, Die Mederien von Samarra, 1927). This Persian type of lute continued to be favoured by the Arabs until Zalâl (d. 798) [v. v.] invented its “perfect lute” or 18d 18ddîh (Ağānš, v. 34), The Persian lute, i.e. the barbat, continued however to be favoured by side by side with the 18d proper, and the 12th century Mesopotamian lute shown in Bowron’s Life and Times of All b. 20 (frontispiece) may very well be a barbat. The same remark may be applied to the lute depicted on the Hispano-Moorish box of the 12th century in Victoria and Albert Museum London (The Legacy of Islam, fig. 89), whilst the lute shown in the sixteenth century Cantigas de Santa Maria (Riásan, Notes on early Spanish Music, fig. 45) undoubtedly represents the barbat (cf. the 18d or lute proper, in fig. 44 b).

Two other instruments of this type of the kind that we know of are the 18ddîh and 18dâmîh. The 18dâmîh is the so-called “balloon guitar” of the Chinese (Van Aalst, Chinese Music, Shanghai 1884, p. 64), who are said to have possessed it since the days of the Han dynasty. It was introduced into Mesopotamia by the Mughals in the 12th century, and Ibn Ghâbî (d. 1435) describes it. It may be found in the paintings of the Mughal-Persian school (Marsden, Miniatures pontains, 1913, pl. 212).

Al-Mas’udî (d. 1216) refers to an instrument which he calls the mawDar [see art. MîDar] and describes it as “a sort of barbat” made by the people of al-Yaman. According to the author of the Tahâf’ al-‘Arâb, this was the instrument known as the 18damîh. The 18damîh (al-Hijâsî, 18damîh (Ulâm), 18damîh (Hadrâmît), 18damîh or 18damîh (Turkey) is a very old instrument. Perhaps that illusive name of the musical instrument of the Varâmî is 428, 339, 117, 428 or 8 in the Murūj of al-

Mâ’sûtî is a copyist’s error for 428, 339, 117, 428 (Farmer, Studia in Oriental Instruments, p. 73; History of Arabian Music, p. 6). Ewliya Celebi (xviib. cent.) says that the 18damîh was invented by a vizier of al-Mrmân b. al-‘Ammâr named Ahmad Pagha Harasî Ughîl. He describes it as being a hollow instrument, smaller than the barbat, and mounted with three strings. (Travels, Ad.xxii. 25). On the other hand, Ibn Ghâbî (d. 1435) says that the 18damîh 18damîh had five double strings. The instrument is no longer used by the Turks, although it has survived under the name of bâbîn, babîn, in Poland, Russia, and the Balkans, but here it is the lute proper and not a barbat type. For the 18damîh of the modern Hijâsî, a long, shallow chested barbat, hollow throughout, with a part bally of skin and six strings see Farmer, Studia, ..., p. 75 (For the Hadrami instrument see Landberg, Arabic, iii. 15, 29, 113, 428). For a Malay gambus see Journal of the Straits Branch of the R.A.S., 1904 [No. 40, p. 13, fig. 5]. In Turkestân a rather primitive bowed instrument is known as the 18damîh (Fitrat, Dâhik Kätâbîn Mîrâmîbîn, Tashkent, p. 43).

The 18d or lute proper, as introduced by Zalâl in the 12th century, had, apparently, a separate neck like the modern instrument, whereas the barbat or Persian lute, which the Arabs had used until then, had no separate neck, the whole instrument from the head downwards being in one graduated piece, perhaps even somewhat like the 18damîh. Zalâl’s 18d al-shabîh was so named because it resembled the fish called the shabîh. The description of the shabîh given by the Arabic lexicographers leads to the inference that the soundbox of Zalâl’s lute was void rather than pear-shaped (cf. the Spanish mañcabe in Engels’ Musik, 1891, in the South Kensington Museum, pl. facing p. 248, which is in the form of a fish). We see the form of the 18d al-shabîh persisting in Islamic art for centuries, but the pear-shaped sound-chest, upon which the barbat was founded, eventually became the more popular type (Luchmann, Musik in Ost, pl. ii. 11). Zîrâb (xvth.-xvith. century), the famous Andalusian musician, is claimed to have improved the 18d at Baghdad, and in al-Andalus he introduced a spectreum or quill instead of the wood of that had hitherto been used (al-MAkka, 1184). He is also said to have introduced a fifth string, a device dealt with by both al-Khâlid (d. 947) and al-Fârîbî (d. 950). For a full statement of the influence (a-dahr, cf. 18ddîh) of the strings of the 18d lute proper see Farmer, The Influence of Music from Arabic Sources, London 1926.

At this period the names of the various parts of the 18d were: br’d (head, scroll), 18ddîh (tuning pegs), anf (nut), bûth (neck), 18ddîh (strings), 18dâmîh (frets), 18damîh (bridge-basepiece), 18damîh (bells), 18damîh (sound-hole), 18damîh (plectrum).
For the particular names of the strings and frets see art. -widget. Dimensions and other details are given by al-Kindi (Berlin MS., No. 3530, fol. 25), al-Fārābī (D’Erlanger, La musique arabe, i. 153) [q.v.], the iʿād had five strings (Carra de Vaux, Le traité des rapports musicaux, p. 53), and this continued up to the xvith century in the East. This instrument, called the ḫūd rāmāl, was slightly larger than the older classical lute (iʿād jādīm) of four strings. Some very large types of lute have been preserved in Persian art (lit., iii., fig. 6). A (modern) lute is a ve full details of the construction of the iʿād. In the xvith century copy of a Marghābī treatise on the iʿād we have a four-stringed instrument (Farmer, on old Moorish Lute Tutor, p. 4). Unlike the iʿād of the modern Moorish iʿād with four double strings see Hūst, Nachrichten von Maresch und För (1757), p. 261, pl. xxxi., and for a seven double stringed instrument see Lavignac, Encycl, de la musique, v. 2927. Neither Russian (Nat. hist. of Aleppo, 200 ed., 1794) nor Niebel (Reisereisewohnen in Arabien und anderm undgelegenen Ländern, 1774—1775) mention the iʿād, but the seven double stringed instrument is figured and fully described by Villoteau in the Description de l'Egypte (1800—1826), fol. ed., i. 847, and in Lane’s Modern Egyptians (1836). The Egyptian iʿād of to-day has five double strings (Darwish Muhammad, Sāfī al-ʿAwbāt, Cairo 1910, p. 11; Muhammad Kamīl al-Khulāsī, al-Maṣbīḥ al-ṣhābiyyāt, Cairo 1904) although occasionally six double strings may be found (Lavignac, op. cit., v. 2785). In Syria and Palestine a seven double stringed instrument was in use (Murshākī, Rābaṭ al-shābiyyāt) in the early xviith century, but this has now fallen into desuetude in favour of the five double stringed instrument (Dalman, Palastinischen Dichter, i. F. O. B., vi, pl. iii.; Z. D. V. F., l. 4). Turkey favours a six stringed iʿād with five double strings, one single string (Lavignac, op. cit., v. 3017; Fakhrit Bey, Nargis ve-limni, 1878 [i.e., Directeur, Stambl]). Specimens of the ʿād may be found in most museums (South Kensington, London, No. 659/69; Brussels, No. 164; New York, No. 378). Europe owes both the instrument and its name (al-ʿād = Port. alaud, Span. lute, French luth, German Lute, Eng. lute) to the Arabs.

Among other types of the lutes are the tabūfat al-ʿād, kawitā, laṭṭa, ʿād, shahrūd, ṭarab al-fustūk, ṭarab sūr, awānūn, rubāb, mughāth, thidirgāh and rub afšā. The tabūfat al-ʿād is described by Ibn Ghāsib as a half-sized ʿād. The kawitā or kawīṭa is a lute with a smaller and shallower sound-chest, its head being fixed obliquely rather than at a right angle as in the ʿād. It is common to the whole of the Maghrib and has four double strings (Salvador-Daniel, La musique arabe, 1879, p. 81; Christianowitsch, Enquête historique de la musique arabe, p. 30, fig. 4). The name is a diminutive (vulg.) of bittār or biṭṭār, an instrument used in Moorish Spain as early as the xviith century (al-ʿād al-fasāda). The 8 كمبت of al-Shaḳūndi (d. 1331)

quoted by al-Maṣrī (Musammat, ii. 144) is doubtless ٨ كمبت (cf. Dony, Suppl. Dict. Arab., ii. 1203) [q.v.], the iʿād had five string (Carra de Vaux, Le traité des rapports musicaux, p. 53), and this continued up to the xviith century in the East. This instrument, called the ʿād rāmāl, was slightly larger than the older classical lute (iʿād jādīm) of four strings. Some very large types of lute have been preserved in Persian art (lit., iii., fig. 6). A (modern) lute is a ve full details of the construction of the iʿād. In the xviith century copy of a Marghābī treatise on the iʿād we have a four-stringed instrument (Farmer, on old Moorish Lute Tutor, p. 4). Unlike the iʿād of the modern Moorish iʿād with four double strings see Hūst, Nachrichten von Maresch und För (1757), p. 261, pl. xxxi., and for a seven double stringed instrument see Lavignac, Encycl, de la musique, v. 2927. Neither Russian (Nat. hist. of Aleppo, 200 ed., 1794) nor Niebel (Reisereisewohnen in Arabien und anderm undgelegenen Ländern, 1774—1775) mention the iʿād, but the seven double stringed instrument is figured and fully described by Villoteau in the Description de l'Egypte (1800—1826), fol. ed., i. 847, and in Lane’s Modern Egyptians (1836). The Egyptian iʿād of to-day has five double strings (Darwish Muhammad, Sāfī al-ʿAwbāt, Cairo 1910, p. 11; Muhammad Kamīl al-Khulāsī, al-Maṣbīḥ al-ṣhābiyyāt, Cairo 1904) although occasionally six double strings may be found (Lavignac, op. cit., v. 2785). In Syria and Palestine a seven double stringed instrument was in use (Murshākī, Rābaṭ al-shābiyyāt) in the early xviith century, but this has now fallen into desuetude in favour of the five double stringed instrument (Dalman, Palastinischen Dichter, i. F. O. B., vi, pl. iii.; Z. D. V. F., l. 4). Turkey favours a six stringed iʿād with five double strings, one single string (Lavignac, op. cit., v. 3017; Fakhrit Bey, Nargis ve-limni, 1878 [i.e., Directeur, Stambl]). Specimens of the ʿād may be found in most museums (South Kensington, London, No. 659/69; Brussels, No. 164; New York, No. 378). Europe owes both the instrument and its name (al-ʿād = Port. alaud, Span. lute, French luth, German Lute, Eng. lute) to the Arabs.

Among other types of the lutes are the tabūfat al-ʿād, kawitā, laṭṭa, ʿād, shahrūd, ṭarab al-fustūk, ṭarab sūr, awānūn, rubāb, mughāth, thidirgāh and rub afšā. The tabūfat al-ʿād is described by Ibn Ghāsib as a half-sized ʿād. The kawitā or kawīṭa is a lute with a smaller and shallower sound-chest, its head being fixed obliquely rather than at a right angle as in the ʿād. It is common to the whole of the Maghrib and has four double strings (Salvador-Daniel, La musique arabe, 1879, p. 81; Christianowitsch, Enquête historique de la musique arabe, p. 30, fig. 4). The name is a diminutive (vulg.) of bittār or biṭṭār, an instrument used in Moorish Spain as early as the xviith century (al-ʿād al-fasāda). The 8 كمبت of al-Shaḳūndi (d. 1331)
musical Instruments", p. 14–15, and frontispiece. The **abárij**, as it is written by Ibn Ghāṭīr (cf. Sachs, *Lexikon, s. v. *bidārij*), was a long instrument with half of its belly covered with skin. It had four strings but was mostly used, he says, in China. The **raš ōstāf** had a hemispherical sound-chest with six double strings of silk and metal. Many instruments with a hemispherical sound-chest are to be found in Persian art (*Pantheon*, 1929, p. 173; *Münchener Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst*, 1911, i. 151).


(H. G. FARMER)

**UDHRA.** An Arab tribe of the southern group, belonging to the great subdivision of the Kūfaʾ. Genealogy: *Udha b. Saʿd b. Ḥudhaib b. Zaid b. Laith b. Aslam b. al-Ḥīf b. Kūfaʾ (Wustenfeld, *General Tabellen*, i. 18). We know nothing of their history in the remote past, for their identification with the *ʿAqbaru (var. *ʿAqbaru)* of Pleneum, proposed by Sprunger, *Die alte Geographie Arabiens*, p. 205, § 363 is anything but certain; in the historical period we find them established in the north of the Hijāz, in the vicinity of other Kūfaʾ tribes (Nahd, Dhiyāna, Bal, Kalb) and their territory adjoined that of the northern tribe of the Garmān. The Udhra Ḳurṭub and Tabhak are mentioned as their principal centres and they were found as far away as Asil on the Red Sea. Their settlement in districts in the north of Arabia is said to be due to the great migration of the Kūfaʾ tribes, which took place after the war with the Himyarites (see especially al-Bakr, *Maṭbaʾ, p. 18, 22, 27, 29, sq. = Wustenfeld, *Die Wandscheuern d. arāb. Stämme*, p. 25, 31, 37, 41; cf. *Ahmad b. al-ʿAnta* (xvi. 161) and the Udhra are said to have acknowledged an agreement with the Jews living in the Ḳurṭub Ḳurṭub by which they were allowed to lead a nomadic life there and they respected the palm-groves and gardens of the latter.

The Udhra seem always to have been closely allied with other tribes of the Saʿd Ḥudhaib (especially the Banū Dinnu, who had the same name as a clan of the *Udha* and the Banū Šalāmān) and were known together with them by the name of Suḥur (of which the doubtful etymology is given by Yākūt, *Maṭbaʾ*, ii. 368); they were also associated with the Dhiyāna, to whom some sources also extend the name Suḥur; this alliance is said to have been a result of the "war of al-Kārib" which took up the Kūfaʾ and caused them to leave al-Thamānīn where they had settled after their departure from the Yemen. We know that modern historical criticism attacks hardly any value to these statements of genealogical tradition, and indeed the *Udha* seem to be allied with tribes which the same tradition assigns to the northern group, like the Bakr b. Ḳurṭub and the Djiṣrā. It is true that al-Ḥamūdānī (*Dirārat al-ʿArab*, ed. Müller, i. 116, i. 17) puts a section.
of the 'Udhra in southern Arabia, but it is impossible to decide if he is referring to this tribe or to another of the same name, especially as the genealogical lists mention almost everywhere other tribes bearing the name 'Udhra (cf. Muhammab b. Ḥabh, Muhkkālif al-Kalbì, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 37, gives four of them; Ḥabn al-Kalb in his Dīmākhurat al-Anīsū gives us another five).

According to tradition, the 'Udhra were closely related to the Meccan Qurash; the latter's ancestor Kuṣiy (q.v.) whose mother had married an 'Udhri is said to have been brought up with this tribe, and his half-brother Kīzā (in Wüstenfeld, General Tabellen, l. c., 24, erroneously: Dārrābī) b. Ḥarb b. Ḥarīm is said to have fought on the side of the Qurash defending Mecca against the Khāza. On the other hand, the mother of the eponyms of the two tribes of Yathrib, al-Aws and al-Khazraj, is also said to have been an 'Udhri called Kāila bint Kāhil (or bint Hālik) b. 'Udhra; so that the Āṣār as well as the Qurash were connected with the 'Udhra on the female side.

The 'Udhra are said to have worshipped a deity Shams, the sun (al-Yaṭṣūbi, i. 296, l. 3), but we know no details.

The principal subdivisions of the tribe (Ibn Durāsīd, Kītab al-Iqtiṣāḥ, p. 320) are the Banū Dīnna, Banū Dālīhuma, Banū Zaṣ̄rafqa, Banū 'l-Qāšābà Banū Ḥarqāṣa, Banū Ḥamm; the Banū al-Kalb (Dīmākhurat al-Anīsū) also adds the Banū Mūḍīḏ, who are said to have been numerous and powerful (they are not mentioned in Wüstenfeld, General Tabellen).

The pre-Islamic history of the 'Udhra is poor in warlike episodes. This is probably due to the fact that the 'Udhra, as poets of this period are not numerous and we know that the records of the wars of the tribes depend almost entirely upon the verses which mention them; there is just a mention of a battle which took place at some time not precisely stated between the 'Udhra and the Banū Marra b. Naṣr, a clan of the Banū Aḥṣā' (Yāṣīn, Muṣīm, l. 171). An allusion to a defeat which they sustained at the hands of the 'Abs is found in a verse of a poet of the latter tribe (Mūṣafajūlī, ed. Lyall, p. 826, l. 2). But the 'Udhra must certainly have attained a considerable degree of influence through the control which they exercised over the road between the Hijāz and Syria: this explains the title 'Master (rab) of the Hijāz' borne by a certain Ḥawwā b. 'Amr (Ibn Durāsīd, Kītab al-Iqtiṣāḥ, p. 320) or better: b. Abī 'Amr, whose praises were sung by Ben-Nabīgha (cf. Dernbourg, Nasīb al-Dhobyatthin idnī, p. 48, n. xvii. [F. A., 1899]) where one should read Dīnna for Qubbāt). This Hassan is a descendant of the semi-mythical mu'ammar poet Uṣā or Ilyyār (numerous other variants) b. Labōd (cf. Goldziher, Abhandl., v. arab. Phil., l. 42 and notes, p. 30); Nöldke, Z. D. M. G., lvi. 168). It is again al-Nabīgha who sings praises of another clan of the 'Udhra, the Banū Ḥumm, against whom the king of al-Hira al-Nu'mān III proposed to take the field (cf. m. xlii., Ahlwardt; cf. Yāṣīn, Muṣīm, l. 583).

But it is only after Isām that the part played in history by the 'Udhra becomes better known; it was undoubtedly their dominant position in the Wādi 'l-Kūtā, which caused Muhammad to enter into friendly relations with them; in the year 7 of the Hijāra he sent them a letter (Ibn Sa'd, t/i. 33) but without any apparent result, and in the year 7 he is said to have assigned a sief (ṣāfā) to a descendant of the above mentioned Hawwā, because he was the first of his tribe to bear the sāḥib to the Prophet (al-Balādhurī, Futūḥ, p. 35); in the following year they fought at Mu'ta against the Byzantines (Ibn Ḥājīn, Sirr, p. 793; Tabari, i. 612). These facts suggest that the 'Udhra were early converted to Isām, but on the other hand it is not till the year 9 that we find the first mention of an official embassy from them to Medina (Ibn Sa'd, t/i. 66-67); this is what makes one think that the earlier references are not authentic and even that the 'Udhra did not become Muslims until after the death of Muḥammab (cf. Caetani, Annali dell' Isām, ii. 59, 229, 444, 1126).

The 'Udhra took part in the Syrian expedition of the year 12 under Amr b. al-'Āṣ and we find them settled in this country in the Omeyyad period (cf. Tabari, i. 1792, 1818) and also at Kūfah (Aḥṣā'ī, xvi. 7, 37), but it does not seem that they distinguished themselves in any way; although their presence in Upper Egypt is noted (al-Hamdānī, Diwanat ar-Rar, p. 130, l. 4-5), they played no part in politics and gave neither here nor elsewhere any personality of note to the history of Isām.

What has given the 'Udhra a name without equal even beyond the bounds of the Arab world down to French and German (Heine) romanticism, is their love of poetry and the touching stories of some of their poets (cf. 'Udhra), whom an unfortunate passion for a woman of their tribe reduced to death by consumption (notably 'Urwā b. Ḥiṣām, the "victim of love" [butt al-kub] who is the representative of this type; cf. Ibn Kutaiba, al-Shir wa l-Suwar, ed. de Goeje, p. 394-399; Aḥṣā'ī, xx. 152-158 etc.). But that love-poetry did not exclude the cultivation of other varieties, is evident from the example of Dāmil (q.v.) whose celebrated love affair with Buthāna (Buthaina) did not prevent him writing panegyric and satirical poetry. Besides, the romantic conception of love is found also among other tribes; in this connection is recorded the answer of an 'Udhri who was asked if his tribe was really the most tender-hearted in all Arabia (Aḥṣā'ī, i. 149): "We were", he said, "but the Banū 'Amir (b. Sa'ā)a have vanished as with their Madjīnāt (the poet Kais b. Mu'tadh or b. al-Mulawwah) (illi. 102). The 'Udhra were also celebrated for their eloquence (cf. Aḥṣā'ī, vii. 54).

The charge of cannibalism, so frequent in the satires exchanged between tribes (cf. al-Jāliā, Kītab al-Bahāsh, ed. Van Vloten, p. 260-261; Kītab al-Haywa, i. 139-150), has also been levelled against the 'Udhra, who are said to have eaten a female slave (Ibn al-Kalbī, Dīmākhurat al-Anīsū, Brit. Mus. MS., Add., 23, 297, fol. 1844); we know that such statements have no value except the very general one of showing that a particular tribe was reputed to be in a miserable state of poverty, and in reality the 'Udhra appear from the rather meagre information we possess about them to have been an essentially communitarian tribe, living mainly in the pre-Muhammadan period and in the tribute paid them by the Jews of the oasis. The occupation of the latter by Isām must have undoubtedly reduced the resources of the Beduins.

Bibliography: (in addition to references in this article). Wüstenfeld, Register der genz. Tu-
UDHRI, a patronymic from the name of the Arab tribe of the Banu Udhri [q.v.], a small tribe of the Hijaz, probably of Ka'bi origin (cf. Abd. al-Ka'bi, al-Adli, MS. Escorial 1698, fol. 205o-2057), al-Nuwaib, Nadhir al-Adr (Cairo 1342), ii. 297.

(G. Levi della Vida)

UDHRI, is a patronymic from the name of the Arab tribe of the Banu Udhri [q.v.], a small tribe of the Hijaz, probably of Ka'bi origin (cf. Abd. al-Ka'bi, al-Adli, MS. Escorial 1698, fol. 205o-2057), al-Nuwaib, Nadhir al-Adr (Cairo 1342), ii. 297.

(G. Levi della Vida)

UDHI, or also 'Abd al-Anas or 'Anas, is the Arabic name of the Biblical Og, the giant king of Bashan. The Kur'an does not mention him. Tabari, Anwaar, i, 500-501 tells of his great stature and death: Moses was ten ells in height, his staff ten ells long; he jumped to ells high and sent Udi in the heel; the body of the fallen giant served as a bridge across the Nile.

Tabari gives more details: Udi was 23,333 ells high, drank from the clouds, could reach to the bottom of the sea and pull out a whale which he roasted on the sun. Noah drove him in front of the ark but the Flood only reached his knees. He lived for 3,000 years. When Moses sent out the twelve spies, Udi put them into the bundle of wood on his head and wanted to trample on them but on the advice of his wife he sent them back so that they might put fear by their report into the heart of those that sent them. When Udi saw the camp of Israel, he broke from the mountain a rock large enough to crush the camp at one blow but God sent the hudud (hoopoe) and birds who made a hole in the rock so that it fell like a collar on Udi. Moses overthrew him in one leap.

Al-Kisai expls the story and increases the marvellous element in it. Udi was the son of Ka'bi (Cain) banished by Adam and of his sister 'Anas ('Anas thus becomes a woman's name). Although chaste by his mother, Udi caught the stone with which his sister tried to kill her. She therefore blessed him with strength and longevity. When Udi walked through the sea, it reached to his knees; when he walked, the earth trembled; when he slept, rivers flowed from his eyes; he used to eat two elephants at a meal. He slept twice a year. In Nimrod's time, he boasted that he controlled the heavens. He worked on the Ark with Noah. He was sitting on Pharaoh's council when Yisra'el sent by Moses, demanded that he should worship God. In order to win Pharaoh's daughter, he was going to destroy the camp of Israel with the gigantic rock, but was slain by Moses.

The sources of these legends are to be found in the Bible and in the Haggadah. The Bible mentions 'Og's great size (Deut. iii. 11) and his fall (Num., xxxi. 33-35). E.约翰an describes 'Og as a fugitive who had escaped the Flood (B. Nidda, 61a). Sometimes he is said to be the fugitive who brought Abraham the news of Lot's capture (Gen., xiv. 13). As a reward for this, he was given long life (Gen. Rabbah, xiii. 8). Like Al-Kisai, Da'udi, and Raba, L. 25 puts him at the court of Pharaoh, B. Berachoth, 54b. Palmet, Targum on Num., xxxi. 35 records how the Egyptians slew him in one leap. It is in keeping with Mosadiah and that place in the ants, or worm, which eat away 'Og's rock we have the Hudud, celebrated in the legend of Solomon.
UDJ — UGANDA


(BERNHARD HELLER)

UPJDA. [See OUPJDA.]

UL-FRANI. [See AL-WAFRINI.]

UGANDA, a British Protectorate in Eastern Equatorial Africa lying to the North of Lake Victoria. It takes its name from the Baantu Kingdom of Buganda, which is one of the four provinces comprising the Protectorate. The Swahili name Uganda ('Country of the Buganda', the Swahili prefix wa 'Country of' replacing the Buganda wa with the same meaning) was first applied to the kingdom of Mutesa, discovered by J. H. Speke in 1862, and in time came to include the whole Protectorate which grew out of the extension of British influence in Buganda.

a. Geographical Outline. The Uganda Protectorate lies approximately between latitude 1° S. and 4° N., and longitude E. 30° and 35°, and has an area of approximately 94,204 sq. miles including 13,616 sq. miles of water. The general level of the country is 4,000 ft., with the slopes of Mt. Elgon (14,000) in the East, and the highlands of Toro in the West at an altitude of 5,000 ft. rising to the Ruwenzi range with its snow-capped peaks, of which the highest is Mt. Stanley, 16,816 ft. Highlands are found in the South-West, culminating in the volcanic region of Mumbiro where great cones rise to 10,000 ft. or even 15,000 ft. But with the exception of some highlands on the Belgian Congo boundary West of the Nile at 2° 15' N., the general level in the northern districts of the protectorate has been influenced by the Nile drainage system and is consequently lower and may not be more than 3,000 ft.

Lake Victoria, or Victoria Nyanza (3,726 ft.) feeds the Nile at the Ripon Falls (discovered by Speke in 1862), and is looked upon as the source of that river. Lake Albert (2,028), which forms part of the western boundary of the Protectorate, is fed by the Semiliki River draining from Lakes George and Edward, and in its turn discharges into the Nile proper, soon after receiving the waters of the Victoria Nile at its northern end. Accordingly Uganda is situated at the headwaters of the White Nile, and the Nile is the main drainage system of the whole country. The climate of the Protectorate is more temperate than that of other tropical countries; the mean maximum in most districts averages 80° F., and the mean minimum 60° F. In the lowlying areas in the North the mean maximum may be as high as 90° F. The annual rainfall varies considerably; on the North littoral of Lake Victoria the average approximates 60 inches, and there is a good rainfall on the slopes of Mt. Elgon and in the Toro Highlands. To the North the rainfall diminishes until conditions similar to that in the Southern Sudan are reached. In areas where the rainfall is adequate, bananas are cultivated, and constitute the staple diet of the people; elsewhere, grains of various kinds are grown. The vegetation of Uganda ranges from a sparse desert type of flora to equatorial forests of the Congo type, and on the Highlands of Elgon and Ruwenzori is found an Alpine Zone of considerable interest. A great portion of the Protectorate consists of rich grasslands in a rolling savannah country.

b. Inhabitants. The population in 1929 was given as 3,410,857, of which 1,995 are Europeans and 12,539 are Asians. In the 1921 Census, the native population was returned as 3,848,735, made up of 267,522 Protestants, 255,014 Catholics, 98,000 Muhammadans, and 2,226,199 pagans. The population of the Buganda Province of 77,415 includes 72,263 Muhammadans, so that nearly 73% of the adherents to Islam are found amongst the Buganda. Ethnologically the inhabitants may be divided into three divisions, following the classification of Prof. C. G. Seligman: Eastern Bantu, Half Hamites and Nilotes. Of the Eastern Bantu the Baganda are the best known. It seems that several centuries ago there were successful migrations of a Hamitic cattle-owning people into this part of Africa, who established the large kingdom of Kitara, dominating the agricultural Bantu. This kingdom in time broke up into the three present divisions: the kingdom of Ankole, where the Hamite is dominant, the kingdom of Bunyoro, where there has been considerable fusion between the original Hamitic stock and the Bantu, and the kingdom of Buganda in which, though the dominant Hamitic stock still carries on the line of Kings, there has been a still greater fusion with the Bantu element.

The Half Hamite is represented by such tribes as the Karamojong and the Iteso; whilst the Nilote is represented by the Acholi, Lango and other tribes in the North West of the protectorate.

c. History. The Victoria Nyanza was discovered by Burton and Speke in 1859 and the source of the Nile, the Ripon Falls, by Speke and Grant in 1862. Stanley reached Uganda in 1875 and wrote the famous letters, depicting the native kingdom of Buganda dominated by the influence of the slave trading Arabs, flirting with Islam and ripe for Christian missionary endeavour, which had such influence in determining the future destinies of that country. A band of Protestant missionaries reached Uganda in 1877 by way of the route used by the Arabs from Zanzibar, followed in 1879 by a party of French priests. Meanwhile Sir Samuel Baker, having discovered Lake Albert in 1864, was sent by the Kedive in 1869 as Governor General to the Sudan with instructions to suppress the slave raiding which was carried on by Turks and Arabs, whose base was Gondokoro and whose furthest station was some 15 days farther south. By 1872 he had reached Bunyoro and annexed it to the Sudan. Gordon followed him as Governor-General and sent emissaries to the kingdom of Buganda, one of whom met Stanley at the court of the Buganda King, Mutesa, and took back with him for dispatch to England Stanley's celebrated letters. On the outbreak of the Mahdi rising in the Sudan, Emin Pasha, who was Governor of the Equatorial Province of the Egyptian Sudan, which included the northern part of Uganda, was cut off from Khartoum and was rescued by Stanley. A large force of Emin's forces remained and remained in Toro, in what is now the Belgian Congo, under the leadership of Salim Bey, an Egyptian officer.

The route to the interior from Mombasa [q.v.] through what is now Kenya Colony having now been opened up by the Arabs, the Imperial British East Africa Company in 1886 sent an expedition to Uganda with a view to annexation, and on the
Anglo-German negotiations for the partition of the east coast and hinterland, Uganda was assigned to Britain.

In 1890 Captain (now Lord) Lugard, who was engaged in building a series of forts from the coast, was ordered to Uganda to consolidate the Company’s position there. Mwangi, the son and successor of Mutesa, had been deposéd by both Christians and Muhammadans, and had fled to the South end of Lake Victoria to take refuge with some Catholic Missionaries, and Kiwewa was put on the throne. The Muhammadans soon tired of Kiwewa and wanted to adopt their customs, and eventually Kalema was proclaimed Kabaka (king) in his stead. He, profiting by the experience of his brother, professed himself a devout Muhammadan, and tried to enforce Muhammadan rites, including circumcision, on the peasants, which caused a considerable exodus of Christians into Ankole.

Mwangi was then invited by the Protestant party to return, and with a large following, he defeated the Muhammadan army and entered the capital. The Muhammadan refugees to Bunyoro whence they made frequent raids into Buganda, and on the death of Kalema chose Mbogo, Mutesa’s brother, to be their Kabaka. Lugard on his arrival forced Mwangi to sign a temporary treaty, and in order to obtain a reliable force, came to an agreement with Salim Bey, the leader of the remnant of Emin Pasha’s troops. He enlisted some of these Sudanic for service in Buganda, and the others he posted in forts in Bunyoro and in Toro. The Sudanic in the forts were not under proper supervision and were left to the care of their native officers. They were allowed to forage for themselves, and accordingly the cause of Islam was not helped by them amongst the neighbouring peasantry.

In 1891 the imperial British East Africa Company proposed to abandon the country on the grounds of expense unless subsidised by the British Government, who at first refused to assist them, but subsequently, partly owing to the pressure of public opinion, mainly organised by the Church Missionary Society, and partly because they were given proofs that the country showed every sign of returning prosperity, reversed its decision, and assumed control in 1894, when a provisional treaty was completed with Mwangi.

In 1897 a series of revolts broke out. Mwangi had never become reconciled to the new state of affairs and was secretly plotting. Finally he fled to Bulaka and raised the standard of rebellion, but being defeated by the Sudanic troops, fled to German territory. Macnald, who had been engaged on the railway survey, was ordered to survey new and unexplored country near Lake Rudolf, and required a large escort, and Sudanic troops who had been almost continually fighting in various areas were detailed for this purpose. The troops were underpaid and in a discontented state of mind, and consequently several companies seized this opportunity to break into open revolt. Messengers were sent to the Muhammadan Buganda and an endeavour was made to induce Mbogo, their leader, to throw in his lot with the mutineers who would place him on the throne. Mbogo, however, refused and remained loyal to the British despite his religion, for not only had he no wish to join the rebels, but he also knew that according to the customs of the Buganda, he, as eldest son of the late Kabaka, could not properly be placed on the throne. Affairs were also complicated by Mwangi joining up with Kabarega, the Mukama (King) of Bunyoro, in an endeavour, whilst the troops were in a state of mutiny, to drive the British out of their countries. Eventually the mutiny was quelled and the capture of the two kings and their deportation to the Seychelles brought the troubles to an end, and since 1899 the country has enjoyed almost unbroken peace. The story of Buganda and its troubles is the real story of the Protectorate.

From Buganda the other tribes have been brought under British rule, sometimes by a show of military force and sometimes by expeditions, more often by peaceful penetration.

Islam was brought to Uganda both from the East Coast and from the North. Arabs from the East Coast had penetrated to the kingdom of Buganda and were in a dominant position when Speke arrived at Mutesa’s court. With the guns obtained from the Arabs in exchange for slaves and ivory, the Buganda, a most intelligent and enterprising race of people, who had already evolved an elaborate system of government, were enabled to gain the ascendancy over neighbouring tribes,

In early days the Arabs refused to give them this, but made converts. No sooner had the Christian missionaries arrived than the Buganda quickly learned that they were willing and anxious to teach them to write, and give them other instruction which would enable them to assimilate a culture, which they recognised to be superior to their own. The Arabs, realising that they were losing ground, set for teachers from the coast and established schools, where children were taught to write Swahili in Arabic characters. The fluctuating fortunes of Islam and Christianity represent the conflict of two different cultures, and the final ascendancy of Christianity must, in the main, be attributed to the superior educational facilities offered by the Christian missions.

Islamic influence from the North has not been so important. In the early days the Turks and Arabs were interested only in raiding slaves from unorganised tribes. The troops and followers of the Provincial Governors and other officials from the Sudán made few converts, and the imported Sudanic, remnants of Emin Pasha’s force, all of whom are adherents to Islam, have not had a great influence on the native population, though they live in communities scattered through the Protectorate and at one time formed the backbone of the Protectorate military forces and the civil police. In the West Nile district, inhabited by the Nilotes, there has of recent years been a spreading of Islam, mostly due to the strong personalities of a few chiefs, who have embraced Islam, encouraged education, and set up schools, but this is offset by large numbers of pagans who have become Christians and receive the benefits of a better education under European supervision.

Bibliography: Besides the Blue Books by the Colonial Office, the Annual Reports of the Governor of Uganda, and the Census Report of 1921, see the article by Sir H. H. Johnston in Encycl., Brit., 14th ed.; H. R. Wallis, Handbook of Uganda, 2nd ed. (London 1920), with bibliography; Naval Intelligence Division, Admiralty, Handbook of the Uganda Protectorate (Oxford 1921); Sir Harry Johnston, The Uganda Protéc.

(R. E. HADDO)

'UKÃB, the eagle, the king of birds. al-Ka-watil and al-Damiri tell remarkable things about his habits, some of which go back to Greek tradition. According to al-Damiri, there are black, brown, greenish and white eagles. Some nest in the mountains, others in deserts, in thick woods or in the vicinity of towns. (Here there is of course a confusion with the vulture and also in the statement that they follow armies and devour the fallen). The eagle hunts small wild animals and birds and eats only the liver, because this is a protection for him against disease. He does not stalk his prey but gives a cry when he sees a bird from his lofty perch and this gives it an opportunity to escape. Sometimes it happens that his beak grows so long that he can no longer hunt and must die of hunger. When the eagle is weak with age and becomes blind, according to al-Ka'awini, he rises into the air until his feathers are consumed by the sun. He then falls down, plunges into a well of bitter water and comes out again completely rejuvenated. According to al-Damiri, the young eagles carry the old ones, when they are blind, from place to place until they reach a spring in India. They are plunged into this and then dried in the rays of the sun while the old feathers fall off and new ones grow and at the same time their eyesight is restored. According to the author of "Agricultura", vultures come out of eagles' eggs and eagles out of those of vultures. According to others, all eagles are female and mate with other birds. They lay three eggs but throw the third young one out of the nest because they can only rear two. The third is brought up by the bird called kisir al-fur ("bone-breaker").

Eagles fly so quickly that in the morning they can be in the 'Iraq and in the evening in the Yemen. Their eyries are built on steep hillsides; the young ones know they must not move or they would fall out and perish as soon as they have feathers, they fly excellently.

The eagle-stone is brought by the eagle from India and put in the nest to enable the female to lay more easily. It is a stone with another stone loose inside it, the rattle of which can be heard. It is used to relieve women in child-birth. This wonderful stone is taken from Greek tradition also.

In astronomy al-Ukâb is the name of the constellation Aquila, N. of Capricorn (a'rik, Aqaila). It has three outstanding stars, which are called al-maṣr al-wâṣir, "the flying eagle", Persian: yâhâin al-arkâb, "the thieving falcon". The brightest star is called Aitair or Atair on our star-maps. Opposite it in the Lyre is the star al-nâr al-wâṣir, "the falling eagle", the Vega of the star-maps.

In alchemy al-Ukâb (Lat. alocaph, etc.) is the most usual name for sal-ammoniac.


(J. RASKI)

AL-ŪKÁṣIR, the name of a divinity of pre-Muhammadan Arabia, or better an epithet, the meaning of which (diminutive of aqar, "he who has a stiff neck" or perhaps simply "the short") seems to indicate an idol in human shape. All that we know of this god (whose real name is unknown) goes back to the references by Ibn al-Kalbi, Khalâb al-ṣâmûn, Cairo 1914, p. 38—39, 48—50, followed by Yâkût, Muṣâjam, i. 340—341 (transl. and annotated by Wellhausen, Reise arab. Heidennamen, 2nd ed., p. 62—64), Djalîl, Ḥayyâm, v. 114, Buḫalâl, p. 237, Khâdiyân al-Ādah, iii. 246 (abridged), Maḥmûd al-Alûsî, Bulhâk al-Ārâb fi Mufrâj Aqwil al-Ārâb, Cairo 1343, ii. 209 below (abridged). Al-Ūkâṣir was worshipped by the tribes of Ka'bah, Lakhm, Ḥijāz, "Amila and Ḥatâflân living on the plateau of the Syrian desert. Verses in old poets quoted by Ibn al-Kalbi mention the stones (anbâq) put up around the sacred place (which another anonymous verse, Liyim al-Ārâb, vi. 416, already quoted by Wellhausen, describes as dripping with the blood of the victims), the "garments" (al-thâb), already the reference to those of the idol (al-mâhân), the "covering for the sanctuary in the style of the hirâf of the Ka'bah), the ditch (dafrf) into which were thrown the offerings, the cries and shouts of the pilgrims. The sacrifices offered to the god were not always slaughtered; they are said to have also included hair kneaded with flour (according to the widespread custom of pre-Muhammadan Arabs; cf. Wellhausen, p. 123—124, 198—199): in this connection a story is told, according to which the tribe of the Hwastin, reduced to great misery and entirely without food, went to beg around the sanctuary of al-Ūkâṣir for the filthy remains of these offerings. The truth of this story is very doubtful; it is a common motif in the hijâf between tribes, but in itself it has nothing improbable.

As Wellhausen notes, the expressions used in the verses which Ibn al-Kalbi quotes in connection with al-Ūkâṣir might refer to a sanctuary as well as to an idol. We might then suppose that the epithet reflects the squat form of the building.

The Encyclopedia of Islam, IV.

(G. LEVI DELLA VIDA)
UKHAIĐIR, the name of an imposing castle now in ruins in the Mesopotamian desert, twenty-five miles from Kerbela and ten south-east of Shīlātīyaz; it perhaps preserves the name of Isma'il b. Yūsuf b. al-Ukhaidīr who came from Yamka and was appointed governor of Kufa by the Kāmilīs in 315 (927). The Badrīn tribes of the Kūrām, which leads a nomadic life in the vicinity, pronounce this name al-Askāfī but prefer to call the castle Dirās or al-Askāfī. Discovered by Pietro della Valle in 1625, discovered in 1908 by L. Massaquin, visited by Miss Gertrude L. Bell in 1909 and A. Musil (1912) was systematically examined by O. Reuther in 1910.

The castle, built of stone and cement, with a few bricks, consists of a rectangular fortified enceinte with forty-eight bastions, with sides 354 feet long, 69 feet high and 9 feet thick; blind arcades support a machicolated chemin de ronde; there are four staircases in the four corner towers and four gates in the centre of the four sides. The north gate, which is the main one, gives access to the palace, one of the halls of which was, according to Miss Bell, perhaps used as a mosque, although wrongly oriented, and rooms for the women, built on to the north wall, with three stories on this side and a single storey on its three other sides around the inner court. Outside the enceinte are two annexes of less importance. From the architectural point of view we may note in the palace the numerous niches, the slated vaulting and the seven domes on drums.

The date of the building of Ukhaidir is disputed; the regularity of its plan, the large scale, and the finish of the work place it in a period when the Mesopotamian cities of the desert still contained royal residences. Dānūfayr and Massaquin see in it a pre-Islamic winter palace, like Hatra, built by an Iranian architect for a prince of the Hāzār; it might be the Kāsr al-Sadīr of the poets. Miss G. L. Bell prefers to regard it as the site of Dānūfayr and would bring its date down to the Umayyad period. Herrsfeld dates Ukhaidir about 215 (830) from architectonic analogies with Șīmarrā; finally, Musil brings it down to 277 (989) in order to identify it with the Șīr al-Sufyān built in this year by the Kāmilīs rebel. It is indeed very likely that they restored it to install themselves in it, but they had not the means nor was it their custom to build such an imposing palace as a "place of refuge."


UKUBAT. [See UKUBAT; HARD.]

ULAMA' is strictly the plural of 'alim, one who possesses the quality 'alim [q.v.]; knowledge, learning, science in the widest sense, and in a high degree (mašūkāga). In usage, however, the accepted singular of 'ulama' is 'alim. Both singulars are Kūrānī and can be used of Allāh and of man; but the plural 'ulama' occurs only twice in the Qur'an and there of men (xxv. 197; xcv. 25). The plural 'alimūn occurs four times: twice of Allāh (xxi. 52, 64) and twice of men (xii. 44; xxiv. 42). On all this see Munfrudī of al-Rāghībī al-Ifṣāhānī, Cairo 1324, p. 348 sqq. and Zādī, xv. 316 sqq.

In the first instance it was known from the traditions and of the resultant canons law and theology, the 'ulama', as particularly custodians of that tradition, were commentators and theologians. They, thus, as a general body, represented, and voiced the Agreement of Article L'habitation to the Muslim people, and that Agreement was the foundation of Islam. In consequence the 'ulama', in whatever stated form they functioned, came to have, in a wide and vague fashion, the ultimate decision on all questions of constitution, law and theology. Whatever the de facto government might be, they were a curb upon it, as a surviving expression of the Agreement and of the right of the People of Muhammad to govern itself. The different governments might try to control them by giving them official status and salaries, and to some extent might succeed in that, if the success were too glaring the people would reassert by contempt for such government agents and would give their respect and devotion to private scholars who refused thus to be muslied. This was a constantly recurring situation under all Muslim governments. The 'ulama', therefore, might be government functionaries, either controlled by the government or keeping the government in a certain awe; or they might be private and independent students of canon law and theology.

The term 'ulama' is applied in the present day in its literal meaning to any one who is evidently a scholar in our sense. For this situation in Egypt, in the early sixteenth century see Lane's Modern Egyptians, chaps. iv. and ix. and index. For a similar situation under the Mamluks see Gaudreuil-Demouyene, La syrie à l'époque des Mamluks, passim and especially p. lxxxv. sqq. It is plain that the organisation of the 'ulama' was the solid framework of permanent government behind those changing dynasties. For the Ottoman Empire see E. J. W. Gibb, History of Ottoman Poetry, ii., p. 394 sqq. For the same situation in the Muslim world generally see Sir Thomas W. Arnold, The Caliphate, by index under 'Ulama'. For the distinction between the 'alim, canon lawyer and systematic theologian, and the 'ārif, the mystic who knows Allāh by religious experience and vision, see article 'Ālim above; so, too, for the distinction between the 'alim who was at first a knower of definite facts (Kūrānī texts and their meanings) and the 'ārif [q.v.] who was at first the independent thinker about these by his intelligence (bi'rā). It is, perhaps, hardly necessary to notice the error of western writers who frequently use 'ulama', in many spellings, as a singular.


(D. B. Macdonald)

ULDIJAITU KHODABENDE. [See OLAJAITU.]

ULUGH BEG, MUHAMMAD TUBBAB, son of Shah Rukh and of Gawhar Shad, was born in Sulhānā in 796 (1393). He became governor of a part of Khūrān and of Mārzandān in 810.
had previously undertaken to publish the Tables (Fac. 1, Paris 1839). E. B. Knobel has published the Catalogue of stars... after collating all the manuscripts in Great Britain and adding a Persian and Arabic glossary (Washington 1917). It has been disputed whether the original version was in Arabic, Persian or Turkish; it is probably the Persian version that we possess. The work seems to have been finished in 1441 (1457). Ulugh Beg, it seems, did not observe all the stars which he mentions and takes his latitudes and longitudes from Ptolomy, but he gives a disproportionate space to astrology. But Sédillot (op. cit., i., p. 361) can say that with him is the period of astronomical works in the East finished.

Ulugh Beg was less happy in war and politics. He drove the invading Özbek back to the Ak Sül following Bokhara's cavalry and that of Muhammad Dschuk soon had their revenge, advanced as far as Khodjend and laid the country waste (1428 = 1431).

The sole survivor of the children of Shah Rukh, he inherited the power on the death of his father (25th Zhil 1-Hijrijja 850 = 13th March 1447); but plunged into despair, he remained inactive for several months, enabling the Timurid princes to act against him. Gawhar Shid wanted to secure the throne for Ulugh Beg's son Ali, but the latter, misled by false reports, thought it had gone to "Ali" al-Dawla, another claimant, who, a few days after the death of Shah Rukh, led her prisoner with all her suite to Semnân. From there he set off for Herât, seized it and had himself proclaimed ruler there. Sultan 'Abd Allah, son of Ibrahim Sultan, took possession of the district of Shurte, Kâbul and Ghazna formed a new state with the sons of Soyardülmisim. Two other princes, Muhammad Mirzâ and Baha Mirzâ, also aspired to the power and the second had himself proclaimed ruler of Djurjân and Mazzarârâh. 'Abd al-Latif, who returned from Nishapûr with his prisoners was surprised by the emirs Mirzâ Şâli and Uwaïs. The prisoners were released and 'Abd al-Latif, who took to flight, was captured. He was brought before "Ali" al-Dawla who treated him generously.

Ulugh Beg finally cast off his lethargy, listened to the advice of his ministers and came out for Khurásân. Wishing to conciliate a rival, ‘Abd al-Bakr, he gave him his daughter in marriage but had to imprison him on being convinced of his treason. He crossed the Oxus, heard in Balkh of 'Abd al-Latif's doings, pardoned him and ready to make any concession to be free of his troubles, sent his first minister Nişân al-Din Mirk to Herât with this object. But Bâbar Mirzâ invaded Khurásân and at Djam routed "Ali" al-Dawla's advance-guard and the latter, caught between him and Ulugh Beg, surrendered. Prisoners were exchanged and 'Abd al-Latif became governor of Balkh. Through fear of Ulugh Beg the generals of "Ali" al-Dawla forced their master to make peace with Bâbar Mirzâ; Khabâshân was to be the frontier.

The treachery of 'Abd al-Latif, who refused to deliver up his hostages and had them massacred after the defeat of an attack on a detachment sent to fetch them, brought about severe hostilities. "Ali" al-Dawla made plundering raids but abandoned an expedition, which he had planned, on the threats of Ulugh Beg, who had now decided to assert his rights as sole heir of Shah Rukh and to avenge the massacres of Balkh (152 = 1448-1449) by the murder of several of his son's officers. 'Abd al-Latif brought large contingents to his father
on his crossing of the Oxus. Defeated through treachery at Tarhāb after a desperate battle, "Alī" al-Dawla sought refuge in Mervah where his brother Bābar Mirzā promised to assist him to regain his lands. He pretended to submit but Ulugh Beg was not deceived, occupied Herāt and its forts and marched on Isfahān where he divided his army into two: the one with Mirzā 'Abd Allāh Shāhī was to lay siege to Bābān and the other with "Abd al-Latif marched against Astara-bād. At this moment the Özbek invaders Transoxians, Sarmatians and Turks were attacked. Ulugh Beg, taking the sarcophagus of Shāh Shamlu and the treasure of Herāt, returned in haste. His rear guard was attacked by Bābar Mirzā and the Özbek captors his baggage at the crossing of the Oxus. He finally reached Bukhāra, where his father's obsequies were held. Khuršān, which was disputed between the Timurids and the Turkomans, was in a state of complete disorder. Yar 'Ali, prince of the Black Sheep, escaped from the castle of Nerbād and laid siege to Herāt. Ulugh Beg relieved the city but Bābar Mirzā rebelled and attacked it in turn. "Abd al-Latif escaped to his father and Yar 'Ali, entering the town by surprise, had himself crowned there and became popular. An emissary of Bābar Mirzā gave him a sarcastic and he was executed.

In Dža' 1-Hiḍḍa 852 (Feb. 1449) the whole of Khuršān belonged to Bābar Mirzā who gave a lustful compensation, the government of the little town of Tūn, to "Alī" al-Dawla, who was replaced by his son. The two, accused of plotting, were sent to Herāt and suffered a harsh captivity. The discontent was general. Bābar Mirzā was re-proached with debauchery, drunkenness, incapacity and the exactions of his agents. Refusing to lead an expedition against Bursīg, the powerful ruler of Hindīkūd, he sought to raise the country with the help of Ulugh Beg, to whom he sent an emissary Eīdākh. The latter was captured by "Abd al-Latif and sent to Bābar Mirzā to whom he confessed everything. In spite of prodigies of valor Hindīkūd was defeated and slain.

"Alī" al-Dawla escaped; he went to Sīstān, then to the ʻĪṣā where his brother Muḥammad Mirzā, who was also lord of Fārs, was ruling. The two invaders Khuršān and Džam inflicted a terrible defeat on Bābar Mirzā, who with eight horsemen escaped and sought refuge in the castle of Timur-lū. At Herāt, Muḥammad Mirzā showed: himself generous; he liberated his nephew Ibrāhīm and sent Bābār's son Shah Muḥammad to his mother.

"Abd al-Latif had a hatred for his father which had been explained in various ways. Ulugh Beg in his communiqué at the battle of Tarhāb is said to have substituted the name of his other son "Abd al-ʻAtīx for his. He is said to have refused to restore to him the money and arms which he had stored in Herāt as, relying on astrological predictions, he distrusted a son in whom he saw a paracide. Rebelling, "Abd al-Latif seized Bālākh, defeated his father and his brother "Abd al-ʻAtīx at Rāmānjān 853 (Oct. 1349; 1449) after a reign of two years night months. After this murder, the dismemberment of the Timurid empire made rapid progress; claimants arose in all directions, many of whom achieved their aims. At the end of six months, "Abd al-Latif himself met a violent end.


(U. BOUYAT)

UMAIYA b. ‘ABD SHAMS, ancestor of the Umayyids, the principal clan of the Kurash of Mecca. His genealogy (Umayya b. ‘Abd Shams b. ‘Abd Manṣūr b. Kūsayr) and his descendants are given in Wüstenfeld, Geneal. Tab., U, V. Like all other surnames of Arab tribes and clans, his actual existence and the details of his life have to be accepted with caution, but too great scepticism with regard to tradition would be as ill-advised as absolute faith in its statements. As those Umayyids who were living at the beginning of the Muslim epoch were only in the third generation from their eponym (e. g. ‘Abd Sulaym b. Harb b. Umayya), there is nothing improbable in the latter's being a historical personage; besides there is nothing in tradition to suggest he was a mythical individual or a later invention. The name Umayya is common in Arab nomenclature and is found in both northern and southern tribes; the meaning which anti-Umayyan polemics gives to it (a diminutive of ‘umma "serving") would make it a sobriquet; we also have the positive form Banu ʻAmm as the name of a tribe (cf. Ibn Dāmid, Kitāb al-Iskāb, p. 34).

Umayya was the cousin on the father's side of Ḥāmpī b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, and tradition relates that, being jealous of the latter's influence, he challenged him to a sumūfayra, the judge of which was to be a ʻālim of the Khuršān. Being defeated, Umayya had to exile himself from Mecca for ten years (cf. Tabarzī, 1, 1090; Ibn Sa‘d, ii. 43-44). This story is evidently only an anticipation of the rivalry between the Umayyids and Ḥāmpīzids ("Aliids and "Abdālids) which forms the centre of the political struggle in the Arab empire during the first two centuries of the Hijra (cf. al-Maqrīzī, al-Tamīmī ma‘ Ṭabīkūnum fi ma‘āla baḥtha wa Umayya wa-Banu Ḥāshim, ed. Vos, Leyden 1883). It looks like a legend of learned origin. Similarly the story of the emissary of Umayya and his nephew "Abd al-Muṭṭalib b. Ḥāmpī and other chiefs of the Kurash to the Hīyazīr king Ǧa‘īf b. Dīl Vazān after the latter had defeated the Abyssinians (al-ʻAzraqī, in Chron. d. Staat Mitte, ed. Wüstenfeld, i. 99; Aḥsān, xi. 75-77; Ibn Ḥabīb, fiḥal al-ṣafar, Cairo 1295, i. 131-133 etc.) is only intended to enhance the
prestige of the Quraysh and to prophesy the coming of Islam. Lastly the truth seems very problematical to us of the stories of alleged eye-witnesses who had seen Umayya, a decrepit old man going through the streets of Mecca leaning on his son Abī 'Amr (according to the historian Haihām b. 'Abdī, this was really his slave whom he afterwards adopted; cf. Tabari, ii. 967; Al-gušāri, i. 7–8).

We come down to historical ground with the statement (Arwāḳ, p. 71, etc.) that Umayya, like his father 'Abd Shams, commanded the Meccan army in time of war (al-hiyāda), a post which was later transmitted to his son Ḥarb and his grandson Abū Suffāyān. Although we perhaps should not interpret this literally as implying a permanent military post (it seems to have been rather an occasional appointment) and although we find alongside of descendents of Umayya as military leaders, numerous members of other clans and even ḫalafā' (clients) (cf. on this question: Lammen, Les Algérie, etc. of the organisation militaire de la Mosquée, in L'Arabie occidentale avant l'hégire, Beyrouth 1928, p. 237–303), there is nothing improbable in the story, especially if we regard the hiyāda as the direction of the military affairs of the republic rather than the actual command of troops in the field. As a matter of fact, the descendents of Umayya never lacked talent either for military organisation or for politics.

At the beginning of Islam, the clan of the Banū Umayya appears as the most powerful in Mecca; it was represented by two main branches: the A'yāz and the A'ansābiya (plur. al-qoturi from the name 'Anṣābiya common in the family). The former claimed to be descended from a son of the eponym whose names come from the same or a similar root (a common occurrence in Arabic nomenclature): Abū l-'Iqā, al-Uwwās, al-Āṣ, Abū l-Āṣ; the others were represented by families of Ḥarb, Abū Ḥarb, Suffāyān, Abū Suffāyān (from his name 'Anṣābiya, son of the celebrated Abū Suffāyān b. Ḥarb), Abī 'Amr (the latter whose name is said to have been Dḥakwān was probably, as already mentioned, an adopted son of Umayya). From a son of Abū l-Āṣ, al-Ḥakam, are descended, through Marwān b. al-Ḥakam, the Umayyad caliphs who succeeded Marwān as well as the emirs (later caliphs) of Anfalasija. Some branches of the family of the calipha settled in Egypt and Persia; although the greater part of the family was exterminated in 132 A.H. by the 'Abbasids, some of its members survived: among these were Abū l-Farāq al-Ṭaybāhāni, the author of the Kitāb al-Āḍāmīy, a descendant of a brother of Marwān I; his Shī'a views contrasted strangely with his descent. Another son of Abū l-Āṣ, Affān, was the father of the Caliph 'Uthmān; his descendents are numerous (among them the poet al-Ardāt; cf. Al-gušāri, p. 153–168), and several of them held important offices under the Umayyads. Of the line of al-Áṣ b. Umayya, the most celebrated member is Sa'id b. al-Áṣ b. Sa'id b. al-Áṣ, governor of Kufa under Uthmān, whose misdeeds were one of the main causes of the rebellion against the latter. The family of Abī l-'Iqā also produced a number of notable individuals under the Umayyads who were all descended from Asād b. Abī l-'Iqā.

As to the A'ansābiya branch, its most illustrious family is undoubtedly that of Ḥarb, whose son Abū Suffāyān plays so remarkable a part in the story of the origin of Islam. Through his son Mu'āwiya, he is the founder of the dynasty of Suffāyānah caliphs, which early became extinct with Mu'āwiya II, son of Yazid I. Another son of Yazid, Khalīl, is said to have been the founder of Arabic alchemy, and a grandson, Abū Muḥammad Ziyād b. 'Abd Allāh b. Yazid b. Suffāyān, was slain by the 'Abbasids at Madīna in 152 (Tabari, III. 54). Yazid b. Abī Suffāyān, who was Mu'āwiya's predecessor in command of the army of Syria in 'Umar's reign, left no descendents. Of the other sons of Abī Suffāyān, Uthba, 'Anbata, Yazid, Muḥammad, 'Amr, only the two first had issue. A collateral branch of the Banū Umayya, descended from Abī 'Amr b. Umayya, whose paternity, as we have seen, was not absolutely certain, included among its members al-Walid b. Abī 'Amr, governor of Kufa under Uthmān and later a favourite of Mu'āwiya during his caliphate and also known as a poet (Al-gušāri, IV. 175–190); his father Uthba had been made prisoner at the battle of Badr and put to death by Muḥammad, who could not forgive the insults which he had heaped upon him at the beginning of his preaching in Mecca; the shameful memory of the father weighed heavily on the son and is often revived in 'Alid polemics against the Banū Umayya. A son of al-Walid, Abī Kaṭifa 'Amr, is also known as a poet (Al-gušāri, i. 7–18). All the members of the line of Abī 'Amr settled in al-Irāq and al-Jāzira.


UMAYYA b. Abī l-Salt, an Arab poet of the tribe of Ṭāqif, lived in Ṭafīf, the son of Abī l-Salt 'Abd Allāh and Ṭuṣayna b. Abī Shams b. Abī Manāf, grandson of Abī Suffāyān, cousin of the Uthba and Ṣabīa who were killed at Badr and closely related to the Quraysh patrician families of Mecca. A lament on the Quraysh who fell at Badr, preserved by Ibn Hīṣam, p. 531 seqq., shows that he was still alive in 624 A. D. According to tradition, he died in 8 or 9 A.H. Traditions differ regarding his attitude to the Prophet and to Islam. But the statement that he was not in personal touch with the Prophet and refused to recognise his claim to be a prophet may be regarded as the better founded. It is also in keeping with his sympathy for the Kurāish expressed in the poem above mentioned. The poems and fragments transmitted under Umayya's name, which have been collected by F. Schultheiss and added to by E. Power, may be divided according to their subject into two main groups. The one, a smaller group, consists of poems and verses which are panegyrics of individuals—namely the rich Meccan 'Abd Allāh b. Djuḍān, and do not differ essentially from similar pieces by other old Arab poets. The other, a larger group, which begins in Schultheiss' edition with No. xxiii., reveals almost entirely the point of view which we may call Ḥanifi. On a basis of the recognition of one personal God as 'lord of the slaves', we have apocalyptic pictures of the abode of God and the angels of his kingdom, stories of the creation, eschatological conceptions of the last judgment, hell and paradise; appeals are made for the practice of a moral life and reference
made to "warning examples" which are taken, some from Arab (Asid, Thamûd) and some from Biblical legends (the Flood, Abraham, Lot, Pharaoh etc.). As the same time he is fond of using the hea-
fable. We may also note the references to magical practices (charms to produce rain, poison, xxxiv. to-
towards the end). As regards religious ideas and the treatment of these themes, Umayia's poems thus show a far-reaching agreement with the Kur'ân, which in many passages is almost word for word (cf. Frank-Kamenetsky's investigations). The question of the dependence of the one on the other has been naturally been raised. Haart (see Blüt) holds the view that Umayia's poems on Biblical legends quoted in Pseudo-Balbaki's Book of Creation are all genuine and direct sources of the Kur'ân. As to their genuineness, this is, as in the case of old Arabic poems in general, in each case questionable. But apart from some Muslim insertions, which at once strike one by their bias (e.g. p. xxiii., a panegyric on Muhammed and such pieces, as have already been recognised by tradition as not genuine, there are no cogent reasons to doubt the genuineness of the poems handed down in Umayia's name as a whole. But that Muhammad actually drew upon Umayia's poems seems to be improbable for the simple reason that Umayia had a greater knowledge of the legendary material in question and one that differs in many details from the Kur'ân. The same fact is against the view that Umayia might have borrowed from the Kur'ân, although this is not chronologically impossible and one tradition (al-Ghazâ, iii. 187, 10) says that Umayia

Mu'awiya b. Abi Sufyân
Yazid b. Mu'awiya
Mu'awiya (II) b. Yazid
Marwân b. al-Hakam
'Abd al-Malik b. Marwân
al-Walid b. 'Abd al-Malik
Sulaimân b. 'Abd al-Malik
'Umar (II) b. 'Abd al-'Aziz b. Marwân
Yazid (II) b. Yazid
'Abd al-Malik
al-Walid (II) b. Yazid
Yazid (III) b. al-Walid b. 'Abd al-Malik
Ibrâhîm b. al-Walid b. 'Abd al-Malik
Marwân (II) b. Muhammâd b. Marwân

was the first to read Allah's book. The agreement between Umayia's poems and the Kur'ân may more easily be explained from the undoubtedly fact that about the time of Muhammad's mission, and probably for some time before, currents of thought of a Hafti nature had attracted wide circles of the Hijâri, especially in Mecca and Yathî, stimulated and nourished by Jewish baggadás and Christian legends, which were in circulation there and over South Arabia in many recensions — and this explains the occasional divergences between the Kur'ân and Umayia. Muhammâd and Umayia like other luminis religiosi (Zaid b. 'Amr, Wârâqa, Maslama, etc.) drew upon common sources, whether written as Schnell's thinks or oral as Noldeke holds (see Birol). Recently, Tór Andræs (see Birol) has put forward and with weighty arguments the view that none of the religious poems of Umayia are genuine and should be regarded as the work older Kur'ânic exegetists, à la al-Saddîq, Ibn 'Abbâs etc.

Bibliography: Fragments of the lost Divân with commentary by M. S. Hâlabî, in Khatâm, i. 119 sqq.; Pseudo-Balbaki (Makhlîf), Kithâ al-
Barûd', ed. C. Huart; Kithâ al-Sâhâbî, i. 199 sqq. (transl. in Spenger's Leben Muhammad's, vol. i); much scattered material in Djâliî, Kithâ al-
Hâyâwân, the dictionaries etc. (complete list of sources in Schulte's edition of the Divân); Fr. Schulte, Or. Studien, Noldeke-Festschrift, 1906, p. 71-89; do., Umayia bin Abî Sallâh, die

(H. H. BRADY)

Umaiys (Basî Umaiya), the dynasty of the caliphs from 41-132 a. H. = 661-750 a. d., takes its name from the fact that its founder Mu'awiya b. Abî Sufyân was the representative of the principal branch of the Basî Umaiya; even after the exclusion of this branch from the caliphate he retained its name, for the caliphate was passed to the head of another branch, Marwân b. al-Hakam b. Abî 'Tâk. For the reader's convenience we give below a list of the Umaiys caliphs with their dates of accession.

Rabi' I or II or Djamâdat 1 41 (July-Sept. 661)
Rahib 60 (April 650)
Rahib I 64 (November 653)
Tih 'A'a-da 64 (June 684)
Rahib 65 (April 685)
Djamâdat II 66 (October 705)
Djamâdat I 96 (February 715)
Tih 99 (October 717)
Rahib 101 (February 720)
Djamâdat II 105 (January 724)
Rahib II 125 (February 743)
Rahib 126 (April 744)
Djamâdat II 126 (October 744)
Tih 127 (December 744)

"The Arab empire" is the title given by Well-
ahausen to his classic work on the Umaiys period; by this, he wished to indicate that the Umaiys caliphs represented the attempt made by the Arabs to assert their power in the world as a nation, while religion only played a secondary part in this attempt. After thirty years Wellhausen's historical structure still stands; if on the one hand the numerous researches of Lammens, full of erudition, have filled up with details the framework supplied by Wellhausen, a little remote and rather schematic; if Caetani, on the other hand, by happily developing — perhaps rather too systematically — a hint from Winckler, has succeeded the expansion of the Arabs after their conversion to Islam with a long series of armed migrations made by the desert tribes seeking more fertile settlements in the north of their peninsula, the main lines laid down by Wellhausen are still followed in modern research in the field of Umaiys history. If there is one thing to be modified in Wellhausen's panoramic view, it is perhaps the too strictly political idea which he had of the
development of Arab history, as if one ought to recognize in the actions of the Umayyad caliphs a conscious desire to give expression to purely national values (cf. Becker's remarks in *Itihās*, ix. 95—99). Although the existence of a national consciousness among the Arabs, especially in the Umayyad period, is beyond doubt (Goldziher, *Muh. Stg.* i. 101—145), we are now convinced that the irrational element plays as important a part in individual initiative as reasoned reflection; in this particular case it should be recognized that Wellhausen and still more those who have followed in his footsteps have somewhat neglected the importance of the religious factor. In reality, if not of mystic tendencies were quite foreign to the descendants of this Meccan aristocracy which had fought Islam in its early stages, and if one ought rather to recognize in it the survival of the spirit of the *sāyiya* of the Dāhilīya and of the business men of the merchant republic, we should run the risk of evading the historical truth if we took no account of the fact that the unprecedented triumph of the Arab movement took place under the banner of the religion of the *kurān* and no mentality, even the most modern and "agnostic", could escape the impression made by this circumstance. The Umayyad caliphs, as men of their period and milieu, must have believed in good faith that the propagation of the Muslim faith and the expansion of their temporal power were one and the same thing; and they must have been convinced that the enemies of their policy, whether Shi'ītī or Kāhidjī, were enemies of the true tradition of the Prophet. This tradition has preserved as a certain amount of evidence which leaves no doubt of the presence of this conviction among the Umayyad caliphs; and if tradition, as established after their fall under the influence of the ideas dominant in pietist circles, has cursed the memory of the Umayyads, we ought not to forget that it was precisely under their regime and partly under their stimulus that Islam established itself as a universalist religion.

This pietist tradition, which under the *Abābāda* became the official history of Islam, further reproaches the Umayyads, even more than with having failed in the duties of religion, with having betrayed the spirit of the constitution of the theocratic state as Muhammad had established it and with having replaced the caliphate by *swall*. In this charge we find (analogous to what may be noted in the attitude of the prophets of Israel to the monarchy) combined the protest of the theocratic spirit which gives to God alone power on earth and the intolerance of the Behaim towards any kind of regular authority. In reality, as the researches of Caetani and Lammens have shown, even the governments of Abū Bakr and of 'Omar were far from corresponding to the ideal of the theocratic regime which the schools of *fukhā* later constructed; but the personal prestige of the two great companions of the Prophet, if it did not succeed in silencing the opposition that centred round 'Alī, prevented a constitutional theory which was in contradiction to the actual situation from being developed in the early days of the caliphate. It is only under *Othman*, whose rule marked the open triumph of the Umayyad party at the expense of the first century, that people began to regard the historical paradoxes, which made the former enemies of the new regime now reap the profits of it, as treason against the *rights of God* by which the Prophet's work was disowned and destroyed. We can easily see how the same aim of opposition united on one side the resentment felt by the pious souls of the heroes and martyrs of the infant religion, and on the other the ambitions of a more positive nature of those who sought to maintain for the family and the encomage of the Prophet the privileged position which the founder of the new theocratic state had secured for them. Religious legitimism and dynastic legitimism found a common champion in 'Alī. 'Alī was able to boast an initial success in his elevation to the caliphate at Medina; then the occupation of Kīta, the victory which he won at Basra against the coalition of 'Abbās, al-Zubair and 'A'ishah, the triumph of his party in Egypt seemed to have secured him authority over the whole Arab empire. In the conflict with Muʾawiyah, 'Alī actually represents, at first at least, considerations of state in conflict with the primitive and quite pagan idea of blood vengeance demanded by Muʾawiyah and by the Umayyads for the murder of their relative. But the situation, ambiguous even from the point of view of the new Islamic ethics, in which 'Alī found himself by his compromise with the murderers of 'Othman, was skillfully exploited by the political talents of Muʾawiyah and was not long in developing and dividing the anti-Umayyad party into its two original constituents: on the one side the religous intransigence which culminated in the extremist attitude of the Khāridjīs; on the other, the dynastic legitimism of the Shīʿa. This division made the fortune of the Umayyads, who came to stand for the moderate element which would guarantee law and order in face of the guerrilla war which was ravaging the 'Irāq and brought the country into a position to reap the benefit of the conquests.

At what moment was Muʾawiyah's formal candidature put forward? This is still an obscure point on which tradition gives divergent views, dating the candidature from the beginning of Muʾawiyah's struggle with 'Alī (37 A.H.) or putting it as late as the latter's death (40 A.H.). In any case it raised a new and exceedingly delicate constitutional problem: that of the assumption of supreme power by the believers by one who was not among the earliest companions of the Prophet. The different chronological statements are themselves an indication of the confusion which must have prevailed when the solution given by the course of events suddenly caused a breach with the precedents. Indeed the indignation of the *fukhā*, which takes no account of the requirements of historical development, is quite legitimate from the point of view of doctrine: the caliphate of Muʾawiyah opens an entirely new period in the constitutional history of Islam; the caliph ceases to be the executor or continuator of the *umma* of Muhammad, to which he has been a witness since its beginning. He is henceforth something more: the outstanding personality of the Arab world; the first among the tribal chiefs in military strength, in family connections and influence and in individual prestige, he is in fact, if not in official title, a "king" or rather a "tyrant" in the Greek sense of the word. This was the ambiguous situation which lasted for a century, i.e. as long as the Umayyad dynasty lasted, and which formed the platform for the Shīʿa propaganda, which was to be ended by the victory of the legitimist idea and by the fall of the Arab *empire*. 
It is exceedingly difficult for us to judge the extent to which Mu’awiya was aware of the difficulty of the situation. If we were to confine ourselves to certain aspects of his policy, usually much clearer and more systematic, we should be tempted to conclude that he did not fully appreciate the importance that the religious factor would assume in the political struggle. It is true that he sought a reconciliation with the sons of his unfortunate rival — he succeeded completely with one, al-Hakam, but was less fortunate with al-Husain — and in general he was full of consideration for the whole family of Muhammad, the ‘Umayyads as well as for the Ansar, proud of their title of ‘helpers’ of the Prophet. But he did not go so far as to insist on the suspicious elements taking an oath of loyalty (the ‘curse of Abū Turīb’), a hateful measure which seemed to be a prelude to the ‘imams of the ‘Abbasids and which brought more secret hatred upon the Umayyads than real benefit, and he made the mistake of giving a free hand in the ‘Iraq to Ziyād b. Abīth’s merciless policy of suppression, so different from the policy which he himself practised and which he might also have applied in person in the ‘Iraq with the insinuating mildness of which he had the secret. It is worth noting that during the twenty years of his reign Mu‘awiya never himself went to the ‘Iraq to try to form personal attachments. The ‘Iraqi population seems then to have been justified in thinking that the Umayyad caliphate really represented the hegemony of Syria over the rest of Islamic territory and the memory of ‘Abīth, which legend soon seized upon, was in a way bound up with the nationalism of the ‘Iraq.

Mu‘awiya was moreover detained in Syria by other problems, really formidable, which the organisation of the empire laid upon him. The first question was that of the relations of the sovereign with his own family and with the tribes. Mu‘awiya did not fail (more Arabi, or rather in obedience to a general human feeling) to see that his relations profited largely from the good fortune that had befallen him; but he was careful not to fall into ’Ommān’s error and did not become the prisoner of his claim. It is worth noting that it was the most important provinces which were assigned to non-Umayyad governors; the relationship with ‘Yazd, all-powerful in the ‘Iraq, was purely a fictitious one, while in Egypt where, after the death of ‘Amr b. al-‘As, Mu‘awiya put his own brother ‘Uba, the latter was not succeeded by another Umayyad when he died after barely a year of office. But it was particularly in his relations with the turbulent chiefs of the tribes that Mu‘awiya showed the complete measure of his talent; the latter, little disposed to be impressed either by the authority of the Kurāsh or by the religious prestige of the ‘umr al-mu‘minin, made the caliph’s position something like that of a European suzerain in the age of feudallism. The long and patient work by which Mu‘awiya tried to gain for his cause the influence of the tribes, which he could not have destroyed, inclined on the one hand at strengthening his power, and on the other at achieving the great aim of his life, the šara’ of the tribal chiefs for his son Yazid, which he succeeded in extracting from them in his lifetime; by this he succeeded in making the caliphate hereditary. It is this that we must regard as the most tangible success of Mu‘awiya’s policy and it was owing to this act that the caliphate of the Umayyads lasted a century, in spite of the convulsion that followed the death of Yazid. But how precarious the situation remained even after the dynastic principle was solemnly affirmed! The principle had only been won by Mu’awiya’s personal prestige, as is shown by the fact that immediately after his death, al-Husain thought the moment had come to raise his standard as a legitimist claimant. When ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zuhayr came forward as a champion of neglected Arabia and the memory of the first Companions, the tragic end of al-Husain’s effort and Kerbela’s left a memory of martyrdom which was later exploited against the Umayyads; but for the moment it crushed the ‘Abīth opposition. Perhaps, if Yazid had lived longer or if he had left a son old enough to succeed him worthy, in place of Mu‘awiya II who was still a child, the position of the Umayyads would have been strengthened. Yazid, if he was not the monster of dissipation and impetuous, which phlegm tradition likes to represent, had certainly not the distinguished qualities of his father but he lacked neither energy nor brains to continue the latter’s work.

The haphazard method in which the vast Arab empire had been formed in the days of the early conquests and the lack of any system in the administration of a dominion so vast and so distant (if the story of the constitution of ‘Umar is not quite legendary, the measures taken by him certainly only represent the embryo of the later financial and civil organisation of the empire) raised a series of problems which Mu‘awiya could not help tackling in his usual practical spirit. Unfortunately it is just on his activity as an administrator that the biography of Mu‘awiya, so rich in anecdotic details, is exceedingly weak and his work as a statesman is known to us only from scanty and insufficient notices. There was a slackening in the progress of the conquests, one of the causes of which was the serious resistance offered to the advance of the Arabs by the Byzantines, who were directly threatened in Asia Minor and in Europe; the series of expeditions into Asia Minor, which brought Muslim arms up to the gates of Constantinople and naval raids in the Aegean sea and on the coast of Sicily recorded local successes which brought no definite result, while the attacks by the Byzantine fleets on the Syrian coast, supported by risings of the highlanders of the Lebanon (the Darajima-Mardaites), made it advisable for Mu‘awiya to sign a truce on conditions little satisfactory to Arab ambitions (57 A.H.). Successes were more brilliant in the east where the penetration of the plains of eastern Iran was actively continued, and in Africa where Egypt continued to form a base for expeditions to the west and south, but here also there was a futile acquisition of territory. These expeditions were as before left to the initiative of the provincial governors and carried out by the resources of the tribes who had settled there following the first conquests (the muhājirūn); the caliph’s own army, formed by the junds of Syria, was reserved for campaigns against the Byzantines and the protection of the caliph against possible rebellions at home. It was to the existence of these forces, so loyal to the Umayyads, that the latter owed their victory in the civil war of 64 A.H.

In the internal administration of the empire, Mu‘awiya, even more than his predecessors, made use of the experience of the Christians with whom he had been in close relations in Syria since the years
of his governorship under 'Omar and 'Othmân, when he had learned to appreciate their knowledge and practical ability. It was at this period that Christian culture of Aramaean–Byzantine type began to penetrate into the Arab milieu, a penetration which ultimately led to the formation of the characteristic civilization of Islâm. But if we can see the beginnings of this process under Mu'âwiya, the process itself escapes us.

The premature death of Yazîd enabled Ibn al-Zubair's rising to involve the whole of the 'Irāq by incorporating the Shi'a hostility, with which however it later broke. As always happens in periods of crisis, all the problems which had only been batted under Mu'âwiya's government presented themselves again in an aggravated fashion: the untruth and particularistic tendencies of the tribes; the relations of the subject peoples with their conquerors; the rivalry of interests and feelings between Syria, the 'Irāq and Arabia; all these combinations of conflicting forces which the genius of Mu'âwiya had been able to restrain, retained all their strength and were even intensified under the stimulus of the war of religion. The support of the great Syrian tribe of the Kalb, which Mu'âwiya had won through his marriage with the daughter of Badrân b. Unalî, the mother of Yazîd, continued to be assured to the collateral branch of the Umayyads, that of al-Hakam b. Abî 'I'sâ b. Umayya, which replaced the Suyûfîs in the control of the clan (there was however a feeble attempt to keep the direct line of descent by making Yazîd's young son Khâlid caliph). Marwân b. al-Hakam was already an old man when he came to power; in his long career he had had experience of feuds among the tribes as well as of the rivalries and intrigues among the Companions, the covetous of the heritage of Mu'âwiya. The victory at Mardj Râkîb (64 A.H.) over the forces of the Kai'a, whom Ibn al-Zubair had won over to his cause, secured him Syria, and Egypt, where the anti-Umayyad party had triumphed, soon came back to him; but his death very soon after this last success left his son 'Abd al-Malik the enormous task of subduing Arabia and the 'Irāq. Succeeding to the caliphate, almost unexpectedly, 'Abd al-Malik represented a new attempt to establish a dynastic sequence in the succession: it was Mu'âwiya's scheme, in complete contrast to Arab custom which regarded the power as an appanage of the family group as a whole. 'Abd al-Malik himself and almost all his successors were to have as the principal aim of their dynastic policy the securing of the succession for their direct descendants and the exclusion of collaterals.

In the confusion of the struggles between caliph and anti-caliph, between the latter and the Shi'i and Khârijî rebels, struggles which extended to the remote regions of Fârs and Khorâsân and in which the particularistic tendencies of the tribes were revealed in all their vigour, taking as their badge the standard of one or other of the contesting parties (the dirâws of the poets of this period and the historical anecdotes that accompany them are the best documentation of this), 'Abd al-Malik had the good fortune to hit upon two men of the first ability who secured success for him: first al-Muhallab [q. v.], an old partisan of Ibn al-Zubair who joined the victor (as Ziyâd had lately been); then, far superior in talent and devotion, al-Hâdjîdîdî, who was able to take up with unselfish and ruthless energy the task of restoring the authority of the state above any particularism of tribe or party. Al-Hâdjîdîdî, whose mentality seems almost foreign to the Arab character, looks to us like the precursor (who was however far in advance of later incarnations) of the vizier of the 'Abbâsid period, knowing no other master than his sovereign (or, we might say in modern language, the intercessor of the state) and resolved to serve him in every possible way. The hatred with which tradition has surrounded his name is well justified; al-Hâdjîdîdî's views and his methods he employed to make them successful must have appeared almost diabolical to the old tribal sentiment as well as to the new individualist and antistatal conception of religion which was in process of formation. In reality al-Hâdjîdîdî was the loyal faithful Muslim; one might even say that in a way he represented the continuation of the tradition of the theocratic state founded by Muhammad. This tradition is linked up with that of monarchy by divine right which western Asia and Egypt had known for millennia, from the time of the Pharaohs and Sumerian priest-kings down to the Roman and Sassanian empires whose actual heirs were now the successors of the Prophet. The whole caliphate of 'Abd al-Malik under the driving power of al-Hâdjîdîdî is simply an attempt to establish an absolute monarchy. What the times were not ripe for in the time of Mu'âwiya (although Ziyâd was in this respect a precursor of al-Hâdjîdîdî) seemed possible to 'Abd al-Malik who directed a whole series of measures towards this same end. First of all the powers of the governors of the provinces and their connections with the tribes were cut down; this policy was exercised with most success in the eastern provinces, the farthest from the centre of the caliphate, where the wars against Turk and Iranian kept alive the bellicose spirit of the tribes: al-Hâdjîdîdî by suppressing the attempts to gain autonomy by the Muhallabids and Ibn al-Ash'ârî asserted the political unity of the state and endeavoured to transform the governors into mere officials (he who, although lord of half the empire, regarded himself as his sovereign's servant). The foundation of Wâṣît, the establishment of the Zaôûdî in the marshes of Bâjan were all measures tending to reduce the importance of the tribal element. Egypt, a land which since the time of 'Amr b. al-Asî had retained a position of semi-independence towards the central government, could not have been reduced to such a position of dependence; on the other hand, its importance for the security of Syria was so fundamental that the caliph thought he could save the principle of the unity of the empire, while respecting Egyptian desire for autonomy, by allowing his brother 'Abd al-'Azîz to rule there uncontrolled. The latter however regarded his vice-royalty as a stepping-stone to the caliphate. Other steps taken by 'Abd al-Malik had also as their object the unification of the state: the fiscal census aimed primarily at the adh'ā l-dhâmmma which however ended by weighing on the Muslims themselves; the adoption of Arabic as the official language; the reform of the coinage; the buildings and sanitary work carried out, mainly in the 'Irāq but also in Egypt and Arabia. In a reign of twenty years 'Abd al-Malik was able to give the Arab empire an outward appearance which more and more resembled an monarchical state, which was following in the path laid down by the true tradition of Islâm; and indeed 'Abd al-Malik's attitude to religion is marked by a renewal of
The caliphate of al-Walid saw the harvest of the seed planted by the long work of 'Abd al-Malik; the imposing personality of al-Hadid(led) continued to dominate it; Maslama b. 'Abd al-Malik, the Umayyad who was to besiege Constantinople, Mu'ad b. Nasir, the conqueror of Spain, and Kataba b. Muslim secured great triumphs for Muslim arms. The mosque of Damascus and many other splendid buildings proclaimed the power of the Umayyads. But the problem of the succession reopened the crisis; this time, it was the "Arab" principle that triumphed, in excluding from the caliphate al-Walid's son in favour of his brother Salman, and the duel between the caliph who wished to keep the power in his line and his brothers seeking to supplant him, continued until the end of the Umayyads with the result that it affected the prestige of the dynasty. The results of the lavish expenditure of 'Abd al-Malik and al-Walid began to weigh heavily on their successors; the economic crisis and the problem of the converts made themselves felt. 'Omar II, the Benjamin of orthodox tradition, which makes an exception for him in its condemnation, felt that a policy of "accommodation" was needed in a terrible catastrophe were not to overwhelm the destinies of Islam itself together with those of the Umayyad house. The deep mark which the work of 'Omar, although it only lasted two years, left on history, shows that this caliph really possessed high qualities and that he was gifted with a vivid feeling for realities; at the same time, we are surprised to find at this time a system already fully developed of principles and religious regulations, a system which it had taken barely two generations to elaborate. The pietist and legalist mentality of Islam was already formed at the end of the first century and had the stamp it was to bear through all successive ages. It had been encouraged in the course of its development by the fact that it had been elaborated in the circles of the opposition, who were kept remote from the exercise of power, and from a knowledge of practical politics; at the same time, by one of the most singular paradoxes in history, its authority has been recognised, owing to the prestige of those who championed it, in the very circles of government against which its reproaches were directed; one might almost think we have here the quite modern phenomenon of the influence which the opposition in a parliametary government insensibly exercises on the direction of the policy of the party in power! This paradox is simply the consequence of that which was, as we have seen, at the very foundation of the Umayyad regime; for this regime represented the carrying out and development of the triumph of the preaching of Muhammad, going back to historic precedents and working by methods and through individuals who were clearly opposed to the spirit of this preaching. 'Omar II, in anticipating the 'Abbasids with perhaps more good faith than they, tried to reconcile the political and financial demands of the state with respect for religious tradition. Although his attempt must be regarded as having failed as regards the destinies of the dynasty, his fiscal reforms paved the way for the equal treatment of Arabs and non-Arabs and contributed more than anything else to the fusion of the descendants of conquerors and conquered. It was undoubtedly to the beneficial activities of 'Omar that we owe the third period of splendour which the Umayyad
caliphate experienced under Hishâm. During the twenty years of his reign, the conquests were resumed on the old grand scale, in the west (in spite of the great Berber rising of 123) as well as in the east; the Arabs advanced into the heart of Gana; the Mediterraneans began its transformation into an "Arab lake"; the Turks who had begun to slip off the Arab yoke on the dismissal and death of Kutba were subdued for a third time.

The Umayyad caliphate was at its zenith when Hishâm died; one can hardly believe that a few months later this state which seemed to be solidly built on the authority of the caliph would be in complete disorder and fall a prey to anarchy. Tradition is undoubtedly to some extent right in attributing to the vicious conduct of al-Walid II, a dissolute drunkard, an important part in the collapse of the established order. But the faults of one individual are not sufficient to explain the unexpected appearance of all the signs of dissolution. The causes must be sought, as usual, in the very elements which gave the caliphate of Hishâm the appearance of prosperity. The latter had exploited to the limit the fiscal reforms of 'Omar and exhausted his Muslim and subject subjects alike (the risings caused by excessive taxation, the memory of which is preserved by the Christian historians in particular, are symptomatic in this respect). Misery, counsellors as ever of extreme measures, had brought about a revival of Khāridjism, which was even introduced into Syria, an unprecedented phenomenon; and in Syria again, the 'umma on which was based the military strength of the Umayyads threw off their discipline, tired of the more and more marked tendency of the government to an absolute monarchy. The Shi'a movement began again to show itself openly in the 'Irak as is evident from the attempt, which however failed miserably, of Za'id b. 'Ali b. al-Ḥusain (123). The increasing extent of the conquests had finally removed the remotest provinces from the control of the central power: the tribal feuds, combining with religious differences, had been resumed with violence, while in distant Khurāsān, in spite of the energetic measures taken by Naṣr b. Sā'īr the secret propagandists of the Shi'i sect met with rapid success. We can understand therefore how (indignation at al-Walid's scandalous conduct found a new and prepared for it to burst forth upon, especially when the ambitions of the various descendants of 'Abd al-Malik were frustrated by the proclamation, as soon as al-Walid mounted the throne, of his two children as his successors designate. A rising in the 'umma of Palestine and al-Uriyuna brought Yazid III to power; al-Walid was slain. But neither Yazid nor his brother Ibrāhīm, who succeeded him after a few months, succeeded in checking the anarchy which was spreading throughout the empire. The Khāridjīs under al-Dāhkhān b. Kais al-Shafi'ī seized Kūfa. It looked for some years as if salvation would come from a distant member of the ruling branch, Marwān b. Muhammad, grandson of the great Marwān, governor of Armenia, who had created an army devoted to himself during the long years he had been successfully fighting against the Byzantines. He arrived in Syria to support the claims of al-Walid's children; finding they had already been assassinated by the murderers, he proclaimed himself caliph and in a few months had put down rebellion in Syria and destroyed the members of the Umayyad house who opposed him; he next took Egypt and the 'Irak. The work he did in the first three years of his caliphate is hardly comparable to that of his grandfather whose name he bore and of his uncle 'Abd al-Malik. But the circumstances were much more difficult for him than they had been for them: the family bonds of the Umayyads had been broken and the energy of the stock was exhausted; at the same time, the confidence of their adversaries in their success had increased: instead of having to fight with the improvised armies of Ibn al-Zubair or with desperate bands of Shi'I who had escaped the disaster of Kerbelā', Marwān had to meet troops hardened by the wars with the Turks and Persian forces of Khurāsān organised by Abu Sulaym, while in the background the 'Abbasids were preparing to enter the field. The sou-diant Shi'I threw down the gauntlet in 130: Khurāsān and Fārs were rapidly conquered and in the following year the invaders occupied the 'Irak where the 'Abbasids suddenly put forward their claims and proclaimed Abu ʿAbd Allah ʿAbd Allah caliph at Kūfa. The latter, having defeated Marwān on the Zab, sent his lieutenants in pursuit of him through al-Djazira and Syria and again defeated him in Egypt where the last Umayyad caliph was slain on 27th Dhu l-Ka'āda 132 (July 7, 750). The assassination of the members of the Umayyad family, the fruitless rising in favour of Abū Muhammad al-Sayfānī in Syria and the flight of 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Mu'awiyya b. Hishām from Medina to Africa and Spain form the epilogue of the tragedy which marked the end of the fall of the dynasty of Mu'awiya and Marwān.

It is undoubtedly an exaggeration to say that the end of Arabism coincides with the fall of the Umayyads and to attribute to the 'Abbasids a kind of translation of the Muslim world. In reality not only did the dynasty of the caliphs remain Arab, but the governors of provinces and generals in the army were recruited from Arabs for nearly a century. It is true on the other hand that the internationalisation of Islām, in the sense that the Arabs ceased to be the sole active element in the organisation of the state and in the development of civilization, had already begun, at least as a theoretical possibility, when the reforms of 'Omar II had made the marwālīs equal with the Arabs. Further, the adoption of Islām brought these heterogeneous elements to form part of a civilization, which we are justified in continuing to regard as Arab even if the analytic research of the last half century has shown that its constituent factors were for the greater part foreign. Not only did the Arabic language give a homogeneous colour to this civilisation but all the varied elements which coexisted it were kneaded together under Arab influence. The merit of having given this composite civilization an Arab colouring is undoubtedly due to the Umayyads. We can unfortunately no longer recognise in detail the preliminary work which sowed the seeds, the fruits of which were seen only in the 'Abbasid period; but the fact that in the second half of the second century, Islāmic civilization is in full bloom, as regards not only religion but also science and the arts, makes it clear that the Arabs did not await the coming of the 'Abbasids to begin their transformation from Beduins to civilized people. What strikes one in the Arab civilization of the Umayyad period, is the coexistence of two worlds, the old and the new, existing side
by side, just as happening elsewhere in periods of transition. Beduin customs and mentality, the poetry of al-Farāhī, of Dājrī and Ṭabarānī were still real and alive when the religion of the Kurān was already being penetrated by Hellenistic and Christian theological speculation, when the interest of traditionists, historians and philologists was beginning to be attracted to the literary products of the spirit of the desert which they knew through the venerable memorials of an epoch now closed. Even the administrative system of the Ṭabarānī in its main lines is practical what the Umayyads had built up on a basis of Byzantine and Sassanian tradition, and the original contribu-
tion by Yaḥyā b. Barmak was very much less than what tradition credits him with. In conclusion, what the Umayyads lacked, namely the power to transform the colossal Arab empire into a homogeneous unity, was equally deficient in the Ṭabarānī: what the latter accomplished, the intellectual and moral unification of the Muslim world had already been begun under the Umayyads.

On matters of detail, which it has not been possible to deal with in this general article, see the articles on the individuals and place-names connected with the history of the period.

Bibliography: Being unable to give the complete bibliography for so vast a subject, we shall confine ourselves to works of a general character. The sources for the history of the Umayyads have been collected by L. Caetani in his Chronographia Islamica, Paris (1912 sq.), pp. 461-1716, an invaluable repository but unfortunately without an index; in it are given along with the Arabic sources, also those from Syriac, Greek, Latin, Armenian and Chinese. Very few really important texts are still unpublished; the chief of these is undoubtedly al-Balādhūrī's great compilation Anāṣ al-ʿĀdadī, of which only a fragment has been published by W. Abūwardā (Anonyme arab. Creativ etc., Greifswald 1883), the publication of which is being undertaken by the University of Jerusalem; we may hope to find in it some reminants of the Umayyad historical tradition which has almost entirely been swept away by writers with Ṭabarānī bias. This same tradition is in part preserved, so far as we can judge from the little we know of it, in the history of the Spanish Arab al-Balīyāṣī (al-Ṭabābīh bi l-Ḥarīb ʿš-Shāb al-Šām, cf. J. Horovitz, M.S.O.S., 1907, p. 22-27), which would be worth publishing. One regrets not to find in Caetani's Chronographia the results of a methodical search of the dārūs of the poets and their commentators (in first place the Naḥḍa of Dājrī and Farasādī) which might supply some new information (a good deal of this work has however been done by Lammens). The papyri also constitute a source, of great importance though limited range, especially the series which bears the name of Kūra b. ʿAbī Shams [q.v.]. The general work which is of fundamental importance for the Umayyad period, is, as we have seen, J. Wellhausen's Das arabische Reich und sein Sturz, Berlin 1904, in which Ṭabarānī's great work was utilized for the first time; his Die religiopolitischen Oppositionskämpfe im alten Islam (Abh. G. W. Gött., 1901) and Die Kampf der Araber mit den Khorasān in der Zeit der Umayyaden (Nachrichten G. W. Gött., 1901) are also of a lesser importance for two essential aspects of the history of this period; H. A. H. Gibb, The Arab Conquest in Central Asia, London 1923 [James G. Furlong Fund, ii], carefully studies another point of great historical significance: it is a matter of regret that we have nothing similar for the conquests in Africa; the researches of H. Lammens (Etudes sur le règne du califat omeyyade, Mémoires 1, M.F.O., i., ii; L'islam des Arabes égyptiens des S et des R, 4. c., iv, 4); Etudes sur le siècle des Omeyyades, Hârîrî 1930), without constituting a complete survey of the history of the Umayyad caliphate, are nevertheless indispensable for the immense quantity of material that is examined in them, for the wealth of detail and the keen penetration with which historical problems are investigated; C. H. Becker's essays (collected in Islamstudien, i., Leipzig 1924, also Beiträge zur Geschichte Ägyptens unter dem Islam, ii, Strassburg 1903) have contributed in remarkable fashion to illuminate the problems of the Umayyad caliphate's place in history. (G. LEVI DELLA VIDA)

II. THE UMAYYADS OF SPAIN.

The Banū Umayyā or Banū Mardwān of the Arab historians, direct descendants of the Umayyads of Syria, reigned from the viith to the xiiith century over the Muslim empire which they founded in the Iberian peninsular with Cordova as their capital.

The restoration in the extreme west of the Muslim world of the sovereignty of the Umayyads, which had been destroyed in the east by the Ṭabarānī, is one of the most striking events in the history of the Arabs in the Middle Ages. It was this dynasty which encouraged the separation of Muslim Spain from the rest of the Arab world and made it a real political unity; it was this dynasty which gave the social physiognomy of this country, already so characteristic, a decided stamp of Syrian tradition. Thanks to the vigour of its princes, it was able to resist the designs of the Ṭabarānī and then of the Fatimids. It succeeded in the evil, exhausted by civil wars, only through allowing a hereditary dictatorship to be established alongside of it and because it failed to restrain in time the excesses of its foreign mercenaries.

The history of the Umayyads of Spain may be divided into three principal periods: 1. the independent emirates of Cordova; 2. the caliphate; 3. the decline and fall of the dynasty. Here we shall only give a very brief résumé.

Chronological list of the Umayyads of Spain.


II. Hishām I, 172-180 (788-796).


IV. Abū ʿAbbās al-Raḥmān II, 206-238 (822-852).

V. Muḥammad I, 238-273 (852-886).

VI. al-Munṣīrī, 273-275 (886-888).

VII. Abū Ṭālib, 275-300 (888-912).


X. Hishām II, al-Muʿassāyad ʾīl-Hāšimī, 366-399 (976-1009), and 400-403 (1010-1013).
XI. Muhammad II, al-Mahdi, 399-400 (1009-1016).

XII. Sulaiman, al-Mustansir bi 'l-Thaqif, 399-407 (1009-1016).

XIII. 'Abd al-Rahman IV, al-Murtadha, 408-409 (1017-1019).

XIV. 'Abd al-Rahman V, al-Mustanshir bi 'l-Thaqif, 414 (1025).


XVI. Hisham III, al-Mustadd bi 'l-Thaqif, 418-422 (1027-1031).

1. The independent emirate of Cordova.

The Arab historians usually give the date 138 (756) for the foundation of the independent emirate of the Umayyads of Cordova by 'Abd al-Rahman I, the son of Mu'awiya b. Hisham, whom they call al-Da'idi, "the immigrant". When his relatives were being persecuted by the 'Abbasids, 'Abd al-Rahman, still quite a young man, — he was born in 113 (731) — succeeded in escaping secretly to Palestine and from there, accompanied by his freedman Badr, went to Egypt and then to Ifrikiya. He was soon obliged to fly from al-Kairawân, where he was exposed to the persecutions of the governor 'Abd al-Rahman Ibn Hâbûb and went to the Maghrib. He spent some time in Taht (q. v.) at the court of a petty dynasty, the Rustamids, then enjoyed the hospitality of various Berber tribes, among them the Mihissa and the Nafa. From the day of his arrival on African soil, 'Abd al-Rahman, encouraged by Badr, had shown a desire for political activity. But his ambition did not find a suitable soil in the Maghrib, and his eyes naturally turned towards Spain.

'Abd al-Rahman was able, very cleverly and with a keen political sense, to turn to his own interests the rivalries which for some years had made a profound cleavage between the Kaifis and the Yamanis settled in the Peninsula. On the other hand, he had no difficulty in securing the support of clients of the Umayyads, who had come some years earlier into Spain with Badr b. Bahr (q. v.) and were scattered, some 500 in number, over the military districts (d'umâra) of Elvira and Jaen in the S. E. of Spain. The governor of the Peninsula at this time was Yüsuf b. 'Abd al-Rahman al-Fihr, who derived most of his authority from the chief of the Kaifis of Spain, al-Sumayil al-Kilabi (q. v.). Judging the moment had come to land on Spanish soil in the guise of claimant to the throne, 'Abd al-Rahman left the Maghrib and arrived at Almuñecar (q. v.) in Rabî II, 138 (Sept. 755). The welcome he received surpassed his expectations; he took the field against Yusuf al-Fihr and as a result of meetings, military engagements and negotiations, for the details of which the reader may be referred to the Arab historians, he was ultimately recognised as emir on the 10th Dhu 'l-Hijja 138 (May 15, 756) in the town of Cordova, the traditional residence of the Arab governors.

The founder of the Umayyad emirate of Cordova was destined to rule for over 33 years. The first of these he spent in consolidating his position in the capital itself. News of his success spread through the whole of the East and there was soon an influx into Spain of clients and partisans of the Umayyads, who came to do their share in restoring in Spain the dynasty which had fallen in Syria. But the Cordovan emir had soon to deal with a number of political complications. He had first of all to put down Yusuf al-Fihr, who was not taking kindly to his fall and, having gathered round him a number of followers, tried to retake Cordova; but he was defeated in 141 (758) and in the next year killed in the region of Toledo. But rebellion continued to smoulder in all parts of Spain, as in the period of the governors; trouble was continually stirred up not only by bodies of marrā'idūn i.e. neo-Muslims, Spaniards recently converted to Islam, but also by the Berbers and Arabs always at daggers drawn with one another on account of their ancient enmities. 'Abd al-Rahman I therefore had to put down in succession risings by the Yamanis and the Fihrs, led by al-'Alî b. Maghthul al-Djalami in 146 (763), by theBerber Shaskàt, who rose at Shantabiyà (Santaver) in 152 (769) and never dared allow any slight local disturbances to spread. In the latter half of the reign of 'Abd al-Rahman I, a coalition was formed of a number of Arab chiefs of the east of the Peninsula, who sought the aid of Charlemagne. The latter himself crossed the Pyrenees at the head of an army and laid siege to Saragossa in 162 (778). But the emperor, suddenly recalled to the Rhine, had to raise the siege. On his way back to France he suffered in the pass of Roncesvax, where the Basques had prepared an ambush for him, the famous defeat associated with the memory of Roland. 'Abd al-Rahman I took advantage of the departure of the Franks to besiege Saragossa in his turn, and occupied it in 164 (780) but for a short time only. An expedition against the Basques was crowned with success. On the death of the founder of the new Umayyad dynasty, which took place in 172 (788), the Cordovan kingdom had already become solidly established from the political and territorial point of view and was possessed of powerful military resources. The success of the exile from Syria and the remarkable way in which he was able to build up a kingdom for himself and to undertake the task of pacifying his new territory has aroused the admiration of all the Arab historians, who give him the flattering epithet of "Eagle of the Kuraish" (al-kuraishî). The pacification of the new kingdom was to be the main task of all the successors of 'Abd al-Rahman I. On his death the power passed to his son Hisham I, who reigned only a little over seven years for he died young in 180 (796). He had at first to fight against his brothers, who wanted to seize the power, and as a result he had to send out two summer expeditions (al-ifa) in 177 (793) and 179 (795), one against Nabitouse and the other against Galiaca. The chroniclers describe Hisham I as a noble prince full of virtues and regret that he reigned so short a period.

His son al-Hakam I succeeded him for 26 years. It is not certain whether it was he or his father who introduced the Mâlikite rite into Muslim Spain: the maddâhāb hitherto followed had been that of al-Awza'î (q. v.). In any case, it was only on his accession that the lawyers or jûsâhî assumed an excessive importance in Cordova and tried to dictate the decisions of the sovereign. Al-Hakam I, unlike his father, had very little sympathy for them; he at once took up a stand against them and showed them that he could resist their demands.
But the faiths determined to resist, made common cause with another body of malcontents, the neo-Muslims or muswalladun, and thus to some extent made themselves in the name of Islam the champions of Spanish nationalism. The result, with a ruler so vigorous and decided as al-Hakam I, was a series of measures cruelly and viciously enforced during the greater part of the reign. The first rising took place in Cordova itself in 839 (852): conspirators from the aristocracy urged on by the faiths tried to drive al-Hakam from the throne; but the plot was discovered and the sovereign dealt most vigorously with the rebels. In the next year, he took Merida and stifled in blood another rising in Cordova. In 841 (853), there took place at Toledo the celebrated "day of the ditch" (waqifat al-hafr). The inhabitants of this town from the beginning of Umayyad rule had been almost continually in rebellion; al-Hakam sent to govern them 'Amr ibn, a renegade who was absolutely devoted to him; he with his master's approval prepared an ambush for the Toledo notables from which none emerged alive. But it is the affair of the suburb which best reveals the implacable character of the grandson of 'Abd al-Rahman I. Determined to destroy completely the seeds of rebellion in his capital, he surrounded himself with a guard of foreign mercenaries, the "silent ones" (al-qubur) who began a reign of terror in Cordova. The discontent continued to increase and in 202 (817) a rising on a large scale broke out in the southern suburb of the capital on the other bank of the Guadalquivir: the mob, stirred up by the faiths led by Yahyā b. Yahyā, tried to take by assault the emir's palace but were soon surrounded and cut down by al-Hakam's troops. The emir then decided at once to hasten from Spain all the Cordovans of the suburb who had survived the massacre. Over 20,000 families had to leave the country: about two-thirds went to Egypt and later to Crete. The remainder went to Fās and settled in the quarter still called the "bank of the Andalusians" (idnibat al-Andalus). The suburb itself was razed to the ground and it was forbidden for any one to build there again. This drastic suppression of the rising made such a sensation in the Muslim world that the historians often call al-Hakam I al-Rahbād (the "suburbanite").

The whole of al-Hakam's reign was passed in this way in dealing with domestic troubles stirred up by neo-Muslim malcontents with the faiths behind them. His energy enabled him to triumph over all but with his attention continually occupied in the interior of his country he could not always defend his frontier districts (shindār) sufficiently. In the reign of al-Hakam I we find the kingdoms of Asturias and Galicia making a notable advance to the south. Barbastro was also taken from the Muslims in 835 (850) by the Duke of Aquitaine.

Al-Hakam's son and successor 'Abd al-Rahmān II was the very opposite of his father. He reigned from 266 to 278 (862 to 883) and was completely powerless to control events. It has been said with justice that he was guided throughout his reign by a fakhr, a musician and woman and a nun chuck: 'Ayyūb ibn 'Abd al-Mu'min who had just arrived in Spain and brought there the refinements of the Abbasid capital; the favourite Tarīb and the cunning Nāṣr, who dictated to the ruler most of his political acts. The reign of this weak ruler, after the reign of terror begun by al-Hakam I, corresponded with a recrudescence of the nationalist movement. It was in this period that the Spanish Mozarabs (q.v.) who had retained the Christian faith, felt themselves strong enough to rebel, led by Eulogio and Alvaro. As a result of the counter-measures of the Muslim government, we find a wave of voluntary martyrdom descending on Spain and particularly on Cordova between 276 and 278 (880 to 883): a council summoned by the Umayyad emir,建筑设计 to put a check on it. Besides the opposition of the Christian communities, the caliph had in deal with new rebellions by the muswallats: Merida and Toledo had again to be taken by force. It was in this reign also that the Normans, called by the Muslims al-Mudjar (q.v.), made their first appearance in Spain. In 290 (844) Norman raiders took Seville and a truce was concluded between the leader and the emir of Cordova who had sent them an ambassador, Yahyā ibn al-Hakam al-Qhatāli.

Muhammad I, son of 'Abd al-Rahman II, succeeded his father on the throne of Cordova when the latter died in 278 (880). His reign, which was to last till 273 (886), was also marked by a series of domestic troubles which in spite of the cruelty of the prince continued to increase. The Mozarab rebellion broke out again on his accession and vigorous persecutions of the Christian communities were at once begun. The Christians of Toledo having appealed for help to Leo Ochrida I, he sent them an army under Count Bierzo, which the Muslim troops routed in 290 (854) at the battle of Wald Salts (Guadaceite). The Christian risings ceased only in 295 (859) after the martyrdoms of Eulogio and Lenceria. But the political instability of the Cordovan emirates had been emphasized and gradually separatist movements began to take shape in all the provinces which were in theory subject to Cordova, usually led by neo-Muslims who posed as independent chiefs and nationalist champions. This attitude of the muswallad aristocrats and soon the pretensions of the great Arab families were to keep the Cordovan emirs busy till the beginning of the tenth century.

It was in the reign of Muhammad I that the long rebellion of the independent chief 'Umar b. 'Abd al-Ḥafṣān (q.v.) began in the S.W. of the Peninsula: he soon exercised absolute power over all the mountainous country between Ronda and Malaga and established his headquarters in an impenetrable citadel, Bobastro (q.v.). Except for a few brief periods of truce, he kept up the struggle against the central Muslim power and soon became recognized by all the malcontents of the country as their undisputed leader.

The successor of Muhammad I, his son al-Mu'ādhdin, had only a short reign (273 to 275 = 886 to 888), entirely filled with the war with the Ḥafṣān, whose influence daily increased, and with the siege of Bobastro, which would have perhaps been successful but for the emir's untimely death, poisoned, it appears, by his brother 'Abd al-Allāh, who succeeded him.

The reign of the emir 'Abd Allāh (275 to 300 = 889 to 912), eclipsed in some degree by that of his glorious grandson and successor 'Abd al-Rahmān III al-Nasir, is rightly said to mark an important stage in the pacification of the kingdom
of Cordova. It is not quite right to see in him only a bloodthirsty tyrant. Like all the rulers of the period, he undoubtedly dealt most cruelly with those who tried to overthrow him, even his own brothers. But he had to face numerous dangers, to fight the movements with which his predecessors had had to deal and which had been increasing in strength in the meantime. The rebellion of Ibn Hafṣūn alone was to occupy almost the whole of his reign. On the other hand, in spite of the relative proximity of Cordova, the country of Seville seemed to be about to cast off Umayyad rule; the Spanish party and the Arab party there were continually undermining the authority of the governor sent from Cordova and occasionally let loose on the town bodies of Berbers who were settled in the neighbouring mountains. The hostility of the great Arab families, the Banū Ḥādījīd and the Banū Khalid, became more and more disquieting; the representatives of these families were great landowners who had large numbers of devoted serfs whom they could equip and arm when necessary. Kuraib b. Khalid, the head of the second family, soon after the accession of 'Abd Allāh raised the whole region of Aljarafe (Arab. al-Ŝaraf) and got the chief of the Banū Ḥādījīd to join him. Then he concluded a treaty with the emir by and arrangement with him attacked the neo-Muslims of Seville which he reduced to ruins (278 = 891). But his submission was only temporary. In 286 (899) the chiefs of the two great Seville families quarrelled and Ibrāhīm b. Ḥādījīd, after disposing of his rival Kuraib, concluded an alliance with the leader of the rising in the S. E., Ibn Hafṣūn. 'Abd Allāh finally received his submission but had to give him such privileges that in practice he ruled Seville as an independent chief. In this period also the growing influence of the nobles, vassals, more or less in theory, of the Cordovan sovereign, contributed largely to break up his authority. The chief of these nobles (গাড়ি) were the lords of Saragossa, Ucles, Huesca, and, in the S.W., of Oromona. As to Ibn Hafṣūn, after having shown at the beginning of the reign of 'Abd Allāh some slight signs of submission, he was not long in resuming the struggle against Cordovan rule. Supported by the Christians of Cordova and their chief, Count Servando, he extended his influence northwards so that the capital itself was soon threatened. Prompt measures became necessary: in 278 (891) the emir 'Abd Allāh marched against the fortress of Poley (now Aguilar, in the south of Cordova) where Ibn Hafṣūn had established himself and forced the rebel to take refuge in his citadel of Bobastro. This success strengthened the emir's authority and procured him, for a brief period only, it is true, the submission of the districts (کیر) of Ecija, Archidona, Elvira and Jaen. Down to the last years of the reign of 'Abd Allāh, the work of pacification continued with continually varying results, but the activity of the prince, never giving his turbulent adversaries rest, gradually achieved a consolidation of his authority and the break up of the anti-Umayyad movement. When he died in 300 (Oct. 912) the situation was more settled; he had prepared the way for and been one of the most vigorous workers for the pacification of Spain, which his grandson was to complete in the first part of his long reign.

2. The Umayyad caliphate of Spain.

'Abd Allāh's successor, 'Abd al-Rahmān III b. Muḥammad, was only twenty-three on his accession; in spite of his youth he had been chosen to succeed to the throne by his grandfather on account of his good qualities, and the choice was fully justified. No reign in the annals of Muslim Spain was more brilliant or more glorious. Its great length (half a century: 300—350 = 912—961) assured the prince the policy the benefit of unusual continuity and enabled him to extinguish for several decades the various centres of rebellion which had been always active in Spain since the coming of the Muslims. The reign of 'Abd al-Rahmān III marks, with that of his successor al-Ḥakam II and to a certain point the period when the two first 'Amirid dictators, al- Mansūr and al-Muṣṭafār, assumed power, the culminating point in the Muslim occupation of Spain. Spain was never afterwards able to attain in the eyes of the Christian and Muslim worlds the political influence and brilliant culture which she attained in the time of these great princes nor to play a part of the first importance in the west, in Europe as well as in Africa.

We are not going to give here a detailed account of the reign of 'Abd al-Rahmān III, but only to study it in its main outlines. It may be divided into two main periods: the first, the period of restoration of peace at home, the result of which was the realisation of the political unity of the Cordovan empire; the second is a longer period marked mainly by preoccupation with foreign affairs, relations with the Christian kingdoms of the north and with North Africa, then more or less under Fātimid suzerainty.

On his accession 'Abd al-Rahmān III set to work and traced out his programme: to put an end to the rebellions which had been drenching Spain with blood since the foundation of the dynasty, to neutralise the influence of the powerful Arab aristocracy and to maintain the Muslim frontiers on the north. He carried through his programme point by point. In the first year of his reign Ecija was taken and its fortifications dismantled; another campaign ended in the taking of the strong castle of Monteleon and in the pacification of the districts of Jaen and Elvira. The subjugation of the south of the Peninsula was continued down to 305 (917); Seville and Cremona submitted; finally the aged leader of the rebellion, 'Umar b. Hafṣūn, died. His sons Ḏa'far, Sulaimān and Ḥafṣ endeavoured to continue the struggle but without any great confidence in the success of their arms; the result was the taking of Bobastro by 'Abd al-Rahmān in person, who laid siege to it and captured it in 315 (beginning of 928). Five years later the last centre of resistance fell: Toledo [؟ی], to which the predecessors of 'Abd al-Rahmān III had been forced to grant a kind of political independence, was strictly blockaded and had finally to surrender in 320 (932).

At the same time the sovereign did not lose sight of the aspirations of the Christian kingdoms of the north, particularly the programme of territorial expansion by the kingdom of Leon, over which there then reigned an energetic and ambitious prince, Ordoño II. The latter had taken the stronghold of Alajen (Kald' al-Hamzah) to the south of
Merida, and a little later with the help of King Sancho of Navarre he sent an expedition into the districts of Tudela and Valtierra. But the Leonese advance was checked by 'Abd al-Rahman III, who in 930 (920) gained a series of successes, with the capture of the castles of Osma, San Esteban de Gormaz, Clunia, Carcar, Calahorra and Merez and the victory of Valdejuquera. Four years later, as a result of a new offensive by Leon, the Umayyad ruler re-established the situation to his advantage in a victorious campaign, profiting by the troubles caused in the Christian country on the succession to Ordoño II.

Throughout all this first period of his reign, 'Abd al-Rahman III was closely watching what was going on in Africa and by building fortifications on the coast and organising a powerful fleet, was preparing for the eventuality of an invasion by the Fatimids, against whom he had committed acts of open hostility. To show it still more he assumed in 316 (949) the lofty title of commander of the faithful (amir al-mu'minun) while his predecessors and he himself had previously been content with the simple title of amir. The little Cordovan kingdom became at the same time a great Muslim empire, and the restoration of the Umayyad caliphate of Damascus in Spain was completed. He assumed at the same time the honorific title of 'Abbasid of al-Nasir li-Din al-Mu'azzam ibn al-Mu'min (cf. E. Las Cases, Provençal, Études musulmanes du XVe siècle, Paris 1932, p. 45 sq.).

A little later in 319 (931), the Caliph captured the stronghold of Ceuta [q.v.] on the African coast and installed a governor and a garrison there; this was the beginning of the Umayyad attack on the western Maghrib. A few years before, the petty rulers of the kingdom of Nador had asked for and obtained Umayyad suzerainty. Al-Nasir did not stop there and was able to rally to his side the little local dynasties who were trying to hold their own against the Fatimid invaders. With the help of an alliance with the Maghrawa [q.v.] he was soon able to subdue the whole of the central Maghrib except the region of Táhert.

The second part of the reign of 'Abd al-Rahman III shows rather less personal activity by the caliph, and at the same time the formation, in the heart of the united and pacified Cordovan empire, of parties, no doubt of little weight at first, which were in the end to cause the greatest disorder in the internal affairs of the caliphate: the Slav party and the Berber party. The Slavs [cf. 99X9] prisoners not only from the east of Europe but also from Italy and northern Spain, soon formed a large class in Cordovan society, and it is in the reign of al-Nasir that we find them for the first time occupying high offices in the state and even in the army. The sovereign seems to have used these slaves, originally devoted to his cause, to reduce or even annihilate the influence of the old Arab aristocracy. In 327 (939) for example, we find him giving the Slav Nadjia the command of an important expedition; but he was to regret it; indeed on this occasion Muslim troops suffered the first reverse of his reign and were defeated by the Leonese under Ramiro II and their allies of Navarre at Simancas and Alba and ega. Henceforth al-Nasir's policy with regard to the Christian kingdoms, while remaining watchful, was confined to taking advantage of any possible occasion. Civil war had broken out in the north of Spain as a result of a feud between Ramiro II and the Count of Castile, Fernán González. On the death of the King of Leon in 951, his sons Ordoño III and Sancho fought for the crown and the former, to have his hands free against his brother who was supported by Castile, offered 'Abd al-Rahman III an advantageous peace and promised to pay him tribute regularly. When Ordoño III died in 955, Sancho succeeded him; but, disliked by the nobles and defeated by the armies of the Cordovan caliph, he was forced to take refuge in Pamplona with the aged queen Tota of Navarre and then appealed to al-Nasir for help to regain his kingdom which had passed into the hands of Ordoño IV. Negotiations were begun and through the skill of al-Nasir's representative, the Jew Hasdai ibn Shaprut, Sancho and Tota came in person to Cordova to seek the caliph's help. This was an event without precedent in the annals of Muslim Spain. The king of Leon had to abandon ten fortresses in exchange for which the caliph gave him troops who assisted him to take Zamora in 958 and Oviedo in the following year.

The Fatimid threat to the Peninsula had not yet completely disappeared. In 343 (954), the Fatimid caliph al-Mu'izz sent his governor of Sicily to make a raid on the Spanish shore. He ravaged the district of Almeria and brought back prisoners and considerable booty to Sicily. A reprisal, al-Nasir gave Chilubi, one of his most devoted clients, command of a fleet of seventy ships, which went and burned Marsa T-Kharaz near Calle on the North African coast.

'Abd al-Rahman III al-Nasir died on the 2nd Rama dán 359 (Oct. 15, 961), aged 73. His political work was to be continued by his son and successor al-Hakam II al-Mustas tür r bi 'llah who was nearly fifty when he came to the throne. He was a pious and scholarly prince and his name is especially associated with the Great Mosque of Cordova which he enlarged and embellished; on it he spent considerable sums and even brought from Mediterranean lands and Byzantium skilled craftsmen and valuable material. His father had been mainly interested in public and strategic buildings and had built for his own residence the town of Madinat al-Zahrâ' [q.v.], 3 miles N.W. of Cordova.

His love of study and his age, it is true, predisposed al-Hakam II to a quiet life; but he is too often represented as taking no interest in political affairs. He had to maintain the situation created by his father and for this he had only to watch the normal working of the wheels of government. But like his predecessor, whose programme he continued to carry out, he did not remain an inactive spectator of events in northern Spain and Africa. He received at Cordova with great pomp Sancho's brother, Ordoño the Wicked, and gradually became the successor of the Christian princes of the north. His political right hand men were the šā'īb al-Mu'hazi and Slav dignitaries, and he may be reproached with having given them too much confidence. On the African coast, the Umayyad government continued to display considerable activity. The Fatimid peril seemed to have disappeared with the departure of al-Mu'izz for Egypt, but his representatives, the Şahibjas, resumed the fight with the vessels of the Umayyads in North Africa. On the other
hand, the petty Ittārid dynasts of the region of Tangier and Arrilla had remained faithful to the Fatimids. The resistance of Ḥasan b. Ghāniya was long but in the end he was taken in his stronghold at Ḥājjarat al-Naṣr and imprisoned in Cordova. The reign of al-Hakam II was also marked by a new attempt by the Normans to land in Spain in 355 (966) [cf. al-Maqrīzī].
al-Hakam II soon felt himself growing old and his principal care became the maintenance of the succession in direct line in the Umayyad dynasty. He had only one son, still a youth, Ḥājjam, and he had him recognised as heir presumptive (wali al-ʿād). He died soon afterwards on the 7th Dārūd 366 (Oct. 1, 976).

The reign of Ḥājjam al-Muʿayyad bi ʿĪlāh, the third Umayyad caliph of Spain, is the period of the establishment of the hereditary dictatorship of the ʿĀmirids and their effective seizure of civil and military power, the sovereign himself being relegated to his palace and deprived of all political initiative. The circumstances under which this new state of affairs was brought about after the death of al-Hakam II are very complicated but quite well known. A detailed account, which need not be repeated here, is given under al-Manṣūr b. Abāʾīn b. Muḥammad. We would only recall that, while in theory preserving for the young caliph the exercise of sovereign power, the famous Ḥājjam, whose ambition knew no bounds, does not ever seem to have really thought of dethroning him in order to take his place. All official measures were taken in the name of Ḥājjam II, who never seems to have shown any inclination to resist the ʿĀmirid control of his lands. It is really only with the disappearance of al-Manṣūr that the weakening of the Umayyad caliphate begins.

Al-Manṣūr in the name and on the purely nominal behalf of Ḥājjam II continued the policy of the caliphs ʿAbd al-Raḥmān III and al-Hakam II, not without, however, giving it the stamp of his powerful personality; but the era of peace and glory which al-Nāṣir had begun continued undiminished throughout the dictatorship of al-Manṣūr. The influence of the Arab aristocracy and of the Slav party was soon completely destroyed. The army was reorganised with the help of mercenaries recruited outside the Muslim lands of Spain, in northern Africa and in the Christian kingdoms of the north of the Peninsula. In the western parts of Barbary, al-Manṣūr established a kind of Umayyad protectorate so that African expenses became less heavy in the caliph's budget. The Ḥājjam was a successful general, the worst enemy of the Christian kingdoms, against which he undertook an expedition almost every year to preserve his personal prestige. Among these expeditions we may mention that of 374 (985) against Catalonia: Count Borrel was defeated and Barcelona taken. Three years later, he turned against Leon and its ruler Bermudo II who had broken a treaty made with Cordova: Coimbra, Leon and Zamora were taken. Al-Manṣūr strove to invest himself with glory in the famous campaign against Galicia in the course of which on 2nd Shaʿbān 387 (Aug. 10, 997), he took Santiago da Compostella (Arab. Shant Yūthīl; q.v.). In 392 (1002) he led his troops against Castile, took Canales and San Millán de la Cogolla. On his return from this victorious campaign he died at Medina del Cid (Madinat Salīm; q.v.) in the same year.

3. The Decline and Fall of the Umayyad Caliphate.

On the death of al-Maṣūr, his son ʿAbd al-Malik, who had already distinguished himself in Africa a few years before, succeeded him as Ḥājjam and was installed by the caliph Ḥājjam II. During the six years in which he held the power, down to 399 (1008), Muslim Spain continued to prosper as regards peace at home. He reinforced the caliph's army with new contingents, recruited mainly in Africa, and undertook several expeditions against the kingdoms of the north. In 393 (1005) he conducted a series of raids against Catalonia, in 395 (1005) against Galicia, in 396 (1006) against Pampiluna, in 397 (1007) against the Castilians whom he defeated at Churias. On the conclusion of this last successful campaign, he had himself given the honorific title of al-Muṣaffar bi ʿĪlāh. In spite of the sullen opposition that was felt in Cordova against ʿAmīr control and several plots, which were, however, quickly thwarted, ʿAbd al-Malik al-Muṣaffar secured the Umayyad caliphate a few more years of existence, abnormal no doubt but free from serious danger at home or abroad. But the second ʿAmīr bi Ḥājjam died soon, poisoned, it is said, at the instigation of his brother ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, who succeeded him, again with the approval of the weak caliph Ḥājjam II.

This ʿAbd al-Raḥmān was the son of al-Maṣūr by his marriage with a Christian princess, daughter of King Sancho of Navarre. The new Ḥājjam was therefore everywhere known as Sanchuelo, little Sancho. Not long after he had assumed control, he made himself singularly detested by the Cordovan population by breaking the restraint which his father and brother had always prudently observed. Strong in the support, which he thought he could always rely on, of the Berber soldiery, he was seized with unbounded ambition and meditated succeeding Ḥājjam II with the title of caliph. The monarch was sufficiently cowed to receive the request favourably and by an edict of 399 (1008) the Ḥājjam was proclaimed heir-presumptive to the Cordovan throne. This proclamation roused the country generally against the ʿAmīrids and the party of the disaffected, singularly increased by this unexpected news and led by the Umayyad princes cut off from the throne, took advantage of the departure of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Ṭamir on an expedition against Galicia to let loose a rebellion in the capital, seize the palace of the caliph and force him to abdicate in favour of a great-grandson of al-Nāṣir, Muḥammad b. Ḥājjam b. ʿAbd al-Dżahhār, who was proclaimed with the honorific title of al-Mahdi in 399 (1008). The new sovereign cleared out and roused to the ground the ʿAmīrids palace al-Madinat al-Zāhirah [q.v.]; a few days later, Sanchuelo, hurrying back to Cordova, was arrested some distance from the capital at the same time as his faithful ally, the Count of Carrion, and executed.

From this time and down to the fall of the caliphate, which was not far distant, civil war reigned in Cordova and the caliphate. The Berber element augmented by the Ṣanḥaḥjids contingents from Ifriqiya, recruited by the ʿAmīrids, played a more and more disastrous part in the troubles that followed. Al-Mahdi, instead of conciliating the chiefs of these mercenaries, alienated them very soon by his brusqueness, the contempt which he
Genealogical Table of the Umayyads of Spain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Higham</th>
<th>Mu'awiya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i.)</td>
<td>'Abd al-Rahmān I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii.)</td>
<td>Hishām I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii.)</td>
<td>al-Hakam I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv.)</td>
<td>'Abd al-Rahmān II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v.)</td>
<td>Muḥammad I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi.)</td>
<td>al-Mu'tamid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vii.)</td>
<td>'Abd Allāh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(viii.)</td>
<td>Muḥammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ix.)</td>
<td>'Abd al-Rahmān III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x.)</td>
<td>Ubayd Allāh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xi.)</td>
<td>'Abd al-Rahmān IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xii.)</td>
<td>Muḥammad III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

was installed in the caliph's palace by the Ṣanḥādja chief Zāwi b. Zīr.

Al-Mahdi did not consider himself beaten. With the help of Wādī and the Counts Raymond of Barcelona and Ermengard of Urgel, he attacked Sulaiman al-Mustā'in and his Berber followers near Cordova, at 'Aṣbah al-Bākār (near Castillo del Viver, to the north of Cordova), routed them and returned victorious to the capital, which was plundered by the Catalans. But the Berbers reassembled, seized the whole country between the Mediterranean and the Guadalquivir and harassed Cordova and the country round. In face of this, the Cordovans soon attributed to their sovereign Al-Mahdi, whose incapacity became more and more evident, the blame and responsibility for the evils that had befallen them. A conspiracy was hatched, Al-Mahdi slain and Hīshām II replaced on the throne (Uḫu 'l-Hiddijja 400 = July 1010).

Hīshām's first care after his second accession was to appoint Wādī first minister and make peace with the Berbers. The latter refused to come to terms and resumed their blockade of Cordova. This situation continued down to 1013; and the Arab historians have left us detailed accounts: cabals in Cordova, periods of hope, timid sorties against the besiegers. In the end, the Cordovans had to capitulate and the Berbers forced them to renew their oath of fealty to Sulaiman al-Mustā'in.

The latter appointed Berbers to the offices of ḥājjis and visiers. The people of Cordova were subjected to a régime of vexations without precedent. The last freed "Slaves" of the Amiridīs went to join their relations in the east of the Peninsula. The Cordovans then agreed to entrust their destinies to an ambitious 'Alī, the governor of Ceuta.
what exactly was the end of his ignorious career.
In any case, the beginning of the 8th century saw the united political state of the Umayyads gradually breaking up and the moment was not far distant when all the provinces of Muslim Spain were to proclaim their independence under a Spanish, Slav or Berber chief and form the numerous little kingdoms of the muluk al-fawā'id. As to Cordova, it was soon to become the centre of a kind of little republic, very soon transformed with the Drahwasid [q.v.] into a principality.
In any case, a few decades sufficed to destroy completely the solid edifice which the great Umayyad princes had built up, among whom the great figure of 'Abd al-Rahman III al-Násir, one of the greatest sovereigns of the middle ages and of the Muslim world, is the dominating figure.

Bibliography: A. Arabic sources.
The history of the Umayyads of Spain has been the subject of numerous works in Spain itself, during the period of the dynasty and later also. Unfortunately not all these chronicles have survived; the most important were those of al-Râzî and Ibn Halyan. Ahmad b. Muhammåd al-Râzî, who lived in the first half of the fourth (tenth) century, wrote a history of the rulers of Muslim Spain (Akhbâr Muluk al-Andalus) which was to be the main source for later writers. Among contemporary histories, which still survive, we may mention the following in chronological order: the anonymous chronicle entitled Akhbar mulk al-andalus (ed. and transl. into Spanish by E. Lafuente y Alcántara, Madrid 1867, under the title Akbar, machinma, Cronica onimina del siglo XI); it is a vivid and colourful chronicle and full of information which seems to be free from legendary matter of the history of Muslim Spain to the reign of 'Abd al-Rahman III; the Kitâb Hishâb al-Andalus of the Cordovan Ibn al-Khâliya, d. in 367 (977), which covers the history of the Muslims in Spain down to the reign of al-Nâṣir. It has on several occasions been edited and in parts translated, and more recently in full by J. Ribera, Madrid 1926. Of the monumental work of the great historian Hâlyan b. Khâlah Ibn Hâlyân, who died in 406 (1016), entitled Mu'athâr fî 'Tarikh al-Andalus and al-Ma'tin, there only survives the manuscript of one volume in the Bodleian dealing with the reign of the amir 'Abd Allah (ed. Melchor M. Antuña, Textes Arabes relatifs à l'histoire de l'Occident musulman, ii., Paris 1912) and the copy of a manuscript from Constantinople (in the Library of the Academy of Madrid) covering a portion of the reign of al-Hakam II. Considerable extracts have fortunately been preserved by later writers, notably Ibn Bassâm in his Dakhkhana. We may also mention as indirect sources, written in Spain itself, the history of the kâdis of Cordova (ed. and transl. J. Ribera, Historia de los Jueces de Cordoba, Madrid 1914) and the works of the Spanish biographical writers which have been published by F. Codera and J. Ribera in the Biblioteca arabico-hispana, 10 vol., Madrid and Saragossa 1885-1895.

But the fullest sources for the history of the Umayyads are undoubtedly two compositions of comparatively late date, one of the 11th century by Ibn 'Idhâr al-Marrakushi, the other of the 12th by al-Ma'âkṣari. The first is called Al-Bayân al-ma'âkhrî fi 'Alâhâr Muluk al-Andalus wa't-Ma'âkhrî; of three volumes now known, two deal with Spain; the first covers the history of the Peninsula from the conquest to the death of the 'âlid al-Mansûr b. Abî 'Amîr; as Dozy, its editor, has shown, this volume reproduces almost in entirety the Spanish part of the work of a Cordovan annalist of the tenth century, Arib b. Sa'd, who continued down to his time the chronicle of 'Alârî (ed. Dozy, Histoire de l'Afrique et de l'Espagne instituée al-Bayân mawgûl, Leyden 1848-1851; transl. into French by E. Fagnan, Algiers 1901; partly translated into Spanish by Fernández González, Granada 1862); the next volume which deals with the history of the fall of the Umayyad caliphate from the time of the 'Amirid 'Abd al-Malik and that of the muluk al-fawâ'id was discovered and published by E. Lévi-Provençal (Textes arabes relatifs à l'histoire de l'Occident musulman, ii., Paris 1930). The other work no less valuable for the history of the Umayyads is the Nâfâ' al-Ṭadh al-Maghribi al-Ma'âkṣari. The first half was published by Dozy, Dugat, Krehl and Wright under the title Analecires sur l'histoire et la littérature des Arabes d'Espagne, Leyden 1855-1861 (also at Bulak 1879 a.f. and Cairo). An English adaptation was made by F. de Gayangos, The History of the Muhammadan Dynasties in Spain, London 1840-1843. Ibn Khâlidân devotes a part of his Kitâb al-Thar to the history of the Umayyads of Spain (Cairo ed., vol. iv., p. 116-155); as do the earlier historians Ibn al-Ahmar in his Khulîl (transl. by F. Fagnan, Annales du Maghreb et de l'Espagne, Algiers 1901) and al-Nuwarî, author of the Kitâb Nikhâyât al-ʿArab (History of Spain, ed. with Spanish translation by M. Gaspar Reino, Granada 1917-1919).

This brief sketch of the Arabic sources for Umayyad history may be completed by consulting the valuable but now somewhat out of date work of F. Pons Boiguès, Ensayo bio-bibliográfico sobre los historiadores y geógrafos árabe-españoles, Madrid 1898, and the brilliant survey by L. Barru-Diligó, Recherches sur l'histoire politique du royaume arabe, Tours 1921, p. 55-78.

UMM AL-KITĀB, the original copy of the Book with Allah in heaven, from which the revelations of the Kur`ān come and from which Allah "abrogates and confirms what He pleases." (Sūra xii. 39). This original copy, called Ḥijāb al-Kitāb in Ḥadīth (e.g. Tabaqat, Tafsīr, xxv, 26), is according to Sūra lxxv. 21 written in a "carefully preserved table" (fī laqm muḥšīfat); cf. Enoch 93, 1; Book of Jubilees 5, 13, 16, 21, 32-34. In the Medina period Umm al-Kitāb is used in another sense: according to Sūra ii. 5. The book revealed by Allah to Muhammad, i.e. the Kur`ān, consists of verses "clearly expressed" (īyād maṣḥūlatu) and of "others ambiguous" (muṣbāḥahār); only the first however constitute the Umm al-Kitāb. In keeping with this expression post-Kur`ānic linguistic usage calls the Fātihā, as containing the essential content of the Book, Umm al-Kitāb or Umm al-Kur`ān.

**Bibliography:** Lane, Lexicon, s. v. Umm; Horovitz, *Keramische Untersuchungen, Berlin-Leipzig* 1926, p. 65. (J. Horovitz)

**UMM KULTHUM, daughter of Muḥammad. Tradition knows even less of her than of her sister Rukayya and this little consists mainly of a repetition of what is told of the latter. Umm Kulthum is said to have married a son of Abī Lahab but to have been divorced by him by his father’s orders before the marriage was consummated; what this means is discussed in the article Rukayya. The view there expressed that Umm Kulthum was really married to a son of Abī Lahab is supported by the usual and literal interpretation of her kumayr (her real name is nowhere recorded). That at a later date efforts should have made to suppress all record of such a grandson of the Prophet is only natural. Otherwise we are only told of her that her brother-in-law Quthmān mounted her after Rukayya’s death during the Badr campaign. She died in Shab’ān of the year 9 without having borne a son to him.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Hīṣam, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 121; Ibn Sa’d, viii. p. 25; Taḥārī, ed. de Goeje, ill. 2302; H. Lammens, *Fatima et les Filles de Mahomet, 1912*, p. 3 sqq. (FR. BULI)

**UMM AL-WALAD (A.), a slave-girl who has borne her master a child.**

1. The master’s right to take his slave-girls as concubines was recognised by Muhammad in continuation of a general practice of Arab paganism. In regard to the position of the children of such unions a change of view had been perceptible among the Arabs in the period just before the coming of Islam. In place of the previous unrestrictedness in marriage and concubinage a certain degree of regulation had grown up, and a higher value began to be attached to marriage with free women and to good birth on the mother’s side also; corresponding to this however, the position of the children of slaves became worse; they were as a rule called only after their mother and not after their father, and only received their freedom when expressly recognised by their father (this condition probably always held) and even then were not fully privileged; the slave-girl, it was argued, must not give birth to her future master as the son would reveal the qualities of a slave like his mother. The position of such a slave was not at all a privileged one. Even her designation umm al-walad ("mother of children") is in contrast to umm al-banīn ("mother of sons") as the name for a free woman. Although the personal position of a woman taken in war was hardly different from that of a slave, yet we frequently find a marriage in this case instead of concubinage, and her sons were considered free men, although they were as a rule only called after their mother and not regarded as having full privileges; but an endeavour was often made to remove even this stain due to the irregularity of the union by a new regular marriage.

This state of affairs was continued under Islam without any essential change at first. The Kur`ān permits concubinage with a man’s own slaves in several passages dealing with the limits of lawful sexual intercourse as against *ādib (vs. 3, 28 sq.; xxii. 6; lxv. 30, all Meccan; cf. the references in Nöldeke-Schurmann, *Gesch. der Rel. i.*); the passage specially addressed to the Prophet (xxiii. 49-51) expressly describes them as prisoners of war. In Islam therefore there was no distinction in theory between the slave-girl and the concubine taken in war, which is not surprising after the above remarks; in practice the old procedure towards a woman taken in war remained in operation (cf. e.g. Wellhausen, *Vehdicti*, p. 178; do., in *N.G.W. Götze*, 1893, p. 436; although not always historical in the particular case, yet typical). In the Kur`ān the position of the umm al-walad is not defined and it is certain that the Prophet issued no decree altering her position or that of her children. That he is said to have set free the slave-girl Māriya, when she had borne him his son Ūthmān (cf. Ibn Sa’d, viii. 155, 151 cf. also 156, 4) should not in any case be taken as a general rule; this episode is not at all prominent in the material of tradition relating to the umm al-walad. The story that the Prophet recognised Māriya’s son only after serious consideration (ibid., p. 154 sq.) might be possible as regards substance but is incredible in the form in which it is given.

3. That an umm al-walad should become free ipso facto on the death of her master, and no longer liable to be sold (or given) was first ordained by the caliph ‘Umar (cf. below). The starting point for this ordinance must be found in a hadith transmitted by Abī Dawd (‘Abī Bakr b. ‘Abī Bakr) and Ibn Ḥanbal (vi. 360) the genuineness of which is thereby rendered certain (a later recasting: *Kana al-ummard*, vi. 52). According to this, a woman, who had been sold in the heathen period by her uncle as a slave had borne her master a son and now on the death of her master was to be sold again to pay his debts, lamented her sad lot to the Prophet; the latter ordered the administrator of the estate to manumit the woman and gave him a slave in compensation. Ibn Ḥanbal observes on this case with justice that the different possible interpretations of the Prophet’s treatment of the case gave rise to later iḥkāfīs; there is
no doubt that it was a decision for this one case only. A tradition given by al-Bukhari (97b, bkb 8; and several other passages) and al-Taba'awi (Shahr Mu'addam 'Abbās, ii. 66) deals with a dispute over the paternity of a child of a slave-woman; Sa'd b. Aish Wāqīṣ claimed it as the illegitimate child of his dead brother 'Uthā in accordance with the latter's last will and 'Abd, the son of Zayd, claimed it as the legitimate child of his deceased father by his grandmother. In spite of the child's resemblance to 'Uthā, the Prophet decided on the principle of al-umm al-walad it 1-l-fāṣākh ("the child belongs to the legitimate head"). In view of the difficulties of interpretation raised by this hadīth (cf. the commentaries, especially al-A'īnī, on al-Bukhari) it might be in the main genuine (the secondary res- form which al-Taba'awi [ii. 67] also gives is certainly not genuine); in any case there is no mention of the manumission of the slave-woman here.

4. The above-mentioned ordinance of 'Umar's is certain from numerous accounts, although the details vary and are embelished with legends (cf. especially Kaus, iv. 5118, 5122, 5124; al-Sa'ūnī, Sahab al-Sa'ūnī, Kitāb al-Buya', on No. 11). Setting aside the settlement of the question whether it was preceded by another divergent ruling (Kaus, iv. 5118), the story that 'Umar ordered the umm al-walad to be free from the birth of her child (al-Khwārizmī, Dhā'im Mu'addam al-lilm al-am'ām, ii. 166; also Kaus, v. 5116) must be regarded as a product of the later dispute over this question. For 'Umar's decree in no way made a final settlement; it gave trouble under 'Uthmān (Kaus, iv. 5122), Ali again diverged from it (ibid., p. 5129-5131). Ibn 'Abbās is specially mentioned as another opponent of 'Umar's view among the Companions of the Prophet. In the dispute that now arose between the different opinions, the attempt was made on the one side to ascribe 'Umar's decision to the Prophet (ibid., p. 5115, 5117) and to ascribe the same opinion even to 'Ali and Ibn 'Abbās ('Ali: ibid., p. 5132; Ibn 'Abbās: ibid., p. 5039-5041; Ibn Hanbal, i. 305; Ibn 'Abbās from the Prophet: al-Irisānī, p. 18, 38; Ibn Mādīja, Itb, bkb 2; Ibn Sa'd, vili. 155; Ibn Hanbal, i. 317), on the other hand, it was insisted, sometimes quite polemically, that the Prophet approved the sale of the umm al-walad (Ibn Mādīja, ibid.; Ibn Hanbal, iii. 321; al-Yātānī, No. 2200; Kaus, iv. 5125, 5127); against this, evidence was quoted to show that the Companions of the Prophet gave approval to 'Umar's ordinance (Abū Dāwūd, Itb, bkb 8; al-'Aīnī giving al-Bukhārī as authority, Itb, bkb 8). But these were not the only two theses put forward: another view ascribed to 'Umar has already been mentioned (some traditions make the Prophet utter a corresponding opinion but one easily distorted to mean something else: Ibn Mādīja, Itb, bkb 2; Ibn Sa'd, vili. 155; both transmitted through Ibn 'Abbās; also Kaus, iv. 5128); 'Ali is credited with having said: "If the master, he can set free his umm al-walad and consider her manumission as her bridal gift" (Kaus, iv. 5133) and Ibn Mas'ūd held the view that the umm al-walad should be manumitted at the expense of the slave of the estate falling to her child (presumed free) (al-'Aīnī, ibid.), both variants of the fundamental thesis. — From the point of view of the criticism of Muslim Tradition, none of these hadīths is impeachable with the exception of the one quoted above in paragraph 5, which itself is not free from ambiguity, so that it is usually preferred simply to quote 'Umar and his ra'y as authority for the view that later prevailed.

5. 'Ali (on al-Bukhari, Itb, bkb 8 at the end) is therefore able to give a list of seven different expressions of opinion on the umm al-walad in addition to 'Umar's from the period of the earliest jurists before the origin of the muqābātī: 1. The master may release her for money (i.e. as mawāba); 2. she may be sold without restriction; 3. the master may sell her at any time during his life-time and when he dies she becomes free (she is thus regarded as mawāba; al-Shāhī is said to have held this view); 4. she may be sold to a debt due by the estate; 5. she may be sold, but if her child is alive at the death of her master and her master, she is manumitted at the expense of any share he may have in the estate and inherits with him; 6. she can only be sold on condition she is set free; 7. even if she is contumacious and runs away, she cannot be sold, but only if she is immoral or becomes an unbeliever (according to al-Mas'ūdī al-Shāhī could not come to a decision on this point). But even by this time the thesis that the umm al-walad could not be sold but became free on the death of her master, had won most supporters, among whom al-Hāshim al-Baṣīrī, 'Abd al-Askālī, al-Qāsim al-Imām al-Qāsimī (cf. on him al-Khwārizmī, op. cit., ii. 167; al-'Abābī, p. 71, 102) and others are specially mentioned. Particular questions which now arise for the first time, are referred back to other authorities, such as the decision No. 5 to Ibn Maṣ'ūd, Ibn 'Abbās and Ibn al-Zahār (ibid.), decision No. 6 to 'Umar (ibid.; also Kaus, iv. 5123), other details also to Ibn 'Abbās (Mawāba, vulgata, Itb, bkb 8; rīzā'a of al-Shāhīn, Kiti' al-Buya'; Rāb Bāf Umūmahā at-Asalād, al-Khwārizmī, ibid.; ibid.). 6. In the time of the formation of the muqābātī the view that the umm al-walad cannot be sold is held by Abū Hanīfa with Abū Yazīr, Zufar, al-Shāhīn and their colleagues, al-Awārī, al-Thawrī, al-Hāshim b. Sa'id, al-Awārī b. Sa'id, Malik (Mawāba, loc. cit.; Mūsawwara, ii. 25) and his colleagues, Abū Thawr and Ibn Hanbal. This is also the final opinion of al-Shāhī and therefore that of his colleagues and pupils, while he, according to a reliable tradition, had previously sanctioned the sale of the umm al-walad (al-'Aīnī on the authority of al-Bukhārī, Itb, bkb 8; al-Nawawī, Majmū'a, ix. 2435; cf. also above, section 5); the liberation of the umm al-walad was deduced therefrom in three ways (al-Nawawī, ibid.) so that in all we have four different opinions attributed to al-Shāhī (al-Shawkānī, Nīl al-Anwārī, Kiti' al-Buya'; Bāb Umūmahā al-Walad, on No. 7). According to Dāwūd also, and the Zāhirī, the Shī'ī Imāms and the Twelver-Imāms (here however sometimes with the qualification that she becomes free if she was still in the possession of her master at his death and her child is alive) and the Mu'tazilīs (al-Shawkānī, op. cit.), she can be sold. Although the four muqābātī in the end all declared that the umm al-walad could not be sold, the existence of idjma on this point is nevertheless sometimes doubted (al-Sa'ūnī, op. cit., on No. 12; al-Shawkānī, op. cit.), sometimes however also definitely asserted (al-Nawawī, op. cit.). The verdict of a ḫāṣī who gave a decision opposed to this teaching is not absolutely without support (cf. e.g. Nawawī, op. cit. etc.).
7. In order to prevent the birth of a child the practice of 'zul' was frequent in intercourse with slave-girls, and it is therefore often discussed in connection with the name umm al-Walad. The most important of the references in tradition on this subject have been collected by Wensinck, *Handbook of Early Muhammadan Tradition*, s.v. "Intercourse"; here it is sufficient to say that 'zul' was considered to be permitted with a slave-girl. — To prevent a slave-girl becoming umm al-Walad the master had also the possibility of not acknowledging the paternity of her child; this goes back to a similar usage in the pagan period (cf. above, sect. 1). While this was never so rigidly regulated as the case of disputing the paternity of a wife's child (cf. thereon Wensinck, *op. cit.*. s.v. Child and the article *t*ālā), nevertheless an effort was made to restrict the right of disputing the paternity in the case of the umm al-Walad also. Hadiths are quoted from 'Umar and Ibn 'Umar to the effect that no one who has intercourse with a slave-girl has the right to dispute the paternity of her child, even if he says he used 'zul' or if there is another paternity possible. The Malikis and the Shafis agree with this. The Hanafis on the other hand hold the view that the paternity of the child and the character of the slave as umm al-Walad in this case depends entirely on an acknowledgment by the master. For this they cite traditions to the effect that Ibn 'Abbas and Zaid b. Thabit had disputed the paternity of children of their slave-women on the ground that they had used 'zul'. This question is discussed by al-Tahawi (*op. cit.*, p. 66, 68) and the traditions cited. — That the child borne by a slave to her master (on the assumption that his paternity is established) is free, has always been recognised in Islam without any difference of opinion and in the discussion of the position of the umm al-Walad it is regarded as a presumption and argument for her not being sold. The deduction is natural that the father's recognition of children born in concubinage (cf. above, section 1) must as a rule have been regarded as a matter of course in the days just before Islam: the survival of considerable possibility of disputing paternity with regard to a concubine seems to have actually been conceded primarily by the considerable improvement in the position of the umm al-Walad under Islam at the expense of her master.

8. The details of the teaching of the 8th about the umm al-Walad are as follows. Every, even non-Muslim, slave-girl who has borne her master (even after his death) a child is considered umm al-Walad; on the death of her master she becomes ṣafīa in free (so that she can neither be sold to pay debts on the estate [cf. however below] nor can she be included in the third of the estate set aside for legacies); a legacy set aside by her master in her favour is therefore valid, as tradition even from 'Umar's time shows (al-Dhahiri, *Waqiyāt*, bāb 27); all legitimate and illegitimate children she has after becoming pregnant by her master are likewise free — in so far as they are not already free as children of her master. Even in the case of a stillborn child, the mother becomes umm al-Walad; opinions differ regarding a miscarriage. There is also a difference of opinion in the case where a man marries a foreign slave, makes her pregnant, and then sells her, as well as in the case where a man makes his son's slave pregnant. From the umm al-Walad's expectancy of reversion to free-

...

UMMA, the Qur’ānic word for people, community, is not to be derived from the Arabic root āmm, but to be explained as a loanword from the Hebrew (ʿamām) or Aramaic (ʿumāmā). It has therefore no direct connection with the homonyms also found in the Qur’ān, which mean a period (Ṣūra xi. 17; xii. 45) and descent (Ṣūra xliii. 11, 12). Perhaps the loanword found its way into Arabic as a comparatively early period (see Horovitz’s citation of the Saʿīf inscription, ill. 407). In any case the word was used up by Muḥammad and henceforth becomes a specifically Islamic term.

The passages in the Qur’ān, in which the word umma (plur. umaim) occurs are so varied that its meaning cannot be rigidly defined. This much however seems to be certain, that it always refers to ethnical, linguistic or religious bodies of people who are the objects of the divine plan of salvation. Even in passages like Ṣūra vili. 164 and xviii. 22, where umma is used in a colourless fashion, there is a hint of this significance. The term is in isolated cases applied to the Djiun (Ṣūra, vili. 36; xii. 24; xvi. 17), indeed to all living creatures (Ṣūra vi. 38) but always with the implication that these creatures are to be included in the divine scheme of salvation and are liable to judgment. Umma is exceptionally applied in one passage (Ṣūra xliii. 112) to an individual, Abraham. Here the term either has the meaning of ittam (so the Arab lexicographers), or Abraham is so called in his capacity as head of the community founded by him (Horovitz), by a use of the part for the whole. Otherwise umma always refers to whole groups or at least to groups within large communities.

God has sent to each umma a messenger (Ṣūra vi. 42, 48; xiii. 29; xvii. 35, 65; xviili. 46; xix. 117; xlii. 5) or admonisher (Ṣūra xxxv. 22, 40) to guide them on the right path. But like Muḥammad, these messengers of God have often been attacked and called liars (Ṣūra xliii. 46; xix. 117; xlii. 5). They will therefore appear on the day of judgment as witnesses against them (Ṣūra ix. 45; xvi. 86, 91; xxvii. 75; cf. ii. 157). For each umma is brought to judgment (Ṣūra xlii. 105; vili. 32; x. 50; xv. 5; xixi. 45; xvili. 85; xlii. 27). In contrast to those who could not be converted, however the individual umma however the appeal of God’s messenger and thus came on to the right path (Ṣūra xviili. 35). This is particularly true of the ahī al-kītāb. The companies of the righteous among the ahī al-kītāb are also called ummī (Ṣūra lii. 109 sqq.; v. 70; vili. 159; cf. ii. 128, 135; vili. 167, 180; xii. 50). They are relatively small groups within larger communities.

Muḥammad frequently discusses the question why mankind consists of a plurality of ummāt and has not remained a unit. He sees the ultimate reason for this in God’s inscrutable decree. *Men were a single umma. Then they became disunited. The word had not gone out from thy Lord, the matter would have been decided between them, about which they disagreed* (Ṣūra x. 20; cf. v. 53; xi. 120; xvi. 95; xiii. 6). Sometimes he traces this to the malevolence of mankind (Ṣūra ii. 209; xxi. 92 sqq.; xxiii. 54 sqq.). In another passage it is traced to the division of the Israelites into 12 tribes (Ṣūra vii. 160; cf. 167). These rhetorical rather than logical utterances of Muḥammad are most likely to be taken as replies to objections raised by his opponents of the ahī al-kītāb. The Prophet would hardly have come to tackle this difficult problem of his own accord.

As regards Muḥammad’s umma in particular, we can trace a number of variations and changes in the meaning of the term. But the question is simpler here as we are dealing to some extent with a historical phenomenon.

In the first period of his prophetic activity Muḥammad regarded the Arabs in general or his Meccan countrymen as a closed umma. Josua, the earlier messengers and admonishers of God had been sent to the ummāt of the past (see above), so he had now been given the task of transmitting the divine message to the Arab umma which had hitherto been neglected, in order to show it the way to salvation. Like the earlier messengers (see above), he also was fiercely attacked by his umma and accused of lying. After he had finally broken off relations with the pagan Meccans and migrated with his followers to Madīnā, he created a new community there. He went beyond the circle of Muslims proper and included those citizens of Madīnā who had not yet heeded his religious appeal in one political combination. The constitution of the community of Madīnā, in which this unification was laid down in writing, expressly states that the citizens of the town, including the Jews, formed an umma (Ibn Ḥishām, p. 341, 8 sqq.; 342, 19 sqq.). The predominantly political character of this new umma was however only a makeshift. As soon as Muḥammad felt himself firmly established and had successfully attacked the pagan Meccans, he was able to exclude from his politico-religious community the Madīnës (especially the Jews) who had not yet adopted his religion. As time went on, his umma came more and more to consist only of his proper followers, the Muslims. In contrast to the ahī al-kītāb, with whom he had previously been in alliance, he now described the Muslims as an umma and laid stress on their religious and ethical qualities (Ṣūra iii. 100, 106). His final breaking away from the ahī al-kītāb had as a result that he turned more and more to the Meccans and their centre of worship, the Kāba (cf. in this connection Ṣūra i. 119 sqq., esp. 122, and Ṣūra xxii. 35, 66). He only apparently resumed his original idea of an umma embracing all the Arabs. In reality the final result was fundamentally different from the starting-point. The Arab umma, which Muḥammad had originally taken for granted, was only created by him after much hard work. It if at first represented a community of Arabs, this was more or less a secondary phenomenon. The essential
thing was the religious foundation on which it was based. The umma of the Arabs was transformed into an umma of the Muslims. It is no wonder then that it spread very soon after Muhammad's death beyond the bounds of Arabia and in course of time brought together very different stocks and nations to form a higher unit.


(R. Paret)

**UMMI, an epithet of Muhammad in the Qur'an, connected in some way with the word umma [q. v.]. It does not seem however to be a direct derivative, as it only appears after the Hijira and has a different meaning from umma, which is already common in the period before the Hijira. In Sura iii. 19, Muhammad invites the abl al-kibbat and the ummu to adopt Islam (ṣal ilight ṣumari ʿalākātina ʿalā ḫiyātina wa ʿummiyya...). Ummiyyin here means "heathen", as it does in the earlier Sura, verse 69, where the word is put with this meaning into the mouths of the abl al-kibbat. The latter passage makes it probable that ummi or ummiyya is a word coined by the abl al-kibbat (probably the Jews especially) to describe the heathen. This explanation is all the more probable since Horovitz has shown that it has an equivalent in the Hebrew ummaḥ kāʾ-ṣām (Greek ὑμματικός). In Sura viii. 9 there is an allusion to God having sent an apostle to the ummiyyin. As Muhammad here is unmistakably called an apostle from the heathen and for the heathen, it is natural to assume that he also refers to himself as the heathen prophet. In the words al-nabi al-ummi (Sura vili. 156, 158) and presents himself "to the Jews and the Christians as the mashiḥ ummaḥ kāʾ-ṣām" (Horovitz; cf. Sura viii. 156; "whose name they find written in their Tawrat and the Inqilāb"). What further shades of meaning Muhammad himself gave to this epithet is however very difficult to ascertain. If we compare the words of Sura viii. 156 with the praise which Muhammad gives in Sura iii. 106, 106 to his umma we cannot help thinking that he might possibly also have been making a play on the etymology ummaḥ < umma. In any case, he did not in the least consider the epithet al-nabi al-ummi as derogatory. Frants Buhl has recently again put forward the thesis that ummi means not "heathen" (Ṣamadiyy) but "untaught" (Ijad). In spite of the fact that this could very well fit the text of Sura ii. 73, there is on the whole more against than for it. Ummiyya in Sura ii. 73 can, if necessary, no doubt be translated "heathen", if one does not want to try something else (see Horovitz). On the other hand, the same word in Sura iii. 69 cannot from the context possibly be translated "untaught", even if we really understand the heathen by it. Ummi would also on etymological grounds be difficult to

explain as "layman" for neither the Arabic umma nor the Hebrew umma nor the Aramaic ummiyya means people in the sense of the laity. Finally Buhl's objection to the Prophet calling himself a "heathen prophet" loses weight when we remember that Muhammad was perhaps not quite clear about the full significance of the Jewish conception of "heathen" and that he, as above indicated, may have given it a new significance.

The application of the term ummi to Muhammad is often quoted as evidence that he could not read or write. In reality the expression has no bearing on the question. For the text of Sura ii. 73 which gives rise to this assumption does not charge the ummiyyin with ignorance of reading and writing, but with a deficient knowledge of the holy scriptures.


(R. Paret)

**UMRA, the little pilgrimage**, i. The ceremonies of the (Muslim) umra. The umra, like the hajj [q. v.], can only be performed in a state of ritual purity (ṣumari [q. v.]). On assuming the ihram, the pilgrim (mutamam) must make up his mind whether he is going to perform the umra by itself or in combination with the hajj and express his intention in an appropriate siya [q. v.]. If he combines the umra with the hajj [see below] he can assume the ṣumari for both pilgrimages at once; in the other case the ṣumari must be specially assumed for the umra in the consecrated area (kibla) outside of the haram of Mecca. This holds also for native Mecceans who, when they are going to perform the hajj, can assume the ṣumari within Mecca. Three places are preferred for the assumption of the ṣumari for the umra: Džyriya, Ḥuṣāibya and especially Ṣumari Ṣuhrā. The latter place was therefore also known as al-Ummra. With the utterance of the ḥabbāba, [q. v.] formula, the actual ceremony of the pilgrimage begins. The mutamir goes to Mecca in order first of all to go around the Ka'ba [cf. tawaf]. He enters the mosque through the north door of the north-east side (Bayt al-Salitum), goes under the portal of the Banū Shālikh to the Black Stone built into the wall of the Ka'ba and, turning right, begins the sevenfold circumambulation of the Ka'ba, saying prayers all the while. The first three circumambulations are performed at a rapid pace (rasmal), the four last at an ordinary rate. After this is finished, in order to acquire a special blessing he presses himself against the part of the Ka'ba wall which lies between the Black Stone and the door of the Ka'ba. In conclusion he prays two rak'ās behind the Makam Ibrahim, drinks a draught of the holy Zamzam water and touches once again in farewell the Black Stone (these last ceremonies are however not considered absolutely necessary). The mutamir now leaves the mosque through the great al-Ṣaft door in order to perform the second essential part of the umra, the running between al-Ṣaft and al-Marwa [cf. the article ašya']. He goes to the hill of al-Ṣaft and utters a few prayers there. He then goes to the hill of al-Marwa, over
four hundred yards further north, past the northwest corner of the mosque. A short low-lying stretch at the east corner of the mosque is covered by a more rapid pace (hamal or khabas). Reaching al-Marwa, the mu'tamir again utters a prayer. He then returns the same way in the reverse direction and so on until he has covered the distance seven times and ends at al-Marwa. He has thus completed the ceremony of the 'umra, and has only to have his hair cut or be shaved by one of the barbers waiting there. If he is making the 'umra, he in combination with the hadjijj, he only has his hair trimmed and has the pilgrimage done on the 10th of the Hijri of the end of the hadjijj. 2. The History of the 'Umra and its relation to the Hadjijj. The ceremonies which make up the Muslim 'umra are undoubtedly for the most part taken over from the pre-Islamic period. They completely lack any close connection with the religion preached by Muhammad, except for the Muhammadian prayers used in them. The Prophet did not alter these practices but only assimilated them to his teaching. This he could all the more readily do as his original significance seems to have become but obscurely understood by his contemporaries. He allowed them to persist at all is probably less to be attributed to his personal reverence for them than to his political instinct which made him respect the traditions of his conservative fellow-countrymen.

On the parts played by the separate ceremonies of the Muslim 'umra in the pre-Islamic period see the articles 'Ibra'm, Sa'y and Tawaf. The Muslim 'umra as a group of ceremonies forming a single whole also goes back to a pre-Muhammadian institution. This is shown by the very fact that Muhammed refers to it by a name which in his time seems already to have become a special term and enables us to assume that the thing itself was well-known. This however does not mean that the separate parts of the pre-Islamic 'umra exactly corresponded to those of the Muslim 'umra. The two institutions as far as we can see, did not exactly coincide. It is however very difficult to make out in what the difference lay, as we do not even know the earliest form of the Muslim 'umra, much less that of the Dhikhrata. We have therefore to make up for the lack of authentic sources by deductions from material which is not absolutely above reproach.

The pre-Muhammadian 'umra probably consisted of ritual acts, which were performed in a state of inayt within Mecca and included the tawaf of the Ka'ba. On the other hand, the course between al-Safa and al-Marwa (sa'y) does not seem to have been included. This follows from the text of Sura ii. 153, which clearly distinguishes between hadjijj and 'umra on the one hand and the course between al-Safa and al-Marwa on the other and describes the performance of the latter in connection with the hadjijj or 'umra as irreproachable, indeed even meritorious, but still as a work of supererogation. Muhammed himself performed it in 632 following the tawaf and thus by his example gave a further stimulus to the incorporation of the sa'y into the Muslim 'umra. If the Muslim 'umra in this respect shows an accretion compared with that of the pre-Muhammadian period, it seems also to have lost something. For the 'umra in the Dhikhrata can hardly have consisted of the tawaf only. Probably an additional essential element in it was the sacrifice of animals bought for the special purpose, a custom which was later mainly confined to the hadjijj. Muhammed himself bought sacrificial animals to the unfortunate 'umra of al-Hudaybiya and a year later to the so-called 'Umar al-Ka'ab. As to the relation of the 'umra to the hadjijj, the very similarity of these two institutions has contributed to confuse them and to blend their distinguishing features. Their reciprocal fusion had already begun in the last years of the Prophet. Muhammed began the only hadjijj in which he took part as head of the Muslim community shortly before his death, by performing the tawaf and sa'y after his arrival in Mecca, ceremonies which did not originally form the beginning of the hadjijj but were elements of the Muslim 'umra. He then put off the 'ibram and said that the ceremonies so far performed formed an 'umra. When over 'Umar and others of those with him did not approve of putting off the 'ibram and did not follow him, this clearly shows how closely the ceremonies of the 'umra were associated with those of the hadjijj for them and that in their view these holy acts should be performed in one and the same 'ibram. If we reflect that the revelation announced on this occasion (Sura ii. 192) laid down a penance for using the hadjijj for the 'umra in this way and that Muhammed to some extent acknowledged himself guilty, then it is natural to suppose that Muhammed had only put off the 'ibram in order to be able to associate with his wives who were there and not with the object of keeping 'umra and hadjijj absolutely distinct (see Sounck Harrowje, Het Mekkaanse Feest, p. 83-102). In the case, Muhammed in the year 632 made the 'umra precede the performance of the hadjijj and thus put his approval on the combination of hadjijj and 'umra. This combination had a deeper cause: Muhammed on the one hand proclaimed Mecca with the Ka'ba as the centre of the worship of Islam and on the other took over the hadjijj, which originally had very little, if anything at all, to do with Mecca, into Islam. He had indeed every reason to bring the Muslim hadjijj into connection with the sanctuary of Mecca. The more he succeeded, however, the more the 'umra lost its raison d'être as a special pilgrimage to Mecca. It was therefore quite a natural development when the Muslim 'umra became more associated with the Muslim hadjijj and original elements of the 'umra were absorbed by the corresponding elements of the hadjijj, as was presumably the case with the sacrifices (see above). The 'umra and the hadjijj did not however absolutely combine into one. This was prevented by, amongst other things, the fact that Muhammed in the pilgrimage above mentioned drew a line of separation between the two by discarding the 'ibram.

In the consensus (ijma') of Muslim opinion, two ways of combining the 'umra with the hadjijj came to be recognised in course of time: tawatu'a and 'ibram. The former term was applied, following Sura ii. 192 (mar tawatu'a 3e 'l-'umra 3is 'l-hadjijj), to the way in which Muhammed had actually followed, namely combining 'umra and hadjijj with a break in the 'ibram. 'Umar threatened during his caliphate to punish its observance with the punishment of stoning and even under the early Omayyads it does not seem to have been usual. 'Ibra'm is the name given to the combination
of 'umra and ḥaḍḍā is without breaking the ṣafāra. In this the ṣafāra is assumed for the 'umra and the ḥaḍḍā at the same time. As in the Muslim ḥaḍḍā the ceremonies which constitute an 'umra are also performed, according to the prevailing view an 'umra is completely carried out when they have been performed, so that - if the ayāt of ṣafāra has been taken - the ḥaḍḍā is completed. Some authorities however demand that the ceremonies of the 'umra should be specially carried through. The ṣafāra must not be broken in any circumstances.

The 'umra, in spite of its partial absorption in the ḥaḍḍā, has however retained its independence, although only to a limited degree. When the ḥaḍḍā is performed alone in the ṣafāra, i.e. by itself (in contrast to tamattu'a and ṣafāra), the 'umra also must be performed separately. Pilgrims who come from outside to Mecca seem as a rule in this case to perform the 'umra after the completion of the ḥaḍḍā ceremonies so that they naturally have to assume the ṣafāra again. In the course of time this independent 'umra ceremony seems to have become gradually confined to such Muslims as were permanently or for a considerable time resident in Mecca or came there at a time other than that of the ḥaḍḍā. But it was just this local limitation of the independent 'umra that favoured the survival of traditions from the pre-Muhammadan period. If we therefore learn that the 'umra for centuries was celebrated as an independent ceremony, preferably in the month of Rajab, we can probably see in this a survival of pre-Islamic tradition: the 'umra in the time of Umayyad was presumably a ceremony observed annually in Rajab and therefore had nothing to do with the ḥaḍḍā, the pilgrimage in ibn 'l-Hīdhā (cf. also the tradition according to which 'Ukkaša had his hair cut in Rajab of the year 2 to make himself look like a pilgrim). As Muhammad could only prepare the way for the combination of the 'umra with the ḥaḍḍā but not complete it, the old tradition of performing it in Rajab survived for centuries later. It is only in comparatively modern times that Rajab seems to have lost its significance for the performance of the 'umra. The custom of the Meccans of journeying to the holy places of Mecca in Rajab perhaps broke it down. When 'umras are now performed in dissociation from the ḥaḍḍā (i.e. in ṣafāra), the nights of the months of the fast (Ramādān) are specially favoured for this purpose and especially the last ten which are connected with the ḥajjad al-ḥādīn.

3. The significance of the pre-Islamic and the Islamic 'umra. If the pre-Islamic 'umra was annually performed in Rajab and also if the calculation is correct which places Rajab originally in the spring, its similarity with the Jewish passover strikes one at once. The animals which are sacrificed at it were perhaps, as in the Jewish ceremony, originally first born (cf. Wellhausen, Rechts, p. 98 sq. ; W. Robertson Smith, *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites*, p. 397, 464). In Muhammad's time however, the original significance of the 'umra seems to have been practically forgotten and it no longer fell in the spring.

The Islamic 'umra is an expression of piety, mainly of a personal nature, especially if it is undertaken separately and not with the ḥaḍḍā, the ceremony observed annually by the Muslim community together. Probably this individual character is the result of the fact that it lost its independence in time and so far as it was not associated with the ḥaḍḍā constituted a work of supererogation. Before Islam the 'umra had probably a more collective character.

The question, answered differently by the different madhhabs, whether the Muslim is bound to the same degree to perform the 'umra as he is the ḥaḍḍā is of little significance, in as much as every Muslim who performs the ḥaḍḍā as a rule performs the 'umra at the same time. The case of the pilgrim who has begun a ḥaḍḍā and for any reason cannot complete it, is a special one. Under these circumstances he is bound to perform an 'umra in order to be able to put off the ṣafāra for a time. The conclusion is however not made good by this. The ḥaḍḍā on the contrary must be made good in the following year.


**UNAIZA**, one of the most important towns in southern Ḥaḍḍā, and of the district of Ḥaḍḍā. The vocalisation used here is confirmed by the Arab geographers (e.g. expressly by al-Bakrî, *Muṣūqum*, p. 670; Yākūh, *Muṣūqum*, i 737 and pass.) and lexicographers (e.g. Līūvī al-Arâbî, p. 251) and also by the modern pronunciation (*C. M. Dougherty, Travel in Arabia Deserta*, Cambridge 1888 (London 1924), ii 551) gives for it as his authority the educated negro Shaikh b. Ḥālîd u. *'Unāiza*. The transcription varies with different writers (*A'neleh, A'neleh, A'neleh, A'neleh, A'neleh, A'neleh, b.; A'neleh, A'neleh, A'neleh, A'neleh, French Enele, Anele*) and sometimes agrees with that of the Arabic Amara, transcribed in different ways. As regards the etymology, M. v. Oppenheim (*Vom Mittelalter zum Persischen Golf*, Berlin 1900, ii 45) deduced too much from the confusion when he thinks that the name suggests the original home of the Amara. If any etymological relation between the two names may be assumed, the most we can
say is that the foundation of the town may be
scribed to the tribe. The note in the **Tāj al-
Arab**, lv. 62 (cf. **Liṣān, op. cit.**) is also based
on a connection with a tribe-name. The explanation
given to Doughty (op. cit., ii. 562, s.v. **Blackstone**
[of 'Aneza']) is untenable: "The name of 'Aneza
is from a berg upon which it is built."

In ancient times the site of 'Unaiza seems to have
been occupied by **Tāhba** (Ptol. vi. 7, 31), i.e. the
Djarad al-Kasim of the Arab geographers (e.g. **Yākūt**, ii. 56), the old capital of **Kasim**;
one of the positions given by Ptolomy corresponds
to the position of 'Unaiza so closely as the
Gordia, "70° 10', 24° 30' (still better the "valgatte
24° 10'). Djarad al-Kasim is located by A. Sprenger,
*Die alte Geographie Arabiens*, Berne 1875, p. 168,
in the vicinity of the modern Buraida or **Uyun**
(north of **Unaiza**), by Doughty (op. cit., ii. 606)
with more reason, in the ruins site of the modern el-
Dhiyat on the Waâl l-Rumma, east of al-Rass
(S.W. of **Unaiza**). 'Unaiza is mentioned in the
older Arabic poetry, e.g. in the **Hamadh**, p. 211, 
501 (ed. Freytag), in **Imru'l-Kais** (ed. Altwardt,
The Discourses), No. 34, p. in the *Nabīt* (ed. Bervan),
p. 344, 646, in a quotation from Aws b. Harih in
there is also the "Alunai'at in the *Mu'allâjah* of
Antara, verse 9, which however does not quite
fit (the dual form also in the quotation from a
poet in **Yākūt**, ii. 135 etc.), a place-name, which
according to al-Bakri, op. cit., and **Yākūt**, iii. 739
is identical with 'Unaiza; it perhaps was applied to
two adjacent settlements (cf. al-Karyatian) of the
same tribe, and similarly with `Unaisid in **Yākūt**,
iii. 398. It should be remembered however that
other places in southern Nadîj with dual endings
can be cited, like Sirrâ, Rāmâtan, Ushhâyân;
but one can hardly see in this simply a local
fondness for dual names, as Sprenger, *Z.D.M.G.*,
xvii. (1888), p. 329 would like to. However little
they may weigh singly, these references enable
us to conclude that the place was already of
some importance in ancient times, as one might
expect from its natural situation. It was only in
the later Muslim period that its importance began
so increased. Of the references in the Arab geograp-
ths the most comprehensive is that in **Yākūt**,
iii. 737–739, according to him, 'Unaiza lies
between Bānî Za'īd and Mecca (i.e. the half-way caravans
station), in the Bâsîl-Rumma, the gathering-place
of the waters of the wâdî, near a hill, which
served as a dam (cf. al-Bakri, p. 207). The place
belonged to the Bânî 'Amir b. Kuraiz. This
emphasises the features which made 'Uinaiza important
at a later date also, its central position on one of
the great roads of northern Arabia and the fact that
it was at the place where numerous small streams
combined to form the main wâdî. In this main
passage **Yākūt** only adds scraps of information
relating to the plentiful water-supply of the district,
which include the statement that (according to
Ibn al-Faqqī) 'Uinaiza was one of the wâdíls
of al-Yamâma (inaccurate for Nadîj or Kâṣim)
(near mount Sûwâd), and quotations from poets
(including early ones) which are of little importance
as the references to other mentions in poetry in
other passages such as i. 626, 762; ii. 259, 255;
iii. 262, 298, 398; iv. 93 or the passages from
poets in al-Bakri, p. 207, 310, 670, 684, 801
842, **Yākūt** refers, iv. 77, s. v. Karyatian (cf. the
article **Sirrâtha** in Pauly-Wissowa's *Realencyclo-
"UNAIZA" 
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pädie der blatt. Altertumswiss.) only briefly
to the state of the water-supply in the vicinity
of 'Uinaiza. No further information is afforded
by the passages quoted from the poets by al-Handâm,
p. 172 (see above) and in the list of old watering-
places (verses from Muhâlîh also given with
variations by **Yākūt**, iii. 739). In al-Handâm,
p. 178, 'Uinaiza (with Wadîja and Zaby) is mentioned
among the watering-places of the Kâṣim (as
so described by B. Murâk, *Arabien*, Hanover 1923,
p. 56). Handâm's editor (D. H. Müllcr, ii. 188)
has already called attention to the fact that al-
Handâm in this passage seems to have taken
the female name 'Uinaiza in the *Mu'allâjah*
of Imru'l-Kais, verse 11 as a place-name (and
so have others, cf. **Liṣān**, vil. 251); Wadîja also
is derived from this *Mu'allâjah*, verse 30, and
Zaby from verse 36. The preceding place-names
in Handâm, p. 177, are also taken from the
poem; this passage is therefore rightly omitted
from the *Index geographiceum* in Müller, ii. 38.

In the excerpt from **Yākūt** in the *Martis ad
Rutam* (ed. J. A. M. Müller, ii. 386), Sâfî al-Dîn
writes 'Uinaiza as a place between Bâsî Za'īd and Mecca,
then as a wâdî near Mount Sûwâd in al-Yamâma,
and lastly as a well 2 miles from al-Karyatian in
the Wâl l-Rumma (the original is **Yākūt**, iii. 738;
iv. 77). — Sprenger's statement (Die alte Geog-
raphie Arabiens, p. 177) that Ibn Khurâdâbîth
mentions along with other stations 'Uinaiza after
Buna, a station on the road leading from the S.E.,
does not agree with the text but the place-names
in this passage cannot be read with certainty (see
*BeG.A.*, vi. 191). Sprenger's remark: "The shortest
route from Yâmâma to Mecca, no itinerary of
which is known to me, joins the Bâsî Za'îd road
at Dârîja and the road to Medina joins it at
'Uinaiza or near it" as regards the second state-
ment is by no means indisputable. The maps
show why we cannot agree with the first. The pilgrim
roads from al-Yamâma joins the great caravans-road
'Uinaiza-Mecca at the watering-place of Sharmas
(North of the Djarâl Khâlid). Sprenger's idea (Z.
*D.M.G.*, xvii. 324, 326) that the **Uinaiza** of the
Arabic sources is different from the present **Uinaiza**
would not be without parallel but there is not
sufficient foundation for it. The statements in
the Arab authors are perfectly applicable to the modern
town. There are ruins of an old settlement of the
Bânî Khâlid, Djanânah, not far from 'Uinaiza
(Doughty, op. cit., ii. 354 sq.). If the name **Uinaiza**
really used to be attached to another town, it was
scarcely farther away from the modern town than
Djanânah. The latter place is said to have been
founded about 1300 a.d. by the Kâsî Sâhî, who
also established other settlements in Kâṣim
(Doughty, ii. 241, 355; on this tribe we now have
more accurate information in H. Philby, *The Heart
of Arabia*, London 1922, ii. 350, index).

Of modern geographers, the first to mention
'Uinaiza is C. Niebuhr, from second-hand information
however. In 1765 he ascertained that "Anâzî" was
10 days' journey from Bâsî (Reisebeschreibung
von Arabien, Copenhagen 1772, p. 344; Ritter,
Erdbuch, xiii. 343, 873), separates this name
from its mention from his Anezyeh, p. 873). The
first more accurate information about the interior
of northern Arabia dates from the beginning of
the sixteenth century, as a scientific result of the
Turkish and Egyptian operations against the Wahhnits.
L. A. Corance's *Histoire des Wahahis* (Paris
1810), already contains reliable geographical information, in the publication of which S. de Sacy co-operated. The latter in the *Tableau*, note 39, p. 214, and p. 218 of this *Histoire* (appendix) gave their first accurate list of the divisions of the Wahhabi kingdom and gave the provinces of al-Nadjj including among them the third place Kasim, with the three towns "Kasym, Berey (Bursida) and Enayz" and ten more (cf. the extract in Ritter, *op. cit.*, p. 467 sq.). When the Egyptian troops under Tussun, the second son of Muhammad Ali, passed and afterwards viceroy of Egypt, in the campaign against the Wahhabis in 1815 had advanced into the interior of Nadjj as far as the borders of Kasim and then began to retire, "Abd Allah, son and successor of the Wahhabi ruler Sa'id who died in 1814, was in Unaiya with a hostile force but did not allow himself to be involved in a battle for a decision. After the withdrawal of the viceroy, "Abd Allah deposed in Unaiya as a punishment the chiefs of Kasim who had joined the enemy, and incited the Arab tribes against one another (cf. on the events of the campaigns: F. Mengin, *Histoire de l'Egypte*, Paris 1853, II, p. 35 sqq.). On Ibrahim Pasha, the oldest son of Muhammad Ali, advancing on Nadjj in 1816, "Abd Allah again collected his forces in Unaiya. Ibrahim forced his way into Unaiya out of which "Abd Allah had retired to Bursida a few hours before. The citadel of Unaiya, about a quarter of an hour from the town, surrendered after several days’ bombardment whereupon the town itself which had been abandoned by most of its inhabitants also surrendered (cf. Mengin, *op. cit.*, p. 105 sqq.). After the fall of Unaiya the rest of Kasim soon submitted to Ibrahim, who had nearly 6,000 palm-trees cut down in Unaiya to use them in the manufacture of war material. — Just before the defeat of the Wahhabis, J. L. Burckhardt (1815 and 1816) had collected at Mecca information about Unaiya and Kasim (cf. his *Travels in Arabia*, London 1829, 2nd ed., p. 452 sqq.). He gives Bursida as the capital of Kasim because this was the residence of the Shalib at this time; but Unaiya was much greater in size, which he compares with Siyut in Upper Egypt (3,000 houses). He mentions bazaars and prominent merchants in the town (extract in Ritter, *op. cit.*, p. 452 sqq.). — The next eye-witness was Captain G. F. Saddler, who (1819) was the first European to cross Nadjj from east to west, from Kasim to Medina. He mentions (Account of a journey from Kasim ... to Yemna, in *Transactions of the Lit. Soc. of Bombay*, London 1823, iii. 474) "Anizir" as a place of importance, but it like other towns had been for the most part destroyed in the fighting; a few date-palm groves had survived. According to him, Unaiya was the capital of southern Kasim and as a result of its central position in a well watered valley was the centre of a busy trade, indeed the emporium for a considerable part of North Arabia, a junction of caravan routes from Baza, Kasim and other places to Medina and Yemna. The town thus had a political as well as a commercial importance. Saddler still found a number of merchants in the devastated town. His journey was frankly too hurried to enable him to gather scientific information of value. — Berghaus, *Arabia* (Gotha 1833), p. 88 sq. calculated the geographical position of Unaiya as 26° 26' N. Lat. and 41° 17' East Long. Paris (44° 7' East Long, of Greenwich; on Moritz's map the position is put too far to the south and east). Ritter published (op. cit., 2nd, 523) from W. Schlimmer's *Arabische Reise* (MS.), a table of population statistics which the botanist had drawn up in T'aiif from the unchecked statements of a Wahhabi in 1836, i.e. about 15 years after the events. "Unaiya according to this had 25,000 inhabitants which is probably too high a figure. The cruelty of Ibrahim's forces had only stimulated Wahhabism and about 1849 the last remnant of Turkish-Egyptian influence in Nadjj disappeared. — Later explorers of North and Central Arabia went through Hail to the north, passing Unaiya, W. G. Palgrave (*A narrative of a year's journey through Central and Eastern Arabia*, 1865) in 1862–1863 on his journey from Hail only came as far as Bursida. His statement that Unaiya has 30,000 inhabitants is untenable, like his other figures for Kasim. His account has always been distrusted; cf. most recently Philby's doubts (*op. cit.*, ii. 134 sqq.) on the reliability of Palgrave's account of his stay in Hail and his polemic against D. G. Hogarth (*The Penetration of Arabia*, London 1905, p. 248 sqq.) and other champions of Palgrave: among the latter are F. Hommel, *Grundzüge der Geographie und Geschichte des alten Orients* [Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, sect. iii., part i, book 1, 2nd half], Munich 1926, p. 527. From about 1855 Faisal, who lived in Riyadh and was presumably a grandson of "Abd Allah, was trying to take Unaiya; but the warlike inhabitants led by Zamil repelled his attacks and peace was made. The treacherous Faisal however again began fighting in 1862; the town could not hold out against the superior numbers of the enemy and after its defenders had suffered a disastrous defeat, it was incorporated with the rest of Kasim in the Wahhabi state of Nadjj (cf. the events after 1847 see Palgrave in A.Zendeh, *Arabien und ihre Arabier seit hundert Jahren*, Halle 1875, p. 379 sqq.). The fettlers of dependence were soon cut off however for by Doughty's time "Unaiya was again the model of a free independent community in Arabia. — In 1864 C. Guarnelli (*Il Nedo Settentrionale, Historie di Gerusalemme e Anizir nel Cisirim*, Jerusalem 1866; with map [No. 7] of his road from Bursida to Unaiya) tried to penetrate into Kasim from Hail southwards but was taken for a Turkish spy and was brought a prisoner to Unaiya, the base of operations of "Abd Allah b. Faisal, who was at war with the Beduins; the emir Zamil however released him and he went to the Djibal Shammar. The fact that he was a prisoner prevented him making any special observations in Unaiya. According to him, it is the most important town in Central Arabia, the capital of Kasim and has 15,000 inhabitants in seven quarters. He confirms isolated statements by Palgrave. — Shalib Hamid of al-Russ, J. G. Wetstein's authority (*Nordarabien und die syrische Wuste nach den Angaben der Eingeborenen*, in *Zeitschr. f. allgem. Erdkunde*, Berlin 1865, xviii. 408 sqq.), talks of an alliance between "Unaiya and Bursida for protection against the people of the Shammar territory, the capital of which is Hail and gives a few geographical statements, e.g. on the relations on the road from Unaiya to Bursida. "Unaiya, "the mother of Nadjj", he calls the largest town of Nadjj; it is surrounded by gardens; the palms cut down by Ibrahim had been
replanted (cf. e.g. J. Euting, Tagebuch einer Reise in Inner-Asien, ii., Leyden 1914, p. 14 on dates from 'Unaiš). The information so far available only enabled a rough picture of the appearance of the town to be drawn. It was known for example, that outside the strong city wall lay palm-groves around which there ran an outer wall. The first and so far the only traveller to give a full and reliable account of 'Unaiš is Doughty (in Arabia Deux; a not always well-chosen abbreviation is E. Garnett's Wanderings in Arabia, London 1912). On his journey through northern Arabia, which occupied nearly two years (1876-1878) he visited Hâ'il and when he was driven from there and afterwards from Buraida also, was given a better reception, at first at least, in the rival of the latter town. Under Zāmil's patronage, he was enabled to stay some months in 'Unaiš (April 29-July 16, 1878), unlike other European travellers before and after him, and had therefore sufficient leisure for thorough exploration and observation. He describes (Arab. Descriptions, ii. 137 sqq.; Wanderings, ii. 161 sqq.) the town and the walls of the town, the town itself, its streets, the houses outside and inside, the wells and water-supply, the date-groves around the town; he gives a vivid picture of the life of the citizens, their personal qualities and manners and customs, their food and clothing, the religious and secular life of rich and poor, the social conditions, and the distribution of labour. In a special chapter (Life in Ayme, ii. 365 sqq.) are collected observations on the characteristic features of tribal life, the defences and other aspects of the life and work of the town. Commerce is especially well developed; among the numerous merchants are some from abroad; merchants of 'Unaiš on the other hand have their depots in Jidda, Messopotamia and elsewhere. Caravans (coming from Başra) go from there to Mecca and Medina. Various classes of artisans and tradesmen are to be found there (field-labours, masons, gold- and silversmiths and other workers in fine crafts whose skill is much esteemed in Mecca; cf. also Morthin, op. cit., p. 57). From his account it is clear that the city occupied an outstanding position in Central Arabia for its prosperity and culture. In the fifteen years before Doughty's visit, it had doubled in size and now had about 15,000 inhabitants; Guarnieri gave about the same number. It is called the centre of Arabia from its position in the middle of the caravan route from Başra to Mecca; it could really be regarded as the metropolis of Najd. Learning is held in high esteem by the rich merchants. Half of the townpeople are Wahhābi (on the movements of Wahhābism for 25 years before Doughty's arrival see ii. 428 sqq.). Wahhābi fanaticism brought about Doughty's expulsion from 'Unaiš; the Nasrāni (set out towards Mecca with the “barter caravan” which had come from Başra. — Doughty's investigations established the main lines of the system of wābis of North Arabia and ascertained that the wādi, which runs south of Buraida, just above 'Unaiš (on this region see Leuchman, Geogr. Journal, London 1914, p. 512, the first to visit it since Nolde), is the Wādi 'Rummah (according to Yaḥṣū, ii. 523, to be written with one ʾ, not Rummah, as Ibn Buraidā for example requires); pronounced er-Rumeh in northern Arabia, see Moritz, op. cit., p. 22), about the course of which erroneous ideas were previously current (cf. Yaḥṣū, op. cit.). Southern Kašm may be called a gift from this wādi.

What we are told about 'Unaiš by writers since Doughty amounts only to a few notes on local history. Euting (op. cit., i. 63) records in his diaries for 1883 (at Kaf) the struggle between the two Wahhābi families, that of Ibn Sa'ūd and that of Ibn Rashād, for supremacy in North Arabia; ii. 226 (in 1884 at el-ʿUbl) a message of victory from Ibn Rashād. — Ch. Huber, who came in 1884 from Hā'il via Buraida to 'Unaiš, where he only stopped a few hours, mentions in his Journal d'un voyage en Arabie, Paris 1891, p. 685, that 'Unaiš was completely independent and had over 5,000 rifles; Palgrave gives a similar estimate for the fighting men of 'Unaiš and the villages belonging to it (cf. Zahme, op. cit., p. 380). Huber (p. 709) gives only a few cursory remarks on the immediate neighbourhood of the town; his map No. 13 gives a very useful sketch of the route for the stretch from Buraida to the Djabal al-Nir. — E. v. Nolde in 1893 on his journey to the camp of the emir of Hā'il, Muḥammad b. Rashād (between Shākhrah and Riyyūd), also made a brief visit to 'Unaiš; in his Reise nach Innerarabien, Kurdistan und Armenien 1892 [recte 1893], Brunswick 1905, p. 78 sqq., he gives only details that were already known. His statement based on his enquiries, that 'Unaiš has about 35,000 inhabitants, is wrong. His information about the wars of Ibn Rashād (p. 68 sqq.) who became lord of Najd after taking 'Unaiš in 1891, is more valuable, — A. Nolde (p. 69) had prophesied, the situation changed; soon after the death of Ibn Rashād (1897), the political preponderance of the Shāhmūrī capital Hā'il disappeared and 'Unaiš again became independent. Buraida which is smaller, has recently come much to the front in the hegemony of Kašm. — Philby is the first to have acquired a knowledge of the land S.W. and S. of the political capital of Najd (Riyyūd), especially of the district of al-Ain; in 1917—1918 he went from Riyyūd around the whole Taʾlūk range to the south to the Wādi Dāwāsir. He tells us nothing special about 'Unaiš, although (op. cit., ii. 120) he went not only to Miṣnāb, but also via Buraida into Kašm, where Raunkjaer had been some seven years before him and Leuchman in 1912, as far as Kuṣalūb (cf. also his references to 'Unaiš, i. 47, 54, 365). He gives in some details an account of the most recent developments of Wahhābism (see ii. 334, index).

Bibliography: The authors of the standard works (such as Yaḥṣū, al-Balkri, al-Hamātān; of modern writers: Bürckhardt, Salzler, Ritter, Guarnieri, Palgrave, Zehme, Sprenger, Doughty, Huber, Nolde, Philby, Moritz) are given in the article with the necessary bibliographical details.

'UNUR (plur. 'ANAS) means, like ali, rubu, isqub (ışqūb), etc., principle, basis, element in the general sense. It is used in the special sense of materia prima. The hel lenising philology treated it as a rule, use arḫān or ʾisqūb for the four elements of the sublunar world, which are composed of matter and form and, according to the prevailing view, are mutable. The material of the heavenly spheres is called rubu by these philosophers, more frequently however a fifth nature (tēqī).

Bibliography: Sprenger, Dict. of Tech., Trent, p. 960 sqq. (Tj. de Boer)
UNSERI, Abu 'l-Kāsim Haran b. Ahmad al-UNSERI of Balkh, a Persian poet. The year of his birth is unknown and that of his death is variously given, the most probable date being 441 (1054–1050). Very little is known of his life. The matter, mainly anecdotes, recorded by the Persian literary historians is of very little value. According to a very late source, Rūhān Kūti Khān’s Majmu‘ al-Fuṣūlī (Tehran, 1325, f. 355), he was captured by robbers while on a trading journey for his youth and deprived of all his goods. He was later brought by Amir Naṣr, brother of Maḥmūd of Gha zam, to the latter’s court, where he was highly esteemed as a court poet. According to the Persian sources, he held the office of poet laureate (shāh-i shā‘rār) at the head of 400 other poets. How far this is accurate, it is impossible to say. That Unseri was highly esteemed by his contemporaries as an artist is evident, at any rate from the reverence in which he is held by Minūrī. The latter sang his praises in the celebrated ‘ādīd of the candles (Nq. xxxiiiiin. in Kazimirski’s edition). The stories however which tell how Unseri was commissioned by King Maḥmūd to produce a poetic version of the Islamic epic and how he did not feel fit for the task and recommended Firdawsi to the king for the work (e.g. Dawat šāh, Tadbirat al-Sharar, ed. Browne, p. 51), are part of the legend that has grown up around the great author of the Shi’ī imām, the Shihāb al-Dīn.

Works. Unseri wrote three mathnawis, all of which are lost. Their titles were Ḵīyng Bust u-turkh Bust (The White and the Red Idol), Nākrī ‘Ain al-Fuṣūlī (this is the most probable reading but the forms in which this title is given vary), and Wānīk u-Adhrā.’ His Īṣā‘ al-waṣī‘a has survived and exist in manuscripts and in a Teherān edition of 1298 (1881).

A. The Mathnawis. While the two first mentioned romantic poems by Unseri are more titles to us, we know at least the contents of his Wānīk u-Adhrā’f. The subject was taken later by several Persian poets, but not much seems to have survived of this poem. There is a fragment of a Persian Wānīk u-Adhrā’ poem by a certain Nāmis in a manuscript in the British Museum (Add. 7722, cf. Rieu, Catalogue, i. 813). The version of this romantic theme by the Ottoman poēt Lāmmi‘ (d. c. 940 = 1533) is well known (cf. J. v. Hammer-Purgstall, Geschichte der osmanischen Dichtkunst bis auf unsere Zeit, ii. 45 sq., where a full synopsis is given. We may note that von Hammer’s much abbreviated verse translation Wānīk und Adhrā (Vienna 1833) does not give a proper idea of the contents of the original).

Lāmmi‘ mentions Unseri as his precursor in the poetical treatment of this subject in the following lines:

\[\text{cəlicən bu həsicə kəlaq manəvarı} \]
\[\text{nqən ndiș yənnəstə mənər kəi ‘Unsərət} \]
\[\text{Rəmən adəsihiq həkərə kərə-rəkə} \]
\[\text{Tərkə xələn xələnən kələşki qəlləs} \]

(from the Leyden MS, No. 360).

The subject of the romance is the love story of Wānîk, son of the Khān of Cim, and the prince Adhrā. The young man falls in love with a picture of the princess and has to go through many adventures and suffer much before he is united with his beloved. He is for example taken prisoner in war, falls into the hands of the black fire-worshippers, who wish to sacrifice him but he escapes, because the flames will not attack him and has adventures with ādə (whose king is his friend) and nəmən. Adhrā has not much better fortune. She also falls into dangers of all kinds, until the lovers meet at the court of King Maḥmūd of Gha zam, where not only is their marriage celebrated in brilliant fashion but several other happy couples, secondary characters in the romance, are also united. The Turkish poem of course only enables us to learn the subject of the lost ‘Unseri poem; its external form with its numerous lyric and rather precious style is a creation of Lāmmi‘.

The nature of Unseri’s poem would have been quite unknown to us if a few verses had not been preserved in Asad’s Persian dictionary Enaght al-Farisi (ed. P. Horn, p. 25 where these fragments are given). We thus learn that the romance was written in waṣī‘ (Poetry); this metre survived in later times only for the heroic epic, while the romantic epic used other metres.

As to the subject of the poem we know only the very poor authority of Dawat šāh however — that a romance of Wānîk and Adhrā had already been written in Pahlavi for Kami raw and that a copy was brought to ‘Abd Allāh b. Tāhir. The latter, however, is said to have ordered it to be destroyed because, as he said, he abominated the books of the fire-worshippers (Dawat šāh, Tadbirat al-Sharar, ed. Browne, p. 30; cf. E. B. Browne, A Literary History of Persia from Firdawsī to Sa’di, p. 275 sqq). This story probably caused von Hammer (G. O. D., ii. 45) to say: “The cause of the disappearance of this poem in Irān seems to have been mainly, the fact that it originally contained the teaching of the fire-worshippers... in its present form therefore it cannot be regarded as the original story but only as a feeble echo of it” E. J. W. Gibb’s judgment (Hist. of Ottoman Poetry, iii. 26) is also based on this passage.

Von Hammer’s assumption is however unnecessary even if we grant that there was a Pahlavi original. The subject of the poem is the final union of two lovers; in spite of all obstacles. This very subject is the main theme of the Hellenistic romances of the early centuries A.D. We may perhaps assume that there were free versions of such romances in Pahlavi literature (which perhaps came through Syriac) and that the original story of Wānîk was based on a work of this kind. The matter must of course have been adapted to the East and Muslim authors must have later contributed their share. That the supposed Pahlavi original had a religious bias, as von Hammer thinks, can never be proved and is, besides, very improbable. One circumstance which makes the assumption of a Pahlavi original most probable is the fact that the two chief characters in the poem have Arabic names, as P. Horn (Goth. d. Pers. Litt., p. 178) has already recognised.

B. The Divān. Unseri’s Divān contains, as one might expect, mainly hāstās in praise of Maḥmūd of Gha zam, his brother Naṣr and his son Maḥmūd as well as of nobles like the vizier Maḥmūd al-Naqī. It of course also contains ḍazān, ḥifŏrs and ṣubḥāhs. The author himself says that he is a writer of love-poems as well as a panegyrist.
Ursuri’s primary importance is as a writer of gazalas. The oriental literary historians are most enthusiastic about these panegyrics but the value of their judgment is lessened by the well-known fact that in most cases they are too lavish in their praise. To a European, the whole panegyric poetry of the Persians offers little attraction; one must however recognise that Ursuri shows himself by no means unfitted for his task. The subjects of the gazalas are usually the great deeds of King Mahmud; in these cases the poems contain an epic element. There are other subjects which we find in other panegyricists, e. g. Minâshiri, such as the descriptions of festivals (gazalâh-e nafa etc.) or the king’s war-horse. Ursuri also writes on Mahmud’s war-elephant and his sword. That the poet occasionally expresses the same ideas and images in different gazalas can hardly be avoided in view of the uniformity of his subjects. Ursuri’s tajribâs are often erotic but we also find descriptions of nature which we know so well from Minâshiri and Arâfât for example. In such mawâf’s we often find quite beautiful lines, for example in a description of the beginning of spring:

Afsar-e zamin frî zâd az sâr kâh-kibulan (Mâdâna al-Fuâzî, p. 356). His gurâzûs (transitions from tajhîb to mawâf) not infrequently contain original ideas, as when he says that in spring the days increase in length like the power of the king and the nights become shorter like the lives of Mahmud’s enemies.

In these poems we find all the rhetorical embellishments of the period just as in the panegyrists of the later Gharnawids and Sâjsâfâs. We frequently find very pretty comparisons: e. g. in the description of one of the king’s victories:

bar ub dar hamah gharâb ûhanad ûn (Firouz

in bar gudhâtâr bar ân ub kîb Mûsâwâr)
(Mâdâna al-Fuâzî, p. 358).

Very neat is an allusion like:

ûn kîd dar hâr âsâr zâmâ hamûlân (nâm-i khowd (= Mahmûd)

wâm kîd dar hâm dârât güm ûnân)
râm-i ûsar (= Masûd)
(Mâdâna al-Fuâzî, p. 360).

Less fine, even to European taste rather frigid, pictures are not lacking; thus he compares a garden bright with flowers to a copy of the book of Euclid with its many mathematical figures.

In one pleasing and ingenious form of poem he attained considerable success, e. g. in the poem on Nasr, which consists of questions and answers (transl. by Browne, Lit. Hist. of Persia from Ferdows to Solti, p. 121 sq.), as in another shyâs he in the same prince (Mâdâna al-Fuâzî, p. 362) which has three internal rhymes in each couplet:

bârjârân tâdji n-pîrâya, uhabrâ dżuwâhar

[u-mârân,

ba dîl ba fâhâr hamidîy, ba himmat ba ba]
[baåd hamhar.

The reading aloud of such a piece must have been very effective, but practically all the beauty of these pieces disappears in translation (cf. F. Horn’s observations in his Gesch. d. Perz. Litt., p. 80).

Some of Ursuri’s smaller poems are said by the literary historians to be improvisations composed on certain occasions. The best known is the qaun which he is said to have uttered when Mahmud had his favourite Ayâz’s locks shorn and regretted it afterwards (cf. Browne, op. cit., p. 38). Other short poems were improvised on the king’s falling from his horse and on Mahmud being blind.

Even in the middle ages Ursuri was reckoned a classic. Ibn Kâsî, the celebrated writer on poetics, quotes him ten times (cf. Ibn Kâsî, Muqdaš [G. Mî. S., x.], index). We may note the passages on p. 325, where the line which is given as an example of the figure of speech called tajhîb-i ma’âsî may be a fragment of the Wâmîk on p. 445, where in the discourse of borrowing in poetry (ma’âf), a passage from Ursuri’s poetry is quoted, the idea of which is borrowed from Rûdaki but is better expressed by Ursuri, and lastly on p. 269 where Ibn Kâsî cites a passage in Ursuri for the archaic form abar instead of bar, of which idiom he however disapproves.


(UL. HuârT)

UNWÂN (A.), the title of a book, usually decorated in fine manuscripts by a frame work of arabesques which the printers have sought to imitate by a happy arrangement of fleurons, tail-pieces and other printers’ ornaments. In Persian manuscripts the first two pages, very much ornamented with floral patterns, are called sarîwâsh “head-plate”.

(UL. HuârT)

URBÂN. [See Arabîa, b.]

URDÛ, an Indian language. The Urdu language, which as the result of a series of events has now come to occupy the position of a lingua franca for India, is of mixed origin. Neither Indo-Aryan nor Persian can claim a monopoly in its creation and formation; it has, lexically and grammatically, thrived upon the linguistic and cultural stocks borrowed from both. It is the ineradicable monument of the mingling of two peoples and their cultures—the Hindu and the Muslim.

With the advent of the Mughalmaddan conquerors from the North-West the first foundations of this language were laid in India. During the reigns of Sulṭân Mahmûd of Ghazni [q.v.] and his son Mas’ûd [q.v.], many Hindûs, such as Tulak, Nîth and others, held highly responsible posts at the court
of Ghazni. A Hind� army also was stationed there, of which, during Mahmud's reign, Swendru R��, a Hind�, was the commander. The last rulers of the Ghurid dynasty left Ghazni and settled in the Panj�h, where they continued to live until their rule came to an end; thus, both in Ghazni and at Lakeh, Hindists and Muhammedahans began to enter into close contact with each other. Many lords, nobles, and other proteges of Kafir's company, the raids of the Sajdals Turks had made homeless wanderers, also sought his protection and made Lakeh their permanent home. This daily contact between the Hindists and the Muhammedahans had a far-reaching influence on the languages spoken by the two communities. Thus we find in Prithvir R�d Kins, the famous work of Can Bardas, the court poet of Prithvir R��d (died 1392), distinct traces of this influence, for, as he himself states, he "has made use of the Kafiric language" (canto 1. 23), and his book contains in fact many Arabic and Persian words.

Urd� is a Turkish word meaning "camp" or "army". As the Turks, Persians, and Indians all lived together in the royal camp, their language, which was an admixture of these three languages, was called the language of the Ahd-i Urd�, "people of the camp", or more simply, the language of the Urd�, the camp; and after some time the language itself became known as Urd�. Whilst the Muhammedan rulers of India spoke Persian, which enjoyed the prestige of being their court language, the common language of the country continued to be Hindi, derived through Prithvir from Sanskrit. On this dialect of the common people was grafted the Persian language, which brought a new language, Urd�, into existence. Sir George Grierson, in the Linguistic Survey of India, assigns no distinct place to Urd�, but treats it as an outgrowth of Western Hindi. This view overlooks the preponderating influence of Persian, which has deeply affected Urd� in its formative process. It is not merely words that are borrowed; the whole poetry of Urd� — its prose, themes, style, imagery, allusions, grammar, and peculiarities of construction — and even its prose are saturated with Persian. It cannot strictly be called either a branch of Hindi or an outgrowth of Persian, but is a distinct language of a mixed character.

The first great Persian poet and writer of India who used Hindi words in his compositions was Amir Khusro (1255-1325) [see Kitab, Abu-i-Maskan Amir]. It is generally believed, and has been mentioned in some Tadhkiras, that Amir Khusro composed many works in Hindi; but these, unfortunately, are not extant, though one or two of his ghazals are still frequently quoted in which one mirda (hemistich) is in Persian and the other in Hindi, and also many versified conundrums (lista) etc. in the mixed language.

This practice of writing mixed poetry, with alternate hemistichs in Hindi and Persian, continued long after the time of Khusro, and it was for this reason that such poetry was called Rikshau. Now the word rikshau has various meanings, one of which is to produce and rhyme something new. After Amir Khusro had succeeded in producing a new combination of Persian and Indian rhymes, the word rikshau came to be used as a term of art, denoting a composition of such mixed Hindi and Persian verses or hemistichs as were in harmony both in respect of the subject matter and of the
sultān Muḥammad Ḥusayn Shāh (reigned 899–1020 = 1590–1621), whose Kulliyāt is a voluminous work, was a poet of versatile genius, and his two successors, sultān Muḥammad Kutb Shāh (1020–1035 = 1611–1626) and sultān ‘Abd Allāh Kutb Shāh (1035–1083 = 1625–1672), and also Tānā Shāh (1083–1098 = 1672–1687), the last ruler of the dynasty, were themselves good poets and used to compose Urdu verses. Other famous poets of the Kutb Shāh period are: 1. Wajdhī, who related a love-story of Muḥammad Kull Kutb Shāh in his mathnawi Kutb-e-Mushtari, written in 1018 a.h.; 2. Shāhī al-Dīn Kuraishi, author of Bhāg Bāl; 3. Shāhī Ahmad Shārīf, author of a mathnawi on medicine; 4. Ghawwāzī, author of Sāif al-Mulūk wa-Bābī al-Lamāt (1035) and Tūba Nāma (1049); 5. Ibn Nāṣir, author of Ḥikmat Bān (1076); 6. Rūzī or Kutbī, translator of Thūfat al-Nashīd al-Pandā or Tūfa Bāja; 7. Tāhī, author of Bakhshānī al-Mulkandām; 8. Wali, author of Tālīkh al-Mulkh; 9. Maqīfī, author of Zafar Nāma-i Īsk (the last-named belong to the period of ‘Abd Allāh Kutb Shāh); 10. The author of Riḍān al-Mulūk al-Islāmī, 11. Shāhī and 12. Mīrāz, both elegists; 13. Naṭīr of Hyderabad, and others flourished under Abu l-Ḥasan Tānā Shāh.

The ‘Adil Shāh kings were also great patrons of art and learning. Under Muḥammad ‘Adil Shāh (1035–1067 = 1626–1656) there flourished four great poets: 1. Ḥasan Shawkī, author of Fathnāma-i Ḥusain Khān (the battle of Talikot); and of Mulkhānā-i ‘Adil Shāh; 2. Miqīm (Mīrza Miqīm Khān), author of Fathnāma-i Yaq̄īnKhān (an account of the victory of ‘Adil Shāh) and a love-poem of Mahvār o Chandar Khān; 3. Rustamī (Kamāl Khān), author of the voluminous mathnawi Khwānāmā (an account of the wars of the Khalīfah) Allī, written in 1059 a.h.; 4. Malik Khushnīd, author of Dīwān Shamsī (the story of Bahram), written in 1055. Whilst it was Ibrāhīm ‘Adil Shāh II (988–1035 = 1580–1626), called the Dījag-Gura on his account of the mastery of music, and author of the famous book Nawwār on Hindu music, who made Hindu (or, more correctly, Dakhari Urdu) his court language in place of Persian, ‘Ali ‘Adil Shāh II (1067–1083 = 1656–1673) was particularly interested in the Urdu language. Amongst the Dakhani Urdu writers who were active during his reign are: 1. Ṣullā ‘Urūdī, the famous author of Gulkhānā-i Īsk and ‘Alīnāma; 2. Ayāghī (Muḥammad Amin), author of ‘Adilnāma (1076) and Shahsīnāma; 3. Siyād Bulūkhī, author of ‘Alīnāma (1065). During the reign of Ṣīhānān ‘Adil Shāh we find the following poets: 1. Shāh Amin al-Dīn Alish (see above); 2. ‘Abd al-Mu’īmn of Ḥidjapur, author of ‘Īsknāma (an account of Saiyid Muḥammad al-Djawa-pur, Makhāl al-mawloud); 3. Ṣālihī, the author of Yāsūf Ṣulayshī, the best-known and greatest poet of this period. He was born blind. It was perhaps he who laid the foundation of ‘īsk, i.e. poems written in the language and idioms of women, developed by ‘Urūdī (see below). Beḥrī (Ḵāz-e Muḥammad) of Gogī author of Man Lagan (1112 = 1700), Wajdhī author of Fanchhī Bacha, the translator of Agfa’s Ḥaft-e ‘Adad and some other poets flourished in the 13th century when Awrangzīb conquered the Deccan. In prose, the first books to be written in Urdu were in the Dakhani idiom. Besides sayings of the saints (such as ‘Ala al-Din Sayyid A†ūn, Sayyid Muḥammad Bada Nava’ī, and ‘Ala al-Dīn Alish), some short treatises on mysticism composed by them are still extant, but these do not possess any great literary significance. Other more voluminous and important works on literature and theology were also written, such as the Sharh-i Sharḥ al-Tadvīl. This was a translation into Dakhani Urdu by Sayyid Mīrā of Hyderabad (died 1074 = 1665) of the Persian work called Tadvīlī written by Ṣā’īd A†īn al-Quṣṭ al-Hamadānī (died 533 = 1137).

The above-mentioned poet Wajdhī or Wajdhī was the author of a prose work which has great literary significance, called Sab-Ras or Husn o Dil ("Beauty and the Heart"). It is a kind of allegory, describing the conflict between beauty on the one hand and the love sentiments of the heart on the other. The whole book is written in thymed prose, and was composed in 1045 (1635). Another voluminous work, bearing the name of Tarjama-i Shamsī al-‘Athsī, is a translation, made by Mīrā of Ya’Barmah about 1080 (1670), of the Persian book of Rūcoh ‘Imād al-Dīn, who was a spiritual disciple of ‘Abd Allāh Bābānī al-Dīn (died 732 = 1332 al-Dawlatī). Many other prose works were also written soon after this time.

In this early language, just as Arabic and Persian words have been allowed to intermingle freely with Hindi words, so also the authors have drawn freely upon both Hindi and Muhammadan legends for the subject matter. While some of the themes versified are translations from Persian writers and poets, for others the authors are indebted to popular legends in the Sanskrit and Hindi languages, and also to Hindi folklore, e. g. Nāl Dau, or ‘Urūdī’s famous mathnawi Gulkhānā-i Īsk, which is a love story of Madhumītī and Manohar, or the story of Kām-rūp Kāntī. In the books written by the Shīfs, words of all three languages, Arabic, Persian and Hindi, have been freely used, and the poets too have drawn their similes and metaphors from all three.

It was, however, only when these works began to be written in Persian characters, and the system of Persian (or Arabic) prosody was adopted, that the real foundations of the Urdu language can be said to have been laid. The Padmāvat of Malik Muḥammad of Dījān (1547 = 1540), although composed in the perfect Hindi of that period and containing but a sprinkling of Arabic and Persian words, was nevertheless written in Persian characters. The prose works as well as the verses composed in the early Dakhani Urdu were similarly written, and the majority of the poems have Persian metres. Malik Muḥammad, by presenting the pure Hindi language of that period in Persian characters, represents the fusion of Indian and Islamic cultures. The writers who came after him went a step further, and by writing prose and poetry in a combination of Hindi, Persian and Arabic words still more closely cemented this alliance. Their adoption too of Persian (i.e. Arabic) prosody helped to make the foundations of the new language permanently strong. This may be ascribed to the influence of Persian culture, which was then predominant. Closely in the wake of foreign prosody
came foreign music, and these two helped to give an entirely new colouring to the nature and moral tone of Urdu poetry.

The beginnings of what may be called modern Urdu poetry were made in the time of Muhammad Shah (1151–1161 = 1716–1748). Even Wali Dakhani (1099–1150 = 1668–1714) of Awrangzaib learned from the masters who were then at Dilli, and drew his inspiration from them. His verse shows a tendency to select and refine, and he sincerely endeavours to choose the most polished words and idioms. The proportion of Hindi and Persian elements in his verse, both as regards diction and subject-matter, is about equal. His contemporary Siraj-ud-din is also a good poet, and uses a purer language than Wali.

The classical period of Urdu poetry begins with Mir Taqi (1137–1223 = 1712–1799). Mir's poetry truly reflects his own life. As he was the son of a pious darwaza who had kept himself strictly aloof from everything worldly, the tender and impressionable years of his life were spent in the society of saintly darwazas. He lost his father at the age of eleven, and leaving Agra, his native place, came to Dilli to earn his living. At this time, the once famous and powerful Mughal empire was fast crumbling to pieces, and the frequent excursions of Akbar Shah Durrani, coupled with the plundering activities of the Dauds and the Marathas, had deprived it of even that meagre share of prestige which had been left to it after the devastating onslaughts of Naitir Shah. All this had a deep effect upon Mir (see his autobiography Dilkash-i Mir), and accounts for the general pessimism and tender pathos of his poetry. His verses are lyrical and were couched in the sweetest, simplest and most melodious language, a combination but rarely met with in other poets. His ghazals and mathnawis are by far the best to be found in Urdu literature, and their merit has been acknowledged by almost all the great poets in Urdu. Mir was a man of very strong character, self-sacrificing even to a fault, and led a severely disciplined life. During the reign of Shah Alam (1759–1806), when there was no one left in Dilli to encourage poetry, a number of poets migrated to Lakhanpuri, which was then the seat of a flourishing court. Mir too, on the invitation of Nawab Asaf al-Dawla of Awadh, went to Lakhanpuri and remained there until his death in A.D. 1799.

Sawda (1125–1195 = 1713–1781), a contemporary of Mir, was also a good poet, but he falls far short of the latter. He was impatient of criticism, had no control over his temper, and wrote long sares, but is nevertheless to be ranked among the masters. The chaste and graceful poetry of Sawda Mir Dard (see the article DARD, (1133–1199 = 1721–1784) reflects the mystic religion of his age. The realist MirHasan (d. 1201 = 1786), a follower of Mir Dard, depicts in his poetry the social manners and customs of the age to which he belonged. His famous mathnawi Shair al-Bevasan, in which he describes both human passions and natural scenes with remarkable fidelity, is the best and most popular mathnawi in Urdu.

We now come to the age of Rangin and Lashkari (d. 1233 = 1817), both of whom, like Sawda, Mir, and Mir Hasan, migrated to Lakhanpuri. At that period Lakhanpuri was the home of fashion and follies and the centre of a polished and pleasure-loving society, which fact could not but be reflected in the poetry written there. Rangin is generally considered the real originator of rangini (see above under Haidari), a form of verse in which everything was written only about women and in the language and idioms used only by them. He is fond of using Hindi words but his standard is very low, and his verses are full of erotic suggestions and other obscenities. Indiya, on the other hand, is not sensual but milharthul. He was a true poet but born in a decadent age, when the place of honour was usurped by servility. He regards life as a sport, and in his poetry, though the colours are usually heightened, the sentiment is often falsified. But it should be remembered that he is a master of technique, and that, while his affectations harmed Urdu literature in a general way, they also contributed to it an element of refinement and freshness. Thus his influence on literature has been both good and bad. His book Daur-i Laphar bears eloquent testimony to his mastery of the Urdu language.

Nasiri (d. 1830) stands out as a solitary figure in the history of Urdu literature. Though one of the most neglected of Urdu poets, and by some biographers even refuted the title of poet, he is an Indian poet in the real sense of the term. Even when swayed now and then by sensual pleasures, he does not cease to be a perfect artist. His best poems are those in which he merely sings the songs of his native land, or on common topics which appeal alike to young and old, poor and rich. Like nature in India, his imagination too is rich and fertile. Several of his poems on birds and beasts (e.g. "The poor Swan", "The Bear-Cub", and "The young Squirrel") indirectly criticise the social manners and customs of his period. In some of his poems he has portrayed the happy scenes witnessed at Indian festivals, and his love of nature is shown in his vivid descriptions of the seasons. His style, however, is sometimes careless, his verse is faulty, and he has no feeling for the choice of words. He is really a poet of the people and allows nothing to stand between himself and his swiftly-flowing narrative.

Dhawe (d. 1747–1855) is a follower of a long line of Persian poets who reduced literary slavtry to a fine art. His Dhawax, most of which were written in praise of the last ruler of the Mughal dynasty, are famous in Urdu literature. Not so, however, are his ghazals, to which his genius was totally unsuited.

At this stage in the history of Urdu literature poetry seemed to have come to a standstill. The poetical productions of the period were mostly imitative, satirical, and uninspiring, repeating with wearisome monotony the old ideas, themes and even the words which had been again and again employed by earlier poets. At this moment Ghulam suddenly appeared like a new planet in the literary firmament.

Ghulam (1212–1286 = 1797–1859) was descended from a family of warriors, and the warm blood of the Alitek Turks in his veins shows itself in his poetry. While yet a schoolboy he had begun to compose verses, but his real merit as a poet shone out only after the great mutiny of 1857. This revolution, representing as it did the conflict of contradictory forces, was destructive of much that ought not to have perished. The complete destruction of many a useful institution of
the Mughal reign, and the extinction of the great Mughal dynasty itself, deeply moved Ghâlib and imbued his poetry with that pathos which makes it so poignant. Like all truly great men, he was far ahead of his time, and for this very reason was not appreciated by his contemporaries. He was a pioneer of the modern movement in Urdu poetry. In the whole realm of Urdu literature there is none to surpass him in originality, strength of imagination, or flight of fancy. Ghâlib was the first to introduce philosophical conceptions into Urdu poetry, with the result that his verses offer a captivating combination of philosophy, mysticism and pathos. His style is decorative, expressive, and pleasing to the ear. Its one defect is that its literary idiom is Persian, but in spite of this a considerable number of his verses were written in a clear and simple style.

The most famous of the Persian elegies on the martyrdom of Husain, the _Hafiz Band_ of Muḥammad Kâhi, served as model for the Indian elegiac poets. But Anis (1803–1874) and Dabir (1803–1875) have far excelled the Persian prototype, except that, as in it, the nature of their grief is far from moral. Religious devotion and the literary excellence of their poems have accorded to them a very high position in Urdu literature. Anis is so graphic in his description of battle scenes, and so realistic in his portrayal of the Martyrs of Karbala, that the whole narrative seems to be alive and is surprisingly true in details. The verse is fluent and majestic, and in places so simple as to be suitable for every-day conversation. But a veil of gloom drapes all the poems. Instead of recounting the heroic deeds of the Imâm in a vigorous epic strain, both Anis and Dabir mourn for him, for his sufferings and death, with true feminine grief. The Imâm as depicted in these verses does not possess that forcefulness of character which marks all those who have gained martyrdom in the cause of truth. In spite of these defects of characterisation, however, Anis is a true master of language and of the art of poetry.

The period which marks the downfall of Lakhnât is one of stagnation and reaction in the history of Urdu literature. The poets are innocent of originality, in matter as in style, and overlaid their verse with redundant figures of speech. Atish and Nasîkh are both great masters of technique, but they do not deserve to be ranked with the other great poets of the Urdu language, and the entire "poetical" talent of their followers and pupils consists in pass and plays upon words. The mathnawî of Dâyâ Shakar Nasîm (1811–1843), written about this time, is a fine specimen of perfect versifying skill, and would have been good poetry had it not been figurative and ornamental to a fault. The various mathnawîs by Shawâ are nothing more than more word-pictures of the corrupt and free manners which characterised the society of that period, and in writing them the poet has drawn his inspiration from the gay and gallant court of Wâjjîd 'Alî Shâh, the last ruler of Awadh. But to do him justice, wanton mirth is not summed with grace of art. That is all that can be said in justification of his mathnawîs. The poet has sacrificed his art on the altar of frivolity.

After Dâgh (1831–1905) and Amîr (1828–1900), the foundations laid by Mir's classical poetry may be truly said to have fallen asunder. The poetry of both of these shows marked degeneration; both are upholders of that effete tradition which devoted its entire efforts to purposeless but sometimes decorative word-play. Of the two, however, Dâgh is a master of expression, and he has certainly enriched the language by introducing into his poetry colloquial idioms and some exquisite expressions.

It was, however, at this stage in the declination of Urdu poetry, when literature had degenerated into a mere farce, that the influence of the West began to make itself felt in the intellectual life of the country. The West formed a new world of thought laid open for the benefit of the Indian mind. Old traditions were changed; modern sciences replaced subjective egoism by objective art; instead of the classical, ornamental, and rhymed language, a simpler and more natural style of expression was adopted, and the effeminate dilletantism of the age gave way to manliness and self-confidence. In short, there began the true renaissance of Urdu letters.

Muhammad Husain Azad (d. 1910) was a remarkable embodiment of the characteristics of this period. He was the first poet to drink deep of the fountain of the Occident. He was a philologist and a master of the _mawâdûtî_metrical prose; but he was not a great poet. His contemporary Hâli, however, was altogether different. Hâli was born at Panipat in 1825 (1837) and died in 1832 (1914). His boyhood and youth were spent at Dihî at a time when the Mughal empire was fast declining, and as is natural at all such times, social and political upheavals were the order of the day. Hâli was an eye-witness of the setting sun of the Mughals, and all that he saw had a deep effect on his sensitive soul. Though in his literary pursuits he was the successor and pupil of Ghâlib and Shefta, yet intellectually he was a true descendant of the great Arab poets of pre-Islamic days.

His early poetical productions were of the type than common, but gradually the modern tendencies of the age began to influence him and led him ultimately to Naturalism and to a minute study of the society around him. The genesis of his didactic poetry was the Aligarh movement. Through the efforts of Sir Saiyid Ahmad Khan the era of a new humanism dawned upon India, and a new spirit suffused the intellectual and cultural life of Indian Muslims. Hâli was destined to be the bard of this new movement. In his _Mataaddas_ he not only made the dead past of History a living present, but he also described with surprising detail the national life of the Indian Muslims. Although his poetry is founded on a deep pessimism, he was filled with a passionate longing for truth and burned with the desire to rebuild and reconstruct. Besides being a great poet, Hâli was also one of the interpreters of English literature to the Indian people. But he was a true realist, and never allowed the surging tide of Occidental ideas to carry him off his feet. Before his time, literature was but a medium for expressing the ideas of a class. It was he who opened it up to the masses, and expressed himself in the common language, which was essential for the success of his mission. This, as was to be expected, raised a storm of hostile criticism and satire, but time has vindicated him against his critics. Moreover
his diction is immaculate, and he uses Hindi words in his verse with great beauty and skill.

In face of the flood of new ideas that swept away old-time conventions, AKBAR HASSAN (1846—1921) raised his voice in support of what to him was Oriental culture, and indulged his humour at the expense of the admirers of Europe and of their follies. Even the modernism of 'Allgahr could not escape his venomous satire. He regarded Indian and Islamic culture as in grave danger of submergence under the swelling tide of Western materialism, and made it the aim of his poetry to avert this catastrophe. New-fangled ideas came in for a good deal of criticism at his hands, and he has nothing but supreme contempt for those small-minded Indians who blindly imitated Europeans. His style, at its best, is polished and humorous, even though his verse is marred by a too-studied effort to create effect by word-play and rhyme. It is doubtful if he will be popular with posterity once his present utility as a satirist is exhausted. Though he is not one of the great ones among the poets he is certainly the least imitable of them all.

In modern Urdu poetry three figures stand out preeminent: Ghalib, Hali and Ibne Babl. Ghalib's soaring imagination and philosophical ideas broke through the crust of old-time poetry, but his verse is filled with the deepest pessimism. Hali is one who stands alone amid the fast crumbling ruins of ancient grandeur and weeps over it, but who yet bourns with the desire to reconstruct and to revive that which is fast decaying. Ibne Babl may not possess the soaring imagination of Ghalib nor the deep pathos of Hali, but he has a vigour, an enthusiasm and a creative force all his own. Though not favourably disposed to occidentalism, he has, more than any other of the poets, availed himself of western ideas, which have widened his poetic outlook. His early poetry was of the popular patriotic type, but of late he has developed a keen pan-Islamic feeling. He calls upon Muslims to make religion a basic and unifying principle and to develop the characteristics of the believers of old, and sees the vision of a day, not far distant, when Islam will prove to be the salvation, not only of Asia, but of the whole world. Of late he has devoted his talent to Persian rather than to Urdu verse, for he considers the Persian language to be more serviceable in propagating his ideas throughout Islamic countries than his mother-tongue Urdu.

The beginnings of Urdu prose have already been referred to above. The first prose books in the language were also written in the Dakhan, but most of them dealt with religion and other allied subjects, and none except the Sah-Ras (1045 = 1635), which is in metrical and rhymed prose, can claim any literary significance. In northern India, even so late as the post-Mutiny period, people wrote books and carried on correspondence in Persian. Shah Rafi's Al-Durr e Dilk (1163—1233 = 1750—1818) and Shah 'Abd al-Kadir (1157—1230 = 1754—1815) both translated the Koran into Urdu, but their translations were too literal. The foundations of modern Urdu prose were laid in the Fort William College at Calcutta, founded by Lord Wellesley in 1800. Of the languages taught there, most attention was paid to Persian and to Hindustani or Urdu. Dr. John Gilchrist, who was in charge of the College and was himself a keen student and author of Hindustani books, may well be regarded as a great patron of Urdu. Mir Aman, the compiler of the Bakhsh o-Bahar or Geeta-o-Geeth Darbars (1801—1802), and Mir Shair 'Ali Afzal, the compiler of the Arz-o-Mahi (1805), deserve special mention. Both of these books are admirable in point of diction and description, especially the Bakhsh o-Bahar (*The Garden and the Spring*) which will remain a perennial source of literary enjoyment. One notable influence of these compilations and translations produced under the auspices of the Fort William College was that Urdu writers began to develop a taste for simple language, and the old metrical rhymed style, laden with Arabic and Persian words and expressions, went out of fashion. But the majority of these books dealt with fiction in one form or another. It was left to the great Sir Saiyid Ahmad Khan (1857—1948) to teach his generation the art of writing on serious and scientific subjects in the simplest and most fluent language. His magazine Takhrib al-Akhbhar almost completely revolutionised Urdu literature. It was for this reason that the masters of modern Urdu prose were mostly those who had come either under the direct influence of Sir Saiyid, or else were in some way connected with the Dilk College, where Urdu was a medium of instruction, and where books were being translated and written in Urdu. In the meanwhile I cannot overlook the letters of Ghulam (see above) published under the title of *Urdi-i Mosalla* which are model of freshness, purity and wit.

Among the principal modern Urdu prose-writers are the following:

**Muhammad Hussain Azad** of Dilk writes chaste prose, and his books, though not free from artificiality, are couched in simple language, and have a genuine charm. His *Ab-i Hayat*, a biography of Urdu poets, should always remain a living thing in literature.

**Khawaja Ali Fazal Hussain Hali** was a master both of prose and poetry. His style, besides being sober and vigorous, is fluent, and he possessed a fine literary taste. He may be regarded as the founder of literary criticism and of biography in Urdu. His *Hayat-i Saud*, Fadlan-i Ghalib and *Mubaddalan-i Sair* are epoch-making books in Urdu literary criticism, and his *Hayati Qadim* (life of Sir Saiyid Ahmad Khan) is the high-water mark of Urdu prose literature.

**Nawab Ahmad (1831—1912)** was a forceful writer and speaker, with a wonderful command of language. In spite of his frequent use of Arabic words and phrases, his vigorous language penetrates to the hearts of his readers, and his works of fiction, such as *Misirat al-Amar*, *Tawabat al-Naqqal*, *Fasani-i Muqtha*, will always be read with interest by lovers of Urdu. Some of his characters have become household words among Urdu-speaking people. His translation of the Koran into Urdu is undoubtedly the best that has appeared.

**Sharif [see SHARIF NOUMAN] (1857—1914)**, who was a professor at Aligarh, was mainly instrumental in developing a taste for history in the Urdu-reading public. In addition to a series of lives of Muslim heroes, he wrote many treatises on Islamic questions and was a distinguished literary critic.

Novel-writing in Urdu dates only from the time of Kuranuddin Sargoor (1847—1902), the author of *Fasani-i Asb*, which, in itself some-
what confused, is yet well-known for its delineation of some of the chief features of the Greek society of its day. The novels of Abd al-Halim Sharrar (1866–1926) are mostly historical, but are weak in characterization. The fact is that with the exception of some of Naqib Al-Madina’s stories, no novel worth the name has yet been written in Urdu. Sharrar’s novels do not helped to create a literary taste, but they did no more.

With the advent of the British into India, a taste for the drama also began to be cultivated, and the Thakurs were the first to popularise it. This naturally produced some dramatists who wrote a number of ordinary plays, but unfortunately there has not yet appeared even one drama in Urdu which is deserving of serious mention.

Although at first the influence of English education tended to alleviate the sympathies of the younger generation from their own language, a phenomenon for which the style of education introduced into India was largely responsible, yet when their taste became more mature they turned to their mother-tongues with greater zest and began to enrich them with translations of European books on the arts and sciences. The Andjumani-Taraqqi-i Urdu of Awrangabad, Dahan, and the Osmania University of Haiderabad, Dahan, with its Translation Bureau, are the foremost institutions to-day for the advancement of the Urdu language. On the whole systematic progress is being made, and the people are beginning to love and feel proud of their language. During the last few years many magazines and journals have been started, some of which are rendering signal service to Urdu, and assisting in the development of a more refined taste.


Al-URDUND, the Jordan, Hebrew (ba) Vardâ emphasis, in LXX, Josephus, Pliny and others of Ḫarmâq. The etymology of the word is obscure and it is even thought by some to be a loanword (cf. the river name Ḫarmâq in Crete). After the Crusades the name al-Sha’ar al-Sabit, the "great watering-place" came into use and is still the most usual name among the Bedouins.

1. The Jordan is formed by the combination of three streams—a-Habsūn, Nahr Liddān and the Nahr ‘Awad. Shortly after their junction, the Jordan reaches the Hule district and here flows through the lake of Bāḥret al-Khālid (Bāḥret al-Hult according to Dalman is only the papyrus swamp in the north). The valley of the Jordan sinks rapidly towards the south, so that the surface of the Lake of Galilee, Bāḥr Tabāriya, through which the Jordan flows (cf. Tābāriya), is 652 feet below the level of the Mediterranean. The valley is known as al-Ghōr (cf. Ghawak) from the south end of the lake to an elevation 3 hours' journey south of the Dead Sea. Here it assumes a character different from that of its northern half: a plain of dazzling white marl, through which the river runs with numerous windings, looking to one who surveys it from a height like a twisted green ribbon, as the banks are covered with dense vegetation, which hides the river. Otherwise the plain is devoid of vegetation but at the foot of the hills on its western edge are several very fertile oases ("the gardens of Urdūn"; cf. Tābarī, Annals, 1:1324; see the article at Jabbok). The Jordan terminates in the Dead Sea, Bāḥr Li‘l (Lot’s Sea), the surface of which is 1,392 feet below sea-level and the deepest point 2,600 feet. It has no exit to the south or west and never has had one. The 1,300 million gallons of water brought down to it every day by the Jordan, evaporate in the burning heat so that the level of the water, apart from slight seasonal variations, remains the same. The result is that nothing can live in the water as the salt and other mineral constituents remain while the water evaporates. The depression south of the Dead Sea is called al-‘Arabah; the ground rises considerably here and then sinks again to the level of the Gulf of ‘Akabah.

The following tributaries of the Jordan may be mentioned. Soon after its exit from the Lake of Galilee it receives on the left bank the important stream of the Sha‘ar al-Sabit (the little watering-place) or Sha‘ar al-Menakhire, in the earlier period Varmik [q.v.], and farther south the Nahr al-Zerkā (the ancient Jabalok) which flows in at al-Damāiy. On the right bank comes the Djalīf, rising in Gollat’s spring (‘Ain Djalīf), which runs by Būsān into the Jordan.

On account of its currents, its numerous windings and many shallows, the Jordan cannot be used for navigation. On the other hand, even in ancient times several of these shallows formed fords which connected the lands east with those west of the Jordan and thus linked up the Mediterranean coast and Egypt with Damascus. North of Lake Tiberias there are five and south of it 54; they are most frequent opposite Būsān. In the Old Testament they are mentioned under the names ma‘abar or ma‘abara. Whether the Israelites had ferries is uncertain and in any case not proved by the obscure passage 2 Sam. xix. 19. On the other hand, it is difficult to imagine that in their fighting with the Aramaeans in the lands east of the Jordan, they would take their troops, horses and chariots (1 Kings, xxii. 35) across the Jordan by
fords, but how they did it we are not told (with floats?). If necessary it was possible to swim the Jordan (1 Macc., ix. 48) but in view of the strong current it required skill and strength. There were certainly no bridges here since these only began to be built in the Roman period. The ford a little south of the Hule district is specially celebrated; from it a road led via Kasiyrah to Damascus. Whether there was a Roman road here is, according to P. Thomson’s map in Z.D.P.F., xli. (cf. p. 33), uncertain but in the middle ages this ford, called Fidum Jacobi (wrongly from Gen. xxiii. 22), is often mentioned and was of considerable strategic importance during the Crusades. Here Baldwin III was defeated in 1157 by Nur al-Din and in 1178 Baldwin IV built a fort below the crossing, but in the following year it was stormed by Saladin and destroyed. At a later date, a three-arched bridge was built of large blocks of basalt at the site of the ford (cf. pictures in Z.D.P.F., xiii. 74). It is known to have been in existence in 1450 and was probably built not long before. The name “Bridge of Jacob’s daughters”, Djiyar Banu Ya’qub, points to the old Fidum Jacobi but it is remarkable as Jacob did not have a number of daughters (cf. above p. 1050).

One of the most important roads from Damascus to the lands west of the Jordan has probably always been the route via Fidj (or Affik, perhaps Afeik [Aphek] i Kings, xx. 26, 30; cf. xiii. 22) to the south end of the Lake of Galilee, where the Jordan was crossed by a ford where it leaves the lake. A little south of the crossing are the ruins of two stone bridges: Umun al-Kasrj and Djiyar al-Sidd. Nothing is known of their history but one of them is probably the bridge at the south end of the lake which Makkaddas mentions in his description of Tabariyya and of which Ya’qub says that it had over 20 arches. As late as the 19th century we are told by W. de Belderssen that he crossed the Jordan by a bridge here (Robinson, Biblical Researches in Palestine, iii.). Close to the junction of the Yarmuk with the Jordan is a bridge Djiyar al-Mudjami whence roads led to Mekka and to Irbid below the hills of Kar Shamha. Further to the south we again find a bridge Djiyar al-Damiyya but this is now out dry land as the river has dug out a new bed here. It was built in 1266 by the vigorous Muslim ruler Baibars who also had bridges built at several other places (cf. Röhrich, Archäe de l’ Orient latin, II, p. 382; Clermont-Ganneau, in J.A.E., ser. viii., vol. ii. [1887], p. 518). Among the most used is the bridge north of Jericho which leads to W. Nimrin.

In the brief descriptions of the Jordan in the Arab geographers there are a few details of some interest. Makkaddas mentions that the river is unmanageable. Ya’qub, quoting an older authority, says that the Jordan above the Lake of Tiberias was called the “Great” and between the lake and the Dead Sea the “Little Jordan”, which statement however is probably based on a confusion with the Yarmuk (see above). He mentions the sugar plantations watered by the river in al-Qatar (cf. xil. 114). Makkaddas mentions the hot springs near the Lake of Tiberias and of Mudjami where the Yarmuk joins the Jordan. He also gives an account of the remarkable phenomena at the river’s end. The Jordan flows by night and day into the Dead Sea without any outflow, yet the Sea does not increase in winter or decrease in summer. The main road

from Damascus to Egypt goes, according to Ibn Khurdadhbih (E. G. A., vi. 214) and the geographer who follow him, via Fidj to the south end of the Lake of Tiberias and thence by a circuitous route via Tiberias to Baisan. In the 19th century on the other hand, the route lay through a part of ‘Ajlun, as one descended from Baisan into the Jordan valley to Mudjami and thence over the bridge to follow the road to Irbid. In the 20th century, a notherly route begun to come into use by going eastwards from the new capital Safat (see below) crossing the Jordan on the above-mentioned “bridge of Jacob’s daughters” and thence via Nuyan and Kasrut to Damascus. This road remained the usual one and has recently been made more convenient by improving the road leading to and from the bridge.

2. The Jordan province of the Arabs, Djamal al-Urdunn (military district of the Jordan), corresponded to the Talasitina Sekmuna of the older division and included the two Galilees, the valley of the Jordan and the western part of the lands east of the Jordan. Most of the towns in it were taken by Abū ‘Ubayda in 14 (635), the remainder by Khalid and ‘Amr b. al-‘Asi; others name Shahrabid as the conqueror. They were all taken by force of arms except Tabaryya which capitulated under shamefaced conditions and probably on that account was made the capital instead of Skybopoli. The size of the district may be judged from the list of towns given by the historians and geographers as belonging to it: according to Balbuzi: Tabariyya, Baissan, Kadas, Akka, Sür, Safarizia and in the land east of the Jordan Sisaya, Affik, Djaraq, Bait Ras, al-Djawlan and (?) Sawad — according to Ya’qub: Tabariyya, Sür, Akka, Kadas, Baissan and in the land east of the Jordan Fahil, Djaraq and (?) Sawad — according to Inh al-Fakih: Tabariyya, al-Samara (i.e. Nabisus), Baissan, Akka, Kadas, Sür and in the land east of the Jordan Fahil and Djaraq — according to Makkaddas: Tabariyya, Kadas, Sür, Fardhखw, Akka, al-Ladhul, Koub, Baissan and in the land east of the Jordan Ajar’at — according to Ibn ‘Ajlun: Tabariyya, al-Mudjân, al-Samara (Nabisus), Baissan, and at Jericho, Akka, Nijam, Sür and in the land east of the Jordan: Zughr, ‘Ammat (Amatus), Habba (Yabis), Djarad, Atiya (Atala), Sisaya — according to Ya’qub: Tabariyya, Baissan, Safarizia, Sür, Akka and in the land east of the Jordan Bait Ras and Djadur etc. These lists show that the boundaries have not always remained the same.

Regarding the yearly tribute of the province of Urdunn the Arab authors give the following figures (cf. vita qurtis): towards the end of the vihth century 96,000 dinars, under ‘Abdun 97,000, according to Ibn Khurdadhbih and Ibn al-Fakih 350,000, according to Kudma 109,000, according to Ya’qub 100,000, according to Makkaddas 170,000 (cf. Z. D.P. F., vii. 225).

In the Crusading period, the previous divisions were abolished and the members of Saladin’s family constituted various kingdoms (mamlukid) instead. The province of Urdunn is represented mainly by the kingdom of Safat which in addition to the town of that name included the following districts: Marsi, Aliyân, Ladgûn, Djarad, Akka, Sür and Selim, i.e. all towns in the lands west of the Jordan. In Shikh al-Din al-Madshûb, who wrote his al-Maqrî in 1351 and was often copied, we find another division, in which al-Qatr and the lands east of
The smellas have never recognised their competence, denouncing as illegal any judgment based on surf. In Turkey it stood for the conception of the Sultan's own arbitrary power as distinct from 'ada (customary law, q.v.), fitna (civil law) and the shar. Sometimes surf might run counter to the shar, e.g. when the Sultan enslaved Christians, though they were dhimmis and thus "protected", in order to recruit the corps of the Janissaries.

Bibliography: As under Am, with the addition of the works mentioned in the body of the article and the following: Olearius, Freges, transl. J. Davies, London 1669, p. 275; 275; Polak, Persien, l. 328 sq.; C. J. Wills, Persia as it is, ch. vii; d’Olluson, Tableau general de l’Empire Ottoman, l, xxvii.; Ahmad al-Nazīt, Kitāb al-‘Uṣūl, Cairo 1312, iv, 267; Drel Courier Berber, in Revue d. Ét. islamiques, lii. 481 sq.; Winstedt, Malayas, p. 107; R. Levy, Sociology of Islam, vol. ii., ch. III.

(R. LEVY)

URFP, DJAMAL AL-DIN, of Shiraz, a Persian poet. His personal name is variously given: al-Sajjīdī (Arāfātī), Khwājā Sayyidī Muhammad (Ma’ṣūrī, Ruknī), and Muḥammad Ḥusayn (Mayḥānī). He was known in his younger days as ʾAlī (Mayḥānī, cf. Oude Cat., p. 126). His father's name was Zain al-Din Balawi (?) and his grandfather's name is Khwajaghi al-Din Sayyidī, but the latter was more commonly known as Khwājā al-Ṣāḥib al-Bālī. 'Urifu was born in Shiraz, where his father held a post in a Government Office. According to the author of the Ma’ṣūrī, the poet was that of the vizier of the Dīrāgā (Prefect) of the town. 'Urifu received his early education in the usual kind in Shiraz, and began to compose verses in early youth. His tahallus had reference to the occupation of his father, who had to deal with matters relating to canon law (qanat) and customary law (urf). At the age of twenty he had a severe attack of small-pox, which disfigured him very much. The various tahallus give us only a few glimpses of his poetical career in Persia. He entered into poetical contests with Muhammad Ghairati (for whom see Hafiz Ḥāmeneh)(s), Shirāz, and Badḫūn, iii. 292) and other poets of Shiraz. Awāhī tells us that a few years before 'Urifu left for India, he wrote ghaslā in the same metre and rhyme as those of Fīghtān (d. 922 or 925) and other famous poets. His extreme self-conceit and arrogance brought him into serious conflict with his contemporaries, especially with Wāhījī of Yazd (d. 953), and caused much unpleasantness. The mortification caused to him by his own discomfiture, his conflict with his contemporaries, and the lure of Indian patronage are given among the causes which induced him to leave his own country and emigrate to India.

Leaving the port of Līṭan, he came by the sea-route to Ahmāndnagār in 994 (1585-1586) (Takī Rāhī, Oude Cat., p. 37), perhaps more correctly in 993 (1585), and thence went to Fathpur-Skri, where he arrived about the new year's day (19th Rāhī, i. 993 = March 10/11, 1585). There he attached himself to Fāṣīd, who took him along to Atoock, where Akbar encamped early in Muhammad 994 (Nov. 1585), to control the operations against the Yūsufzai Afghans, in which expedition Fāṣīd himself took part (Abār Nāma, iii. 476). Later, 'Urifu attached himself to Masīh al-Dīn Ḥakim Abu ‘l-ʿAlī, and, on his death in 997


URFP, (A.), defined by Dijurīn (Naʿīrī, ed. Fligel, p. 154), and "Action or belief" in which persons persist with the concurrence of the powers and which their natural dispositions agree to accept (as right). It stands therefore to represent an unwritten custom as opposed to established law, shar' (cf. Miṣwadī, ed. Eimer, p. 5; Bahaʾ al-ʿAlī, ed. Beveridge, f. 1424, line 7; transl., p. 194) though attempts have not been lacking to regard it as one of the qanats (cf. Goldsader, Tahārin, p. 204 sq). It is sometimes held to be equivalent to case law or common law. This may be where civil laws (akhnīs) are based on recognized local customs (urfī) and it is a well-known fact that in many tribal and other communities these are native codes of unwritten laws and traditions by which life is regulated locally. In Southern Palestine these existed as late as the middle of the nineteenth century a fellahī code called khākat baltal, i.e. "the law of Abraham", as distinct from the Muhammadan code (Palestine Exploration Fund, Quarterly Statement, Jan. 1879, p. 38). Amongst the Bedouin of Arabia also these have always existed, as distinct from the ʿirfi of the sharīʿ special judges possessed of the customary lore of their tribe, to whom recourse is had in matters affecting tribal interests (cf. J. v. Barckhardt, Notes on the Bedouins and Wahabis, London 1831, i. 120-122; A. Muzzī, Araḫa ʿAṭmar, Vienna 1908, iii. 209, 377 sq., 346 sq., 365). Frequently ʿurf is simply the decision made in various cases by the sovereign or his agent — not the kāfī — according as the requirements of the state demand or as prejudices dictate. In Persia, since the Safavid period or even before, decisions based upon ʿurf have been made by the Shāh or his governors or by the special court of ʿurf presided over by the Divān-begī. There was however never any rule to decide which cases were to go to the latter court and which to the courts of the shar, though mainly it was offences against the state and against law and order — e.g. rebellion and disloyal conduct, debase the coinage, rioting, theft, highway robbery, and murder — which came before it.
(1898), to Mirzâ 'Abd al-Rahmân Khân Khânân, to whom the Ḥakím had recommended him, and from whom he was already receiving considerable grants of money every year. The Khân Khânân treated him with great kindness and consideration.

Finally, the Emperor (Akbar) took 'Urfit to his own service but he died soon after in Lâshore, at the age of 35 or 36, on the 18th Amurud (August 1591), of dysentery, or, as later writers say, of poison. He was buried in Lâshore, but thirty (lunar) years after his burial his bones were sent by Mîr u ʿAbîd va ʿInshâvî, vizier of the Khânân al-Dawla (father of Sîr u ʿlîshâ Banu), to Najaf, where they were reburied.

'Urfit's contemporaries describe him as a conceited and arrogant person and the fact is borne out by many disparaging remarks which his divân contains about great Persian poets. As a poet, however, he enjoyed great popularity in his time in India, and outside India, though his early death prevented him from developing fully. He was praised as the inventor of a new style of poetry, some of the outstanding features of which were a forcible diction, coinage of new and original expressions, the continuity of topics, freshness and novelty of metaphor and comparison. In the quote below, his chief merit lies in his giving a personal expression to philosophic ideas and lofty ideals but his fame rests mainly on his Ḥâfizān. In the following centuries 'Urfit suffered somewhat in popularity, especially in his own country, where Akbar condemned his excessive use of similes (see Ateh-Nâdâ, Bombay 1877, p. 276), and more recently Rûdâ Khân indicated that his style was not to the taste of that writer's contemporaries (Madīnâr al-Farsâr, ii. 24).

'Urfit published his first divân in 996 (1587-1588), which comprised 26 Ḥâfizān, 700 hâns, and hâns and enâh is containing 700 hâns (*230 of the former and 350 of the latter*); (cf. Oude Cat., p. 259). In 1026 (1617) Sirâjûḏ-Isfahânê edited a Kullâhâ of 'Urfit (14,000 hâns) from the MSS. which the poets had sent from his death-bed to the Khânân Khânân, For Nâṣim Tabrizi's claim to have edited these after 1023 (1617) see Mayhânû, Hâwâsh, p. 102. The Khânân included, besides the poems of the kind comprised in the first divân, some madâkhâns (viz. Madâkhâns al-Akhâr, Farhâd va-Shirvâs, and a Khânân). Apparently Sirâjûḏ's edition had a preface from the pen of Mulla 'Abîd al-Bûkî Nâshâwândî. 'Urfit also has a short prose treatise called Naftûyê. Several commentaries on his Ḥâfizān exist in Persian and Turkish (see Bûbikâr Cotationâ, ii. 198 ed.). His Ḥâfizān has been frequently lithographed in India. An English translation of his Ḥâfizān was published in Calcutta 1887.

Bibliography: Ansâr-i Ahmad Râzî, Haft Iskâm (Lahore MS., transcribed in 1904), fol. 94 ed.; Badrûn, Muntashir al-Tawârîkh, Calcutta 1869, ii. 375; ii. 285, and English translation, ii. 387; iii. 392 (Biblioth. Indica Series); Akbar Nâma (ed. Blochmann), Calcutta 1886, i. 595; Blochmann, Ain-i Akbari, Calcutta 1873, i. 569-571; Muntakhib-i Ra’îs (Pandîshîh Univ. Libr. MS.), fol. 192; Ta’îr Awhâlâ, Arafât (Bûnîkâr MS., p. 509); Ta’îr Khâtûn (Oude Cotation, p. 37); Mâdâkhân al-Rûmî, Calcutta 1927, ii. 293 ed., 118; Mulla ʿAbîd al-Nâbî, Mâdâkhân, p. 175-185, and Hâwâsh, p. 45 ed., 102 ed.; Khâtûn Khân, Muntakhab al-Ludâb, Calcutta 1869, i. 241; Mîr ʿAbîd al-Khâyûl (Lâshore MS., transcribed in 1114), fol. 269; Khushgu, Shâhî (Pandîshîh Univ. Libr. MS.), fol. 619 ed.; Khâshâb, Jâmî (Cawnpur 1871, p. 318); Shâhî ʿAlî Shâhî (Lâshore 1924, ii. 73-119; Agha Sâyiḍ Muḥammad, Ali, 344 for 344-'Urfit, Hâdâsabâd 1345, ed., Islamic Culture, Hâdâsabâd 1929, i. 96-125; Spranger, Oude Cotation, Calcutta 1854, p. 533; Rieu, Cat. Brit. Mus. Pers. MSS., i. 169; ibid., ii. 310, 311; Gilb, Hist. of Ottoman Poetry, i. 127, 129; ii. 247, 260; Bûnîkâr Cat. of Persian and Arabic MSS., Calcutta 1919, ii. 189; Brown, Persian Literature in Modern Times, Cambâlî, 1924, iv. 241 ed.; M. A. Ghani, History of Persian Language and Literature at the Mughal Court, Allahbâd 1930, i. 103 ed. (Mohammad Shafi).

URGIÊNÇ. [See KUWAIT.]

URMIYA, a district and town in the Persian province of Ādâbâr-Đâlân.

The name, the Syrias write Urmîyû, the Armenians Ormi, the Arabs Urmiya, the Persians Urtûn, the Turks Urîmi or Únlûn (through a fanciful derivation from Únlû Byzantium, Turkey). The name is of uncertain, non-Iranian origin. Asyr. sources mention a place called Urmiya in the land of Mann in the vicinity of the Lake of Urmiya (cf. Streck, in Z.A., xiv. 140; Belek, Das Reich der Mannû Çav, in Verkhvi. d. Belr. Geisl. f. Anthropol, 1894, and Minoros, Khâshkan etc., in Zap., xxiv. 1617), 179). On the other hand, the name is unknown to the classical geographers and to the Persians and Pahlavi sources (cf. Jackson, op. cit., p. 87). The name is also unknown to Armenian geography of the 9th century (cf. Marquart, Erânîhî); this is in spite of the fact that late Zoroastrian tradition early recorded by the Arabs (cf. Balâshûrî, p. 331; Ibn Khurdâshîhî, p. 119) placed the birthplace of Zarastur at Urmîya.

Geography. The district of Urmîya is bounded on the east by the Lake of Urmîya and in the west by the mountain range which runs north and south and separates Persia from Turkey. In the north it is bounded by the transversal range (Shâh-Bûrîd-Awûtân-daghî) which separates it from Salmas [q.v.]. To the south Urmîya is bounded by the valley of the Garîd, the upper course of which belongs to Úshû (q.v.) and the lower waters the Sûlûz [q.v.]. Urmîya is about 80 miles from N. to S. and 33 from E. to W.

The district of Urmîya consists of plain and mountains. The rivers that water it and which flow from W. to E. are:

1. the Bârândus which unites the waters of the district of Mûgâvûr and then runs through the gorge of Nergî into the plain which it runs E. and then south on the south side. On the right (south) bank the Bârândus receives the Khâshîn which runs through the little Dâsh-tâbâl. The mountains of Mûr separate the eastern Dâsh-tâbâl from the Dâsh-tâbâl. This last district lies in the shape of a horse-shoe on the S.W. shore of the lake (to the north of Sûlûz).

2. the Barâd-e Sar (= Kurd. "Red Stone") runs out of the gorge of Bîkûzî (belonging to Turkey) through the mountainous region of Dâshâh, which belongs to Urmîya and then through the pass of Band into the plain and through the town of Urmîya, whence its other name, Shahr-i Zai, "the river of the town."
3. The Roušā (Ravādā)-čai drains the hilly district of Tārgāvar and before reaching the lake has been used up by irrigation canals.

4. The Nāζlū-čai is made up of a number of streams of which the southern rises in the Turkish district of Detir (where the monastery of Mar-raisio is) and below the village of Arzin runs through the northern part of Tārgāvar (where on the right bank it is joined by the Mawānā); the middle one comes out of the gorge of Bālīs (Turk.) and near the village of Sēro enters the Persian district of Bārīs; the northern stream is that of the district of the Sonā [q. v.] which belongs to Susa. The waters of these three join at a foot of Mount Mānīdār (in Kurdu "set on the head") and from the fort of Isā'īd Khan Shākāk [q. v.] the river formed by their union flows through the northern part of the plain. On the north of its left bank on the slope of the Awhgam-daghī is the district of Amād.

The lake of Urmīa lies at a height of 4,245 feet above sea-level, the town of Urmīa 4,390 feet; the heights of the outer spurs are: 4,780, 7,520, 8,395, and that of the frontier range is 11,120, 11,542, 11,830 feet.

The abundant supply-water renders the alluvial plain of Urmīa extremely fertile. The villages are buried in verdure. In the mountain districts the agriculture is dependent on the rains. The natural conditions there are very favourable for the breeding of sheep.

Archaeology. Several tells in the vicinity of the town (Gūk-tāpā, Dega, Taramān, Almāzān, Sarāzan, Dinā-tāpā) have already produced objects of great antiquity (cf. Virchow, Fundstücke und Grabhügel bei Urmiya, in Zeitschr. f. Ethnologie, xxvi., 1900, p. 609—612; Jackson, op. cit., p. 90—98; Lehmann-Haupt, Armeenien, i. 276). In 1888 in a vaulted chamber discovered at Gūk-tāpā at a depth of 25 feet was found a cylindrical seal representing the Babylonian god. W. H. Ward, Amer. Journ. of Archæology, vi., 1890, p. 280—291 and Lehmann-Haupt, Materialien z. Alter. Gesch. Armenien, 1907, p. 8—12, date it c. 2000 b. c. If Urmīya is the ancient Urmiata it must have been included in the land of the Mannaces (Mmin. of Jeremiah, ili. 27), exposed to the invasions of the Assyrians as well as to the influence of the kingdom of Wan (Urasu); cf. the rock chambers at Nergi and Ka'ā Isā'īl-khan which have a Vānic character; cf. Minoros, in Zap. xxiv., p. 188—191. There seems to be a third chamber on Mount Kotul at Brèlsdyot.

The Assonism of the two names of which it was supposed to be an origin had the identity of Urmīya with the Gāzipādā; where stood the great fire-temple and which was burned by Harecius in 625. But it is strange to find thevāsmans on the road which Khrusav Fotwiz took to go to Dastgerd (cf. Ritter's remarks, Frāz. bndi, ix. 944). According to the text of Theophanes, restored by de Boor, i. 358, ii. 190, 619, thevāsmans was situated to the east iv. of Avarzādī, evidently with reference to Gāzipādā. Since Rawlinson, the latter place has been located at Taht-i-Sulaimān (cf. 4952). De Brébisson connects thevāsmans with Betharram, Bethrāisā, and Berma mentioned by several classical authors.

Islam period. Urmīya was conquered by Sādaqa b. 'Ali, a client of the 'Azd, who built several castles there (Balāḏūrī, p. 331—332); according to another story, the town was taken by 'Uṯa b. Farajād whom the caliph 'Omar had sent in 290 (640) to conquer the district of Mawṣil.

The geographers of the ninth century (Iṣākhī, p. 181; Ibn Hawqal, p. 239) give Urmīya the third place among the towns of Adharbājān (next to Ardabil and Marāgha) and emphasize its wealth in water, pastures and fruits. Muḳaddasi, p. 51, puts Urmīya in Armenia and says it is governed from Dvin. At this period Urmīya was on the great road Ardabil—Marāgha—Urmīya—Barkīt (to the N. E. of the lake of Wan)—Āmid (Muḳaddasi, p. 303). As Tābrīz [q. v.] was not yet of any importance, the road made a detour to the south to serve the principal towns. It is possible that the presence of unattached elements in the north of Adharbājān (cf. the name of the lake Buḥairat al-Shirāt and the history of Rābak) also influenced this deviation of the road towards the south.

The district of Urmīya, being inhabited by Kurds and Christians has never played a great part in Muslim history. It was a remote fief in which the off-shoots of the dynasties that reigned in Adharbājān lived in isolation.

In the period of Dailamite domination in Adharbājān we find in Urmīya a certain Dījāstan b. Sharmāzan. This general had begun in 542 (1953) as a devoted partisan of the Kur Daisans [cf. kur]. Later on, with the Dailamites, he became governor of Armenia under Marzubān. When Dījāstan succeeded his father Marzubān in 546, Dījāstan b. Sharmāzan did not recognize his sovereignty. At first he left Urmīya to throw in his lot with Irāhīm b. Marzubān for whom he conquered Marāgha. He later left him to return to Urmīya which he surrounded with walls; he also built a strong fortress there. He then entered the service of the claimant to the caliphate Mūsā b. 'Uṯān and had the support of the Khāḏān Khurd. But the sons of Marzubān (Dījāstan and Irāhīm) defeated him with the help of the Khāḏān Khurd. In 549 at the instigation of Wāḥsūn, brother of Marzubān, he inflicted a defeat on Irāhīm b. Marzubān, captured the remnants of his army and annexed Marāgha to Urmīya. In 555 through the mediation of the Būyid Rūkn al-Dawla, he again recognized the authority of Irāhīm (Ibn Miskawayh, Taḏkārāt, ed. Amèdès, ii. 150, 167, 177—178, 180, 219, 229 and Ibn al-Athir, viii. 395).

When the Ghūz invaded Adharbājān in 420—432, the lord of Urmīya was a certain Abu l-'Iḥšūd b. Rabīb al-Dawla, chief of the Ḥāḏābī Khurs, whose mother was the sister of the prince of Tabrīz, Wāḥsūn al-Rawwādī [cf. tarkā and marāgha]. This son of Rabīb al-Dawla boasted of having destroyed near a bridge 25,000 Ghūz of the 36,000 who were trying to cross his territory (iv. 413?); cf. Ibn al-Athir, i. 271.

In Muḥarrar of 455 (1063) Sulṭān Tughrīl passed through Urmīya (al-Bundārī, p. 35). When Sulṭān Muṣʿūd returned from Baghdad to Adharbājān (in 5267), the amīr Ḥāḏīq Tātar had fortified himself in Urmīya but later he submitted to the Sulṭān (ibid., p. 105). In 544 (1149) Urmīya belonged to Malik Muhammad b. Malīkābīd b. Muhammad, nephew and son-in-law of Sulṭān Muṣʿūd b. Muhammad b. Malikābīd (Rāḥīṣ at-ṣudārāt, G. M. S., p. 244). When the last Sulṭān Tughrīl quarrelled with his uncle, the Ildegrids Ẓīrlī Ārānī, Tughrīl had the support of the amīr Ḥasan b. Ḥāḏīq and with him laid siege to
Urmia in 585. The town was taken by storm, sacked and destroyed (Bundârî, p. 302). From the same Saldâk period must date the building of Se-Gumbadîn, on which Khanyovk reaped the name of Allah Mânsûr b. Mâwâ and the date 580 (1184).

In 602, the Atabeg of Tabriz Abî Bakr gave Ushnâ (-cancel for Ustawa) and Urmia to the Atabeg of Marâğa [q.v.] "Abâ Îl-Dîn to recompense him for the loss of Marâğa (Ibn al-Athîr, xii. 257). Yâkût, who visited Urmia in 617 speaks of it as having lost its security on account of the weakness of its ruler, the Ilkhanid Ozbek b. Fâhâwân.

During the rule of Aqâhârâddîn of the Khârizmshah, Djalîl al-Dîn, Urmia, Salâmâ and Kâbû formed the personal appanage of the Saldâk princes whom Djalîl al-Dîn had carried off from her first husband the Ilkhanid Ozbek. In 623 the Iwâlî Türkomans seized Urmia and levied xâshâyî. On the complaint of the princess his wife, Djalîl al-Dîn sent troops who defeated the Türkomans (Ibn al-Athîr, xii. 301). Later Urmia was given to Boghöh, a former slave of the Ilkhanid Ozbek; cf. Nasawi, ed. Houdas, p. 118, 153, 165.

On the other hand, according to Djewwantsî, u. 160, 184, the Georgian generals Shalwa and Iwane, taken prisoners in the battle of Kârhi (622=1225) and at first treated with honour by Djalîl al-Dîn, were given for a short time Marnad, Salmas, Urmia and Ushnâ. In 628 (1230-1231) the Khârizmshah had a press of the Mongols spent the winter in the region of Urmia-Ushnâ (cf. Abu'l-Farâdî, ed. Focucce, p. 470; Raashî al-Dîn, ed. Blochet, p. 33). His stay there may explain the story of the building by the Khârizmshah of the Se-Gumbadîn (cf. above) and even of his burial at Urmia; cf. Rittner, p. 75; Hörnle, p. 488.

According to Khanyovk, the cathedral mosque of Urmia bears the date 676 (1277) [reign of the Ilkhan Khân Abâghâ].

Timmûr. According to the local chronicle (Nikîkâne), Timmûr had given Urmia as a seif to Gurgin-leg of the Ahsârî tribe, who established himself in the fortress of Torpakh (= Toprak-Kâlı), a quarter of a farsakh from the town of Urmia. The Zafar-nâmê, however, (i. 424), mentions as governor a certain Timru (?) whose rights were confirmed by Timmûr in 789 (1307).

The Brâdâsî. According to the ʿAlâm-ārî, p. 559, in the time of Shah Tahmâsp the great amirs were governors at Urmia while the Kûr Kûr Tâdî of the Brâdâsî tribe who had been made abâhâr was given the districts of Târgâvar and Mârgâvar. In 1012 (1603) Shah Abâhâ, to reward the loyalty of Amîr-Khân Brâdâsî, who had not submitted to the Ottomans, gave him Urmia and Ushnâ. But Amîr-Khân under the pretext that the fortress of Urmia was dilapidated made his stronghold at Dîmidîn (to the south of Urmia at the mouth of the river Kâmilîn in the Bârândûs) and became suspected. Dîmidîn was taken in 1019 (1610) and the district (âlîq) of Urmia given to Kâhân-Khân Bâqâdbâlî. The Brâdâsî, by a stratagem, recaptured Dîmidîn after which Bâqâdbâlî. Pommak (of Tabriz) was appointed in place of Kâhân-Khân and later Aqa-Khân Mîyâkshâm (of Marâğa). In the list of the great dignitaries of the kingdom, however, the same source (p. 762) mentions as governor of Urmia Kallû-ʿAlî Sultanî, son of Kâmil-Khân of the Ilmân clan of the Ahsârî tribe.

Conversions to the Shi'a (cf. above) under the Saljuqids seemed to have been of an isolated character among the natives of the region of Urmia where to this day the Kurds and a few villages (Below) are still Sunnite. The influence of the Sunnite Nâshîbânî šâhîs may be judged from the fact that in 1630 Sultan Murad executed in Dîyârî-bakr the šâhî Mâhkâm of Urmia who had 30,000.40,000 partisans. His ancestors were also šâhîs of Urmia; cf. v. Hammer, G. O. K., ill. 187; cf. Xâshâyî-nâmê, p. 385.

Ewîliyê Celiêbi. For the years 1065 (1653) we have the very detailed account of Ewîliyê Celiêbi (tr. 271-318) who had gone from Van to Urmia to recover the flocks of sheep which the Khân of Urmia (whose name is not mentioned) and 20 other Khâns had carried off from the Khân tribe of Tû-yânî. Unfortunately Ewîliyê's itinerary and story are very confused.

According to him, the founder of the fortress was Ghanâz in 694 (1295); it was enlarged by Shah Tahmâsp in 930 (1532). At the Turkish conquest in the reign of Sultan Sulaimân Urmia was fortified by the Fâhâs Sulaimân and Dîyârî-bakr. The usual name of the fortress is Toprak-Kâlı, but the Persian (?) historians call it Surtîyâ-Ghanâz. The fortress the walls of which were covered with plaster looked like a white swan, its circumference was 10,000 paces, the walls were 70 zabir high and 30 zabir wide; the ditch was 80 zabir wide and 15,000 paces round. During the night the walls were lit by torches. The garrison consisted of 4,000 men and 310 (!) guns. The Khân had at his disposal 15,000 soldiers and 20,000 mukûr.

The town was a gunshot from the fortress. It had 60 quartermaster's houses and 8 cathedral mosques, among which was that of Umm Hatun, which was finished under his son Sultan Yaʿâmî. In the plain of Urmia (âlîq) there were 150 villages with 300,000 peasants.

Ewîliyê Celiêbi says the town was exceedingly prosperous and gives a list of its sanctuaries (Hâzûr Keğha Sulâtqân), its medresas, schools, coffee houses, etc. (nîkâh-i šâhî Xâshâyîân). The Afâhir. In the xviiith century the fate of Urmia was closely bound up with the fortunes of the Afâhir settled in the plain (cf. above). Their chief bore the title hâshâyî. The best known among them are (Nikîkâne):

Khândâdâlî Beg Kâmilî 1113-1134 (1707-1722)
Fath-ʿAlî Khan Arêhî 1157-1172 (1744-1758)
Kâmil Kâlî Khan 1132-1158 (1707-1722)
Imâm Kâlî Khan 1186-1197 (1772-1783)
Mujammâd Kâlî Khan 1198-1211 (1784-1796)
Husain Kâlî Khan Kâmilî 1211-1236 (1796-1821)
Nâdir Kâlî Khan 1236-1252 (1820-1865) [cf. Fraser, i. 56].

These chiefs were continually fighting with their neighbours (in the north, the Dumbâli of Khol, in the south, the Zarrî and Makrit Kurds) in troubled times, so frequent in the xviiith-century, they even led expeditions to the east of the Lake of Urmia.

During the campaign of 1724, the Ottomans employed the Hekîkî Kurds to ward off the Afâhir who were threatening the provision- ment of the army. When in 1725, the Turks organized the administration of the country, the Khânate of Urmia was recognized as hereditary in the family of Kâmilî (Afâhir). In 1729 Nâdir recaptured from the Turks Marâğa, Saʿdîj-bulâk
and Dumlup (cf. *Histoire de Nadir*, transl. Jones, p. 104), but in 1731 the Hekim-oghlu Pasha 'Ali and Rustam seized Urmia after a desperate resistance — which lasted a month. Urmia was entrusted to the Hekim chief Binasingh (cf. v. Hammer, iv. 225, 228, 279). It was only by the treaty of 1736 that the Turks were put out of Adharbajdjan.

Azad Khan. After the disappearance of the Naderid Iskand-Shah (in 1161 = 1748), one of his generals, Azad Khan, a descendant of an Afghan chief, retired first of all to Shahzur and then taking advantage of the troubles among the Afshar, seized Urmia where he was favourably received by Fath 'Ali Khan. Urmia became the capital of the ephemeral principality of Azad. The mountain name Aqwghani-dagh to the north of Urmia seems to preserve the memory of Afghan rule.

The Kadjars. In 1769, Muhammad Hasan Khan Kadjar having defeated Azad in Gilan, seized Urmia. Fath 'Ali Khan Afshar joined Muhammad Hasan. On the latter's death Fath 'Ali Khan reappeared on the scene and from Urmia captured Maragha and Tabriz. In the winter of 1173 (1759) he was besieged in the latter town by Karim Khan Zand and in the following year, after the battle of Karaj-Misran (near Miykun), Adharbajdjan passed into the power of Karim Khan. Urmia was taken after a siege of seven months. Fath 'Ali went into Kish as a result of Kalin Khan Kadjar's battle with the Shahag [q.v.]. In 1179, the Dambulla of Khoi formed a coalition against the Kadjars but had no success. Fath 'Ali Shah had Muhammad Kuli Khan put to death but married the sister of Hassain Kuli Khan Afshar (Fraser, i. 59), whose sons were the first governors of Urmia to be appointed by the central government in Tiberias.

In 1828 in the course of the Russo-Persian war, Urmia was occupied for several months by Russian troops. In the absence of the governor (the prince Malik Kásim Mirza), the town was ruled by the beylerbeyi Nadjaf-Kuli Khan Afshar (cf. Gangelov, op. cit.).

Ubadullah. In 1880 the Shahik 'Ubadullah of Shandian [q.v.] invaded Adharbajdjan. Urmia was besieged by the Kurds and was about to surrender when the arrival of the Khán of Mâki [q.v.] saved it.

Turkish occupation. In August 1906, after the reverses suffered by Russia in the Far East, Turkey, under the pretext that the Turco-Persian frontier had never been settled, occupied the district of Urmia except the enclaves of the town (cf. Nicolas, op. cit.). The Turkish troops were recalled at the beginning of the Balkan war. After the incidents at Tahir [q.v.] in Dec. 1911, Urmia was occupied by Russian troops. During the world war Urmia changed hands several times. As early as Oct. 9—12, 1914, it suffered the first attack from Turks and Kurds. The town was vacated by the Russians on Jan. 2, 1915, occupied by the Turks from Jan. 4—May 20 and retaken by the Russians on May 24. As a result of the break up of the Russian army in 1917, the actual authority in the town passed into the hands of the council of "Assyrian" Christians (mutassar). After a series of traumatic and bloody events (massacre of the Muslims of Urmia by the Christians on Feb. 22, 1918, the assassination of the patriarch Mâr Shimun by followers of the Kurd chief Simko on Feb. 25, the arrival of 20,000 Armenian refugees from War, the flight of the Assyrians and Turks), all the Assyrian population collected in the plain of Urmia and to the number of 50 to 70,000 set out for the south to put themselves under British protection (end of July — beginning of August). This exodus with women, children and cattle took place via Sa'in-Kal'a and Hamadân in the midst of fighting with Turkish troops and the Kurds. The refugees were settled at Ba'ashina to the north of Baghâd (cf. Rockwell, Canjole, Wigram, Shklovski, pp. 24). After the departure of the "Assyrians", the Catholic Bishop Mgr. Sonntag and the Baptist missionary H. Pfauem were killed at Urmia on Aug. 1, 1918.

The peace found Urmia in ruins and depopulated. Only gradually was the central government able to reassert its authority in the West of the Lake of Urmia.

Population. We have given above the figure, probably exaggerated, given by Ewliya Celebi (in 1655). At the beginning of the sixteenth century there were at Urmia 6—7,000 households of which 100 were Christian, 500 Jewish and the remainder Shī'ī Muslims (Persian memoir published by Bittner). According to Fraser (1821), there were 20,000 inhabitants at Urmia. According to Hörnle (1835), the population consisted of 75 500 families of whom the majority were Sunnis (?), 300 Jews and 100 Nestorians. In 1872 Arsimis reckoned 8,000 houses with 40,000 inhabitants. In 1900 (Maximović) the total population of the province was put at 300,000 among whom the Christians numbered 45% of whom 40,000 were Nestorians, 30,000 Orthodox, 5,000 Catholics and 30,000 Protestants, and 30,000 (?) Armenians. The town had 3,500 houses. During the world war Dr. Canjole reckoned 30,000 inhabitants at Urmia, of whom a quarter were Assyrians, and 1,000 Jews occupied a special quarter. Nikitine (Ethnographie, 1926, p. 25) enumerates 37 villages in the plain of Urmia, inhabited by the Christians only and 59 with a mixed population.

We do not know at what period the Aramean Christians ("Syrians") who since the war have called themselves "Assyrians" appeared in Urmia. The town is not given in the oldest lists of the eastern dioceses (Guilin, in Z. D. M. G., 1889 and Chabot, Synodicon Orientalis), Assemani, ii. 449 and 455; notes the presence of Nestorian bishops at Urmia in 1111 and 1289. According to the same author, the Nestorian patriarch settled at Urmia in 1582 (ibid., ii/iv. 621). In a document of 1653 the Chaldaean (Uniate) patriarch Simon (writing to Rome from Kososova in Salmas) gives a list of his congregations in Salmas, Arma (?), Saphrans (?), Targosvar, Urmia, Anzal (district N. E. of Urmia), Sulbat, Ashnogha (Ushnâ), (cf. ibid., iii/iv. 622 and Perkins, Residence, p. 95). Nöldeke, Grammatik des assyrischen Sprachen aus Urmia-Suc und in Kordistan, Leipzig 1868, p. xxiii, and Hoffmann, Auszüge, p. 204.

The first American missionaries of the "Mission of the Nestorians" (Perkins, A. Grant) settled at Urmia in 1835. The Lazarists followed them in 1840 and a Catholic bishop was appointed to Urmia. In 1859 the Americans organised an evangelical community in Urmia. Towards the end of the century, Anglican missionaries were sent to Urmia by the Archbishop of Canterbury. In 1900, an important Russian Orthodox mission began its
activity among the Christians; it was dissolved however by the Perso-Soviet treaty of Feb. 28, 1921.

Bibliography: given in the text; cf. also Huudd al-Alam, ed. Barthold, 1910, fol. 34b, Arman—Urmia, a large, prosperous and agreeable town; Kazemi, p. 104; Yi§it, l. 219, 513; Handbuch der neuen Länder, p. 80, 85, 241; [Hadjji] Jalil, Ehem.-ruhm., p. 385 and the map of the town from the survey and map of the lake. On a manuscript list of the villages of Urmia, "Urmia-i KIamisleri wa-Ayni-i Wilaya-yi Urmia-i, ne kurn, Das Sammlung ... welche die Kaiserl. Akademie im Jahr 1828 von Herrn v. Chasayno erhoben hat;" St.-Petersburg 1865, p. 32, NN. 113; M. Bittner, Der Kurdengau in Schlesien und die Stadt Urmia im, in Stiirnegg, Ahad, Wien, phil.hist. Classe, cxxxii/l3, 1896, p. 1–97 (text and translation of a Persian memoir completed at the beginning of the 19th century with historical and geographical commentary); San' al-Dawla, Mir al-Buldan, l. 1924, s.v. Urmia; Nikitin (former Russian consul at Urmia), Les Affaires d'Urmia, in J.A., January–March 1929, p. 67–123; résumé of a Persian memoir prepared in 1917 (perhaps from the Takhiriz Urmiai of which a MS. was in the possession of the notable of Urmia Madsa al-Salama in 1910).


The Lake of Urmia. The lake is about 90 miles long (N.–S.) and 35 broad (E.–W.). Its area is 2,230 sq. miles and the area drained by its tributaries is 20,265 sq. miles.

The most important rivers flowing into the Lake are: in the east, the Adjai "bitter river", which wades Sarab and Talbit; the Sefai and Mardu-kai which flow from the S.W. face of Mount Sahand [cf. MAHRABA]; in the south, Djaghajt, Tatskak and Sarghl-Bakl [s.v.], to the south-west, the Gadir [cf. sardun and uvash]; in the west, the
The name Shahi (Shahi) although only found late, is connected with the old fortresses which stood on the peninsula to the N.E. of the lake. The fortress of Shahi is known to Tabari, iii. 1172 and 1379 (under 200 = 815). It is mentioned in the time of the Khwarizmshah Djalal al-Din (Nasawi, p. 157). It was at Shahi that the first Mongol

Ilghásu Hülägü and Aliaks were buried (cf. Rashid al-Din, ed. Quatremère, p. 416; Hâfiz Abîrî quoted in Le Strange, op. cit., p. 151; d’Ohsson, Histoire des Mongols, iv. 340). Abu l-Fadhîl calls the Lake Buhurait Tâlî. It is not clear if Tâlî = Shahî. The Persian translation of Ispâhîrî (cf. de Goeje in Ibn Hâwîlî, p. 267, note 27) seems to distinguish between the two names, and the fortress of Tâlî mentioned by Nasawi, p. 153—154 (cf. Yâkîî, iii. 541) who takes Tâlî to be a Persian word would seem rather to be connected with the west bank. In this case, it should be sought at Guvercin-Kâla on a cliff which rises above the lake on the Salmâs shore; cf. Ker Porter, Travels, ii. 593; Khanykov, in Poyestski, Primstices Géogr. Obyaz., 1852, vi. (Khanykov found at Guvercin-Kâla the inscription of a certain Abu Nâsîr [al-Nâsîr?] Hüsîn Bâkdûr Khân [should this Hüsîn be Umm Hasan, whose title was exactly Abu l-Nâsîr] and Lehmann-Haupt, Armenien, 1. 306—314.)

On the other hand, it remains to be seen whether Guvercin-Kâla is not identical with the stronghold of Yâkîî (or Bakdûr) which Tabari mentions along with Shahi and which in turn may correspond to the mountain of Bakîrî (which may be read Bakdûr; cf. Bundakîh, xii. 2 and 20) where Afsârîyâr (Fraârîyân) took refuge. In the Avesta, Yâstî v. 49; ix. 18, Khazar slays him "behind Lake Caecastas", which seems to indicate the region west of the Lake. [The latter tradition puts the place of Afsârîyâr's death in Artânî; cf. Shahî-nâmâ and especially Nasawi, Sîrat Djalâl al-Dîn, p. 325; transl. p. 375.]

The Arab geographers know that the salt waters of the Lake will not support organic life. According to Tabari, iii. 1380, the Lake does not contain fish or anything of value. Ispâhîrî (p. 189) and Khanykov (in Kazwînî, p. 194) alone affirm the contrary. The first talks of the "fish-animal" called "water-dog"; Khanykov delights in wonderful stories, which are later repeated by Ewrîlî Câelîsh.

URALYA — URS


(V. MINORSKY)

URALYA, a district in ABAKH BAIAN." According to Baladzhi, p. 328, Sar'd b. Al'i, sent to conquer ABAKH BAIAN, attacked the people of MUKUN and GIIL. A number of inhabitants of ABAKH BAIAN and Armenians who had gathered in the niziy of URM and at SHIRAZ were defeated by one of Sar'd's captains. The leader of the rebels was hanged on the walls of the fortress of BAJjarwan (Voskhod, 1811). Bajjarwan was a farangh of nookh of ABAKH BAIAN.

Ilm Khudairedib, p. 110, mentions the citadel of URM between al-Bajjar (a town of Bulak's on a river which flows into the Araxes above the river of ABAKH BAIAN) and BALONKIRAN. Ilm al-Fakih, p. 216, speaks of several districts (ra'sat) of URM. YELU, i. 216, mentions the region (muf) of URM but gives only an abridgment of Baladzhi's. The names mentioned by Baladzhi and by Ilm Khudaredib suggest a district in the N.E. of ABAKH BAIAN, perhaps in the KARAJA-dagh of the present day (the capital of which is in ABAKH and in the northern districts of which we find Armenians). (On the other hand, the element *Balavan* can be connected with the name of the river *BULHAN* (Bolguni) in MUKUN; q.v.).

(U. MIMORSKY)

"URS, URSU (A., Pl. d'ursu and 'ursahi), originally the leading of the bride to her bridgroom, and also the wedding feast simply; whence a denominative verb, 'urs 'to celebrate a marriage'. 'Ursu means both bridegroom and bride in modern linguistic usage. This term has however been supplanted by 'aritbridgroom' and 'ursu bride' (as early as the 1200s, cf. Doro, Suppliment). Two kinds of weddings have been to distinguished: 'urs is the wedding performed in the tribe or the house of the man, and 'ursu is the wedding performed in the house or tribe of the woman (this distinction is already made by Ibn al-Arabi [d. 351=845] in the Li'nah al-Arab, vi, 283; cf. Farsabadi, *alMa's, s.v. 'ursu and 'arit). The two forms agree for the most part in practice; they only differ in the choice of place for the main ceremonies and in the fact that in the 'ursu the affa of the bride is omitted.

"We learn little from the poem" says G. Jacob of the wedding customs of the pre-Muhalla in Arabs. They seem to have been very simple in the Arabian Peninsula itself, as is still the case among the Beduins (cf. below). The pomp and display of later centuries, especially in the bridal procession, was probably unknown. The wedding lasted a week, whence it is also called wadi (cf. Aghani, xii. 145). The bride is adorned, perfumed and painted with azah. There is an old proverb which says: "The scent behind the bridgroom cannot be concealed" (Noldake, Diction., p. 48; Maldant, Preverb. ed. Freytag, xxiii. 260). The bridgroom is called the "conducted one" (cf. 'Antara, xxvii. 1). She was therefore conducted to the bridgroom, usually by a number of women without any escort, but very quietly and simply. This is at least is indicated by the story of 'Ukati b. Ullaha who betrothed his daughter to the caliph YASIR III; he made it a condition that the caliph's people should not come for his daughter but that she should bring her himself on a camel. (Aghani, xi. 90). Sometimes she was brought in a litter (mudhaf) (cf. Djawhari, Shidah, s.v. sif-sif), as is still the case in Mecca (Snoock, Hurgenolje, Mecca, ii. 182). A special tent was always put up for the young couple. About the bridgroom there is an old proverb: "The bridgroom wants little to be an amir (or king)" (Djawhari, Shidah, s.v sif-sif; Maldant, Preverb., xii. 143).

In the lands adjoining Arabia on the other hand, weddings were celebrated with great splendour. Thus we are told (Aziz al-Aghani, xx. 23) of a Persian wedding in the *Mish' with a splendid bridal procession; similarly for Syria as early as I. Marz, ix. 37: "and the groom and the bride and the bride's relatives and the guests...with the trum- phal parade and...with parades and parades..." As late as the beginning of the third (nineth) century, we find a simple Beduin moshie surprised at a splendid wedding in North Syria (Aghani, xii. 35 sq.), which shows that Syrian usages were foreign to the Arabs (cf. on the above section: Freytag, Einführ. in das Studium der arab. Sprache, Bonn 1861, p. 309—324; Wellhausen, Die Reihe der Arabern, in V.G.W. Gsell, 1895, p. 441 sq.; Jacob, Arab. Recht, Berlin 1897, p. 57—58).

The records in Tafsir are as in the whole in keeping with the simple usages of the Arab pagan period. *Al* was at her wedding with the Prophet a robe of red striped material which came from Bahrain (cf. Hudaib, b.b 24), Fatiha's wedding with *Ali, Al* and UMM SALAMA made the preparations at home; they scattered soft dust from the *Bath* over the ground and filled two cushions with straw (laf) and tossed it out. They laid out dates and figs to sat and sweet-tasting water to drink; they also put up at one side of the room a stand for the clothes and the water-skin (Hudaib, b.b 24). Fatiha's trousseau consisted of a silk robe with fringes (lafmi), a water-skin (birkha) and a cushion filled with rushes (shider) (Naas, b.b 81). In another tradition the Prophet allows considerable expenditure on large carpets with fringes (lafmi) (Naas, b.b 83). From numerous traditions (Hudaib, b.b 58, 64; Tafsir, Sura xxiii., b.b 8). ABDUL MADJ, B. Hudaib, b.b 21, 24; Naas, b.b 37, b.b 18, 77; ALI, b.b 58). Tradition gives no further details of the toilet; but the men seem also to have been perfumed; a perfume was used which left yellow stains (ililul, *ufra* or *ufara*), such as the Prophet noticed on "Abd al-Rahman b. AWF still a few days after his wedding (according to Anas b. Makk in Hudaib, b.b 7, 55, 77; Muslim, b.b 70—71; Naas, b.b 84; Muslim, b.b 24; Dzirini, b.b 82; ALI, b.b 22; ALI b. Shahb)."
According to a tradition transmitted by Abu Hurairah, the Prophet uttered the following blessings at weddings: Dārakha 'ilā kūthum (var. laka) wa-dārakha 'ilākūthum (var. 'alaika) kānumāni (var. 'alaika) wa-dārakha 'ilā kūthum (var. 'alaika) kānumāni or instead of the third part: wa-dārakha labba ʃīkā (Ibn Mūdža, Nikāh, bāb 23; Tirmīḏī, Nikāh, bāb 7; Abu Dā'ūd, Nikāh, bāb 35; Ahmad b. Hanbal, l. 381; cf. i. 201; iii. 451; Nasā'i, Nikāh, bāb 73; Tirmīḏī, Nikāh, bāb 6), while he forbade the wish from the period of the Dāliliya bi-'iṣra' ʿam 'in harmonies and with songs! (Nasā'i, Nikāh, bāb 73; Ibn Mūdža, Nikāh, bāb 23; Tirmīḏī, Nikāh, bāb 6; Ahmad b. Hanbal, l. 201; iii. 451).

The bride was conducted to the bridegroom by young girls who sang 'anāhāra; two opening lines of such a ghazal are preserved: Atnāmān a'tn'āmān fa-sha'iyāni na-sha'iyākum *we come to you, we come to you, may (God) give us long life and give you long life* (Ibn Mūdža, Nikāh, bāb 21; cf. also Bukhārī, Nikāh, bāb 64) or aatnāmān a'tn'āmān fa-sha'iyāni na-sha'iyākum *we come to you, we come to you, then greet us, we greet you* (Ahmad b. Hanbal, iv. 78).

The participation of women and children in the wedding ceremonies is approved by the Prophet (Bukhārī, Nikāh, bāb 76; Mas'ūdī al-Anṣārī, bāb 5). On these occasions young girls used to beat tambourines (drum) and sing of the death of the champions of Badr, which the Prophet is definitely said to have permitted (Bukhārī, Nikāh, bāb 49; Māqālī, bāb 12; Ibn Mūdža, Nikāh, bāb 20, 21; Tirmīḏī, Nikāh, bāb 6; Nasā'i, Nikāh, bāb 72, 80; Tayālīsī, l. 1221; Ahmad b. Hanbal, l. 418). Other instruments are mentioned, such as another variety of tambourine (ghirāh, Ibn Mūdža, Nikāh, bāb 20) and the drum ( tabl; Ibn Mūdža, Nikāh, bāb 21). The object of this music was to call public attention to the marriage (Ibn Mūdža, Nikāh, bāb 20; Tirmīḏī, Nikāh, bāb 6; Ahmad b. Hanbal, iv. 5). According to one tradition, the Prophet is even said to have forbidden marriages to be performed in complete quiet (Ahmad b. Hanbal, iv. 78).

A wedding feast (wa'ilima or ja'āma) for the men was part of the wedding (Bukhārī, Nikāh, bāb 69; Ahmad b. Hanbal, v. 359; Zāhid Māmduḥī, l. 949, etc.). A feast is obligatory for the first day (ka'āb) and commendable for the second (maṣ'īf). Tirmīḏī regards it also as maṣ'īf, i.e. done in order that people may hear and see it (Tirmīḏī, Nikāh, bāb 10; Abu Dā'ūd, Af'ima, bāb 5; Dārimī, Af'ima, bāb 28; Ibn Mūdža, Nikāh, bāb 25; Ahmad b. Hanbal, v. 28, 371). Sa'd b. al-Musayyab (according to Dārimī; the Prophet) is said to have accepted the invitation for the first two days, but refused that for the third (Abū Dā'ūd, Af'ima, bāb 5; Dārimī, Af'ima, bāb 28). Bukhārī, in the superposition to Nikāh, bāb 72, speaks of a week's feast and says that the Prophet did not limit it to one or two days. The feast at the Prophet's wedding with Ṣafīya consisted of ḥāsia, a dish of dates, curds (yāfīf) and fat, to which according to some traditions was added meal of roasted barley (nūmaṣ) (according to Anas b. Mālik in Bukhārī, Nikāh, bāb 13, 61, 69; Bukhārī, bāb 111; Dālālā, bāb 73; Af'ima, bāb 8; Muslim, Nikāh, tr. 84, 85, 88; Nasā'i, Nikāh, bāb 79; Ahmad b. Hanbal, iii. 99, 102, 159, 195, 264) according to another tradition, the Prophet used on this occasion another 1/2 mūdī of the best kind of dates (ṣafqān) (according to Dālimā b. Abūl Allāh in Ahmad b. Hanbal, iii. 353). At the Prophet's wedding with Zainab (according to Anas b. Mālik in Muslim, Nikāh, tr. 87, 89, 91, 92; Ahmad b. Hanbal, iii. 98, 103, 172, 196, 200, 263) and at the wedding of Rabī' b. al-ʿAtāmī (Ahmad b. Hanbal, iv. 58) bread and meat were given, which seems to have been usual along with ḥāsia as in some cases it is specially mentioned that there was no bread and meat (Ibn Mūdža, Nikāh, bāb 24; Mālik, Nikāh, bāb 48; Ahmad b. Hanbal, iii. 99, 195, 264; Bukhārī, Nikāh, bāb 13, 61; Nasā'i, Nikāh, bāb 79). In other passages a mūdī of barley is mentioned (Bukhārī, Nikāh, bāb 71; Ahmad b. Hanbal, v. 113); a sheep and mallet (Ahmad b. Hanbal, v. 359); but for the wa'ilima at least a sheep should be slaughtered (according to Anas b. Mālik in Bukhārī, Nikāh, bāb 7, 55, 57, 69, 70; Tirmīḏī, bāb 54; Abu Dā'ūd, bāb 67; Bukhārī, bāb 1; Muslim, Nikāh, tr. 79—84, 90; etc.). Anas b. Mālik also records (that his mother ʿUmm Salāmā sent the Prophet a dish of dates (ḥāsia, see above) on the occasion of a marriage and that the Prophet offered it to his guests in groups of ten until they were satisfied (Muslim, Nikāh, tr. 94, 95; Nasā'i, Nikāh, bāb 84). Sahl b. ʿAbīd records that at the wedding of Abū Asyad al-Sāʿīdī his bride offered the guests after the feast a beverage made by steeping dates (nāfī), which she herself had prepared (Bukhārī, Nikāh, bāb 72, 78, 79; Adhīma, bāb 7, 9). Bukhārī concludes from this that on the one hand non-intoxicating beverages are allowed at weddings and on the other that women may wait on the men at a wedding. As a rule the traditions give no information about the time of the wa'ilima. In the few passages which admit a definite time, the wa'ilima took place after the bride had been taken to the bridegroom's house but before the wedding night (Bukhārī, Tafsīr, Sūra xxiii., bāb 8; Ahmad b. Hanbal, iii. 196 and the other traditions about Zainab's wedding); but the waiver that Ṣafīya's wedding seems to have taken place next day, probably as a result of the special conditions, as the Prophet married her on the return of the expedition to Khaibar (Bukhārī, Bawāy, bāb 111; Dālimā, bāb 73; Muslim, Nikāh, tr. 88; Ahmad b. Hanbal, iii. 195 and the other traditions about this wedding; cf. however one tradition about Zainab's wedding in Ahmad b. Hanbal, iii. 98, 105). An invitation to a wedding feast ought always to be accepted (Muslim, Nikāh, tr. 100, 101; Abū Dā'ūd, Af'ima, bāb 1; Ahmad b. Hanbal, ii. 22). ʿAbd Allāh b. Qomār used never to refuse an invitation even when he was fasting (Bukhārī, Nikāh, bāb 78; Muslim, Nikāh, tr. 105; Dālimā, Af'ima, bāb 40). People of all conditions, rich and poor, should be invited; in one tradition given by Abū Hurairah, we read: "The wedding feast: at which the rich eat and from which the poor are kept away is an evil feast!" (Ahmad b. Hanbal, ii. 494). For further references see Wensinck, Handbuch of Early Muhammadan Tradition, Leyden 1927, s. v. Wa'ilima and the article was published in 1927.

The following two traditions presumably refer to the procedure in the bridal chamber: "If any one of you marry a woman ... she shall take her on her forelock and pray (to God) for blessing (baraka) ... and pray to God for refuge from the accursed Satan" (Mālik, Nikāh, bāb 52) and "If any one of you marry a woman ... he shall say:
O God, I pray Thee for her good and for her good inclinations which Thou hast created, and I seek refuge with Thee from her evil and from her evil inclinations which Thou hast created" (Abū Dāwūd, Nikāb, bāb 44). Umūm Salāma for her wedding night with the Prophet prepared a meal of barley and fat (ṣajida) (Ahmad b. Hanbal, vi. 307).

According to many traditions (Anān b. Mālik, among others), it is a sunna for the young husband to spend seven days and nights with his young wife if she is a virgin (ḥab) and only three days and nights if she is not (ḥayāth); only after this does the regular rotation with the other wives begin (Bukhārī, Nikāb, bāb 101, 102; Abū Dāwūd, Nikāb, bāb 33; Tirmidhī, Nikāb, bāb 40; Māsim, Ṣafī, tr. 45: Zain, Muṣannaf, NA, 737; Iḥnātī, Nikāb, bāb 26; Mālik, Nikāb, bāb 15; on the Prophet's marriage with ʿAisyah (whom Ṣafī calls): Abū Dāwūd, Nikāb, bāb 33; Aḥmad b. Hanbal, ii. 99; on the Prophet's marriage with Umūm Salāma (who Ṣafī calls): Muslim, Ṣafī, tr. 41—44; Iḥnātī, bāb 33; Mālik, Nikāb, bāb 14; Aḥmad b. Hanbal, vi. 202, 295, 307, 313, 320, 321 (this was done by her request; the Prophet had given her the choice between seven and three days)). According to another tradition, the young husband should only stay three days even with a virgin and only two with a bride who is not (Aḥmad b. Hanbal, ii. 178; Tirmidhī, Nikāb, bāb 40).

As to the season of the year, the month of Shawwāl is expressly mentioned in Tradition as the month in which the Prophet celebrated his wedding with ʿAisyah (Nawz), Nikāb, bāb 18, 77; Muslim, Nikāb, tr. 73; etc.).

5. In the Fīh, the Mālikīs pay special attention to wedding customs, since most of them are primarily intended to call public attention to the conclusion of the marriage. According to Mālik b. Anzā as well as Ibn Abī Lailā (cf. Sarakhi, Muhājir, v. 50) in contrast to other schools, making the wedding public (al-ṭāla) is a necessary condition for the validity of a marriage. Witnesses are not essential as an essential for the conclusion of a contract of marriage, although with the Mālikīs it is usual to have them in practice; if the two witnesses were not present at the conclusion of the contract they must be present on the night of the wedding and for example yeal the bridal chamber (Kairawa, Qishā, Cairo 1335, p. 66; Khalīl, i. 1459; Kāsım, Badrū ʿal-Sanāʾ, Cairo 1327, p. 252; Ibn Rūḥā [Avertre], Ḳalayt al-Muḥājir, Cairo 1349, i6 where we already find witnesses mentioned among the essentials). On the same grounds of publicity, Khalīl (ii. 1) also recommends congratulating the bridal pair. The doors of the house should therefore not be closed at the wulmat al-was (Khalīl, i. 117). This wulmat is considered praiseworthy (muṣafakh) among the Mālikīs, Ḥanafīs and Ḥanbalis while the Shāfīʿis hold a stricter view: according to one view, it is sunna muṣafakh; according to the others, it is sunna muṣafakh (cf. Shināzī, p. 205; Ghasālī, ii. 22; Nawwāb, p. 90; Ardaibī, ii. 94). According to Khalīl, it should be held the day after the wedding, according to other Mālikīs, however, before, so that the wedding is only consummated after its public proclamation (Tafsīr, Tawhīf, p. 35). A wealthy man should kill at least a sheep, a poorer man provide as much as his can afford (Shināzī, Ardaibī). To accept an invitation to a wulmat is according to the Ḥanafīs praiseworthy (muṣafakh), among the Mālikīs, Ḥanbalis and Shāfīʿis on the other hand a duty (ṣajīdah), (Nawwāb, vi. 178 says: ṣajīdah). Among the Shāfīʿis it is praiseworthy to accept the invitation for the second day also; on the other hand, it is best to refuse it for the third day (Nawwāb describes acceptance for the third day as muṣraḥ). If the person invited is fasting, he should nevertheless accept the invitation; he need not however eat anything; it is best however if he breaks his fast unless he is pledged to observe it. If an intoxicated man is at the wulmat or wine or anything else forbidden, it is best to stay away; similarly if there are in the room representations of living creatures, even if one tramples on them (e.g. on carpets). According to Shināzī, one should also stay away from the wulmat where songs are sung, even if one does not listen to them and only pays attention to ṣajīdah and eating. Music is on the other hand permitted to some extent — for example that of the tambourine (duff) already mentioned in tradition; Ghasālī gives a list of permitted instruments: another kind of tambourine (ghirsh), an instrument kind of lute (mishār [cf. ṣal] cf. H. G. Farmer, History of Arabian Music, London 1929, p. 46—47), a kind of lute (sumūwār) and horns (ḥūr). The question is much discussed whether one should scatter among the crowd at weddings nuts, almonds, sweets (Ardaibī also mentions dates, dirhams and dinārs). According to Dimāghi (ii. 76), Abū ʿAbd Allāh and Aḥmad b. Hanbal had no objections, while Mālik, Shāfīʿ, and Aḥmad b. Hanbal in a second opinion declare the practice muṣraḥ. The views of the later Shāfīʿis are however divided. Muzani recommends the omission of the practice, as the things would be hurriedly picked up as plunder by the people; it is not however forbidden except when the people fall upon one another and try to take the things from each other. Ghasālī allows the scattering of sweets, since it was done in the time of the Prophet (cf. no reference in the canonical works; cf. above), and Nawwāb and Ardaibī, while regarding it as permitted, consider it better omitted, Shināzī on the other hand declares it muṣraḥ.

Bibliography: cf. the articles Nikāb and Walīma; Shināzī, Ḳ. al-Uṣūl, ʿUṣūl, 1324, ii. 175; Muzani, Muhājir, on the margin of the preceeding, iv. 39—41; Shināzī, Tawhīf, ed. Jaynabboll, Leyden 1879, p. 205 sq.; Ghasālī, Waftī, Cairo 1318, ii. 22; Nawwāb, Muhājir, Cairo 1339, p. 90; Ardaibī, Kitāb al-Anwār li-Amīl al-ʿAbrār, Cairo 1348, ii. 94—96; Khalīl, Muhājir, tr., Trans., Santillana, Milan 1919, i. 65 sqq.; Ibn Rūḥā, Muḥājtīnāt, on the margin of the Muṣawwara al-kabīr, Cairo 1324, ii. 58; Shināzī, Muṣawwara, Cairo 1925, ii. 124; Dimāghi, Ṣalāḥ, al-Uṣūl, on the margin of the preceding, ii. 76; Tornow, Das moslemische Recht, Leipzig 1855, p. 70 sq.; Juyonboll, Handbuch der islamischen Geisteswiss., Leyden 1910, p. 162 sqq. d. Later usages down to the present day. For the older period we are dependent on occasional scattered notes; it is only with the literature of European travellers (from the xth century), with the recording of texts in dialect and the systematic collection of folklore in recent decades (Westernmark for Morocco, Janssen for Nablus etc.) that we have a wealth of material which is almost impossible to deal with. These sources are however not all of equal value. On
the one hand, particularly with the earlier literature, we have first of all to investigate the trustworthiness of the traveller. To take a striking example: The Itinerary of the Syrian pilgrim, Abu al-Aswad, 1281-1282, says (Voyage, Gent 1559, p. 288) that the old that the bridal pair before the marriage contract is signed are put one in each of two adjoining rooms with an eyehole through which they can see each other naked. This is contradictory to Muslim ideas. (Cf. however the fact that some jurists like Da'ud al-’Azhiri permitted the man before marriage to see the whole of the woman's body except the pudenda; Ibn Rashid, Bidaya, ii. 3; Dimishq, Kutub, ii. 62.) On the other hand, there are gaps in the records of the travellers; they only record what is done in the street or more or less publicly. Full accounts of the customs observed, as in Leo Africanus and Lane, are by no means numerous and can be supplemented for the earlier period by scattered references in the Alif Laila wa-Laila and the popular romances.

Wedding customs are more or less distinct according to country. This is most clearly seen on the periphery of the Muslim world, for example in the Malay Archipelago, Central Africa, among the Kirdzhali and Turkomans. Here Islam has taken over old local customs and sometimes adapted them to its point of view. For the original lands of Islam however, the same observation can be made, except that the process was completed in the early centuries of Islam. In modern Syria and Egypt the customs among Muslims and Christians are almost identical except as regards purely ecclesiastical and religious matters (cf. the sketches in Littmann, Neuruhische Volksseept; Jaussen, Contumes Palestiniennes; Blackman, The Fellahin of Upper Egypt, p. 93). This fact shows that we have to deal in this case with old customs of the nearer East, at any rate not with specifically Muslim practices. In this connection we may call attention to the already mentioned pompos pre-Islamic practices in Syria and Mesopotamia. Pre-Islamic origin can in some points be definitely proved. In many districts the Muslim bride wears a crown of flowers or of pasteboard (cf. below); in this I see the adoption of a practice of the Christian east where the crowning of the bride was and still is a part of the wedding ceremony. (This crowning is mentioned as early as a liturgical poem by Ephraim the Syrian in Deminger, Ritu Orientallium, Würzburg 1864, ii. 443; in Barbaraeus, ibid., ii. 385; among the Copts of the sixteenth century, ibid., ii. 395; cf. also ibid., ii. 391 ff., 408 ff., 423 ff.). The carrying of lights in the bridal procession may also be of Christian origin (for the Copts of the sixteenth century, cf. Deminger, op. cit., ii. 364; cf. the carrying of lights in the Mawlid festival and its Christian origin, op. cit., p. 420). The ceremonies on the seventh day have also their parallels in the Christian liturgy of the East; on the seventh day the bridal crown is solemnly removed among the Copts (Deminger, op. cit., ii. 380).

From the point of view of method, it would be more correct to deal with wedding customs by regions. But this would take up too much space here. I shall therefore endeavour to give the most important customs in vogue in towns in the old lands of Islam and as far as possible to treat them historically. It should be noted in this connection that practices differ in different levels of society.

Therefore, three groups have at least to be distinguished: customs in the towns, among the fellahin and among the Beduins. The two last named are essentially simpler and agree more with the Arab practices than do those of the town-dwellers.

Among the Ruwala Beduins (Musil, The Manners and Customs of the Ruwala-Beduins, New York 1928, p. 228 sqq.), a camel is killed on the morning of the wedding before the bridegroom's tent and its flesh distributed. In the course of the day the bride puts up her tent — the woman always brings it with her — and at night she is taken by a few female relations in all secrecy to this tent; soon afterwards the bridegroom enters the tent. There are no ceremonies, no singing or dancing, not even the usual zgâharît cries of the women. On the next morning the bridegroom goes to his relatives while the bride is visited by the women and congratulated; she then receives a gift from her father-in-law and remains for seven days in her tent while the bridegroom goes about his usual business. He must however spend seven nights with his young wife (cf. the traditions quoted). Among other Beduins the Arab tribes (Musil, Arabia Petraea, iii. 196 sqq.) the youths and maidens sing bridal songs and dance.

Here as on the Sinai Peninsula (Burckhardt, Berichten über die Beduinen, Weimar 1831, p. 216–217) the bride runs away into the desert after the first night, sometimes for six days, sometimes even for longer and the husband must go to look for her.

Between these very simple practices of the Beduins and the highly developed rites of the town-dwellers numerous intermediate stages are to be found among the fellâhîn, among whom we can observe the gradual advance of usages from the towns.

Let us now come to the towns. Weddings were celebrated with great pomp at the 'Abbasid court in Baghdad. In the sources, sums of 50 and 70 million dirhams are mentioned as having been expended by the caliphs Harûn al-Rashîd and Ma'mun for their weddings. But the common people also on such occasions liked to appear wealthier than they really were. Even in early times, the wîlduse used to lend ornaments to the bride (cf. the tradition above quoted about 'Âisha). The carpets, utensils etc. were also sometimes borrowed (Mez, Renaissance des Islams, p. 404, 455).

As was mentioned early in the article, two kinds of weddings have to be distinguished: the 'uwa and the 'umrah. The 'uwa seems to be the usual kind; at least it is almost exclusively the one that is described by travellers. We find the 'umrah for example in the case of the wedding of the caliph Ma'mûn with Bûrân (210 = 825; Tabari, Amali, ed. de Goeje, iii. 1081 sqq.); in Ibn al-Mudjâwir (d. 690 = 1291) in Landberg, Études sur les dialectes de l'Arabe meridionale, t.I. 859 for Mecca; Alif Laila wa-Laila, transl. Littmann, I. 265 sqq.; in the Karâgân play "The Wrong Bride" in Ritter, Karagân, Hanover 1924, p. 109 sqq.

Here we may also note that these wedding customs are only observed when a woman marries for the first time. When she marries for the second time they are content with the legal mdâlma. The parties often agree to have no festivities (Snouck Haurong, Melka, li. 155; Lane, Manners and Customs, London 1871, I. 219–220).

The celebrations extend over several days; they...
usually begins on Monday and the actual wedding takes place on Thursday. In Arab popular poetry we therefore have frequent reference to seven days of celebration while the *dhikha* takes place on the eighth (e.g. Alf. Liwa wa-Liwa, ii. 467; iii. 437; Strat. Saff, ii. 22, 33; v. 28; xii. 59). When however we find references to 50 days of feasting and the 34th night as the *būlāt al-dīkhka* (Alf. Liwa wa-Liwa, iii. 642; Strat. Saff, xii. 45; xiii. 12) or when 40 days and nights are mentioned in Turkish romances and fairy tales (Spies, Türkische Volksbücher, Leipzig 1929, p. 25), this is only a stereotyped literary form to express that the wedding celebrations lasted a long time.

The principal usages are as follows:

1. Immediately after the formalities of the marriage contract, the *wutha* takes place in the bride’s house; only men are present at it. This is already found in Ḏaḥīḥ. On this occasion sweets, money and other things are often thrown to the crowd. For example, the visier al-Hāsan b. Sahil at the wedding of his daughter Bīrān al-ʿAbidah al-Maʿmūn (210 = 825) had 1200 silver coins scattered among the leaves on which were inscribed the names of pieces of land, slave-girls and the distinguishing marks of horses. Any one who got one of the tickets received what was written on it. On this occasion, gold and silver coins, little bags of musk and pieces of amber thrown among the populace (Tabari, Annals, ed. de Goeje, iii. 1083 infra; Masʿūdi, Murūjū al-Dhākah, Paris 1873, vii. 405). — At the *wutha* on the occasion of the wedding of the Mamluk Muhammad b. al-Sulṭān (920 = 1514) wise (tabar) was served in vessels of Chinese porcelain (Ibn Ṣāfī, iv. 406). In general however, the *wutha* consisted simply in offering of sweets and other dainties (cf. Alf. Liwa wa-Liwa, ii. 23-24); sometimes however, roast meat and vegetables etc. were also served. Music and dancing are not usual on this day. In Nahla (Syria), according to Jaussen, there is only a meal for the women, while in Fāṣa a feast is held in the house of both bride and bridgegroom (Leo Africanus [1526], Tharaud [1930]). The real wedding ceremonies do not usually begin until a week later.

2. The bride’s bath. A few days before the wedding the bride goes to the bath with her friends; rich people perform this ceremony in their own house; usually however, a public bath is hired for a whole or half day. In Cairo in Lane’s time, they went with great pomp to the bath (ṣafat al-ḥammām). In front walked two men carrying dishes on which lay the bath requisites covered; then came water-carriers and men with rose water and censers to sprinkle the passers-by and offer them beverages. Then came musicians with oboes and drums and the bride’s friends two by two. The bride herself thickly veiled with a crown on her head walked between two female relatives under a canopy carried by four men; musicians brought up the rear of the procession. In the bath itself there were all kinds of diversions and feasting while women-singers sang songs. In the evening in the house there was a banquet for the women at which women-singers sang to pass the time. In modern Fāṣ, the bride is taken to the bath and led home dressed like a doll with shams of joy (Tharaud [1930]). In xivth century Morocco the bride’s bath before the wedding was unknown (Leo Africanus) while in Algiers in the same period, according to Hašīd, the bridal bath was usual. It is also unknown in Mecca. In Syria and Asia Minor they go very quietly to the baths while Colonna in the end of the xvth century in Syria saw a solemn procession with wax candles.

In the bath itself numerous ceremonies and diversions take place. In Nahla (Jaussen [1927]) the bride is put on a throne in the bath while her friends sing and dance around her with lights in their hands. They then all bathe, the bride last. After the bath the bride is sprinkled with perfume and refreshing are taken. She is then taken home very quietly and thickly veiled. For Constantinople, White (c. 1840) also reports that the bride sits on a throne while dramatic presentations are given and refreshments are offered. Then, just as in Persia (Polak [c. 1860]) and Tunis (Berthelot [c. 1900]), the hezma ceremony which in other lands does not take place till next day. The fingers-nails (in Persia also the hair) are dyed with henna. The guests theretofore distribute money to the bath attendants. This is called the ‘hezma gift’.

3. The adoration of the bride. This day is often called after the principal ceremony. *Sulūt-al-bawār* or *hezma gūzīrī* (e.g. in Mecca, Egypt, Tunis and in Turkey). In the present day, while the female relations and friends of the wife’s eyelids are blackened with *ṣaḥī* and the hands and feet coloured with hezma. In doing this the hands and feet must be coloured exactly the same and no pictorial representations put on them (cf. Atı Bakr Almād b. Muḥammad al-Mawrāzī [d. 375 = 888], Kitāb al-Warāʾ, Cairo 1340, p. 104). In earlier times, yellow patches (nāṣūr al-arīs) used to be put upon the cheeks (Dhūn 1-Rummā [d. 707 = 1719] in Aţţāli, xvi. 115; Maidānī, Furfūrs, ed. Frytag, ii. 762, N. 24; Surātal [d. 619 = 1222] in the commentary on Ḥarīrī, Muyammat, p. 610). On the same day the bride’s wedding ornaments are put on, including necklaces, bridal girdle (ḥūṣān; cf. Strat. Saff, xvii. 53), crown (ṣaḥī or ḍhīl; old reference: Strat. Saff [xvith century], iv. 36; xvii. 53; cf. also the title of the celebrated dictionary Taḥfūṣ al-arūs [xvith century]). The bride on these occasions often put on different dresses (e.g. in Siyāf, Narbeshah: cf. Alf. Liwa wa-Liwa, i. 265 sqq.: 6 different dresses). The dress display in silver pendants and foot-rings, pearls, henna, aloes-wood (for perfuming the face), rose-water, sesame-oil and other aromatics is already mentioned in the papyri (cf. Petruša Erhard’s Rainer, Führer, N. 584, 1014). After being dressed the bride is put on a raised seat or throne, where she has to sit quite still with downcast eyes while the women guests sing, dance and make music. These ceremonies often last far into the night (for the older period cf. Leo Africanus for Morocco; d’Arvieux [1674], Mémories, Paris 1735, v. 287, for Algiers and the other travellers). In Mecca and Siyāf (Narbeshah) the entertainment does not take place till the next day. In Cairo (Lane 1835) on this day the bride takes a lump of henna in her hand and her friends stick coins into it. In Nahla (Jaussen [1927]) there is a different collection for the bride. In Constantinople also we find the henna ceremony; but before it, all the women guests with wax candles in their hands go into the garden with the bride and dance there in long rows (Garnett c. 1890). Pictures of the bride in her wedding
The bridal procession (saffat al-‘urūba) and the elevation to the throne. As Friday is frequently recommended by the theologians for the completion of marriage (cf. Ghazzālī in H. Bauer, Islamische Ethik, Halle 1917, ii. 90) it is the custom to take the bride to her new home on Thursday evening when she passes the night with her husband. The bride is usually fetched by her bridegroom and his relations and accompanied by her own relatives in an imposing and solemn procession. From the superscription alone in Bahkārī, Nikāb 62 (al-bīdār ‘al-maḥār bīgħtar marbūt wa-tāhrūrāt) it is clear that the solemn procession was general as early as the beginning of the third (nineteenth) century; in those days the bride was taken at dusk in a litter borne on a beast of burden and accompanied by lighted torches (cf. Tājdar, Zafafa, p. 40–41, who for this reason speaks of it as a procession between a bride procession (a ṣaḥla and one by night; but the bīgħtar marbūt is against this). The other oldest references known to me are for the bridal procession of the wedding of Umm al-‘Ulwā in Kairawān (425 = 1024); the bride was taken on Thursday by slaves and nobles of the kingdom to the port put up for her (Ibn Iذhār, Bayān al-Mughārī, ed. Dory, i. 284). A story in a book from al-Ya‘māh, the bride is fetched by slave-girls who sing and play stringed-instruments (mawṣūfīt) (Kazwīnī, d. 682 = 1283, Astār al-Bilād, ed. Wustenfeld, ii. 88). A miniature by the painter Yāḥyā b. Maḥmūd b. Wāṣīt of 634 (1237) in the Paris MS. of Ḥarīrī, Arāb 5847 (Kühnel, Miniaturenmalerei im islamischen Orient, Berlin 1923, pl. 15) shows a bridal procession; in front go horn-blowers, drummers and men with peons sitting on camels; the bride herself is completely hidden in a splendid camel-litter and the bridgroom rides beside her on a finely caparisoned horse. Further references may be found e.g. in Alī Lālī wa-Lālī, li. 123; Sīrat Saffī, xiii. 12. The oldest western reference is in the travels of the monk Richold de Monte Criccius (d. 1409), ch. 9, 46 (Laurent, Peripateticus medici, Leipzig 1864, p. 116): „Turkei (= Mongolen in eastern Asia Minor) . . . quando tradunt cum [i.e. usuren] ad nupcias, parentes et consanguinei viri, qui cum accept, ducunt cum eum syntaxis et canco, sed parentes et consanguinei mulieris sequuntur cum eum planctu quasi mortuam“. Later European travellers all describe the bridal procession more or less fully. Almost everywhere the bride, who is always closely veiled, is fetched by the bridgroom in a procession carrying lights (candles, torches or lanterns) and accompanied to her new home by relations and friends of both sides. In modern Fārān, as in the time of Leo Africanus (1526), she gets into a silk-hung octagonal box which is carried on the shoulders of eight men (Westermarck, p. 166) or she goes on foot, if she belongs to the lower classes (Westermarck, Tharandt); while in the rest of Morocco a “covered cage” or a litter is generally used (Mogueri 1604, Hoest 1760, Westermarck 1914). In Algiers in the eighteenth century she was also carried (Haidūlī). In Egypt and Syria she walks or rides under a canopy (as early as Cotovicius 1598). In Turkey in olden times the bride used to ride on a horse (Dernschwam 1553) usually veiled in a red silk cloth, the ends of which were held up by many people accompanying her (Schweigert 1758, della Valla 1615, Tournesort 1717). In the Turkish album of miniatures of the xvith century published by Taeschner entitled Alttimamöhlner Hof- und Volkstheten (Hanover 1925, pl. 32) she is on foot, led by two women. According to della Valla (1615), in place of the procession of lights in front of the bride, a kind of high candlestick is carried which was made with flowers, painted paper, beaten gold, and other foliage, sometimes decorated with gold, silver and ivory; Schweigert (1758; cf. the pictures there) describes them as “wedding candles of green wax, made transparent but not burning”. In the same connection may be mentioned the tray of candles which is carried before the bridal procession in the Kūrāgā-play “The Wrong Bride” (pict. in Ritter, op. cit., fig. 34). In the sixteenth century, the bride rode in a covered carriage as did the women accompanying her, while the men were on horseback (White, Garnett). In Persia she usually rides, robed in red (Olearius 1637, Chardin 1673, Polak c. 1860, Willis c. 1870). At the present day, the motor car is of course also used in large cities like Cairo. — For pictures of the bridal procession see for Morocco: Dapper, Beschreibung von Afrika, Amsterdam 1760, p. 177; for Cairo: Niebuhr (1763), Reisebeschreibung nach Arabien, Copenhagen 1774, pl. 28; Cassas, Voyage pittoresque, Paris 1806, pl. 63; Lane (1835), Sitten und Gebärüchte, pl. 32–33; for Constantinople: Schweigert (1758), Keyzbeschreibung, p. 207; Taeschner, loc. cit.

The trousseau is usually carried in the bridal procession, distributed over as many horses and mules as possible; often empty chests are carried to make the trousseaus look as large as possible, while in many districts the delivery of the trousseau is a special solemn ceremony (cf. e.g. Ibn Iذhār, i. 284 for Kairawān [415 = 1024]; Ibn Ilyās, iv. 107 for Cairo [912 = 1506]). On leaving her parents’ house and entering her new home, a series of symbolic ceremonies are performed which refer to married life, averting evil spirits, fertility etc. I omit these here as they vary much in different towns and districts. In her new home she is welcomed by the bridgroom or her mother-in-law and taken to the bridal chamber. There she is placed by the woman on a high chair or throne and congratulated. Sometimes the bridgroom now gives her a present of money — if it is only a piastre — and she is unveiled so that the bridgroom sees her face for the first time. In a (not genuine) hadith in Muḥaddād (B. G. A., iii. 126) it is said “God shall place Muʾāwiya by his side and cover him and then unveil him to the people like a bride”. The throne (maʾaṣuq) on which the bride is raised and unveiled is mentioned as early as Zawāzīd (d. 486 = 1093) and Baydūsī (d. 494 = 1100); in their commentaries on the Muʿajjala of Imruʾ ʿl-Kais, ed. Hengstenberg, Bonn 1823, verse 32 or Cairo ed. 1828, p. 33). Cf. also Alī Lālī wa-Lālī, ili. 455; Sīrat Saffī, v. 29, where a throne (ṣaffī) of temper wood decorated with plates of gold and shining jewels is mentioned. In Mecca at the present day, the throne is called rīka (= arīka); cf. the picture in Soucek Hurgonje, Bilder aus Mecka, Leyden 1889, pl. 18.

The bridal procession is followed by a feast.
which lasts far into the night with music, singing and dancing (the men and women of course separate); in Turkey of the xviith and xviiith century Kangüre performances were also given (Thevenot, Voyer, Paris 1689, I. 172; cf. I. 169-110) while in Persia of the xviith century wrestlers (jahabandar) were performed (Charidin). A Persian miniature of 1604 shows festivities on the occasion of a wedding in the reign of Aly Arsalan (beginning of the xivth = xviith century) (Gromholt andArnold, The Islamic Book, Munich 1929, pl. 67).

The bridegroom's bath and his safa or turban take place on the same day as the bridal procession, i.e. on the Thursday; a visit is usually made to a mosque in connection with it (cf. Alf Laira wa-Laila, ii. 24). In the story of Nur al-Din and Shams al-Din (Alf Laira wa-Laila, I. 285) it is however a case of murra — the bridegroom goes to the bath and is carried on horseback in a torchlight procession to the bride's house; singers with tambourines accompany him and stop from time to time to get money from the bridgegroom. Another safa — but without a bath — is described in the Saffat, xii. 12. The bridegroom rides on a richly caparisoned steed through the town accompanied by dignitaries. Wax candles with camphor are carried, while slaves swing censers and sprinkle rose and jasmine water (cf. Saffat, vi. 65; xv. 32). Ibn Jyds (iv. 107, 196) records for Cairo in the early xviith century that the bridgegroom goes through the streets accompanied by eunuchs with lighted candles in their hands. This was not as usual in Lane's time in Cairo. Shortly before sunset the bridegroom was taken to the bath by his friends to the bath, accompanied by musicians or singers and torches (magashaf); from there they went to the mosque to attend the evening prayer. On their way back from the mosque, the friends carried candles and flowers in their hands. For a later date (c. 1875) Klauninger describes the bridgegroom's bath and safa for Kusair on the Red Sea.

In other lands, the bridegroom's bath appears to be less usual; at least it is only rarely mentioned in the sources (for Palestine: Rothstein [1907] 30 pictures of the safa; Jansen [1877]; for Tunis and Sfax: Bertholon and Nizheshuber [ca. 1900]; for Tlemcen: Ganderoy-Demouny, p. 40 [c. 1900]; for Tangiers: Westermarck, p. 118; for eastern Asia Minor: van Lennep, Travel, p. 627 [c. 1860]; for Persia: Polak [c. 1860]). The bath and safa seem to be quite unknown in Constantinople. Similarly the bath (but not the safa) for the bridegroom have been long unknown in Morocco (Ibn al-Mudawar [d. 690 = 1291] in Landberg, op. cit.; Snouck Hurgronje; Rutgers), while Niebel, Reisereihnung, I. 402, mentions both in 1765 for Yarmut in South Arabia. Leo Africanus also does not know of the bath in Fils (nor does Westermarck [c. 1914] nor Tharoud [1930]); on the other hand, he describes an imposing procession of the bridegroom, which met the bridal train in the principal square of the town and went home along with it. — Pictures of the splendid safa of the bride in India: Thevenot [1665], Voyages, Paris 1689, iil. 66; H. Goets, Bilderwurdeur Kulturgeschichte Indiens in der Grozmgallzeit, Berlin 1930, pl. 15 (xviiith century miniature).

6. The wedding night (lalat al-dubbla). During the festivities mentioned at the end of 4 the bridegroom goes to the bridal chamber or feigning reluctance is thrust in by his friends. In addition to the sandukh (see p. 1039) we have two descriptions of the early Islamic age of the proceedings in the bridal chamber. According to one (Akgiht, xiv. 70), the caliph Uthman stroked his bride Nafs on the head, asked the blessing of God (karaka) upon her and unveiled her. According to the other (Akgiht, xvi. 37), Shurak took his bride Zainab by the forehead while she knelt down, then prayed two raas with her, just as now is the usual practice in the two entomate ceremonies in Mecca (Snouck Hurgronje, ii. 180 and 185). In the oldest parts of the Alf Laira wa-Laila (Taghiud stratum, c. xviith century A. D.) we find the following usages. In the story of Nur al-Din and Shams al-Din (i. 269-272) the bride is undressed by her maids and led by an old woman in a long robe into the bridal chamber where the bridegroom awaits her. While in this case the unveiling has already taken place, in other passages it is only done by the bridegroom himself in the bridal chamber (e.g. ii. 5). In the story of Urs al-Wajdijd and al-Award 6 'Akmam (iii. 437-439) the two drink together and entertain one another with poems and entertaining stories, in the story of Nur al-Zaman (iii. 478-479) after the consummation the bride summons her maids who give shouts of joy. — In Cairo in Lane's time, the bridegroom was carried by a friend a part of the way to the baram during the festivities. He was only allowed to unveil his bride in the bridal chamber in return for a sum of money and see her for the first time. He then undressed her, laid her with her head in the direction of Mecca and performed two raas. After the consummation he summoned the women waiting outside the door to give shouts of joy (zaghari) and then returned to the guests. Jansen gives a similar description for modern Nahshas. Polak records [c. 1860] a very old and widespread practice for Persia (Leo Africanus knows it for Fils [1526], Haedo for Algiers [xviith century], Bertholon for Tunis [c. 1900]) after the unveiling the couple try to trample on one another's feet; the idea is that whoever does it first will be master in the house. In Turkey, according to Schweigge [1578], the bride is pushed into the bridal chamber by her companions with jests and scoldings. In the xviith and xixth centuries in Turkey after the unveiling and the usual prayers in the bridal chamber, coffee was served to the bridal pair and then a wedding feast held. Only then were they left alone (Glotter, White, Garnett).

In some districts of Morocco (e.g. Fas), it is considered seemly for the bridegroom alone to entertain his bride in the first night and to consummate the marriage only in the second night (Tharoud [1930]; Westermarck, xvi. Consummation). In Egypt on the other hand, it is a frequent practice to deflower the bride by mechanical means (Schwally, in Niederh-Petrkanscri, p. 418 af.). Both these customs are due to superstition, the fear of evil spirits, and perhaps in the first case to a certain feeling of shame.

During the wedding night, if the guests are still there, or on the next morning, the nurse shows the token of virginity to the women friends and relatives. If the bride is not a virgin, the bridegroom can send her back to her parents. The nurse or the mother therefore frequently make arrangements in case of need. In the Alf Laira wa-Laila (ii. 478) a pigeon is killed. In some districts the
bloodstained cloth is carried through the streets to the house of the bride's parents with drumming and shouts of joy. This is reported by Mocquet [1605] and Hoest [1760] for Morocco, Tournefort [1777] for Turkey, while in Burckhardt's and Lane's time (beg. of 19th century) in Cairo, it was only the custom among the lower classes.

On the morning after the wedding night in obedience to the precepts of religion both go to a bath [see Ṭahāna].

The ceremonies after the wedding night, especially on the seventh day. Sometimes the prescribed wistina is not performed till the day after the wedding night (cf. p. 1039 sq.). This is also the case in the story of Kamar al-Zammān (Alf Laila wa-Laila, ii. 461, 478). In Turkey on this day, the wedding ceremonies conclude with a feast, the "festival of the sheep's trotters" as it is called from a traditional dish; then the bride has one or two days to receive congratulations (Garrett [c. 1890]). In Egypt and North Africa the bride remains for a week in the bridal chamber and is visited and entertained by her female relatives. On the seventh day the bride and bridegroom usually hold a reception or give a banquet. The first seven days of marriage called sāḥet al-ʿarūṣ have always played a special part and go back to a usage sanctioned by the Prophet (cf. Dozy, Supplément, i. 626—627; s. above p. 1048). In the story of Us al-Wudujī, women singers come on the seventh day and gifts are scattered among the populace (Alf Laila wa-Laila, ii. 439—440). Leo Africanus [1526] mentions "a very old custom" in Morocco: on the seventh day the husband buys fish, which his mother or other women throw over the bride's feet. A similar practice is still found in Sfax (Narshabacher, p. 16). Probably there is some old magical practice to secure fertility concealed in this.

In conclusion we may briefly mention the entirely different customs in Mecca and Medina as recorded by Snäck Hurgonje [1884] and Rutten [c. 1828] for Mecca and Burton [1855] for Medina. Here there is a peculiar combination of the two kinds of wedding, the ʿārīs and the umra. On the evening of the fourth day, the ʿumra day (cf. umra), the bride in her wedding finery is put on a throne in her house, while the bridegroom goes to the Ḥaram in a procession with lights, to go through the evening prayer there and then go to the bride's house. He is there taken into the throne room and there unveils his bride. After a supper, everyone, including the bridegroom goes home. Towards morning the bride is taken by a few women secretly in a litter borne by two mules to the house of the bridegroom, which is in keeping with the old Arab practice. After a meal with the bridegroom the throne scene is repeated in his house on the fifth evening in a simpler form, after which consummation takes place. From this duplication, a combination of different ceremonies, it may be concluded that the modern Meccan wedding customs are not native to Mecca and Medina, but some features have penetrated in course of time from lands adjoining Arabia, been misunderstood and combined. This is confirmed by the simple practices in pre-Muslim and early Muslim Arabia (cf. p. 1038 sq.), and also by Ibn al-Mudžāwī (in Landstegg, op. cit., p. 859) who describes a pure ʿumra for the 7th (sixth) century in Mecca: the bridegroom goes to the Ḥaram, performs the sevenfold circumambulation, two ṭawāfs at the Makkah Ḥusayl, kisses the Black Stone (i.e. makes the ṭawāf) and then goes with candles to the bride's house. —

Weddings are usually celebrated in Muharram in Mecca, when the ḍuḥdī is over and most of the pilgrims have gone (Ibn al-Mudžāwī, op. cit.; Burckhardt, Travels in Arabia, i. 361).

Although the history and origin of Muslim wedding customs are very difficult to ascertain in view of the lack of early sources, it can be said that in Islam in general many old oriental customs of Syria, Mesopotamia and Egypt, partly taken over from Christianity, have been preserved and have been disseminated by Islam in other Muslim lands and there have become mingled with local customs.


Descriptions of weddings in modern times are given in the undermentioned works of Gaudefoy-Demollemyes, Westernmark and especially of Marquès. Here I give only the most important works and additions to the references in Marquès. —


South Arabia: C. Niebuhr, [1763], Reisebeschreibung nach Arabien, Copenhagen 1774, i. 402—403; Ad. von Wrede [1843], Reise in Hebräenland, Braunschweig 1870, p. 262 sq.; C. von Landberg, Études sur les dialectes de l'Arabie méridionale, Leyden 1909, ii. 192—202; ii. 717—869. —

It is recorded of him that he used to read one fourth of the Qur'an every night, and that he suffered his cankers foot to be amputated without uttering one groan.

Urwa had assiduously frequented his maternal aunt 'Abdah up to three years before her death, and collected a great many important traditions from her, from both his parents, from 'Abd b. Abi Kalib and Abi Warraza. Among those who received traditions from him are Muhammad b. 'Umar b. Hisham, and especially the famous traditions of 'Abd b. Yasar and Ibn Abi Malik.

As an authority on tradition 'Urwa ranks very high, and is one of the seven great sabah, authors of treatises on rijal and 'ilm muja'ala b. 'Abdah have no fault to find with him. He had collected an important library, bearing upon many subjects, both historical and juridical. He was the author of a Kitab al-Maghazi, but his traditions are only to be found incorporated in the works of later historians: Ibn Sa'd, al-Tabari and Ibn Ishaq. A feature of his traditions is the lack of a regular inma, which was formed after the time of 'Urwa.

Bibliography: al-Tabari, ed. Goeje, i. 1180; ii. 1166; Ibn Sa'd, iii. p. xviii (Einleitung), p. (Einleitung by E. van den Enden); Wellhausen, Skizzen und Verarbeitung, vi. 4; al-Khazraki, Armal al-Rijal, 1st ed., Cairo 1832, p. 124; Caetani, Annali dell'Islam, Introduzione, §11 and passim.

(V. Vacca)

URWA B. AL-WARD B. 'HAMIS, of the tribe of 'ABA, an old Arab poet. His father, whose fame was sung by 'Antara, played a part in the Dajjal war. His mother belonged to the less esteemed Banu Nahd, a branch of the 'uqayl (cf. Wustenfeld, Tal., i. 173; allusions to them in poems ix., xiv., xx.). He lived, as is expressly stated, in the Dihliya. But his allusions to individuals who survived into the time of Muhammad, like 'Abd b. 'Umar b. 'Uthman (schol. on l. 1) show that he must have flourished just before the coming of the Prophet. His poems and the anecdotes related of him give us a picture of a true Beduin, devoted to a chivalrous life of adventure, who for his protection of the poor later became known as Urwa al-Saffar. Among his adventures may be mentioned his raid from Mawān in the region of Yathrib upon the Bakhtan in N.W. Arabia, and the story of his wife Umm 'Amir (also Umm Wabab or Salmā) of the tribe of Khaybar whom he is said to have been tricked into giving away, while intoxicated, by the Jewish Banu 'Najjar (or in their region).


(H. H. BRAU)

'URWA B. AL-ZUBAIR B. 'AWWĀM, of the tribe of MADINAN, one of the earliest and foremost authorities on tradition in Madīna, born between 23 and 30 A.H. died between 91 and 99. His mother was the celebrated Asma' bint Abi Bakr, his father al-Zaibar b. al-Awamm b. Khuwailid was a nephew of Khadija. Some thirty years younger than his brother 'Abd Allāh, 'Urwa did not take part in politics or in the civil wars, but gave himself up entirely to study. When his brother, in 73, was vanquished by al-Hadjudād, 'Urwa abandoned him, like the rest of his family, and fled in haste to Damasus, to carry the news to 'Abd al-Malik and thus win his favour. Thereafter he lived in studious retirement on his property at Madīna, until his death, and there wrote, on 'Abd al-Malik's request, a series of communications on the earliest period of Islam, probably in the form of letters to the Caliph (see al-Tabari, i. 1180-1182).
years (1164—1174) in Hijaz Kaifah with the Urtuqshid Kara Arsalan, mainly engaged in his literary work. The fame of Saladin, who was so successfully conducting the war on the Crusaders, attracted him for the third time to Damascus. He died here at a great age in Ramadan 584 (Nov. 1188). His tomb on Mount Kuaiyin was a century later by the famous historian Ibn Khallikan.

Usama, one of a family whose members are frequently mentioned in literature (see e.g. Yahia Milli, Qayum al-Udabat, ii. 173—197), attained renown as a poet and a man of letters. His Divan (in two volumes) still existed in the time of al-Yahya (d. 1357) who knew it (see Mir'at al-Libyan, iii. 427); Deringen collected a number of his poems from the Gotha fragment and several anthologies (Ouassama b. Mouaddib, i. La vie d'Ouassama, Paris 1889—1893, p. 336—338, 545—562). Of his prose works we know the names of over a dozen (cf. Deringen, op. cit., p. 330—339) but only five are so far known to have survived. The most remarkable and most interesting of his works, the importance of which stretches far beyond the scope of ordinary Arabic literature, is the Kitab al-Dhikr, his memoirs, which gives a vivid and lively picture of his time in peace and war. The only MS. far known was found by H. Deringen in the Escorial (see Commentaire découvert en 1880 à l’Escorial le manuscrit arabe contenant l’Autobiographie d’Ouassama b. Mouaddib, as introduction to the German translation by G. Schumann (see below) and edited by him. It has been four times completely translated: into French by Deringen (Paris 1895), into German by G. Schumann (Innsbruck 1905), into Russian by Salier (with introduction, notes and bibliography by I. Kratschekov, Petrograd 1922) and into English by Hitit (New York 1929). Usama’s other works are still only accessible in manuscript. His treatise on poetics al-Abadak fi 'l-Abadak' was described with extracts by Deringen from three manuscripts (Berlin Leyden, Cairo) (op. cit., p. 330—333, 691—724). We may now add the MS. of the Asiatic Museum in Istanbul (see Kratschekov, in Zephi, i. 3—4). His anthology Kitab al-

Afi atr, deals with many quotations in prose and verse, with the "staff" known in history and legend (Deringen, op. cit., i. 334—336, 499—542); we may now add the MS. of Milan from the Yemen (see Griffini, in Z. D. M. G., ixxix. [1915] 193). Recently a hitherto unknown work of Usama, the Kitab al-Manasiy al-Diwar (autograph of 568 = 1172, written in Hijaz Kaifah), was found in the Asiatic Museum in Istanbul. This anthology, which was suggested by an earthquake in August 1157, contains all kinds of poetical quotations about maw'ud, mawqaf, alfi, ra'um, ra'um, etc. (description of the MS. with many specimens of the text by Kratschekov, in Zephi, i. 4—18). We do not yet have any details of the Laktuq al-Adab, which we know in Cairo in a MS. of 598 A.H. in the possession of Yaqub Sarraf (editor of the periodical al-Muktabat).

Bibliography: The most important material for the biography and on the works of Usama has been collected by Deringen in his comprehensive work (see above). He also wrote a number of separate articles on him (cf. Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 320) which are reprinted in his Opuscules d'un arabe, Paris 1905, p. 313—336. These works and later literature and the more important reviews are listed by Ign. Kratschekov in the appendix to the Russian translation of the Kitab al-Dhikr by M. Salier (Petrograd 1922, p. 206—207). We may add T. Kowalski, Fałszywe arabskie i pierwotne wiedż krzyżackie, in Przegląd Warszawski, 1923, N. 18, p. 380—400 and Ign. Kratschekov, Niewykonane zmieny autografa zmirza Usama, in Zapiski, i. (1925), 11—18.

USAMA B. ZAID B. HASSAN AL-KALBI AL-HEMRI, AND MUHAMMAD, SON OF THE ABASINIAN freedwoman Baraka Umm Aiman and reckoned among the Prophet’s freedmen, was born in Mecca in the fourth year of his mission. Tradition records many instances of the Prophet’s fondness for him as a child, and gives him the surname of Khadi b. Khadiya Umm Aiman.

He joined the fighters on the way to Uthman, but was sent back before battle on account of his tender age. Questioned by Muhammad in the case of slander against 'Ali, he spoke in her favour. After Khadiya he received a pension, and in a.d. 8 rode behind the Prophet into Mecca and entered the Ka'bah with him. He fought gallantly at Hunain.

In a.d. 11 Muhammad put Usama in command of an expedition to avenge his father Zaid, fallen at Mina. Notwithstanding criticism, due to Usama’s youth, the Prophet, already in his last illness, insisted on a prompt departure, but the expedition turned back at the news of his death, and Usama was among those who prepared him for burial.

The newly-elected Caliph ordered the expedition to be resumed, in accordance with the Prophet’s wishes, though the tribes were already revolted. Usama reached the region of al-Balqa’, in Syria, where Zaid had fallen, and raided the village of Uthba (the modern Khan al-Zaid). His victory brought joy to Madina, depressed by the ridda, thus acquiring an important out of proportion to its real significance, which caused it to be regarded later as the beginning of a campaign for the conquest of Syria.

In the same year Abu Bakr left Usama in command at Madina, while at the battle of Uthba l-Kaaja.

In 20 Umar bestowed on him a pension of 4,000 dirhams, equal to that of the men of Badr, on account of the Prophet’s fondness for him and his father.

The election of ‘Uthman to the caliphate took place in the home of Fatiha bint Kais al-Fihitya, Usama’s wife; he probably had a part in the event, and was in favour with the Caliph, receiving from him the grant of a piece of land, and being sent by him to Harra in 34 to report upon the political situation there.

After ‘Uthman’s death Usama refused homage to ‘Ali, whose supporters attacked and ill-treated him in the Mosque at Madina. Therewith he lived in retirement, first in Wadi l-Kura, then in Madina; he died in al-Diwar, about 54, and was buried in Madina.

Usama has a place among transmitters of hadith. His political career, though not brilliant, appears blameless; we hear nothing of his riches.

In appearance Usama resembled his mother, being black and flat-nosed. The emphasis laid by tradition on Muhammad’s love for him is partly due to the intention of setting him off against ‘Ali’s family; it may also have been meant to
show that the Prophet was a true democrat and free from colour prejudice.


UShäN, a town in Asia Minor, capital of a kadi in the sandjak of Usbeyk in the province of Khudawan-dijar, on the edge of a cultivated plain at the foot of the mountains; it had 15,000 inhabitants of whom a third were Armenians and Greeks; the houses are built of brick, with gardens, and the streets are broad. It was rebuilt after a fire in the xith century. It is celebrated for its manufacture of carpets known as Smyrna carpets because they are exported through this port (150,000 yards per annum). There is a fortress on the site of the ancient acropolis (Eucarpia). Towards the end of the xvith century, the devr-beyi (governor) Hududji Murad-oglu declared himself independent but he was besieged by Kara Oghman-oglu of Adin, taken through treachery and executed. In the district there are asbestos mines and sulphur thermal springs.


Al-USHród ‘Ali b. Othman Sirdij al-Din al-Fardhami al-Hanafi, of whose life nothing is recorded (‘Abd al-Kadir b. ‘Abd al-Wafa’ al-Kureishi, al-Nzahdi al-unfla fti Tabakat al-Hanafi, Hadhirabad 1323, i, 367 does not even give a date), wrote about the year 569 = 1173 (s. Z. D. M. G., xvi, 685) a confession of faith in rhyme entitled Kajada al-Lamiya fti l-Tvihd, also called Raud al-Muslih or from the opening words Kajada yakhtib ‘I. ‘Abdi (Carmen arabicum Amali dictum, ed. P. V. Bohlen, Regensburg 1825; also in Mu‘jam, Muhammadi al-Muslin, Cairo 1273, 1281, 1295, 1233; on the margin of Salim b. Sumair, Safnaz al-Nadja, Singapore 1295, with Hindustani paraphrase by Mawlawi Muhammad Naqir Ahmad Khan, Dhill 1317). These printed editions show the popularity of the work down to the present time and commentaries have often been written on it. To the commentaries given in G. A. E. L. i, 439 of which the oldest is by Muhammad b. Ahi Bakr al-Kureishi, author of the Tafsir al-Muslih (G. A. E. L. i, 383, d, according to Hadijdi Khalifa, NO. 733, in 660 = 1260), some more may be added from the Stambul and other catalogues. The most celebrated among them is that of al-Kureishi al-Hamawi (d. 1014-1605), written in 1010 (1601) in Mecca entitled Dauw al-Aamili, pr. Stambul 1393, Bombay 1395, Delhi 1884; with Turkish tranal by Husain Effendi, Stambul 1304; anonymous glosses Tabak al-Adal, Cairo 1309 and d. There have also been printed two Persian commentaries Naqsh al-La‘ali by Muhammad Bakhs Rafik (lith.), Lucknow 1869 and by Ahamd Darwiza Nangahari, Lahore 1891, 1900; a Turkish commentary Morak al-Ma‘alib by Ahmad ‘Asim ‘Ainthal, Stambul 1304; and a Turkish paraphrase with commentary by Muhammad Shukri, Stambul 1305. Of his collection of traditions Gharar al-Abhir wa-Darur al-Adur, only a selection, containing 1,000 short traditions in 100 chapters, entitled Nish al-Abhir wa-Tadkhirat al-Abhir has survived in Berlin (Ahwardi, Katalog, No. 13001), Munich (note No. 163), Cairo (Fried, i, 444) and a fragment in Mqwil (s. Dschud, al-Maqsimat al-Musliny, p. 24, No. 28). His collection of stories, which according to Hadijdi Khalifa, NO. 8767, he finished on 2nd Mulharam 569 (Aug. 14, 1173) in Usba, was printed in Calkinta 1243 and Lucknow 1223-1225.

Bibliography: given in the article.

C. Brockelmann

USHËN (Ushn, Ushnya), a district and town in Acharbasjân. Ushn lies to the south of Urmia [q.v.] from which it has usually been administered. The district is watered by the upper course of the river Gdïr (Gader) which, after traversing the district of Saldus [q.v.], flows into Lake Urmia on the S. W. To the south of Ushn is the district of Lähigjân which is administered from Saldul-Budak [q.v.]. The town of Ushn (710 houses) is situated on the left bank of the Gdïr (Com-i-Cala, "river with 40 mills") which rises in the Gîlas valley through five districts and communicates with Margaviz [cf. USMA].

The population of the district is Kurds. The town and its villages are occupied by the Zarrâ tribe, the other twenty-five villages by the tribe of Masan which also occupies a part of Lähigjân and of Saldus.

It is possible that in the Khalidi (Yenic) name Ushnî corresponds to Ushn. Rawinson had identified the village of Singân (three miles S.E. of Ushn) with the Zorvan mentioned by Ptolemy, vi. 2 in Media. The town of Ushn is mentioned in Arabic sources from the time of I斯塔khri (p. 186). This author says that Ushnî al-Adharfa formed part of the lands of the Bantu Roudain, which also included Dakhurjan and Tabhira (Nir), but Ibn Hawkal, p. 240, already notes that this tribe had disappeared. On p. 239, he notes the richness of Ushnî in grass and fruits. Its produce (honey, almonds, nuts and cattle) was exported to Mawasîl and to al-Djazira. Its steppe (Yâdavî = Lähigjân ?) belonged to the Hadärjân Kurds who spent the summer there (yâdavî). The principal fief of these Kurds was at Arbîl (cf. above, ii, p. 1200).

We know nothing of the coming of the Zarrâ Kurds to Ushnî (they may perhaps be a branch of the old Hadärjân) but the Zarrâ are already mentioned in the Masâlik al-Abhir of Shihab al-Dîn al-Umarî, written in Egypt in 1335 (cf. N. E., xiii, 1835, p. 300-329). The author explains its name as malad al-‘abhir which Quatremère has emended to malad al-‘abhir "children of gold" (in Kurdish sîr = zarîr).

In the Shafâf-nâmeh the section on the Zarrâ, mentioned in the preface, is omitted in all the manuscripts. They must have occupied a very considerable area. In a mutilated passage, ii, 280, Shafâf al-Dîn seems to say that Lähigjân was taken from the Zarrâ by Pir Budaq, the first chief of the Bâban tribe (xvth century). He also mentions (ii, 278) the defeat inflicted on them by Sulaimân Beg Sûrân (in the time of Murad III, 982-1003).

Ushnî lies on the road between Mawasîl and the
valley of Lake Urmiya (Mawil-Rawanduz-pass of Kela-Shin [c. 10,000 feet]-Ushun-Urmiya or Maragha). This road, blocked by snow in winter, is much less convenient than the route from Rawanduz via Rasht to the pass of Garshi-Shinka (south of the Kela-Shin) which does not exceed 3,800 feet. The pass of Kela-Shin (in Kela "green stele") is celebrated for the stele with a bilingual inscription (Assyrian-Khaldic) erected in 300 n.c. in the time of the Khaledic King Japhetuni and his son Menas. The Musallak al-Aghtir (transl. Quatremere, p. 315) has a detailed account of the mountain of Hatch-jain, i.e. "the Two Stones" (i.e. the Kela-Shin and the similar stone of Topaszwa, S.W. of Kela-Shin). In the legendary account by Tabart, i. 440, of the campaign of the King of Yaman (Rashid b. Kain) in the region of Mawil, we are told that his general Shawr b. al-Ashaf had his exploits engraved on "the two stones (baqarayarain) still known in Ashbarahidja". These two texts have been published by G. Hoffmann, in Austrjia, p. 249-250.

The place-names of the district (in Aramaic Ashokh, Aghna) reflect the former presence of a Christian element which has now disappeared (cf. the names of the villages of Sargis, Dinja and Benmarla). As early as 558 already, a Christian of Ushun founded the church of Sargis and Becchina near Malayta. In 1271 the Nestorian Catholics Dengi transferred the see of the metropolis of Assyria to Ushun to be better protected by the Mongol rulers (Assemeni, li. 350, 456). An old Christian church may be concealed by the ruins of Deir- el- Shaikh Ibrahim (near Singin), which are venerated by both Muslims and Christians. Rawlinson (p. 17) saw there the tomb of the bishop of Ushun, Ibrahim, who in 1258 was present at the consecration of the Nestorian Catholicos Yahbalghay III. Bibliography: cf. Urmiya; Rawlinson, Notes on a Journey from Tabris, in J.R.G.S., xxi. 1840, p. 15-24; Fraser, Travels in Kordistan (1834), London 1840, i. 89-98; Bittner, Der Kordangil Uschakji etc., in Situatio, Ak. Wiem., cxxii., Vienna 1895; Lehmann-Haupt, Armenien, i. 240, 260; De Morgan, Mission scientifique en Perse, in Recerches archéologiques, 1896, i. 261-85 (Kela-Shin); cf. also Etudes geographiques, 1895, ii. 315.

On the Kela-Shin see the bibliography in Lehmann-Haupt, Lc., and in detail in Minorsky, Kela-Shin, in Zbl., 1917, xxiv., p. 146-93. (V. Minorsky)

**USHR.** The tenth or tithe levied for public assistance, is frequently used in the sense of qadarah and nakah (Abul Vusuf, p. 34; Yahyâ b. Adam, p. 79, 83, i. 23) and indeed there is no very strict line drawn in the Shi'ite books between zakat and 'ushr due (cf. Tormaur, p. 318). The term 'ushr is not found in the Kur'an but Sura vi. 142 is taken to refer to the tithe or half tithe (Abu Yitnuf, p. 32; Yahyâ b. Adam, p. 88 sq.) Etymologically 'ushr is the same as the Assyrian izb-rin-a (E. Schrader, Keilschriftliche Bibliothek, iv. 192, 205) which means tribute paid in kind (corn, dates) or in gold, and with the Hebrew maqhir (Gen. xiv. 20; xxix. 20-22), the tenth which the sanctuaries received but which was also levied by kings and which the Mosaic law wished to introduce as compulsory (Lev. xxvii. 30-33; Num. xviii. 21-26). While the prophet Samuel (1 Sam. viii. 13-17) wanted the tenth to go primarily to the king, later the demand was raised for a general tithe on behalf of the sanctuary of Sion, and under Persian rule a tenth of everything actually did go to the temple of Jahav (Mal. iii. 8-10). On the other hand, according to Deut. xiv. 28; xxi. 22, the Levites and the poor were to receive the tenth while, according to the code of the priests, the whole tenth was to belong exclusively to the Levites, who had in their turn to hand over a tenth to the priests (Num. xviii. 12-19). In the cases of lapses by Jews to idolatry, they bought the tenth to the temples of the gods (Amos iv. 4; cf. H. Grotius, Kursus Bibel-bouwende, Leipzig, 1743, p. 743; L. Castani, Annali dell' Istituto, iv. 49). It is also significant that in these cases was usually a tenth of natural products (grape-juice, curu, oil) but it was permitted to offer money instead.

An investigation of the significance of the tenth as a tax among neighbouring peoples is therefore important and necessary, because light is thereby thrown on Arab conditions. Of great significance is the fact recorded by Pinay, Hist. Nat., xii. 66 especially for South Arabia (Arabia Felix) that the tenth part of the frankincense harvest was collected by the priests for the god Sin (Masari) of which out of which to meet public expenses and the maintenance of the priests. In the inscriptions we find "mahar and 'ushr along with fr" as a tax and both are taken by N. Rhodokanaki, Studien zur Lexikographie und Grammatik des Altdarabischen, ii., S. B. Ak. Wien, clxxvi/7, 1917, p. 58 to be taxes on land, which however came under the temple tax. According to Sutra iv. 137, the pagan Arabs, even the Kuraish, both Bedouin and Fellah gave to their fields of the fruit and animals to Allah or other gods, which in practice of course went to the guardians of the sanctuary. Muhammad, probably deliberately, deprived the tenth of any connection with worship and, perhaps on the analogy of South Arabian customs, made the tithe a kind of tax. This, in his letter to the Khath 'Abbas bin (J.L. Volkmann, Stuken und Verfarbeiten, iv., Berlin 1859, Kap. 65, p. 130), it is laid down that a tenth is to be paid on all land irrigated by running streams and a half tenth on lands artificially irrigated. This also hold for the otium of Dina al-Dinial (ibid., N. 119, p. 173) and the Hunsar (Yahyâ b. Adam, p. 83); in the letter to the latter the tithe is called sanba. For the nomads around Shahr for example a tax of one in ten loads of dates is fixed for their palmgroves (J. Wellhausen, op. cit., iv. 57, p. 150).

Mecca, Medina, the Hijaz, the Yaman and the Arabian territory were thus regarded as 'ushar land (E. Paguan, p. 96) from which alone the tenth was to be raised (op. cit., p. 79) and this was contrasted with the zaruragi land on which the land tax was levied. With the gradual expansion of the Islamic empire, the 'ushr land increased considerably in area. For example at the conquest of al-Raqqa (18 A.H.) the lands which the protection people (abd al-sifini) did not use were given to the Muslims on payment of the tithe (Amali al-Istamal, p. 40). The lands acquired by the peace treaties, on which no land tax was levied became 'ushr land in so far as they belonged to none converts (Yahyâ b. Adam, p. 15). Further all land on which no land tax was levied became 'ushar land on the conversion of its owner, if the cultivator, dug a well or an irrigation channel (Paguan, p. 99).
A considerable increase in 'ushr land also resulted from the transference of land by sale or gift. If for example a Muslim bought land from the Banti Taghibi he paid the tithe, according to others the double radda; the same held of every member of this tribe or Christians generally who became converts to Islam, since the land thereby became 'ushr land (Yahyā b. Adam, p. 12, 16, 46 sq.). Land in areas acquired by treaties of peace became 'ushr land in so far as it had been acquired by Muslims by purchase, even if the payment of land tax was expressly laid down in the treaty (op. cit., p. 37). The tithe was also to be levied on naturally irrigated kharāj lands in Sawād (Fagman, p. 79). H. Becker, Islamstudien, p. 230 sqq., has shown how 'ushr land developed in Egypt. Gifts of land to meritorious Muslims and purchase by Muslims from Copthelanders here made the land 'ushr land, which in Egypt certainly developed to a considerable extent out of the old domains. On the other hand, the practice of allowing new converts to pay only the tenth frequently created 'ushr land. Of the rules which were in force regarding the transference of 'ushr land it may be mentioned that allies (mashūrī) who acquired 'ushr land by purchase had to pay kharāj, which remained a burden on the land if it was sold again to a Muslim. This at any rate is the Hanafi teaching (Yahyā b. Adam, p. 16). If on the other hand a Christian buys 'ushr land from a Muslim he has to pay the double tithe (hātum), which is regarded as a double radda. The land is further treated as mashūr if the owner becomes converted to Islam (op. cit.). This had of course great disadvantages for the treasury, as had the sale of kharāj land to a Muslim and therefore 'Umar II laid it down that in the latter case the land tax fell upon the new owner, who had also to pay the tithe or half tithe on the produce and agricultural land, as the kharāj was due upon the soil and the tithe or half tithe was due as zakāt from the Muslims (Yahyā b. Adam, p. 10). This regulation was however in contradiction to the principle that by 'Irāqī kharāj and 'ushr could not be levied at the same time, any more than zakāt and sadaqa or diya (poll-tax), and 'Umar II had already prohibited the collection of the tithe from a Muslim or ally when he paid kharāj (ibid., p. 10, 32, 46). How far this limitation was actually observed it is impossible to say. In Inv. Av. Pap. 194 of the Rainer Coll. in Vienna, which deals with taxation but unfortunately is very fragmentary, and contains lists of land-tax, poll-tax, palm-tax, sadaqa, dī'ār, the two last entries are missing so that conclusions cannot be drawn from it. How greatly the practice varied is clear from Mawardi (p. 104) according to whom an ally who owns 'ushr land has to pay neither 'ushr nor kharāj according to the Shāfi'i, according to the Hanafīs, kharāj, according to others, sadaqa, while according to Yahyā b. Adam, p. 15, the ally of the tribe of Taghibi who bought 'ushr land had to pay the double tithe but if he belonged to a tribe which had been adopted into the Islamic state as an ally, he paid neither 'ushr nor kharāj. Further it was open to the Imam — in practice the financial administrator of the province and the machinery of collection — to turn kharāj land into 'ushr land (Fagman, p. 89) so that in later times the rule as to what land paid kharāj and what paid 'ushr was treated quite arbitrarily and at most we can observe a certain tendency to observe principles generally regarded as valid and sanctified by custom. In the letting of lands and masāra's agreements the rule was probably that the cultivator of 'ushr land should pay a tenth or twentieth of the yield, according to the kind of ground (Yahyā b. Adam, p. 121). If a Muslim takes over the land of an ally to till it he pays a tenth of the yield, the sadaqa the land-tax, if he has lived untilled land out of the kharāj land, the landlord pays the kharāj but the cultivator no tithe (Yahyā b. Adam, p. 120). If the untilled land is mashūr the cultivator has to pay 1/12 or 1/16 of the yield as naskī (op. cit., p. 116, 123). If a Muslim has leased mashūr untilled land, he pays the tenth while the landlord pays nothing (ibid., p. 124). The Muslim also pays on rented kharāj land 1/10 or 1/16 of the yield as naskī, the landlord the kharāj (this is the Shāfi'i practice) while the Hanāfīs make the landlord pay tithe (Mawardi, p. 105). The same thing holds if owner and occupier are the same individual (Yahyā b. Adam, p. 118—120). According to Mawardi, p. 104, however, the Muslim occupier, as having contracted an agreement to cultivate a piece of kharāj land has to pay tithe and kharāj (Shāfi'i), only the kharāj according to the Hanāfīs. According to Abū Yūsuf (Fagman, p. 79), the tithe was only to be paid on durable products of the land but not on vegetables, fodder or fuel, according to Yahyā b. Adam (p. 84, 105) was paid on palm, wheat, barley, grapes, raisins, while (op. cit., p. 79, 101) it is laid down that the tithe is to be levied as sadaqa on all that the earth produces, even if it be only a bundle of green stuff. The latter is according to Yahyā b. Adam (p. 103) along with walnuts, almonds, and all fruit, only liable to tithe in the form of naskī if it is over 200 dirhams in value. For dates the limit of exemption is 5 mārā (Fagman, p. 80). 'Umar levied no tax on vines, peaches and pomegranates, while wine and oil are regarded as liable to tithe (ibid., p. 50, 111). According to some, 'ushr is levied on honey, according to others, only when it is produced on 'ushr land (op. cit., p. 17); this also holds of saffron. As a kind of trade-tax, the 'ushr was levied on merchants coming into Islamic territory and the ally paid a twentieth but a tenth on wine and pigs (op. cit., p. 32—49 sq.). Muslims under age are according to some jurists exempt from the tithes, according to others not (op. cit., p. 48). The half, single, one and a half and double tenth are the rates for the 'ushr; we even have higher ones, for they are fixed quite at the discretion of the Imam (Fagman, p. 93). It is however a principle and it is keeping with the old practice that the tenth is levied on all land which is irrigated by running water, brooks and streams or by rain, the half tenth on land which is irrigated by carried water, by water-wheels or water drawn by canals (Yahyā b. Adam, p. 78, 80—86). The income from the tithes could be used for other than benevolent purposes. Thus for example, the administrator of the provincial revenues in Egypt, 'Ubayd Allāh b. Ḥabbās, gave the Kais who were settled here funds to buy beasts of burden out of the tithes (Maḳrit, Abhandlungen, p. 488). Echoes of the ancient pre-Islamic practice have survived in South Arabia where the ṭālīṣr pay 'üşhr to the sulṭan or emir; here it is also called 'ażhara but it is worth noting that it is
mainly leaved on the fruits of the field, corn, dates, coffee, indigo etc. Among the Barkán and the people of Aryan, the corn is piled up, measured and 1/90 of the wheat set aside, of which the poorest of the sanctuary receive the half and the other half goes to the gashtabā, a custom which has analogies with the conditions in the Bible and also with those recorded by Pliney.


**Ushahkizade,** a Turkish patronymic borrowed from the Persian, meaning strictly son or descendant of 'Usbāh, the latter word being the ethnic from Ushāb (arabicized into 'ušbāb, plural of 'ušbāb), a town in Asia Minor. 'Ushahkizade therefore means a descendant of a man from Ushāb.

Two families in Turkey have borne or bear this name:

The descendants of 'Ushahkizade 'Abd al-'Askār al-Naṣīr of Mecca and son-in-law of the Naṣīr al-Dīn Seikzade 'Abd al-Rahmān Efendi. He was the third of the four sons of the saint Ṣayrī Ḥasan Hūsain al-Dīn said to have come from Buhārā, who was a pupil of Shamsī Ahmad al-Samarkandī in Erivan and who settled in 'Ushāb at first and later in Constantinople in the reign of Sulaimān the Magnificent. He died at Konya in 1003 (1594-1595) and was buried in Constantinople with the shəhīd who succeeded him in the mosque founded by him at the same time as a sāhib at Kāsim Pasha. Hūsain al-Dīn founded the first order of the 'Ushahkizade dervishes, the rules of which are influenced by the Kubrawīya and Nūrshāhkhābiyya dervishes. and which forms a branch of the Ahmadzade who in turn are connected with the Khālwaṭiya. According to v. Hammer (Hist. de l'Emp. Ottoman, vii. 287), the brotherhood of the 'Ushahkizade was founded in the reign of Murād III (1574-1596). The priority of the order did not long remain in the direct line of the founder, owing to failure of male descendants. On the other hand, another branch of the same family, the 'Ushahkizade properly so-called, flourished greatly. 'Ushahkizade 'Abd al-'Askār, already mentioned, had a son 'Ushahkizade...

Haş Hâshem Efendi who founded a family and acquired a certain reputation for his historical works (cf. Bahninger, G. O., W., p. 258-259; v. Hammer, op. cit., ii. 477). 'Abd Allah Nâṣīr Efendi, another son of 'Abd al-'Askār, was Naṣīr al-Dīn at-Tabrīzī at Constantinople from 1123 to 1130 (Sīdīji, iii. 373 sq.; Rifāt, Ṣaḥḥāl al-Muḥātār, p. 33 sq. 3). A family of merchants (carpet, etc.) and notables which was settled in Smyrna at the end of the sixteenth century and to which belonged the well-known prose-writer and novelist Ushahkizade Khālid Dīya (Halī, Zīya) [cf. KHALID ZIYA] and his niece Hamīl, formerly the wife of Ǧāḥiẓ Muṣṭafā Ḥanṣa.

Halī, Zīya has himself pointed out in his memoirs (Ḥallīrat al-ṣaḥāba, publ. in the Folli from Jan. 19, 1931, cf. No. 2 of these Memoirs), the family as late as 1869 was called Halīzāde (Halīzāde). The branch which went to Smyrna was known as ‘Ushahkizālī, "those of ‘Ushāb," a name which was later replaced by that of Ushahkizade, which was thought more elegant.

**Bibliography:** (for the first of the two families only): Thurecy (Surecy) Bey, Sūriyya Camii, iv. 298; ii. 112, 180; Shams al-Dīn Sîmî Bey, Kāmi̇ al-‘Ālam, iv. 2156; Hammer, Hist. ii. 207 (Fr. ed.); Bahninger, G. O., W., p. 259 (sources).

On the one side of ‘Usbāh, vivit Rāfīt, Lughāt al-Qurān, no. 243 s. v. ‘Āṣib (also in this Encyclopaedia s. v. Ṭārīkā, p. 705). Details of the different shahkis will be found in Hāfiz Hūsain b. Ḥalīlīd Is’āmī ‘Ātwāntāsīrī, Ḥayāt al-Dīwānī, Constantinople 1581, i. 23-25 (considerably abridged in the translation in Hammer, Hist. i. 69, No. 634). (j. deny)

**Uşkub** (Serb. Skopje), capital of the former Turkish vilayet of Köşova (Serb. Kosovo), now the capital of the Vardar basin in the kingdom of Jugoslavia, is situated at a height of 596 feet above sea-level in the centre of a fertile valley surrounded by snow-covered mountains and built on both sides of the Vardar; in 1531 it had 64,807 inhabitants (only 32,409 in 1621) of whom more than a third are Muslims. On the left bank of the river were the older quarters of the town (the fortress, the Turkish quarters, etc.; on the right are the modern buildings and the railway station. Skopje has 8,958 houses, 15 mosques, 6 Serbian Orthodox and 7 Roman Catholic churches. Of specifically Muslim buildings we may mention a Mescit-i-Ulūm (i.e. a college of legal authorities, usually called "Ulūm-medresa"); a Wafi-Meşrut Council ("Vakufsko-mearšk spač"; cf. i. p. 768 seq.), a chief Shari‘at court and a state high school for Muslims ("Velika medresa kralja Aleksandra I") in which, in addition to the usual subjects, religion, Arabic and a little Turkish are taught. Owing to its splendid geographical situation, Skopje has become the economic and cultural centre of Southern Serbia.

The town has already played a similar role in the past. Originally an Illyrian colony called Scupi, it was later the capital of the Roman province of Dardania and lay about two miles farther up the river at the present village of Zlokučani (N, W. of the modern Skopje) but was completely destroyed by an earthquake in the year 518.

According to Sir Arthur Evans, Scupi was rebuilt in the neighbourhood of the ancient town on the
site of the present Skopje by the Emperor Justinian (527-565) and called Justiniiana Prima, but this new name did not survive. On the other hand, W. Tomasek thinks it more probable that Justiniana Prima was built very much farther north of Skopje. Professor N. Vulić also had adopted this view (Ona bila Justiniiana Prima, in Le Musee Belge, xxiii. [1928], 65-71) but now he agrees with Evans.

At the end of the seventh century, the town was taken by the Slavs. In the following centuries, Skopje (this is the usual Byzantine name; hence it also appears as Ishkija on Idrisi's map of the world of 1154 [ed. K. Miller, Stuttgart 1928]) belonged mainly to Byzantium, with a few longer and shorter intervals when it was under Bulgar (Jireček, i. 211 and 222) and Serbian (op. cit., i. 201) rule.

Towards 1282 Skopje finally passed from the Byzantines to the Serbs (op. cit., i. 245) and became the favourite residence of the medieval Serbian kings and emperors. It was here that the powerful Abbé Đukan had himself ceremoniously crowned as the first Serbian emperor (1346). This time Serbian rule in Skopje lasted 110 years (1282-1392) and this epoch may be described as the golden period in the town's history (especially down to 1374).

After the battle on the field of the blackbird (Serb. Kosovo polje) in 1389 Skopje became of especial importance to the Ottomans and they occupied it in the early years of the reign of Hānizad I. In the older Ottoman chroniclers (Urđič ad-Dîl, p. 26; Ašikpepağâzâde, ed. Giese, p. 58 [Stamba's edition, p. 64]; Negri-Nöldeke, ii., in Z.D.M.G., xv. 333; anon. ed. Giese, p. 73 [only in the critical appr., hence not in the trans.]), Paša Yigit (Yiyit) Beg, "who is the tutor of Ishkije Beg (Ishaq Beg efendi) and is like his father", is named as the conqueror of Čakub and its first governor. The exact date of the conquest is not given in any of these historians but preserved in a contemporary Serbian inscriptions: Jan. 6, 1392 (Lj. Stojanović, Staror. srpski spisi, i. [Belgrade 1902], p. 56, No. 177). Elwiliy Celebi (953) assures however that Erenow Beg took the town. Skama al-Din Şāmī (Kūmsū al-Aflâm, ii. [1889], 912-913) on the other hand gives Timur Taš Paşa as the Turkish conqueror of Skopje in 792 (began Dec. 20, 1389) but without giving his authority. "Ali Djedw (TUrks. ve-liceddrettâr Ishaqâdet), i. [1311 = 1895], 87) also gives Timur Taš Paşa but his authority seems to be the Kūmsū al-Aflâm. Čakub was at once settled with Turkish colonists (Hammer, G.O.R.2, i. 183) and was for a time the second residence of the Ottomans sultan next to Adrianopole (cf. e. g. Elwiliy Celebi, i. [553]). Čakub was the base of further Ottoman campaigns northward, and it was from here that their governors controlled their Christian tributaries (Jireček, i. 97). In the course of time a busy trade developed in which the Ragusans played a prominent part. Building activity was also considerable and was mainly devoted to mosques, madrasas, baths etc. The largest and finest mosque dates from the 14th century (Sašti Murâd mosque built in 840 = 1436-1437; Ishaq Beg [Iškija]) mosque built in 842 = 1438-1439; Ishaq Beg mosque about 880 = 1475-1476; Koca Muṣṭafâ mosque built in 900 = 1495 [destroyed 1925]) and from the beginning of the xvth century (Vâhî Paşa mosque built in 908 = 1502-1503). Some of the Čakub medreses early acquired a great reputation.

That Čakub in the xvth and xviith century also played a large part in the poetry and scholarship of Turkey is shown by the following celebrated names: i. Aštâ, poet, d. 950 = 1543-1544 (Gibb, H.O.P., ii. 191, note 3); 3. Išaḫâq Câlebi (Uškubit), lyricist and scholar, d. 949 = 1542-1543 (Gibb, iii. 40-45); 3. Aštâ Câlebi (Pîr Muḥâammad), biographer of poets and himself a poet, d. 979 = 1571-1572 (Gibb, iii. 7-8 and 163; note 4; cf. also Elwiliy, v. 566); 4. Wezîz (Uwaiz) Muḥâammad, one of the most brilliant prose writers of his time, died as Kât of Čakub in 1357 = 1627-1628 (Gibb, iii. 208-218 and Elwiliy, v. 560); 5. (New 'îzâde) Aštâ, the famous poet and continuator of the Shâkî 'al-naw'm 'ânâya of Taşköprüzâde, whose last judicial post was in Čakub, d. 1044 = 1634-1635 (Gibb, iii. 242-243; Brisał M. Tahir, Othmâniyyû Malkiller, ii. 93-96; Babinger, G. O. W., p. 171-172).

Western travellers of the xviith and xvith centuries (e. g. T. Petančić [1502], the anonymous Italian [1559], M. Biri [1604], Dr. Brown [1669]) describe Skopje as a large and fine town. The two Turkish accounts of the xvith century agree with this. The one is by Halictedj Kâhil (c. 1648) who not only describes Čakub, the capital of the sandjak of the same name, as a fine town but says that the tower clock, which dated from the time of the unbelievers, was the largest in all Christendom; the other description by the somewhat later Elwiliy Câlebi in spite of all its exaggerations is the best account of the accounts of the town. At the time of his visit (1661), Čakub had 70 mahallas, about 10,000 solidly built houses including several famous serays, 2,150 well built shops, 130 large and small mosques (45 Friday mosques), several churches and synagogues, 20 dervish monasteries, 110 fountains etc. Commerce, trade and industry were also all very flourishing. Conditions were so settled that a garrison of only 300 men sufficed.

But towards the end of the century, the Austrian general Piccolomini supported by rebel Serbs advanced across the Danube and the Save into the Vardar district, plundered Čakub and burnt it to the ground on October 26 and 27, 1669 (cf. M. Kottić, in Jutba Serbiya, i. [1923], 121-128).

In the xvith century, the plague raged in this region and at the end of this century the population had sunk to 6,000. It was only at the beginning of the sixteenth century that Čakub began to revive again rapidly as a result of the immigration of inhabitants from adjoining regions. The reforms of Omar Paşa Latas restored peace and order in the whole region after 1840 and trade flourished once more. From 1875 onwards Muslim emigrants from Serbia and Bosnia considerably increased the population of the town. In 1873 the railway Salonika-Čakub-Mitrovica was opened to traffic and in 1875 the capital of the vilayet was removed from Pristina to Čakub. The opening of the railway Belgrad-Nish-Skopje-[Salonika] in 1888 connected the town directly with Serbia and Central Europe. At the end of the xviith century, Čakub had already 4,474 houses with 32,000 inhabitants (17,000 Musulmans, 14,300 Christians and 800 Jews).
The Balkan war (1912) put an end to the 520 years of Turkish rule in Skopje. Since 1918 when the town definitely passed to Yugoslavia the number of inhabitants has doubled and the development of Skopje has been considerable in all fields (philosophical faculty of the University, Scientific Society of Skopje with its organ Glasnik skopjeg naučnog društva [Bulletin de la société scientifique de Skopje], South Serbian Museum, National Theatre, Hygienic Institute etc.).
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THE OLDEST AND LARGEST QUARTER OF THE TURKISH constantinople ON THE ASIATIC SIDE OF THE BOSPORUS, Lying at the foot of the hill of Buğlarh, where the Asiatic coast advances farthest to the west, opposite the Tower of Leander (Kî Kuclei). In ancient times the small town of Chrysopolis (already mentioned in Xenophon's Anabasis, book vi., ch. vi. 38) existed on this site; it was then a suburb of the still older colony of Chalcodon (now Kadi Köy). Towards the end of the Byzantine Empire the name Sencari had come into use (cf. Phrantzes, ed. 1838, p. 111; ὁσ εἰς τὸν Σενκράνταβολγὸν νήσον τῆς Ἀχαϊῶν). It is uncertain if this new name is to be derived from the corpus of shield-bearers that was located there in the time of the emperor Valans (cf. Cuenot and G. Young, Constantinople, London 1926, p. 203). The direct reason may have been that there was, from the time of the Commonol, a palace there called Scutariun (Cujen). The Turkish Uskudar contains at the same time a popular etymology, as the Persian word askudar (also askudar is given) has the meaning of a post station (Arabic harāt); by its geographical position, Uskudar became indeed the main base for all greater and smaller expeditions from the capital to the Asiatic parts of the empire (cf. E. Tischner, Das anatolische Wegennetz, Leipzig 1924 and 1926). Large armies generally were encamped in the vast plain to the south of the suburb, where now stands the part of the town called Harad Pasha. Still another explanation of Uskudar (viz. Eski Dâr) is given by Ewliya Celebi.

The historical sources do not mention in what particular way Uskudar was conquered by the Ottoman Turks, but it certainly was taken under Othman's rule, either after the capture of Enik (1331), together with the other localities of Kadif Èli (q. v.) (cf. Niceforos Gregoras, ed. Bonn 1840, iii. 458) or in any case after the death of the emperor Andronicus (1341; cf. Phrantzes, p. 41). The Old Ottoman chronicles mention it for the first time during the reign of Muhammad I. The local traditions, as recorded by Ewliya Celebi, connect Uskudar closely with the different expeditions undertaken against Constantinople by Sâydî Battûl Ghiuri.

To the Turkish times Scutari became much more an integral part of the capital than it seems to have been in Byzantine times, though, according to Ewliya Celebi, it became fully populated only in the time of Sulaiman I. One of the reasons was certainly that it became the seat of several dervish congregations and their tekke's, and consequently an important centre of the mystical life of the capital. The best known are the Hafıziye Tekke of Shaikh Mahmod (lived during xvii. century) and the Rifahiye Tekke. Scutari contains moreover a number of remarkable mosques, the largest of which were all founded by ladies of the imperial court. The most notable mosques are: Mihr-â-Māh Dâjîmî or Iskelse Dâjîmî, erected in 954 (1547) opposite the chief landing-place; Eski Wâlide Dâjîmî, more to the south, finished in 991 (1583); Cümiî Dâjîmî, on the south-eastern point, finished in 1050 (1640); and Yeni Wâlide Dâjîmî, finished in 1050 (1705). The Selimiye mosque was founded by Selim III and belongs to the buildings erected by that sultan for his new troops called niqâni开设ed. Finally this suburb is famous for the large cemetery that extends on its eastern side.

In the judicial hierarchy the Uskudar Molla ranked with the mollah of Ghâta and of Eyüp among the lowest class of the highest order of judges (d'Ohsson, Tableau, ii. 271). Administratively Scutari has long been a part of the town of Constantinople (Cuijets). In the new administrative division of the Turkish republic it is annexed to the province of Istanbul (Deveci Şahsmas) for 1926, p. 612; on p. 655 of this publication the number of inhabitants is given as 155,093.
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RÖTSCH, ÜSÜL

Among the various terminological usages of this word, three are prominent as terms for branches of Muslim learning: üsül-â-din, üsül-â-hadîth, üsül-â-fikr. U.â-din is synonymous with hadîm [q. v.]; by üsül-â-hadîth is meant the treatment of the terminology and methods of the science of Tradition [see hadîth]; the üsül-â-âfikr [frequently called simply science (of the) U.â] are the doctrine of the “principles” of Muslim jurisprudence, âfîk (q. v.).
1. In the usual classification of Muslim sciences, the *uṣūl al-khrāṣṭ* are generally defined as the methodology of Muslim jurisprudence, as the science of the proofs which lead to the establishment of legal standards. Its existence is justified by the consideration that man was not created without a purpose (ṣūra xxiii. 117) and is not aimlessly left to himself (ṣūra lxxv. 36) but all his actions are regulated by legal standards; as there cannot be a special standard for every individual case, one has to depend on their derivation on proofs. These proofs, according to the view which finally prevailed, are of four kinds: *kurban*, *sunna*, *iǧmāʿ* and *ḥiyāt* (? v.). In the *uṣūl al-khrāṣṭ*, therefore, we are not so much concerned with the material sources of Islamic law as with the formal basis of the individual prescriptions. Thus the four *uṣūl* include in addition to the two material sources, *kurban* and *sunna*, which are regarded from the point of view, not of their substance but of their legal force, the general condition of *iǧmāʿ* and method of *ḥiyāt*, while other historically no less important sources of Muslim law are not recognised. The development of these and other *uṣūl* which did not attain full recognition is somewhat as follows:

2. The logically first and most highly esteemed source of law in Islam is of course the Kurān; there could be no doubt of its conclusive authority and infallibility — in spite of the possibility of attempts to falsify it by the devil (ṣūra xxii. 51; cf. Noldeke-Schwally, *Geschichte des Quran*, i. 100), nor could there be any doubt that it had been handed down essentially intact (cf. ibid., i. 261; ii. 93) — in spite of the Prophet's forgetting several verses (ṣūra ii. 100; lxxxviii. 6 sq). The fact that the Kurān itself describes several of its sections as abrogated (*manākh*); the passage abrogating the older one is called *nawṣī*) by later revelations is not in contradiction to this (ṣūra ii. 100; xvi. 103 sq; cf. Noldeke-Schwally, *op. cit.*, ii. 52 sqq.). It was the task of later interpretation to get rid of the numerous contradictions within the Kurān, which reflect the process of development of Muhammad as a prophet, by harmonising them or in extreme cases to assume that the later revelation abrogated the earlier. It was in no way Muhammad's intention to create a "system" even in its main outlines, which was to regulate the whole life of his followers; the old Arab customary law, which already included many elements of foreign (Roman provincial, Babylonian, South Arabian?) origin, on the contrary remained in force in Islam as a matter of course with its variations adopted to local conditions (Bedouin, Mecca (commercial town), Medina (an agricultural centre)); Muhammad's legislative activity was confined to correcting isolated points out of considerations of religion — for even the modifications affecting social life have a religious basis, and from case to case usually under the stimulus of extraneous happenings. Including the very dealing with questions of public worship and those of a military or political nature, the total number of verses forming what is known as the *ṣūṣa al-ḥārīya* is only about 300—600; but essential parts of the legislation affecting worship, e.g. the ritual of the *qārat*, were not regulated by the Kurān, but simply by example and guidance of the Prophet, and a number of other prescriptions by Muhammad are not in the Kurān, usually of minor importance and not of general application, although having prophetic authority (cf. Noldeke-Schwally, *op. cit.*, l. 260). From the beginning, the prophetic authority of Muhammad has never been doubted, even on matters not laid down in the Kurān; at the same time, however, his actions as a mere mortal were not considered infallible even in religious matters and on several occasions he was sharply criticised. The abolition of certain customs permitted or practised by Muhammad very soon after his death points in the same direction. The Prophet himself made no claim to infallibility: the Kurān expressly states (e.g. ṣūra xviii. 110; xii. 5): "he was merely a man "like others" and sometimes even condemned his attitude (e.g. ṣūra xxi. 1)."

3. With the death of the Prophet, legislative activity through Kurānī revelation and prophetic authority of course came to an end. It was natural that the early calipha should endeavour to guide the Islamic community on the lines of its founder, in consultation with the leading Companions of the Prophet. The guiding principles were to be found in the Kurān and in authoritative decisions of the Prophet not in the Kurān. The endeavour to extend these comparatively narrow foundations led very early to their interpretation being broadened beyond the original meaning and probably to the rise of new traditions. At the same time the caliphs, as heads of their state and representatives of the Prophet, were not to be prevented from starting legislative activity of their own and from sometimes even altering decisions of the Prophet (cf. above). It may be historical that according to tradition Abu Bakr is represented as modelling himself exactly on the Prophet in this connection and 'Umar rather as showing more tendency to interfere and change.

The relationship to customary law continued unchanged, even after the latter had been more than ever exposed to foreign influence as a result of the great conquests in the 'Irāq, Syria and Egypt.

4. With the coming of the Umayyads and the transference of the seat of government to Damascus the circles of the devout in Medina, hitherto the centre, lost all actual influence on the business of government. They therefore began to devote themselves with all the more zeal to preparing an ideal picture of things as they ought to be, in contrast to the actual practice. While in reality the customary law continued to exist and disturbed in the various provinces of the caliphate, and developed in combination with the actual administration of justice — for the Umayyads caliphs down to 'Umar II had in general little inclination to interfere and establish standards based on religion — the principles of Muslim law arose first in Medina and later also in the 'Irāq and Syria. The object of these pious men who at first worked without any thought of theory or method, was to correct and adjust the material of the laws they found in existence according to Muslim religious principles and to systematise it. They took their religious points of view from the Kurān and the material of Tradition, which they recognised as binding; the (real and alleged) sayings and actions of the Companions of the Prophet, of whom as a body they were the successors, had also high authority with them. It was of special authority when a majority of the Companions acted in the same way and the same majority principle did a great deal to cause individual views gradually to approximate to one another. The results of these cogitations were for the most part formulated in traditions and put in
the mouth of the Prophet. This considerable increase in the material of Tradition, from other sources also, again introduced into Muslim law numerous new elements, particularly those of Jewish origin. This resulted in establishing already certain characteristic peculiarities of Muslim law: its character as the interpretation and unfolding of the prescriptions, given in essence at least, by Allah through the Prophet, the denial of the possibility of development of and of legislative activity after death of the Prophet; in contrast to the historical development, the recognition in the usage of the Prophet, the *sumu* at-nabi, as the second main standard standing next to the Kur’an only in position, not in power and authority. It was just because the teaching was based for a very large part on Muhammad’s (real or fictitious) *sumu* that this was regarded as an infallible norm for the Muslim community, a view which was with difficulty read into the Kur’an (e.g. iii. 29; iv. 67; xvi. 46; xxxii. 21; liii. 3) but was distinctly laid down by tradition. The contradictions, which naturally appeared more frequently in Tradition than in the Kur’an, were to be disposed of by the same means as in the latter (cf. above), and also by criticism of the *istihsan* [q.v.], behind which criticism of the subject matter had, it is interesting to note, usually to conceal itself. The more or less strongly islamized customary law was still recognized as having an independent basis, especially on points where it was not at all identical with the *sumu* at-nabi (cf. above). Both *istihsan* and *sumu* of Medina are to him closely connected; his work represents the degree of islamization of the customary law attained in his time in Medina and as is evident from a comparison with the later period— the process was now complete. The great works of al-Shabab were undoubtedly something similar for the *irak*.

6. In al-Shafii’s (d. 204 = 820) we have the founder of Muslim jurisprudence. It is his great achievement that in him legal thought becomes conscious of itself and thus becomes a science, that he argues not only occasionally and ad hoc but throughout and on principle and gives a discussion on the starting points and methods of argumentation in jurisprudence. The important steps in advance which he made in the *ugd* al-*fikha*, based on the results of previous development, are as follows. He finally defines *sumu* as a source of law as the usage of the Prophet, as the *irak* school had already done before him. He further defines the *istihsan* as the view held by the majority of Muslims and uses it as a secondary source of elucidation on questions which cannot be decided from the Kur’an and the *sumu* of the Prophet; he justifies its authority by general considerations and traditions which order adhesion to the community of Muslims and he therefore does not yet know the *hadith* later often quoted: “My community will never agree upon an error”. While the islamization of law had in general been already completed before Malik, al-Shafii did a great deal to advance its systematization. To attain this object, he to some extent abandoned the usual path of legal thought, not the first appearance of this tendency, and if he did not invent the process of *fiyad* (analogy), he considerably developed the principle and applied it extensively. It is essentially the old method of *ra’i* which he adopts here under this less ominous name, but a certain limitation of the process is apparent (among the old representatives of the *Irak* school *fiyad* seems to have been used to dispose of isolated abnormal traditions). Al-Shafii’s further endeavoured to lay down definite rules for its use; he only succeeded to a very small extent however and even in later times, in spite of limitations in method, *fiyad* still had not overcome the vagueness which causes it lack cogent power of conviction. In al-Shafii’s it still seems as synonymous with *istihsan* [q.v.] in the old sense in which the latter as a synonym of *ra’i* means the jurist’s use of his intelligence. Among the representatives of the *Irak* school and also among those of the Hidja, *istihsan* [q.v.] was used as a variety of *ra’i*. It consisted in
diverging from the result properly to be expected by analogy (ṣāha) out of considerations of reasonableness or practical considerations etc. Al-Shāfi‘ī vigorously challenged this process as purely subjective and held that only ṣiṣṭa was valid. Al-Shāfi‘ī in this way carried through a deliberate Islamisation of the šiṣṭa.

7. The development after al-Shāfi‘ī in the predominant school resulted in the āṣūl, summa, ʿijmā‘a and ʿiyas being classed together as the four ʿāṣūl al-ṣiṣṭa, which is only intelligible from their history, and in further developments in detail. Among the latter are the settlement of the mutual relations of ʿurūn and summa: while al-Shāfi‘ī taught that the precepts of the ʿurūn are given greater precision by the summa but the ʿurūn can only be received by the ʿurūn and the summa by summa, it was already recognised in part before and certainly generally after him, that it was possible to abrogate the ʿurūn by summa, which was thus ranked not only equal to but above the ʿurūn; the practical legal results were however hardly affected by this theoretical differentiation. As to the ʿijmā‘a, in later times they were not content with the majority of Muslims, but demanded the general agreement of all scholars living at the same time in a certain period, which was to be binding on all futility, but unanimity in the literal sense was never demanded. The ʿijmā‘a in this sense did not remain merely supplementary to the ʿurūn and summa; but was regarded as confirming them, on the ground of the general conviction of its infallibility, which had developed out of general considerations and found expression in the above quoted ḥadīth (Kufranic passages like iii. 98; iv. 85, 115 are also quoted in support); finally it was even allowed the power of cancelling prescriptions of the ʿurūn and summa, as was actually done for example in the case of the worship of saints and the doctrine of the infallibility of the prophets (cf. above §2). Important sections of Muslim law are based on this ʿijmā‘a alone, e.g. the caliphate, the recognition of the summa of the Prophet as an obligatory standard, the authorisation of ʿiyas etc.; in the last resort, in this view the whole of Muslim law owes its authority to the infallible ʿijmā‘a, which guarantees its correctness and agreement with the true meaning of the divine sources. This conception of ʿijmā‘a is in its essentials already found in Tabari (d. 310 = 923). This is the common orthodox doctrine; only the Malikis define ʿijmā‘a as the agreement, firstly of the Companions of the Prophet, then of the two generations following them (the so-called “successors” and “successors of the successors”), and therefore as the summa of Medina, the home of the true summa (cf. above §5), but grant this ʿijmā‘a the same authority as the others do. Only some Hanbalis and the Wahhabi, as well as the Zahiris, to be mentioned below, limit ʿijmā‘a to the agreement of the Companions of the Prophet, which has resulted in considerable differences in doctrine. The Khārijis (Ikhāṣ) recognised only ʿijmā‘a within their own community and here they demand unanimity. At the same time, there were various divergent views of ʿijmā‘a in the early period. Even after al-Shāfi‘ī’s death his opponents to ʿiyas was raised by Dīwād al-Zahirī (d. 270 = 883) and his school, who rejected all ʿiyas and ra‘y and declared for the interpretation of the ʿurūn and summa in the outward sense (ṣāhib) only; but even they could not get along without making deductions, which they endeavoured to represent as being already inherent in the words of the text (ṣawā‘il). But this school, which survived down to the ixth (xvth) century was not destined to have a lasting influence. We also still find other isolated opponents of ʿiyas and ra‘y, even among the Shāfi‘is, e.g. al-Buhārī (d. 256 = 870) and al-Ghazālī (505 = 1111), who—at least in his mystic period—applies it in practice, but in theory does not recognise it as having equal force with the traditional sources (cf. Al-Ghazali, Zahirīti, p. 182 sqq.); in the end however, ʿiyas won undisputed recognition and the Hanbalis and the Wahhabis as well as the Khārijīs (Ikhāṣ) recognise it. The Shāfi‘is and with certain limitations also the Hanafis use in ʿtiṣṣā‘ (q. v.) a special variety, surer in method, of the usual ʿiyas which is regarded as an independent ʿāṣūl. The Hanafis followed the other māḏhāb in taking over the term ʿiyas but the old ra‘y but in contrast to al-Shāfi‘ī they retained ʿtiṣṣā. The Malikis continue to recognise it, but in general they prefer the process or rather the name ʿtiṣṣā‘ (q. v.), a variety of ʿiyas which decides in favour of what is generally considered best. This ʿtiṣṣā‘ is also found among the Shāfi‘is, who following their master vigorously reject ʿtiṣṣā‘. As a matter of fact, the two processes are practically identical. On account of the arbitrariness with which the results of ʿiyas were often simply thrust aside, when it was considered necessary or simply desirable to diverge from the strict demands of the theory, both methods are disputed by many and have therefore never been generally included among the ʿāṣūl of the Ṣūfī.

The Twelver Shi‘is (Imāmīs) agree with the Sunnis in recognising the ʿurūn and summa as ʿāṣūl of the Ṣūfī; with them however not only the summa of the Prophet is authoritative but also that of the divinely guided twelve imāms, whose infallible authority guarantees the correctness of the law in a similar fashion to the ʿijmā‘a in the Sunni system. For the documentation of the summa the Shi‘is have several works of their own on tradition, which differ materially from those of the Sunnis; in particular all traditions and decisions are rejected which go back to the authority of the first three caliphs before “Ali or in which “Ali appears as their representative and successor. Under the guidance of an imām further ʿāṣūl are unnecessary; during the concealment of the last imām, however, there are still two others which correspond to the last two Sunni ʿāṣūl. But even in this period the school of the Alawis regards the summa along with the ʿurūn as above authoritative and seeks to trace back all decisions to traditions of the imāms, limiting as far as possible the shaddāl deductions, and even demands for the elucidation of each verse of the ʿurūn a tradition relating to it. The school of the Uṣūlī, on the other hand, which enjoys greater prestige as the more widely disseminated, recognises reason (ʿaḥf) as the third of the ʿāṣūl, but disputes the right of ʿiyas (this variation from the Sunnis is however limited to terminology). Lastly the fourth among the ʿāṣūl is the agreement of the majority of jurists since the beginning of the concealment of the last imām. While the summa can arrogate another summa and even the ʿurūn, this ʿijmā‘a can only dispose of traditions, the correctness of the transmission of which it disputes. At the same time, the Shi‘is recognise as secondary ʿāṣūl, ʿtiṣṣā‘, the similar methods of deduction
known as ṣurar and ṣifārī as well as, in the ultimate resort, the choice of the judge between several possible views.

8. Although the ḫāṣiṣ is strongly rooted in customary law and has actually gained official recognition for important elements in practice even against the Qurān and Tradition (cf. above), its fitness for the further development of Islamic law, the rejection of old prescriptions and the assimilation of foreign elements must not be underestimated, as it is as likely from its development to prevent, as much as to encourage, innovations; the numerous foreign elements which Muslim law contains had for the most part entered into it before ḫāṣiṣ had begun to prevail over ṣurar as a whole. On the other hand, ḥiṣār and ṣifār afford the possibility of paying consideration to customary law, though to a gradually diminishing extent in course of time. In places the attempt was even made to place ṣurar, the general usage, as a fifth of the ṣurar alongside of the four generally recognised, even as late as the yah (ṣiḥā) century; in general it is regarded as meritorious not to let the laws derived from the Qurān and Sunna come into conflict with actual practice and to legitimate the latter as far as possible *to escape the danger of sinning* (cf. ṣuruwā, xvi 21); but a general direct recognition of ṣurar, even in a subordinate position, by the ṣurar never came about. The discussion which we find about ṣurar in annas (general usage) and ṣurar (local custom or custom observed for a time only), their relation to the ḫāṣiṣ and their legal authority, are purely theoretical; in the cases in which the ṣurar itself refers to ṣurar or ṣinasi (custom), the reference is hardly ever to legal usages; customary law is not recognised as binding even for the cases for which the ṣurar gives no rule. The view prevailing in the Dutch East Indies for example, of the equality of ṣurar and ḫāṣiṣ (cf. the article ḫāṣiṣ at the end) takes us quite outside of the teaching of the ṣurar which can leave almost all practice to customary law, but not give it a place at all in its theoretical system. Even the later Milliki jurists, especially in North Africa, who have made particular efforts to adapt themselves closely to actual practice, make no exception on this question of principle. However important and natural the influence of customary law and of foreign legal elements in general was in the early period of Islamic law, all the more difficult has been its further advance, especially since the theoretical recognition of the ṣurar in its final form.

9. As the ṣurar had already developed in all essentials before the theory of the ṣurar was established, the elements which led to its origin cannot be given in their correct historical perspective. But even from the point of view of Muslim systematisation, they have for long had a purely theoretical position as regards ṣurar. Only the ṣurrājihā is qualified to apply them, that is to say to derive independently legal regulations from the ṣurar, but according to the orthodox ḫāṣiṣ, ṣifār is long ceased and all jurists are obliged to use the lowest stage of ṣinasi. Many jurists are therefore content, without going deeper into the study of the ṣurar, with the occasional brief notes on them, which most of the ṣinasi books add to the discussion of different regulations. There are however numerous special works on the ṣurar and these form the subject of one of the traditional Muslim sciences.

The Sunnī works on ṣurar deal mostly with, according to the author's point of view, with Ṣurar and Ṣifār as regards genuineness and arrangement for the purposes of ṣurar, the rules - usually given very fully - for their interpretation, according to form and legal substance, also the so-called formal legal categories (cf. the article ḫāṣiṣ), the recombination of contradictions among the sources by harmonising or assuming abrogation, the use of ḥiṣār, dispensation etc. and lastly as a rule with ṣifār and ṣifār. The first work of this kind, which however does not yet fall into the scheme given, is al-Shāfi'i's Rū'idā. Among especially important and much annotated works of a later period are the following: Ḥamād al-Nassāmī al-Ṭurāwīn (d. 1105), al-Waḥshī fī Ṣinā' al-Ṣirāḥ; al-Nasīrī (d. 881), Ṣinā' al-Ṣinā' ilā Maṣūfīat al-Ṣinā' al-Shāfi'i al-Ṭurāwīn (d. 747 = 1348), al-Tasbīḥ, al-Tawāṣṣil, al-Suḫkā (d. 771 = 1369), al-Shāfi'i al-Lawḥāwī; Mulla Khoshaw (d. 885 = 1480), Miḥkār al-Ṣhāfi'i and Miḥkār al-Ṣinā' al-Shāfi'i. The authority of the ṣinasi is the foundation of the ṣinasi and among the ṣinasi it plays a part similar to ḫāṣiṣ among the Sunnis; ṣifār also continues to exist here.

**Bibliography**: The fundamental works for the history of the ṣurar are: Goldscheider, Die Qādīs, vols. 1, 2, 3; Al-Makānī, El., xvi, 70 sqq.; Macdonald, Development of Muslim Theology, p. 65 sqq. gives an older historical view: concise account of the prevailing theory with historical notes are given by Juyb-nil, Handhālād, p. 34 sqq. (Handhālād, p. 39 sqq.) and more fully by Sanhāna, Istīramān, p. 25 sqq.; further literature is also given there. - Lists of the best known Arabic works on ṣurar are given in Ḥadīth Khalīfa, ed. Fligel, i., ii., 483 sqq. and in Ṣawā'īr al-Turāwīn, al-Safāi, ed. Hāmīd, p. 25 sqq.; further literature is also given there. - Lists of the best known Arabic works on ṣurar are given in Ḥadīth Khalīfa, ed. Fligel, i., ii., 483 sqq. and in Ṣawā'īr al-Turāwīn, al-Safāi, ed. Hāmīd, p. 25 sqq.; further literature is also given there. - Lists of the best known Arabic works on ṣurar are given in Ḥadīth Khalīfa, ed. Fligel, i., ii., 483 sqq. and in Ṣawā'īr al-Turāwīn, al-Safāi, ed. Hāmīd, p. 25 sqq.; further literature is also given there.
it intensifies its good or evil influences, just as with the Greeks and Arabs. — A detailed account of the part played by Mercury in Arabic astrology, its significance in the zodiacal circle, its conjunctions with the moon and other planets is given by Abü Mašhar, to whose work the reader is referred.


(WILLY HARTNER)

AL-UTBI, ABU NASR MUHAMMAD B. MUHAMMAD AL-DJARKEB, the author of the Kitâb al-Yamminî, was born at Rayî about the year 961. He left his home in early youth and came to live in Khurásân with his maternal uncle Abî Naṣr al-Îbî who held an important post under the Sâmâniids. After the death of Abî Naṣr, al-Îbî served as secretary first to Abî'î Ali Siyûrî, the commander of the army of Khurásân from 378 to 383 (988—993), then for a short time to Shams al-Ma'alî Khâbî b. who was living as an exile in Khurásân, and finally to Subuktîgin, ruler of Ghurâna. He continued to hold this post under Abû Nasr b. Subuktîgin whom he claims to have persuaded to surrender Ghurâna to Mahâmand.

In 389 (999) Sulṭân Mahmûd of Ghurâna sent al-Îbî as a special ambassador to Khurásân to persuade the ruler to acknowledge him as his suzerain, and he accomplished this mission successfully. About the year 412 (1021), al-Îbî finished his famous work the Kitâb al-Yamminî, presented it to Shams al-Kûftâh Ahmad b. Hasan al-Maimandî, the wazir of Sulṭân Mahmûd, and as a reward was appointed to the important post of Şâhibi Barid (Postmaster) of Kanaîj Rastsh. But al-Îbî quarreled with Abu 'I-Hasan al-Baghawî, the governor, and made complaints against him to Abîâd al-Maimandî, the wazir. As a result of the enquiries which were instituted into the matter, he was dismissed in 413 (1022). After this he entered the service of Prince Masûd, son of Sulṭân Mahmûd, and was heard of no more. He died in 427 (1035), or, according to another account, in 431 (1040).

Al-Îbî was the author of many works, only one of which, the Kitâb al-Yamminî, has survived. It is a history of the reign of Anûr Subuktîgin, his son Sulṭân Mahâmand and the contemporary rulers. The style of this work is very ornate and verbose and has always been appreciated in the East. Djarjî Zâdîn, in his Tâbîrî Al-dâd al-Lughât al-Mamandî (VIII, 322), regards its style as superior to that of al-Thâebî's Vatîm and compares it favourably with Hîsl al-Šâbî's Tâbîrî al-Wusârî.
'Uthūr and its commentary 'Fath al-Wakhāl, commonly known as al-Mufrad (Cairo 1285 H) and 'Iyār al-'Uthūr al-Dhāhīnah (M. NāṣIM)

AL-'UTRUSH AND MUHAMMAD AL-HASSAN B. 'ALI H. AL-HASSAN B. 'ALI H. UMAR AL-ADIRAR B. 'ALI ZAIN AL-ĀRūDIM [S. 'ALI H. AL-HUSAYN], both about 230 (844) at Medina of a Khurāsān slave girl, died in Shāhān 304 (beginning of 917) at Amal as ruler in 'Tabaristān, is recognized under the official name of 'Al-NāṣIR AL-KĀMI AS İMĀM BY THE ZĀĪDI, and also by those of Yemen.

Al-'Utrush came to 'Tabaristān in the reign of the 'A'id al-Dā'ī al-Kābīr al-Hassān b. Zāid [see al-Hassān w. Zāid b. Muhammad]; his brother and successor al-Kāṁī b. l-'Jフラ Muhammad b. Zāid distorting him, he endeavoured to found a kingdom of his own in the east, at first with the support of the governor of 'Naṣir-Bū Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāh al-Khādirjū, who took 'Utrush from al-Kāṁī. But the former's actions on 'Utrush and al-Khādirjū threw them into prison in 'Naṣir-Bū or 'Utrush and had him assassinated, which injured his hearing and to this he owes his epithet "the deaf". On his release he returned to al-Kāṁī Muhammad and in 283 or 288 or (according to Abu 'Ishāq Jābāl al-Imām, Muṣāfi al-Tulāysh, Tabaristān 1357, p. 229, 234) not till 289 (900–901) he shared in the latter's defeat at Dāmghān and Raîy among other places. On the death of the caliph al-Mu'taḍid in 289 (902) he came forward again, especially as Muhammad b. Hāriz, who had quarrelled with the Sāmirids, supported him. 'Utrush received a welcome from Ḍā'imūn of Dā'imūn (or his son Wali-Sālim; cf. Jāmāy in Iran, iii. 165 200). The friendship of the Dā'imīs, which dated from the time they and 'Utrush were with al-Kāṁī, was reflected as their attitude to Islām which their ancestor Marzbān had adopted only a century earlier. Several joint undertakings thus came to nothing, 'Utrush recognized the necessity of first of all securing a following of his own and through them the followers of the Dā'imūns. He conducted Islamic missions and 'A'id propaganda from Hawkins among the not yet 'Ummānīs tribes on the coast of the Caspian Sea and in Ghur and also built mosques.

The Sāmīrid Ahmad b. Ismā'il in 298 (910) sent 'Ummānīs b. Sālim to 'Tabaristān with orders to anticipate the foundation of the new state; but a Khurāsān army superior in numbers and still more in equipment was completely defeated by the Dailamites under 'Utrush at Shāhīn in 'Uzājmān in 301 (Dec. 913); many fugitives were driven into the seas; a detachment led by Abu 'Ishāq al-Wafā' al-Shafārī b. Nūf escaped to the fortress of Shāhīn, surrendered to 'Utrush on a promise of pardon but was shortly afterwards, massacred by his general and son-in-law al-Hassān b. al-Kāšīn b. al-Hassān b. 'Abd al-Ra'yīmān b. al-Kāšīn b. al-Hassān b. Zāid b. al-Hassān b. 'Abd al-Tālib b. 'Utrush had in the meanwhile come to Amal with the rest of the army sent for by the terrified inhabitants, and had taken up his abode in the former palace of al-Kāṁī Mahzār. He was able to install his officials from Shāhīn to Sā'im, unhindered by the Sāmirids, because just then Ahmad b. Ismā'il was murdered and his son Nasr had first of all to make his position secure against his family and the Banū Qays. The 'Imām Shāhīn b. Ruqaiyā of the house of Kharmān, which had been very dangerous to the earlier 'Ummānīs, made peace with 'Utrush.

In accordance with the usual experience in the foundation of 'A'id states, the ruler alone was found in getting the numerous relations to work together. As 'Utrush was at least 70 when he entered Amal, and his sons seemed rather incapable, the tension that had formerly existed between al-Kāṁī Muhammad and 'Utrush was now repeated between the latter and the already mentioned general al-Hassān b. al-Kāşīn. The latter broke for a time with 'Utrush, even took him prisoner as one occasion but had to fly to Dā'imūn in face of the general indignation. But equally general was the pressure brought by the notables upon the dying 'Utrush to designate this same al-Hassān his successor and they all once paid homage to his in after the death of 'Utrush.

'Utrush owed his rise not only to the skillful way in which he took advantage of the political discord on the Caspian Sea but also to his unusual intellectual ability. He was also a poet (cf. Brit. Mus. MS. Suppl. 195, iv., and specimens in the 'Itārā, see Rīyād, but he particularly cultivated dogmatism, tales and love tales also Ibn al-Nadim, Fihrist, 3: 281, 293; 4: 497). His name has been preserved indirectly (see Rīyād); he differs from the Yemeni practice in the ritual of burial and minor points of the law of inheritance; he also recognized the revocation of a marriage pronounced three times as successive to three actual divorces, by which he met the custom of the 'Ummānīs which was considerable in the north; one of his sons, Abu 'Ishāq 'Alī, actually joined the latter; and he himself used the form of washing the feet, of course with the general Shī'ī refusal to recognize the rubbing of the covered foot as a substitute for washing; he also showed himself less strict against members of other faiths, which is intelligible in view of his political and missionary aims. A particular Zaidi sect, the Nāṣirīs, was called after him, which was only merged in the Nāṣirīs, which had become predominant in the Yemen, by the Imam al-Muṭhir Abu 'Abd Allāh Muhammad, son of the above-mentioned al-Hassān b. al-Kāshīn. This, however, as al-Dā'ī al-Saghīr, succeeded 'Utrush and was able to conquer Nāṣirīs in 306 (919) through 'Abd al-Ra'yīmān, an old general of his predecessor, and even to send an army against Tus. But he was killed in 316 (928) when going from Raîy to the relief of Amal, which was occupied by 'Abd al-Ra'yīmān b. Shuwarlī b. Dallāmī and Abu 'Ishāq Jābāl al-Merduštī b. Ziyār. His power had always been limited by the sons of 'Utrush: Abu 'Ishāq al-Dībarī b. 'Utrush had taken Amal in 306 (918) with the help of 'Ummānīs b. Sālim, governor of Raîy, and again in 312 (925), on each occasion holding it for a short time. In 311 (924) his brother Abu 'Ishāq Ahmad had entered in his son Abu 'Abd Allāh Husain and his brother and successor Abu 'Abd al-Dībarī had also to fight an anti-'Ummānī, his son Ismā'il, who however was poisoned in 310 (921). In the meanwhile, another rival of Utrush, Abu Fāṭīmah al-Dībarī, had set himself up with the title al-Dībarī al-īthārī and soon after 320 (932) was able to occupy Amul for a time, aided by his policy of taking sides alternately in the
war between the Ziyarid Washqur with the Baydids who were now coming to the front, especially as the Fihrizid al-Hasan and a certain Ustazdar of the Banid's,[not specified] who had once been conquered by the Dagh al-Kahb al-Hasan b. Zaid also intervened.

This little north 'Abid state was continually able to hold its own, although its importance and size constantly changed, among the petty native princes, the Fihrizids, notably Makan b. Kull, and 'Umar Bagdadi the Ziyarid, Ispahbads of the house of Baitun, Baydids and Samaniids, even in spite of domestic troubles. It lasted down to about 8130 (1260), the year of the death of 'Abid al-Talib al-Saghat Vahty b. al-Husain al-Baghzi b. al-Mu'mayd who could not prevail in Dailam against the Assassins; we can hardly reckon in this line the alleged 'Alid dynasty of Kiya-Husain in Gilan from the end of the viiith (xiiith) to the end of the viiiith (xvith) century. 'Abid Talib was the general-nephew of the imam al- Nasir 'Abd al-Talib (see Buhayr) who, born in 340 (951), has given us the most important account of 'Utrush, based on the stories of eyewitnesses, such as his father.


(R. Strothmann)

UWAIS (Sultan Uwaq) was the second king of the dynasty of Dagh (q.v.) or Talik (Ilken, Ilken) who reigned 756-776 (1355-1374).

Uwaq, born about 742 (1341), was the son of Hasan Buzurq (q.v.), son of Husain Gurjan (Kashnian, son-in-law of the Kaha), son of Akbuhg Noyon, son of Talik (Ilken) Noyon (Rahman al-Din: II,-852). Hasan Buzurq's mother was a Mongol princess, daughter of Arghun Khan. Hasan himself married the famous Dilshad-Khatun, daughter of Damakhi- Khatun, son of Copan (Suwaidi) who had previously married Abu Said al-Khatun and on his death in 762 had married a certain amir Sulayman (Khatun al-Siyar). Dilshad-Khatun was famous for her wit and beauty. The visitors used to consult her in affairs of state (ibid.).

Uwaq, according to the majority of historians, succeeded his father who died in 756 (1355-1359) but according to Djalabih, the direct successor of Hasan (d. 757) was Sultan Husain (d. 760) (A man of charming character and a poet). One should probably allow with Markov that Husain and Uwaq had received separate fiefs which were united by Uwaq on the death of his brother.

Baghdad was the centre of Uwaq's activities. At this period Tabriz (q.v.) was held by the Khans.

Kiptak Djafari beg who had come to Adharbajdjan to put an end to the tyranny of Ashraf, grandson of Cahan (cf. Sultan) in the spring of 759 (1358) when the news of Djalabih's departure reached him, Uwaq marched against Akhbiujjik, whom Djafari-beg (or his son Berdji-beg) had left as his lieutenant at Tabriz. Meeting Uwaq near Mount Sisay (I), Minay (I) [probably Saland], Akhbiujjik retreated, first to Tabriz and then to Naqibnawam. Uwaq established his headquarters at Tabriz in the Imamati Raghib. In Ramsam (Aug. 1358) the execution of 47 of Ashraf's amirs (Hafiz al-Siyar: waranari shurb, a palpable error!) alienated the sympathy of his friends who sought out Akhbiujjik and went into the Karabagh with him. Uwaq sent against them 'Ali Pilten who acted with weakness and suffered a reverse. Uwaq had to retire to Bagdad.

In the spring of 760 the Muradhari Musammat of Shiraz marched against Akhbiujjik, drove him from Tabriz and stayed in the house of Khwaraji Shaikh Kadjajah (or Kadjajijah) while Akhbiujjik sought refuge with his father Sadr al-Din Khaajani. On the surrender of Akhbiujjik, Uwaq executed him on the charge of treason.

In 765 (1365), Khwaraji Marjana, governor of Bagdad, rebelled but his resistance was short.

He opened the gates of the city and Uwaq poisoned him but appointed Sadr-Khatun (Kashni al-Siyar) in his place. The Egyptian sources however (Markov, al-Sultun, Buhayr, Nat., MS. st. 673, fol. 49, 53) mention in 767 an attempt by Marjana to secure the assistance of the Sultan of Egypt Ashraf Shabtan by promising to send the khams in his name. The envoy of Uwaq, who afterwards came to Cairo to explain that Marjana was simply a rebel was received cordially. But in the meanwhile Uwaq had disposed of him. The date 767 given by Markov seems in any case to indicate that the rebellion of Marjana had lasted a considerable time. (According to the name source Marjana was blinded).

Uwaq stayed eleven months in Bagdad and then marched west. He took Mawjil from the brother of Baimar-Khwaraji (Turkman of the Kara-Koyunlu tribe), then at Mush he defeated Baimar-Khwaraji and plundered his lands. In the meanwhile Mardin was taken, the amir of which had in vain sought Egypt's help (cf. Markov, al-Sultun, fol. 53).

Uwaq returned via Kara-Kilisiya (between Erzerum and Bayazid) to Tabriz where he heard that the lord of Shirwan Ka'us b. Kailukhan had twice carried off to Shirwan (north of the Kura) the people of Karabagh (Arab) which Uwaq had evidently incorporated in his dominion on the disappearance of Akhbiujjik. Uwaq's general Baimar Rukn-ud-Din married Ka'us in the fortress of Shirwan. Ka'us brought in chains to Uwaq, was exiled to Bagdad but after three months was re-established under the suzerainty
of Uwais (cf. Djalâîrid coins struck at Shirwân).

In 772 (1370) Amir Walt, successor of Tâghâ Tâhir of Astârâbâd (cf. Tâghâ Tâhir), attacked Uwais but was defeated near Kâsî. In 773 Uwais himself took the field against Amir Walt but returned on reaching Ujzân. Amir Walt occupied Sâwâ. In 776 Uwais was preparing to punish him but died at Insârî Rashid on 2 Djamâd I 776 (Oct. 10, 1374).

According to Djalâîrid (p. 261—265), Uwais was so handsome that the people of Baghda'd used to run out in crowds to see him pass. The historians unanimously praise his kindness, justice and courage; he was also a great patron of literature. His chief panegyrist was Sâfâmân Sâwâl'dî from whom we have a series of odes on the principal events of his reign. Uwais himself was a fine calligrapher, draughtsman, and poet of merit. He built a great building, the Djalâîrid Khâna at Tabris (Ṭâhâgâna of Claivijo), probably identical with the Ark of our day (cf. Târîkh).

A scion of a completely iranised family and connected through his mother with the family of Cohan whose romantic adventures are celebrated, Uwais seems to have been of an impressionable nature. We learn of his passion for his favourite Boirâm Sâb and of the public mourning which he ordered on his death. The death of his brother Zâhid, who fell from a roof in a state of intoxication, caused him to cancel the expedition of 773 against Amir Walt. Uwais died of phthisis (dîrâ) aged about 30. He is said to have had a presentiment of his death and to have ordered his own shroud and coffin.

He had five sons: Hasan, Djalâî al-Din Ḥusain, Shâkit' ʿAli, Gîyâth al-Din Abûl-Nâbi, Bayzâd, and a daughter, Tâdû. Uwais wished to give Baghda'd to his eldest son Hasan and leave the throne to Ḥusain. When the nobles expressed doubts as to whether Ḥusain would agree, Uwais is reported to have said: "You know (what to do)". Hasan was therefore put to death on the day that Uwais died.

According to the Muntakhab al-Tawârîkh, the waiz of Uwais was Amir ʿZakâriyyâ and his admir al-umaraʾ Abîl-ʿAqâb [cf. Sulṭân Yâh].

Markov has given a description of 66 coins struck in name of Uwais at Baghda'd, Wâsît, Tâbâriz, Ardâshîr, Khûr, Nakhchivan, Shâbistan, Rûki, Gushnâta, Barâda, Sâwâ, Wâsît (Ṭân), Ujzân (Ujzân), Darâ (Ṭân), Band (Ṭân). The coin of 758 (Baghda'd) bears the title: al-ṣulṭân al-aʿlam al-dâlî; that of 762 (Baghda'd): al-ṣulṭân al-mâmuṭ shâkit Uwais al-Bâdilâ; that of 769 (Baghda'd) bears the name in Mongol. Lane-Poole's Catalogue contains descriptions of coins of Uwais struck at Tabris, Sulânîshá, Baghda'd, Bidâr, Shâkit and Khûr; that by M. Mâjârân contains the description of coins struck at Baghda'd, Sâwâ, Khûr, and Shâkit (the latter dated 766 gives Uwais the title of al-ṣulṭân al-aʿlam al-dâlî).
are found to agree; the Jews therefore believe that "Uzair must be the son of God."

Alongside of this legend we find a fuller one as early as Tabari's commentary on the Qur'an (and frequently later). Israel is oppressed by 'Amael (the Philistines). The learned men bury the Torah, "Uzair lectures and prays in the mountains. One day he meets a tomb a woman (in reality she is an earthly woman) but Duniya, the world) who seems to be lamenting him that fed and clothed her. "Uzair asks her who cared for her before her husband. She replies "Allah!" But, says "Uzair, Allah still lives. The woman then asks who had taught mankind before Israel. "Allah!" replies "Uzair. But Allah still lives, says the supernatural woman. At her bidding "Uzair then consecrates himself and swallows something an old man puts in his mouth namely a glass, like a large coal. "Uzair now announces that he has the Torah within him. He is branded as a liar. He then ties a pen to each finger and writes the Torah. The 'Ulamâ' dig up the Torah and find complete agreement; from this they conclude that "Uzair must be the son of God.

In *R. E. J.* 1904, xliii. 209, I have pointed out that an Arabic apocryphon has survived in these legends which corresponds to IV. Ezra where we are told that God had given Israel lands and instruction but when they sinned he took them away. Ezra is given a goblet full of flaming water. Then his breast swells with wisdom, teaching flows from his heart, and for 40 days on end he dictates to five men (in the Muslim legend they are his fingers) the sacred books (IV. Ezra, xiv. 18—49).

Sura ii. 261 is sometimes explained as referring to Ezra (more often to Jeremiah); "He passed by a city which had been destroyed to its foundations. How shall God quicken this dusty city to life? God caused him to die for a hundred years and then raised him to life and asked: how long hast thou stayed here? He answered: probably a day or less. But God replied: thou hast stayed here one hundred and one hundred years. Look on thy food and drink, it is not corrupt; and look on thy ass; we make thee a wonder unto men; look also on the bones, we raise them and clothe them with flesh."

The following legend is associated with this passage: Nebuchadnezzar slew 40,000 men of learning, including "Uzair's father and grandfather. "Uzair being a child was spared but already he was advanced in the Torah. When he asks whether the town will arise again, God plagues him into sleep for a hundred years. After a hundred years he awakens, his ass is still alive and his food uncorrupted. He appears as a man of twenty among his children and grandchildren who are now greybeards, proves his identity by making a blind girl see, and particularly by restoring the Torah. The original Torah is dug up out of a vineyard and found to agree: "Uzair must be the son of God.


In 606 (Ibn al-'Abīr, xii. 128) Abū Bakr sent Ay-oghmish to dispose of Kōkē who had in the meanwhile taken Rayi, Hamadān and Djalal (Media). Kōkē was killed and Usbek became ma'lūk, with Ay-oghmish as adviser and guardian. In 608 Ay-oghmish came to the side of Abū Bakr and enabled him to take Marāghi [q.v.], but in the end only allowed him to have Adhārbaījān and Arrān (Ibid., p. 196, 197).

Usbek-Atābek. Usbek had probably retired to the north where in 607 (1210) he succeeded Abū Bakr (Ibn al-'Abīr says nothing of this).

In 608 another slave Māngli took the place of Ay-oghmish who was finally slain in 610 (Ibid., p. 194, 196, 197). Māngli took up an independent attitude to his master Usbek. The caliph took the side of Usbek and brought about the intervention of the Atābek of Fārāšā's in his favour. The lands of Māngli were divided and Usbek gave his share to his slave Aghlamīsh (in 612; Ibid., p. 201). It should however be noted that Aghlamīsh said the ādānīša in name of the Kḥwārizmshāh and the latter regarded him as his lieutenant (cf. Nasawi, p. 15).

In 614, the Ismā'īlīān assassinated Aghlamīsh and the Atābek of Fārāšā occupied Rayi and Usbek Iṣfahān. Hearing this the Kḥwārizmshāh 'Abd al-Dīn Muḥammad came to Djalal (Media) and scattered the allies. Usbek withdrew to Adhārbaījān while his dignitaries, the prince of Aḥrār Nasrūr al-Dīn Bāqīfīn (of Georgiān origin) and the vizier Rāhī al-Dīn, were captured. By an arrangement with Usbek the Kḥwārizmshāh left him Adhārbaījān and Arrān, but forced him to read the ādānīša and strike coins in his name (cf. Ibn al-'Abīr, xii. 207; Nasawi, p. 17).

The Mōngol. When in 617 (1220) the Tatars appeared before the walls of Tābrīz, Usbek, who was spending his days and nights in drinking bouts, took the cowardly but prudent plan of paying a ransom for the city to them (Ibid., p. 244). The Georgians, beaten a first time by the Tatars, proposed an alliance with Usbek and the lord of Khīlāt, but the Tatars reinforced by troops whom a Turkīsh slave of Usbek named Aqūh (Aqūhū) had collected for them, frustrated these plans by a new attack on Tābīs [q.v.] and came in 618 for a second time to Tābrīz. Once again Usbek ransomed the city (Ibid., p. 246). When they came to Tābrīz for a third time (Ibid., p. 250), Usbek left for Nakhidawān and sent his family to Khōl.

"He held all Adhārbaījān and all Arrān and in spite of this was the most helpless creature to protect his country against the enemy" says Ibn al-'Abīr (Ibid., p. 250).

In 619 the Rīkēch, who had penetrated into Transcaucasia via Derbend, stirred up trouble in Arrān and later the Georgians, perhaps enraged at the failure of their new offer of an alliance, sacked Balaqəš (Ibid., p. 266). Towards the end of the year (Oct. 1222), we find Usbek again inactive at Tābrīz but he must have had a certain amount of influence, for an amir of Mawjīl put himself under his protection (Ibid., p. 268).

In 620 during a quiet period that followed the withdrawal of the Mōngol trouble broke out in Persia between the son of Kḥwārizmshāh Ghiyāth al-Dīn and his uncle Iṣfahānī Usbek; Usbek, accompanied by his slave Alībek al-Shāmī, marched against Ghiyāth al-Dīn but was defeated (Ibn al-'Abīr, xii. 270). According to Nasawi, p. 76, Ghiyāth al-Dīn, when he had established himself in the 1235, undertook operations against Adhārbaījān (Mārāghi, Uḏjan) and Usbek endeavoured to pacify him by giving him in marriage his sister, the princess of Nakhidawān; on the other hand, Iṣfahānī twice came and pillaged Adhārbaījān (cf. Ibn al-'Abīr, xii. 251).

In 622 (1225) the Georgians set out from Tābīs against Adhārbaïjān. The expedition was destroyed in a battle. The Georgians were preparing to avenge this reverse when suddenly came the news of the arrival of Djalal al-Dīn at Marāghi and again the Georgians sought an alliance with Usbek.

Arrival of Djalal al-Dīn. Before the approach of Djalal al-Dīn, Usbek withdrew to Gūndāt while a Kḥwārizm commander was admitted into Tābrīz. On the 16th of Rašd 622 (June 34, 1225), Djalal al-Dīn occupied the town.

During the absence of Djalal al-Dīn in Georgiā, a plot was hatched at Tābrīz to bring back Usbek, in which so important a man as Sha'in al-Dīn Tughrift took part, but Djalal al-Dīn arrived in time to check it. The Kḥwārizmshāh dealt Usbek a blow, which he felt deeply, by marrying his wife, the daughter of Tughrift. II. Legal authorities were found to bring grounds for a divorce between Usbek and the princess, but the scandal was considerable. The princess was afterwards neglected by Djalal al-Dīn and she finally appealed to the Aybīd Malāh Ahrāf and the latter in 624 sent an expedition to Adhārbaījān which brought the princess to Khīlāt (Ibn al-'Abīr, p. 307; Nasawi, p. 154).

Gandā also was lost to Usbek and he spent his last days (622—1225) in the fortress of Allindia (cf. Minorsky, Transcausia, in J.A., 1930, July, p. 93) overwhelmed by his misfortunes and humiliations (cf. Nasawi, p. 119; Dīwānī, ii. 127).

With him ended the rule of the Atābeke descended from Hedegī (Eghīdī). Usbek left one son whose name seems to have been Ḥīlār Ahrāf (Nasawi, p. 168, contrary to the Rūbild al-Sudur, p. 393, where he is called Tughrift), but he was generally known as Kūflī ("the silent") for he was deaf and dumb (cf. Nasawi, p. 129—130; Dīwānī, ii. 248).

Usbek is very severely judged by the historians. Ibn al-'Abīr, deprecating from his usual judicial calm, returns several times to the charge (xii. 244, 250, 267, 283) and accuses him of being devoted to wine, good living and games of chance (al-faṣār al-i'talif, ou the game of "agg") The Atābek led an indolent life and four months never left his home (cf. also Yākūn, s.v., Urmiya, p. 219). This gloomy picture must have been a contrast to the hopes which at this time Muslims were placing on Djalal al-Dīn who, however, was by no means free from vice in his private life (Nasawi, p. 186,
In his youth, Uzbek had taken part in several expeditions, but his forces were insufficient to meet the attacks of serious (the Georgians were then at the height of their power; cf. 71823) or redoubtable enemies (the Mongols and the great warrior Khilji al-Din).

Ibn al-Athir, ii. 283, mentions at Tbilis a kiosk built at great expense by Uzbek. The evidence of this hani lived Attabek attracted poets and artists. Uzbek's visit to Khabilt al-Din was a great patron of letters (Nasawi, p. 162–163 and the conclusion of the Marwani-nama).

Bibliography: K. Kandili, Khatib al-Suluk, G.M.D., cf. the index; Ibn al-Athir, ii. 3. cf. the index; Nasawi, Great Khabilt al-Din, ed. Houdas, cf. the index.


(2) UZBEK HASSAN, a ruler of the Turkoman dynasty of the Al-koyunlu (the founder of the dynasty was Bayraman), prince of Divyar Bahr from 533 and then (872–882) sovereign of a powerful state comprising Armenia, Mesopotamia and Persia. The stature of Hasan Beg b. Ali Beg b. Kara Othman (see Kara Iski, reading uncertain), earned him the nickname of Uzun (see the image).

The reign of Uzun Hassan is very important but not well known.

Rise of the Turkoman tribes. The original seat of the chiefs of the house of Bayraman and of their Turkoman tribe "of the White Sheep" (Al-koyunlu) was in Divyar Bahr (from before the period of Timurid). From there they spread to the west, north and east. At first, the chief rivals of the Al-koyunlu were the Kara-ko-yunlu Turkomans and this rivalry was accentuated by religious differences, for the Al-koyunlu were Sunnis and the Kara-ko-yunlu Shiites (and extremely heterodox).

Kara Othman, an adventurous and energetic individual, died in 838 (1434–1435). His son Ali Beg spent his reign fighting with his brother Hamza against whom he sought the support of the Ottoman Sultan Murad II and Sultan Cajmuk of Egypt. After the death of the two brothers, Divyar Bahr, son of Ali, resumed the struggle against the Kara-Koyunlu but offended his brother Uzun Hassan, his uncle Ghazi Beg [whom v. Hamner, i. 500 calls Hassan] and the governor of Erzinjan, Gharib Arslan b. Pir Ali. In spite of his quarrel with Divyar Bahr, Uzun Hassan defeated his two adversaries and then conquered the western principalities of Asia Minor. The princes of Karaman [q.v.], gravely threatened by the Ottomans, endeavoured to enter into an alliance with their eastern neighbour Uzun Hassan. On the other hand, Uzun Hassan became involved in the affairs of the empire of Trebizond, which was then almost at its end. In 1458, the last emperor of Trebizond, David, gave to Uzun Hassan the daughter of his brother and predecessor Kalo-loannas, named Catherine, in marriage (in Europe she is more often called by her title Despina; cf. the Venetian travellers). Trebizond was closely linked with Georgia, while Venice and Rome were closely watching events in these two Christian states. The Muslim sources entirely neglect this complex of international political interests (cf. W. Miller, Trebizond, the Last Greek Empire, London 1926; Unzepanek, Ocherki po istorii Trujan. imperii, Leningrad 1929).

The embassies sent by Uzun Hassan to Constantinople in 1457 and 1460 revealed to the Sultan
his rival's ambitions (cf. v. Hammer, i. 464-466). Very soon passing to deeds, Usun Hasan took by surprise the fortress of Köyulu-i-Hasar (or Kayulu-i-Hasar) on the Kilkis-su above Nîskâr and sacked the suburbs of Toğat and Amasía (cf. Münêşidja-i-bâsh, iii. 375).

Having disposed of the Işendîyâr-oghlu (q.v.) of Sinope, Muhammad II turned his attention to Trebizond and first of all to Köyulu-i-Hasar. Usun Hasan concentrated his forces near Kemâkkh but the detachment sent into the mountains of Mountsirr (Sa'd-al-Din, i. 476; 1 Kâfî-i Mnâzî) was defeated by Köyulu-i-Hasar. Usun Hasan then sent his mother to negotiate with her captor; she8r, her story, and the capture were turned towards Bâğhzar-dagh (east of Erdâqisân, between the Kilkis-su and the Euphrates). In spite of the renewed appeals of Sûrâ-i-Kâtûn (the sultan called her "mother") that said that Trebizond belonged to her daughter-in-law, the town was taken in 865 (1461) and the Cinnonei dispersed and exiled. A portion of the treasures taken in Trebizond was given to Sûrâ-i-Kâtûn (Aşhâb-pâshâ-zade p. 159-160; Sa'd-al-Din and Münêşidja-i-bâsh, iii. 376).

The peace was of short duration, for according to Münêşidja-i-bâsh, iii. 160-161, Usun Hasan retook Köyulu-i-Hasar and advanced as far as the environs of Sîvak but the Ottomans defeated those of his troops who had entered Asia Minor. Usun Hasan sent to Constantinople Kehrşid Beg to summon the Timurid princes and ask the Sultan to renounce his claims on Trebizond (17). In view of the circumstances (işbir-ü askar) the request was granted (18) and Usun Hasan returned to Erzincan and then to Bâghhzar-dagh. (In this part of his story, Münêşidja-i-bâsh seems to give in somewhat different form the events of 1461.)

Death of Dîhân-i-Shâh and of the Timurîd Ablî Sa'id. Usun Hasan very soon achieved brilliant successes. In 871 (1466-1467) his rival Dîhân-i-Shâh of the Kara-Koyulu, who at this time held all Persia, marched on Diyar Bakr (on his plans cf. his letter to Muhammad II, in Feridân Bey, l. 273). Usun Hasan collected troops and received reinforcements from Mârdân. On 14th Rabi'I, 872, Dîhân-i-Shâh had reached Mûsîd and Çapshâm. Here his advance-guard was defeated by Khalîl, son of Usun Hasan. Dîhân-i-Shâh, who, on account of the excessive cold, had sent most of his troops home, went back to Kight, whence he wanted to reach Erzincan and the valley of Bûl-kul (Kilkis). On 13th Rabi'I, 872 (Nov. 11, 1467), Usun Hasan attacked him unexpectedly and Dîhân-i-Shâh lost his life while trying to escape. The field in the east now being open, Usun Hasan began the conquest of the lands which had been left without a master. He went via Mûsîl to Bâghhzâh, which he besieged for 40 days, but in Adharbâjûdâhe, the son of Dîhân-i-Shâh, Hasan Alî, had assembled a large army (Hâbbî al-Siyar, iii. 234: 180,000 men) and invoked the help of the Timurîd Ablî Sa'id, who set out from Khurâsan in the month of Şabân 874 (March 1468) and appointed governors for the whole of Persia (19). As a result of treachery on the part of certain amis of Hasan Alî, his army quartered at Marand broke up and Usun Hasan seized the opportunity to advance as far as Karabâgh (q.v.). In the meanwhile in spite of the protestations of friendship by Usun Hasan, who recalled the loyalty of the Ağ-Köyulu to the Timurîd, Ablî Sa'id had reached Mûyân but was caught there by the approach of winter. He thought of spending the winter in Karabâgh, out of which Usun Hasan was to be dislodged, but his march to the Araxes was disastrous and at Mahâmâdshâh (cf. Muğâs) he was blocked by Usun Hasan. The negotiations conducted by Ablî Sa'id's mother, however, came to nothing; he took to flight but was captured on 16th Rajab 873 (Feb. 11, 1469). Two days later Usun Hasan seated on the throne (to emphasise his accession?) received the prisoner kindly but on Rajab 22 Ablî Sa'id was handed over to his rival, the prince Yâdîgâr Muhammad b. Sultân Muhammad b. Ebrûshû, who put him to death. Ablî Sa'id's amirs were put under the command of Yâdîgâr who, supported by Usun Hasan, began the struggle against Hasan Balîkara. The latter was temporarily driven from Herât (6 Muḥarram 873) but the exactions of the sons of Usun Hasan (Khağli-i Olang, Khâtâb and Zeynûl in KhâshÎan) provoked a rising against Yâdîgâr, who was deposed and put to death by Sultân Usun Hasan Balîkara.

After the disappearance of Ablî Sa'id, the Timurîds of KhâshÎan remained a purely local dynasty while Usun Hasan's deputies occupied the remainder of Persia, including Kirmân, Fars, Kûshîstân and Kerdîstân (cf. the valuable details on the distribution of the fields in the letters of Usun Hasan to Muhammad II: Feridân Bey, i. 275 and 276; cf. Hâbbî al-Siyar, iii. 330). The Kara-Koyulu Usun Hasan Alî had retired to Hamâshîn but was surprised there and killed by Usun Hasan's forces in 873 (1468) (cf. the History of the Kâşîs, ill. Nat. MS. Pers. N. 174, fol. 16v). About the same time Bâghhzar-dagh was also occupied by the great amir Khâghli-beg, governor of Mûsîl (cf. Feridân Bey, ii. 276).

After these great successes, it became evident that Usun Hasan alone in Asia was strong enough to bar the Ottoman advance and the enemies of the latter, the rulers of Kanmân and the Christians, particularly the Venetians, sought to exploit this new power.

Venetian policy. On Dec. 2, 1465, the Venetian Senate had adopted the plan of an alliance with Usun Hasan and L. Quirini was sent to Persia with this object. On March 13, 1464, the first ambassador from Usun Hasan (a certain Mâmensaheb?) arrived in Venice and spent six months there. In 1465 Khâêm Hasan (?) arrived with a letter from Usun Hasan. The negotiations were interrupted for some time but the conquest of Euboea (which the Venetians had held for 264 years) by the Ottomans in 1469-1470 threw them into consternation. In Feb. 1471 Quirini returned from Persia with Usun Hasan's ambassador Mirath (Muhpûd) while another Persian representative arrived at the Vatican. It was then that the Venetian Senate sent to Persia the noble Caterino Zeno, who through his mother was a nephew of Despina Caterina, wife of Usun Hasan. On April 20, 1477 Zeno was in Tabriz. In the same year Hâddîl Muhammad (Athânumâne) came to Venice with a request for arms and munitions. Giuseppe Barbaro was then sent to Persia to take to Usun Hasan six large mortar and guns, 6000 cannonballs (şînâkû), matchlocks (şînâkşû), and munitions; 2000000 shields with their officers accompanied the consignment. In Barbaro's secret instructions (of Feb. 11, 1473), it was laid down that Venice would never conclude
peace with the Ottomans until they had been forced to renounce in favour of Persia all claims on Asia Minor as far as the Straits. Barbaro was delayed in Cyprus where he took part in the operations of the Venetian fleet (commanded by P. Morencigo) which on the appeal of the princes of Karaman had occupied Selyke and two other points on the coast.

In the meanwhile Zeno was active in Persia and according to the European sources (Jorge, ii. 164), the nephew of the last Comnenos, who had sought asylum with Uzun Hasan, had invaded the region of Trebizond.

Invasion of Asia Minor. The Karamanlaks were working alongside of the Venetians to force Uzun Hasan's hand. On the appeal of Piri Ahmad, Iskâr's successor, Uzun Hasan equipped an army which was placed under the command of the vizier 'Omar Beg b. Bektaşı (the Ambarci Sultan Nizamüzzazâ of Zeno, p. 16) and Uzun Hasan's cousin, Yüsufa-mirza, and which, according to Angeliolelo, p. 77, numbered 50,000 men (Zeno, p. 18: 100,000). These troops advanced from Dyâr Bakr on Tokat, which they sacked and then on Kaisariya, where, as Sa'd al-Din says, "they revealed their Tartaroman character." Caterino Zeno, p. 18-19, was an eye-witness of a part of these operations. (The attempt to take Biza from Egypt is perhaps connected with the same expedition).

After some time 'Omar Beg returned to Dyâr Bakr while Yüsufa-mirza overran Karaman and Hamid.

Resumption of the war with the Ottomans. Sultan Muhammad II was gravely concerned with these events and with this diplomatic activity of which he was certainly aware (cf. Feridun Bey, p. 287 and Ibn Ilyas, ii. 145). Uzun Hasan's letters assumed a more and more aggressive tone (cf. Feridun Bey, i. 278 and the humiliating title of 'inşar ma'ale' was given to the sultan in them; and p. 278: Muhammad II's reply in which he addresses familiarly the 'sar-âd-i wa'yam'). In autumn 877 (1472) the Sultan crossed from Constantinople over to the coast of Asia, but was held up there by the cold season. But by 11th Rabii' I (Aug. 19, 1472) the prince Mustafa and the beglerbegi of Anastolos Isidore Pasha, who had a force of 60,000 men under him, destroyed the Turkmans in the district of Krtelli (west of Konia).

The Sultan set out in the month of Shawwal 877 (March 1473). His army numbered 100,000 men in all (cf. Sa'd al-Din, i. 529 confirmed by Angeliolelo, p. 79-80, who writes as if he were in the Ottoman army). The famous akbaft [q.v.] ʿAl-Miḥrikül-oghlu [q.v.] sent with the advance-guard sacked Kemâh and took prisoners the Armenians of this region.

Uzun Hasan, who had arrived in the region of Erzincan at the end of July 1472, had established himself on the hils on the left bank of the Euphrates and when Khâis Murad Pasha rashly crossed the river, he surrounded him and defeated him. Khâis Murad was drowned in the Euphrates and the total losses of the Ottomans rose to 12,000 men (Angeliolelo: Caterino Zeno who was in Uzun Hasan's suite gives Aug. 1, 1473 as the date of this first encounter. The battlefield was in the district of Torçan (above Erzincan); the low ground on the Euphrates which Khâis Murad (Angeliolelo) wished to utilise began at the level of Pekerdî. Sa'd al-Din, i. 535 is not explicit but according to Angeliolelo (and Zeno), the Ottomans were ready to abandon the campaign. They left the valley of the Euphrates and leaving Balıkbûr on the right (towards the N.E.), took the road northwards towards Trebizond, evidently with the intention of turning there to the west. But while the Ottoman army was in the canton of Üç-agîftî (probably to the north of the mountains which separate Erzincan from the valley of the Kilkîl-su), Uzun Hasan's troops appeared on the heights of Otük-belî (a mountain which separates the Euphrates valley from the sources of the Coruk) on the right flank of the Ottomans. The latter accepted battle and on 16th Rabii' I, 878 (Aug. 12, 1473) (according to Zeno 10th Aug. 1473) routed the Ak-Koyunlu. The Sarâgâ of Uzun Hasan, Kâsîr Ihsân (a Christian?; according to Zeno, there were Georgians in the Ak-Koyunlu army), fell on the battlefield as did Uzun Hasan's son Zeneîn. Uzun Hasan himself took to flight, but: it was not so precipitous as Sa'd al-Din would have it, for Zeno's account of Aug. 18 is dated from the camp of Uzun Hasan, four days from Erzincan. In any case the Ottomans, thanks to their firearms (Zeno), gained a brilliant victory. The artificery and exports captured were taken to Constantinople. The Kârâ-Koyunlu mobilised by Uzun Hasan secured their liberty; the remainder of the Turkmans were put to death (ṣufî-i ʿalem) by order of the Sultan. Dârîb-Beg, commander of [Shahîn:] Kara-Hasan on the Kilkîl-su side Koyunlu-Ihsân, bearing the defeat of his master, handed over the fortress to the Ottomans. On the advice of the grand vizier Mahmûd Pasha, who explained the difficulties of keeping the territories still to be conquered, the Sultan refrained from pursuing Uzun Hasan, but later regretted this decision and the grand vizier lost his office (Sa'd al-Din, i. 541-544).

Uzun Hasan lost no appreciable territory by this defeat, but the moral effect must have been considerable. After the battle, Uzun Hasan wrote to Venice (Berchet, p. 375) that he was going to return to the attack ("cavalcheremo adesso a l'Ottoman") and at the same time sent Caterino Zeno on a mission to plead his cause with the European governments. The Polish and Hungarian ambassadors were sent back with Zeno.

The Venetian Senate, which always attached great importance to the alliance sent to Persia the secretary P. Ogniben Barbaro, leaving at Rhodes the representatives of the pope and of King Ferdinand of Sicily, then set out and arrived in Tabriz on April 12, 1474. Lastly a new envoy, A. Contarini, left Venice on Feb. 13, 1474, arrived at Tabriz on Aug. 4, 1474 and at Isfahan on Nov. 4.

We also know that at this time the friar Lodovico of Bologna was in Persia, who said he represented the Duke of Burgundy. But on this occasion the ambassadors could obtain nothing definite out of Uzun Hasan.

In the meanwhile Uzun Hasan had gone to Shirâz to put down the rebellion of his son Oghurlu Muhammad. On his return from Shirâz he took leave of Contarini (April 26, 1475) who saw a review of his troops (25,000?) but said that the expedition against the Ottomans was postponed to a later date. In 886 the plague wrought great havoc in Persia and Uzun Hasan's troops had to take the field against his brother Uways who was defeated and slain at Ruîh (Ibn Ilyas, ii. 160). Very soon the Venetians recognised the futility of their hopes and less than a year after
the death of Urn Hasan signed a peace with the Ottomans (Dec. 1478). Relations with Georgia. According to Münzeddjim-bashi, Urn Hasan thrice invaded Georgia, in 871 (1466), in 877 (summer of 1472) and after his defeat by the Ottomans. According to the Dižbən-dərə this last expedition took place in 881 (1476–1477). Barbaro (p. 90) who was an eye-witness, took part in the negotiations with the Georgians. The Georgian sources of the 18th century are very confused (Bremond, Histoire de la Géorgie, ii/1, 62, 249). The King of Kharthlia, Constantine III (1469–1503) seems to have utilised the support of the Ak-Koyunlu against his rivals Begrat of Imeretia and the Attabeg of Akhal-taškhe (Qurkware < Korkora).

Relations with Egypt. The frontier between the original sief of Urn Hasan (Diýar BAKr) and the lands of the sultans of Egypt lay roughly along the bend of the Euphrates. The Egyptian historians alone (used by Welz, Gesch. d. Chul., v.) tell us of the extensive relations between the Ak-Koyunlu and the Burdi Mamluks. The rivalry with the Ottomans forced Urn Hasan to deal very tactfully with the ruler of Cairo (we have references to them from 866 = 1465) but on the other hand, he had to seek an exit to the Mediterranean to be in contact with the Venetians. The lands on the right bank of the Euphrates, belonging to the rulers of Egypt and Syria thus formed an impediment to him and Urn Hasan endeavoured to round off his lands at the expense of the Mamluks.

In 868 the Kurds who had seized the stronghold of Gargar (on the right bank of the Euphrates S.E. of Malatya) sent its keys to Urn Hasan who in 886 (1485) restored Gargar to the wall of Aleppo but at the same time compensated himself by taking Kharptar (then occupied by Arabši Dumlad) and by ravaging Abulastain [cf. ALIBXAN and IHU 'L-KADIR].

In 877 (1471) Kähki [q.v.] and Gargar were occupied by Urn Hasan’s troops but the amir Yeşbek al-Dawdār sent by Kəšt-baý [q.v.] drove the Ak-Koyunlu out of Bina (cf. Ibn Iyās, ii, 140–144 and Rehmsch, sub anno 1783 [1471]). The Ottoman ambassador sent to Cairo stirred up feeling against Urn Hasan, the ally of the Christians, but the Kəšt-baý acted prudently. The amir Rustam and the kâd Ābdul b. Wadjdin who were leaders of the İrāk kəšt-baý in 877 (1473) succeeded in getting the kəšt-baý named in Medinas in the name of al-mawāl al-Ūnān al-Ṭawfiq kəšt-baý al-bərəmā, but the Amir of Mecca, Muhammad b. Barrakāt (cf. iii, p. 514), arrested Rustam and his companion and sent them to Kəšt-baý, who six months later liberated them “to please Urn Hasan” (Ibn Iyās, ii, 145–146). In 882 (1482) Muhammad Beyg from his father was supported by the Aleppo troops but the latter suffered a severe reverse (ibid., ii, 152). In 882 Kəšt-baý visited the line of the Euphrates and re-established the situation.

Death of Urn Hasan. Returning from Tiflis Urn Hasan fell ill and at the age of 54 died at Tabriz on the eve of the feast of Ramadan in 882 (night of Jan. 5–6, 1478), which agrees exactly with Barbaro’s statement, p. 92: “The Eve of Epiphany.”

The historians (Hābbi al-Siyar, iii, 330; Dižbən-dərə; Münzeddjim-bashi, iii, 165) praise his justice and piety. He created many pious endowments (khašārati wa-hašārati). On his mosque in Tabriz cf. the article.Tabriz. The Allah-i Hašzi of Dawānt is dedicated to Urn Hasan (cf. Rice, Catalogues, p. 443b). The astronomer Ali Kâşi lived at the court of Urn Hasan and was sent as ambassador to the court of Constantineople (Rice, Catalogues, p. 456; Münzeddjim-bashi, p. 164).

The family. The blood of the Ak-Koyunlu princess was considerably mixed. The mother of Kâm Othman, to begin with, was the princess Maria of Trebizond (cf. the Chronicle of Michael Panaretos, ed. by Palmer). Despina, whom Urn Hasan married, when he was thirty-four, was certainly not his first wife and in 1471 when her nephew Catarino Zeno visited her, she was living at Kharptar far from the court. She had remained a Christian and was buried in a church of Diýar Bakt (Barbaro, p. 84). According to Angiolello, p. 73. Urn Hasan had one son and three daughters by her; the son (Jacob?) is said to have been strangulated by his brothers after the father’s death (l). Despina’s daughter Martha (whom the Sīrāt al-nasab-i şāfa‘iyeh, Berlin 1843, p. 68 calls Bāqī-Ak; Hābbi al-Siyar: Haulma Begi Ak; and Münzeddjim-bashi: ‘Abdūl-bən Begum) was given in marriage to Shaikh Haldar of Ardebol and became the mother of the Safawid Shīh Ismā‘il I (the mother of Shaikh Haldar, Khadjīd-Begum, was the sister of Urn Hasan).

The oldest son of Urn Hasan, Muhammad, was the son of a Kurd amm waḥdat (cf. Ibn Iyās, ii, 160; Catarino Zeno, p. 36; Contarini, p. 145). In 879 (1474) after a rising in Shirāz, he took refuge for some time with Sultān Ḥāyāzid, but was finally killed in Persia by his father’s orders (Ibn Iyās, ii, 39).

Urn Hasan’s principal wife (mohād ‘ayyā) was Sālātīk-Shāhī-Begum who played a very active part in the government (cf. Tarikh-i Amīn, fol. 198). Her sons were Sultān Kha‘lil, Yaḥī‘, Yūsuf (and perhaps Mādhil). We do not know the name of Zeinat’s mother.

Urn Hasan’s visitors were Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Sayyid Ābdal, Burhān al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Hamīd Kīmānī and Mādhil al-Dīn Shīrāzī (Hābbi al-Siyar, iii, 330).

Bibliography: According to the Hābbi al-Siyar, a contemporary of Urn Hasan, Mawānā Abd Bakr Thīrān, had written his history. This rare work, inaccessible to Khodāmī, may have been used by Münzeddjim-bashi among whose sources (cf. v. Hammer, G. O. R., vii, 549) is a Tarikh-i Bayānāriyā. The latter may be identical with a Kītāb Diyyūrākāriyā in which, according to the Tarikh-i Amīn (fol. 10), the ancestors of Urn Hasan were given in detail. ‘Abd al-Kaţār, Mātī’ al-Sā‘īn, is still in manuscript; Fadl Allah b. Rūshābah, Tarikh-i Amīn, Bibl. Nat. Paris, MS. Pers. N° 101 (history of Ya‘kūb b. Urn Hasan, with some notes [fol. 66–69] on Urn Hasan to whom the author gives the title of ḫābī-sīrān); Khodāmī, Hābbi al-Siyar, Teheran 1271, iii, 330 (very short paragraph) and p. 195–237, 237, 252 and 359 (the celebrities of the period); Ibn Iyās, Tarikh-i Mīrāj, ii, Cairo 1311; Ābdal al-Charkh, Qāzinār-dār, Brit. Mus. MS, Or 141 (love to Muhammad Khān Karawī the use of the copy of this MS., fl. 1876–1906, history of the Ak-Koyunlu with valuable details; the author’s grandfather was
the kült muʿaṣṣar (see) in the suite of Uzun Hasan in the campaign of 851 in Georgia; 'Ashqā-pāshā-kâle, Taʾrīḵ, Stambul 1832; Saʿd al-Dīn, Tawqīr at-Tawālīf, Constantinople 1279, 467–484 (capture of Trebizond), p. 521–544
with Uzun Hasan, a few meagre facts drowned in rhetoric; Džumānī, Taʾrīḵ, still in MS. (cf. Bahinger, G. O. P., 106) was used by v. Hammer; Müœeddjemb-dāgh, Sefīr al-ʿUṣūr (Turkish abridgment of the Arabic original), liii. 154–167 (numerous unedited details), liii. 337 and liii. 387; Ferhān Sīyāh, Minnas al-Tawālīf, Stambul 1274, l. 274–288 (very valuable documents and of undoubted authenticity); Chalcedonians, Bonn 1843; p. 166–168 (very confused data regarding the relations of the ‘Amrūsāt→ = Al-Kūyūnīl with their neighbours), 461–497 paean (the correspondence between Despina and the Comnenoi taken to Constantinople was the pretext for their execution); Dacca, 339, details on the embassy of 1457; Behnsch, Keram. scule X, in Memogstia geoturam liber, Breslau 1858 (curious details).


(V. MINORSKY)

Al-ʿUZZĀ, an old Arabian goddess, whose name means "the Strong, the Powerful". She was especially associated with the Ghūṭāf (cf. ʿAbd, i. 296) but her principal sanctuary was in the valley of Nakhlā on the road from Tārif to Mecca (cf. ʿAbd, iv. 765 sqq.) to which Hasan b. Ṭabīb (ed. Hirschfeld, xiv. 3, where nakhlā is to be read) refers. It consisted of three samara (acacia) trees in one of which the goddess revealed herself. It also included the sacred stone (Wilāla, trnsl. Wellhausen, p. 315) and the so-called Ghūṭāf, a cave into which the blood of animals sacrificed was poured (Ibn Hīfīm, p. 556). There are also references (e.g. Ibn Hīfīm, p. 839) to a "house" (Wilāla, trnsl.) which Wellhausen takes to be a confusion with another sanctuary of al-ʿUzzā. From these centres her cult spread among a number of Beduin tribes, the Khurāt, the Ghambam, the Khirba, the Dākhīf and especially the Kūrājīl, among whom she gradually acquired a predominant position. Here she formed with al-ʿLāt [q.v.] and Manīt [q.v.] a trinity in which she was the youngest and came in time to overshadow the others. The Meccans called the three

"Allah's daughters", which produced a vigorous polemic from Muhammad after he had retracted a compromise [see Mūhammad]. The way in which ʿUṣūr and al-ʿLāt are several times mentioned alone (Tabari, l. 135; Ibn Hīfīm, p. 145, 206, 721, where Wadd is also mentioned). When in the year 3, Abū Sufyān set out to attack Muhammad he took the symbols of al-ʿUzzā and al-ʿLāt with him (Tabari, l. 1359). That of the two al-ʿUzzā was the more important as the patron deity of Mecca is shown from Abū Sufyān's war-cry: al-ʿUzzā is for us and not for you (Tabari, l. 1418; cf. on the other hand: ari habal! Ibn Hīfīm, p. 582) and the same thing is seen in Ibn Hīfīm's poem, p. 145, where Zaid b. ʿAmr talks of "ʿUzzā and her two daughters", if by them are meant al-ʿLāt and Manāt.

Outside of Arabia proper, 'Uzzā was worshipped especially by the Lakhdīms of Ḥira. Manūḥīr IV swears by her (Kūbih al-ʿAṣān, ii. 21, 3 from below) and according to Zanbīn, p. 116, a Lakhdīm prince 'Nuṣān sent men to her so that she might settle a dispute. Her worship here had a particularly cruel character. Manūḥīr IV sacrificed to her 400 captured nuns and on another occasion a son of the Ḏafādī Ḥarthī, whom he had taken prisoner.

The name 'Uzzā is also, although rarely, found among the Syrians. As a rule, they use instead the name Kūbihī the "female" star, which they, like the Jews, apply especially to the morning star. It agrees very well with this that the Saracen who stormed the Sinai monastery according to Nilus wanted to sacrifice the young Theoloumis to the morning star. The nature of 'Uzzā could be defined in this way but the question arises whether we would yet have the true Arab conception of her and whether some syncretism had not taken place in the frontier lands. The same question is raised by the identification of 'Uzzā with the "Queen of the Heavens" (Jer. vii. 18; xlv. 17–19 in Isaac of Antioch, Ṣafā, ed. Bickell, l. 210, 220, 244).

This name occurs among the Syrians and the sacrifice of the women upon the roofs mentioned by Jeremiah is known among the Arabs according to Isaac, and the baking of cakes in honour of the goddess could also be proved to have existed among the Arabs (see also Wellhausen, Reste, p. 41). But this may all be due to foreign influence (as just the word kamsūnūn used by Jerusalem goes back to the Assyrian kamsun connected with the worship of Istar) so that the true Arab significance of al-ʿUzzā still remains uncertain.

After the taking of Mecca, Muhammad sent Khālid b. al-ʿAlābī to the sanctuary of al-ʿUzzā to destroy it. According to Wākidī, the last priest was 'Alābī b. Nāṣr al-Sabāšānī, according to Ibn al-Kalbī, Dubāyih b. Ḥarīm. Her cult disappeared after this as did the numerous proper names, combinations of al-ʿUzzā, while the masculine counterpart 'Abd al-ʿArīz remained because 'Arīz was one of the names of 'Allāh. But Doughty's statement that the Arabs still seek the help of the three goddesses in cases of illness is therefore very interesting [see AL-LĀT].

VALENCIA, Arabic Balantium, a town in Spain, the third in size as regards population, which is over 250,000, lying on the east of the Peninsula, 3 miles from the Mediterranean and from its port, el Grao. It is connected with Madrid by 340 miles of railway; the distance as the crow flies is however only 188 miles. Valencia is the capital of the province of the same name and the diocese of an archbishop. Its situation is a striking one, in the centre of the fertile Huerta de Valencia which is watered by the Turia or Guadalaviar (Ar. Wadih ‘labiyad, the “White River”). Unlike Cordova or Toledo, the old capital of Valencia has seen its importance grow with the years and it remains the capital of eastern Spain; the Shârîf al-Andalus of the Muslim period. It is still known officially as Valencia del Cid in memory of the part played in its history by the celebrated Castilian hero.

Valencia was founded by the Romans in 138 B.C. After the death of the rebel Viriathus, the corsair D. Junius Brutus established a colony there of veterans who had remained faithful to Rome. The inhabitants later took the side of Sertorius and in 75 B.C. Pompey partially destroyed the town which began to return to prosperity under Augustus. It was taken by the Visigoths in 475 and became Muslim in 714, when Tariq [q.v.] established himself there and at Sagunto, Jativa and Denia.

In the political history of Umayyad Spain, Valencia seems only to have been a place of minor importance. The country of which it was the capital soon became arabised by the settlement of Kâsh colonies; the capital of eastern Spain thus was one of the most active centres of Arab culture throughout the whole period of the Muslim occupation; on the other hand in the mountains along the Valencian littoral there were little islands of people of Berber origin. Valencia at this time was the capital of a province or ídara as we know from the eastern writer al-Majdil and the Spanish al-Râzi (in Yâkût, Muṣṭafîn al-Buldan, 4 v.) and the residence of a governor (mâlid) appointed by the caliph of Cordova. It is only from the 10th century, with the break up of the caliphate, that, becoming the capital of an independent Muslim state and very soon one of the principal objectives of the Christian reconquest, Valencia began to occupy a more and more important place in the Spanish and Arabic chronicles of the mediæval history of Spain that have come down to us.

The Muslim kingdom of Valencia was founded in 404 (1010–1011) by two enfranchised ‘Amirids, Muḥârrik and Muḥâṣṣaf, previously in charge of the irrigation system of the district who declared themselves independent and shared the power. After a very short reign Muḥârrik died and Muḥâṣṣaf was driven from Valencia; the inhabitants of this town then chose another “Slav” [cf. șārâlik] to rule them, called Labib, who placed himself under the suzerainty of the Christian count of Barcelona. The principality of Valencia soon passed into the hands of a grandson of al-Mansûr Ibn Aṭîf ‘Amîr [q.v.] ‘Abd al-ʿAzîz b. ʿAbd al-Rahmân who, like his grandfather, assumed the laḫab of al-Mansûr; he had previously been a refugee at the court of the Tuğlûkid Mahumîr b. Yaḥûs at Saragossa. The reign of ‘Abd al-ʿAzîz, which lasted till his death in 452 (1061) brought an era of peace and prosperity to Valencia. He recognized the authority of the caliph of Cordova, al-KâSIM b. Ḥamûd, who gave him the right to bear the titles al-Mâṣîmân and Dhu l-Şâbîkâtîn, and kept on good terms with the Christian kingdoms of Spain. His son ‘Abd al-Mâlik succeeded him and took the title al-Musaffar. He was still a youth at his accession and the vizier Ibn ‘Abd al-ʿAzîz acted as regent. Very soon afterwards, Ferdinand I of Castille and Leon attacked Valencia but failed to take the town, after inflicting a severe defeat on the Valencians who made a sortie to attempt to drive off the besiegers. ‘Abd al-Mâlik sought the assistance of the king of Toledo al-Mâṣîmân b. Dhu l-Nûn [q.v.] but the latter came to Valencia and soon dethroned the young king (457 = 1065). The principality of Valencia was then incorporated in the kingdom of Toledo; and al-Mâṣîmân left the vizier Abû Bakr b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz there to govern it. When al-Mâṣîmân died in 457 (1075) he was succeeded by his son Yaḥûs al-Kâsid, whose great incapacity soon became apparent. Valencia then gradually recovered its independence; al-Kâsid sought the help of Alfonso VI, king of Castille, to bring the town under his authority again but he ended by having to surrender his own capital to him in 473 (1083). For the course of events and part played in them by the great Castilian hero Rodrigo Díaz de Vivar, the Cid of history and legend, cf. the article al-Garîs.

On their arrival in Spain, the Almoravids tried to regain the kingdom of Valencia for Islam but their efforts against the Cid were fruitless. When he died in 492 (1099) his widow Chimaena was still able to offer some resistance to the attacks of the Almoravids, led by Mandali. But in the end she abandoned Valencia after first of all setting it on fire and the Muslims entered it on the 13th Ramadan 495 (May 5, 1105).

Governors appointed by the Almoravids succeeded
one another at Valencia until the middle of the eleventh century, when the town was eventually re-established. It was under the dominion of the Almohads in Spain, and it passed under the control of the Almohads in 1238. Under the rule of local princes until it finally fell to the hands of the Christians after the capture of Valencia in 1238.

**Valencia—Varna**

VALENCIA, Varna, a Bulgarian town on the Black Sea, the chief harbour of the country, capital of the district of the same name, lies at the mouth of the Devna, surrounded by gardens and orchards. The town, which now down to 1878 was strongly fortified, is the terminal station of the railway from Sofia and Rusek and according to the census of Dec. 31, 1926 has 60,569 inhabitants. The development of the modern harbour has considerably increased trade, commerce and industry. Before the war of 1878, Turks formed more than half the population, and Jirecek (Der Fürstenthum Bulgarien, p. 531) could say as late as 1861: "Turkish is predominant in the streets and is also spoken by the Armenians and the Gagauzes" but linguistic and ethnographical conditions are now completely changed. In ancient times the site of the modern Varna was occupied by Odessos (later Odysseis, Odysseopolis), a Miletian colony founded in 585 B.C. Excavations have shown that the town also flourished in the Roman period. It has born its present name since the end of the seventh century (679) and was called after the river Devna which was previously called Varna or Varna. Varna is occasionally mentioned in the middle ages. Idriš in 548 (1153-1154) mentions "Varna" as a large town (cf. Die Weltkarte des Idriš vom Jahre 1755 a. Cchr., restored and edited by Koundil Miller, Stuttgart 1928). According to Jireček (ibid. cit., p. 531), Varna was Bulgarian again from 1201 and much visited by Italian seafarers. In the second half of the fourteenth century a Bulgarian dynasty of Roman origin was established on the coast here (ibid.). In 1366 Varna was besieged by the Crusaders under Amadeus VI of Savoy. The first Turkish attack on Varna, which took place in the time of Murad II in 1388, under the leadership of Djandar Ali Pasha (cf. on him Tschirch and Wittke, Die Vorfahren der Oandaer, in Ist., xvIII, 86 sqq.), but was unsuccessful. It was only after the fall of Býdn (Vinid) that the whole of Bulgaria from Varna to the Timok became a Turkish province (1593; cf. Jireček, Geschichte der Bulgaren, p. 356). On Nov. 10, 1444, was fought the celebrated battle between Murad II and the Christians under Wladislaw III of Poland and Hungary, in which the latter lost his life. His Polish epithet was warmenéz (Wamer néz); and his army suffered a fearful defeat. This victory of the Turks consolidated their position in Europe and formed a stepping stone to the conquest of Constantinople. According to Hridjati Khalif, in the sixteenth century Varna was the capital of a district in the sanjak of Silistria. About this time and later it was repeatedly the scene of battles between Russians and Turks (1610, 1773 and 1810). Ewliya Çelebi in his Travels (i. 290) records a defeat of Cossacks at Varna in 1601 (1600-1613). He himself was wounded in another Cossack raid on Varna (v. 84-85). The same traveller mentions the town in several other passages (e.g. iii. 302, 304, 350, 373) and describes it fully in connection with his visit in 1656 (v. 88-92). According to him, the Muslims lived in seven mahallas while the Greeks (Rumis), Jews and Armenians occupied five. Varna then contained 4,000 well built houses, 5 large mosques, the names of which Ewliya gives, and 26 madrassas. The trade of the harbour was very busy. In the neighbourhood there were 10,000 vineyards and many gardens. In this connection Ewliya tells the amusing story of the Kâč of Varna of the time (called Paćawwa-Kâč by the people) who in addition to a wicked tongue had so large a nose that he could not perform the prostrations (naqal) with his forehead but only — contrary to the rules — with the right ear. Although the Paćawwa-Kâč was very strict (mequll), it was continuously discussed in the town whether his salt could be regarded as valid at all.

In the Russo-Turkish war of 1828-1829 Varna had to surrender on Oct. 10, 1828 after a three months' siege and was only restored to the Turks at the peace of Adrianople. In the Crimean war, the French and English joined the Turkish army at Varna by the end of June 1854, built a large camp here and at the beginning of September began the Crimean campaign from here. In the last Russo-Turkish war, Varna was not near the field of action and was handed over without seeing any fighting to the Russians and Bulgarians on the conclusion of peace (1878). At the Congress of Berlin, Varna was definitely allotted to Bulgaria.

The cession of the Dobrudja to Rumania (1913) is said to have affected the commerce of Varna. In the Great War Varna was twice bombarded (27 Oct. 1915 and 16 Jan. 1916) by the Russian fleet.

**Bibliography:** The battle of Varna is very fully described by the early Ottoman historians, e.g. Urduj b. Adil, f. 55-58 (Oxford MS); f. 117-120 (Cambridge MS); Aymis-pasha-aše, Stambol 1332, p. 132-133; Nešbi,
in M. Q. G., i. 118–119; Anonymous, ed. Giese, p. 65–70 (transl. p. 92–94) but it is not neglected by modern Turkish historians (cf. Amed Reki, Türkiye Türkçesi, i/1. [Istanbul 1923], p. 240–242, with a plan of the battlefield). The Ukrainian orientalist A. Krymski gives in his History of Turkey (Little Russian, Kiev 1924; cf. the review in M.O.G., ii. 335–37), p. 47–56 not only an account of the battle but also discusses the reports of eyewitnesses, the sources in the earliest European, Turkish and Byzantine histories as well as European works of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries including Slav and Rumanian, with occasional critical notes. Krymski came to the conclusion that the works on the subject by Slavs and Rumanians of the sixteenth century are of less value than German works of the sixteenth century. — Also: Halid Jiři Khalifa, Ruské a Rumské transal. J. v. Hammer, Vienna 1812; Évliya Celebi, Séjournés dans, III. iii. and v. Constantinople 1314–1315; J. v. Hammer, G. O.R. 3, l. 345–356 and iv. 647; Constantin Jireček, Geschichte der Bulgaren, Prague 1876; do, Das Fürstentum Bulgarien, Prague–Vienna–Leipzig 1891, p. 520–532 (= main passage) and p. 537; Eustachije Jerskdjew, Slaveno-Bulgarensien, vol. v. (St. Petersburg 1892), s. v.; J. Nikolova, 'H Οθωμέζα', Varuana 1894 (inaccessible to me; quoted by Hasluck, Christianity and Islam under the Sultanate, Oxford, 116 and 267); Jorga, Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches, vol. i. Gottha 1908, p. 441–443 (with literature of the battle of 1444); St. Lane-Poole, Turkey (= The Story of the Nations, vol. iv.); London 1908, p. 91–95; H. A. Gibbons, The Foundation of the Ottoman Empire (1300–1267), Oxford 1916, p. 129 and 172; A. Hajek, Bulgarien unter der Türkendynastie, Berlin and Leipzig 1924, p. 10, 13, 107–108; O. Taflalé, La cité pontique de Dionysopolis, exploration archéologique de la site de la vie Noire entre les caps Kali-Arva et E刈iou faite en 1920, Paris 1927, s. Index (only deals with Varuana indirectly); The Encyclopaedia Britannica 14, 1929, s. v.; Annuaire statistique du Royaume du Sultanat 1929–1930 (Bulgarian and French), Sofia 1930, p. 22; Almanah kraljevine Jugoslavije (Zagreb since 1930), l. 40 and 44.

(Fënyh Bajkakteenići)

VIDJAYANAGAR, a city of Southern India, now in ruins, situated in 15° 20’ N. and 76° 28’ E., on the southern bank of the Tungabhadra. It was founded about 1336 A.D., either by Vira Balla III of Dvaravattiya, or by three Hindu chiefs variously described as being wardens of the northern marches of his kingdom or as officers of the Kâkâyta kingdom of Wargal or of Muhammad b. Tughluq [q. v.] of Dîhlî. Two of these chiefs, Harihara and Bukka, established themselves in Vidjayanagar while the Muslims, of the Deccan were in rebellion against Muhammad b. Tughluq, and later, while 'Abd al-Dîn Bahman Shâh was occupied in founding and consolidating the kingdom of the Deccan, they gradually extended their rule over the Peninsula and founded the great Hindu kingdom of Vidjayanagar, the history of which is largely a record of intermittent warfare with the Muslims on its northern frontier, first with the great kingdom of the Deccan, and later with the Muslim states which rose on its ruins. The wealthy Hindu kingdom was able to maintain an army greatly outnumbering that of the Bahmanis, but the balance of success lay with the more virile Muslims, though for two centuries and a quarter they were unable entirely to subdue the great Hindu state. The battlexible cause of difference was usually the possession of the Râyâsr Dîhlî, the disputed land lying between the rivers Krishna and Tungabhadra, but the Bahmanis seldom needed a pretext for attacking their Hindu neighbours. About the middle of the sixteenth century, after the dissolution of the Bahmanian kingdom, the Sultans of the independent Muslim kingdoms of Bijâpur, Audmâna, Gulkanda, and Bidar foolishly sought the aid of the Râjâ of Vidjayanagar in their internece disputes, and the Râjâ, more powerful than any one of them, so disgusted all by his assumption of superiority and by the insults which he offered to their religion that they formed a confederacy against him. In December, 1564, the allied Sultans of Bijâpur, Audmâna, Gulkanda and Bidar met at Sholapur, and, marching southwards, met the army of Vidjayanagar on January 3, 1565; on the south bank of the Krishna, about thirty miles from the small town of Tâlîkota, Râma Râjâ, the regent of Vidjayanagar, was captured and put to death, and at the sight of his head, raised on a spear, the Hindu army broke and fled, and was pursued with great slaughter as far as Vidjayanagar, which the Muslims destroyed, after having occupied the city for six months, reduced some neighbouring strongholds, and laid waste the country. The great kingdom of Vidjayanagar ceased to exist. Some of its southern districts were annexed by the neighbouring Muslim states, and its southern districts passed under the rule of minor Hindu chiefs.

Bibliography: Muhammad Kasim Firatânu, Gulkânâ-ı İbrâhîmi, Bombay lith. 1852; 'Ali Saumâni, Eserhâni Ma'âthir, MSS., and translation by Sir Wolseley Haig in the Indian Antiquary, 1920–1923; R. Sewell, A Forgotten Empire, London 1900; S. Krishnaswâmi Aiyângar, South India and her Mohammedan Invaders, Oxford 1921; A Little known Chapter of Vidjayanagar History, Krishnaswâmy of Vidjayanagar; Sources of Vidjayanagar History, Madras 1919; Cambridge History of India, vol. iii., chapters xvi. and xviii. (T. W. Haig)

VIZIER. [See Wazîr.]
WABAR, a district and tribe of the earliest period, in the southern half of Arabia. Al-Ḫakī, Māḏgām, p. 835 and Yezdī, Māḏgām, iv. 896; give the vocalisation Wāhāri and compare the form with Ḥaddāmi and Ḥaddāni.

The Wāhāri are mentioned by the historians along with the ʿĀd, Thamūd, and other extinct tribes as one of the original peoples of Arabia, all of whom are included (as al-ʿArab al-ḥabībā) by some genealogists among the "true, original Arabs" (al-ʿArab al-ḥabīb or al-ʿArabi). Al-Suyūṭī, for example, whose estimate of the ʿArab" Ibn Dārid in the Qisas al-ḥarāmī and others agree (see E. Frenzel, Letter IV, v. 1810, p. 529 sqq.; following him Ritter, Erdkunde, Berlin 1846, xii. 57), gives as the true Arabs the ʿĀd, Thamūd, Ṭūnūn, Ḥaddāni, etc., putting the Wāhāri in the last (ninth) place and distinguishing from this group the muṣṭaʿrība, the naturalised, "amalgamated" Arabs, who also include the descendants of Kaʿb, who altogether make up the descendants of Ṣum, son of Siqeem, and along with them as a special (third) group of peoples, the muṣṭaʿrībā, which comprises the descendants of Khaṭṭu (the Maʿdāni), while other genealogists with Yemen bias oppose them muṣṭaʿrība or muṣṭaʿrība as one group (the Maʿdāni) to these extinct tribes and along with them to the Kaʿb (trump) Wābār (in some MSS. curreat; in i. 221 we have the form ṣāḥ; Ibn al-Aṯīr also gives the right form in his Chronicle). Similarly Al-Masʿūdi, Tabaḳk (R. G. A., viii. 184) and Murūjī (Paris 1861, v. 288 sqq.) numbers the Wāhāri and others among the extinct Arab tribes, at the same time giving the names of their ancestors, as does Ṭabarṭi, i. 221 (on the genealogy, cf. i. 750).

The statements of the Arab geographers and historians about the history of the Wāhāri are strongly saturated with legend. The stories current among the Arabs are strongly given by Ibn al-Fāḫī (B. G. A., v. 37 sq.), whose statements are combined from several sources, al-Bakri (op. cit.), much more fully Yāḥyā (iv. 806 sqq; a brief synopsis in the Liwan, iii. 147), still more briefly in the Kāmil, and a little more fully in the Taʾṣī (r. w.). Yāḥyā quotes various authorities, including Ḥīṣām b. al-Ḵalīl, Muḥammad b. Ḥāshim, Ibn al-Fāḫī, and other direct and indirect sources. His statements (iv. 896 sqq.) agree almost for word with those of Ibn al-Fāḫī. Al-Kānishī (Arabīdī, ii. 4, ed. W. Weissenfels, Gottingen 1848) and later writers, except for the Muṣṭaʿrība (al-ṭfīs), are based on Yāḥyā. The same characteristic features are common to the authors and compilers mentioned. They include the purely legendary elements, that the name of the land goes back to an ancestor Wāhāri, who flourished at the time of the confusion of tongues (so Ḥasim al-Maḏzī, Tabaḳk, p. 184; Ṭabarṭi, i. 221, 250), that after the fall of the ʿĀd (cf. Ibn Saʿd, Tabaḳk, i. 20), the previous inhabitants of Wābār, the ʿĀqām took possession of the land (so al-Ḥamīṣī, op. cit., p. 154, 223; Ṭabārī, i. 221), and men lived there no longer but only half men (maṣālim), beings who had only half a head, one eye, one hand, one leg (Yāḥyā, ii. 263, tells the same story of Ṣhiḥr), that no one dared enter this land and its mysterious inhabitants destroyed the crops of the adjoining lands between Ṣhiḥr and Ṣinan. A feature which is developed in the legend, on older models, is the story that Wābār was a particularly fertile land, rich in water and fruit-trees and especially in palms (so also al-Maṣʿūdī, Murūjī, iii. 276, 288 sqq.; al-Nābiṭī, ii. 122, 126 sqq.; al-Labīṭī, ii. 110, 112 sqq.; al-ʿIṣāmī, ii. 225, 228 sqq.); al-Nābiṭī's mention of palms in the land of Wābār (in Abūwād, Ṭabārī, etc., London 1870, p. 112 from Yāḥyā) was taken as evidence that the land was fertile and inhabited (cf. al-Ḥakī, loc. cit., with Yāḥyā, iv. 898). The mention of Wābār in the poetry are of course not independent evidence, but repeat as a rule only the conventional notions of the great antiquity and fall of the people and the isolation of their land (cf. also Yāḥyā, iv. 897).

What arouses interest in these tables and may be of use are the geographical ideas at the bottom of them. According to some of these statements, the broad land of Wāhāri stretched from Ṣhaṭra to Ṣanʿa, in general to the eastern frontier of Ṣinan; according to others, it comprised the whole territory between Ṣanʿa and Ṣuṭr; lastly, according to others, it was the territory between the "sand of Yāḥyā" (Rimūl Yāḥyā) and Ṣinan (see also Dājbard). From these topographical hints, which in spite of their differences together give a rough general picture, it can be deduced that the portion of the South Arabian desert, of the Rab al-Ḫalīl or Dāhia, north of the Maḥra [q.v.], country, was called only Wābār by the Arabs, but this geographical name was also understood in a wider sense and extended to the whole Dāhia. The part called Ṣanʿa-Wābār adjoined in the east the desert area of the Ḥaṭṭāt (卣) which lay north and west of Ḥaṭṭāt, C. L. Cameron, (Études sur les dialectes de l’Arabie méridionale, Leyden 1901, p. 160) says on the authority of information received from natives that in the expression al-ʿAṣṭāl (.guild) the place-name, according to South Arabian ideas, refers not only to the district of al-ʿAṣṭāl (North Ḥaṭṭāt, p. 149) but also to caves in which the Arabian troglodytes live (cf. Yāḥyā, i. 154, on the different topographical clues for this district).

It is impossible to accept Ritter's (op. cit.) identification of the Wābār with the Banū Ṣinaṣ, who are mentioned by Prolemy in connection with the Thamūdī and are to be located in the northern half of the west coast of Arabia (the first component of the name is obviously connected with Banū; attempts at identification will be found in Spruner, Die Alte Geographie tiberiana, Bern 1875, p. 30 sqq. and in E. Glaser, Geschichte der Geographie arabisch, Berlin 1849, ii. 251 sqq.). Ritter's comparison (xii. 727, 592) of Wābār in Mäṣṣa (ed. Jusbert, i. 156) is also
to be rejected. There never was any cogent reason to dismiss the Wabar into the realm of fable, with Sprenger (op. cit., p. 296) and others, as a people that never existed and to deny any historical or geographical foundation to their mention along with other extinct tribes. Wüstenfeld (Die Wohnsitze und Wanderungen der arabischen Stämme, in Abb. G. W. Götter, 1868, xiv. 13) in agreement with the Arab writers described the tribes of 'Ad, Ṭamīl, etc., as the original inhabitants of Arabia, who had partly extinguished one another and partly become mingled with the peoples who succeeded them, so that they are to be regarded as having been extinct many centuries before Islam.

Although the records are clothed in the form of legend, it does not follow that the whole story is a pure invention, but only that we have here the memory of an ancient people, which has become a legend; similar things are to be found in the history of most nations. There is a series of fabulous stories associated with the whole of Southern Arabia between Yemen and 'Oman, a region little known to Arab men of letters. Moritz (Arabien, Hanover 1923, p. 28 sq.) also says that the names of those extinct peoples of the early days of Arabia including the "Wabar" (so also on p. 60, 122) are at least historical and that there may be a historical kernel in the stories of the fertility of cultivated areas which later became desert through natural causes, such as continued drought and sandstorms. He quotes similar phenomena in Egypt. The formation of the desert, moreover, must have made some progress since the time of Ptolemy, as his map of Arabia shows towns or villages in regions which have since become desert or only contain ruins; on references in Greek and Roman writers for the historicity of the Thamīl cf. the article Egra in Pauly-Wissowa's, Realencyklop. der klass. Altertumswissenschaft. — It is also worthy of note that south of Sa'īf, the chief town of the flourishing oasis of Al'id, Phylly (The Heart of Arabia, 1922, ii. 99 sqq.) in 1917 saw, along with other remains of an ancient culture, the ruins of a large building, the Ḳusairat 'Ad, as so called, as his companion told him, after the king 'Abd al-Qādir al-Rashādī, who ruled in the remote past over these regions and whose capital was in "Wabar" (ibid., ii. 353), a mouth's journey to the south in the desert near the frontier of Ḥadramāt. The story told by him of this king contains several details found in the well-known traditions of the Prophet. The ruined site of Ḳusairat 'Ad is marked in Phylly's map under 22° 10' N. Lat. and 46° 20' East Long., a position which of course is only calculated approximately. Of Wabar he was also told (p. 221) that the Dimān, a clan of the Al Murra, included it in their territory. If the geographical conception of Wabar still exists among the Arabs, there is no reason to suppose that the references in literature to this land and people are based on an invention of the genealogists. The old view put forward by Blau (in Z.D.M.G., xxii. 659) and recently championed by Moritz (op. cit., p. 29, 122) that the Wabar "offenbar die Ḳusairat des Ptolemaus sind (vi. 7, 24)" is certainly not probable (cf. the article Egra in Pauly-Wissowa; ibid., for Landberg's mention of the Ḏawākān, which has lately been used again as a basis for further deductions, and also for Glaser's errors). Isolated statements of Arabic authors regarding the countries round Wabar seem to make it possible to define its frontiers approximately. According to Ţaharī, i. 221, the land of Al'ur (see above) lay between Yamāma and Shīrī; Yākūt, iii. 591, gives the information that the "Sand of Al'id" (raʾīn 'Al'id) adjoins Wabar; the former is a northern salient of the great South Arabian desert which stretches between Bahrain and Yamāma and is characterized by the fact that trees and plants grow there. As a matter of fact the north-eastern termination of the great desert is an oasis, that of Yabarīn, in which the desert region, which some, especially later geographers, misunderstood as the Dakhnī proper, i.e. a north-easterly continuation of the Rubī' al-Khāli, has its southern limit. After this oasis, the most southern part of the district of Yamāma, the adjoining desert is also called "Sand of Yabarīn". The frontiers between 'Al'id and the Dakhnī fluctuate in the Arab geographers, and sometimes the two regions are even said to be identical. Al-Bakrī interprets the extent of the desert of Yabarīn in a wider sense, for according to him it extends from Yamāma to Ḥadramāt. For our knowledge of Yabarīn, the Ḳusairat of Ptolemy, vi. 7, 35, the statements in Abu 'l-Fidā' (see Rommel, Abūl-Fidā' Arabien descript., Göttingen 1802, p. 84) in Yākūt (see his several references from the index) and al-Hamālīn (p. 103, 137, 149). Burckhardt had already heard from Beduins that the only habitable area in the eastern Dakhnī was the Wādī of Yabarīn with date-plains and wells (which the latest reports confirm) but with an unhealthy climate. It is an oasis, rich in water, with settlements and was at one time, as Pelly, who visited the region in 1865 tells us, a fertile well-tilled district with an imposing town, but suffered heavily in the Karmatian wars. Phylly obtained some information about the oasis, which belongs to a section of the Al Murra (see op. cit., ii. 216 sqq.). Cheese man's account contained the first more accurate information (in G. 7, lxxv., 1925, p. 112 sqq.). Using the statements of the Arab authors, we may regard the oasis of Yabarīn as the most northerly part of the ancient extensive land of Wabar; this agrees with the stories of Wabar's wealth of palm-trees and with the geographical background of the legends, in so far as they do not, like some geographers, locate Wabar definitely in the adjoining desert of 'Al'id (cf. Māʾṣūdi, Murādī, iii. 288). The southern continuation of it is then either the sandy region of Ḥizrān about sixteen days' journey south of Yabarīn, a settlement of the Al Murra with some wells and water-pools (Phylly, op. cit., ii. 219), or the district about half a degree west of it in the same latitude. The farther continuation to the south goes via al-Alkhāf to the northern frontier of Ḥadramāt, N.W. of Mahrā. The sandy region of Yabarīn also runs southwards into the desert of al-Dijūz and then into that of al-Alkhāf. In Sīāyer, Hamadānī, 590, ed. map 60, Goa 1905, Wabar is located about 46° 47' E. long. and c. 22° 40' N. Lat. which is rather too high.

Bibiography: The works of the Arab authors and of the modern writers (Ritter, Sprenger, Moritz, Phylly, etc.) have been given with references in the article. We may only add F. Wüstenfeld, Bahrein und Yamama, in Abb. G. W. Götter, xix. (1874), 473 sqq. (J. Tschatsch)
it was Wara to the N.N.W. of Abeghe, down to the middle of the xviith century. It was then transferred to Abeghe (or Abeghe), which is a town of about 50,000 inhabitants with houses of clay and huts thatched with straw; the royal quarter, surrounded by a high wall of earth, is distinguished by a castle, three storeys high, of baked brick, built in 1860 in the reign of King *All* by two Egyptian or Tripolitanian architects.

According to local tradition, *Wadari* was at first under the authority of a dynasty of foreign princes, belonging to the tribe of the Tundjr, who had their capital at Kadama and who were more or less vasals of *Dir-Fur*. These princes were not Muslims but several of them whose memory has survived have Arabic names, like the last of them, Djuwied, called Almerenu. It was only in 1615 that Iklam is said to have been introduced among the native peoples of *Wadari* as a result of the preaching of a legendary individual sometimes called Djuami and sometimes Sahl, whom some say was of Maba stock, but whom others connect with the Arab tribe of *Jas'ali*, which has its cradle near Berber on the Nile. In any case, the family which claims descent from Djuami is undoubtedly of negro stock and regarded as of Maba origin.

About 1635 a son or nephew of *Djuami* called *Abd al-Karim* and also known as *Mahmud al-Sahl* gathered around him the Maba and the Kodol recently converted to Islam by his father or his uncle, as well as the Arabs of the district, preached the holy war against the infidel dynasty of the Tundjr princes, defeated or killed the king Djuwied, proclaimed himself *koluk* (i.e., sovereign) of *Wadari*, made his capital at Wara, and founded a new dynasty there which retained the throne till 1911.

The *koluk* exercised power with the help of several counsellors, including his mother, who had the title of *mama*, and four dignitaries called *kenalik*, assisted by lieutenants (*nadeker*), squires (*sowram)*, and a supervisor (*rinemati*). He had around him chamberlains, pages, eunuchs, messengers and tax-collectors as well as a military guard, one section free men and the other slaves.

The territorial commands were in the hands of military governors each of whom, called an *agid*, had at his disposal an army raised from the tribes of his district. The most important of these commands were: that of an agid who had the title of *djemara* under whom were the Kodol, as well as the town of Wara and the western provinces; that of the agid *Almahammed* which included the Arabs of the north and the Zaghwa; that of the agid *Al-Salamit* who ruled the territories of the south. There were as many as 80 agids. Each province or *djer* was administered, under the authority of the *agid*, by a *tundjir*, and each village had at its head a political chief and an agricultural official.

This organisation however lacked solidarity; the different agids were often fighting with one another or with the *koluk* and they had frequently to use force to secure the obedience of those under them. The history of *Wadari*, so far as we know it, is simply the history of foreign or civil wars and of the cruelties perpetrated by the kings and dignitaries on members of their own families.

The first *koluk*, *Abd al-Karim* (1635–1655), paid tribute to *Dir-Fur*, like the Tundjir rulers who had preceded him. He succeeded however in giving *Wadari* a certain amount of independence
and settled its eastern boundaries by agreement with Sulaiman Solong, the king of Der-Fur. He contributed to completing the conversion of a considerable section of his subjects to Islam. This work was continued after him by his son Khairu al-Kahir (1655-1678). Khairu (1678-1681) and Ya'qub 'Arus (1681-1707) endeavored to cast off the suzerainty of Der-Fur; the second succeeded in defeating the Der-Fur army which was commanded by 'Umar Lele and in taking him prisoner. Khairu al-Saghir (1707-1745) engaged in an unsuccessful war with the Baghirmi. Djoda (1745-1795) resumed the struggle against Der-Fur, defeated its king 'Abd al-Ka'im and secured the independence of Wadai'; he undertook a number of expeditions against the pagans of the south and even succeeded in taking a portion of Karem from the ruler of Bornu. Shihh Derret (1795-1803) was dethroned by his son 'Abd al-Karim who assumed the name of Shihh (1803-1813) and distinguished himself in a war against 'Abd al-Rahman Gawayn, king of Baghirmi, whose capital Masaanya he took and plundered in 1806. 'Abd al-Rahman was killed in the course of the campaign and his son and successor Djurgumanda who acknowledged the suzerainty of Wadai'. The khalif Shihh developed the trade of his lands and established relations with Egypt. He was however of a cruel and blood-thirsty disposition and made enemies in his entourage, who finally assassinated him. His son Yusaif Kharinein (1814-1829), a debauchee and drunkard, was poisoned as a result of a conspiracy against him. Rakkib (1829-1830) was placed on the throne at an early age under the regency of his mother but soon died of smallpox. 'Abd al-'Aas, great-grandson of Djoda, was chosen to succeed him after a bloody civil war but he also died of smallpox in 1834.

Famine now desolated the kingdom, and drove the Wadaians to plunder the western provinces of Der-Fur, Muhammad Faddal, king of this country, sent a punitive expedition which reached Wara and put on the throne a Wadai'an prince named Muhammad Sharif who recognised the suzerainty of Der-Fur and reigned from 1835 to 1858, possessing a prestige of authority and a sense of justice which had been previously unknown. Having cause to complain of the conduct of the powerful Shikh 'Omar, lord of Borni, he attacked him and defeated him at Kusti and forced him to pay an indemnity of 8,000 dollars. It was Muhammad Sharif who moved the capital from Wara to Abeshe. He became blind and had to defend himself against one of his own sons; ultimately he went out of his mind and died in 1858. It was in his reign that Wadai' for the first time was visited by a European, the German Vogel, who spent 13 days in Abeshe in 1856 and was murdered on leaving it.

His successor 'Ali (1858-1874) devoted himself to the restoration of order in the state and encouraged trade between Wadai' and Tripolitania and Cyrenaica. In 1870 he went to war with Abu Sakkin, lord of Baghirmi, who had attempted to cast off the bounds of vassalage; he besieged him in his palace, which he mined and took by storm, and brought back from Masaanya in 1874 over 20,000 captives, chosen mainly from among the artisans, as a result of which he gave a considerable stimulus to industry in Wadai'. It was he who built the royal palace of Abeshe and added to Wadai' the provinces of Raha and Kuti. In 1873 he was visited by the German explorer Nachigal, whom he treated with great consideration.

Yusaif (1874-1898) allowed Baghirmi to regain its independence. He entered into friendly relations with al-Mahdi, the head of the Santustya brotherhood. It was in his reign that the adventurers Rabah, who came from Bahir al-Ghasali, invaded Kuti (1879), then Raha, laid waste the southern provinces of Wadai', and installed a slave-dealer named Santast as suljan of Kuti and Raha (1890). In 1891 the latter was visited by the French explorer Crampel, who had come from Ubangi; he tried to prevent him from going on to Wadai' and being unable to make him abandon his plans, had him assassinated along with his companions. In 1894, Rabah being engaged in conquering Bornu, the khalif Yusaif sent an army against Santast and forced him to recognise his suzerainty. A little later, in 1897, the same Santast signed a treaty of friendship with the explorer Gentil, the French commissioner in Ubangi and Shari.

Ibrahim (1898-1901) had to put down several risings and died of wounds received in battle. Abu Ghasali (1901-1902) had to fight against one of his agis named 'Asif who raised a considerable section of the people against the khalif with such success that the khalif had to abandon his capital. In his place Didumurra, son of Yusaif, was proclaimed; he pursued Abu Ghasali, captured him and put out his eyes, while 'Asif, who had taken refuge in Fitti, put himself under the protection of the French troops who had established themselves in Yao. Didumurra reigned from 1902 to 1911. Soon after his accession, 'Asif left Fitti and made war on the pagans of southern Wadai'; arrested by order of Commandant Larguen in 1903, he was for a time interned at the French post of Fort-de-Posse. However, Didumurra's advisers professed to hold the French responsible for 'Asif's doings and the agis al-Salama set fire to the French custom-house of Gulfe to the west of Lake Iro and attacked Lieutenant Dujour at Tomba in April 1904. On June 7, the gurme' Ughun summoned the commandant of the French fort at Yao to evacuate the district of Fitti; the latter indignantly rejected the ultimatum and his post was attacked in January 1905 by a lieutenant of the gurme'. The attack was driven off and the Wadai'an army, routed by Captain Riviere. Didumurra blamed 'Ughun and had him poisoned in 1906. Various Wadai'an governors however continued to raid French territory, which gave rise to fighting in 1907 and decided the French to invade the western dependencies of Wadai' along with 'Asif, who, restored to favour with the French, posed as a claimant to the throne. Didumurra sent against the French an army of 2,800 rifles, led by the agis Almahmid, who was defeated on March 29, 1908 by the 280 men led by Captain Jersalamy and for a second time on June 19 of the same year by Commandant Julien.

On June 2, 1909, Abeshe was taken by Captain Fiegsensg and Lieutenant Bourreau and on Aug. 30, 'Asif had himself proclaimed Khalif in place of Didumurra, who had fled. But in January 1910, Captain Fiegsensg, going with a detachment of troops among the Masali, was attacked and massacred by them at Bir-Tawil and 'Ali Dinar, king of Der-Fur, seized the opportunity to invade eastern Wadai', while Didumurra again resumed
the offensive from the north. The latter was driven back across the Galba by Captain Chavaley. Then on Nov. 8, 1910, Lt. Col. Moll took Djedjil, the chief town of the Masali, which Dumdura was defending; the latter was wounded and put to flight, but Moll was himself killed at Dorothea along with two lieutenants and five non-commissioned officers. A little later, on Jan. 12, 1911, Captain Modat took at Ndele (Kutti) the fortified palace of Sanabi who was killed in the fighting and in October of the same year, the Ndele Dumdura came to make his submission to Colonel Largeau and abdicated. Asil became king of Wadi under a French protectorate but he reigned only a few months as he had to be deposed on June 5, 1912, on account of his duplicity. Since then Wadi has been directly administered by the commander of the district of Abessi, which forms a part of the French colony of Chad.


**WADI HALFA** or simply Halfa, a modern town in the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, 21° 55′ N. 31° 19′ E., on both right bank of the Nile, or 770 miles south of Cairo and 5 miles north of the Second Cataract, is the chief town of the province or *khríya* of that name. It includes the village of Tawfikia, a new suburb with fine bazaars, and its inhabitants, inclusive of the Nubian villagers of Dahbour, number almost 3,000. Besides the Muslim places of worship there are the churches of the Copts, Greeks and English. The Government offices and hospital, and the official residential district lie to the south. The head of King John of Abyssinia is said to be beneath a tree near the hospital. The name of the place is due to the halfa grass abounding in this region. In Pharonic times the district was called Baken. Opposite the town, on the west bank, are the remains of the old Egyptian fortress of that name established under the Middle Empire. Faraabee, the *fervil* of Ptolemy, was also in the neighbourhood (Budge, *The Egyptian Sudan*, ii. 83).

It was only towards the end of the nineteenth century that the town developed from a miserable Sudanese trading village into the important centre it now is on the frontier of Egypt and the Sudan. During the years 1884-9 it was made the military base of the British troops. Lord Wolseley's expeditionary force passed through it on its way to assist General Gordon at Khartum. The place grew in importance as a result of the subsequent decision which made it the political frontier, and when a garrison of Egyptian troops was established on the spot it figured again in the campaigns of 1896-98 against the Mahdi. By the Sudan Convention of 1899 conditions were changed. The modern political boundary is now fixed at 22° N. Lat., a distance of 27 miles north of Wâdi Halfa. The government railway to Khartum, which begins at the town, accounts largely for its present day importance. Nile steamers connect it on the north with Shalahl, a village on the outskirts of Assuan, the terminus of the Egyptian State Railways. **Bibliography:** Baedeker, Egypt and the Sudan (1949); Wallis Budge, *The Egyptian Sudan*, i. 77; do., *By Nile and Tigris* (index); Reinwardt, *Geogr. d'Aboufida*, u. 139; C. G. Gordon, *Journals*, p. 5. 137; Alford and Sword, *The Egyptian Sudan*, p. 75 sqq.; H. G. Lyons, *Photography of the Nile and its Basin* (Survey Dept. of Egypt), p. 281 sqq.; H. C. Jackson, *Oman Digna* (index); H. A. MacMichael, *Hist. of the Arabs in the Sudan*, (Cambridge 1923), index.

**WADI 'L-KURA**, the valley between el-'Elt and al-Medina on the old trading route from South Arabia to Syria, usually called Wadi Deidibian. It is the dry bed of two wadis which join in the centre, the Wadi el-Djejel from the north and the Wadi el-Hamid from the south which comes down from near Medina above the village of Henskiya and runs between the Djebel Hamid or Uljed (Ejd) and the city of the Prophet. Half-way between el-'Elt and al-Medina it is joined on the right by the Wadi el-Tublij or Wadi el-Silsila, which connects it with Khaihar.

The most important place in the Wadi 'L-Kura' is el-'Elt' with rich date-groves and cornfields which owe their existence to warm springs in the valley. At one time Kurj was the most important trading centre of the Wadi 'L-Kura'. It presumably took the place of the ancient Dédân (Daidân) the ruins of which, now called al-Kharaiba, lie in the northeastern corner of the gardens of el-'Elt'. The oasis of Dédân, which was of importance as an important point on the old trading route from the south to Egypt and Syria, was at one time in the possession of Minaean rulers who had their deputies here. Numerous Minaean inscriptions, which were found in el-El't, and the mention of the name Dédân in the Bike (Gen. x. 7; xxv. 5) are further evidence of the close connections the old South Arabian states had with this place. Yâkût still knows the old name of this place and records that Daidân was once a large town on the road from 'al-Bal'k to the Hadhras but was already in ruins in his time. Legend connects the decline of the people of 'Ad and the story of the prophet Hud with this region. These stories were probably suggested by the rock tombs in the vicinity of Daidân (Khariba). At the beginning of Islam the Wadi 'L-Kura' supported a considerable Jewish population which, like their co-religionists in al-Medina, were hostile to Islam. When in the year 2 (623-624) the Kaûfûkûs were driven out of al-Medina and went through the Wadi 'L-Kura' to Syria, they sheltered them for a month and gave them food and horses for the journey. In the year 5 (626-627) the Jews of the Wadi 'L-Kura' joined the defensive alliance formed by the Jews of Ta'inik, Fadak and Khairalib against Muhammad. It was however not till 7 (628) that they came to blows with the Prophet's forces, when after the capture of Khairalib, he marched through the Wadi 'L-Kura' to al-Medina. The Jews of the valley, which was defended by towers, offered a vain defence. They were forced to surrender after heavy losses but were allowed to remain in the country; they had to till the soil for their hated enemy, and in this way contributed considerable wealth to the treasury in al-Medina. Henceforth this important corridor, used
for the victorious campaign of the Muslims under Abū Ḫubayl against Syria, remained in the hands of the lands of al-Madinah, although for administrative purposes it continued for a time to belong to Syria and formed the frontier against the Ḥijāz. The Jews were allowed to remain for some time in the Wādī l-Ḳūrā. Whether they were expelled as early as the reign of the caliph ‘Umar I is not certain. All we know is that in al-Baladjarī’s time there were no longer any Jews in the Wādī and the land had long been divided among the Muslims and belonged to the district of al-Madinah. 


WĀDĪ NŪN, older form WĀDĪ NŪL. This is not the name of a river but of a great plain in S.W. Morocco between the western Anti-Atlas and its Saharan outliers twenty miles from the sea. The plain is formed by the silt from number of water-courses, of which the chief are the Wādī Šayṣūd and the Wādī Umm al-Aṣḥar, which unite to form the Wādī Askkā; the latter river joins the sea through a defile which has given it its name.

We find in the Wādī Nūn a certain number of oases with large villages (Awegelim or Gleimim, Ḫṣāli, Tīlīwin, Ṭīk, Dūḥāyān, Tīghmat, Aṣūr, Waṭrān, Ābbūda etc.) which serve as trading centres for the Saharan nomads and contain 3,000–3,500 families. These are Arabo-Berbers belonging for the most part to the Maʿṣūl and the Lāmṭa [q.v.]; a few belong to the Gāsûlī and to the Ṣanḥāja. They almost all belong to the Tekna, but some to the Alt Bāʿamrān and the Altānān. There are also a number of shīrfs, marabouts, ḫārīfīn and Jews. 

There is hardly a historian or geographer who has dealt with the Maghrib al-ʿĀṣa who has not mentioned this province. It owes its importance to several things: the Wādī Nūn is in Morocco one of the rare groups of oases which throughout the centuries has communicated in the south with the Mauritiana Aḍrān and the Senegal and in the southeast with the bend of the Niger; it is the exit of the easiest route between the desert and the northern slope of the Atlas, a natural route which runs on as far as Mogador; lastly its proximity to the Ocean has enabled its inhabitants to counter at various periods into commercial relations with Europe and to secure the exportation of the rich produce of the Sahādan. 

Historical Sketch. The Wādī Nūn was, we are told, at one time a great pastoral region; native tradition says that it used to be called Wādī Nūn "the river of the shee-camels". Its name is sometimes derived from the Hebrew and Nūn is said to mean a fish-god. Jewish legends make the whale throw Janah up on the coast of Sūs and the memory of Joshua son of Nūn is said to survive in the name of the tribe of Ait Ṭaṣ. 

In the 8th century of our era, Lāmṭa Berbers were the owners of the oases and we may imagine that the expedition of ‘Ukba b. Nāfr and the ephemeral rule of Abū Allāḥ b. Ḥadīrā in Sūs brought them for the first time into contact with the world. They were probably great nomads; in the tenth century, however, they had a town, Nūl Lāmṭa, which seems to have occupied the site of the present village of Aṣārī. We do not know the date of its foundation but it was undoubtedly much earlier; it was a great market, where shields were made of antelope hide (lamṭa) and it from caravans set out to cross the Sahara for the Sāhādan and Mauritanian. It was no doubt this commercial activity that at an early date attracted a Jewish colony here. 

In the 9th century, Nūl Lāmṭa was conquered by the Almoravids who made it one of their base of operation and established a mint there. The Lāmṭa served this dynasty faithfully; on the other hand, their resistances against the Almohads in the following century resulted in bloody reprisals. A little later, in 1218, the invasion of the Maṣūl Arabs reached the Wādī Nūn and one of their tribes, the Lāḥt Ḥassān, soon incorporated the Lāmṭa, who ceased henceforth to play an independent part. 

Nūl henceforth lost its importance and was replaced as a port for the Sahara by Taghast (the modern Ḫṣāli); it was under this name that Europe for long knew the Wādī Nūn. In the 18th century began the expeditions from the Canaries to the coast of Africa, the object of which was to procure slaves for the exploitation of the country; these were the celebrated entradas, several of which reached the gates of Taghast and resulted in the foundation of a number of Spanish fortresses; one of them, San Miguel de Sáns, which however only lasted for a very short time, was quite close to the Wādī Nūn, at the mouth of the Askkā. These expeditions were perhaps preceded or accompanied by Christian missions. In 1325, Taghast venerated the relics of a Portuguese of the Order of the Hermits of St. Augustine, who had lived in this region. 

The foundation of the Sahādan dynasty resulted in the expulsion of the Christians and the people of Nūn supplied ḡāṣd contingents to the sovereigns who had liberated Islamic soil. But very soon, it seems, their oases began to lose their position as starting-points for caravans. The Ṣhūrta came from Tagmādārī in the upper Dar’s and it was by this route naturally that they brought to Marīkush the booty of their conquests on the Niger. 

This fact no doubt explains why the people of the Wādī Nūn very soon disposed of this dynasty, as well as why they were always at more or less open enmity with the Filalī, who for similar reasons favoured the route by Tafīllīn. In the 18th and 19th centuries the Wādī Nūn seems to have belonged to the marabout state of Tāzīrāwāl, founded by Abū Ḥassān al-Samīlā, whose ambitions at one time was to conquer the Sahādan. He and his successors in every case maintained very regular commercial relations with the country south of the desert. In their reign European ships frequently came to the coast of Sūs to carry away merchandise brought down by the caravans. This
Economic life. In the Wàdī Nûn a few cereals are grown, the vine and tobacco. The latter has a certain reputation in all the western Súddán. There are also palm-trees, figs, pomegranates, a few arganiers, oranges and Barbary figs. Numerous hives produce an excellent honey. The main wealth of the country is in rearing camels, horses, cattle and particularly sheep and goats.

Industry is rudimentary; there are a few armourers and several Jewish goldsmiths. Fishing is practised by certain tribes of the Teknà.

The markets of Awgelmia and Tíghart are of only local significance. The most notable are the fairs (müemem, awugfâr) of Asârî, Kiîsî and Awgelmia which annually give an opportunity for the settled population and the nomads to exchange commodities. Trans-Sahara trade has practically disappeared completely.


Wàdî (A), deposit, custody, is a contract (âdâb, mustawâfi) by which the depositor (mûdî, mustawâfi) hands over to the depositary (nûdî, mustawâfi) something to be kept and returned intact at a later date. Wàdî's means not only the thing to be kept but also the agreement regarding the transaction. The custody is therefore based on a special agreement and is therefore dealt with in legal works as a branch of the law of contract. While in the case of amâna entraîned goods, there is no agreement but only a general obligation to keep faith, without a binding agreement; under amâna therefore come such things as come into the keeping (yad) of any one by chance or without special intention, e.g. a garment blown into the house by the wind or an article found (likâyta) or a pledge (rabîn).

1. Wàdî is not found as a technical term in the Kûran but only amâna in the more general
meaning. Muhammad with all emphasis admonishes his followers to keep their contracts and to restore goods and pledges entrusted to them in their care (Sura iv. 61: ii. 283) and promises Paradise to those who obey these commands (xxvii. 8 sqq.; Ixx. 32). These verses show how little and how reluctantly the pagan Arabs fulfilled the obligations and agreements they had entered upon. The later fuḥūṣ also quoted Sura v. 3: “Help one another to do good and to the fear of God” in order to find support for the contract of custody in the Qur'an and represent it as a commendable action (mustaṣqaḥa).

2. Traditions also remind us that goods entrusted should be restored: “To whom a thing is entrusted, he should return it” or “give the thing entrusted back to him who entrusted it to you.” More numerous are the haddiths which relate to compensation when the thing deposited has been lost or has perished; in these cases there is no liability (Ibn Mādiya, Ṣaḥābat, bāb 7; Kanz al-ʿUmmāl, viii, N° 5443, 5444, 5448, 5449, 5450) because the depositor is regarded as a person worthy of confidence (Kanz al-ʿUmmāl, N° 5444, 5447). In other haddiths it is asserted that there is a forfeit, because the depositary has not observed the necessary care or has acted illegally, although this is not definitely asserted in the traditions (Kanz al-ʿUmmāl, N° 5451, 5452).

3. In the Fikh books the doctrine and legal position of waḍā'a are minutely expounded. According to the jurists we have the following rules:

1. Placing in custody is a contract (ʿaḍḍ) and an ʿaḍḍ dafūʿ, i.e., a revocable contract which can be cancelled at any time simply at the wish of one of the parties. The following conditions (arkān) are necessary to secure the validity of the agreement:

a. The two contracting parties must be capable of doing business. Therefore a minor (nāṣir), a lunatic (manṭūn) and a spendthrift (fājš, muḥādic) who has no guardian, can neither put nor take anything in trust, i.e., he can be neither a depositor nor a depositary. If a minor makes a deposit with a person competent to do business, there is no contract but it is binding on the ground of ʿamūnāh.

b. Only such things as are ʿamīl can be deposited. Therefore impure things (nāṣir) for example cannot be deposited.

c. A form (riḥa) is requisite and this is offer and acceptance (rāḥa wa-kaḥaḥ), i.e., the declaration by both that they are willing; one must have the will to give the thing into custody and the other to take it. This may be expressed in words; or in other form of declaration or may be done silently, e.g., by the depositary at once taking over the thing silently after the depositor has offered it.

II. The depository's obligation to preserve. He has to keep the thing as such things are kept, "as is the custom in ordinary usage". He has to use the care with which he preserves his own things, in the words of Roman law diligentissimae quae in esset. As to the place of preservation, he can keep the thing deposited where he pleases. But if the depositor has given instructions and directions about the method and place of custody the depositary must observe them strictly.

If he does not do so, he is liable to pay compensation if the goods suffer injury or perish.

III. The right to compensation (dāmmāṭ). The depositary is not liable if the thing deposited is damaged or perishes through no fault of his. Nor is he liable for the acts of a higher power or accident. On the other hand in cases of ʿaḍḍ and ʿaḍḍ dafūʿ, the depositary is always liable.

a. It is a case of ʿaḍḍ when he does less than he ought to, i.e., omits the necessary care. This occurs:

1. When he does not prevent damage to the thing deposited, e.g., if he neglects to give food and water to a mule left with him or does not keep the mules from clothes deposited with him.

2. If he is neglectful in the usual way of preserving the thing deposited and does not observe the instructions of the depositor.

b. It is a case of ʿaḍḍ dafūʿ, if he "exceeds the bounds", i.e., proceeds contrary to the law. This occurs:

1. If he deposits the thing with a third person, for the deposit is based on the personal confidence which the depositor has placed in a definite individual known to him. Ibn Abi Laila alone allows the depositary to deposit again. Opinions differ regarding further deposit with members of the family. As members of the family are considered such persons as live with the depositary and belong to his household: wife, children, parents, servants, slaves, ʿawm mawāʾir. The Shāfiʿī jurists follow Ḥanafī and forbid further depositing, while the Ḥanafī and Malikis who follow Ṣaḥīḥābī allow it. According to all schools, however, the depositary may deposit again in face of pressure of a higher power in order to save the thing deposited. As cases of this kind the examples are given of shipwreck, fire, inundation, enemy raids.

2. If the depositary uses the thing or derives advantage from it, e.g., if he wears the deposited clothes or rides the mule: unless he is trying thereby to avert damage.

IV. The termination of the contract. The contract of preservation is extinguished by the return of the thing deposited. Both parties have the right to dissolve the agreement when they please. The restoration can therefore be made at any time and at the wish of one party, since this contract is an ʿaḍḍ dafūʿ. If one of the two parties dies or becomes insane the agreement is dissolved. The thing remains until its return ʿamānā in the hand of the depositary. Here again we have a clear distinction between depositing by agreement and ʿamānā with no agreement.

If the depositary refuses the return of the article without reason, the degree of liability increases, if the thing deposited deteriorates. While the depositary is generally not responsible for any casual deterioration, he is now liable for causal deterioration also, since he is delaying restitution.

4. In literature, a thing entrusted to some one's custody sometimes plays an important part in a story. Entrusting with a depositary, especially a faithless or deceitful one, provides well-known motives (cf. Handwörterbuch des Deutschen Märchen, ed. L. Mackensen, s.v. Unredlich Aufbewahrer). The motif most frequently occurring in Oriental literature is that of the faithless depositary who is in turn outwitted. The ḥafṣ is frequently represented as a deceitful depositary. As it would lead us too far to analyse the legal


WAFĀ, SHARAF AL-DIN 'ALI HUSAYN, a Persian poet of the eighth century, belonged to a family of sāyids of Kūm, who had charge of the mausoleum of Fālāw, daughter of the Imam Miṣrā Khān [cf. H. v. Humboldt]. He went to India at the end of the reign of Shāh Shāh, stayed there nearly 30 years, returned home in 1180 (1766), made the pilgrimage to Mecca and died in Persia in 1194 (1780). The Asiatic Society of Bengal possesses a short muḥtawwī entitled 'Azīz-al-maṣfūrūn. "Pearls arranged in Order" by him; his Divān is in the India Office Library.

Other poets have had the same tāhāshīs: 1. Wafāf of Fārshān (Mirza Muhammād-i Husain), a satyric and mystic, brother of Miṣrā, called the great Kām-mīl. He was for a time a minister of the Zand dynasty and on their disappearance rendered great service to the Kādjar. He died at Kāvar and has left a Divān; 2. Wafāf of Yarī (Akkāb Muhammād), a poet of the ninth century; 3. Wafāf of Ashrafī (Mirza Mahdī Khān), also of the ninth century, was a descendant of a Georgian family that had settled in Persia in the time of the Safawī; he was secretary to Miṣrā Khān, Muhammād al-Dawla; he wrote a beautiful hand; 4. Wafāf of Daṭrī (Mirza 'Abd Allāh Khān), a derwīsh, was for some time in the service of the princes of the imperial family, Zill al-Salṭān and Shāhīz 'Alī Khān; he once visited Shirāz.

Bibliography: Ridāt Kālī Khān, Mudūna’s Fadāšt, ii. 577, 584, 586; Lāfī All Bāg, Aḥāk Aʿlā (not paged, towards the end, in the chapter on contemporary poets); A. Sprenger, Descriptio Catalogi, Calcutta 1854, l. 584; Ethel, Cat. Pers. MSS. India Office, l. NP. 1718; W. Ivanow, Descriptive Catalogue, Calcutta 1924, p. 398. (Cl. Husky)

WAFIR, the name of the fourth metre in Arab prosody. It consists in theory of three

The alterations that may be undergone by the feet are as follows: 1. the fairly frequent disappearance of the vowel of the ālām in muḥtawwā (muḥtawwā = muḥtawwā); 2. the rather rare disappearance of the ālām and its vowel (muḥtawwā = muḥtawwā); 3. the excessively rare disappearance of the vowel of the ālām and of the ālām (muḥtawwā = muḥtawwā). It sometimes also happens that the first foot of the first line of a poem loses its ālām and taken with the above changes, we have muḥtawwā, muḥtawwā, and muḥtawwā.

(W. Moh. Ben Chener)

WAFK, plur. Amfūf, magic square, i.e. a square divided up like a chessboard, each square of which is inscribed with numerals, letters or words; it is worn as a talisman against illness and for all sorts of other purposes, or can be used for all kinds of magic.

The simplest form of a magic square is the nine-compartmented square with numbers as shown in fig. I. Under the name Bi-sāl̄, it is mentioned in Chinese literature: The legendary Emperor Yā (2200 B.C.) is said to have seen it on the back of a turtle which arose out of the Houng Ho. In Arabic literature, the square is first found similarly arranged in the Kitāb al-Musāfāra of Zanjīr b. Hājīyān, whose writings we must now date about 900 A.D. There it is ascribed to Bālās (Apollonius of Tyana) and is said to facilitate child-bearing if written on two uncut pieces of linen and tied below the mother's feet. The same amulet with the same use is also described by al-Ghazzālī (1048-1111) in the Muqaddam; it is still in use to-day as "Ghazzālī's seal". The essential point in the arrangement of the numbers is that all lines, vertical, horizontal and diagonal, should yield the total of 15. This is only possible if 5 is put in the middle of the four even numbers in the corners and the remaining (odd) numbers in the middle compartments. Beside that shown in figure 1, seven other arrangements are possible, but they do not differ essentially from the first, as they are easily obtained by revolving or interchanging the lines. In manuscripts of the Risālī il al-Ikhwan al-Salṭān, the method of filling up the square is described in terms of moves in chess. In the Safr al-Shem of Abraham ben 'Essa (1092-1167) the square is connected with the name of God in the account of the sum 15 = H. The corner figures form in the Arabih alphabetic numerals the word budāh [q.v.] which is considered a particularly powerful charm.
If we may believe the statements of the Arab bibliographers, Thabit b. Qurra (826–901 A.D.) wrote on magic squares. In this case, it is natural to suppose that this mathematician did not confine himself simply to the square with nine compartments, but also showed how to form squares with 16, 25 and 36 and more compartments. It is also not impossible that the connection of the squares with the planets goes back to Thabit, i.e. to the Sabaeans.

According to Suter, *Mathematiker und Astronomen*, p. 93, Ibn al-Haitham (965–1039) also dealt with the subject of magic squares; but it is mainly the mathematicians or students of secret sciences in the xilth century whose works on magic squares are recorded. Only the works of al-Bānūn (d. 1225), the *Kitāb Shams al-Ma’dūrīf* and the *Kitāb al-Durr al-mašràm fi Ǧim al-Anfšāq wa l-‘Nujum*, are known in detail. In these we find the use of magic squares developed in all directions which presupposes a long history behind it. A collection of the ways of using them would fill many pages and cannot be given here. In al-Bānūn it is a striking fact that squares with the base four predominate, no doubt because these already show a large number of independent forms, which the author makes available for his purposes.

Still very frequent, apart from the base 3, is the base 35 squares with the base 6, which are difficult to prepare, do not seem to exist, and squares with still higher basic figures seem to follow simpler rules.

Among the innovations which appear in al-Bānūn the first is the increase in the size of the numbers inscribed in the compartments. It is easy to see that the conditions for magic squares will also be fulfilled if each number is raised by the same amount or if the numbers form arithmetical series (fig. 2 and 3). That in the MSS. and editions of the *Kitāb Shams al-Ma’dūrīf* many defective squares are found is partly due to the copyists.

How the squares can be put right, with as little correction as possible, has been shown by W. Ahrens in his work.

As the Arabs use two systems of numerals side by side, the two systems are easily mixed. The usual form is for a word, usually a name for God, broken up into its consonants, to be put as a clue in the upper row, with its numerical value, while the other lines are filled up with ordinary numerals. Al-Bānūn gives numerous examples, one of which I reproduce; only I replace the letters of the word

\[
\begin{array}{c}
36 & 41 & 34 \\
35 & 37 & 39 \\
40 & 33 & 38
\end{array}
\]

Fig. 2.

need to replace 31 by 39 in order to get line IV correct also. For the last wrong numbers 6 and 20 we have to put 10 and 197 in order to have 299 everywhere, including the diagonals (fig. 5). The rows of figures are therefore now

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 50 & 1 & 40 \\
38 & 11 & 198 & 48 \\
196 & 51 & 2 & 41 \\
5 & 39 & 7 & 199 \\
10 & 197 & 52 & 3
\end{array}
\]

Fig. 5.

by their numerical values (fig. 4). The sum of all the numbers in one line or vertical series must give 299 as this is the numerical value of the clue word. But we get this sum only in the vertical rows \( \epsilon \) and \( \eta \); all the other sums differ

more or less. If we put the figures written in the squares in order of magnitude we get the groups

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\end{array}
\]

The figures 21, 29, 31, 99 cannot be correct, because they do not fit into the five-lined rows; 38 also occurs twice. If we replace the 38 below 8 by 48, the 21 by 41, we get two new correct lines II and III, and if we write 199 for 99, the vertical row \( \varepsilon \) also becomes correct. Now we only

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
50 & 1 & 40 & 8 & 200 \\
38 & 11 & 198 & 48 & 49 \\
196 & 51 & 2 & 41 & 52 \\
5 & 39 & 7 & 199 & 49 \\
10 & 197 & 52 & 3 & 37
\end{array}
\]
yet: in general use. What al-Bīnī tells us on this subject in the Shems al-Ma'ārif is not complete; presumably the second work contains more about it. In any case, the two systems — the one ascending from Saturn to the moon, the other reversed — must have been well-known in the Muslim world by the xivth or at latest the xvth century. In the west, the first system became widely disseminated through the Ars Mathematica of Alciphron of Nisibis (1333), the second is taught in the Practica Arithmeticae of Cardinalis. The period when the making of seals of the planets was especially popular was the xvth or xviith century. In the coin cabinets we find complete collections of seals of different metals as follows:

The seal of Saturn with the magic square 3 x 3 of lead.

The seal of Jupiter with the magic square 4 x 4 of tin.

The seal of Mars with the magic square 5 x 5 of iron.

The seal of the Sun with the magic square 6 x 6 of gold.

The seal of Venus with the magic square 7 x 7 of copper.

The seal of Mercury with the magic square 8 x 8 of silver plating.

The seal of the Moon with the magic square 9 x 9 of silver.

In the east a number of empirical rules seem to have been used for the preparation of magic squares. The "rule of the Indians" was first made known by La Louës about 1691. Long before that, however, the Byzantine Moschopulos (c. 1400) dealt with the problem in a general form. From the middle of the xviith century onwards, i.e. after the seals of the planets became known in the west, the mathematical side of the problem has been continually studied down to the present day. For the literature of the subject S. Günther's work should be consulted specially.


Al-Wafarānī or Al-Ifrīnī, Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammad bin 'Abd Allah, called al-Saghīr, a Moroccan biographer and historian, born in Marrakush in 1080 (1669-1670); he belonged to the Berber tribe of the Idris or Ufān (Wafarānī) which was settled in the south of Morocco in the valley of the Wādī Darra. We know very few details of his life. He studied in his native town, then at Fās and spent his life in one or other of the chief towns of Morocco or at the al-wiṣāya of the Sharqāwā [q.v.] of Abu 'l-Lā'la' (Bujjad). Towards the end of his life he was imām and preacher (khāṭīb) at the Masjid Yūṣuf (or Madrasat Ibn Yūsuf) in Marrakush; he died in 1140 (1727) or 1154.

Al-Wafarānī is best known as the author of the great chronicle of the Sa'dians entitled Nushat al-būdī al-Akhbārī Makhāl al-Karn al-bādī, ed. and transal. by O. Houdas, Neshat el-boudi, Histoire de la dynastie saoudienne au Maroc (1122-1160), in F. E. L. O. V., 3rd. ser., vol. ii., Paris 1888-1889 and lithographed at Fās in 1307 A.H. It is by far the most important source for the history of the first of the Sharqi dynasties of Morocco, for it makes use not only of contemporary chronicles but also to some extent of state documents which the author studied at first hand. It covers the period 917 (1512-1513) to the end of the xiiith (xviiith) century and deals, very unevenly however, with the reigns of various Sa'dian princes, the longest and most detailed section naturally being that dealing with the reign of Sa'dan Ahmad al-Mansūr [q.v.]. For a critical study of the matter of the Nushat al-būdī, see E. Lévi-Provençal, Les Historiens des Chérifs, Paris 1922, p. 120 sqq.

Besides his history of the Sa'dians, Al-Wafarānī wrote other historical, biographical and literary works. These are, in chronological order: 1. al-Maṣlah al-nahī fi Šarḥ Tawābqī Ilūn Sahl, a commentary on a poem by the famous poet of Spain Ibrāhīm b. Sahl, lithographed at Fās in 1334; 2. a monograph on the 'Alawīs of Morocco Mawla 'Isā, al-Zil al-marīf fi Muḥarrir Mawla 'Isā Ilūn al-Shāfīr; 3. an unpublished monograph on the "Seven Saints" of Marrakush, Durar al-bīdāt al-Maṣābir Muḥarrir Muḥarrir; and lastly 5. a biographical collection on Moroccan saints of the xixth cent. a. H. Šaraf wa rūn ašhār wa rūn al-Maṣābir Al-Aḥammad 'Abd al-Dawla' al-Shāfīr al-Karn al-bādī 'agār. The last work, which has been lithographed in Fās, is an indispensable work of reference for the history of the Moroccan and Marabout movements in the history of Morocco from the end of the middle ages.


Al-Wāh (pl. Al-Wawāt), the name of a group of oases to the west of Egypt. There are three of them: the first is opposite the Fayyum and reaches to the length of Awaṣa; it is the largest of the oases and contains several villages; its palms give the best dates in Egypt. The second is smaller and less populous. The third is the smallest and contains a village named Santa. This is the information given by Yaḥyā. Maḥrīq makes four oases which he calls outer
and inner; in his time Sautariya was a little town of about 600 inhabitants of Berber stock called Swa who spoke a dialect resembling that of the Zenata. The soil of the oases produced alum and vitriol; the exportation of 1,000 quintals of alum per annum was imposed on the holders of the hil (mudjab) by the Ayyubids of Cairo; later this contribution was neglected and finally ceased. There are springs of acid flavor, the water of which is not used in place of vinegar, and others of an astringent and bad taste; there are about twenty springs of fresh water. Certain illnesses are endemic and fevers common. There are groves of palm trees, olive-trees, fig-trees and vines. There was said to be an extraordinary citrus tree there which yielded 4,000 citrons each year; which may be compared with the examples given by botanists of the fertility of the Aurantiaceae. In 339 (950) the oases were ravaged by a Nubian army, which carried off numerous prisoners.

Bibliography: Yahut, M. D. G., iv. 873; al-Mas'udi, Muradd, i. 90.

WAHB b. MUNABBIH, Asil 'Abd Allah, a South Arabian story-teller (Bâb al-aqâbâb, Bibliothèque, in Z.D.M.G., xlv. 483) of Persian descent who was born in Dhamar, two days' journey from San'a in 34 A.H. (no credence need be given to statements that he adopted Islam in 10 A.H.). Wahb is celebrated as an authority on the traditions of the Ahi b. Khalid and like his brothers Hammân, Khâlid and Maqûdî is classed among the 'Abîmâfân. The earliest sources know nothing of the story that before his conversion to Islam he belonged to the Ahi b. Khalid (Fihrist, p. 50) more precisely was a Jew (Ibn Khalidu, ed. Quatremère, ii. 179); he was presumably born a Muslim. Thâ'labî (p. 191) records a story of his meeting Mu'awiya, and al-Mas'udi says that al-Wahb sent him an inscription discovered in Damascus to be deciphered. We also learn that he held the office of kâfî in San'a, and it is related how in the emirate of Urwa b. Muhammad he once beat with the emir's stick to the effusion of blood an official (aswâl) against whom the people complain. When the saying is attributed to him that by accepting the office of judge, he lost the gift of foreseeing the future in dreams, this is only, as in numerous similar utterances, meant to be a warning against accepting this office (see Wensinck, in Oriental Studies presented to E. G. Brouwer, p. 496 sqq.). Many stories are told of his ascetic mode of life: for forty years no word of abuse of any living creature ever passed his lips; for forty years he never slept on a carpet and for twenty years never performed a mudab between the night and morning prayer (i.e. lived a life of continence). In keeping with this ascetic mode of life is the utterance he made after being thrown into prison: abâdha 'l-kâw lama 'l-âbâh fa-abâdabu lâhun siyâda 'l-bâdâw (Dbahat, op. cit., p. 492), an 'Islamic counterpart to Job, i. 21. Warnings against quarrelosomeness are also attributed to him and the advice not to avoid the society of men but rather to meet them with caution: be deaf when listening, blind when seeing or dumb when speaking. Wahb is said originally to have professed hadâr, but later rejected this teaching as in contradiction to all revealed scriptures. In what period of his life the already mentioned imprisonment fell, is not recorded; probably not till his last years for he died as a result of a fall to the ground to which he was sentenced by the governor of the Yemen, Yâsam b. 'Umar b. Thâ'labî, in 110 or 114 A.H.

Wahb's intimacy with the traditions of the Ahi b. Khalid is attributed to the fact that he had read 70, 72, 73 or even 92 of their holy scriptures, statements which, as the lists of his writings show, are pure inventions; his knowledge apparently came from intercourse with learned Jews and Christians in his native district. His statements which are sometimes in complete agreement with Jewish and Christian sources and sometimes variants adapted to Muslim tradition, are said to have been drawn from the field of Aâbâb al-A'mâhâr wa-l-Abâbâd wa'l-Mubâdâr (Ibn Sa'd, vili. 97), and were handed down to posterity by his pupils among whom several members of his own family were prominent. 'Abd al-Mun'im b. Idris (d. 229 A.H.), the son of his daughter, in particular, distinguished himself in preserving his grandfather's writings. Wahb's Kitâb al-Mubâdâr, which Thâ'labî used in the redaction of 'Abd al-Mun'im, is ascribed in the Fihrist, p. 94, to the latter and quoted by al-Mas'udi as Kitâb al-Mubâdâr wa-l-Siyâr, al-Mubâdâr in this title is to be interpreted as Mubâdâr al-Kâfî (cf. Ibn Kutilah, Mas'ûdî, p. 4) and al-Siyâr perhaps means not only the Kitâb al-A'mâhâr but also the Kitâb al-A'mâhâr (Hadâdî Khâli'a, No. 9436) where the A'mâhâr correspond to the 'Ubâdî of Ibn Sa'd, Hadâdî Khâli'a (No. 9826) also ascribed to Wahb a Kitâb al-Irâtît, which does not seem to have been known under this name at an earlier date. Yahut, ii, 124, says of Wahb that he was hadâr wa-la'nâf min al-islâm wa-l-hadâr wa-l-'asâs wa-l-irâtît, that is, he was a hadâr for the writings of 'Irâtît, i.e. Wahb used al-irâtît in the writings of 'Irâtît, origin, which Wahb used as sources. In later writers we frequently find quotations from Wahb's Irsâlit, but such passages are neither sufficiently reliable nor ample enough to reconstruct Wahb's supposed work, as Chauvin tried to do. It is certain that Wahb took account of Jewish as well as Christian tradition; this is proved by the numerous quotations which survive in Ibn Kutilah, Thâ'labî, Mas'ûdî, etc. Statements attributed to him even in these older sources are frequently contradictory and have apparently undergone all kinds of alterations in the various compilations to which they are to be traced. At a later period, stories of doubtful origin were readily given the authority of his name; in particular, what is credited to him in works like al-Kisiy's Kitâb clearly bears the stamp of later invention. In a separate work, the Kitâb al-Muilih al-mutawwadda wa-l-Himyar wa-al-Abhriram wa-l-Kâzâfîm wa-l-Abhirîm wa-l-Kâsâbirîm, Wahb dealt with the early legendary history of his native land. This work has not survived but it was presumably from it that Ibn Hishâm borrowed the introduction to his Kitâb al-Tâhib; Ibn Hishâm does not mention the name of the historian who takes Wahb's statements from the transmission of his grandfather. In the work used by Ibn Hishâm, Wahb follows Biblical sources completely in his account of early history and gives it — in contrast to the Western sources used in the Mubâdâr — the names and figures of the Biblical text exactly; he even regularly gives alongside of the Hebrew forms of names, those of the Syriac translation. Ibn Idrîs took over
Wahb's account of the beginnings of Christianity in South Arabia (Ibn Ḥishām, p. 20), and Tabari frequently quotes from Ibn Ḥishām the stories he had taken from Wahb. For the biography of Muhammad, on the other hand, Ibn Ḥishām never quotes Wahb as a source nor does Ḥāḍīqī, Ibn Sa'd or Ṣaḥābī, Ḥajjājī Khalfān, N. 12,403 however, says of Wahb that he collected maqāṣid and among the papyri of the Schott-Research collection, C. H. Becker discovered a fasciculus of a biography of the Prophet by Wahb which deals with events before the Hijra, and even includes the expedition against the Khāṭām. Wahb therefore did deal with maqāṣid proper. The same grandson of Wahb, 'Abd al-Man'am, as transmitted the Muhadditha, also appears in the Ṣaḥīḥ of the Heidelberg papyrus written in 228 A.H. The latter confirms what was already to be deduced from the quotations in Tabari and others that Wahb himself did not know of the use of the Ṣaḥīḥ; it also shows that Wahb, like Ibn Ḥishām, used to intercalate his stories with inserted poetry. Ibn Sa'd (VII, 97) mentions that Wahb's grandson used to read his stories, as well as his books, and a Ḥikmat Wahbī four parts is quoted by Abū Bakr Muhammad b. Khāliq (d. 575 A.H.) in his Fihrist (see Bibli. Ar. Hist., ix, 20) with a complete Ṣaḥīḥ going back to Wahb's nephew. This Ḥikma may be supposed to have been a collection of wise sayings taken, some from Jewish and Christian tradition and some wrongly ascribed to it; according to Ibn Kūtaiha, Wahb read over 10,000 chapters in the Ḥikmat al-Fātimiyyah. The Ma'ānī must have been of similar content, which the same Abū Bakr in his Fihrist (op. cit., p. 294) ascribes to Wahb and traces back to Abu 'l-Yasir, the pupil of Wahb and also mentioned in the Heidelberg papyrus. Finally, he also attributes to Wahb a translation of the Psalms (op. cit., p. 294): Kitāb Zabur al-Ṣawāfa Tarrajumah Wahb Ibn Munabbih; it is perhaps identical with the Kitāb al-Masānīs Tarrajumah al-Zabur which still exists, which however is not attributed to a particular author but is said to be by the 'Ulama al-islām in general (cf. 220B20). For the sake of completeness we may also mention the Kitāb al-Ṣawāfa, which Wahb composed but he later regretted having done so (see Yākūt, op. cit., p. 322) as well as the Fihrist, which Ḥajjājī Khalfān (N. 8902) quotes which but seem to be otherwise quite unknown.

Much has undoubtedly been attributed to Wahb for which he is not responsible. That he pursued serious studies can hardly be denied in view of the exact reproduction of Biblical matter preserved by Ibn Ḥishām in his Kitāb al-Tīfāq; when on the other hand even Ibn Kūtaiha points out the contradictions between Wahb's statements and the text of Genesis, the only explanation must be that either the information collected by Wahb was very early remoulded by those who transmitted it, in the manner of the popular story-tellers (faqīh), or that Wahb himself adapted it to popular taste.
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WAHBI, a Turkish poet, usually called Saiyid Wahbi to distinguish him from Sûnûlûzâde Wahbi (q.v.). He was a contemporary of Nûmân and like him a native of Sâmûbîl. His father Ḥajjâjî Âmûdî, the bâgâya of İnâmûdî, Kâfî of Venâîghârî, claimed to be descended from the Prophet through a certain Hâsûn Âl-Adîn. After the latter, his son Hâsûn, our poet, was at first given the nîsba Husûnî but then, on the suggestion of Âmûdî Nâlî, the man of letters, given instead the nîsba Wahbi, since it was a gift of God (wahb) that he combined himself in himself descend from the Prophet (siyâsûlû) with the gift of poetry (shârî'î).

Wahbi chose a judicial career and became mûlîl in Aleppo. When a son was born to his nîsba there, the latter was also called Wahbi after him; this boy later became the poet Sûnûlûzâde Wahbi. Saiyid Wahbi was present at the reception of the Persian ambassador Mustâdî Kûl Kûhân in Sâmûbîl in 1134 (1724). At the inspection of the Arsenal on this occasion he is said to have jokingly asked the ambassador to crush into a huge canon in order to be able to report this in İsfâhân as proof of its size, which, to the amusement of those present, the ambassador took seriously. The poet also took part in the reception to the ambassador 'Aqâ al-Azîz Kûhân in 1138 (1726). After Saiyid Wahbi had made the pilgrimage to Mecca and returned again to Sâmûbîl he died in 1149 (1736). He is buried in the cemetery of the monastery of the rope-dancers (Izânâbî Târîbî or Mûsûfî) near the mosque of Djarâth Pasha. His tombstone bears a šâhâdât by Âyânî Nûmân Efendî. A son of Saiyid Wahbi was the mûdârîs Mûnîn Efendî, who had also the reputation of being a poet and died as kâfî of Mûnîn in 1153.

Saiyid Wahbi is reckoned with Nûmân, Belîgh and Nûrâsîs as one of the most important representatives of the romantic group in the reign of Âmûdî III. He is, like them, mainly a court poet singing the praises of his Sultan. His works have not yet been printed. There is a manuscript in Vienna of the Kûlîyât (Flügel, N. 735). A šâhâdât of his is famous in which he celebrates the completion of a well in front of the Rûbî Humâyûn, and it is still to be read in letters of gold on the building. According to tradition, the Sultan himself had endeavoured to make a chronogram (šâhâdât) for it but could not work in the necessary values. The poet succeeded and then added a whole rhyming šâhâdât. Of other works, Wahbi left a dîmûsî, also a few isolated poems. He also completed a romantic methârîs begun by Kûfîzâde 'Abd al-'Azîz (d. 1631 = 1621) entitled Lailût usc-Mûsûfî. Of importance for social history is his book of festivals (Sûrûmûne, MS. in Vienna: Flügel, N. 1092) in which he describes the ceremonial at the court of Âmûdî III in connection with the circumcision of four princes and the marriage of five princesses in 1132 (1720) in vivid and attractive fashion. There is also a tâhâmîrî by him on a gazel of Nûmân, which endeavours to imitate
the latter; in other works however, in spite of the fact that he is of the school of Nādir, he strikes an individual note.

Ottoman critics are not quite agreed in their estimate of Wāhbi. Ziya Paša praises his fine language but finds his other work long-winded and faulty so that not twelve of his ghazals are worth picking out. Kemal and Nādir esteem him highly and would put him at least among the best poets of the second rank and above (Nādir: below) Sīlahrīdē Wehbi.


(W. BÖKKEMAN)

WAHHABĪYA, Islamic community founded by Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Wahhab (1115-1205 = 1703-1787). This name was given to the community by its opponents in the founder's lifetime, and is used by Europeans; it is not used by its members in Arabia, who call themselves Ṭurāzīdē fāsepī, "unitarians" and their system (ṣīḥa) "Muharramīan"; they regard themselves as Sunnī, following the teaching of Ibn Ḥanbal, as interpreted by Ibn Taimiyya, who attacked the cult of saints in many of his writings, especially in a Kitāb condemning the visitation of tombs (in his Rasūl, Cairo 1332).

§ 1. Life of the Founder. He was of the Banū Sinān, a branch of Tānim, and was born at ʿUyain (written by travellers ʿArabina, al-ʿArabina, al-ʿAjība, ʿAina), a place now in ruins, but which (according to L. P. Dame, in M. W., xii. 350) "at one time must have had a population of nearly 25,000". He studied at Mecca under Salāmīn al-Kubari and 'Abdul-Hamid Iyyāt al-Sindī, both of whom (according to al-Dhīlān) detected in him signs of heresy (īḥīā'). Many years of his life seem to have been spent in travel; according to the ʿLamʿi, he lived four years in ʿArab, where he was tutor in the house of a āṣāf Hàṣan; five years in Baghdād, where he married a wealthy woman, who died leaving him 2,000 dinārs; a year in Kūsān, two years in Hāmān, after which he went to Ṣafqū at the commencement of Nādir Shāh's reign (1148 = 1736); here he is said to have studied for four years peripatetic philosophy, the Ḥāshīyā and the Shiʿī systems; for a year he attracted students as an exponent of Ṣūfī, then went to Kūmm, after which he became an advocate of Ibn Ḥanbal's school. Returning to ʿUyain, where he had property, he spent eight months in retirement, and then publicly preached his doctrines, as set forth in his Kitāb al-Tuwārid. He met with some success, but also with much opposition, and indeed from his own relations, such as his brother Salāmīn, who wrote a tract against him, and his cousin 'Abd Allah b. Ḥusain. It appears from his correspondence that his views attracted attention outside ʿUyain before he left the place. Different reasons are assigned for his expulsion; according to the ʿLamʿ, his dispute with his cousin led to bloodshed between the Tānim clan of Yūmān, in consequence of which Salāmīn b. Ṣūfī, al-Anazi, prince of ʿArab, wrote to the governor of the place demanding that he be expelled. He departed with his family and property, said to be considerable, and was received at Darīya (at the time a village of 70 houses) where the chieflain ʿAbdul-Muḥammad b. Saʿīd accepted his doctrine and undertook its defence and propagation. Possibly later events originated the statement that the two came to an arrangement whereby, should they succeed in enforcing their system on their neighbours, the sovereignty should rest with Ibn Saʿīd, whereas the religious headship should belong to ʿAbd al-Wahhab; this in any case represents the relations between the two. The founder's subsequent history belongs to that of the fortunes of the community.

§ 2. Doctrines of Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Wahhab. His general aim was to do away with all innovations (ḥadda) which were later than the third century of Islam; thus the community are able to acknowledge the authority of the four sunnī law schools, and the six books of tradition. His written polemic and that of his followers is almost entirely aimed at the cult of saints, as exhibited in the building of mausoleums, their employment as mosques, and their visitation. The following list which is taken from the ʿLamʿ seems to agree with what is known of Wahhabī practice.

1. All objects of worship other than Allah are false, and all who worship such are deserving of death.
2. The bulk of mankind are not monotheists, since they endeavour to win God's favour by visiting the tombs of saints; their practice therefore resembles what is recorded in the ʿUṣūl of the Meccan ṣunnahīn.
3. It is polytheism (zhār) to introduce the name of a prophet, saint, or angel, into a prayer.
4. It is zhār to seek intercession from any but Allah.
5. It is zhār to make vows to any other being.
6. It involves unbelief (ḥarām) to profess knowledge not based on the ʿUṣūl, the Sunnah, or the necessary inferences of the reason.
7. It involves unbelief and heresy (ḥift) to deny ḥadāth in all acts.
8. It involves unbelief to interpret the ʿUṣūl by a tuwārid.

His system is said to have departed from that of Ibn Ḥanbal in the following manners:

1. Attendance at public ṣalāḥ is obligatory.
2. Smoking of tobacco is forbidden and punished with stripes not exceeding forty; the shaving of the beard and the use of alcoholic language are to be punished at the ʿālim's discretion.
3. Allms (ṣahāb) are to be paid on secret profits, such as those of trading, whereas Ibn Ḥanbal exacted them only from manifest produce.
4. The mere utterance of the Islamic creed is not sufficient to make a man a believer, so that animals slaughtered by him are fit for food. Further inquiry must be made into his character.

The list given by S. Zwemer in The Muḥammādin World of to-day (New York 1906, p. 106) does not differ materially from the above, but contains the following item which may be noticed:

They forbid the use of the rosary, and count the names of God and their prayers on the knuckles of the hand instead.
Wahhābi mosques are built with the greatest simplicity, and no minarets nor ornaments are allowed.

The *Nawmāt al-A fighter devotes a long section to a list of the practices savouring of paganism prevalent in Arabia in Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb’s time; besides the visitation of tombs, reverence was paid to sacred trees and gilibs, and food was placed on graves. It is clear that the two latter were not "innovations," but survivals of pre-Islamic usage. Charges brought against him of burning theological works on a great scale are treated both by himself and his followers as calumnies; they neither admit the burning of the work *Rawm al-Khatib*; but not (apparently) that of *Dallāl al-Khatīrīt*. The charge of rejecting the Sunna altogether (repeated by Nolde) is certainly erroneous. On the other hand, the destruction of tombs on a great scale was practised both by Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb and his followers. The former destroyed that of Zaid b. al-Khaṣṣāb at Dhubaila, and it has recently been carried on on a great scale at al-Raj’ of Medina, as a comparison of the photographs in Kilat Pascha’s *Mil’at al-Hamannin* (1925) with Eddon Rutter’s *Holy Cities of Arabia* (1928) shows.

Various minor points of ritual, in which they claim to have abolished innovations are enumerated in *al-Hadīya al-Sunnīya*, p. 47–49; such as: raising the voice in places of *ṣajja* with matter other than the *ṣajja*; reciting the Tradition of Abu Huraira before the Friday sermon; special gatherings to hear the *Sirāt al-Nabi* recited, etc.

It would appear that under the Bani Ḥāshid the founder’s precepts were followed less rigorously than under the Bani Ṣa‘ūd; yet Philby in confining the name Wahhabi to the followers of the latter does not differ from the other travellers, who regarded Ḥāshid as for a time the metropolis of the community. As has been seen, the community does not itself recognize the appellation.

§ 3. Early history of the movement. It is certain that within the year of Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb’s arrival at Darʿiya he had won the assent of all the inhabitants except four, who left the place; he proceeded to build a mosque with a floor of uncarpeted gravel; there he gave instruction in his *Nawmāt al-Tawwīl*, punishing those who failed to attend. But he also gave instruction in the use of fire-arms. The new sect soon became involved in war with the Bani Riyād, Duhātam b. Dawwāṣ, which, commencing in 1160 (1747), lasted 28 years. During this period Ibn Sa‘ūd and his son ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, who proved a capable general, were steadily winning ground, with occasional reverses; it became the practice of Ibn Sa‘ūd and his son, when they captured a place, to build a fort at some distance from the original citadel, with a most round it, if the soil were suitable. These forts were garrisoned with men called *almusri*, who were well paid. In the larger places a jābī and a mutil were installed, in the smaller only a jābī. The series of raids whereby the power of Ibn Sa‘ūd gradually grew is sketched by Philby, and need not be reproduced. In 1178 (1765) Ibn Sa‘ūd died, and was succeeded by ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, who retained Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Wahhāb as his religious guide. In the following year a deputation was sent to Mecca, which was honourably entertained by the Sharīf, and satisfied the theologians appointed to discuss matters with it, that the Wahhabi doctrine accorded with the system of Ibn Ḥanbal. In 1187 (1773) the most stubborn opponent of the sect, Duhātam, fled from Riyād, which was occupied by ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, who was now master of "the Province of Najd from Qatif in the north to Khajr in the south" (Philby). The son of ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, Sa‘ūd, also displayed some military capacity, and was employed by his father in various expeditions. Meanwhile relations had become strained with the new Sharīf of Mecca, Surūr, who forbade the Wahhabis access to the city as pilgrims: but owing to the difficulties which resulted to pilgrims from ‘Irāq and Persia, this prohibition was withdrawn in 1190 (1785).

In 1192 Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Wahhāb died, at the age of 82; in the years that followed (1192–1195) the Wahhabis advanced eastwards, subduing the Bani Ḥāshid in Ḥaṣā; but even before 1190 they had made casual raids into the grazing grounds of the Mutaṣaṣik and other tribes on the borders of ‘Irāq; and representations having been made to the Porte of the danger from the new power that was arising in Arabia, the Paşha of Bagdad received instructions to deal with it. In 1193, Thuwanī, chief of the Mutaṣaṣik, was put to death for a time been exiled, but was now officially in control of Bayra, collected a force with the view of crushing the Wahhabis, but was assassinated by a negro slave at Shībik on July 1, 1194, in consequence of which the force dispersed. Meanwhile the new Sharīf of Mecca, Ghaθib, after some attempts at compromise, had been attacking the Wahhabī communities from the west, with very little success. In 1198 a fresh expedition was organized from Bagdad on a great scale, but this also proved abortive, and in the following year a treaty between the opponents was ratified in Bagdad. It had little effect, as the Wahhabi tribes continued to raid, and in 1199 invaded and sacked Kerbelā; and massacred the inhabitants. In 1193 Ghaθib found it necessary to evacuate Mecca, which was entered by Sa‘ūd, who proceeded to purge the city of all that in Wahhabi opinion savoured of idolatry, and to execute persons suspected of favouring such practices. His attempts on Djjdā and Medina failed, and in the same year he left the Hijjāz, where the garrison which he had established in Mecca was massacred by the inhabitants. On Nov. 4 of this year (1203), the Wahhabi Ibrāhīm, ‘Abd al-‘Azīz I, was assassinated at Dar‘iya by a Shī‘ from Kerbelā, who had come to the capital as a pretended convert to Wahhabism; Sa‘ūd, who had previously been declared heir-apparent, succeeded him without opposition, and employed his son ‘Abd Allah as commander of the army. A fresh attack on the Wahhabis was organized from Bagdad, but petered out, as the previous summer’s expeditions had done; Sa‘ūd was thus left free to renew his invasion of the Hijjāz, where Medina capitulated in 1204, Mecca in February 1806, and Djjdā some months later. In the following years his raiders advanced beyond the bounds of Arabia, attacking Nadjaf, and Damascus, which successfully resisted. The Wahhabi empire extended in 1211 from Aleppo in the north to the Indian Ocean (?) and from the Persian Gulf and the Iraq frontier in the east to the Red Sea" (Philby). The alarm felt by the Ottoman government was now so serious that Muhammad `Ali Pašha, ruler of Egypt, was authorized to deal with it. He proceeded to do with his usual energy, and although his army, commanded by his son Tūsūn,
suffered an initial defeat, it was after reinforcement able to take Medina in 1812, and recover Mecca in the following year. Muhammad 'Ali himself took the command in the latter half of 1813, and suffered a serious defeat, but the death of Sa'ūd on May 1, 1814, was a blow to the Wahhabi cause, since 'Abd Allah, who succeeded him, was far less capable. Tāṣūn, whom Muhammad 'Ali left in command, found it necessary to make a treaty with 'Abd Allah, who was to acknowledge the sovereignty of the Ottoman Sultan, while the Egyptians were to evacuate Najd; but this treaty was denounced by Muhammad 'Ali, who in 1816 organized a fresh expedition under the command of the able Ibrahim Pasha. (Since Philby has repeated the story told by Palgrave about the carpet, cut in proportioons with an apple set in the midst, which Ibrahim succeeded in reaching without treading on the carpet, by rolling the latter up, it may be observed that this story comes from Ibn al-Thir, who records it in connexion with an event of the year 444H. Ibrahim fought with varied fortunes, but on April 6, 1818 reached Dar'iyah, and on Sep. 9 took the capital. 'Abd Allah himself surrendered and was sent to Constantinople, where he was beheaded. This terminated the first Wahhabi empire.

§ 4. Restoration of the Wahhabi state after Ibrahim Pasha's departure. While the Hidjaz after the conquest was securely garnished by Turkish troops, less importance was attached to the security of Najd, where a revolt was organized by Turks, a cousin of Sa'ūd, who chose Riyadh for the capital of the reviving community, and established himself there in 1821. "By 1833 the whole coast of the Persian Gulf acknowledged Wahhabi rule and paid tribute" (Sir W. Wilson), and several of the inland provinces which had formerly been held by Sa'ūd were recovered. During the absence of Turki's son Faqih at the head of his army the former was assassinated in 1834 by a pretender of the royal family, who shortly afterwards met the same fate at the hands of Faqih, aided by a Shammar chieftain, 'Abd Allah b. Rashid, who was rewarded for his service by the governorship of Ha'il.

§ 5. The Rashid dynasty of Ha'il. 'Abd Allah b. Rashid, a capable ruler, continued to maintain amicable relations with both the Egyptian overlord and the Wahhabi ruler of Riyadh till his death in 1847, when he was succeeded by his son Tali, known to Europeans from Palgrave's travels, who calls him "a warrior even more energetic than his father, and infinitely his superior in the arts of statesmanship". His military skill was displayed in his conquest of the Hijaz, of Khaibar, and of Ta'izz; the province of Qasim, which belonged to the sovereign of Riyadh, voluntarily transferred its allegiance to Tali, and steps were taken to pacify the Bedouin raiders on all sides. (Henceforth no Bedouin in Jebel Shammar, or throughout the whole kingdom, could dare to molest travellers or peasants) (Palgrave). Tali further encouraged the presence of traders in Hai'il by offering liberal terms and security to members of different religious communities. In 1868 this ruler took his own life, through fear of losing his position; he was followed by his brother Mis'ab, shortly afterwards murdered by Tali's sons Badi and Bandar, of whom the latter assumed the sovereignty; he was shortly afterwards slain by another brother of Tali, Muhammud, who inagurated his rule with a massacre, described by Doughty (ii. 16). Doughty's statistical computation of the populations under the rule of Ibn Rashid at this time at 30,000 and of his revenue at £30,000 and expenditure at £13,000, is criticized by Philby as an understatement. About the same time Faqih died at Riyadh (Dec. 25, 1860) and was succeeded by his son 'Abd Allah, who had endeavoured to obtain poison from Palgrave for his brother Sa'ūd. The latter obtained allies who helped him to dethrone his brother in 1870; his reign was marked by the loss of Hasa to the Turks, and other losses on the west; and on his death in 1877 'Abd Allah returned to Riyadh as ruler, it is said through the influence of Muhammad b. Rashid. Relations between the two soon became strained, and in 1883 a pitched battle took place between the forces of the two, wherein Ibn Rashid won a complete victory; peace was made but a revolt of Sa'ūd's sons in 1884 gave Ibn Rashid the opportunity to invade Riyadh; despatch 'Abd Allah to Hai'il, and place a governor of his own in Riyadh. "Ultimately in the spring of 1891 events occurred which seemed to settle the fate of Najd for a long time" (E. Nolde, Reise in Insurabien, 1895, p. 69); a great alliance was formed against the too powerful Emir of Hai'il, consisting of 1. "Utalha under its warlike chieftain Zaud; 2. the whole royal family of Riyadh; 3. the towns Buraids, Kaa's and Shaker; 4. the united tribes "Utalha and "Mutajair. According to Nolde, who gives the most detailed account of this campaign, the forces on either side numbered about 30,000; in the struggle, which lasted a whole month, the initial results were in favour of the allies; but at the end of the month (March) Ibn Rashid succeeded by a mass attack of 20,000 camels in spreading panic among the allies' infantry, and won a complete victory (battle of Mulaidah). Riyadh had been during this rising governed by 'Abd al-Rahman, another son of Faqih; after the defeat of the allies he sought refuge in various places and finally received protection in Kuwait. Muhammad b. Rashid was ruler of desert Arabia till his death in 1897.

§ 6. Restoration of the Sa'ud dynasty. Muhammad was succeeded by his nephew 'Abd al-'Aziz son of Miš'ab; and so long this ruler was involved in a struggle with the Sheikhs of Kuwait, who was harbouring 'Abd al-Rahman b. Sa'ūd and his family. In January of 1901 'Abd al-'Aziz, son of 'Abd al-Rahman, at the head of a small force succeeded in entering Riyadh, and re-establishing the old dynasty there; after an interval of eleven years spent in exile. The succeeding years were spent by him in recovering provinces which had belonged to the old Wahhabi empire, and by 1904 "he was master of all that his grandfather had ruled effectually in Najd" (Philby). The campaigns which he conducted in the following years against Ibn Rashid, the Turks, disaffected tribes, pretenders of his own family, and finally the rulers of the Hidjaz, are recorded in detail by Philby, but only a few events of importance need be mentioned here. On Nov. 2, 1911 Ibn Sa'ūd seized possession of Hai'il, and put an end to the Rashid dynasty. In October 1924 he seized occupied Mecca; on Dec. 5, 1925 they obtained possession of Medina, and on Dec. 23 1923 Djjada. Thus the whole of the Hijaz was added to Ibn Sa'ūd's realm.

§ 7. Institution of the Ikhwān. In 1913
In India the foundation of agricultural colonies, whose residents were to be devotees, who took the title ḍhīfāṣ, "heathen", indicating that the religious tie had superceded that of the tribe. The first of these colonies was Araria (the locality is called by Philby, Rihani by Rihani) in the Kasim, and its inhabitants were mainly drawn from the Mughal treasurers. The able-bodied were provided with grants to be used in the ḍīḥāṣ, but they were also told to cultivate the land, which in some cases was near a source of water, and the accumulation of wealth was encouraged. Mud huts were built to serve the Bedouin in lieu of their tents, and they were told to sell their camels. About seventy ḍhīfās (the name for these colonies) with a population of 2,000 to 10,000 each sprang up after the Wahhabi revival in about ten years," writes Ameen Rihani, who adds that the Wahhabi doctrine is to be found in three classes: Ulema, who have become farmers, missionaries called muḥāfīz, and the merchant class; but for military purposes the division is into those who are at all times ready to respond to the call to the ḍīḥāṣ, the reserves, who in time of peace are herdsmen and journeymen, while the third class are those who remain in the colonies to keep up trade and agriculture, though not exempt from military service if necessary. The first two classes can be called out by the şalat, but the muḥāfīz, or calling out of the civil population requires an announcement by the ʿalāma, that it is necessary. A list of the ḍhīfāṣ with their population and the tribes represented is given by him (Jum Nāṣib al-ʿArabī, 1928, p. 198). Dame (L. s.) declared that the agriculture of these ḍhīfāṣ was exceedingly primitive, and that the movement was on the wane.

§ 8. Wahhabism in India. The Wahhabi doctrine was introduced into India by one Saiyid Ahmad, a native of the British District of Rai Bareli, born 1786; having already adopted puritan views, during his pilgrimage to Mecca in 1822—1823 he incurred the hostility of the authorities by the similarity of his doctrines to those of the Wahhabites, and having been expelled from the holy city, became an adherent of the Wahhabi system. He had already acquired a large following in India, and established a permanent centre in Patna, where he appointed four ḍhīfāṣ, and an imām; visits to Bombay and Calcutta swelled the numbers of his followers, and in 1824 he was at the head of an army at the Peshawar frontier, preaching a ḍīḥāṣ against the Sikh chieftains of the Punjab. (Jumādā al-ʿAṣar, 1242 Dec. 21, 1825) was fixed as the date for the commencement of the war, which all Muslims were called upon to join, in a proclamation called ṣarāḥb al-Ḥāṣ. The resistance, Saiyid Ahmad's army took Peshawar towards the end of 1830. He proceeded to take the title ḍhīfāṣ and to strike coins in his own name. His reign was ephemeral, as he was killed by a Sikh army in the following year. His adherents however found a refuge at Sattara in the mountains beyond the Indus, whither those Muslims who were unwilling to live under non-Muslim rule fled, and two of his ḍhīfāṣ from Patna circulated the doctrine that Saiyid Ahmad was not dead, but was merely hidden with the view to reappearance at a suitable time. They founded the ḍīḥāṣ to Hindus and British, and started an insurrection in Lower Bengal, under a disciple of Saiyid Ahmad, Tīvā Mīrā, who, after some successes was defeated and killed by government forces (Nov. 17, 1831). In spite of these defeats the ḍhīfāṣ continued to spread among the Muslim population of India, and while maintaining the puritan doctrines of the Wahhabites of Arabia concentrated attention on the duty of the ḍīḥāṣ. The Wahhabi movement thus became a constant source of trouble to the government of India, since a system was devised whereby funds were collected and men selected and trained to be sent first to the headquarters of the community at Panya, and thence to the frontier camp of Sattara, and thereafter employed in fighting against the non-Muslim rulers of India. After a great deal of trouble, destruction of property, and bloodshed had been caused by their efforts, and a series of trials had revealed the ramifications of the conspiracy, the older Muslim communities of India, both Ḍūʾa' and Sunna, in 1870 and 1871 issued official declarations dissociating themselves from the Wahhabi doctrine of ḍīḥāṣ. Since that time, the sect, though it still exists in India, has attracted little attention and indeed one portion of it is said to have abandoned the doctrine of ḍīḥāṣ. As late, however, as 1890, according to E. A. Oliver (Across the Border, p. 29), it had not ceased to be formidable.

§ 9. Wahhabism in Other Countries. Schuyler in his Turkestan (London 1876, ii. 254) mentions the presence of Wahhabi preachers in Khokand; in 1871 an attack was made on the Russian station Kara, on the high road between Taškent and Hodjent, led by Iyān Ḫālid Muhammad Kal, disciple of a Khokandian Wahhabi preacher, Sāfī Badal. Here, as in India, the aim of the community was to throw off non-Muslim authority, but the forces collected were too excessive to accomplish anything of consequence. The presence of the community in Afghanistan is connected with their aim in India.

§ 10. Wahhabi Literature. Prior to Ibn Saʿūd's recent conquest of the Ḥijāz there appears to have been no printing office in Wahhabi territory; the works of Muhammad b.ʿAbd al-Wahhab circulated in MS. Those contained in the British Museum (MS. Or. 4540) are Muḥāfāṣ al-Sūra, Ḥudūd al-Taḥkī, ʿAṣāṣ al-Kalābī; the autographs are said to be preserved in the Landberg collection at Leyden. The Ḥudūd al-ʿArāf contains a number of his Rasāʾil and Fāṣāṣ. A collection of Wahhabi tracts of different dates was published in Cairo by order of the king of the Ḥijāz and edited by Sulaymān b. Sulaymān (2nd edition, 1344); they are by ʿAbd al-ʿAsīr, ʿAbd Allāh son of Muhammad b.ʿAbd al-Wahhab, Ahmad b. Nasīr b. Muḥammad, ʿAbd al-Lāṭīf of the family of the founder, and his son Muhammad. The title of the collection is Ḥudūd al-Sanīyya wa-Talḥa al-Wahhābī al-Nāṣīfīya. The content of all these is doctrinal, as is that of an anonymous Risāla inserted by ʿAbd al-Ḥāṣ al-Fāḥshī in his Tāṣāṣ al-Ālam (Cairo 1327; reproduced in the Māʾār, xii. 390 and xii. 739).

Numerous tracts have been written against the Wahhabis; three preserved in the Berlin Library belong, according to Ahlwardt, to the commencement of the founder's activities (see his Catalogus, No. 2156, 2157, 2158). Dalais mentions one by the founder's brother Sulayman, one by Muḥammad b.ʿAbd al-ʿRāḥmān, b. ʿAṣīkī, (Zakāh al-Maḥšidīh in-maʿa suḥa Tāṣāṣ al-Dīn), and one by ʿAlī b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Baḥdālī (al-Miṣgūrī, 1835).
al-Muḥfīṣ). Some belonging to the middle of the sixteenth century are preserved in Cambridge University Library (see Browne’s Handlists). Two which have attracted especial attention are al-Durrar al-
ṣārīyā by ʿAbd al-Ṣāliḥ b. Zayn al-Dīn (about 1500); and printed in Bairūt in 1900), and a tract by ʿAṭālī b. Ḥāfṣih, by Baghdaḍī (recent).

The biography of the founder which has been excerpted above (Lam al-
ṣāḥīb fi Sulam Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-
Wahhāb, Brit. Museum MSS.) is somewhat, but not excessively hostile. Philby mentions it as Wahhābī historians Ḥusayn b. Ghanīmah al-Najjāh,* who died more than a century ago,* and ʿUṯmān b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd al-
Hanbali of the fifth decade of the sixteenth century. A British Museum MSS. (Add. 19, 799) without name of author, called Rawāʾī al-
ṣāḥīb wa l-
ṣāḥīb al-
Mushāriq, ʿAḥmad b. ʿAbd al-
Ṣāliḥ has in two volumes, of which the second is a chronicle of Wahhābī campaigns ending with the year 1212, whereas the first contains chapters dealing with various aspects of the founder’s mission and activities.

Several members of the ruling families are credited with skill in versification; specimens of Wahhābī poetry are given in an appendix to al-
Hadīth al-
Ṣaṣānīyyah.

The Wahhābīs of India appear to have employed the printing or lithographic press on a considerable scale. Hunter, p. 66, enumerates 13 works in Arabic, Persian, and Urdu by Wahhābī authors of this country, and adds that the Husayniyyah of the Wahhābī treatises in prose and verse on the duty to wage war against the English would fill a volume.* A work by Muhammad Ḥusayn, nephew of Sayyid ʿAḥmad, al-
Ṣaṣānī, is said to be the "Kūrān of the Wahhābīs of India."

**Bibliography:** British Museum MSS. mentioned in Vol. 10, II. St. John Philby, Arabia (London 1930: a complete history of the community to date of publication); A. Musli, Northern Nijar (New York 1928: p. 256–304 furnishes a continuous history); Ameen Rihani, Ibn Sawūd of Arabia and his Land (London 1928); S. E. Mills, The Countries and Tribes of the Persian Gulf (London 1919: treats especially of the dealings of the Wahhābīs with Ḥāfiz; S. H. Longrigg, Four Centuries of Modern Iraq (Oxford 1925: treats especially of their dealings with the British). For the Indian community: W. W. Hunter, The Indian Muslum (London 1871); Calcutta Review, vol. 1 and 2; (Calcutta 1870); W. R. van Dissevel, De leen der Wahhābītiten, thesis Leiden University, Leyden 1927.

D. S. MARSHALL: WĀḤIDĪ, THE NAME OF A DYNASTY IN SOUTHERN ARABIA, which rules over three sub-tribes, those of the 'Arab 'Ama'īn, Bāl Ḥāfiz 'Isā'īn and Ḥāfiz al-Ṣāliḥ. H. v. Maltzan (p. 222) after investigation divided the whole territory belonging to this ruling house into two groups: Lower Wahhid on the coast from 48° to 50° 30' East Long. (Greenwich) in the 14° N. Lat. reaching barely two hours journey into the interior, and Upper Wahhid from 47° to 48° 30' East Long. (Greenwich) and from 40° 20' to 4° 5° 30' N. Lat. C. v. Landburg (p. 180) gives Ḥāfiz al-Kuśārī in the west and al-
Ṣāliḥ al-
Ḥānṣūr in the east as the boundaries of the coast territory. The lands of the Wahhid dynasty therefore lie between those of the 'Awāli̇ and Ḥāfiz al-Ṣāliḥ. The most important area in the lower Wahhid territory is the Wālī Ma'īṣa, which reaches the sea about east of Ras al-
Kuśārī and is the lower course of the Wālī Ḥādī; its most important place is 1201 al-
Ṣāliḥ. The coast territory is so divided by the lower Wahhid into Bāl Ḥāfiz and Bāl Ḥāfiz 'Isā'īn that the former rules the land between Ḥūṣ al-
Ḥānṣūr and the promontory of Ras al-
Ṣāliḥ, while the latter rules from here to Ras al-
Kuśārī. Wālī Ma'īṣa belongs to the lower Wahhid, who lives in the summer at Ḥūṣ, but the ruler of Bāl Ḥāfiz 'Isā'īn also has land there. The two important harbours are Bāl Ḥāfiz al-Ju'wān and Bāl Ḥāfiz al-
Ṣāliḥ which is used in winter.

To the Upper Wahhid territory belong the Wālī Ma'īṣa of Bāl Ḥāfiz, which is independent, Wālī Ṭabār, al-
Ṣāliḥ, al-
Ṭāmūr, al-
Ṣāliḥ, and al-
Ṭabār, with the most important place which bears the same name. The Beutu tribes of Nu'mān, Sa'd and Ṭabār as well as the Ḥyam tribes of Ḥid al-
Ṣāriq, Bāl Ḥāfiz, al-
Ṭabār, and al-
Ṭamūr are distributed over the Wahhid territory. The wadi is particularly rich and fertile and produce cereals and dates, as well as tobacco, indigo and cotton. Textiles are manufactured, notably in al-
Ḥāfiz, while carpentry flourishes in al-
Ḥāfiz. Ḥūṣ al-
Ṣāliḥ and al-
Ṣāliḥ are important centres of the Saharan period.

In 1870 negotiations took place with Sultan Ḥāfiz regarding the cession of the two ports of Bāl Ḥāfiz and al-
Ṭabār to the Turks who wished to build quarantine stations there. This plan fell through however, owing to English opposition, as it involved the cession of a Turkish port to the Turks. However, in 1870, the Sultan of Bāl Ḥāfiz and al-
Ṭabār agreed to the cession of the town of al-
Ṭabār to the British, with the condition that the Sultan should have the right to collect duties on trade at the port.


A. GROHMANN: WĀḤSHĪ BĀFĶI, a Persian poet, born al-
Ṭabār, in Kirmān, died in 991 (1583) or 992 (1584) and spent most of his life in Yazd. He wrote paraphrases in honour of Shah Ṭahmāsp I and his court, began a poem (Ferādž u-Nād) which he did not complete; it was finished long afterwards by Ḥādī in 1265 (1848–1849). He wrote two other poems, Khudā Bārīn and Rūṭī
Wahshi Baki — Wahy

w-Mansur, ghulal’s and `abid’s. Forhad’s w-Shirin
has been lithographed in Persia and several times
in India.

Bibliography: La t’Ali Beg; Ateeh Kodeh,
Hombay 1277; p. 111—120; Ridj Kulli Hijn,
Mujzma al-Muqadda, li. 51—541; Rien, Pers.
Literature in Modern Times, Cambridge 1924,
p. 358; W. Ivanso. Descriptive Catalogue, Cali-
cutta 1924, p. 300.

Wahy (Ar.), revelation [cf. also PROPHETS,
MUHAMMAD]. As to the etymology of the word,
cl. Jewish-Arabic تحية "to hasten", Anthropic
Wahy, "to go round, to recognize", and the non-
religious meaning ليه make it heard given by the
Dictionary of Technical Terms; on the use of the
verb by the pens, see Litts, v. v. As a religious
technical term it is distinguished from inspiration
(إلهام, q. v.), of saints, artists and others, from
نفل which chiefly denotes the object of revelation
and from إنذر which denotes the sending down
of revelation from heaven and from its heavenly
archetypal [see UMMAK-NABU], in so far as it
denotes revelation as transmitted to the
prophets.

Use in the Kur’ân. a. In the early passage
 sûra xix. 5. The earth is the object of divine
revelation: On that day shall she (the earth) tell
out her tidings, because thy Lord hath inspired
her. In sûra xxviii. 6. The object of revelation
is the mother of Moses: here ali-Badawi explains
the term by inspiration or vision, in order to
distinguish it from wahy proper. Likewise in sûra
xxix. 12 the subject of انذر is Zakaryya and its
object his people; here it is explained by اسماء’s.
In a peculiar way the term is used in sûra vi.
112: Even thus have We given an enemy to every
prophet, Satanas among men and among djins:
twice discourses do they suggest (يُدعَ) the one
to the other, in order to deceive.

The technical term for daemonic inspiration
is يُدعَ. The means of communicating between
God and man is wahy, either directly, or
indirectly through the intermediary of the angels:
It is not for man that God should speak with
him but by revelation, or from behind a veil, or
He sendeth a messenger to reveal by Him, or he
sendeth a messenger to reveal by His permission,
what He will (sûra xlii. 50 sg.). — Allah’s com-
munications to the angels are also called wahy,
sûra xliii. 121: When the Lord revealed unto the
angels: I will be with you etc.

b. In many passages wahy and the verb انذر refer
to the prophets before Muhammad: نُبى
(sûra xxiii. 37); مای (sûra xx. 13 etc.; xxi. 7;
xxii. 160), يُسْتَذَر (sûra xlii. 13) etc. — All those
who were sent before Muhammad, were men to
whom We granted revelations (sûra xxlii. 7).

The chief object of revelation in the Kur’ân
is Mahommades. Sûra xili. 29: Thus have We sent
thee to a people whose other peoples have preceded,
that thou mightest rehearse to them our revelations
to thee. — Sûra xxiv. 49: But I have guid-
ance. It is of my Lord’s revealing. Mahommades’s con-
temporaries are astonished at his receiving revelations:
A matter of astonishment to the men (of
Mocca) that to a man among themselves We
teach and to. (sûra x. 2). But he says: I say not
to you, “In my possession are the treasures of
God”; nor “I know things secret”, neither do I
say to you, “Verily, I am an angel”: only what
is revealed to me do I follow (sûra vi. 50).

The words of Allah that revealed to him may not
be changed: And publish what hath been revealed
to thee of the book of the Lord, none may change his
words (sûra xvii. 26).

The divine character of Muhammed’s revelations
is emphasized in sûra lii. 4: Verily, it is no other
than a revelation revealed; his honesty in sûra vi.
92: But is any more wicked than he who deviseth
a lie of God, or saith, “I have had a revelation”.
when nothing was revealed to him. — Mahommades
therefore is ordered to follow nothing but what
was revealed to him by his Lord (sûra xxi. 2;
xiii. 42). He does not forbid any food, because
he does not find such a prohibition among his
revelations (sûra vi. 146).

d. The contents and the aim of revelation are
described in various ways [see also MUHAMMAD].
The story of the Al ‘Imran is interrupted by the
verse (sûra iii. 39): This is one of the announce-
ments of things by thee unseen: To thee do we reveal it. — The story of Yashûf is introduced
to him with the verse: In revealing to thee this
Kur’ân, one of the most beautiful narratives will
We relate to thee, of which thou hast verily
more time been regardless (sûra xii. 3)—
Muhammad’s following “the religion of Ibrahim” is
ascribed to divine inspiration (sûra xvi. 124),
likewise his knowledge about the djins listening
to the recitation of the Kur’ân (sûra lixii. 1), as
well as about the disputations of the angels at the
creation of man is due to wahy (sûra xxxviii. 69 sqq.).

The aim of the revelation of the Kur’ân is men-
tioned in sûra vi. 19: And this Kur’ân hath been
reveal to me, that I should warn you by it
and all whom it shall reach.

Various terms are used in the Kur’ân in order
to denote the contents of revelation. Sûra v. 52: And
to thee We have sent down the book with truth
(cf. sûra xxxix. 2; 42; xxxii. 2; xxii. 72; xvii. 106, etc.),
confirmatory of previous scripture and its safe-
guard (cf. vi. 92). — Sûra xxxi. 1 sg.: These
are the signs of the wise book, a guidance and a
mercy to the righteous. — Sûra xxvii. 1: These
are the signs of the Kur’ân and of the lucid book;
guidance and glad tidings to the believers.
Sûra vii. 50: And now We have brought thee
the book: with knowledge have we explained it:
a guidance and mercy to them that believe. — Sûra
xxiii. 52: And thus we have sent the spirit to thee
with a revelation by our command. Thou
knewest not, ere this, what the book was, or what
the faith. But we have ordained it for a light.
Further the contents of revelation are called
knowledge (علم, sûra iii. 54; li. 114, 140), wis-
dom (sûra xvii. 41), guidance (sûra xli. 10; vii.
50 etc.), healing (sûra xlii. 44), light (sûra iv.
174; xliii. 52).

Regarding the forms of revelation recorded in the
biographies of Mahommades the following may be
said. The beginning of revelation consisted in dreams
anticipating real events (Ibn Hähim, p. 151; Tabari,
Tafsir, xxx. 138; Ibn Sa’d, i, 129). Also after-
wards such dream visions are said to have occurred.
When A’shar was under suspicion, he hoped that
Allah would reveal her innocence to Mahommades
in a dream vision (Abjad b. Hâmbal, vi. 197;
Bakhtari, Tafsir, s. 24, ba’h 6).

The first revelation in which Jibbân appeared to
Muhammed took place on mount Hira; when
The angel said to him: I am Dāirīr. Thereupon Muhammad hastened to Ḫādījā, crying: Wrap me up (ṣūra lxxiii. 1 or lxxiv. 1).

The first portion of the Qurān revealed was ṣūra xxi., when the angel, in the month of Ramādān, during his retreat, showed him a piece of cloth, on which this ṣūra was written, saying: recite! When Muhammad protested that he could not write, the angel pressed him so strongly that he was nearly suffocated. At the third repetition the angel pronounced the verses which Muhammad retained.

After this there came a pause (ṣafra) in revelation. During this time Muhammad was in such commotion that the thought of suicide came up in him (Ṭabarî, ed. de Goeje, i. 1150; Ibn Hāshim, p. 136, 166; Ibn Sa'd, i. 131). The pause ended with the revelation of ṣūra lxxv or xxvii.

The angel who transmitted revelation was visible to Muhammad and to others (Bukhārī, Fadā'il al-Qurān, līb 1; Ibn Hāshim, p. 154, cf. 156; Abū Nu'aim, p. 69). To some extent the ascension [cf. Mīrāj] and the night journey may also be reckoned as revelations. Visions also are mentioned in the Qurān. Ṣūra lxxiii. 18 ṣayr: Verily it is no other than a revelation revealed: one terrible in power taught it him, ended with understanding. With even balance stood he. And he was in the highest point of the horizon. Then came he nearer and approached closely, and was at the distance of two bows and even closer. And he revealed to his servant what he revealed; his heart falsified not what he saw. Will ye then dispute with him what he saw? And he saw him once again, near the ṣūra-tree, which marks the boundary... His gaze turned north, nor did it wander, for he saw the greatest of the signs of the Lord.

Ṣūra lxxxvi. 19 ṣayr: Verily this is the word of an illustrious messenger, powerful with the Lord of the throne, of established rank... faithful also to his trust. And your compatriot is not one possessed by dijinn; for he saw him in a clear horizon.

In other ṣūras, however, revelation is said to have taken place by audition. Ṣūra lxxv. 18: Move not thy tongue that thou mayest hear over the revelation; we verily will see to the collecting and the recital of it; when therefore we recite, then follow thou the recital. Afterwards, verily it shall be Ours to make it clear. — Moreover the whole form of the Kurān with its often repeated ṣayr as on the part of Allah, supposes revelation by the way of audition.

Particulars regarding Muhammad’s auditory revelations are to be found in the ṣūra and chiefly in ṣūra ii. 3.

The Apostle of Allah heard a sound like the humming of bees near his face; thereupon ṣūra xxviii. 1 ṣayr, was revealed to him (Ṭabarî, Taafsir, ṣūra 23, trad. 1; Ahmad b. Hanbal, i. 34).

The Apostle of Allah used to move his lips from pain, as soon as revelation began. After the revelation of ṣūra lxxv. 16, however, he recited what had been heard (Bukhārī, Taafsir, b. 431; al-Naṣṣābūrī, Ḥiftāštā, b. 371; Taṭbīqīl, No. 2628).

... on the authority of Abū Abd Allah b. ʿUmar I asked the Prophet: Do you perceive the revelation? He answered: Yes, I hear sounds like metal being beaten (cf. above, under 1). Then I listen, and often I think to die (from pain) (Abū b. Hanbal, ii. 222).

How they were perceived by others.

1. Even on cold days, sweat appeared on his fore-head (Bukhārī, Baqā al-Wāy, b. 7; Taafsir, ṣūra 24, b. 6; Muslim, Taafsir, trad. 86; Abū Hanbal, vi. 16, 103, 197, 202, 256 sq.; cf. ill. 21; cf. further above under 1.1).

2. When Muhammad covers his head, his colour grows red; he sweats as one asleep; or tattles like a young camel; after some time he recovers (murrīya ṣamah) (Bukhārī, Ḥiftāštā, b. 177; ʿUmar, b. 16; Fadā'il al-Qurān, b. 2; Muslim, Ḥiftāštā, trad. 6; Ahmad b. Hanbal, iv. 222, 224).


4. He falls into a lethargy or a trance (ilha): Abū b. Hanbal, vi. 103).

Thereupon the Apostle of Allah sat down, turning towards him (ʿUthmān b. Maṣʿūd). When they talked, the Apostle of Allah let his gaze swerve towards heaven; after a while he looked down to his right side and turned away from his companion, following his gaze and began to shake his head as if he tried to understand what was said to him, while ʿUthmān sat looking on. When ʿUmmad had reached his aim, his gaze turned anew towards heaven, etc. (Abū b. Hanbal, i. 318).

6. When Muhammad received a revelation... this caused him much pain, so that we perceived it. That time he separated himself from his companions and remained behind. Thereupon he began to cover his head with his shirt, suffering intensely, etc. (Abū b. Hanbal, i. 464).

At the time of the Apostle of Allah received a revelation, he began to cover his face with his shirt. When he had swooned, we took it away, while etc. (Abū b. Hanbal, vi. 34; cf. above § 2).

7. Zaid b. Thabit said: "I was at Muhammad’s side, when the sakīna [q.v.] came upon him. His thigh fell upon mine so heavily, that I feared it would break. When he recovered, he said to me: Write down, and I wrote down ʿṣūra iv. 97" (Abū b. Hanbal, v. 184, 190 sq.; Abū Dāwūd, Līlālāt, b. 19).

8. Abū Abd Allah b. Ṛṣdī says: "The ṣūra al-Māʾida was revealed to the Apostle of Allah, while he was riding on his camel. The beast could not bear him any longer, so that he had to descend from it" (Abū b. Hanbal, ii. 176). A similar tradition on the authority of Aḥmad b. Yazd,
Ahmad b. Hanbal, vi. 455, 458; another tradition of the same type: Ibn Sa'd, i, 325.

c. The circumstances under which revelation came to Muhammed. i. Muhammed is directly or indirectly asked for his opinion on a decision, when the answer is revealed to him, e.g., concerning the use of perfumes during the "awra (Bukhari, Hadith, b. 17; see above a. 2.), concerning excuses for staying at home during an expedition (Abu Dawid, Dabas, b. 93; Ahmad b. Hanbal, v. 184); concerning the question whether evil may proceed from good (Ahmad b. Hanbal, iii. 21; Taayiis, No. 2150); concerning the question whether his wives were allowed to relieve a want near town (Ahmad b. Hanbal, vi. 56); concerning Khasibi’s being or not being guilty (Bukhari, Taifis, s. 24, b. 6; Ahmad b. Hanbal, vi. 103, 197); concerning divorce in case of adultery witnessed by one witness (Taayis, No. 2067); concerning idris (Tabari, Tadis, xvii. 2).

2. Revelation comes upon Muhammed while he is riding (above, b. 8.; Tabari, Tadis, xxvi. 39), while his head is being washed (Tabari, Tadis, xvii. 2), while he is at table, holding a bone in his hand (Ahmad b. Hanbal, vi. 56), while he is on the pulpit (Ahmad b. Hanbal, iii. 31).

d. The contents of these revelations are not always communicated, and, if so, they are not always parts of the Koran (cf. Noldeke-Schawally, Geschichte der Querun, i. 356–361), e.g. Muhammed’s answer to the question whether evil may proceed from good (Ahmad b. Hanbal, iii. 31; Taayis, No. 3180); the permission granted to his wives to leave the town (Ahmad b. Hanbal, vi. 56), the punishment of fornication (Ahmad b. Hanbal, v. 317, 318, 320 sqq., 327, not the Surat al-Nahin), the permission of idris (Taayis, No. 2067).

As far as I can see, the idea of revelation has not called forth discussions of importance. Al-Idj and his commentator al-Djurjani combat the views of philosophers according to whom it is a charisma peculiar to the prophets that “they see the angels in their corporeal forms and hear their speech by revelation; it is not to be rejected that they are awake seeing what common people see when asleep, i.e., that they see persons who speak to them poetical words, which point to ideas corresponding to what really happens, since their soul is free from bodily occupations and can easily come into contact with the divine world (Shahih al-Bukhari). Often this peculiarity becomes in them a settled faculty which is easily set working. This theory of revelation is, according to al-Idji, misleading, not being in harmony with the views of the philosophers themselves, according to whom the angels cannot be seen, being merely psychic beings, who do not possess audible speech, which belongs specially to corporeal beings. So the theory of philosophers explains revelation as the imagining of what has no basis in reality, as little as what comes from the lips of ailing and lunatic people. Yet if any of us should command and prohibit on his own authority what is salutary and sensible, he would not on account thereof be a prophet. How much the less then would be a prophetic utterance what is based upon imaginations which have no foundation and often are contrary to reason (Maajzif, p. 172 sqq.).


(A. J. WUSNICK)

WAASI, properly Uwaas b. Mehem, known under his mahjub of Waaiz, a famous Ottoman scholar and poet. Born in 969 (1561–62) in Maablak, the son of a kazi named Mehem Efendi, he also adopted a legal career. After completing his training in Constantinople with the ‘ulema ‘Ullah Efendi and Ahmad Efendi, he filled a series of important posts in all parts of the Ottoman empire (in Rozetta, Cairo, Ahi Ihsar, Tire, Alaghebr, Seres, Rodosito, Uskub, Gumuljina) and died in 1037 (1628) in Uskub, where he filled the office of kazi seven times, after his dismissal at the age of 68. Waiz who was on his mother’s side a nephew of the poet Maksil was likewise a successful poet. He was also one of the finest prose writers of his time and wrote in a particularly fine persianising style. After the death of Baki, he was regarded as the greatest master of his time in prose and poetry. His language is laden with a foreign vocabulary and not easy to understand; his diction nevertheless is clever, intellectual and attractive. Anjati says of him (Shahih al-Nabawi, i. 715) that his poetry is better than his learning, his prose-style more distinguished than his poetry, his gift of entertaining finer than his prose and the beauty of his face and figure more striking than his gift of entertaining.

Waiz left a considerable number of writings in all fields. Some of his works still have their admirers, particularly his two chief works: Strbat al-Nabi and Khab-nama. The former, the Siyati Waaiz or to give it its full title: Durrat al-Tamith fi Strbat Sihi al-Mafridi is best known although he did not quite finish it. It only comes down to the battle of Bard. The holograph is in the Serai library. The book was continued by Nabi and after his death by Nasir-ud-din Shaik Hakfik. Waiz’s text with Nabi’s continuation was printed in 1245 in Bulak and in 1489 in Istanbul in his collected works. No less celebrated is his Khab-nama, a vision. It is a conversation between Ahmad I and Alexander the Great in a dream written in simple, clear Turkish.

According to ’Abd al-Hakim Hamid, the modern school was founded by Shihab under the influence of poems in the style of this vision. This Khab-nama, which is also called Wa’e-nama (Mejem
Tahir wrongly thinks there are two different works and which contains a criticism of his times, has often been reprinted (Bülbül, 1452; Istanbul 1263, 1293, and in the collected works in 1286).

His Şahabdúl-ma'âne or Dütük al-'Amal (Istanbul 1283 and 1286) which is of a religious nature has often been printed as has his Muğhâl of al-Ma'âne (collection of letters; collected works 1286).

His other works, of which Özelik Tahir gives the fullest list, are still unprinted, e.g. his complete Dümân of which only a few copies exist; a Tâlim which deals with a saying of Zain al-Din Kâbî, the Zainiyya order; the incomplete history of the conquest of Egypt: Fârûq al-Ma'ân; a reply to the attacks of the Kâmil on the Şâfîyya of Djâhâr (chronology in the Râhîl at-Adâr library); lastly two essays: Guerrero al-ajr al-sâfâr Sûrat al-Naṣr and Jadîyat al-Muqâlîn wa-Tâhkîrati al-Mu'assim.


WAQ'A NUWIS, WAQAT NUWIS. 'Waqa' nuwîs is the officially appointed Ottoman historian while 'waqat nuwîs means keeper of records; the distinction between the two terms was always pointed out by von Hammer, G. O. R., vii. 465. The first official historian of the Ottomans is usually said to have been 'Abd el-Rähmân 'Abd el-Vâth (cf. F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 237 sq.). The list of official Ottoman historians is not yet complete and accurate. There are gaps and errors in the list given by J. v. Hammer, G. O. R., vii. 591 sq. (cf. thereom P. Wittek in M. O. G., li. 152 and 243 sq.) and also F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 227, note 3 and p. 285, note 1). It seems that a keeper of records ('waqa' nuwîs) is occasionally given as official historian ('waqa' nuwîs); for example, the poet Nerkesi (cf. F. Babinger, G. O. M., p. 173) while the case of Mustafa Bântû (cf. F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 285) who is said to have been given the title of an official historian still wants elucidation. The office of Ottoman official historian is in any case a continuation of that of Şâfîîbînî if he was appointed and paid by the court. The last 'waqa' nuwîs of the Ottoman empire was Waqa' Efennî (?v.).


WAKALA (also Wawla), mandate, authorisation, is a contract (wa'aba) by which one content party, the muwaqâkî, commissions the other, the mandator (waqâlî), to perform some service for him. In the Kûr'an we find forms derived from waqâlî in the meaning of "to rely upon, to trust in Allah" (5th form) or associated with the idea that Allah, is the waqâlî, one of the 99 names of Allah, which according to the commentators has the meaning of haqa' (Sûra xii. 65; ix. 52; xxii. 28). The word is therefore not found as a technical term. Nevertheless at the basis of Sûra xxxii. 11 we have the idea which belongs, rather to the field of law, that the angel of death is regarded as the authorised agent of Allah. But this passage is not quoted as evidence that the conception of wakala is found in the Kûr'an. The "waqâlî" quase as authority for wakala Sûra xviii. 18: "Send one of your number with this your money to the city." This was an authority and therefore according to them Kûr'ânic authority for wakala. Sûra iv. 39 is also quoted: "then send an arbitrator (= negotiator) from your family and an arbitrator from his family".

II. Hâdîthtîs are numerous about mandates and the mandatory, some of which may be quoted here.

The Prophet authorised Hâkim b. Ummâr to purchase a sacrificial lamb (al-Saraghhs, xix. 2) and on another occasion he appointed 'Amr b. Ummâiy al-Dumâni as his waqâlî at his marriage with Ummâl Hâlî. According to Bukhari, Wawla, Bibb. 3, a shepherd may kill an animal that is near to death and the mandatory may repair the thing that is deteriorating. There are also hâdîthtîs regarding the mandate in criminal cases. The Prophet for example gave authority for a woman to be stoned and a drunkard to be beaten (Bukhari, Wawla, Bibb. 13). Other hâdîthtîs mention the agent who demands debis in names of a third person (Bukhari, Wawla, Bibb. 4). From this it is evident that the debtor satisfied the creditor by paying his agent. Here the representation had further effects, for legal relations arose through the act of his agent between the principal and a third person.

III. Ijâma finally sanctioned the legality of representation (waqârat al-wawla). The Muhammadas have from the earliest times to the present day med wakala, without the slightest disapproving being shown, in the settlement of their affairs with one another. For wakala is an urgent necessity for man, since a man is sometimes not in a position to administer his own property when on a journey or on the pilgrimage, or to manage his estate on account of his lack of ability, or pressure of business or his great wealth. By wakala he can appoint a deputy. The verse v. 3: "Help one another to good deeds and to the fear of God" particularly urges this mutual help. — More particularly people of high rank or office usually do not attend to their affairs personally but through authorised agents.

IV. According to the teaching of the jurists, the wakala is a contract and a revocable one (waqât dîjârîs).

1. For the validity (jâfa'îa) of the mandate we have the following four requirements (wâzîkân):

a. the muwaqâkî,

b. the wakala. Both persons must be able to dispose of their property (titâq al-tâqarrûf). A minor (kadî), a lunatic (mâsâkîn), a slave (âbîd) or any one who is mâyâ'îr (q. v.) cannot be either principal or agent. For validity are also required the conditions demanded for other contracts. In particular we should add that in this marriage and divorce only a person of impeccable character in the eyes of the law (waqâlî) can be a wakala, while in all other cases this is not demanded. If then a woman chooses a man who is not of blameless character for her wakala at a marriage, the marriage is invalid. According to the Mâlikîs, a Muslim and a dîjârî cannot be wakala for one
another; but the hadith in Bukhārī, Wākāla, Bāb 2 is not so strict.

1. The object (mawakkil fikhi) must be the property of the principal, definite, legal, and incapable of representation. Representation under a condition to come into operation in the future is not permissible. The principal therefore cannot for example appoint a mawā'il in order to divorce a wife whom he is only going to marry at a later date or to sell a slave whom he is going to buy in the future.

Views differ on the question whether representation by a deputy is possible in the case of acquiring wādisah, e.g. water, wood, or game.

In general one can appoint a mandatary for all actions which one can carry out oneself. Thus we have proxies in all contracts, marriage and divorce, law-suits, payment of blood-money etc. According to Abū Hamīs’s teaching however, a representative in a law-suit could only be appointed with the approval of the other side; his successors however did not think this necessary. According to the unanimous teaching of all the madhāhib, an oath cannot be transferred to a proxy. A list of the commonest cases is given by al-Sarakhsī, xix. 190.

As regards one’s personal duties towards Allah and actions being brought into the sphere of the ‘hadādah, one cannot in general appoint a deputy because they are obligations of a purely personal nature, with the exception of the hadīfah and the distribution of wādah (tawfiqah or adu’ah) al-nāfahah. A proxy cannot be appointed to commit crimes like murder or theft on account of the illegality of the action.

4. The form (lijqah) is that of offer and acceptance (ijāfah wa-kabālīh). Both parties must be willing for this legal transaction to take place and give their approval to it. This is done by offer and acceptance. Acceptance may be given in silence or by an act which clearly shows the approval of the mandatary. Representation is purely a matter of mutual agreement.

2. The authorisation may be definite or general according as the proxy has to carry out a particular piece of business or all the business of his principal in the way he thinks fit. The first kind of proxy is called makhlī bi-wa’dan, the latter makhlī wu’udah. The Shāfi’is reject the general authorisation as they demand that the mandate must define accurately the nature of the business.

3. The proxy does his work without a fee; but some recompense may be made by arrangement. The proxy has in any case the right to be compensated for all expenses or losses that he has incurred. This does not affect the mandate as such. There is a difference of opinion among the jurists on the question where and when and an end to this kind of process into the service (ijāfah).

4. As to the liability (dāmān) it has to be remembered that the wādah is a person of trust. His statement on oath is therefore valid without proof but only as far as the loss, deterioration and return of the res mandata is concerned. His statement regarding the return of the thing to another person than his principal is only to be accepted with proof.

The proxy must adhere to the orders given him and is responsible for all mistakes in the transaction; he is thus responsible, a in shrift, i.e. culpa in omissione, if he does less than he ought strictly to do, and b in adadda, if he does more than he ought, i.e. exceeds his commission.

5. Termination. As the mandate is an ‘ādah, both parties can dissolve the contract when they please. The contract is dissolved like other contracts through death, insanity or the legal incompetence of one of the parties, since the mandatary like the depository [cf. wādah] is regarded as amūn.

V. Here we cannot go into the later development. The Cura Civil Ottomani Art. 1449—1550 contains, broadly speaking, the doctrines of the Hanafīs. In the ‘Awāma al-Majmū‘a, wakāla is dealt with in §§ 512—531 and in the Shāh al-‘Awāma, pp. 199—200.


WĀKĀR, MIRZĀ AḤMAD SHIRZĀD with the taqālīd Wākār (Browne vocalises it Wickār), a Persian poet, the eldest of the six sons of the poet Wājār. His five brothers also attained fame as poets. Specimens of the poetry of the father Wājār are given in the Magdīnā‘ al-Fāṣiḥah2 of Rūdāb Kuli Khān, ii. 528 sqq., and in Browne, Persian Literature in Modern Times, p. 318; in the last named work on p. 301, 319 sqq. and 323 sqq. are also specimens of the work of Dāwār and Farhang; two brothers of Wākār. In the Magdīnā‘, ii. 103 sqq. are two further poems of Wājār’s second son Māhmūd Ḥakīm and in ii. 384, poems by Farhang. Six haqīdas on Nāsir al-Dīn Shāh composed by Wājār and his five brothers are given in the British Museum manuscript, No. 570 of Rūdāb Kuli Khān, ii. 82 sqq., gives a few poems by Tawḥīdī (Mīrzā Ismā‘īl Shīrzwī), another of Wājār’s sons.

Wājār must have been born about 1239 (1827) (cf. Browne, Supplement, p. 250; Browne, op. cit., p. 300). A few years after his father’s death (in 1262 = 1846), Wājār travelled to India along with his brother Māhmūd. He stayed there from about 1266 (1849) to 1268 (1851) in Bombay until a letter from the memoirs of Naṣr al-Daula Firuz Mirza induced him to return to Shirāz. Rūdāb Kuli Khān says that Wājār was very highly honoured in Bombay, but the poet seems to have suffered from homesickness there. The verses in Magdīnā‘, ii. 552 refer to his sojourn in India.

WAemachine — WA£F

The main principles of Fikh

1. The founder (waqfi) must have full right of disposal over his property; he must therefore be in full possession of his physical and mental faculties, be of age and a free man (qabil, makhk, shawar). He must further have unrestricted ownership in the subject of the endowment. Endowments by non-Muslims are therefore only valid if they are intended for a purpose not incompatible with Islam (e.g. they must not be intended for Christian churches or monasteries).

2. The object of the endowment (manafa) must be of a permanent nature and yield a usufruct (ma'afif), so that it is primarily real estate. There is a difference of opinion about movables. One section of the Hanafis regards the granting of movables in an endowment as impossible but the majority, like the Shafis and Mlikis, grant the principle, and from this arise questions about the nature of things which can be the subject of an agreement of the Sharis, e.g. animals for their milk and wool, trees for their fruits, slaves for their labour, books for study. There is however here also a difference of opinion about points of detail (thus Shafis does not permit a slave to be made a waqf). Provisions, money (prohibition of usury) etc. are in general not admitted if their substance is consumed; they can only be the object of a wakala. Among the Maliks a manafa's can also be made a waqf, e.g. the yield of a piece of ground which is let for the period of the lease (laksal, ii. 553).

3. The purpose of the endowment must be a work pleasing to God (surba) although this is not always apparent on the surface. Two kinds are distinguished: waqf khari, endowments of a definitely religious or public nature (mosques, madrasas, hospitals, bridges, waterworks), and waqf akh or shurai, family endowments, for example for children or grand-children or other relations, or for other persons; the ultimate purpose of such a foundation must however always be surba, for the poor for example.

An endowment for oneself is however invalid (except in Abü Yaa). The Shafis give a subterfuge (khila) to evade this condition: the thing which is to be the subject of the endowment is to be presented or sold at a low price to a third person; the latter can then create an endowment in favour of the original owner. Ibn Hajar mentions a further subterfuge which is rejected by others: a waqf is created in favour of the children of the benefactor's father and in the deed he himself is exactly described (Ardabil, Anwa'ur, i. 433). On two other subterfuges see Kaswini, Nikh al-fiqal, ed. Schacht, iv. 45.

4. The form need not be a written one, di-
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Band 1:


Vol. 1:

The Dogmatic Teachings of the followers of Islam, Arabic text edited by H. Ritter. Two parts. 27 + 610 pages. 1929—30. RM. 30.—

This is the oldest, most detailed and most important work on the Islamic Sects and was compiled by the celebrated founder of Islamic Orthodoxy, Abu l-Hasan al-Aš'ari (died 324/936). It is the main source for the study of the history of Islamic Creeds. The two parts contain the Text. A third part, containing the Index and sources of biographical information, is in the press.

Band 2:

ad-Dānī, Abū 'Amr 'Uṯmān b. Sa'īd, Kitab at-Taisir fi l-qirāt as-sabā'

Das Lehrbuch der sieben Koranlesungen. Herausgegeben von O. Pretzel. 1930, XV + 228 Seiten. Preis RM. 12.—

Nachdem anerkannt ist, daß eine wissenschaftliche Beschäftigung mit dem Koran auf Grund der üblichen Drucke ohne Heranziehung der Lesarten nicht möglich ist, gehört das klassische Handbuch der Koranlesungen von ad-Dānī zum unentbehrlichen Rüstzeug jedes Arabisten, der mit dem Koran zu arbeiten hat.

Vol. 2:

A Manual of the Seven Authoritative Readings of the Koran, edited by O. Pretzel. 15 + 228 pages. RM. 12.—

It has now been established that no scientific study of the Koran is possible on the basis of the usual text without reference to the different readings. Therefore the classical manual of the different readings of the Koran by ad-Dānī will be required for the study the Holy Book of the Muslims.
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ad-Dānī, Abū 'Amr 'Uthmān b. Sa'īd,
Kitāb al-Muqni‘ī ma‘rifat khatt masāhif al-amsār,
ma‘a kitāb an-Naqīt


The two works of ad-Dānī on the Orthography and Punctuation of the Koran are clearly of fundamental importance for the history of the writing down of Mohammed’s revelation as they form the oldest written documents of Islam. They are essential for the history of Arabic writing as a whole and for an examination of the difficulties with which the Arabic language had to contend in order to adapt a strange system of writing. They are important for the understanding of the readings of the Koran and their origin. They also are the key for forming a judgement upon the Cufic Koran Manuscripts. Besides the text, these volumes contain a detailed introduction in German and the indices for Volumes 2 and 3 of the Bibliotheca Islamica. The notes contain full indications of all the material, printed and unprinted, required for the study of the orthography of the Koran as far as it is accessible to-day.
Band 4:

an-Naubakhti, Abū Muḥammed al-Ḥasan b. Müsā,

Kitāb fiḥī madḥāhib firaq ahī al-imāma wa-asma‘uḥā

Die Sektenten der Shi‘a. Herausgegeben von H. Ritter. 1931. XXX + 115 Seiten. RM 10.—

Das einzige Werk, das uns von der reichen schriftstellerischen Tätigkeit des schītischen Gelehrten Naubakhti (um 300 H) erhalten ist. Es enthält die älteste Darstellung der Parteien innerhalb der Schīa, von einem Schriftsteller geschrieben, und darf daher das größte Interesse aller Gelehrten, die sich mit der politischen und religiösen Geschichte des Islam befassen, beanspruchen. Die Einleitung enthält eine eingehende Darstellung des Lebens und der Schriften des Autors aus der Feder des Bagdadischer Gelehrten Sejjīd Hibetuddin as-Sahrastānī, sowie eine Zusammenstellung aller Fragmente aus den verlorenen Schriften Naubakhti’s, die sich bis jetzt haben nachweisen lassen. Der Namenindex enthält zugleich biographische Quellenangaben, die auch über den Rahmen des gedruckten Werkes hinaus von Nutzen sind.

The Sects of the Shi‘a, Arabic text, edited by H. Ritter. 1931. 30 + 115 pages. RM 10.—

This is the only work which has been handed down out of the extensive literary activities of the Shi‘a Scholar Naubakhti (c. 300 H). It is written by a Shi‘i and contains the oldest exposition of the formation of the groups within the Shi‘a, and can lay claim to be of the greatest interest to all scholars who are concerned with the political and religious history of Islam. The introduction contains a detailed account of the life and writings of the author by the Baghdad Scholar Sejjīd Hibetuddin as-Sahrastānī. It is a combination of all the fragments of the lost Naubakhti’s writings which have up to now been discovered. The index of names also contains biographical information which is not confined to the present book but is of general interest to students of the Shi‘a sect.

Vol. 4:

Band 5 d:

Ibn Iyas, Muḥammed b. Ahmed al-Hanafī,

Badā‘i’ az-zuhūr fi waqā‘ī ad-duhūr


Band 5 d:

Vol. 5 d:
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Band 5e:

Ibn Iyās, al-Hanafi Muḥammad b. Ahmed,

Badā’i‘ az-zuhūr fi waqā‘i‘ ad-duhūr


Vol. 5e:


After the discovery of 4 Volumes written by the author, Ibn Iyās, himself and their comparison with the Bulagèr edition, a great part of the latter was found to be very defective and faulty summary of the original. It became therefore necessary to rebuild the original text, written in half colloquial Arabic, on the basis of these newly discovered MSS. The published Volume comprises the years 922—928 (1515—1521) and consequently deals with one of the most important periods of the history of Egypt — the Conquest by the Turks.
Band 6a:
ap-Safadi, Salâheddin Khalîl b. Aibek
al-Wâfi bi l-wafayât
I: Muhammed b. Muhammed — Muhammed Ibrahim b. ’Abdarrahmân


The biographical dictionary of al-Safadi (died 764/1363) comprising 29 Vols, forms the largest and most comprehensive work of reference which exists in Arabic literature. The first volume of this enormous work is published on the basis of the oldest MSS. partly written by the author himself. The lives of a great number of men are described in it, about whom information cannot be found anywhere else. As the work contains also extensive biographies of contemporaries of the author, the book is much more than a mere compilation of other works.

Band 7:
Ibn Khâlawâih, al-’Usain b. Ahmed,
Mukhtasar fi shawâdhdh al-qur’ân min Kitâb al-Badî’


Die nichtkanonischen Koranlesarten gewähren Einblick in eine verschüttete Welt von altem arabischem Sprachgut und zeigen, wie der


The unauthoritative readings of the Koran give us an insight into a lost world of the ancient Arabic speech, and show how at one time

On sale by
ARTHUR PROBSTHAIN
ORIENTAL PUBLISHER
41, Great Russell Street, LONDON W. C. 1
Ottoman’sche Konsonantentexte einzudruckhaft nicht allgemein anerkannt war und wie sein Buchstabenbild viel freier und mannigfacher gedeutet wurde, als die offiziell anerkannten Lesarten erkennen lassen; sie beweisen, daß auch auf dem Gebiet der Überlieferung des Koran die geistige Entwicklung im Islam von Reichhalt und Fülle auf dem Wege der ausschließlich Anerkennung einiger bedeutender Schulen konvergierend zu relativer Einförmigkeit verlaufen ist. Die Sammlung solcher Lesarten von dem alten Grammatiker Ibn Khallawáh (gest. 370 d.H. = 980/81 n. Chr.), die ein Späuterer aus seinem Werke ausgehoben hat, ist die einzige uns vollständig erhaltene; sie faßt nicht nur das verstreute Material zu einem sehr großen Teil zusammen, sondern bietet auch viel noch ganz unbekannten. Zusammen mit der Edition wichtiger Werke ad-Dáni’s (Nr. 2 und 5 der Bibliotheca Islamica) leitet die Herausgabe dieser Sammlung eine neue Epoche in der wissenschaftlichen Erforschung des heiligen Buches der Muslime ein.

the consonant text of Ottoman was not generally accepted, and how its characters were much more freely and more variedly interpreted than the official readings let appear; also they prove that in the transmission of the Koran as well as in other spheres the mental development of Islam by exclusively following a few important schools gradually converged from fullness and diversity to relative monotony. The collection of such readings by the ancient grammarian Ibn Khallawáh (died 370/980), taken from one of his works by a later author, is the only complete one which has been handed down to us; it not only brings a large part of the otherwise scattered material together, but adds much that was unknown. Together with the appearance of ad-Dáni’s important works (Vols. 2 and 5 of the Bibliotheca Islamica) the publication of this collection inaugurates a new epoch in the scholarly examination of the Holy Book of the Muslims.
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though this is usually the case. The founder must clearly express his wishes either by ważfī/urnished, haddarhī or if he uses other formulae by an addition that “it must neither be sold nor given away nor bequested!” (a phrase always occurring in ważfī documents, cf. the tradition quoted below and the ważfī document of Shāfi‘ī, Umm, iii. 281–52; otherwise it would only be a pāda rī). The founder must further describe the object accurately and state exactly for what purpose and in whose favour the endowment is made. The šāhī works deal very fully with the interpretation of the separate expressions describing those for whom the foundation is intended.

5. The following conditions are further necessary for the completion of a valid ważf:

a. It must be made in perpetuity (wūnaddab), which in the case of foundations for definite individuals is managed by allotting the proceeds after their death to the poor. It is therefore also inalienable.

b. It must come into force at once and there must be no provision for postponing it (wannajdīn), except the death of the founder; but in this case, as in the case of a will the founder can only make one third of his property ważfī.

c. It is an irrevocable legal transaction (fard alsmīn); but according to Abī Ḥanīfah (not however his pupils and the later Ḥanafīs), the foundation may be revoked except when it is connected with the death of the Founder (Sarābštī, Mahbūbī, xii. 27). The Ḥanafī founder therefore always brings a formal suit against the administrator for the restoration of his property; the judge, who then has the choice between the teaching of Abī Ḥanīfah and that of Abī ‘Ullāfūs, decides according to Abī ‘Ullāfūs, since the latter teaches irrevocability, and confirms the ważf by rejecting the petition.

d. Among the Ḥanafis (also in Ibn Abī Laisī; Sarābštī, xii. 35) and the Imāms there is further the requirement of the conveyance (tāzil) of the endowment to those for whom it is intended or rather to the administrator; on the other hand: not in Abī ‘Ullāfūs, since according to him, as in the other schools, the endowment is already complete by the declaration of the founder’s wishes (hashīn). In the case of a foundation for the common good (mosque or cemetery), the conveyance is completed by its being used, even if only by one person.

Among the Mālikīs on the other hand, the points mentioned here are not essential, e.g. it can be revoked not only by the founder but also by his heirs (Khāṣīfī, trans. Santillana, ii. 560–561).

6. As Muslim law does not know the conception of the legal person, opinions differed regarding the position of the ważfī in the law of property. According to one view (Shāfi‘ī, Abī ’Ullāfūs and the later Ḥanafīs; Shāfi‘ī and his school), the founder’s right of ownership ceases; it is usually said that it passes to Allāh; this however only denies the right of ownership of the founder and that of all other mortals. According to a second view (Abī Ḥanīfah [cf. thereon also Shāfi‘ī, Umm, iii. 375 sq.] and the Mālikīs), the founder and his heirs retain the right of ownership; he is however prevented from exercising it. According to the followers of this school, in the case of a mosque, the right of ownership of the founder ceases as soon as a single person has performed his salāt in it. According to a third view (some Shāfi‘īs, Ahmad b. Ḥanbal), the ownership passes to the beneficiaries (mawṣūf ala’thalī)

(cf. e.g. Shāfi‘ī, Tāj alāhī, ed. Jami‘bī, p. 164, 2). The ownership in the yield (mawṣūf ala’thalī) belongs however, according to all jurists, to the mawṣūf ala’thalī.

7. The administration of the ważfī is in the hands of a nāżīr, haizim or muwattawī who receives a salary for his services. The first administrator is usually appointed by the founder; frequently he is the founder himself (among the Mālikīs this invalidates the foundation). The šāhī has a right of supervision; he appoints the administrators and if necessary dismisses them (e.g. for neglect of duty). The form of the administration and the use to which the revenues are put depend on the conditions laid down by the founder. The revenues must however be used primarily for the maintenance of the buildings etc.; only the surplus goes to the beneficiaries. Agreements to lease the lands and buildings can only be made for three years as a maximum.

8. Extinction of the ważfī. If the founder secedes from Islam, the foundation becomes invalid and passes to his heirs. Endowments which have at their object fall, according to the view held of the position with regard to the law of property, to the legitimate heirs (among the Mālikīs only if they are poor) or they must be used for the poor or for the common good; in no case may they be confiscated by the temporal authorities.

II. Origin, history and significance

According to the general opinion of the Musslmans there were no ważfīs in Arabia before Islam, neither in houses or lands (cf. Shāfi‘ī, Umm, iii. 275, 286). The ṣadqā‘īs trace the institution to the Prophet although there is no evidence of this in the Qur’ān. In comparison with other things the support for this institution in tradition is very slight although it is always said by the legists that the companions of the Prophet and the first caliphs used to make ważfīs. In a tradition of Anas b. Mālik it is said that the Prophet wished to purchase gardens from the Bani ‘Uqab in order to build a mosque; they refused to take the purchase money however and gave the lands for the sake of God (Bakhrāshī, Wazīyāh, bāb 25, 37, 35). According to a tradition of Ibn Oman, one of the legists lay chief stress, „Omar, later caliph, at the partition of Khāibar acquired lands (ṣa‘d) which were very valuable to him and asked the Prophet whether he should give them away as ṣadqā‘ī. The Prophet replied: „Retain the thing itself and devote its fruits to pious purposes“ (habbī ṣadqā‘ī wa-raḥīl thumma-rataḥā). Omar did this with the provision that the land should neither be sold nor bequested; he gave it as ṣadqā‘ī for the poor, (needy) relatives, slaves, wanderers, guests and for the propagation of the faith (fi nabi Allāh); it is not to be a sin for the administrator to eat of it in mitigation or feed a friend if he does not enrich himself from it (Bakhrāshī, Shubātī, bāb 19; Wazīyāh, bāb 29, cf. 33; Mālikīs, Wazīyāh, tr. 15, 16; Ibn Mādis, Šodāštāh, bāb 4; Ibn Hānbal, ll. 12, 55; Ibn Sā‘d, Tabaqātī, ll. 111, 266, cf. Nasā‘ī, İḥār, bāb 2, 3). In another version the reference is to a palm-garden called Thamīgh (Bakhrāshī, Wazīyāh, bāb 23; Nasā‘ī, İḥār, bāb 37; Ibn Hānbal, ll. 114) which he acquired from the Jews of the Bank Hāritha (Ibn Hānbal, ll. 125). In both cases however, the reference is to one and the same piece of ground in Khāibar which was called Thamīgh (cf. Nasawī,
he showed that in Egypt the custom of making sites in the towns (riwaq) waqf and non-agricultural land (ard al-riwaq) which existed down to the Fatimid period, goes back to a Greek original. But already in this early period agricultural land must have elsewhere have been made waqf; Shahtaf already speaks of this and Bukhari (Waqiyat, hāf. 477) has a chapter ---If anyone makes agricultural land (ard al-riwaq) waqf and does not give the boundaries:'. This was not unknown to the Byzantines also; Justinian (Novell. 63) exceptionally allows the Mysian church to sell lands and vineyards, which had been given as endowments for the ransom of prisoners and to be used for the poor and brought in no yield worth mentioning.

On the further history of the waqf in Egypt Makrizi (Kāhīrī, i. 295 sq.) gives interesting notes. Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. ʿAlī Maḏāhirī (this is the right reading, d. 345 = 956) was the first to make agricultural land waqf for the holy cities and other purposes. The Fātimids however at once forbad the making waqf of country estates and entrusted the Kādi ʿl-Kudrat with the supervision, assisted by a ḍārūk al-ḥāṣar. In 361 (974) al-Muẓār ādjudged the property of the endowments and the waqf documents (ṣabrāh) to be handed over to the state treasury (baṣr al-waqf); the revenues from the waqfs were then farmed out for 1,500,000 dirhams annually; out of this sum the benefactors were paid while the rest went to the treasury. As a result of this system of farming them out, the waqf possessions had so sunk in value by the time of al-Ḥakim that the revenues in the case of many mosques no longer sufficed for their maintenance. In 405 (1014) he therefore created a large new foundation and had the condition of the mosques regularly examined.

In the Mamlūk period the foundations were divided into three groups. 1. Abūl. These were under the supervision of the māgār al-mašūra and were administered by a māqīr with his council (ṣālīs); they comprised extensive estates (in 440 [1339]: 130,000 saḥlat) in the provinces of Egypt and were used to keep up mosques and ziyārat. Makrizi (d. 845 = 1442) complains bitterly about the abuse and neglect of these endowments; they had come through corrupt practices into the hands of the emirs; the benefactors, who were called faṣiḥ or ḍārūk but knew nothing of ṭibb or of preaching, were registered in the name of some ruined mosque. 2. Abūl, bukmīya. These consisted of town lands in Misr and Kāhir; their revenues were earmarked for the two holy cities as well as for charities of all kinds. They were under the control of the Kādi ʿl-Kudrat and were administered by a māqīr (sometimes by two, one for each part of the city); there was a special ʿārbīs for each part of the town. In this connection Makrizi again makes a touching complaint about the conditions which were becoming worse and worse; from the time of al-Maḏāhirī al-Nīṣābūrī (301-815 = 919-1412) the waqf estates had become poorer and poorer as a result of maladministration. The ʿārbīs in return for bider's sales, without another piece of ground being purchased in place of that sold, it was only necessary to produce witnesses who alleged that this or that building was dangerous to the neighbours and the passers-by. 3. Abūl, alūmīya, family endowments, each of which had their own administrator. These were monasteries (ḥāsīlāt)
founders themselves endeavoured to prevent embarrassment etc. by dividing the lands among a number of endowments in small portions so that several administrators could keep a check on one another, or the supervision is put by the founder in the hands of an administrative commission, to which the kādh, the kāshīth and the prominent citizens of the town belonged (e.g. in Montargen of the year 742 [1340] in J.A., ser. 11, xii. 81). We have very early evidence of a central waqf administration like that of Egypt, e.g. under the Umayyads in Cordova there was a central treasury for the waqf (hāli al-nāāfū in contrast to the state treasury: hāli al-nāāfū) under the supervision of the Khāl L-Khafif (Levi-Provencal, L'Espagne mauresque, Paris 1937, p. 71, 85) and in Fās in the time of the Marinids there was an official who had to administer all the waqfs of the town (J.A., ser. 11, xii. 376). But all this could not permanently prevent embarrassment and flittering away of the waqf estates.

The waqf system in the east was very beneficial in ameliorating poverty and misery and in furthering learning; but it had its shady side morally as well as economically. On the one hand, considerable sections of the populace were taken from industry by the continual creation of new simchars and supported at the expense of the country; on the other hand, the capital for these great endowments had to be supplied by the wealthy and this was acquired not by productive labour but by extortion and unprecedented exploitation of the people (cf. C. H. Becker, op. cit.). The immense accumulation of landed property in the possession of the Dā'ūd family also was economically injurious, although from time to time confiscations by the state and illegal disposal by the administrators had a regulating effect. One consequence of this accumulation very frequently was that the soil was not used to the best advantage; these great latifundia are even often an impediment to the introduction of modern agricultural methods. They often deteriorated so much that the yields were not even sufficient for the necessary upkeep and improvements. To avert this evil and to arouse the personal interest of the tenants perpetual leases have been granted, apparently since the xvii century, which differs somewhat in the different countries but not the same in their main lines. Originally only used in case of lands that had gone out of cultivation, they gradually came into use for other waqf estates also.

The most widely distributed type of agreement of this kind (throughout the whole of the former Turkish empire, including Egypt and Tripoli) is the dafara-nisā' (as contrast to this the short term lease is called dafara wa'ā'afū) so called from the two words in it: the tenant pays a lump sum down according to the value of the land on the conclusion of the agreement (dafara wa'ā'afū) and an annual fixed rent (dafara wa'ā'afū) so that the right of ownership in the endowment may not lapse. He is bound to keep the land in order and make it productive. He can bequeath it (originally only to his children, since 1867 however, to other being named by statute) and sell his rights in the land with the approval of the administrator of the endowment. If the tenant dies or the tenant following him without leaving heirs the land as wa'ā'afū goes back to the endowment. New buildings are regarded as increment.
Another kind of agreement usual in Syria and Egypt is the ǧazā‘ which corresponds to the ǧārā‘ in Tripolitania and Tunisia but has a rent which rises or falls with alterations in the value of the produce on the ground. The tenant can only bequeath it, but has unrestricted rights in his new buildings and new plantations. The agreement only becomes void on non-payment of rent. In Turkey the Ǧawf is similar and in Tunisia the Ǧawf (炷sfol) agreement, but with a fixed annual rent and in Algiers down to the French occupation the Ǧawf (炷sfol) agreement and in Morocco the Ǧawf (炷sfol: in the case of business houses and factories) and Ǧawf (炷sfol: in case of agricultural lands) (cf. Michaux-Bellatere, in R.M.M. xiii. [1911], 197-245), as well as throughout the Maghrib the ǧārā‘ or Ǧufr (炷sfol al-Ǧufr). In all these agreements it is a question of the usufruct (碣r al-Ǧawf). The thing itself (碣r Ǧawf) remains the property of the endowment, which is recognised by the payment of rent; whereas the Ǧawf becomes the property of the lessee. As a result the legists, who at first regarded these agreements in accordance with the customary law as an unpermitted innovation, in the end came to tolerate them because the inalienability of the Ǧawf remained secure.

These varieties of agreement were not however created specially for the letting of Ǧawf estates but were rather older forms of lease adapted to the Ǧawf. They probably originated in cases in which a piece of land had been made Ǧawf with similar formulae. Thus the Ǧawf is already found in the Marind period in a Ǧawf document for the medrese al-Ǧafrad in Fas of the year 733 (1323) in which such Ǧawf plots of ground are made Ǧawf (7 A., ser. x., 1, 223); similarly in Egyptian Ǧawf documents of the year 691 (1292) Ǧawf lands are made Ǧawf (Moreberg, in M.O. xii. [1918], 10 N. 8). According to Maqrizi (Ka’afradi, ii. 114), it is a question of “lands the development of which undertaken by a third person is prevented”. They were originally state lands, which however on payment of ground rent ( getLocation) could be built upon or used for planting gardens. Later however, they became completely Ǧawf (Maqrizi, ed. Wies, ii. 107). According to a Ǧawf of al-Ǧarqas (d. 1601 = 1670), the Ǧawf agreement is a form of lease by which land is given in perpetuity when built upon or cultivated. Similarly the Ǧawf, a word which must be of Persian origin, is found as early as a Ǧawf of al-Buzarai (d. 877 = 1474). In both cases we have the question whether such a piece of ground can be made Ǧawf (in Ibn Ǧafr, Radd al-Ǧawf, Mir, v. 277, iii. 438). These agreements probably deal with forms of lease which were originally used in the large domains and are ultimately a survival of the ancient empyrean, which was already usual in the Byzantine period for churches and monasteries and their lands (Mittel and Wilcken, Grundzüge und Christ. der Papyrus- Kunde, i., p. 313).

Family endowments are almost as old as those for the public good. The earliest example is the Ǧawf document in which Ǧubayl makes his house in Fustat with everything belonging to it a Ǧawf for his descendants (Umm, iii. 281-283). Such foundations while being a charitable object in keeping with religion, primarily secure the descendants an income for all emergencies and in particular protect the property in times of insecuruty from unscrupulous rulers, although in practice they did not always have the desired result (cf. above). In addition it was a legal means of evading the KuhÂحnic law of inheritance, whether under the usus or anwa or in order to exclude particular heirs or to include those not entitled to inherit or in order to keep the estate intact, when it would be broken up by the application of the law of inheritance. The institution of the family endowment was also abused for other purposes: a man would make his property Ǧawf for his descendants in order to put it out of reach of his creditors, which however is forbidden in a Ǧawf of Abu ‘I-Sa’ïd (d. 928 = 1474; cf. Brit. Mus. Add. MS. N. 7, 834, fol. 131v). Family endowments in the east are very numerous and economically harmful from their great extent. In Egypt for example, the income from these endowments in 1928-1929 was higher than from all the other Ǧawfs together (over £ 1,000,000, p. R.E. Isr., iii. 295).

III. Modern Conditions

The estates of the Dead Hand in the former Turkish empire were estimated at three quarters of the whole arable land and in modern Turkey they have recently been calculated at £ 50,000,000 in value (O. M., v. [1925], 8). In the budgets for 1927 the revenues are entered as £ 3,489,000. Towards the middle of the sixteenth century, they comprised in Algiers the half, in 1885 in Tunisia the half and in 1927 in Egypt 1/4 of the cultivated soil. The accumulation of such extensive possessions in the Dead Hand meant a serious injury to the economic life of the country; but apart from anything else a piece of ground that is Ǧawf cannot be burdened by a mortgage. In addition there were everywhere abuses in the management of these estates and frequently there was an uncertainty in law regarding the question of ownership. The Ǧawf system thus everywhere became a problem in the course of the last century. The European powers (France) were the first to see in it an impediment to the economic development of their Muslim colonies but Muslims themselves (Turkey, Egypt) are now no longer blind to this point of view.

France was the first to try to tackle the problem in Algiers and in not very skilful fashion. As early as 1830 it was laid down that all public Ǧawfs should pass into the possession of and be administered by the French government which aroused particular indignation among the Muslims on account of the endowments for the holy cities. The inalienability of the Ǧawf was thus overcome indirectly: in 1844 the permanent rent was declared redeemable and in 1858 the annuity contract became a simple contract of sale, in which the rent was regarded as the interest on the purchase price. It was further ordained that the argument of inalienability should not be used as a ground of a charge against either French or natives. The sale of the Ǧawf was thus protected. Finally by the law of July 26, 1873, the legal position of land was brought completely under French law and all conditions contradictory to it were abolished. The sale of the Ǧawf was thus recognised in practice, but in order not to interfere further with the religious sentiments of the Muslims or with their family life, the institution was left in existence as a means to circumvent the Muslim law of inheritance, although in this mutilated form. Since 1873 the French courts have adopted this standpoint, which does not follow
with absolute certainty from the ordinance. The
holders of the wakf are now no longer guaranteed
the peaceful enjoyment of the endowment, since one
of the partners can sell the habous and the others
in such a case have to make their claims against
him. The Muslim population however avoided a
sale as far as possible or again invested the
proceeds in another piece of ground to take the
place of the first.

France went to work more cautiously in Tunis
and Morocco. Esrail al-Din had already in 1874
created a central office for the administration
(libéralisation) of the public habous in Tunis. In
1885 the wakf-agreement was legalised in the sense
of the customs previously in vogue. In 1898 it
was then arranged that the habous could either
be exchanged in kind or for money (in the latter
case another piece of ground must be purchased
to replace it, in keeping with the Sharías) and
that it could be let out on a simple lease for a
period of years (as long as ten with the possibility
of renewal). Here again however, they went a
step further to break up the estates of the Dead
Hand. By the decree of Jan. 22, 1905 the censal-rent
was declared redeemable in 30 annuities. Later
however another plan was adopted, less offensive
to religious sentiment, to create small holdings
on a state assisted basis. By the decree of April 12,
1913, natives could get their lands as censal
without public competition, if they had for a long period
passed from father to son. These endeavours were
concluded for the present by the decree of July 17,
1926, by this in the case of landed estate the
Tunisian Muslim, who lives on the piece of ground
in question and tills it himself, or his ancestors
have for at least 33 years, becomes the permanent
possessor on payment of a yearly rent; the piece
of land can however only be inherited in the male
line. This measure met with opposition from occupiers
of family foundations (cf. the party's item in the
programme for the elections in the native
section of the Grand Council in 1928: "to protect
private wakfs", O. M., xii. [1928], 322). For the
administration there has been since 1908 alongside
of the office of the habous also a Conseil Supe'ieur des Habous.
The habous of the Zawiya, which are administered
by Wakifs (usually identical with the Shaikhs), are
also under state control; in the case of the family
endowments which are under the supervision of the
wakf, the government interferes only under certain
conditions e.g. if the ownership of the endowment
is threatened.

In Morocco in 1912 a Direction des Habous
was created which also has to supervise family
endowments and by a dahir of July 21, 1913 the
leasing of the habous was regulated anew; in the
first place the long lease of untitled lands was
restricted to ten years and an exchange for money
was made possible with the obligation to buy another
piece of ground instead. It was further ordained by
dahir of Feb. 27, 1914, that the rents, heretofore
very small, should be raised in keeping with the
value of the estates. A dahir of July 8, 1916
then gave permission for the reservation of manfa'at's
privileges (jeza, qmilas etc.) so that the wakf land
became the property of the occupier. In these
cases however, the sums received had to be invested
in another piece of ground. France thus sought
to avoid a conflict with the Sharías and to use
the legal possibilities of the Sharías to improve
the economic situation.

In Tripoli and Cyrenaica the central
administration of the wakf which existed under
the Turks was taken over by the Italians and
reformed. The institution itself was not disturbed
in the slightest. But under Italian jurisdiction
disputes are settled, not by the Sharía's courts but
by the ordinary courts of law as the wakf is
regarded as coming under the civil laws. Another
regulation introduced in Cyrenaica by the decree
Aug. 23, 1923, was soon afterwards repulsed.
By the decree of July 3, 1921 (No. 1207) new
land registers were introduced, including a special
register for the wakf and for the wakf disposed of
by idjfaratian agreements. The first interference
with private wakfs originated on political grounds
and resulted in the confiscation of all the property
of the Senussi by the state; only the mosques and
cemeteries retained their wakf character and passed
under the administration of the public wakfs (decrees

For Palestine, Syria and the 'Iraqi, it is pro-
vided in the mandate of 1921 that the wakfs
should be administered by the mandatory power
in keeping with the Sharía's and the conditions
laid down by the founder. In Palestine, England
was content with a theoretical right of control by
decree of Dec. 20, 1921; she created a Supreme
Muslim Sharía Council (altered regarding the
method of election and several other points in 1926
and 1929), of 5 members indirectly elected, which
controlled the affairs of the wakfs along with
other matters (O. M., x. [1921], 594-596; ib.
[1929], 311-313). — France on the other hand
in her mandated areas in Syria placed the wakfs
under direct supervision of the mandatory powers.

By an edict of the High Commissioner of March
3, 1921, three bodies for the administration of
the Muslim wakfs in the whole Syrian mandated
territory were created: a Conseil Supérieur des
Wakfs, a Commission général des Wakfs musulmans
and a Contrôleur général des Wakfs musulmans,
who is the official directing the two other offices
and at the same time the general controller. The
controller is appointed by the commissioner and is
responsible to him (Rababah, "L'Evolution politique
de la Syrie sous mandat, Paris 1928, p. 207 sqq.).
In 1926 wakfs'atun and idjfarat agreements were for-
bidden by the High Commissioner and replaced
by mutahadi'a. — The 'Iraqi by the constitution of
July 10, 1924, the wakfs were put under a Wakf
Ministry, the duties and powers of which are to
be regulated by a special law (not yet formulated);
disputes on points of law are dealt with by the
Sharía tribunal, which decides according to the
Sharía's tribunal, which decides according to the
Sharía tribunals, which decide according to the
Sharía's tribunal, which decides according to the
endeavour to support their proposals, like their opponents, by traditional views and to show that the waqf endowment is not a religious institution.

Carrie Russia had already administered the waqfs in the Crimea through Russian officials for its own advantage and had confiscated numerous waqf lands in Turkistan and given them to Russian emigrants, and under Bolshevik rule in the war against all that is connected with religious the waqf buildings and mosques were also declared state property and let out. Cf. on this the statements by 'Iyâd Iskâf at the Islamic Congress in Jerusalem in Dec. 1931 (O. M., xii. [1932], 133-134).

Various Islamic congresses have dealt with the problem of waqfs but always on traditional lines. Thus the second pilgrimage congress at Mecca (1924) protested against governments dealing with waqfs in any way not in keeping with the stipulations made by the founders and demanded that they should be administered by the standards of the Shârâ'ī (O. M., ix. 402). The Islamic Congress at Mecca in 1926 as well as the National Congress of the Hijjas in 1931 demanded of the government that care should be taken to see that revenues from waqfs in favour of the holy cities outside of the Hijjas were collected (O. M., vi. 314; xi. 454). Similarly the Muslim Congress at Jerusalem in 1931 demanded the return of the Hijjas railway with all its rolling stock, because, before it was built, it had been declared a waqf by the Ottoman Sultan.

Bibliography: In addition to the well known collections of traditions and the Fiqh books there are numerous special works of which the following have been printed: al-Khâṣâ'î (i. 621 = 875), Aṣqâm al-Wakf, Cairo 1904; Isâhâk b. Mâlik al-Târâbulusî (d. 922 = 1516), al-Wâqf fi Aṣqâm al-Awâfi, Cairo 1924; tr. B. Adda and E. D. Ghalioungui as Le Wakf, Alexandria 1893. — Of the extensive literature only the more important need be mentioned: Tornaua, Das moslem. Recht, Leipzig 1885, p. 155 sqq.; Th. W. Juyaboll, Handbuch des islam. Gesch., Leyden 1910, § 603; in (Dutch) ed. 1925, § 62; Kreimkirk, Das Waqfrecht vom Standpunkte der Vaterrechtlich und der Roheinsch. Scliven, in Z. D. M. G., xiv. (1891), 511-576; E. Clavel, Le Wakf ou Haben en Egypte (Études habesque et malabite), 2 vols., Cairo 1898; E. Mercier, Le Haben ou Ouakf, ses règles et son jurisprudence, Algiers n. d. (from Règles algériennes et turques de législation et de jurisprudence), le Cours des habens, Constantine 1899; Santillana, Instituciones de derecho musulmán malabita, Rome 1926, i. 346 sqq. (on long term agreements).

WAKF — WAKHAN

Wakhan (in Arabic Wakhkhān), a district to the south of the Pamir [q.v.]. Wakhan is a long and narrow valley which runs from east to west and is watered by the upper course of the Oxus (Pandj) and by the river Wakhan-darya, which is the most southern source of the Oxus [cf. AMū-DARYA]. The length of Wakhan along the Oxus is 67 miles and of the Wakhan-darya (from Langar-kīsh to the Wakhlīr pass) 113 miles. Afghan sources put the distance from Ishkashim to Sarhad at 66 būrīhā = 22 farsakhhs.

To the south of Wakhan rises the wall of the Hindu-Kush through which several passes lead to the lands of the upper Indus. The main pass (12,460 feet) of Baroghīl leads into Citzal. The northern wall of Wakhan is the Wakhan (Nicholas II) which range the peaks of which reach a height of 25,000 feet. In the west, Wakhan stretches to the bend of the Oxus, where the river entering the boundaries of Zanghān (q.v.) turns northwards. In the east Wakhan (through the high valley of Wakhlīr) is joined by Chinese possessions and lake Cakmak-kul.

Wakhan lies as a barrier between Russian lands in the north and British in the south so that nowhere are they in direct contact. By the Russo-Afghan agreement of March 4, 1875 defining the frontier, it runs s. in the lower part of Wakhan up the course of the Oxus as far as Langar-kīsh where the two sources of the Oxus meet: the river Wakhan from S. E. (from the Little Pāmīr) and the river Pāmīr from the N. E. (from the Great Pāmīr); s. from Langar-kīsh the frontier follows the course of the Pāmīr river to its source (lake Zor-kul or Victoria); c. more to the east again, the frontier runs by a zigzag line towards the south to China (near the Meyk pass). Afghan territory therefore comprises the left bank of the Oxus, all the valley of the Wakhan-darya, the land on the left bank of the Pāmīr river and a small part of the upper course of the Ak-su (including lake Cakmak-kul).

Afghan part of Wakhan contains seven districts, namely from east to west: Warg, Urgand, Khandal, Wakhkhan, Pāmīr, Bābā-Tangī, Nirra-va-Shalak and Sarhad (this last named village is at the foot of the Baroghīl pass at a height of 11,350 feet), as well as the thinly populated territory of the Little Pāmīr (watered by the Wakhshīn-darya).

On the Afghan side there are in Wakhsh 64 villages with 3,500 inhabitants and on the Russian 27 with 2,000 inhabitants. The population (Wakhshīs) belongs to the race of Iranian mountaineers (Qaγhāsī) very often with blue eyes, a feature which had struck the Chinese as early as the sixth century. The Wakhsh language is an unusual variety of an Iranian dialect (Qaγhāsī). At the present day the Wakhshīs on the Russian side form part of the autonomous republic of Tadjikistān.

In his monumental works Sir Aurel Stein supports the thesis according to which the Wakhshīs corridor ("the most direct thoroughfare") has been used from very early times for communication between the settled areas of northern Afghanistan (Balgh) and those of the modern Chinese Turkestan.

From the seventh century, Wakhan is continually mentioned in the early Chinese sources under the names of Hu-um, Fo-ho etc. (cf. Marquart, Erklärung, p. 243, and Chavannes, Documents sur les Toussins occidentaux, Index). Hsien Tsang mentions the greenish eyes of the people of Ta-mo-al-ti (a form not yet satisfactorily explained) and its capital Hu-um-čo (= Khondol) with its great Buddhist stupa. In 747 A.D. Wakhsh had become the theatre of the operations of the famous Chinese general Kaouen-či against the Tibetans (cf. Chavannes, p. 152—153). Among Arab authors, Iṣḥāqī (<Balgh) several times mentions Wakhsh as a land of infidels, as the place from which monks come and where the Oxus rises (cf. Ḩṣahāni, p. 279, 280, 296; Ibn Rusta, p. 91). Māni, Marīg, i. 213: Turnīsh, p. 64, applies the term "Türk" to all the inhabitants of the upper Oxus: the Wakhshīs (Xkān) read: Ḩolbus (Xkān). Tūbbat (Tibetan) and Ayghān (?). As to the Iranian Wakhshīs the term "Türk" can only refer to their dynasty (cf. Marquart, Werōt and Arang [still unpublished], p. 101—102). More detailed information is supplied by the Persian geographical work Ḩudud al-Ālam (372 = 852, ed. Barthold, 1930, fol. 235) which calls Wakhsh the residence of the king and capital of the land (chakor) of Sīkhām (it ought probably to be emended to Ishkashim, the capital of Wakhshīs). At Khūndā (Khūndād) are the temples (būd-khānas) of the Wakhshīs and "to the left" was a fortress occupied by the Tibetans. Samarkandī is regarded as the remotest frontier of the dependencies of Transoxiana; it had Hindu, Tibetan and Wakhshī inhabitants (probably the Sarhad of the present day).

AL-WĀKI‘A (A.), the name of Sūra lxi. The title "this befalling, suddenly happening" which is the subject of the first verse is generally taken to refer to the ḥyā’ma (i. e. where the word is translated "the event") or ēṣr, both periphrases for the Day of Judgment. The content of the Sūra is in keeping with this. Opinions differ as to the date of its origin. Nöldeke and Schwally put it in the first Meccan period but add that Ḥasan al-Bayrāt regards it as Medinese. That some verses are Medinese seems to be generally acknowledged in tradition while Nöldeke-Schwally think the Sūra was composed at one time. In contrast to the verses there quoted as traditional Medinese, the Tafsir al-Diḥālah for example allows verses 80 and 13 (equal 38 in Flügel's notation) to the Medina period, while the official Egyptian Qur’ān (cf. Bergsträsser, in Jcl. xx, 2 seqq.) allows verses 81 and 82 (Flügel So and 81) to Medina. The same Qur’ān describes the Sūra as revealed after Sūra xx. which according to Nöldeke and Schwally belongs to the second Meccan period.

AL-WĀKI‘I, ABD ‘ABBĀD ALLĀH MUHAMMAD b. ‘UMAR, an Arab historian born in 139 in Medina; according to Alkānī, vii. 189, his mother was a great-grand-daughter of Sa‘īb who introduced music into Medina. Al-Wākī became so called after his grandfather al-Wākī, al-Aslamī as a mawla of Abd Allāh b. Barada who belonged to the Medinese family of Aslam. On the occasion of Hārūn's pilgrimage in 170 (see Tabari, iii. 605) he was recommended to him as the best authority on the holy places of his native town and acted as guide to the caliph and his vizier Yahyā when they visited the sacred places. He used the connections he had then formed with the court in 180 (see Ibn Sa‘d, vii/ii. 77) when he met with financial difficulties and went to Baghdād and thence to Rākja where Hārūn was then holding his court (see Tabari, iii. 645). He was kindly received by Yahyā and presented to the caliph who recalled with pleasure his visit to Medina and gave him rich gifts. He himself left a full account of his journey to Hārūn’s court and the reception he found there, which is given in Ibn Sa‘d, v. 314 sqq. The older sources make no reference to his receiving from Hārūn the office of kāfī of the eastern quarter of Baghdād: the story first appears in Yākūt, Uṣūl, vii. 56, without a source being given. On the other hand it is certain that Ma‘mūn after entering Baghdād in the beginning of 204 (see Tabari, iii. 1037) appointed him kāfī of ‘Askar al-Mahdi in Kuṣāfa (Ibn Khallīkān, Cairo, l. 641, wrongly ascribes to Ibn Kūtaiba the statement that Wākī was kāfī of the western side of Baghdād; Ibn Kūtaiba only says, agreement with Ibn Sa‘d that the kāfī of the western side conducted Wākī’s funeral service). Wākī became on intimate terms with al-Ma‘mūn and appointed the caliph his executor, and al-Ma‘mūn carried out the duties in person (see Ibn Sa‘d, v. 321) when Wākī died at the end of 207 (see Ibn Sa‘d, v. 321, vii/i. 77; Ibn Kūtaiba, Mu‘arrif, p. 579; Sam‘ānī, fol. 527v; Yākūt, Uṣūl, vii. 56). Wākī made no secret of his gratitude to Yahyā even after the fall of the Barmecide; the vizier had several times relieved him of the financial difficulties in which Wākī was constantly involving himself. Wākī himself (Ibn Sa‘d, v. 319 sqq.) gives an

example which has become celebrated of the vizier’s generosity, which occurs again in al-Ma‘mūn, Ma‘ṣūf (Cairo), ii. 237 sqq.; Yahyā, Uṣūl, vii. 57; Ibn Khallīkān, l. 641 in a slightly different form. — A list of Wākī’s writings is given in the Fikrist, p. 98 sqq. and Yahyā has used that is almost exactly the same (Uṣūl, vii. 58). The great majority of these works are of an historical nature, some relate to the Qur’ān, Fiṣṣ and Ḥadīth. To the first group belong: 1. al-Ṭāwīl wa ‘l-Muqaddimah, 2. ‘Āthār Ma‘mūn, 3. al-Tafsir, 4. Fiyūd al-Ṣahib, 5. Fiyūd al-‘Irāb, 6. al-Lamā‘, 7. Maṣāḥif al-Mahsūm, 8. al-Sūr, 9. ‘Awarīq al-Nahl, 10. al-Radd wa ‘l-Dīr, 11. ‘Adab al-Amīr wa ‘l-‘Arādāt, 12. Sīyās, 13. Wāfāt al-Nūr, 14. Amr al-‘Abbās wa ‘l-Fīl, 15. al-Sitāḥat al-Mustahbilah wa ‘l-Nafis, 16. Sirr al-‘Abbās wa ‘l-Wafāt, 17. Mu‘āwwad wa ‘l-Mansūḥ; fi ‘l-Kal‘ah wa ‘l-‘Aqīdah wa ‘l-‘Uṣūl wa ‘l-Ma‘ṣūf. Umar al-Dawāni wa ‘l-Maqāṣid wa ‘l-Aqād, 18. Mu‘āwwad wa ‘l-Husn, 19. Dar ‘al-Dawāni wa ‘l-Dār al-Dawāni, 20. Tawīl al-Fākhrī, 21. al-Tawīl al-Khāṣṣ, 22. Tawīl al-Ma‘mūn, 23. Taḥrīr al-Ma‘mūn, 24. Taḥrīr al-Ma‘mūn aḥṣā‘ī, 25. Taḥrīr al-Ma‘mūn fī al-Waqi‘a wa ‘l-Mu‘arrif. Wākī’s historical interests covered the early history of Meccan and Medina as well as the Muslim period. Only the Kitāb al-Ma‘ṣūf has survived as an independent work out of all his writings; the Taḥrīr, which comes down to events of the year 186, is the foundation of the Taḥrīr of Ibn Sa‘d (q. v., v. 314, 77) who also made considerable use of the Sūra (cf. also Bibli. Arab. Hist., ii. 437). Wākī’s and Awarīq; in all parts of his work that cover the same field, Wākī is the main authority and also in the Maṣāḥif. Tabari frequently quotes the Ta‘rīkh al-ḥābar, which must have come down to the year 179 (see Tabari, iii. 639) and Ibn Ḥubaysh (l. 584) has preserved numerous fragments of the Kitāb al-Radd wa ‘l-Dīr (Yawm al-Dīr) i.e. the assassination of Uthmān (see Cazamian, Annu., i. index, 6. v. Wāqī; cf. also Bibli. Arab. Hist., ix. 237). The Fiyūd al-Ṣahib and al-‘Irāb are not preserved; the books which go under these names belong to a later date and have been credited to Wākī. Wākī prefaced a list of his most important authorities to his Maṣāḥif, a list of which was published by H. von Krüdener, History of Muhammad’s Campaigns, in Bibli. Ind., Calcutta 1856) and of which Wellhausen has given a synopsis in German (Mohammed in Medina, Berlin 1882); the list is repeated in Ibn Sa‘d, vii/i. 1, 330 and vii/i. 1 (cf. also vii/i. 77) and has been fully discussed by Scahau in M. S. O. S. A., vii. 1 sqq., 21 sqq. The list consists entirely of the names of learned men, either born or settled in Medina, who had given information to Wākī, and went back to authorities like al-Zuhārī, ‘Aṣim b. ‘Umar, ‘Ansābī b. ‘Arāmī et al. Many of the authorities quoted by Wākī, like Abū Malīhar, Ma‘ṣūf b. Rāshīd, Mūsā b. ‘Ukhrī had written books on the Maghāzī; on the other hand Wākī did not mention by name his most celebrated predecessor in the field of the biography of the Prophet, Muhammad b. Ḥāfṣ. This is all the more remarkable since only (in Tabari, iii. 231) he expresses a very favourable verdict on him and undoubtedly made very great use of his book and obviously follows him in the arrangement of the material (see Wellhausen, op. cit., p. 11 sqq.; J. Horovitz, De Wāqīīr libri, p. 9 sqq.) he possibly wished to conceal his indebtedness by not mentioning the name of Ibn Ḥāfṣ. In the Kitāb al-Maṣāḥif
Wākīṭ. [See Zamān.]

WĀKĀWĀK or WĀKĀWĀK, in Arabic orthography, وککک or وککک or وککک or وککک or وککک and in the spelling of Oriental works refers, unless otherwise stated, to G. Ferrandi's Relations de voyage et textes géographiques arabes, persans et turcs (cf. the Bibliography).

I. WĀKĀWĀK OF THE SOUTH OR WĀKĀWĀK OF AFRICA

The islands of Wākāwāk are situated in the Lārwī sea which washes the western coast of India and the lands inhabited by the Zandj (Yaḵšūb, p. 49). The Wākāwāk of the south is different from that of China (Ibn al-Faḵīh, p. 55). The lands of Sofāla and of Wākāwāk are situated at the extremity of the sea of the Zandj (Maḵzūn, p. 108). The land of Wākāwāk is contiguous to that of Sofāla; there are two towns in it, Đarī and Nabhān, miserable and sparsely populated (Idrisī, p. 183). The town of Daḵḏaghīn, inhabited by hideous and deformed negroes, is next to the land and island of Wākāwāk (Idrisī, p. 184). Wākāwāk is situated in the land of the Zandj (Ibn al-Wardī, p. 425), to the east (= south) of Sofāla, on the same southern (= western) shore of the Indian ocean which extends without interruption to the end of the tenth section of the first clime, at the place where the Indian ocean flows out of the Surrounding Sea (Ibn Khölādī, p. 460). The islands of Wākāwāk are near the last of the islands of Dībāḏšt-al-Dūm (= Laccadives and Maldives) (Merveilles de l'Inde, p. 586).

The Wākāwāk of the land of the Zandj is vast, fertile and prosperous (Ibn al-Wardī, p. 425).

The gold of Wākāwāk of the south is of inferior quality compared with that of the Wākāwāk of China (Ibn al-Faḵīh, p. 55). There is much gold in the Wākāwāk of the land of the Zandj (MaḴzūn, p. 108; Ibn al-Wardī, p. 425).

The natives of the Wākāwāk of the land of the Zandj have no ships, but the merchants of Qumān come to trade with them and get slaves in exchange for dates (Ibn al-Wardī, p. 425; cf. also Idrīsī, p. 183). They know neither cold nor rain (Ibn al-Wardī, p. 425).

II. WĀKĀWĀK OF THE EAST OR WĀKĀWĀK OF CHINA

Wākāwāk lies to the east of China (Ibn Khurḏāḏbaḵ, p. 39), behind China (Ibn al-Faḵīh, p. 55), to the south of the Irāk (Aḥreḏ eq de merveille, p. 140). The Wākāwāk of China differs from the Wākāwāk of the south in the superior quality of its gold (Ibn al-Faḵīh, p. 55). Kankī Ḫī is the remotest town in the east; it is situated at the extremity of China and of Wākāwāk (Maḏfūḏ al-Ulūm, ed. G. van Vloten, p. 217). The island of Wākāwāk is situated to the north-east of the Greater Sea (al-Biṟūnī, Kāmān al-Maḵzūn, p. 598). The island of Wākāwāk forms part of the group of islands of Kāmār (al-Biṟūnī, p. 163). The islands of Wākāwāk are situated in the southern part of the Sea of Darkness (Idrisī, p. 160); they adjoin the islands of Muqūs and those of the Clouds and of places consisting of islets and inaccessible mountains (Idrisī, p. 192—193). It is a land situated above [i.e. south] of China (Yaḵšūb, p. 231—232). The islands of Wākāwāk situated in the Chinese
Sea, are close to the islands of Zabag [= Sumatra] (Ibn Sa'd, p. 334); they are situated in the extreme range, quite close to the coast; they are reached by the Chinese Sea (Dimashki, p. 375), beyond the ocean of Darkness (ibid., p. 391). They are the most famous islands of the Chinese Sea and number over a hundred (Nasrat al-Kulûb, trans. G. Le Strange, p. 222). The islands of Wâkâwâk are situated to the south of the island of Korn and to the west of the islands of Sîf [= Corea] (Ibn Khaldûn, p. 461); in the China Sea and near the islands of Zabag, they are said to number 1,000 (Bukwâ, p. 463); to the south of the islands of Timor, Banda and the Moluccas (Râdî 'Athîr, p. 513); opposite China, a year's journey from the east coast of Africa (Merveilles de l'Inde, p. 585), Wâkâwâk is 4,500 parasangs from Suze (Ibn Khurdâdhbih, p. 32).

The island of Nias on the west coast of Sumatra, which adjoins Zabag, forms part of the archipelago of Wâkâwâk (Ibn al-Wardî, p. 414—415). An island situated 52 li [150 hours' sailing] from Sribusa (Palembâng, S.E. of Sumatra) on the way from Sribusa to China, and 15 li [45 hours' sailing] from Campa (modern Ambon) forms part of Wâkâwâk (Merveilles de l'Inde, p. 589).

The route to Wâkâwâk is from the Coronamian coast (Dimashki, p. 391): one comes there by steering by the stars (Kazwînî, p. 300 and 311; Ibn al-Wardî, p. 415; Bukwâ, p. 463).

It is a large island (Ibn al-Wardî, p. 415). The islands of Wâkâwâk number 1,700 (Kazwînî, p. 300; Ibn al-Wardî, p. 415); 1,500 (Kazwînî, p. 311; Bukwâ, p. 463). They are inhabited and cultivated (Ibn al-Wardî, p. 415); they contain large towns (Merveilles de l'Inde, p. 387).

The ruler of the islands of Wâkâwâk is a woman. She sits nude on a throne, a crown of gold on her head, surrounded by four thousand young slaves also nude (Kazwînî, p. 300; Ibn al-Wardî, p. 415). This queen is called Damhara, wears a robe woven of gold and shoes of gold (Ibn al-Wardî, p. 415; Idrîsî, p. 131).

Some inhabitants of Wâkâwâk are black (al-Bitrînî, p. 164). They resemble the Turks; they are numerous, very industrious, active and intelligent, but treacherous, lying and cunning (Merveilles de l'Inde, p. 387). They weave tunics with sleeves in a single piece; they build large ships and floating houses (Ibn al-Wardî, p. 415).

In 334 (945) of our era, a fleet of 1,000 ships from Wâkâwâk came to plunder some islands of East Africa and certain towns of Sumatra and Zandj. The Wâkâwâk used to come there to get the merchandise necessary for their country and China (Ibn al-Wardî, p. 415). They trade ivory, tortoise shell, panther-skins, amber and Zandj slaves. The voyage lasted a year (Merveilles de l'Inde, p. 587—588). The men there are finer than the women (al-Bitrînî, p. 164).

The Chinese sometimes land there (Idrîsî, p. 193); merchants go with them to look for gold (ibid., p. 194). One cannot land there (Ibn Sa'd, p. 335).

Gold is abundant (Ibn Khurdâdhbih, p. 31; Ibn al-Fakhîr, p. 55; Idrîsî, p. 194; Kazwînî, p. 300; Ibn Sa'd, p. 334; Ibn al-Wardî, p. 415; Bukwâ, p. 463). The chains and collars of dogs, monkeys and other tame animals are of gold (Ibn Khurdâdhbih, p. 31; Kazwînî, p. 300; Dimashki, p. 391; Ibn al-Wardî, p. 414; Bukwâ, p. 463). The chief have bricks made of gold with which they build fortresses and houses (Ibn al-Wardî, p. 414; cf. Abû Zayd Hasûn, p. 84). Tunic woven in gold are sold there (Ibn Khurdâdhbih, p. 31 and 6741; Kazwînî, p. 300—301). The gold is exported in ingots and as dust (Idrîsî, p. 194). The gold mines of the islands of Wâkâwâk is of such productivity that official ordinances are engraved on plates of gold (Nasrat al-Kulûb, trans. G. Le Strange, p. 192).

There is no iron so that it is valued as gold in other countries (Dimashki, p. 391). Florus: "Iron of excellent quality (Ibn Khurdâdhbih, p. 31, Idrîsî, p. 194); ebony (al-Bitrînî, p. 164; Kazwînî, p. 301).

Fau na: elephants, many birds (Idrîsî, p. 193); elephants of great size (Ibn al-Wardî, p. 415); many monkeys which are trained to sweep the houses, and to look for wood in the forests and to do other work (Burhân el-hâkî, p. 563). Fabulous Fânh: fish 200 cubits long, tortoises 20 cubits round (Kazwînî, p. 303); flying scorpions (Merveilles de l'Inde, p. 356); the saumândâr bird which flies fire without injury, a kind of hare which changes its sex (ibid., p. 587).

III. Wâk or Wâk

In Arabic orthography وَكَ. لُوّاٴ

The island of Wâk lies to the south of the "ifâk (Abîregî des merveilles, p. 140), in the neighbourhood of the island of Konar, behind the mountain of Ujûkûn, in the centre of the Southern Sea (Abîghîhî, p. 470). One goes from the sea of Campa to the land of Wâk (Abîregî des merveilles, p. 144). The sea of Campa, which comes before the China Sea, adjoins Wâk (ibid., p. 145). The land of Wâk with its islands lies to the east of China (ibid., p. 153). The land of Wâk lies south of the equator between China and Sumatra, and lies to the south coast of the Indus Sea (Nuwrârî, p. 394).

Wâk is 4,500 parasangs from Suze (Mills à une nuit, p. 506).

The mahârâja, king of the islands, lives in the land of Wâk (Abîregî des merveilles, p. 153; Abîghîhî, p. 144). Marvellous statues are made there (ibid., p. 153).

Much gold is found there (Abîregî des merveilles, p. 153; Abîghîhî, p. 471). The bits for horses, chains and collars of dogs are of gold (Abîregî des merveilles, p. 153; Abîghîhî, p. 471). The people make shirts woven of gold (Abîregî des merveilles, p. 153 and 678).

The mahârâja sits on a throne with a crown of gold on his head, surrounded by 400 young virgins (Abîghîhî, p. 470). The exports are aloe, musk, ebony, cinnamon and all kinds of merchandise (Abîregî des merveilles, p. 153).

IV. The Wonderful Tree of Wâkâwâk and of Wâk

The earliest mention of the story of the fruits in the shape of human beings is given us by a Chinese text: the 道典 T'ung Tien of Tou Yeou, a book which was written between 766 and 801 of our era. Tou Yeou frequently quotes his relative Tou Hua, who was in all probability a monk at the battle of Talas in 754, was in Arab lands from 751 to 762 and put what he
had learned in foreign lands into a book, the

**King of the Arabs** which is now lost.

It was therefore apparently Tou Houna, who, during his forced sojourn among the Arabs, picked up the legend which Tou Yeou relates as follows (*T'oung Pao*, ch. CXCI, p. 235):

"The king of the *Tu-γε* (Arabs) had despatched men who boarded a ship, taking with them clothes and food and went to sea. They sailed for eight years without coming to the far shore of the Ocean. In the middle of the sea, they saw a square rock; on this rock was a tree with red branches and green leaves. On the tree had grown a large number of little children; they were six or seven thumb's length. When they saw the men, they did not speak; but they could all laugh and move. Their hands, feet and heads were fixed to the branches of the trees. When the men detached them and held them, as soon as they were in their hands, they dried up and became black. The messengers returned with a branch of this tree which is still in the palace of the king of the *Tu-γε* (Arabs)" (*T'oung Pao*, Oct. 1904, transl. by E. Chavannes, p. 484-497).

This text was reproduced in the encyclopaedia of Ma Tswan-lin (Ch. occ. era) who wrote in 1319.

Schlegel, who translated it for de Goeje and did not trouble to find out whence Ma Tswan-lin had taken it, inserts before the pentultimate phrase the words: "The name of this tree was vui sokou.

*"I do not know," says Chavannes, where he got this note which is not in the text of Tou Yeou nor in that of Ma Tswan-lin*.


Trees called *wákwí* are also found in India, the fruit of which looks like human beings (Mu- tajhah, p. 117) or like women (Ibn Ṭafail, p. 260).

This island of Wákwí is not so called after a tree the fruit of which is said to be in the shape of human heads crying: *wákwí, wúl (Ar.Briûni, p. 163).* The island or land of Wákwí is on the contrary called after this wonderful tree (Kazwini, p. 300; Ibn Sa'di, p. 334; Dimaghí, p. 375; Ibn al-Wardi, p. 416; Bakuvi, p. 463; Ibn Tyas, p. 483; Siuri Ṭali, p. 513; Burhân bîsh, p. 563; Milli et une nuit, p. 587-589; Merouillés de l'Inde, p. 580; Nuskat al-Kulûk, transl. G. Le Strange, p. 222).

There is in Wákwí a tree like the nut-tree and cassia tree, the fruit of which looks like a man. When the fruit is ripe, it utters distinctly the words: *wákwí, wúl,* then falls (Dimaghí, p. 375; Abâghí, p. 470-471).

The *Kulû mân* of the anonymous geographer of Almeria (xinth cent. A.D.) contains the following interesting description: *"In the part of the land of China which is in the sea, there are many islands; among them, those which are famous and well known number eight. The largest and most important is the island of Wákwí. It is so called because there are great, tall trees there, the numerous leaves of which are like those of the fig-tree, except that they are larger than the leaves of the fig-tree. This tree bears fruit in the month of *Adar,* i.e. the month of March, and they are fruits like the fruits of the palm-tree. These fruits end in the feet of young girls which project from them; on the second day of the month the two legs protrude, and on the third day the two legs and thighs. This continues so that a little more protrudes each day until they have completely emerged on the last day of the month of *Nisân,* i.e. April. In the month of May their head comes out and the whole figure is complete. They are suspended by their hair. Their form and stature are most beautiful and admirable. At the beginning of the month of June, they begin to fall from these trees and by the middle of the month there is not one left on the trees. At the moment of falling to the ground, they utter two cries: *waâk, waâk.* It is also said that they utter three cries. When they have fallen to the ground, flesh without bones is found. They are more beautiful than words can describe but are without life or soul. They are buried in the earth. If they were not buried but left lying no one would be able to approach them on account of the stench. This is a wonder of the land of China. The island is at the end of the inhabited world in this sea. It is in the east of the section of the coast where it touches the Greater Sea" (MS. 770 of the Bibliothèque du Protectorat Francais au Maroc, in Rabat, fol. 5b, supplemented by a manuscript of the same work in the René Basset library.

V. THE ANIMAL-VEGETABLE WÁKWÍ

The Wákwí are according to the *Kulû mân* of Al-Djihâd (in 255-289) the product of plants and animals (in *Ḥayât al-Hayâyân al-kulûh* of al-Damiri, Cairo 1330, ii. 177 and 38). The Wákwí are beings closely resembling the human species. They are the fruit of great trees from which they hang by the hair. They have breasts and sexual organs like those of women. They are coloured and never cease crying *wákwí, wúl.* When one of these creatures is captured, it becomes silent and falls dead (*Abrégé des merveilles*, p. 138 and 677-678). The Wákwí are like palm and coconuts trees, intermediate between the animal and vegetable kingdoms (Dimaghí, p. 367).

VI. THE KING OF THE ISLANDS OF WÁKWÍ

The king of the islands of Wákwí is known as Kapoor (var. *Kaqmir, Nuskat al-Kulûk*, Pers. text, p. 239; Engl. transl. by G. Le Strange, p. 222). Mr. Jadunath Sarkar has kindly examined the MSS. of the *Nuskat al-Kulûk*, accessible to him. In that of the Oriental Public Library (Khuda Baksh Library) of Patna, the name of the king is blank. The Imperial Library of Calcutta (Bohair Collection) has two MSS. of the text: No. 99 has *Kaqmî* and No. 98 *Kaqmî*. These readings unfortunately do not recall any possible known name.

VII. PROPOSED IDENTIFICATIONS

In an appendix to the *Livres des merveilles de l'Inde* (p. 295-307) de Goeje published a French translation, reviewed and corrected, of his *Arsenalbergichten over Japan* under the title *Le Japon commun des Arabes*. He naturally knew and quoted most of the Arabic texts above mentioned. In the course of his researches, he found that the Chinese name for Japan in the Canton dialect is *Wàn-âwâr,* of which *Wàkwí* is a perfect Arabic transcription and the identification of *Wàkwí* therefore seemed certain to him.
The old Chinese name for Japan is 倭国 We-kou, once pronounced *Wa-kou, "land or kingdom of Wa", in Japanese Wa-koku, with a barely perceptible final "u". Wa-kou would be rendered exactly to the forms given by the Arab and Persian geographers. This reasoning is then by no means worthless but it does not supply decisive proof. It remains to be seen if other evidence can be found to support this agreement.

De Goeje's thesis calls for several observations. In the first place, according to certain geographers, there are two Wa-kou: Wa-kou of China and Wa-kou of the south. Ibn al-Fakih expressly says so (cf. above, i.). Masudi, Idriis, Ibn Khallib and Ibn al-Wardi locate the African Wa-kou beside Sofala on the east coast of Africa; Ya'qubii in the Laccu sea, west of India. Now according to certain modern works of Africanists like C. MacTheal and R. N. H. Hall, wa-kou is a name given to the Bushmen by the Bantus of the country, who regard them as a kind of baboon. This explains the statements made by Masudi and the Arab geographers who follow him.

On the other hand, Wa-kou is represented in Malagasy by *tsoua, a vowel which corresponds phonetically to an old wa-kou and means "the people, the subjects, a nation, tribe or clan as a whole". Madagascar might therefore be the island Wa-kou of Ya'qubii. This identification is made certain by the following fact: in the great African island a pandanus called tsoua grows in great profusion; its fruit is a voluminous synocarp. It is known to the French as papaye. Its shape and characteristics might well have given rise to the story of trees producing human beings (cf. above, iv.). Madagascar thus corresponds as exactly as possible with the description of Wa-kou of the south. The "ego" of which the Livre des merveille de l'Inde speaks cannot in any case take the place of this wonderful tree, as de Goeje thought.

The other information supplied by the Oriental geographers is as a rule of little use on account of its fantastic nature or its inaccuracy. One note in the kitab *Adh-Dhib al-Hind may be mentioned: a famous sailor of the lands of gold, Ibn Lzk. reports that in 824 (945) the Wa-kou came with 1,000 ships to the east coast of Africa to procure merchandise and Zandy slaves. The voyage lasted a year. De Goeje, who identifies these Wa-kou with the Japanese, acknowledges that the history of Japan makes no mention of this remarkable fact and concludes that it must have been a private enterprise of Japanese merchants and daimyoos. E. Chavannes says that such an expedition could, not have taken place (Tsung-Pao, Oct. 1904, p. 495). M. Maurice Courant, whom I have consulted, is also of this opinion and Mr. Basil Hall Chamberlain, the eminent master of Japanese studies, has written to me to the same effect. It was impossible for the Japanese of the tenth century to undertake an expedition by sea to the islands and coast of East Africa. The Wa-kou of China or eastern Wa-kou are therefore not the Japanese.

The Arabic and Persian documents which seemed to de Goeje decisive in favour of his thesis, are far from being as conclusive as the illustrious Leyden orientalist believed. Indeed some are definitely against the Japanese theory of Wa-kou, which is really untenable. The existence of two Wa-kou is indisputable. The identification of Wa-kou of the south with Madagascar and East Madagascar of Sofala is equally certain. It only remains to locate Wa-kou of China. The most valuable hint for its identification is the statement that the Mahotsaadj, king of the islands, lives in it. Now we know from other sources that this is the title of the ruler of Zabag, i.e. Sumatra, the land of gold. The Sumatrans were acquainted with the islands and coasts of the western Indian ocean. They peopled Madagascar at an early period and Malagasy is a descendant of a Malay dialect. Idriis gives valuable information on this point: "The people of Komer (= Madagascar) and the merchants of the land of the Mahotsaadj (= Sumatra) visit them (the natives of the west coast of Africa) and are well received and trade with them" (MS. 2223 of the Bibliothèque Nationale, fol. 37v, 1-7-8).

A few pages earlier he says: "The people of the islands of Zabag come to the land of the Zand (here: Madagascar) in large and small ships and they export merchandise from it since they understand one another's language" (ibid., fol. 29v, 1-15).

The name of the port of Baros on the west coast of Sumatra, the Haliis of the Arab geographers, the Po-lou-jie of the Chinese, is mentioned for the first time by Ptolomy (*Paparora *Mere), the five Baros islands, inhabited, it is said, by the anthropophagi, in L. Remou, La Geographie de *Ptolomeos, vii. 1-4, p. 59); then, by the Long *Sung History of the Long (502-550) in the form *Pulo and at the end of the vijth century by Yi-Tak, who has Po-lou-chen. The Arabs call it sometimes Haliis and sometimes Fan'on < Malay Panur. One or other form is found in the oldest texts and recurs in the later ones. It is the famous port of Pakkaland or land of the Pakpok from which used to come the most esteemed camphor.

The tribal name Pakpok goes into Arabic as Pakpok, which is phonetically so close to Wa-kou, that one need not hesitate to identify the two. In Sumatra, as in Madagascar, the pandanus flourishes in a wild state and its Batak name bakhun wana = Malagasy vakona. There are remarkable agreements in the tribal names and in the flora of the two islands: in Sumatra a Batak tribe called Pakpok > Arabic form Pakpok and the pandanus: bakhun wana, in Madagascar the Vakoun < old *Wa-kou and the pandanus: vakona. It is an historical fact that the Sumatrains only have on several occasions come into the western Indian ocean. The Japanese theory of Wa-kou is therefore to be abandoned.

This article is only a synopsis of a memoir now being printed, which will appear in the *Journal Asiatique under the title: Le Wa-kou est-il le Japon ? In the limited space available here, the main arguments in favour of this new identification have been given.

**Bibliography:**
Gabriel Perraudin, *Relations de voyages et textes géographiques arabes, persans et turcs relatifs à l’Extrême-Orient du VIIème au XVIIIème siècles*, Paris, 2 vol., 1913–1914 (these two volumes with continuous pagination contain translations of the text of Ibn Khur-džubib, 844–848; the Arab merchant Sulaiman, 851; Ya'qubib, ca. 875 or 880; Ibn al-Fakih, 902; Ibn Kostel, ca. 903; Abu Zaid Hasan, ca. 916; Mas'udi, *Les prairies d'or*, 943; Le livre de l’aventurier et de la révision, 955; Makul-
This conception resembles that of Indian poets telling of the great ascetics of Brahmanism who, by power of penance succeeded in gaining complete power over matter; but not in Islam, this power is rather the result of a gift from God than the result of the personal merit or ascetic practices of the saints. Popular belief has however not extended the power of the saints in this way: it has rather inclined to specialise it, each of them having in the eyes of the multitude the power of performing a special miracle, like curing a particular disease, bringing success in a particular kind of business, guiding travellers, discovering secrets etc. These miracles of saints (karānāt) are distinguished from the miracles of the prophet, which are called ma'ā'is and are besides few in number, and the theologians discuss in an interesting fashion their evidential value. It is not absolute, whereas the miracles of the prophet count as proofs of religion. — The Mu'tasils denied that there were men like this having special gifts; they reject the privileges and miracles of the saints and teach that every faithful Muslim who obeys God is a 'friend of God' and of the prophet.

3. The saints have been classed in a hierarchy according to a system which is found in much the same form in different authors. There are always saints on the earth; but their sanctity is not always apparent; they are not all not always visible. It is sufficient that their hierarchy goes on and that they are replaced on their death so that their number is always complete. 4,000 live hidden in the world and are themselves unconscious of their state. Others know one another and act together. These are in ascending order of merit: the aḥāyir to the number of 300; the abād, 40; the abur, 7; the awlād, 4; the muḥābata, 3 and the Pole who is unique, kfit or gawwāb. A number of mystics have actually been given the title of Pole. Djinnaid for example was the Pole of his time; Ibn Masrūq was one of the 'pillars' (awlād). Every night the awlād traverse the universe in thought and inform the Pole of any defects in order that he may remedy them. Another variant of this theory is given by Douttē from Algeria. The hierarchy consists of 7 degrees. In the lowest there are the nuṣākā to the number of 300, each of whom is at the head of a group of saints without special titles. Next come the maṣṭakā; then the abarā, from 40 to 70 in number; the aḥāyir, the chosen, 7, who continually move about and spread the Muslim faith in the world; the awlād, pillars, 4, living at the four cardinal points of the compass with reference to Mecca; the kfit, the Pole, the greatest saint of his time, and quite at the top the gawwāb, here distinct from the Pole, capable of taking upon his shoulders a portion of the sins of the believers.

D'Ossison gives the following theory for Turkey: here also there are 7 degrees. There are always 356 saints living on the earth. The first is the gawwāb aṣām or 'great rogue'; the second, his viceroy, the Pole, kfit. Then come the 4 awlād, the pillars. The rest are known by their numbers: ulter, the 3; yodiller, the 7; kirkler, the 40 and yıldiller, the 300.

These seven classes correspond to the 7 degrees of beatitude in Paradise. The saints of the first three classes are represented invisibly in Mecca at the hours of prayer. When the gawwāb dies, the kfit replaces him and there is a moving up all through
mosque that bears his name stands. A son-in-law of Bâyârî I, Emir Sultan, was regarded as a saint. Several Ottoman sultans are also venerated but the title of wâli has actually only been given to Bâyârî II, on account of his piety. Other princes of the Imperial house have been regarded as saints and miracles attributed to them. Among the Arabs the only caliph who is reputed a saint—excepting of course the first four who occupy a special position—is the Umayyad ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz, a very pious ruler.

In Egypt the most popular saints are Ilyâsh al-Mâjâs and Shaikhu Ahmad al-Badawi whose tombs are at Tântâ. To these we may add Sâd al-Shâshâli who died at Hama, in the mountains of Upper Egypt; his tomb is much visited. The festival of Saiyid Maṣrî, al-ʿAzmî in Cairo is the cause of one of the most picturesque processions. A very popular saint in Egypt is Sît Nâfast.

In Arabia various individuals are honoured in the holy cities and their tombs visited, in addition to the usual rites of the pilgrimage. At Medîna in the cemetery of Bâkî are the tombs of several imâms, that of the caliph ʿUthmân and that of the amir Hâmid, uncle of the Prophet. The tomb of Eve recently destroyed by the Wahdhâns, as well as many others, was a few minutes from Dîdî and much visited. The tomb had the peculiarity of being in several parts: the head, the navel and the feet were separated by a short distance from each other. In Mecca, in the cemetery of al-ʿUmdâl, the pilgrims used to visit the tombs of Ŧâmin and Khâshîl, the mother and wife of the Prophet.

In North Africa the worship of saints and marabouts is highly developed. The road to Tripoli along the sea and the vicinity of the towns are fringed with numerous tombs of marabouts, elegant in style, shaded by palm-trees, decorated with gaily coloured cloths and ex-votos placed there by the devout. In the desert at Djebrâl is the tomb of Shaikhu Sanûsî, founder of a well-known order.

The patron saint of Tunis is Sîdî Mâkhlîg and its other saints are Sîdî Ben Arîs, Sîdî Ben Kâsîm, Sîdî Ben Saïd. The Tunisians hold in reverence the caves to which these pious men retired. This region includes the sacred city of Carthage which has many tombs and the famous mosque of Sîdî ʿOqba and that called ʿof the Barber’ in which the barber of the Prophet is said to be buried. — In Algeria in the first rank we have Sîdî Abî Mâkîn, a great miracle-worker whose mausoleum near Tiemcen is still much visited. No less important is Sîdî Abî Kâdir Djjâlî, the saint of Baghdâd to whom are dedicated a vast number of mosques, chapels, and cemeteries in Algeria. Over 200 ʿhabba’s are dedicated to him in the province of Oran alone. Next come Sîdî Ben Mâfîsh, successor to Sîdî Abî Mâkîn of the tribe of the Beni ʿArîs, assassinated in 625 H., whose tomb is in the Djebel ʿAlem near Tidjanié; Mâwâlî al-ʿArîs al-Durkâwî of Fes, a modern saint who died not long after 1822, and was buried in his shaâra near Fès; Shaikhu Tîdîjânî, founder of the order died in 1250 (1835) and also buried in his shaâra near Fès. In Morocco the principal patron saints are Mâwâlî Idrîs, the founder of the dynasty, venerated at Volubilis, and the shaâra of Wezzân, even during their lifetime.
on account of the blessing they bring (their barakat) which is much esteemed by the people; even their women are believed to possess this virtue. Several women in Morocco like Lalla Marna, and Umm 'Abd Allâh have been given, like Sitt Nafsîna, the title of saint (maâliyya). Mârâkiûh has some panegyric saints called "the 7 thieves", andabit al-nasîr; among them are Sidi 'Abbas and Sidi Sliman al-Djaâni, author of a wide-spread book on prayers. In Tangier there is Sidi Bîl al-Rikaya, a miracle-worker of the xvith century whose festival (mezwem) is celebrated on the seventh day of the Prophet's masjidat; at Mekez, Muhammad b. 'Issa, founder of the 'Isâwa. In this town a strange story is recorded of a living saint who kept standing leaning against a wall; pious people had a penthouse built above him, then a baheb without disturbing him. - In Timbuktu Sidi Yâbû, a miracle-worker of the xvith century, and Sidi Ben Sâsî are held in honour.


(B. Carra de Vaux)

AL-WALID b. 'ABD AL-MALIK, Umayyad Caliph (85-88 = 705-715). On the death of his father, the caliph 'Abd al-Malik (Oct. 705), al-Walid, his successor, was over 30. A prince of only average culture, he brought to the throne an aristocratic outlook and a display of religious fervour unknown among his predecessors. In the history of the Umayyads he ranks as the great builder of the dynasty. One of his first cares was to give his capital Damascus a magnificent mosque. Walid cast his eyes on the basilica of St. John the Baptist, once a temple of Jupiter Damascenus. Of this edifice, tradition says that it was divided in two between its old owners and the Muslims after the Arab conquest. Against this we have the explicit testimony of the pilgrim Arculf who visited Damascus in the reign of Mu'awiyah I. He says "in honorem sancti Johannis baptistae grandis fundata ecclesia est. Quadrum exist Sarracenorum ecclesia incendiorum et ipsa in eodem loco, quam ipsi frequentant, fabricata est". If this may be believed, then under Mu'awiyah, the Arabs in Damascus were content with a single mosque, a modest (quantum) erection built for them and not obtained at the expense of the basilica which was still in Christian ownership in the time of the Sufyanîd caliphs. The upholders of the Muslim tradition say that Arculf made a mistake. He did not notice that mosque and church formed a single building.

The caliphs Mu'awiyah and 'Abd al-Malik had vainly negotiated with the Christians for the cession of the whole basilica. The autocratic Walid decided to confiscate it without any ado. He did not take down the building; he only abolished the eastern apse; he built the Rûbat al-Narî, the "Dome of the Eagle", above the transept and to the north of the mosque pavement the "Minaret of the Fanece"; the two other minarets were built upon older towers. Walid's activity was fully displayed in remodelling the interior of the basilica in which he gave rein to all his taste for magnificence and to the suggestions of Syrian decorators. He mobilised a regular army of marble workers. The capitals were covered with gold and the walls with mosaics. An inscription "in memoriam legionis of gold on a ground of lapis-lazuli" (Mas'ûlî) bore the name of Walid with the date (Nov. 706) marking the beginning of the work, a year after the accession of the Caliph. Along with this great undertaking, Walid directed the building of the great mosques of Medina and Mecca, which he also entrusted to Christian architects.

The arabisation of the administration is another striking feature of his reign. The great government offices were taken from the Christians, the control of the finances from a Damascus family, the descendants of Ibn Sandâm. Finally we may mention the progress of foreign conquests. By a process of expansion which was almost automatic, the Arab empire in this reign attained its greatest extent from Transoxania to Spain, where the Arabs now succeeded in gaining a footing. Walid was a continually fortunate sovereign. Everything succeeded with him, even his autocratic manner, which had acquired distinction in a diminution in the tolerance shown to the dhimmîs. In Syria he enjoyed undisputed popularity. People admired his great buildings, his charitable undertakings and public works and the great conquests of his reign. In keeping with the will of 'Abd al-Malik, his brother Sulaimân was to succeed him. Walid was thinking of substituting his son 'Abd al-Azîz in his place when death overtook him at Dair Murân, near Damascus on Feb. 23, 715 at the age of about 45.


AL-WALID b. AL-MU'AIWAH b. 'ABD ALLAH b. OMAR b. MAQARH, an opponent of Muhammad. Little is known of his life but it is certain that he was one of the most powerful men in Mecca and one of the most ardent opponents of the Caliphs. 

---

---
he Prophet. As head of the numerous and prominent family of the Mağhām he naturally represented the aristocratic interests in the city of Muhammad's birth and that he was himself very prosperous is evident from the fact that, according to traditionists, he owned a garden in Ta'ifi which he planted for pleasure only and never pulled the fruit in it (Sprenger, I, 359). According to the commentators, there are references to him in several passages in the Kur'ān, e.g. Sūra vi. 10; ališ. 30; łxxiv. 11 sqq.; 1xxx. 1 sqq., although his name is nowhere expressly mentioned. One cannot of course place implied confidence in such statements, which are sometimes based on later deductions. Many historians frequently mention al-Walid among those Kurāqār who vigorously persecuted Muhammad and endeavoured to silence him. Thus he is said to have been a member of a delegation which went to Abū Ta'līb [q. v.] and protested to him but without success at the Prophet's conduct. It is also related that Muhammad's enemies had on one occasion, on the approach of the pilgrims discussed the best means to set strange visitors against Muhammad and proposed in turn the epithets ẖāṣīn 'worthless', maghānīn 'possessed' and ẖamīs 'poorer' but al-Walid rejected them all until those present finally agreed to his proposal to call Muhammad a sāhir 'magician,' who would separate a man from his father, brother, wife and whole family, and to warn the pilgrims seriously against the alleged magician. When 'Oğmān b. Ḥafṣū, a relative of al-Walid, who had adopted Islam and taken part in the immigration to Abyssinia, was still under al-Walid's protection, wished to break off this relationship, the latter endeavoured to dissuade him, but in vain. After al-Walid had therefore released himself from all obligations to his relative 'Oğmān was severely wounded in a squabble, whereupon al-Walid again offered him his protection but 'Oğmān rejected this kindly meant offer. Al-Walid died in Mecca in the year 1 and three of his seven sons adopted Islam. In keeping with his aristocratic descent and social position, his actions were frequently characterised by a certain megalomaniac and dignity, and Sprenger (ii. 111) describes him as follows, probably with justice: "He was one of the earliest and most decided enemies of Islam, but at the same time chivalrous and not without culture. He therefore laid more emphasis on dissuading his fellow-citizens from the new religion than on seizing it in the bud by attacking the personal rights of the Muslims. Instead of using physical force, he gathered round him men of talent, knowledge and experience like Umayya b. Abu l-Salit and Naḍr b. Hārith and endeavoured to expose Muhammad's contradictions and deceptions and to make him ludicrous and despicable in the eyes of intelligent people, while he silenced the common people by his prestige and material advantages".
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(K. V. Zettlerstein)

AL-WALID b. YARĪZ, Umayyad Caliph. He was about 35 (Feb. 743) when he succeeded his uncle, the Caliph Hishām b. 'Abd al-Malik: if only for his personal courage, liberality, love of letters and patronage and practice of poetry, Walid was bound to shine in the first rank among the Umayyads'. Such is the judgment of the Kitāb al-Asrār (vi. 101) the author of which could not be suspected of partiality for the Umayyads. An artistic and remarkably cultivated young man, which was due to the culture his predecessors had been, the son of the hysteric caliph Yazid II he was certainly also the most libertine. After a brief appearance in Damascus for the enthronement (kalāla) the new caliph hastened to resume in the desert the free life, void of all constraint, that he had led as a prince without worrying about affairs of state or the interdictions of the Kur'ān. We need not however believe all the stories of his eccentricities given in the Kitāb al-Asrār. He spent his time in merry company surrounded by poets, parasites, musicians of both sexes, he himself being justly esteemed as a musician.

His cruelty towards the faithful Khalid al-Kafrî [q. v.] whom he put to death soon raised against him the Yemenis in Syria. Fond of field sports, the caliph had in the lifetime of his uncle built in the middle of the desert a hunting lodge, Kuṣair Amra [cf. 'Amra]. When he became caliph he proposed to build in the solitude a grand palace and transfer there all the refinements of civilization. Such was the origin of the fantastic castle of Maḥṣūr [q. v.]. A virtuoso in music and poetry, this bizarre and blasé character dreamed of eclipsing the architectural glories of 'Abd al-Malik [q. v.] and of Walid I [q. v.].

With his unusual proportions, its façade, carved with delicate treacly lacework, the building of Maḥṣūr "has fascinated the whole world and caused more ink to flow than any other in Syria" (van Berchem). Archeologists have attributed it successively to the Romans, Byzantines, Ghausoids and Persians. They have neglected the Umayyads, who were great builders from 'Abd al-Malik onwards, and all fond of a ḫājiyya or a holiday in the desert. For the builder of Maḥṣūr, we hesitated at first between Yazid II and al-dhisand, both of whom lived in the region of Moab (Lammens, La Bédia et la Hira sous les Omayyades, p. 110 sqq.). A passage in Severus Ibn Maṭṭaṣṣ' (p. 163-164) settles the question in favour of our Walid.

Rebellion was stirring in the provinces and soon spread to Syria. For the first time since Mu'awiyah, the harmony between this country and the Umayyads which had given them strength to face the most violent storms, was broken. The discontented Yemenis - they formed the great majority of the Arabi in Syria - were joined by the Kaddars, who also had been ill-treated by Walid II. The numbers of the Kaddars had grown and they were led by a Marwanid, Yazid, son of Walid I. The majority of the Marwanids, whom he had alienated by his capricious and the conspiracy. The rebels left Damascus to surprise the caliph who was hunting. In his flight northwards he was overtaken and killed in the little fort of Bakhrā' south of Palmyra (April 17, 744).
WALID SULTAN (A). Turkish pronunciation valide or valide sultan; the two words are, in asposition, according to Turkish syntax, the sultan's valide or sultan mother, a title borne in the old Ottoman empire by the mother of the reigning sultan and only for the duration of her son's reign.

The political history of the Wâlide Sultan is fairly well known from the Turkish historians, at least as far as those are concerned who took part openly in the government of the country, for example Nur Râni, Şâfiye, Mâh-Feiker Kösem and Turhan Khaddije.

We are by no means so well informed about the conditions of their life in the sultan's harem. The organization of the harem only began to be unveiled at the period when the institution itself was beginning to disappear. Influenced no doubt by a feeling of discretion or of modesty, the Turkish historians do not touch on the subject. Western writers, in spite of a lively curiosity, never succeeded in piercing the mystery and frequently give rein to their imagination to complete their notes. The oldest travellers passed over the subject in silence. It is however in western sources that we find valuable information if it is used with care. It is only in modern times however that criticism has dealt with certain fables long believed, such as, for example, the story of the bandarchief thrown by the sultan to his favourites (cf. v. Hammer, xiv. 71-73).

As Na'mâsh says (iv. 250, s v.) the Ottoman sultans according to the sultanian fâmi did not live in a state of marriage but of concubinage (fûstûrî). The word fâmi is to be taken here in the sense of "traditional usage" and not of written law. The chief of the customs (âmrûnâ sâgirî) and later the official slave dealers (srâfârî hâdûtî) and private individuals by gifts supported the sultan's harem with slaves of the most varied origins: Europe, Asia and Africa.

The custom of concubinage — which we also find in Persia (Chardin, vi. 233) down to the reign of Muhammad 'Ali Shah (1807-1809) — must have become established in Turkey gradually. In the early period the Ottoman sultans chose their wives from the daughters of the Turkish rulers of Anatolia or Byzantine princesses. It is difficult to say what was the social status of these wives or to know in what way they differed from the concubines of these princes. We see clearly from 'Ashk-paşa-zade's history (ed. Geise, p. 109-110) that Murâd I regarded the Serbian princess whom he married simply as a srâfî or "slave" but the preparations for certain other unions were made with a solemnity which suggests that great importance was attributed to them.

After the taking of Constantinople, official marriages of the sultans became quite the exception. We may mention Sulaimân the Magnificent and 'Othmân II and lastly Ibrahim who was the last to conclude a matrimonial alliance with one of his harem Tellî-Khâşèk or Şâh-Sultan in 1647 (D'Ossor, vi. 63; Na'mâsh, loc. cit.). The sultan was however represented in this ceremony by the Grand Vizier.

The principles of Ottoman policy were themselves against these marriages. The relatives of a slave seemed less to be feared and indeed were officially put into seclusion. It is hardly necessary to add that this prohibition only partially palliated the evil it was intended to avoid. As is seen from the bloody story of the Jews Kera, a contemporary of the Wâlide Sultan Şâfiye (Bâba), harem intrigues played a great part under some sultans. In Turkey as in Persia (Chardin, vi. 225), the sultan's mother had to be reckoned with. It was therefore natural for a politician to endeavour to get into the sérâfî or gift to the sultan a woman devoted to his interests. The Circassians in particular were very skilful in deriving advantage from the secret influence of such connections. It may also be noted that some sultans such for example as Muşafâz III and 'Abd al-Hamîd I married slaves formally or rather from conscientious scruples. "Religious law," says D'Ossor, "not permitting a person born free and a Muslim to be reduced to slavery, the intercourse of a master with a female slave can only be legitimate when it is certain that she was not born a Muslim and free. If he has not proof of this, and wishes nevertheless to live with her, he ought for the peace of his conscience to free her and marry her. The sultan then marries his manumitted slave without the slightest display in the presence of the Muqâbbî." From all this then it is clear that the Wâlide Sultans were always former slaves. Von Hammer (viii. 288) is therefore right when he says that the sultan was bound to be the "son of a slave". Ubicini (La Turquie actuelle, Paris 1855, p. 122) also adds that the people never mention him except by this name, but we do not know to what Turkish term he refers.

From her former position there survived to the Wâlide Sultan a picturesque name which was popularly believed to be taken from the Persian and to which was sometimes added an ordinary Muslim name (cf. the list of Wâlide Sultans, below).

The mere fact that she had given birth to a prince had early earned her the title of hâdût or hâsîk (hâsîkî) but nothing could equal the prestige which the accession of her son brought her and which, unlike dowager queens of other countries, she had not to share, officially at least, with a queen consort. Under the name of Wâlide Sultan she became henceforth the first woman in Turkey, simply as a result of the respect due to her quality of mother. This respect is so deeply rooted among the Turks that the influence of Islam (cf. the hâdût; "Paradise is at the feet of the mothers") is not sufficient to explain it. The sultans used to set an example of filial piety and the Wâlide Sultan sometimes exercised a very considerable influence over her son whom she called in Turkish fashion asלאمة the "lion" or پاشا "my tiger" (we know that 'Alî's mother called her son Assad, "lion", but this had been her own father's name).

The installation of the Wâlide Sultan was a solemn ceremony, especially if she had been relegated to the old sérâfî (srâfî-i sérâfî-i sérâfî, a building erected by Meşhed II, later the Seraskerat and now the University. This relegation
took place regularly when, after the death of the sultan, her husband, the throne passed to an heir who was not her son. A week or two after the accession of her son, the new sultan's mother was brought in procession (wa'lide alyaэфф) to the new sultan (top-şâph or top-şâph surâtly wrongly called the "old sultan") by western writers) where the sultan lived (cf. the examples of wa'lide alyaэфф in Wâfi, i. 28; Djezewetz, iv. 1275, 243; Mustafa Nedjîb, p. 112). The chief bodyguard (numerous) (dâlân-sâ'âdat uşûl-chârîe aghârî), the wa'lide alyaэфф (cf. below) and the officers of the imperial harem figured in this procession. The Wâlîde Sultan was borne on a litter (âkkârâsvâran), later in an open carriage, surrounded by pîkâ and sâhâ (q. v.). According to Andreyessi, the Wâlîde Sultan, as a remarkable privilege, showed herself to the people without a veil (âzghâmî). The sultan went to meet her mother at the Bâb-e-Sâ'âde gate of the sersi. She was settled in her suite (wa'lîde sultân yeri) which can still be seen to-day, although in comparatively modern form, for it was destroyed by fire on 10th Mubârak Ramdë 1076 (July 23, 1665) (Silhâtar Tarihi, l. 384; Halîl Ethen [Khalil Ethem], Le Palais de Top-kapou, in French, Istanbul 1931, p. 58 and picture on p. 50; cf. also a description of this suite in Pouqueville, Voyages en Turquie, à Constantinople etc., Paris 1805, ii. 256–255). Her removal to her new abode was announced next day to the Sublime Porte in an official document called hâkîm-îâmîc (Ahmed Râsim, 'Osmânîl Tarihi, pp. 1082).

The new Wâlîde Sultan sent to the Grand Vizier a dagger (khowlet) studded with jewels. The Grand Vizier and the Shâhîch al-Îlâm each received a clasp of sable (jâmâl).

The Wâlîde was supreme mistress of the female personnel of the imperial harem, the discipline of which she supervised. Every favour or permit to go out had to be submitted to her. The deference shown to her found expression in a special etiquette. She could not be approached unless a formal request for an audience had been made. It was forbidden to address her without being invited to speak or to sit down in her presence. One stood in front of her in the respectful attitude called âşâm durmâc or el jâmâl durmâc. Ladies, even the greatest favourites, never appeared before her except in the enbarl, the name in the language of the palace for a kind of ceremonial robe. When the Wâlîde Sultan went out she was escorted by an imposing suite and all the guards saluted her (P. de Régla, La Turquie officielle, 1891, p. 262–263).

The Wâlîde Sultan was so used to those honours that the adopted mother of 'Abd al-Hamid II is said to have been offended when the German Empress did not kiss her hand (G. Rizas, Les Mystères de Yildiz, Constantinople 1909, p. 64–65). As to the incident of the salute paid to the Wâlîde Sultan by ships of the Marquis of Nointel, the French ambassador, it was exaggerated if we may rely on what the Marquis de Bonnac says: according to him, his predecessor made excuses (cf. Vandal, Les Voyages du Marquis de Nointel, p. 53; Le Marquis de Bonnac, Mon. hist. sur l'Ambassade de France à Constantinople, ed. Schefer, 1894, p. 28). On the death of the Wâlîde Sultan, the sultan accompanied her remains as far as the gate at which he went to meet her on his accession. The cortège then went on to the place of burial led by the Grand Vizier and the Shâhîch al-Îlâm (Wâfi, i. 50). Forty days of mourning during which the ministers visited the tomb and the Qur'an was read (Tarikh-i Selimît, 1281, p. 173).

If on the other hand the sultan died before his mother, she returned to the old seray to join the women retired or disgraced from the harem (Ahmed Râsim, 'Osmânîl Meşâmû, N, 10, p. 190).

We can only quote two cases of the Wâlîde Sultan retaining the title in the reigns of two men: Mîh-Çeiker Kosem Sultan, mother of Murâd IV and of Ibrahim, and Gûl-Nâşir Emet-Ullah Sultan, mother of Meşêm II and of Ahmed III. In one case there were two Wâlîde Sultan simultaneously: Mîh Çeiker Kosem Sultan already mentioned, grandmother (bâyiûk wa'lîde) and Tarâkhan Khadîjû (Tarîkh-i Hâcîce) Sultan, mother of Meşêm IV. This was however terminated by the violent death of the former.

When a prince imperial became sultan after the death of his mother, the title of Wâlîde Sultan was given to his foster-mother or nurse (vîstie wa'lîde, tava kadın; older formula: ûçyê hâtûun), foster-relationships being held in high regard in Turkey. In default of either, the name of wa'lîde was given by the sultan to the Khamârûdar-Ûsta or Grand Mistress of the Treasury.

In the reign of 'Abd al-Hamid II, who had lost his mother at an early age, the rank of Wâlîde Sultan was given to his adopted mother Peresto Hanım, formerly fourth kadın of 'Abd al-Medjid (Razia, op. cit., p. 109; Dorys, Abu al-Hamid imâmê, 1907, p. 6 sqq.).

The position of the Wâlîde Sultan was very important during minorities. They acted practically regents.

Titles of the Wâlîde Sultan. The word wa'lîde "she who gives birth" is not in itself of any honorific significance. It is a synonym of the word ana "mother" but with the implication of greater respect. The Wâlîde Sultan very frequently has additional epithets like mûjdîdê "glorious" or muhtereme "honoured"; wa'lîdine mújdîdê (muhtereme), the (deceased) father of a reigning sultan was called wa'lîdine mújdîd. (The popular pronunciation is due to the loss of the narrow vowel in the second syllable, a phenomenon fairly common in Turkish which even affects foreign words, when the accent is displaced to the last syllable; khâlîf > xâlif; khâsin > xhasin. Cf. also in Arabic Bâshî; see below).

The title of sultan "sultanîa" on the other hand was the peculiar prerogative of the mother of the reigning sovereign. It was not given by the sultan and she was the only woman who could bear it "without birth" as Baron de Todt says. It is moreover used here as an honorific affix or more accurately, in post-position (cf. the article SULTAN) like other titles of this kind (pâga, bey, efendi, etc.), and it is a mistake to explain it as, is sometimes done, by the Arabic wa'lîde sultanî (i) which is said to mean "mother of the sultan". "Mother of the sultan" would be in Arabic in the construct state wa'lîdet as-al-sultanî. And we actually find this in the Arabic epithet of Kâhîvand khatun or Mâherî, mother of a Saljûq sultan, at Pazar Nâwiyesi (4 hours from Tokat; cf. the text in Isma'il Hâkîfi, Kâhiyûre, Istanbul 1345 [1927], pp. 77–78). Nor is there any question of a haplography in the Persian construction wa'lîdet-i sultanî.
Besides the Wālide Sultān, the only women entitled to the affixed title of Sultan — like begum in Persia (Chardin, vi. 233) — were princesses, daughters of a sovereign or a prince imperial, the daughter of a sultan having the right only to the title khanum-sultan.

Numerous authors, such as Cantimir and Guer, who followed him, are therefore wrong in lavishing the title sultan on the wives of the sultans. De Otti — who got his information from his wife who was born in Turkey and on terms of intimacy with Turkish princesses — long ago protested against this misuse of the term (ib. 42). It seems however that we must not go to the other extreme. Thornton (Present State of Turkey, London 1812, ii. 411) seems to be right when he says that the title of sultan was given "by courtesy" to all khanjets, and according to d’Ohsson (vi. 85) it is only since Mehemed IV (1648-1687) that it was given only to daughters of sovereigns. The dates would have to be brought down a little, if we remember that the same author (vii. 65) says that down to the reign of Ahmad III (1703-1730) the sultan who gave birth to a prince was given only the title of khanjetsi-sultan. If we believe the Marquis de St. Maurice, this title was given only to the mother of the male firstborn; cf. La Cour eathmane ou l’Intérêt de la Perse, Paris 1673, p. 94 and, with the necessary modifications, p. 185.

These customs were sufficiently well known in the west for Racine, who was nothing of an orientalist, to allude to them in these lines of his Bajazet (Act. II. Sc. 2): "Et même il (Sultan Amurah) a voulu que l'heureuse Roxane, Avant qu'elle eût un fils, pût le nom de Sultan".

It is clear from the above that from the beginning of the xviiith century at latest the title of sultan had ceased to be given to certain concubines of the sultan but we do not know at what period it was given to the latter's mother.

Among the Saliūi, the predecessors of the Ottomans, the sultan's mother had the title khatun [q. v.], (arabicised plural: khanwîlas) "empress", "queen", as in the already quoted epigraph of Khand-khatan.

The mothers of the early Ottoman princes bore the same title of khatun which under the form of sultan was to remain until the end of the imperial régime as the title of the sultan's principal favourites and in ordinary usage to lose its honorific significance to the extent of becoming inferior to khanıa "lady" and meaning simply "woman". This is how we find the mother of the Sultan Celebi Mehemed I called demet-sultan in the epigraph of 816 preserved at Bruss (cf. T. O. E. M., p. 509-510; corrected in M. T. M., ii. 177, l. 4 sqq.).

The mosque founded at Tokat by Bâyazid II in honour of his mother is called Khattaniye (T. Taqel, op. cit., p. 29-30). It is probable that in the following reign the practice became established of calling the sultan's mother Wâlide Sultan.

We have not space here to enumerate the other titles, administrative, literary or poetic, given to the Wâlide Sultan. The most common was that of mehdi-i īshik found as early as the Mongols of Persia (Mirkhod).

Allowances and house of the Wâlide Sultan. The allowances to the Wâlide Sultan like those of the khanjets and also sometimes those of the judges (Ewliya Celebi, ii. 6) were in general called başmâfi or paşmâfi, properly "for sandals" (v. Hammer, vi. 318; z. 75, 188). They were not fixed and consisted sometimes of money and sometimes of land. Sultan Ibrâhim distributed whole provinces among his khanjetsi as başmâfi (Na'ım, iv. 243). In normal times the Wâlide Sultan enjoyed a much larger income than the sultans (relations or sisters of the sultan; cf. d’Ohsson, vii. 95). According to Cantimir, it amounted to over 1,000 purses. The Turks, says the same author, never take a town without setting aside a street in it for the başmâfi of the Wâlide Sultan (cf. also Bianchi's dictionary under the word başmâfi). The town of Smyrna formed part of her appanage and she maintained a müstevel there (Taucogne, Voyage à Smyrne, Paris 1817, l. 29-30). On her appanage of Crete, cf. Savary, Lettres sur la Grèce, 1788, p. 247). The mother of the Sultan was the Wâlide Sultan, a title sometimes rich enough to build mosques or, like Ahmad III's mother, to raise troops.

In modern languages, the word başmâfi was replaced by tağıfi (the sâneyyân) "civil list" (Khloros). In 1850 the civil list of the sultan's mother and of the married sisters of the sultan amounted to 8,400,000 piastres, the piastre at this time being worth 23 gold centimes (De la réforme en Turquie au point de vue financier et administratif, Paris 1851, p. 12, a brochure of 34 pp. 8°, of which a résumé was given in the Revue des Deux-Mondes of Sept. 1st 1850 in 10 pp.; p. 938-948).

Like all the sultans, the mother of the Ottoman sovereign had a bâyâha (bânânda) or "superintendent, comptroller of her finances" (cf. the expression selçûkî bânânda, "comptrollers of the sultans" in Silahhar Târîkh, l. 646 below) but that of the Wâlide Sultan was by far the most important in view of the considerable financial interests which he controlled, and the influence which he himself could exert with the Wâlide Sultan. He sometimes exerted enormous influence although it was frequently hidden. Foreign ambassadors were well aware of this and as a rule did not fail to win these officials' good graces by every means in their power (Beauvaisins, p. 12; Târîkh-i Ebrûlet, 1288, viii. 252-256).

It has been said that the wâlide bâyâha combined this office with that of master of the Mint (dârâsâ-î umârî nâşirî) and this was indeed frequently the case (e.g. al-Hâdid Mehemed Efendi later Pasha and his successor, in 1127, Atitâl Dâsim Efendi; cf. Sidifis-i othmanis, iy. 219; III. 425; Râşid, l. fol. 105, 105-106) but there were very many exceptions; cf. Agha-babai Ibrâhîm Agha appointed wâlide bâyâha in 1605 (Wülf, p. 30 et seq.; cf. also Abdulkâhi, Mehînîli, 1931, p. 180, note 1).

The rank of râûbi-i iîsî (âfisî ruvelî) created on Monday 10th Rabbî II 1255 (July 24, 1837) was given to the wâlide hâlâ bâyâha and to the Master of the Mint (Silânum-i nezaret-i bâ-"idîfî, 1702, p. 109). When the rank of hâlâ was instituted in 1253 (1845-1846) the wâlide bâyâha Husein Bey was one of the two officials who first received it (J. Deny, Sommaire des archîves turques du Caïro, p. 559, below).

The Wâlide Sultâns, like all the important ladies of the serây, had at their command a first (baş-agha) and second enouch (Leila Hanoum, Le Harem Impérial, 1925, p. 113). Details of the organisation of their household, which resembled those of other sultans, except that it was more
magnificent, are given in Osman-Bey, Les Femmes en Turquie, p. 268.

List of Sultan's mothers. The list of mothers of the rulers of Turkey is here given from the Sīyāṣāl-ā'īb-māni of Thūrīyā (Sūreyyā) Bey with a few modifications.

The princesses figuring at the head of this list were not, as we have seen above, properly Wālīde Sūlṭāns since this title did not yet exist in their time. This title was nevertheless and like that of the Sūlṭāns themselves often wrongly put back to the beginning of Ottoman history. The title was given even to the mother of Ertoghul Ghâzâ, a legendary figure known as Khiyimey Ana "mother test" whose tomb was discovered in the reign of 'Abd al-Ḥamīd II at the village of Čehârghembe (Čeşme) in the mālûy of Dumnâni, in the district of Ine-Gul (Sīyāṣāl, i. 86). We do not know if this discovery is due to the zeal of an inventor devoted to the old dynasty or to the persistence of a local tradition which cannot be substantiated. The very name Khiyime Ana is suspicious.

In Sūreyyā Bey's list, the title of "sultanah" first appears in the case of Gûlbehār, mother of Bâyâzîd II, which in itself is not impossible but we have already seen that she had the title of khâtun.

The following is this list with a few changes and a list of the buildings erected by the Wālīde Sūlṭāns interested in building (Nos. 7, 8, 11, 13, 15, 16, 21 and 23). The references refer only to these buildings. Abbreviations: m. = mother; s. = sultan; Ḥad. Lâwâni = Hâkim Hâsim b. al-Ḥâdidī Jamâl al-Awânsârî, Ḥad. Lâwâni, Constantino-pol, Ramâdad 1281, 3 vol. (transl. by Hammet, Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman, vol. xviii.); Cuinet = Vital Cuinet, Le Turquie d'Antie, 1924, 4 vols. in-4°.

1. Mâlkhum Râhâh Khatun (or Malikhatun), daughter of Shaikh Edebalî, m. of Orkân-Bey (and of the vizier 'Ali ad-Dîn); 1276 (1226-1236).

2. Nîlâfer, daughter of tekbâr of Yâr-Hisrâr, m. of Murâd I.

3. Dewlet Khatun (Sûreyyâ: Sultan Khatun), daughter of Germany Oghuî, m. of Mehmed I.

4. N., daughter of Isfendiyâr, m. of Mehmed II (cf. however Isfendiyâr) where Hâfiz, daughter of Mahbîr al-Isfendiyâr and wife of Murâd II, is given as mother of Hisân, killed in 855).

5. Gûlbaneh, m. of Bâyâzîd II.

6. 'Āshâ b., m. of Sultanam the Magnificent; 14th Ramâdad 940 (March 19, 1544).

7. Nûr Bâbû, b., m. of Murâd III; 21st Dhu-l-Ka'da 991 (December 6, 1585; according to Shâhâr Tâhirî: December 7).

Buildings: in Scutari in Asia (Top-taghi quarter): mosque called 'Alâlīç (atâ-lâmî), with madrasa, primary school (mekâbûs-i şubnâr), hospital (ďer esh-kestâbâ) with in-patient school (dîr al-'âbdâh), school for the Korân (dîr al-'âbdâ), a hostel (ma'îsûr-âlamî); cf. I. Dârî, ii. 182-184 and 218-219; Hammet, xviii. 89, No. 749; p. 94, No. 781; p. 114, No. 54; Cuinet, iv. 639-640.


10. Mîh-Firaq (s.), m. of O'câmân III.


12. N., m. of Mâşafat I.

13. Turhan Khatülde (Turhan Hatûte), s. of Russian origin, m. of Mehmed IV; Tuesday Shu'âbân 10, 1094 (Aug. 4, 1683; according to the Shâhâr Tâhirî, ii. 116 sqq., date confirmed by the Relations de Donado; cf. the Bibliography; otherwise, Sûreyyâ Bey, Ahmed Reçi in Turhan Valide, p. 424; 10th Radjah).

Buildings: in Stambul (Emin Öâli quarter, Bagçe-kapul, dominating the well known bridge of Karakoy or Galata): the famous mosque Yêni gûmânî or Yêni wàlîde gûmânî (begun by Sâfiyya s. (No. 8) and finished in 1074 (inscription); on the Dardanelles: completed the building (inscription of 1070) of the citadel begun by Mîh-Peiker Kösum No. 11; cf. Had. Lâwâni, ii. 109, No. 3; v. Hammet, xvi. 89, No. 748; Pitton de Tournefort, Relation d'un voyage du Levant, Lyon 1712, i. 106; Charles Pertuiset, Promenade pittoresques dans le Constantinople et sur les riviers du Bosphore, Paris 1815, p. 185-189; Gabriel, Les Mosquées de Constantinople, in Syria, 1946; Ahmed Reçi, Wâlîde Dîwânî-i Ivi, Yêni Dîwânî, in Yêni Mevâni, No. 10, p. 189-192 (according to the Shâhâr Tâhirî, i. 218 and 390, the building of the mosque was resumed in 1071 and finished on Friday 20th Râbî II 1076 [October 30, 1665] (according to the Shâhâr Tâhirî, i. 218). On Sunday 22nd Şafar 1101 (December 4, 1669).

14. Sûhîye Dil-Ashûb b., m. of Süleîmân II; 22nd Muḥarran 1101 (according to the Shâhâr Tâhirî, ii. 484, Sunday 22nd Şafar 1101 [December 4, 1669].)

15. Gülbâhâr (or Gülûbâm) Emet-ullah s. (often wrongly called Ummetullah), of Cretan origin from Retimno (of the Vertzanos family, according to Donado), m. of Mâşafat II and of Ahmed III; 10th Dhu-l-Ka'da 1127 (November 6, 1716), according to Had. Lâwâni, ii. 188; Tuesday 8th Dhu-l-Ka'da = November 5).

Buildings: in Mecca: Kháşkeıye 'inâret, fountains and wells on the pilgrims' road, at Galata: Yâhiçî...
The 1117
WALIDE SULTAN

The mother of Mehemd II was the daughter of Ifendi (cf. de Salaberry, Histoire de l’Empire Ottoman, Paris, l. 148; cf. No. 4, above, in the list of the Walide Sultan). The very interesting but always credulous and often mendacious Ewliya Celebi admits in spite of everything (l. 106 sqq.) that Mehemd II was the son of Ifendi’s daughter, the “Alime Khannum” (it may be noted that this is the name given to the alleged French princess) but to arrange matters he makes the king of France’s daughter the concubine of Mehemd II and the mother of Bayazid II. He also says that his father had known a certain Sukemerli Mustafat, bagh­-i-khan of Janissaries, who was related to this princess and on this account used to receive presents from France. On the other hand, Cantimir (1743, ii. 410) records, without however believing it, another version of the story in which a grand­daughter of a king of France enters the hareem of Suleyman the Magnificent. It was obviously the Turks themselves who invented these fables, to explain the favoured treatment accorded the “padişah” of France in Turkey.

More recently the French and Turkish governments have had to deal from time to time with people desirous of having their relationship with the old Ottoman dynasty recognised. Mehemd II was, it was said, the son of Al­-Umar, a leading officer in the Buç de Rivery, a Creole of Martinique and a relative of the Empress Josephine (see below). The impossibility of this has been proved from official documents: Sultan’s harem behind 215 at the time of the attack on the Balkans on 1550, and had seen in Nantes in 1788, when she was a witness to and signed the marriage contract which is still in existence. The thesis was however abandoned on this account; it was simply modified. Aimee de Buç de Rivery — whose admission to the hareem of Suleyman was refused by the Sultan, he died in Constantinople after the death of Abd al-Hamid I. It is a hypothesis which has little chance of ever being proved. We know actually that at the accession of Mehemd II his mother, who was brought to Constantinople from the old seray to the new (Magal Cola Pasha, viii. 1288, 424; Mustafat Sedicim, p. 122). It is unlikely that the honours of the walide aleay were ever accorded to what might be called honorary Walides, like the nurses or adoptive mothers of the sultans. Moreover, according to the Moniteur Unis’c, in 1817 she was about 50 years old; at that time A. de K. must have had an age of 41 years.

The customs of the hareem of the Kedives were almost exactly copied from those of Constantinople. As in the Ottoman seraglio, the viceroy’s concubines were numbered and called birinji, ibinji (female) and according to the Arabic pronunciation birinji, ibinji etc. "first, second", etc. The title of "mother of the Kedive", or as they say in the official French of Cairo the "Kedive’s Mother" (in Turkish also walide-i khidir) was modelled on that of mother of the sultan with the substitution of "pasha for sultan. It was also the only case in which the title pasha was borne by a woman, for it is a case of an honorific epithet and not of an expression meaning "mother of the pasha", which would be in Arabic Walidet al-Basha and not Walidat Bagha.
In the wealthy Khojivli family of Egypt, the Wálida Pasha was no less rich and her dâ'irâ of offices for the administration of estates was very important. Two streets in Cairo bear the name Wálida or Wálida Bagha. On one of them stood the palace of the last Khojivli Mèreâ, Emînê Khañâm, mother of 'Abbâs Ûlîm II, daughter of Ihlâm Pasha and grand-daughter of the viceroy 'Abbâs I. She died in her country house at Bebek near Istanbul on 18th June 1931. The present king has broken with the Turkish custom by acknowledging his own wife as the queen of the empire. This is a consecration of the principle of monogamy and of association on the throne. The widow of the Sultan Ûsînân enjoys an analogous position by right of survival.

Bibliography: (for the more famous Wálida Sulthanâ see the general histories of the Ottoman Empire. We have been content here to give a few isolated bibliographical references to supplement those in the text of the article): Michel Bandier, Histoire Générale du Serrail, et de la Cour du Grand Seigneur Empereur des Turcs, Lyons 1859, p. 84 (book 1, chap. xii.), p. 95 (chap. xii.), p. 101 (înî, in four).; Richert, History of the present state of the Ottoman empire, chap. iv. (relating to Mâk-Keiser Kösem s., N°. 9, 11 of our list); J. B. Tavernier, scavenger Baron d'Anbon, Nouvelle relation de l'intérieur du Serrail du Grand Seigneur, Paris 1691, chap. xviii.; De l'entrenée a Constantinople of the Sultan's mère du Grand Seigneur, appehare par honneur la Válida le 2 juillet 1668 (Târkhân or Târkhân Khâdîlé, N°. 13 of our list); Relation del nobil uomo Gambattista Donato quondam Nicolò (1684), in Barozzi e Berchet, Relazioni degli ambasciatori e balli veneti a Constantinople, Venice 1781, il. 303 sqq. (N°. 11 and 15 of our list); Demetrius Cantimir, Hist. de l'Emp. Othomân, Fr. trad. de Jonquière, Paris 1743, iii. 228, p. 450 sqq.; Bonnois, Notice sur la Cour du Grand-Seigneur, Paris 1804, p. 11 sqq. (relating to Mîhrî Shâh s., N°. 18 of our list); Adam Nesse, Voyage en Allemagne, en Pologne et en Turquie, transl. from the English, Paris 1818, il. 169 to 185 (the same sultana); Moungdre d'Oboum, Tabhâm de l'Emp. Othomân, viii. (1842), p. 366 sqq., p. 62, 64, 69; M-me Kibriili-Mehmet-Pacha, Perinâ dans les harems d'Orient, souvenirs de Meteh-Hanum, femme de S. A. le Grand-Vizir, K.-M.-P., 1840-1870, Paris 1875, p. 130, 271 sqq. (relating to Bezmî-‘Aleâm s., N°. 21 of our list); Osman-‘Ali, alias Major Vladimir Andrievitch (= Descour- demanche, son of M-me Kibriili-Mehmet-Pacha), Les Femmes en Turquie, Paris 1878, p. 267 to 273; Paul de Réglia, La Turquie officielle, 1891, p. 264–265, 260, 282; Ahmed Reîfî (Ahmet Reîfî), Kadîîlar Sallıamati, 4 vols. in-12. 1 (years 999 to 1027), il. (1027 to 1049) — Istanbul 1337; il. (1049 to 1058), il. (1058 to 1094) — Istanbul 1924; by the same, Turkish women (in Turkish characters), Istanbul 1931, 424 pages in-12; Mehmed Zihni (Djihînî), Mehbûtîn Nûn-Nîsî; Lucy M. J. Garnett, The women of Turkey, il. 393–397.

The quotations from Na’tîn’s history are taken from the 4th ed. (cf. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 246); those from Râghîd, from the edition by Drîbîlî Mûsâdarîqa, of 1553; those from Wâṣîlî, from the new edition of Bilîbî, 1246 (cf. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 337); those from the Sûltântâr Târîh from the edition of T. T. E., in 2 vols., 1928.

We shall not give here the abundant literature relating to the "wâlida sultanâs" (Aîmêc du Buc de River), It will be sufficient to mention those who have written on the subject, Xavier Eyuz, Juzy, Sidney Daney, Dr. Cahân, Pakistan Burton, author of The Veiled Emperoi, New York 1923, Marc Hélay. The majority of these writers reveal a remarkable credulity. We find more criticism displayed in the lengthy articles by M. Renê Faucaux in Le Temps of Oct. 7 and Nov. 10, 1923. A résumé of the subject was given by M. Albéric Cahaut in L'Illustration of Nov. 21, 1931, p. 382–383. The theory by which Nakûbî-Dîl was the adopted mother of Sulthan Mahmut II. is defended in the recent work of Mme. A.-M. Martin du Tiche, Silhouettes et documents du XVIIe siècle (Martinique, Périgord, Lyonnais, Ile-de-France), Périguex 1932, 138 pp. in-4° with illustrations (p. 7 to 46: Aîmêc du Buc de River, Sa mystérieuse destinée).

The Wálida Sulthanâ could also, it seems, be studied in the novel: V. Smînnow quotes in Vostornya sâmîbîthi, p. 56, Begyttî vâghad na nansyârtiyi in roughly essay, note 1, a novel by Coskayon, in Zurna dîha fetevrey, 1884, N°. 5 and 6; cf. also the novel by Nizameddîn Nâzîî, Armandin dîâmî, pub. in the feuilletons à Veîî, beginning November 11, 1931. (J. Dey).
The subject was also taken up in Ottoman Turkish by Bibiğit (a contemporary of Bayazid II; mistake in Gibb) who put it in his 'Hammer and probably prepared it from the versions of 'Unsuri and 'Asfahani, and by Lami (d. 937 = 1530 or 938 = 1531), also probably from 'Unsuri. Gibb (H.O.P., iii. 357 sqq.) has given an analysis of the latter poems: 'Wāmik, son of the emperor of China, falls in love with 'Adharah, daughter of a king and sets out to find her again through all kinds of difficulties which he overcomes with the help of fairies. He finds his beloved princess then, is taken prisoner by the enemy, taken to India where the natives try to burn him; the flames do not touch 'Wāmik, whom the Indians worship as a god. The hero escapes, finds 'Adharah again and marries her.


Wān, town in Turkey on the Armenian plateau on the eastern shore of Lake Wān.

The town of Wān is not found in the Arabic sources which deal with the Roman conquest. Lake Wān is usually named the Arabs after the towns on the northern shore, Ardiqkū and Akhīrāt.

In Hawkal alone (p. 250) mentions the Arturund, Ibn Dairān, lord of Zawāsa, of Wān and Wosfān. Yākut, iv. 895, mentions a fortress of Wān but makes it a dependency of Erzerum and locates it between Akhīrāt and Tūfīs (?)

For the Muslim conquest of Armenia see that article. The important fact is the campaign of Baghāl al-Kabīr who in 238 (852) overran the whole of Armenia including Allābī (at the source of the Great Zāb) from which he carried off the Arturund prince Ashūr Arturani.

In 885 the Bagratid Ashūr was recognised as king of Armenia by the caliph and later by the Byzantine emperor and the princes of Waspurakan became his vassals. Of these the principal were the Armanis whose hereditary see was Hadamakert in Allābī.

In the ninth century colonies of Arabs had settled in Armenia, like the Amirs of Manako (Malizgīr) whom the Armenians call Kañakkī (< Kāi), and who ruled on the northern shore of lake Wān (Apshuniq, in Arabic "الأسفيقه") and the 'Ogjmanūs (in Armenian: 'Ogjmanākī) on the northeastern shore of the lake, at Begri and Amiuk. Towards the east, Waspurakan was exposed to the attacks of the Arab governors of 'Ahrābādjiša. The Sādījī (916) Ashūr occupied Wān and Wosfān and summoned envoys as governors there (cf. Thomas of Artunian, transl. Brosset, p. 221).

In 916 the Sādījī Yūsuf executed the Bagratid king Sinbat in Dwīn (cf. Stephen Asolik, History, ill., chap. iv. -v., transl. Macer, p. 18 - 24). Before this catastrophe, the Arturund prince Gagik (through his mother a nephew of Sinbat) had enrolled himself in Yūsuf's suite and by this manoeuvre was able to assert the independence of Waspurakan against Sinbat's successors (kings of Kars and Ani). The Arturund kings were overlords of the principalities of Mokh (now: Moku) and Andizvank (cf. Markwart, Südarmenien, p. 359 - 358).

The Arturund princes are several times mentioned in Ibn Miskawī's Chronicle. In 326 (937), the troops of the Dailami chief Laḫšen were defeated near 'Āṣḥab al-Fanān by Atom b. Dūrđīn (-Gurgen), lord of Zawāsa (Ibn Miskawī, l. 402; Ibn al-Alsūh, viii. 262). This Atom belonged to the elder line of the Arturundas which was eclipsed by that of Hadamakert. In 330 (940; ibid., ii. 33); Gagik, prince of 'Āṣḥababādjiša, took refuge with Dūrđīn b. al-Dirān (Gagik b. Dūrđīn). L. 342 (953; ibid., ii. 151), Ibn Dairān and 'Īṣāb (probably "Dūrđīn b. Gagik") surrendered Daisam to the Mūsāfār al-Murāzānī.

In 1004, the Arturund Seneqerim being pressed on all sides ceded Waspurakan to the emperor Basil II who gave him in exchange Stwān to which 40,000 Armenian families followed their king. Byzantine domination was of short duration: the battle of Melizgirt in 463 (1071) lost the Byzantines the last of their possessions in Armenia (cf. a brief account in Lynch, Armenia, l. 334 - 367).

The name of Wān is briefly mentioned among the towns of *the province of Akhīrāt* which the Khwarizmshāh Dānjīl al-Dīn besieged after the capture of Akhīrāt in 626 (1229) (Barghi, Manako, Bīlīs, Waspurakānd, Wān, Woṣfān, Yūsuf). In the Mongol period (after Arghun Khan, 1284 - 1291), the region of Wān was close to the summer encampments of the Mongol Ilkhāns (on the mountain of Ala-Tagh, the ancient Nafīs, Tendürek, to the N.E. of Lake Wān) but the local authority of Wān must have been in the hands of the Kurd chiefs of Hakkārī (cf. below).

The Naḥṣat al-Kalābī, p. 102, says that *Wān is a fortress while Woṣfān (Ostan) has been a large town but now is a medium sized one*, *its climate and its fruits are good, its water comes from a mountain; its taxes amount to 33,400 dinārs (Urmiya 74,999 dinārs and Ardabil 85,000 dinārs)*.

Towards the end of the viith (xivth) century, the rule of the Kāra-Koynūn Turkomans whose hereditary centre was at Ardiqkū, was extended over Wān but the direct administration remained in the hands of a family of Kurdish begi. In 787 (1387) Timūr had plundered the Kāra-Koynūn encampments of Ardiqkū (Ibn Dairān). In 1402, he ordered the destruction of the fortress but *this building of the city of Shaddād* resisted his efforts. Timūr made *Iṣṣ al-Dīn, lord of the fortress, governor of the Wilāyāt of Kurdistān* (Zafar-šāhī, l. 421 - 424.). The *Iṣṣ al-Dīn, here referred to in the Zafar-šāhī, was an important figure and took part in many of the events of his time (cf. Maftūh al-Salāmeh, transl. Quatremère, in N., E., xiv. 110, 153 - 180). The son of *Iṣṣ al-Dīn Muhammed was well received by Shīth Rukh in 824. Under Uzun Hasan [v. i.] the Ak-Koynūn troops conquered Hakkarī and placed it under the Dombol tribe: the Nestorian Christians restored the power to a scion of the old family.*

After the coming of the Şafawids, prince Zāhid b. *Iṣṣ al-Dīn II entertained friendly relations with Shīth Ismā'īl.*

In view of the rival propaganda of the Şafawids the Ottoman empire must have endeavoured to strengthen the very loose organisation given to Kurdistān by Idris, but the incorporation of the distant frontier district of Wān, filled with foreign elements, was full of incidents.
In 1534, during the offensive of the great vizier Ibrahim Pasha against Tabriz, delegates from Wān gave him the keys of the fortress. But as soon as the cold weather forced Sultan Sulaiman's army to withdraw, the Persians advanced to Wān and soon afterwards occupied this town and Ardijeh ('Ašām-ar-ūn, p. 51 [according to Ewliya Celebi, iv. 174 the Persians retook Wān in 933=1526]).

The situation during the 14 years from 1534 to 1548 is not very clear but when, at the instigation of the Persian prince Alīshār Mirza, Sulaiman again marched on Tabriz, he laid siege to Wān in 955=1548 (Aug. 1548). The town surrendered through the mediation of Alīshār Mirza and the dīdarān Čerkes lakedner Pāghā was appointed governor (cf. v. Hammer, ii. 309; cf. Ewliya Ecelbi, ii. 174).

From this period date the walls of Rustam Pāghā at Wān and a mosque of 975; cf. Džižān-nāma.

The dates inscribed on the šāh-i-{dārān of the sixteenth century (cf. Lynch, ii, fig. 131-132, and Bachmann) have now disappeared.

With the appearance of the Ottoman mir-i mīrān at Wān, the Kurd chiefs retired to their fiefs of Džjālmak and Wostān. On the intervention of the mir-i mīrān in their affairs, cf. Şeraf-šīrāz, l. 99.

In 1013 (1604) Cighīlā-Żade, appointed commander-in-chief against Persia, established his head-quarters at Wān (of which he had previously been wāli in 1585; cf. v. Hammer, ii. 552). He was besieged there by the Persian troops under the command of Allah Werdī Khān and escaped from the fortress by boat. Very soon he undertook a new campaign against Tabriz but it ended in a complete debacle in the autumn of 1604; cf. Alm-ūrā, p. 474-476, and the article TABBĀR, Hammer, G. O. A. R., ii. 678, 660; Gover, Relation des voyages des voyageurs, French transl., Rouen 1649, book ii., ch. xvi., xvii., p. 208—286; Arakel de Tauris, Livre d'histoire, transl. Brussels, St.-Petersburg 1874, ch. vi., p. 303-307.

About 1600 the administrative organisation of Wān was described by Koçja Nişanci (1528-1567) who in his Tābihāt quoted by Hājjī Khānī included in this cihlešt some places now belonging to Persia (e. g. Salmās), and by Alī, 'All (cf. Tischendorf, Das Lahrwesen in d. osm. Staaten, Leipzig 1872, p. 72) who numbers in Wān 13 sandjaqs and 1 ḥākimān, including in all 1,115 large and small individual fiefs (šahīd).

Ewliya Celebi, who in 1065 (1655) accompanied his uncle Ahmed Meliek, who had been appointed Wāli of Wān, has given us a very full description of the cihlešt of Wān (iv. 130-190). It is curious that the text is silent about the Christian population unless this information was suppressed by the censors under ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd.

Ewliya (iv. 165) gives 37 feudal sandjaqs in Wān of different dimensions and with different privileges. The most important were the ḥākimān of Hakkār (with an army of 47,000, including 10,000 with guns), of Bīlīš, Mahmūtli and Pīryānīsh.

The description in the Džižān-nāma, faṣl 41, p. 110 (Ermeniye) is much shorter.

In the autumn of 1236 (1821) the heir to the Persian throne, 'Abd al-Ẓamir, took advantage of some complications with the Ottomans to invade the Turkish territory of Bāyarid as far as Bīlīs. Diplomatic complications and more particularly the epidemic of cholera arrested the Persian operations and the status quo was re-established (cf. Mirzā Taḥrīr Sābūrī, Taḥrīr-i Kāflūhā, Tebriz, 1, under the years 1286—1287; cf. Watson, A History of Persia, vol. 1, p. 1117-1221). After the Russo-Japanese war the Ottomans in their turn advanced claims to the "unredeemed" territories and in July 1907 Vīver-Pāghā occupied many districts of the region of Salμā (q. v.). The status quo was however re-established after the Italian war (Ottoman note of Oct. 12, 1912) and gives legal sanction after the delimitation of 1913-1914 (on the basis of the Final Protocol of Nov. 17, 1913).

As a result of the Armenian movement which had broken out at the end of 1895 in many areas inhabited by Armenians, trouble broke out on a large scale at Wān between June 3 and 11, 1896 which cost the lives of 500 Armenians and 250 Muslims (cf. Blue Book, 1896, No. 8).

During the Great War, Russian troops occupied Wān on May 20, 1915. On Aug. 4, the Turkish counter-attack forced them to evacuate the town, but at the end of the month they returned to their lines till the armistice of Dec. 18, 1917.

Statistical. It was only at the beginning of the sixteenth century that the first European travellers penetrated into the region of Wān. Schala, who visited Wān in 1829 estimated that it contained 10,000—12,000 houses. In 1889 Mayovsky counted 4,953 houses in the town of which 2,012 were Turkish and 2,887 Armenian.

Cuimet, La Turquie d'Asie, ii. 1891, p. 629—756 for the wilayah of Wān gives the following figures (from the Turkish sīlahāri):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sandjak of Wān</th>
<th>Sandjak of Hakkār</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11,530 sq. km</td>
<td>10,000 sq. km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of towns</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of villages</td>
<td>724</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of inhabitants in the wilayet was 28,000. Kurds 210,000, Armenians 79,000, Nestorians 92,000 etc.; total 430,000.

Mayovsky (about 1900) is probably more accurate: the wilayet of Wān had an area of 62,820 sq. km. in two sandjaqs: that of Wān (in the west near Lake Wān) and that of Hakkār (in the east along the Turko-Persian frontier).

The vicissitudes of the Great War, the deportations of the Armenians, the expatriation of all the Nestorian population to Persia and later to Mesopotamia and the trials in which the Kurds were exposed from the Christian militia in the Russian army left the wilayet of Wān in ruins, and we are still (1932) very ill informed regarding present conditions there. After the reorganisation of the wilāyets, the old sandjaqs of Wān and Hakkār were made into separate wilāyets.

The Turkish official annuals of the years 1921—1926, 1926—1927, 1927—1928 (Türkiye Dışişleri Dairesi Sihhat-i Vilâyeti [Vilâyet]) reflect the changes in the administrative system. According to that of 1927—1928 (with numerous mistakes in the Roman transcription), the wilayet of Wān has an area of 21,915 sq. km. and 75,437 inhabitants. Its 4 kadās are: Wān, Ardijeh (Erdoji), Rash-Kal'a, Shatak, Kiwāsh, Mūrad-i, Saray (Mahmūd).

The wilayet of Hakkār has an area of 15,505 sq. km. and 25,246 inhabitants. Its 4 kadās are: Hekār, with the chief town Džjālmak (Callemark), Buzj-i Shab (capital Elī), Shemdināb, Gavār (Gower).

It should be noted that the two wilāyets do
not coincide with the old sancjak. The old boundary between them followed the meridian while the new follows the parallel. The vilayet of Wān (which includes Baḥr-Kāla) is situated in the north and the vilayet of Ḥekkārī in the south on the frontier of that part of Kurdistan which belongs to the Irāk.

Biography: Cf. the art. ARMENIA and the very full bibliography in Lynch, Arménia, ii., 1901. The early travellers are fully used in Ritter, Erkundige, ix. (1840), 972—1009; 639—687 (Hakkārī); x. (1843), 285—356; Lehmann-Haupt, Armenien einst und jetzt, iii., 1926 (very full study of the antiquities); on the excavations at Wān during the Great War: Marx and Orbelli, Archeologische expedizjiya v Wān, Petrogad 1922, Markwart, Streifzüge, and Markwart (Marquart), Südarmenien und die Tigrisquellen, Vienna 1930, contain many topographical and genealogical details in the Kaisānī, Upmanīkī etc. The most detailed description of the vilayet of Wān is by V. T. Maykovskiy, Foyenstatisticheske opisanie Wanzgo in Bitisskago vilajetov, Tiflis 1904. (V. Minorsky)

WANKULI, Mehmed b. Mustafə Al-Wāni, a famous Ottoman jurist in the time of Muḥāfīd Mūsā (1095–1121) who especially distinguished himself in the field of piyyut, lexicography and literature. Born in Wān, he acted as a number of towns (Constantinople, Rhodes, Mānas, Salonika, Amasia, Kutahia, Yemashir) as muftī, kādi and mulla, and died in 1090 (1591–1592) as mulla of Medina, to which he had come in 998 (1590) in succession to Saʿuddī. In his long period of 30 years service, he displayed great activity in writing and translating. His principal work is the translation of the ʿAṣāfīr of ʿAbd al-Qayyīm ibn Saʿīdī [q.v.] which is regarded as the most correct Arabic lexicon and is more esteemed by many than the ʿAṣāfīr of Fīratbādī. This work, which is briefly called Wānuṣī, brought him the most enduring fame. It was printed in 1141 by İbrahim Mutaferrika, as one of the first books printed in Turkey. A new edition appeared in 1168. His translation of ʿAbd al-Qayyīm ibn Saʿīdī (which according to M. Ṭūhir is also attributed by many to Nasawi) was celebrated. In addition to a few brochures like his Tārtib-i Bāstār wa-Tārtib-i Siyāsat, he wrote commentaries on the Durur-i Ḥāmar and on the Wānent entitled Miṣṣāf al-Najafī. Bibliography: Maḥmūd-i Wānūṣī, in vol. i. of the edition of 1141; Saḥīḥ-i muwatāya, Dhaiy of ʿAbbī, p. 316—317; Ṭurayyī, Siyaylī-i ʿAbdullāh, iv., 130; Brusàlī M. Ṭūhir, ʿOṯmānī Mūlīsīrī, ii., 48; Séma, Rūmān al-Aʿlām, vi., 4678; v. Hammar, G. A. L., i., 575. — The Turkish translation of the Saḥāb: should be added in Brockelmann, G. A. L., i., 128.

AL-WANSHARISI, nisba from the land of Wan Sharis, a montane region in western Algeria to the south of the Wādi Shalaf (Chelif) known to modern geographers in the corrupt transcription Ouarens.

1. Abū l-ʿAdīrābāb Ahmad b. Ṭahīya b. Muḥammad b. ʿAdī Al-Ṭahīya b. ʿAlī Al-Thimṣānāb Al-wansharīsī, a famous Mālikī jurist of the Maghrib, born at Tlemsen, studied under celebrated teachers, like Ibn Marṣaṣa b. Kaṭīf and Abū l-ʿAdīrābāb. Khānṣām al-Uḫbānī. In 874 (1469) after some trouble with the government of Tlemcen of which we do not know the details, he left his native town to settle in Fās where he devoted himself to teaching and gave lectures to numerous pupils. It was in the northern Moroccan capital where he spent most of his life that he died at the age of 80 in 914 (1508).

The most important work of Ahmad al-Wansharisī is a voluminous collection of legal opinions (fatwās) entitled Kitāb al-Mīyar al-mughīr wa l-Dāmīr al-mughrī ammiṣ taṣwīmīratun Fatātun man ʿāyā fin wa ʿAladīn wā la ʿAladīn. This work, which is a regular corpus of the non-buṣrī jurists of North Africa and Muslim Spain, contains a mass of material of considerable value from the legal as well as sociological point of view. It has been lithographed at Fās in 12 vols. (1315 A.H.); a partial translation was published by E. Amar, Conciluliones jurisprudentiae fatwān du Maghreb, in A.M., vol. xii, Paris 1908. The biographers of Ahmad al-Wansharisī also mention among his works: 1. Kitāb al-Fāsī wa l-Wānisī; 2. Tārīkh Al-Maṭbāb ilā Ṭadiṣ al-Imām Muḥammad b. Abī al-ʿAlā; 3. a supplement (tārīq) in three volumes to the Muḥassar of Ibn al-Hajjī [cf. the article]; 4. a commentary on the Bāṭalīa of al-Fihrist; 5. a commentary on the work of his teachers (farrā). Bibliography: Ahmad Bābā, Ṣulḥ al-ḥaqq, Fās, p. 74; Ibn al-Kāli, Dijāwāt al-ṭalās, Fās, p. 80; Ibn ʿAskar, Dawḥat al-Naghīr, Fās, p. 37; Ibn Maryam, al-Bṣūr, Algiers, p. 53, transl. Provençal (Algiers 1910), p. 57; Muḥammad b. ʿAbī Ṣafar al-Kattānī, Salwāt al-Anfārī, Fās, ii., 153; Brockelmann, G. A. L., ii., 248; M. Benchenebe, Études sur les personnages mentionnés dans l'Isāyaf du cheikh Abd al-Kader al-Fāry, § 711; E. Lévy-Provençal, Les Manuscrits arabes de Rabat, Paris 1921, p. 70, no. 217. II. Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Wahhīd b. Ahmad b. ʿAyyāb b. ʿAlī al-Wānisī al-Zakātī al-Fāsi, son of the preceding, a learned legist of Fās, where he held the office of ʿāṣīf along with that of muftī and a teaching post. He had been a pupil of his father and of the principal teachers of the Moroccan capital. He was celebrated for his independence of character; for example, having to preside at the sūhqīa in the open air on the occasion of one of the canonical fasts and the Marīmā sūhqīa being late, he was not afraid to begin the solemn service before the sovereign arrived. In the course of the troubled period which immediately preceded the occupation of the capital by the Saṭṭānas, when brigandage was practised in it with impunity, he was assassinated on the threshold of one of the doors of the mosque of the Kairāwānīn (Dīmān al-Karawīnīn) at the end of Dhu l-Ḥijjah 955 (1540). He was about 70. He left a number of works of a legal nature.


WARĀṢA b. NAWFAL b. ʿABD AL-KURĀSHĪ, a cousin of Khādījih, who encouraged and possibly influenced Muḥammad in the first years of his mission.
All we know concerning him has the colour of legend: he is classed with the (artificial) group of Meccans known to tradition as the ḫudayyin, who, abandoning paganism, resolved to seek for the true religion of Abraham. Waraka became a Christian; he was astownomous, knew Hebrew, studied the Bible, and had written down the Gospels in Hebrew (in the Hebrew alphabet?).

In his relations with Muhammad he is endowed with supernatural powers, like the hermit Bahira. The fictitious woman who offered herself to ‘Abd Allah in order to become the future prophet’s mother, is described as a sister of Waraka, who had seen on ‘Abd Allah’s forehead the sign of his son’s mission. It was Waraka who found the infant Muhammad when he strayed from his nurse. Khađja consulted him on her marriage, of which Waraka warmly approved. One of the earliest confidants of the first revelation, he told Muhammad that Jesus had predicted his mission, that he had been visited by the Nāsīrī whose return to Moses, and foretold his career and final triumph. It was also Waraka who conspired Hilāl, tormented by his pagan master.

Tradition however admits that Waraka was never converted; this is rather feebly explained by making him die in the second or third year of the mission, before Muhammad had been ordered to preach and make converts. He was probably an independent religious thinker, unlikely to follow a young and less learned enthusiast. In the last years of his life Waraka became blind. After his death Muhammad had a dream of him in white robes, meaning that he was in heaven.

Waraka died too early to transmit any traditions: Muslim authors on ḥadīth denounced as apocryphal the brief account of Gabriel’s appearance which Ibn Ṭab‘īn claimed to have heard from him.


**WARĀMĪN** (or Warāmī, cf. Yakhūn, Mu‘jamāt, iv. 918), a town about 40 miles (Yakhūn, c. 30 mlt) S.S.W. of Tēhrān, now the capital of the district of Khwār-Wa-Warāmīn. The plain of Warāmīn watered by canals from the Dīlgūrān was regarded as the granary of Tēhrān. The town lies to the south of the great road from Raîy to Khurāsān passing via Khwār (near Ṣāfā) and Simnān (cf. Ibn Khurādhībī, p. 222; only in the Mongol period did the road from Sulīhūn to Khurāsān run via Raîy-Warāmīn-Khwār; Nūserat al-Khālit, p. 173). On the other hand in the ninth and tenth centuries, Raîy was connected with Iṣfahān and Karajār (cf. sūr ‘Alī) by Warāmīn (Yakhūn, iv. 918, also puts Warāmīn on the route taken by couriers from Raîy to Iṣfahān). The route took this detour to the east apparently to avoid the low lying Hawīl-Ṣulān which before becoming a brackish lake was probably a salt-impregnated desert. Iṣkhāk, p. 290, mentions the little town of Warāmīn as a dependency of Raîy but does not explicitly say that it is on the Iṣfahān road. The Omeley MS. (B.G.K., iv. 414) alone contains a later addition saying that Warāmīn had a large market; from Raîy to Warāmīn it was once an important and prosperous country (except for a stretch of 2 farsakhs) and from Warāmīn to Dīlar-dīlīgī (according to Tomasevich to the south of the Khwār) a main road through the desert which faces the Kargakād; (from there the road went to Kīyāl and Kūm) (cf. also the statements regarding the journey of the celebrated Rūzīdī viserc Ibn Ṭab‘īn, who on the way from Raîy to Iṣfahān passed through Warāmīn ["a village like a town"] and then through a village called Namshābīr; Yakhūn, iv. 817). Muḥammad, p. 401, places Warāmīn 2 marjāl from Raîy (via Kākān) and 6 marjāl from Karajār (via Awa; cf. the article Nāwā). Cf. particularly Tomasevich, Die Wege durch die persischen Wüsten, in Stammesgesch. Wien. Akad., phil. hist. Classe 1885, 11., p. 125–128.

Warāmīn does not appear to be specially mentioned in ancient times but situated between the great city of Raîy [q. v.] and Khwār (the ancient Xwār, Xwār; cf. Markwart, Südasienkunde, Vienna 1930, p. 410) it must have lain within the settled and civilized area.

L. G. Pérand to whom we owe a detailed map of the region found no traces of a large town having disappeared, but excavations made to a depth of 10–15 feet brought to light Sasanian ruins (of a Tapa-Mīl). "There is no doubt that there are in deeper strata... between Tēhrān and Warāmīn much older remains." It seems that the site of Tapa-Mīl shown on the map by Pérand to the north of Īshālādār as the city of Mōsāvarīs has recently described as "palace of Afrāīsīs" to the south of Khav-yi nāh and 15 miles from Tēhrān; cf. Revue des arts asiatiques, Paris 1931, p. 20–22.

Warāmīn had a period of fame in the Seldjūk, Mongol and Timurid periods. We have no exact information about the inhabited and administrative centres of the region of Raîy but the many monuments of Warāmīn show that even when Raîy was at the height of its glory important buildings were being erected at Warāmīn. The destruction of Raîy by the Mongols must have contributed to improve the position of Warāmīn which was less affected by events. It was a long time before Tēhrān [q. v.] finally triumphed over Warāmīn as the successor to Raîy. In the Nūserat al-Khālit (740 = 1340) Warāmīn is called "the capital of the town of Raîy... Its climate is better than that of Raîy and Warāmīn produces cotton, wheat and fruit just like Raîy... The inhabitants are Twelver Shi‘is very arrogant in their dealings". L. G. Clavijo (transl. M. Shangre, p. 306) describes Warāmīn ("Watami") as a large town without walls and considerably depopulated. We may regard as echo of the Shi‘is tendencies of the people of Warāmīn the fact that we have in its neighbourhood this to-day Turkish tribes who follow Aḥl Allāh teaching (Ahl-i Ḥaḳḳ); cf. Minorsky, Notes sur les Aḥl-i Ḥaqq, in R. M. M., xi, 1920, p. 48, 63.

The architectural features. Pérand mentions 18 ancient buildings in the neighbourhood of Warāmīn. Among them is the great square citadel of Khā‘r-yi Gāb, to which Pérand ascribes "great antiquity" (Sarre: to the 7th century). Then there are the great sepulchral towers called after the
WARMIN — WARGLA

Shott and Adjadja to the E., and Rominat, the most important in the S. E. The settled population consist of the proprietors of the palmgroves who cultivate them as "hummus" (paying a rent of a fifth) on behalf of merchants of the Maghreb and to a lesser extent by the nomads who lead a nomadic life in this part of the desert. Of Berber origin, and still speaking a Zend dialect, the original purity of their stock has been much affected by intermarriage with negroes. The "Wargha" as they are called, have retained certain ancient customs, particularly in connexion with marriage and a kind of carnival ("chat al-iwwal") corresponding to the first fortnight of the month of Muharram. Alongside of these are negroes, Mahdis, and a few Jews. The population of Wargla and of the 5,149.

History. We have no information about Wargla before the Arab conquest. At that time the land was occupied by Zenata tribes. According to Ibn Khaldun, the Beni Wargla (Berber Beni Uq dal) came from the N. W. along with other Berber elements (Iren Maghrébwa) and founded several little towns in these regions which combined to form the town of Wargla. The people adopted Islam doctrines so thoroughly that after the destruction of the Roman kingdom of Triet by the Fatimids at the beginning of the tenth century A.D., many Khāridja came to settle in Wargla and founded the town of Sedrata, the ruins of which still exist buried under the sands half a day's journey to the S. W. At the same time Abu Ya'qub, the "man with the ass," who had rebelled against the Fatimids recruited many followers in this region. The Ilājī had nevertheless in the xiith century, as a result of conflicts with the orthodox and perhaps under the pressure of Arab elements, to abandon the region of Wargla and migrate to the Tamenrasset, where they finally settled and created the oasis of the Māţā [q.v.]. Ilājī, however, continued to survive at Wargla, where in the xviith century it still had a few representatives.

During this period, Wargla, according to the traveller al-Ayyūbi, was ruled by the Beni Tuq'un dynasty, seems to have been a prosperous city enriched by trade with the Sudan (Ibrī, trans. de Goeje, p. 145). The Ilājī invasion marked the beginning of a troubled era. In the course of the wars between the Hammādis and the Aḥmad, with whom the people of Wargla had contracted an alliance, the dynasty of the Beni Tuq'un was overthrown and the town destroyed. Rebuilt a short distance from the original site it suffered later in the wars between the Almohads and the Beni Ghānīy. In the viiiith century, although under the suzerainty of the Beni Masm, representatives of the Ḥafṣids in the Zag, Wargla was practically independent under the rule of sulţāns belonging to the family of the Beni Aḥbāb, of the fraction of the Beni Waggūn (Ibn Khaldūn, Histoire des Berbères, transl. de Sane, ii, 256). At the end of the viiiith century, these sulţāns were extremely wealthy but according to Leo Africanus (ed. Schaefer, book vi, vol. iii, p. 146) they had to pay heavily for the protection of the nomadic Arabs. Wargla at this time still preserved the commercial importance which it owed to its situation as a "port of the desert," to use Ibn Khaldūn's phrase (loc. cit.). It was a market where the produce and slaves of the Sudān were exchanged for the merchandise bought from Tunisia.
and Constantine. Leo Africanus remarks on the beauty of the houses, the number of artisans and the wealth of the merchants. This opulence attracted the attention of the Turks to Wargla. In 1552 'Salāh Re's at the head of an army of Turks and Kurdish advanced as far as Wargla, the inhabitants of which offered no resistance and he returned after plundering the town and imposing on the sulān an annual tribute of 30 negroes. The expedition of 'Salāh Re's was followed by a new period of troubles which ended, it seems, at the beginning of the 17th century by the proclamation of a new sulān Allahham, to whom local tradition attributes a Sharī'ī origin; his descendants held power down to the middle of the 18th century. But the real masters of the country were the nomad Shamshān, Ben Tar, and Sālid Otha, whose continual interference in the quarrels of the two jufis into which the settled population was divided kept up the disorder and made the authority of the sulān illusory. The latter had even to recognize the supremacy of the Ben Bahār, hereditary chief of the oasis of Nguda, which they did not cast off till 1847. But ten years later, a new cause of trouble arose. Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāh (the shāfiq of Wargla) raised the tribes of the Sahara against the French who entrusted the task of reducing the rebels to the Shāikh of the Ulema Sulṭān Shāikh, Si Hamza. The latter occupied the town in the name of France in 1853 and was given supreme command of the Sahara tribes. But the participation of the people of Wargla in the rising of the Ulema Sulṭān Shāikh in 1854 forced French columns to intervene on several occasions in the region. Another rebel, Ben Shābha, nevertheless succeeded in establishing himself in Wargla in 1854. The suppression of this rebellion resulted in the final establishment of French authority in 1872.


Warith. [See Mirkahf.]

Al-Warka, a ruined site in southern Iraq, was 15° 25’ N. Lat. and 31° 10’ East Long. (Greenw.). Vahid (M’plaw., ed. Wüstenfeld, 1922) knew al-Warka as a place which belonged to the district of Kaskar and the circle of Zawāj in the area of the two southern Babylonian Euphrates canals called Zibba (cf. Strick, Babylonien nach dem arak. Geographik, in, Leyden 1900, p. 32; G. Le Strange, The Land of the Eastern Caliphate, Cambridge 1905, p. 27; 73). According to a Muslim tradition, Ibrahim, the Abraham of the Bible, was born in al-Warka (see Yavhb, iv. 922, aq. and cf. also Lofthus, op. cit., p. 161 sqq.). At the same time however, a whole series of other places are mentioned as Ibrahim’s native place. As Sall b. ‘Umar records in his Kitāb al-‘Ukīd (see Yavhb, iv. 922, aq.?) the first encounter between Arabs and Persians at the beginning of the Muslim campaigns against the Sasanian empire took place at al-Warka.

Warka is the largest of all the groups of ruins in Southern Babylonia. It marks the site of the town of Ur or (Sumerian Uruk) of the cuneiform inscriptions, which, with Nippur, Ur, Kish and Lagash, was one of the oldest towns in the country and played a prominent part in the religious life of the Babylonians from the most primitive times to the Parthian period. Alongside of Ur we sometimes find the form Arku for the name in inscriptions (cf. the ethnic Arzakû in Ezra iv. 9). Besides this reference, Urk occurs only once in the Bible in the form Erakh where it is mentioned with three other towns as a part of the dominions of Nimrod (Gen. x. 10).

Of the epoch of Babylonian history before Hammurapi, we know five dynasties of Urk, of which however, the first, to which belongs Gimmong, the hero of the famous epic which bears his name, is mythical. The end of the fifth dynasty of Urk is to be dated about 2300 B.C. Urk remained an important town under the rule of the Persians, Seleucids and Arakids; many cuneiform documents of this late period have been found here. Pliny, Nat. Hist., xxvi. 123, 130 and Strabo, xvi. 739, know Orchoe, Ḥarrān (ethnic Orcheni, Ḥarrān) as a great centre of Chaldaean astrology (cf. also the reference in Ptolemy, v. 19, 21, vili. 20, 19).

Urk was not a Hellenistic town like Babylon, but it is very possible that it had a considerable Greek community within its walls. Even in the later Parthian period only a small portion of the extensive site of the old town was still inhabited, under the Sasanians the town must have become more and more ruined. By the time of the Muslim invasion, it was presumably completely deserted and abandoned.

The most exact examination and description of the ruins we owe to W. K. Lofthus (see Bibl.). He was three times in Warka in 1850 and 1854; on his second and third stays there he conducted excavations for three weeks and three months respectively. Of further visitors we may especially mention: W. H. Ward (1885); see J. P. Peters, Nippur or Explorations and Adventures on the Euphrates, i. (New York 1898), p. 349–350 (Peters himself also visited Warka; see op. cit., ii. 98–99); also E. Sachau (1895); P. Anastasie Carme (1900), see Bibl. The examination of the ruins of Warka entered into a new phase with the scientific expeditions of the Deutsche Orientgesellschaft.

Lofthus gave an excellent account of the topography of Warka (see his plan, op. cit., p. 160; repeated e.g. by Hommel in his Gesch. Babylonien und Assyrien, p. 208 and in Zeich., fund., p. 59, 1904). Andrae prepared a later plan. The new plan made in the winter of 1912–1913 for the Deutsche Orientgesellschaft’s expedition is still more accurate and shows even more details; see

Uruk must have been a very populous town at its zenith when it extended for a period beyond the walls around it, which can still be recognized today, as is shown by the mounds of ruins and other traces of habitation outside them; cf. Loftus, op. cit., p. 185; Scahau, op. cit., p. 24.

In Babylonian antiquity, either the Euphrates itself flowed past Uruk or else an arm of it, which might be identified with the now entirely silted river-bed of the Shatt al-Kar (in the N.W. of Warka), supplied the town with its water by a canal. Jordan thinks the latter can be identified with remains of the Shatt al-nil which comes from the north and runs along the N.E. city wall. The modern Euphrates flows south of Warka at a distance of over 4 miles, reckoning from the nearest point on the bank. The easiest road to the ruins is now from Khalid on the north bank of the river, a station on the Baghdad—Baṣra railway. The ruins lie in a completely deserted region which is only occasionally visited by Bedouins pasturing their flocks.

The expedition of the Deutsche Orientgesellschaft in the winter of 1912—1913 found a considerable number of small bullae and seal impressions which throw an instructive light on the style of the mixed Babylonian and Hellenistic culture: they also obtained ceramics of the late period (especially clay figures, terracotta animals), and among other things a hoard of 196 coins of the Parthian king Gutazes (40—51 A.D.); the number of cuneiform documents was particularly large but they came mainly from the Seleucid period (cf. Jordan, Uruk-Warka, p. 39, 57—70 and in the Mittell. d. Deutsch. Orientgesellschaft, No. 66, p. 12—17). In 1929—1931 were found numerous clay tablets with pictographs.

Besides these things found as the result of official excavations, we have a considerable number of objects (mainly inscriptions but also sculptures) which have been brought to light through the plundering by the Arabs, tempted by the gold of the dealers in antiquities. This systematic pillaging began before the excavations by the Deutsche Orientgesellschaft (1912) and was continued before the Society could resume their work in 1928; through the market these finds of Arab burrowings found their way into various European and American museums and private collections, in Paris, London, Brussels, Berlin, Newhavn (Vale Babylonian Collection), Baltimore (Goucher College), Pierpont-Morgan Library, Nies Collection etc. On a number of especially remarkable objects found cf. Unger, op. cit., p. 36.

In the last two decades, numerous cuneiform texts from Warka, among which documents of the late period (late Babylonian to Parthian) predominate, have been published in specialist periodicals and in separate works.


WARRAK, ABI TAI ł Muḥammad b. ḤABīn, an independent thinker, who finally was accused of 'zandaqa, was like his friend and pupil, Ibn al-RAWANDI [cf. al-RAWANDI], at one time a theologian of the Mu'tazila school. Victims of the same persecution, both died in exile in Abwāz in 297 (909).

His theological vocabulary only makes mild concessions to Hellenistic philosophy, but his dialectic is powerful; and his documentation of an objectivity and exactness unknown in this period enabled him to write a manual of the history of religions, the Kitab al-Maḏali, the only source (unfortunately lost) of al-BIRUNI and al-SHahrASTAMI for certain Iranian heresies and Jewish sects. His critical examination of the three branches of Christianity of his time, a little book of great accuracy, has survived under the title Kitāb 'l-Radd 'ala 'l-Fira'aq al-thalāth, the methodical refutation of which was attempted by the Jacobite philosopher Yahiyya b. Adī [Bibl. Nat. Paris, MS. Arab, No. 167]. His Kitāb al-Maḏali is lost.


(Louis Masson)

WASHMIGR B. ZIPYR, ABI ṬALIN (and according to his coins ẒIYAR AL-DAWĪL) or better WUSJMI, if the name means "catcher of quails" (cf. al-MAṢūDĪ, Murūjī'is, iii. 50, note), second ruler of the Ziyarīd dynasty, reigned 935—965. He only left his native land in Jīlān, after his brother Mardawīdī [q.v.] had come to power, and had lived until that time the primitive mountaineer life of his people (Ibn al-Attīr, viii. 182). Under Mardawīdī he conquered ʿĪṣāfān and drove from there ʿAlī b. Būye, who had taken that town when he was in Mardawīdī's service. After Mardawīdī had died in ʿĪṣāfān (323 = 935), Washmīr went to Rāy, where his brother was buried with great solemnity; there he was proclaimed Mardawīdī's successor by the population.
and by the Dailamite army that had been previously sent to Khurusan in order to march on Bagdad. Until about 328 (940) Washagh was able to keep together the territory conquered by his brother; he corresponded with the vizier Ibn Muhla about an advance to Bagdad in order to drive out Ibn Ra‘i, and tried to extend his influence to the west by supporting the Kurid Dailam b. Shakhir in his endeavour to reconquer Ahdashdjan. In the year mentioned, however, Washagh came into conflict with the Sainids in consequence of his alliance with Makan b. Kaki [q. v.], who at that time had made submission to the Sainids but had received in 936 from Washagh the government of Djurdjan and also of the country round Safiya (Siri) on account of previous good relations. Makan then renounced his allegiance to the Sainids and the Sainid ruler sent against him his general Abd Allah ibn Mu‘tadi. The latter invaded Djurdjan and at the same time the Buyid brothers 'Ali and Hasan ('Imad-al-Dawla and Rukh al-Dawla) took the opportunity to seize Isfahan and even Ra‘i. Washagh and Makan mobilised in Sariya an army composed exclusively of Dailamites and Dijlas to meet the Sainid army. In the battle of Ishakabad near Danghkan, however, Makan was killed (Dec. 25, 940) and Washagh retired to Amal, leaving Ibn al-Mu‘tadi to take Ra‘i in his turn.

In the following years Washagh got into difficulties through Makan's nephew Hasan b. Fairuzan, who at first had taken the Sainid side in order to recover his uncle's possessions, then made an attack on Ibn al-Mu‘tadi and was already retiring troops, so that he was able to make himself master of Djurdjan, while Washagh recovered Ra‘i for the last time. But soon Hasan turned against him, while the Buyid Rukh al-Dawla seized Ra‘i again. Washagh had to fly for protection to the Sainid ruler Nuh b. Na’ir in Khurusan and so lost his political independence. The protection sought for was readily given and until Washagh's death Nuh was constantly helping him with reinforcements against Hasan b. Fairuzan and Rukh al-Dawla; in this way Tabaristan became a useful buffer state between Safiyadids and Buyids. Washagh all the time remained a loyal ally of the former dynasty, Hasan being the candidate of the Buyids. About 950 he was attacked by Rukh al-Dawla in Tabaristan and had to retire; in 954 a last endeavour was made to recapture Ra‘i, together with Ibn al-Mu‘tadi. After the failure of this expedition he was again driven back to Khurusan, but soon reinstated by a Sainid army. In 962 the same thing happened again; Washagh had to leave Sariya and withdraw to Djurdjan. At last, in 967, great military preparations were made by the Sainid Mankur b. Nuh to attack Rukh al-Dawla; the Sainid general Muhammad b. Ibrahim Sina‘i joined Washagh in Djurdjan. Washagh was to be chief commander of the expedition, but before it came to an end Washagh was killed by a mobl in Muharram 357 (December 7, 967). He was succeeded by his son Kilbus b. Washagh [q.v.]. Washagh had won the reputation of an able and good ruler and the Ziyyarid dynasty is not seldom called after him the dynasty of Washagh. As his biography shows, he did not excel in the arts of war, which accounts for the dwindling down of the large territory originally conquered by Mardawij. At times, however, he was undisputed ruler of Tabaristan and Djurdjan, although, as Ibn Hawkal (p. 274) points out, there remained strongholds which he had never been able to subdue.


AL-WASHSHA', ABI 'L-THABRI MUHAMMAD b. A'MAD b. JUSJUK b. YAHAYA, Arabie philologue and bel esprit, pupil of Muhammad and of Thabrah, who earned his living as a teacher in an elementary school, but in the most important of his works that has survived to us, the Kitab al-Mowahhabah (ed. R. E. Brunnnow, Leyden 1886, reprinted as Kitab al-Zaraf wan 'l-Zarafyi, Cairo 1324), prepared a handbook of rules of good society for the aristocrats of Bagdad. In addition there survives by him a letter-writer: Tufkiri al-Mudaff al-Sabab al-Wazif al-I‘ara‘y or Saurif al-Mudaffa wa 'l-Alahi fi Rasid al-Azhari in the Berlin MS., Akademi Vers., No. 8678. He was probably also the author of the Kitab Washiyya Mafal al-Arabi fi 'I‘dhisriyya, the first part of which was printed in Bagdad in 1322, although Yahaya al-Washsha' is named in it.


WA$kI. [See Washya.]

WASI ‘ALISI or ‘AI, an Ottoman author, scholar, poet, and calligrapher of Philippopolis. His full name is: ‘Ali al-Din ‘Ali Celebi b. Salih or Sahib-aside al-Rumi, known as ‘Abd al-Was‘i ‘Alisi or Was‘i. ‘Alisi (from the middeeris Mewlabin ‘Abd al-Wasq whose assistant [weibin] he had been). He was middeeris in various medreses in Brussa, Adrianopel and Constantinople, then was’i. He died in Brussa in 950. His fame is mainly based on the elegant and pompous translation, surpassing even the Persian original, of the Amurat-i Sukulli of Husain, Hadi Kâhi, [f. 317], which in turn is a translation from the Arabic version of the Kitbl wa-Dimmah of ‘Abd al-Mugaffa being based on the Faksitcentara. On the complicated process of the Kitbl wa-Dimmah see that article. The manuscript of a version of the Kitbl was-Dimmah done directly from the Arabic is No. 1807 in the Laleli Library in Stambul. The Turkish translation by Was‘i. ‘Alisi called Humayun-nimes with its pompous and elegant style and the interspersed verses was regarded as one of the most important prose-works of the old school, a masterpiece which could not be equalled and a model of tasteful
style and composition. While the grand vizier Luqif Pasha (945—947) accepted the dedication of the work to which Wāṣif had devoted his whole life with the reproachful remark that he would have done better to have devoted his time to legal treatises, Sulṭān Sulaimān, whose attention was called to it by the historian Raṣūl-Allāh b. ʿAbd Allāh (d. 930—938), appointed him to the important office of kāhi of Brussa. He died there only a year later.

The Ḥumāyūn-nāma was printed in Bīlāū in 1535. One of the two synopses made by Oṭūmān-šēde Ahmed Ṭāḥī (d. 1536—1723) appeared in 1542 under the title Zāmīr al-ʾAʾārīr. Another synopsis was made by Muṣṭafā Vāḥīy Efendi.


WĀṢĪF, Aḥmad, official historian of the Ottoman empire, belonged to Baghdad, early entered the service of high Ottoman dignitaries, for example Keš Ahmed Pasha and Ahāzā Meḥmūd Pasha, for whom he acted as librarian. He was captured by the Russians and his fortune was made when he was sent with letters from Catherine the Great to the grand vizier. He finally acted as secretary (waṣīʿ muṣṭafā; q. v.) at the court of Bucharest (1772). In Iʿtībāʾ ʾHājīdīja 1192 (Oct. 1783) he was appointed imperial historian (waṣīʿ muṣṭafā; q. v.) in place of Enver [q. v.] Efendi. Five years later he was sent on an extraordinary mission to Madrid, which fully described by him. As the Russo-Turkish war had broken out in the meanwhile Enver was again appointed official historian during his absence in Spain and Edhi his deputy. Wāṣif on his return had therefore to be content with an office in the Porte until in 1205 (1791) he was able to take a very active part in the peace negotiations, for which he was granted the important post of Anān al-ʾumār, Muṣṭafā waṣīʿ ʾumārī. Later we find him leading a lonely and wretched life in Stamīl, maintaining a constant fight with poverty. He was then banished to Mytilene but recalled on a change of government and, again given the post of imperial historian (1213 = 1798). In Dīmāyād 1220 (July 1805) he was even promoted to reʾiz ʾumārī. Sickness and bad health crippled him however and he died on 7th Rābī 1 1221 (May 24, 1806). He was not an attractive character because he was greedy, envious and malicious to a degree but rightly enjoyed a great reputation as an historian. As he had taken an active part himself in important events, his accounts are of peculiar historical value.

His style is noble and sonorous and was regarded by his contemporaries as a model of impressive writing. From his pen we have four state chronicles known as Ḥumāyūn names, appendices, because they follow on to ʾIṣṭaʾiʾs work [q. v.]. The history, printed under the title Muḥāsin al-ʾAṭḥāb wa-Ḥāfiẓ al-ʾAlāʾī (on the various editions cf. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 337), runs from 1166 (beg. Nov. 5, 1752) to 1st Radjab 1188 (Sept. 7, 1774) but the greater part of the second volume (1185—1188) is from the pen of Enverī. As to the appendices themselves, the first which follows on to Enverī's fourth part deals with the concluding events of the year 1197 (end of 1793) and ends with the month of Shaban 1201 (June 1787). The second appendix begins with Selim III's accession (Radjab 1239 and April 1789) and ends with the beginning of the year 1209 (beg. July 29, 1794). The third appendix covered the period for 1213 (beg. June 15, 1798) to 1217 (beg. Mūh. 4, 1802); it seems to have completely disappeared. The fourth and last appendix runs from Rābī 1 1217 (July 1802) to the end of Shawwal 1219 (Jan. 1805). In conclusion Wāṣif wrote a brief account of Napoleon's invasion of Egypt. It is one-sided and therefore of no value as history. Wāṣif also prepared translations from the Arabic, for example, he translated Zamākhshārī's [q. v.] Nāwāṣī al-Kalīm into Turkish.


FRANZ BABINGER

WĀṢĪL B. ʿAṬĀ, Aḥmad Ḥusaynī al- Ḥaẓāza, the chief of the Muṭaṣīla [q. v.]. Biographical facts concerning this personality are meagre, especially from early sources, yet without considerable divergencies. Born in Madina in 80 (699—700), where he was a client of the Banū Ḥabīb, and of the Banū Makātihn, he migrated to Baṣra, where he belonged to the circle of Ḥasan al-Baṣri [cf. al-Ḥasan b. Abī l-Ḥasan al-Baṣri], and entered into friendly relations with notable personalities such as Dāhīm b. Sāfīn [q. v.] and Bashāh b. Burd [q. v.]. With none of these men, however, these relations remained undisturbed.

His father was a sister of ʾAmr b. ʿUbayd Abī ʿUthmān [q. v.], next to himself the most celebrated of the earliest Muṭaṣīla. He had the guttural pronunciation of the ʾt; on account of his mastery of the language he succeeded in avoiding this letter, in ḥaṣf and ṣawāt, and his sayings, specimens of which are preserved. Further he was conspicuous for his giraffe-like neck, an object of satirical lines by his former friend Bashāhīr.

He received the ḥabīb al-Ḥaẓāza because of his frequenting the spinners' market in order to bestow alms upon the poor women who exercised that métier. He was praised for being very scrupulous in touching money.

Wāṣīl's deviation from the views of Ḥasan is said to have become the starting point of the Muṭaṣīla. The origin of the name of the sect cannot, however, be based on that fact [see Muṭaṣīla].

Four theses are ascribed to Wāṣīl: Denial of Allah's eternal qualities [cf. the art. SHIFA]; the doctrine of free will, which he shared with the Kudarites; the doctrine that the Muslim who commits a mortal sin enters into a state intermediate between that of Muslim and that of a kāfīr; the doctrine that one of the parties who took part in the murder of ʿUṯmān, in the battle of the Camel and that of ʾUṣfr was wrong, just as in the case of ʾIṣraʾ [q. v.] one of the parties must be considered to swear a false oath.

The last doctrine is made by the author of the Ḫitāḥ al-ʾIntifār the starting point of Wāṣīl's
system. He represents it in this form: The intention to kill a çâhil [cf. ašqâs] does not render a Muslim fâsil (p. 170). Yet he admits to having been rebuked for this representation, on the ground that Wâṣî was considered the intention to kill one of the çâhil as khurf [cf. kharf].

In this connection it may be noted that the passage on Wâṣî in Dhî‘îq Bayân suggests more important deviations from orthodox Islam than those mentioned in later sources.

Lack of contemporary information is the cause of our not being able to say more of this.

It is said that Wâṣî propagated his ideas through missionaries whom he sent to different parts of the Muslim world. Al-Shahrastâni states that in his days a sent called al-Wâṣîyya was living in the Maghrib. Yet the Wâṣîyya are not mentioned in al-‘Aṣâr’s Matbâ‘i, where the name of Wâṣî occurs once only (ed. Ritter, l. 722). He is said (see e.g. Ibn Khallîkâ) to have written several books of pamphlets on the theological and political questions of his day. He died in 131 (749–750).


Wâṣî, once of one of the most important cities of the Trak in the center of which it stood. The city was a creation of al-Ḥâdjīdî b. Yûsuf [q. v.]. As to the date of its foundation, the statements of the Arab writers vary between 83 (702) to 84 (703). Yâqût is probably right in saying that the building of it occupied the years 83–86 (702–705). Al-Ḥâdjīdî was certainly living in his new city by the year 84. On the date of its foundation cf. Streck, op. cit. (see Bibli.), p. 324; 325; Pârîer, op. cit., p. 258; Manûtî, B. G. A., viii. 360.

On the immediate reasons which led to the building of a new town and the choice of its site see the story in Tabart, XII 1125, 72 sq. (transl. in Streck, op. cit., p. 323 sq.). Al-Ḥâdjīdî wished by creating a fixed camp for the Syrian troops, his best soldiers, to strengthen their morale and by separating them from theIrâq to avert friction between their new garrison town was also intended to keep in check the tumultuous military colonies of Kûfû and Bâṣâr, for it was built equidistant between them (cf. Mu‘allâ, Der Islam im Morgen- und Abendlande, Berlin 1885–1887, l. 394); Wallhausen, Das arabisch Rîch und sein Stûne, Berlin 1902, 136; Pârîer, op. cit., p. 205 sq.; Reitemeyer, op. cit., p. 40 sq.). Being immediately above the Bôs’âm [q. v.], Wâṣî was also intended to facilitate the effective control of these somewhat inaccessable regions.

According to the usual statement, al-Ḥâdjīdî himself chose the name Wâṣî as "middle" for his new city, because it was roughly midway between the two principal cities of the Trak, Kûfû and Bâṣâr, and was a similar distance from al-Ahwâz, the capital of Kûfû.

According to another story, however, there had previously been a village named Wâṣî al-Kaṣâb (the Wâṣî of the Reed) on the site chosen by al-Ḥâdjīdî [cf. Streck, op. cit., p. 322 sq. and Pârîer, op. cit., p. 206 sq.].

In the Muslim east, at least where Arabic numeracy prevailed, there were over 20 places called Wâṣî in the time of the Abbasid caliphate. The most important of all these was Wâṣî al-Ḥâdjīdî, as the town is often called to distinguish it from others of the same name; it is also particularised as Wâṣî; al-‘Umrân ("Great Wâṣî") and Wâṣî al-Trak [cf. Streck, op. cit., p. 233].

Even if we reject the somewhat doubtful existence of a place named Wâṣî al-Kaṣâb, the immediate vicinity of al-Ḥâdjīdî’s town was already inhabited in the Sâ’dânian period; Wâṣî was built on the west bank of the Tigris while opposite it on the east bank lay the town of Kusár.

In the story of the foundation of Wâṣî which has been embellished with legendary details a not inconsiderable part is played by the great magician Abû Allâh b. Hilûl, whom al-Ḥâdjīdî brought specially from Kûfû (cf. Ya‘qûb, iv. 885, 4 sq. and W. Z. K. M., vii. 255). Considerable sums were required to build the new city (cf. Streck, p. 325; Pârîer, p. 208 and Reitemeyer, p. 47–48). The palace built by al-Ḥâdjīdî was surmounted by a towering golden dome which got the name of al-Khumhâ b. al-Kumhâ (square in general form, the measurements of the sides, the dome) afterwards served as a model to the caliph al-Mansûr in building his palace in Baghûdâ; the latter was therefore also called al-Khumhâ b. al-Kumhâ (Beside his palace al-Ḥâdjīdî built the chief mosque; al-Mansûr also copied the proportions of this in his chief mosque likewise built beside the palace in Baghûdâ, as Herzfeld points out in Sarre-Herzfeld, Arch. Relig im islamischen und türk. Gebiet, ii. (Berlin 1919), p. 135).

Among the buildings erected by al-Ḥâdjīdî in Wâṣî must be mentioned the large prison called Dimûs (presumably Greek δεμός, "prison") (see Streck, op. cit., p. 326). Al-Ḥâdjīdî died in 95 A. H. (714) in Wâṣî and was buried there. At first al-Ḥâdjīdî would only allow Arabs (preferably Syrian) to settle in his new capital; much later he settled there Transoxanian Turks (mainly from Bukhûr originally) from Bâṣâr where a considerable number had settled, sometimes as prisoners and sometimes as voluntary emigrants (cf. Pârîer, r. Wâṣî).
The decline of the city seems to have gradually begun in the 18th century. This was mainly the result of a change in the direction of the water to the two arms of the river at the old bifurcation of the Tigris at Kūt al-Aswad. It may be mentioned that the Turkish geographer Hāmid Khālīṣ, who lived in the first half of the 18th century, gives an account of the city in his Līhāț-e-namā (Latin version by Norburg, Lund 1818, p. 70) records of Wāṣīṭ that it lies in the middle of the desert and that the canal there is famous for the pens made out of its reeds.

The population of the town in the days of its prosperity was certainly very considerable. Yāḥūt who was several times in Wāṣīṭ shows that in the early decades of the 18th century it was still a large place. The al-Abbāsids, the Persian landowners, were still in Yāḥūt’s time (see B.G.A., VII. 322), i.e. about 907, living in the old town of Kaskar. The Christian element must have been not inconsiderable in Wāṣīṭ in the Muslim period; their quarters were probably in Kaskar, as in the Sasanian period. Here there was in any case a Jewish colony before the Arab invasion. Benjamin of Tudela, who visited Babylonia about 1170, found a strong Jewish community in Wāṣīṭ which he estimated at 10,000 people, the same as in Bāṣra. The bulk of them presumably lived in a small quarter of the old eastern city.

The region in which Wāṣīṭ was built is said to have been unfertile before the settlement by al-Ḥāḍiṣiyy. The latter improved the soil of the surrounding country. The result was that conditions of life became much healthier and sanitation was improved so that the climate of Wāṣīṭ was regarded as healthier than that of Bāṣra. The Arab geographers agree in their panegyrics on the countless orchards, extensive groves of date-palms, the water flowing everywhere, the plenitude of fish, and the very frequent yield of the soil of the region of Wāṣīṭ. Much corn was exported from the granary of Wāṣīṭ and in times of famine Baghdad had to be supplied from here (cf. the accounts of Isakhrī, Ibn Ḥawšalṭ, Maḏ芝加哥, Yāḥūt, Kaswīnī, Ibn Baṭṭūṭa in Streek, op. cit., p. 328–330).

Wāṣīṭ was also an important centre of communications, partly from its location on the navigable Tigris and its position in the centre of the ‘Irāq and from the fact that important roads ran north, south and east from it, one along the Tigris to Baghdad, another through the Bithl and to the third to al-Ahwāz (Ḵāṭirān), Wāṣīṭ was therefore bound to become an important commercial centre; as Maḏ芝加哥 mentions, it had fine bazaars; among other things, valuable textiles were manufactured here (or curtains) which were known as Wāṣīṭi-fabrics (cf. St. G. A., IV. 375 and Salmon, L’Introduction topographique à l’histoire de Bagdad, Paris 1904, p. 135). Shipbuilding also played a part in the activities of Wāṣīṭ in view of the busy traffic on the river; al-‘Arabīya is still found in the ‘Irāq as the name of a kind of boat, cf. Loughat al-‘Arab, v. (Baghdad 1921), p. 494; see also.

Wāṣīṭ also took the place of its predecessor Kaskar as capital of one of the twelve districts into which the Sasanians had divided the ‘Irāq for taxation purposes (cf. thereon Streek, op. cit., p. 15; 18, 332).

Wāṣīṭ was not only a strong garrison town but an important agricultural and commercial centre. It also distinguished itself in the cultivation of knowledge, particularly of Muslim theology. Among its inhabitants in the time of Maḏ芝加哥 (c. 895) were mullahs, jurists and Qur‘ān readers; the study of the sacred book was especially carried on here (B. G. A., I. 118, 119, note). Ibn Baṭṭūṭa (ii. 9, 90 and cf. Streek, op. cit., p. 330–331) who was in Wāṣīṭ in the first half of the 18th century, is full of praise of the pious citizens, most of whom knew the Qur‘ān by heart and recited it correctly. The subject of tafṣīl al-Qur‘ān (q. r.) was studied with especial enthusiasm. A representative of the art of reading the Qur‘ān belonging to Wāṣīṭ was Ismā‘īl b. ‘Ali (d. c. 1291; cf. Brockemann, G. A. L., I. 411)

It may be mentioned that the mystic theologian al-Hallāj who was born in Fārs, spent his youth in Wāṣīṭ (cf. L. Massougnou, al-Hallaj [Paris 1922], i. 30 sq.). In this connection it may be noted that the founder of the Kermānī sect of the Baḥrīya, Abū Ḥātim, made his first appearance in 395 (908) in the wa‘ādi of Wāṣīṭ (cf. above, art. BAGLIVA).

In Wāṣīṭ was also studied the history of the town and of that of the adjacent Baṭṭāra. Aslam b. Sahb Bahlīṣ (d. 904) wrote a local history, consisting mainly of biographies (see Wüstenfeld, Die Geschichtsschreiber der Araber, in Abb. G.G.W., 1882, No. 83; Brockemann, G. A. L., I. 138). The history of Ibn al-Maghdūl al-Djailī (d. 1139; see Wüstenfeld, op. cit., p. 240) was probably a continuation of this. An appendix to the latter work was probably the local chronicle of Abū al-Raḥmān Maḥammad b. Sa’d al-Maghzī al-Dubḥī (c. 1239); see Wüstenfeld, op. cit., No. 323; Brockemann, G. A. L., I. 330; Z. S., ii. 107.


As to the history of the mūṯ̂ al-‘Aṭāf, we have columns of the town from its foundation (85 = 704) down to the period of the Mongols of Persia (cf. e.g. St. Lane-Poole, Catal. of Oriental Coins in the British Museum, vol. x., p. xxvii.–xviii. (years 85–126 = 704–937 or 701–770 = 1301–1368) and O. Codrington, Manual of Muslim Numismatics (London 1904), p. 194.
In conclusion we have still to discuss the site of Wāsit. Its exact location is one of the most difficult and most important problems of the historical geography of mediaeval Babylon. We know definitely that the twin city of Wāsit-Kashar stood on the Tigris on either side of it. All the Arab geographers of the ixth- to the xith centuries agree in this (cf. the passages in Strack, op. cit., p. 319 sqq., to which we may add Mas'ūdī, B.G.A. viii. 53, 57 and also Suhrab [Ibn Serapion], who about the middle of the tenth century described the river and canal system of the Yemen fully; see his Khidā An-Nozul 'An Tahālīn al-sha'ab [ed. Māzik, Leipzig 1930] p. 118, = F.R.A.S. 1895, p. 9, 9, from below). In order to identify the site of Wāsit the first thing necessary is to establish the course of the mediaeval Tigris. It must be pointed out that the arm of the Tigris on which Wāsit stood, the main stream of which since the xth century has been gradually diminishing and sinking to be a secondary arm, as the bulk of the water was gradually diverted from below Kūt al-'Amāra into the eastern bed, is to be considered the real lower course of the Tigris.

The Shāṭ al-Hayā (better Shāṭ al-Gharaf) which branches off at Kūt al-'Amāra S.E. from the main stream, has been usually said to be the mediaeval Tigris (on this water course cf. especially the art. DIQALA, 'IRĀQ and MAŠĀN). It forks again a little below the town of Kūt al-Hayā (also known briefly as Hayā) into two arms, one of which is now called Aḥn Ḫāšāris and as a rule sinks to the only one to contain water, and the eastern Shāṭ al-Amāra. Both unions again at the village of Shāṭ al-Khurāf (Kūt al-Hayā and khurāf (Kūt al-Hayā and khusāra). Between the two there is a small island about 30 miles long called Djarat al-Halir on maps. Herzfeld has rightly pointed out in Sarre-Herzfeld, op. cit., p. 247, that the Shāṭ al-Hayā forms the greatest crux in the ancient geography of the 'Irāq. Is it really the mediaeval Tigris or is it only a secondary arm? Perhaps we have to see in it a canal which was dug in ancient times to give a convenient connection between the Euphrates and the Tigris. The little that we have so far learned from European travellers about the ruins of Wāṣīt is against locating it on the banks of the Shāṭ al-Hayā and therefore against identifying the latter with the mediaeval Tigris.

Unfortunately the whole canal and river system of the Shāṭ al-Hayā, especially the wide territory between it in the west, the Tigris in the east and the Euphrates in the south, has been very insufficiently investigated from the geographical point of view and the maps to be consulted for the region of Wāṣīt are very defective. Of these the following have been used here: F. R. Chesney, *The Expedition for the survey of the rivers Euphrates and Tigris* (London 1850), Atlas, plate ii., (pertinent text in vol. i. 36-37); Ed. Sachau, *Das Euphrat und Tigris* (Leipzig 1900), plate ii. and cf. p. 69 sqq.; *Lower Mesopotamia between Bagdad and the Persian Gulf* (1:1,000,000), London, War Office, 1907 (also reprinted by the cartographical section of the German General Staff, Berlin 1915); *Karte von Nordmesopotamien* (temporary edition; 1:200,000), sheet 9; Kūt al-'Amāra, Berlin (cartograph. Abteilung der preussischen Landesaufnahme), 1918; *Karte von Mesopotamien* (temporary edition; 1:400,000), sheet 54, Bagdad, Berlin (Ibid.) 1919.

A number of European travellers visited the actual site of the mediaeval Wāṣīt in the xth and xth centuries; their accounts however are rather brief. The first to be mentioned are the English officers Ormby and Elliott who stopped in Wāṣīt in 1831. On their information are based the statements in Chesney, op. cit., i. 37; J. R. Wellsted, *Travels in the province of the Caliphs* (London 1840, p. 171) (an edition of the author's diary) and J. B. Fraser, *Mesopotamia and Assyria*, Edinburgh 1842, p. 155. R. Kohlweg and R. de Liedekerke-Beaufort, who fell in 1916 in the War, also visited Wāṣīt on an archaeological expedition in 1886-1887; but so far nothing has been published of their observations. Count Aymer de Liedekerke-Beaufort, who fell in 1916 in the War, also visited Wāṣīt on an archaeological expedition in 1913-1914. His valuable account of the district in question was published by Violeaud, in *Babiloniaca*, vi., Paris 1922, p. 105-116 unfortunately without a map. We therefore really have only two brief descriptions of the ruins of Wāṣīt, one of 1831 and the other of 1913-1914.

The former going back to Ormby and Elliott gives (according to Chesney) the following data. The old dry bed of an arm of the river can be followed for a few miles below Kūt al-'Amāra; this flows S.S.E. through the ruins of Wāṣīt and then goes on in the same direction under the name of Shāṭ al-Hurām, and rejoins the Euphrates midway between the Shāṭ al-Hayā and Khuras. That this rivercourse should be recognised as the Tigris proper, on the banks of which Wāṣīt lay, is suggested by the breadth of the ancient bed and the ruins on both sides of it; some of Wellsted's notes supplement this: mounds of ruins are to be seen everywhere; the ground is covered with fragments of buildings (pillars, architraves, friezes, glass and ceramic). Special mention may be made of a fairly well preserved little domed building in the style of the period of the caliphs, very probably a mosque; the channel which cuts through these ruins is of the breadth of the Euphrates. Fraser finally tells us that in the vicinity of the old town there has arisen a little village of 40-50 wretched houses built out of the material of the ruins and inhabited by fishermen.

As to A. de Liedekerke-Beaufort's description 50 years later (see op. cit., p. 115-116) it may be noted that this traveller came to Wāṣīt from the old Babylonian site of Zerguhl (Surgiyl), 4 miles N.E. of Shāṭa; striking N.E. After 3 hours' march from Zerguhl he crossed the old filled up bed of the Tigris of the 'Abbasid period which the natives call Shāṭ al-Khādir. He met again at the ruins of Wāṣīt. Among the shapeless mounds of ruins there the only remarkable thing was a fine brick portico. According to A. de Liedekerke-Beaufort, Wāṣīt lies 25 miles west of Hayā (Kūt al-Hayā). This remark must be due to an error or rather to a slip of the pen, for it must be east of Hayā (cf. above, art. KĀNA). Our traveller thinks that the Tigris in ancient times used the Shāṭ al-Hayā as far as Jīlatseker (meaning Kalut Sikkar on the Shāṭ al-'Amāra), then followed the lakes of the swamps (hūrā: cf. above, art. MĀṢĀN) of Tellūn al-Habiş and Surgūl, finally entering the sea at the side of the modern Hūr al-Hammūt (cf. above, art. MĀṢĀN); in the Muslim period on the other hand, it created for itself this eastern bed on which Wāṣīt lay.
According to the already mentioned map of Mesopotamia, sheet 54, Baghdad, the geographical position of Wasit is 32° 15' North Lat. That this town is probably to be placed north and not south of 32° N. Lat. was already proved by Wagner (in N. d. G. G. W. phil.-hist. Kl. 1902, p. 272–279) from the statements of the mediaeval Arab itineraries. On the above mentioned map the ruined site of Wasit is crossed by a channel running S.E.; three further channels enter it of which those still in use take their water from the Nahis Djudjel. Quite close to Wasit is marked a place Belej, presumably the fishing-village mentioned by Ormsby and Elliott in Frascati.

The Djudjel (or little Tigris) leaves the Tigris about 6 miles below Kut al-Amara. It might be identical with the ancient, now dried up arm of the river which Ormsby and Elliott were able to follow and which they took for the mediaeval Tigris of Wasit (see above). In Stieler’s Handatlas sheet 50 (1913), this water course is marked as Sharqi al-Wasit and Wasit itself is marked on it in 32° 15' (according to the map of Mesopotamia, leaf 9, Wasit lies 4–5 miles south-west of the river Djudjel). The distance between Wasit and Kut al-Haiy is, according to the map of Mesopotamia sheet 54 and that of Babylonia, sheet 9 (see above), and sheet 59 in Stieler’s Handatlas, about 15 miles as the crow flies; A. de Liedekerke’s estimate (35 miles) is decidedly too high. The distance Wasit–Kut al-Amara is about 45 miles as the crow flies.

The question of the site of the mediaeval Wasit would therefore seem to be solved with considerable certainty by the above considerations. The town was at one time sought on the bank of the Shatt al-Haiy or at least in its immediate neighbourhood; modern native geographers of the Trak like Hashim al-Sa’di and Abd al-Razak al-Hassani still hold this view. It is a fact that the place-name Wasit is still found in the district in question, especially around Kut al-Haiy as well as to the south in the island formed by the two arms of the Shatt al-Haiy, quite near the eastern arm, the Shatt al-Amara, Cheyne (op. cit., l. 36 and Atlas, plate ix.) knows the “mountains Nebagat Wasit” in the neighbourhood of Kut al-Haiy to the west of it. On the same position Lofthus puts Wasat in the map accompanying his Travels and Researches in Chaldæa and Susiana (London 1857); Streck therefore also at one time (1911, see above, L. p. 677) considered locating Wasit near Kut al-Haiy. Hashim al-Sa’di (Liwa‘iyyat al-Trak al-Haditha, 2nd ed., Baghdad 1927, p. 145) has obviously the same region in mind when he places the ruined mounds (tells) of Wasit on the banks of the Shatt al-Amara near the town of al-Haiy, ‘Abd al-Razak al-Hassani (Rihla li l-Trak, 2nd ed., Baghdad 1925, p. 29) holds a similar view; he lays stress on the existence of numerous tells and pieces of buildings, still visible at the present day. The same author says in his more recent work Mijdje Trak al-Buldan al-Ha‘aya (Baghdad 1930, p. 119) that al-Haiy is identical with the ancient Wasit.

Cuinet’s authority (see his La Turquie d’Asie, iii. 313) says that half-way between Kal‘at Sukar (the already mentioned Djelatseker in A. de Liedekerke = Kal‘at Sikkar; a little below 32° N. Lat.) and Kut al-Haiy one comes to an area covered with mounds, which may be presumed to contain old ruins; the most important is ‘Hai al-U’asit’, the celebrated town of Wasit; there one can still see the door of a palace which the local Arabs call al-Menare. With this statement in Cuinet, I would take a note in L. Massignon, Le passion d’al-Hallaj (Paris 1922, i. p. 23) which is based on a communication by a Bagdadí, a former inspector of the domains in the region of al-Haiy. According to the latter, the now abandoned ruins of Wasit, which lie on the bank of a dead water-course named Rašid, consist only of a few old tombs and a minaret in ruins (apparently that mentioned in Cuinet). The reference here is probably to the same ruins as are mentioned by Cheyne and the two modern Arab geographers. In keeping with these views Wasit is placed by Kiepert, Carte générale de l’Empire Ottomans (Berlin 1892), on the eastern bank of the Shatt al-Haiy, in 31° 55’.

We also find marked on maps (e.g. in Cheyne, plate ix. and in Stieler’s Handatlas, loc. cit., in the latter in about 31° 45’ N. Lat.) on the already mentioned Shatt al-Haiy island a village of Wasit al-Haiy, which no doubt still exists. It is about 25 miles south of Kut al-Haiy and at least 4 miles from the Shatt al-Amara which probably at one time flowed directly past it. This is the Wasit of the map Lower Mesopotamia, several times already mentioned, which marks also in 31° 45’ on the east bank of the eastern Shatt al-Haiy, near a Kal ‘at Shakhî Djewaid with the addition “al-Wasit”.

It must be left for future thorough topographical study on the spot to establish what these villages or ruins near and on Shatt al-Haiy are. The existence of two places called Wasit, one in the vicinity of Kut al-Haiy, one much further south (Wasit al-Haiy), seems to be proved; but it also seems safe to assert that all these places in the region of the Shatt al-Haiy have nothing to do with the mediaeval Wasit. The occurrence of the name Wasit in this region could, in my view, be explained most simply by saying that they are settlements by emigrants from the old mother city. When their existence became more and more threatened by changes in the course of the Tigris, many, if not the majority, of the inhabitants must have abandoned the city and settled on the banks of the Shatt al-Haiy which presumably gained in importance with the decline of the Tigris at Wasit in volume and importance. To distinguish it from the ancient Wasit, a colony of people of Wasit on the Shatt al-Haiy may have been called Wasit al-Haiy.

On the antiquity of the town of Kut al-Haiy nothing is exactly known, but I do not consider it probable that it goes far back into the middle ages; while it may have existed then as an insignificant village, it only began to come to the front from the xvth century with the decline of Wasit. It may in a way be described as the successor of the ancient Wasit. Kut al-Haiy is now developing rapidly; it is the largest place in the whole valley of the Shatt al-Haiy and at the last census had about 10,000 inhabitants (cf. ‘Abd al-Razak al-Hassani, Musta‘in, etc., 1929, p. 119).

WASIYAT — WASIYAH

p. 318—338 (where further references are given);
G. Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate (Cambridge 1905), p. 39—40 and
previously in J. R. A. S., 1895, p. 44—45.
Périer, Vie d’Al-Hadijah Ibl om Yusef (Paris
1904), p. 205—213 (and index, p. 273); E. Reitz,
Die Stadtgründungen der Araber im Islam
(Munich 1912), p. 44—48; J. Obermeier,
Die Jandi-Schiitische in Zeiten der
Talmud und der Goanot (Frankfurt a. M. 1929),
P. 91—93, 199—204, 339—337; cf. also the
articles AL-WASAYHA, KASKAR, and MARAN.

(M. SUTREK)

WASIYAH (A.), commission; as a technical term,
last will, testament, legacy; wasi, the per-
on empowered, particularly the executor of a will.

1. The wasiyyah of the pre-Islamic Arabs was
less concerned with the distribution of the estate
than with orders and instructions to the survivors;
its principal interest lay in the spiritual testament
of the dying man, with the religious sanction of
the community at large. It is the responsibility of
the wasi to see that the deceased's wishes are
complied with and that his estate is not
breeched. The wasi must be a Muslim, and
must act in accordance with the teachings of
the Prophet Muhammad.

2. In so far as the term wasiyyah was of signifi-
cance in connection with the law of property
in Muslim society, it must have consisted in the
consideration of more remote heirs — something
between legal will and an expression of wishes —
alongside of the qay'a which are called upon first
to inherit (cf. MSR.HI). According to Surah 3.50
(of the second Meccan period) to draw it up
before death was the obvious duty of a Kuranah
merchant. Such a wasiyyah is expressly ordered
by the believer in Surah 2.176 qpp. in favour of parents
and "relatives" (Surah 4.37, which, without using
the term demands the same thing, adds also the
so-called confederates); at the same time any
alteration falsifying it is forbidden, and no friendly
interference in the interests of the deceased is
allowed; Surah 2.241 goes decisively beyond the
old Arab usage, makes provision for the widows
by a wasiyyah a duty. These three passages date
from about the same time, the year 2 A. H. Surah
105 qpp., apparently later, prescribes for the
wasiyyah, which it presumes to be usual, two wit-
nesses, the method of swearing them and the
manner of challenging their evidence.

3. The later thorough regulation of the law of
inheritance was doubtless intended to replace
the earlier rules for the wasiyyah (cf. MSR.HI); a tradition
which expressly states: this was very early in-
terpreted to mean that a legacy in favour of an heir
at-law is inadmissible at all; the former verses
were therefore considered abrogated by the latter.
Along with this prohibition the restriction of the
legacies to one third of the estate is prominent
in the traditions. Neither of these rules is traced
to Muhammad; it is true, but they obtained recog-
nition so early and so generally that only the
slightest traces of divergent views are to be found
in tradition (e.g. al-Nu'man, Wasiyah, Dan 8, 14,
66; Karna al-Mu'inaddil, viii, No. 5409). The question
was more disputed, following Surah vi. 12—15;
whether the legacies should be handed over before
the payment of the debts or vice versa; the
second alternative predominated and quite early.
Further traditions reveal two opposite views on
the making of a wasiyyah; on the one hand it is
urgently recommended and, on the other one is
advised against it; in any case, an unjust wasiyyah
is regarded as a breach of the law and a just one on
the contrary as a good deed. To insert pious
advice in the wasiyyah (cf. section 4) is regarded
as commendable. — Stress is laid upon the state-
ment that the Prophet died without making a
wasiyyah — against the Shi'a view (cf. Lammens,
Fatima, p. 110 qpp.).

4. According to the teaching of the Fakih, every
Muslim may make arrangements by will that:
a. one or more individuals shall settle the business
of the estate as wasi; this wasi represents the
estate, actively and passively, may not however
beber the property, and enjoys the privileged
position of the amir; that, he or another wasi
must be named as wasi al-mamluk to administrate the property
of his infant children (or grandchildren); for
this office the mother usually comes first; although
according to the Shafi'i school, the property of
infant children, in the absence of any other
claim, is placed in the hands of a guardian
appointed by the judge (cf. Mar., 64); but may
not pledge or dispose of his land or house in case of obvious advantage or absolute
necessity, and when the latter reaches his majority
he must render an account; in both cases a.
and b. the persons named are urgently recommended
to accept the appointment as wasi (the so-called
`as') and if possible to do the work of the office
without payment; in case of necessity the faikin,
the public authority, represented by the `asdi,
extends the appointment of a wasi, who in this case
is usually called hawiyah; the `asdi is also empowered
to supervise the wasi and if necessary to dismiss
him; that, e. legacies which in all must amount to
more than a third of the estate after payment of
debts (cf. MSR.HI, 60) are to be paid; if it turns
out that they amount to more than a third of
the estate they are cut down pro rata unless the
eas al-intisat, to whom the remaining two thirds go, confirm the provision of the deceased
after his death. Under the same limitation come
certain gratuitous business transactions which the
wasiyyah has undertaken in a condition of severe illness (maraj al-mawzaw') or, according to the Shafi'i and Maliki,
also under any other serious threat to his life, if
its death results from it; a legacy in favour of
a person who is also an heir of the testator to
be valid needs the approval of the other heirs;
it is further demanded that the person who draws
up the will should be capable of doing business
(with the exception of the spendthrift under age)
and act under no pressure; that the legatee at the
time of making the will is in a position to accept
the bequest (except an unborn child, which is
born within the next six months) and survives
the testator and further that a transfer of property
in the subject of the legacy is possible (but it need
not yet lie in existence at the death of the testator,
for example the produce of a piece of land); the
wasiyyah can be used not only for individuals
and groups of individuals but also for public purposes
or even assume the form of a foundation (wasfiyyah):
but in this case its purpose must be one approved
by law; a definite form is not prescribed for
drawing up a will but the Muhammadan law of
evidence requires two witnesses even in the case
of a written wasiyyah; lastly for validity acceptance

by the legatee after the death of the testator is necessary; the testator on the other hand retains while alive the power to alter the waṣṭa.

5. The limitation of gratuitous disposal of property in case of mental illness to a third of the estate is the answer of the šikh to attempts to obtain real liberty of bequest by evasions; other plans however, which are still in use at the present day, could not so easily be prohibited. Among these is the irrevocable acknowledgment (šahr) which may refer to all kinds of obligations, admits no counterpart and in case of a mental illness as well as, at least according to the Šāfīists, in favour of an heir, may be completely rejected; only in case of obvious impossibility is it invalid. The next two evasions are only effective before being overtaken by mortal illness. They are the so-called kilihi bi ʿwāf, i.e. a gift, in return for which another, even if insignificant, gift is stipulated or given, which cannot be regarded in law as the purchase price (this gift is complete and irrevocable even if the giver does not own it to his death), and the annulment (waṣṣ) the yield of which the founder can allot quite freely to any one legally qualified and (but this is only according to the Šāfīists) earmark during his own lifetime for his own support or the payment of his debts. A simple gift (kilihi) from one man to another cannot also be used to circumvent the restriction to a third and sometimes the waṣṭa is actually put in the form of a kilihi, for which as far as possible the approval of the nearest blood relation is obtained (both usual in the Dutch East Indies). Further possibilities of evasion by fictitious transactions are given in the Šāfīī-litigation. In many Muslim countries however, in contrast to these endeavours there is a decided objection to the waṣṭa, e.g. in Somaliland.


WAṢṬA, a Persian historian, properly Wsatt al-Hādrat "pamogrist of the court", the name by which Sharaf al-Dīn ʿAbd Allāh b. Naṣr Allah of Shiraz is known. Employed as a tax collector under the Mongols, he became the protégé of the minister and historian Rażīd al-Dīn and also presented him to Īljan in (1721 = 1225), when the Ilkhan was in Sultānābād. His history, the Tarikh-i Waṣṭa, is the continuation of the Tabīkh-i Dīnjākh-wāgh of ʿAbd Malik Dīnjākh; it is called Tabīkh-i waṣṭa i. e., "division of the towns and propagation of the centuries" and covers the period 1257—1328.

Although it contains an authentic account of contemporary events, its value is diminished by the lack of method and the artificial and bombastic style, imitated by his successors. J. von Hammer edited the first volume with a German translation (Vienna 1856). The whole text has been lithographed in Bombay in 1269 (1853).


WADAT or WATID, "a peg", meaning in prosody 1. a group of two vocalised consonants followed by a quiescent consonant (watid muṣnmin); 2. a group of two vocalised consonants, separated by a quiescent consonant (watid waṣṣ). Each foot ought of necessity to have a watid followed or preceded by one or two ʿayd (q.v.).

Bibliography: See the article ʿAYD. (MOHAMMED BEN CHERKES)

WAṬHĪKH BI LLĀH ABD ALLĀH EL-MAṬUŠIŅ, ʿAbūsārī Caliph. He was given the name Hārūn after his grandfather Ḥārūn al-Raṣīd; his mother was a Greek slave. On the day that his father al-Muṭashi in bi llāh [q.v.] died (18th Rābiʿ I 227 = Jan. 5, 842), al-Ṭawīkh was proclaimed as his successor. Before al-Muṭashi in's death an alleged descendant of the Umāyiyyah, named Abū Ḥarb, usually called al-Muḥāṣr in, "the veiled" from the veil which he always wore, had provoked a dangerous rising in Palestine, and Raḍźi in b. Ayyūb al-Ḥāḍrī when al-Muṭashi in sent against him could at first make no progress. Soon after the accession of al-Ṭawīkh, Damascus also became the scene of a great rising; the rebels shut the governor up in the citadel and encamped on the plain of Marzā Rāḥi not far east of the town, but they were very soon routed by Raḍźi in who had been recalled to meet the danger from Palestine.

Next turned his attention to al-Muḥāṣr in. After a section of the latter's followers had left him because the season for sowing the fields was approaching Raḍźi in succeeded in defeating and capturing him. The Beduins around al-Medina also gave the Caliph trouble. When the Banū Sulaim plundered the market places of the Hijāz the governor of al-Medina sent a large army under Ḥammād b. Djārīr al-Fahhār against them; but he was defeated and slain so that al-Ṭawīkh had to turn to the tried general Bogha al-Kahf [q.v.]. In Shawwāl 2390 (April—May 845) Bogha entered al-Medina and after defeating the Banū Sulaim and taking the prisoners to al-Medina he performed the pilgrimage to Mecca, and then turned his attention to the Banū Ḥillāf, who had also taken part in the rising. The most guilty were imprisoned in al-Medina and the others pardoned. Bogha then turned against the Banū Murra and the Banū Faṭhr, who had seized the town of Fadak, but as soon as he appeared they abandoned the town and took to flight (231 = 845—846). In the meanwhile the prisoners escaped from al-Medina and killed their warders but were cut down by the citizens of the town with the help of the many negro slaves in al-Medina. In the following year, Bogha had also to fight against the Banū Numair in al-Yāmān and only subdued them after much
difficulty. There were also troubles among the Khārijīs and the Khurāsānīs. Al-Wāthīk died on the 25th Dhu l-Hijjah 322 (Aug. 10, 847) at the age of 34, or according to others 34 or 36. He had not the gifts of a great ruler and his brief reign was not distinguished by remarkable events. The Caliph's character also was not such as to make him beloved. It is true that he was liberal to the poor in Mecca and al-Medīna and he also treated the ʿAlīids with great benevolence and took a considerable interest in poetry and singing; for the rest he is described as covetous, intolerant and devoted to sensual pleasures. He extorted huge sums of money from the high officials and as an ardent Muʿtazilī he persecuted the orthodox theologians. In the circumstances, it is not remarkable that the generally respected Ahmad b. Naṣr b. Muḥammad al-Kaẓāfī prepared a plot to dethrone the Caliph and put a check to the arrogance of his Turkish officers. By an accidental signal, the plot was given too soon (Shabīb 231 = April 846); the authorities were therefore able to discover the conspirators without difficulty and Ahmad b. Naṣr was executed.


(K. V. Zettersten)

WATṬĀSĪS (BANU WATṬĀS), a MOROCCO dynasty of the xvth and xviith centuries. The Banū Watṭās were a collateral line of the great family of the Banū Marīn, to which also belonged the Banū Abī Ḥakīm, founders of the dynasty generally known as the Mūsāidī dynasty [q.v.]. After leading a nomadic life on the edge of the Sahara and the high plateau of the Central Maghrib the Banū Watṭās settled in the xviith century in eastern Morocco and soon established themselves in the Rif, of which they were became practically independent rulers, when their relatives the Banū Marīn had replaced the last Almoravid rulers in northern Morocco. Henceforth their history is at first linked with that of the Marinids and afterwards closely connected with the Christian attempts to conquer territory in Morocco and with the events which led to the accession of the Saʿdīan princes to power in the middle of the xviith century.

During the whole of the Marinid dynasty, the Banū Watṭās, on account of the bonds of relationship which connected them with the ruling family, had been overwhelmed by the latter with honours, dignities and offices which they held either at the court of Fāṣūd or in the principal towns of the country. In 833 (1420) Sulṭān Abī Saʿīd Ṭāḥṣim was assassinated and Morocco was left in complete anarchy and exhausted by civil war. Spain had now been almost entirely reconquered by the Christians; the Portuguese had seized Ceuta: several pretenders supported by Timūrī or Granadan were endeavouring to restore for their own advantage the unity of the kingdom of Fāṣūd. It was then that one of the outstanding members of the family of the Banū Watṭās, Abū Zarkarīyāʾ Yāḥyā b. Zayyān, who was governor of the town of Sawda', took control of the destinies of the country. He proclaimed and succeeded in getting recognised a son, still a minor, of Sulṭān Abī Saʿīd, Abī Muḥammad Abū Ḥakīm. Abū Ḥakīm, and ruled the country in his name as vizier. This regency was continued, far beyond the minority of Abū Ḥakīm. When Abū Zarkarīyāʾ (called in his latter Abū Zekrī) died in 1448, he was at first replaced as mayor of the palace by his cousin Abī Bakr ʿUṯmān, then by his son Yāḥyā b. Zayyān. When the regent of the Portuguese on the Moroccan coast soon produced throughout the country a revival of religious sentiment which found expression in summons to a dīkhāt and in arousing the fanaticism of the masses by marabouts and descendants of the Prophet. The Watṭāsī regents at first turned to their own advantage this feeling among the people by taking the lead in the holy war and organizing the struggle against the Portuguese. While Abū Zarkarīyāʾ succeeded in inflicting a severe defeat on the latter in 1437 and taking the Infanta Fāṭimah prisoner, Abū Bakr ʿUṯmān was less successful and could not prevent the fall of al-ʿAṣīr al-Saghdīr. In Fāṣūd, the Idrīsid ʿAlī b. Muḥammad [q.v.] saw his power growing daily. At the same time the regency of the Banū Watṭās had come to an end; two months after he had assumed power in 1458, Yāḥyā b. Zayyān, the third Watṭāsī vizier, was assassinated along with most of his family. The Marinid Sulṭān Abū Ḥakīm then tried to govern directly but he very soon alienated the people of the capital by his mistakes, such as appointing the Jews Ḥārūn as vizier. In 869 (1465), he was assassinated and with him the Marinid dynasty ended.

But two brothers of the vizier Yāḥyā b. Zayyān had been able to escape the massacre of their family in 1458. One of them, Muḥammad b. al-Sāliḥ, had taken refuge in Arrūs (Aṣfīl), and had been able to create an increasingly important party in the highlands of northern Morocco. On the death of Abū Ḥakīm, he made up his mind to take Fāṣūd, under a Mūnīdī government, and after a six years' struggle, he entered the ancient capital of the Watṭāsīs and was proclaimed sulṭān there in 1452. He reigned until 1504 but had to face many difficulties. The capture of Granada by the Catholic kings in 1492, the foundation of Mazagán [q.v.], and of Safa [q.v.], by the Portuguese had only exasperated still further the religious movement in Morocco and encouraged on all sides the rising of pretenders who used the dīkhāt for their own private ambitions.

On his death, Muḥammad b. al-Sāliḥ was succeeded by his son Muḥammad, called al-Burtūkālī (the Portuguese), who managed to hold the throne of Fāṣūd until 1524. But events were moving rapidly; the Saʿdīan shortlives, after consolidating their authority in the extreme south of Morocco, advanced rapidly northwards and in 1573 seized Marrākūsh. The struggle between Watṭāsīs and Saʿdīans was only to end in the final triumph of the latter. The successors of Muḥammad al-Burtūkālī, his son Abū ʿĪsā b. Abū Ḥakīm (1526 and 1547–1549) and his grandson Muḥammad al-Kāsīrī (1545–1547), vainly endeavoured to check the vigorous progress of the Saʿdīan
WATTAŚIS — WAŻIR

pardon the poet. In 547 (1152—1153) he incurred the wrath of Atzin and was banished from the court of Kha‘ rim but was restored to favour on addressing a poem to him. He died in this town in 578 (1182—1183) aged 97 lunar years, it is said. In addition to poems, he left works in prose. the Ma‘īlī Kull Tālibī, a translation and paraphrase in Persian of the two sayings of ‘Ali, which has been edited and translated into German by H. L. Fleischer (Leipzig 1877), and the Ḥadi‘ī al-Sibī‘ “gardens of magic”, a treatise on rhetoric based on the Targumim of Ballūghāt, “the interpreter of eloquence” of Farrukhī, used by E. G. Browne in the introduction to vol. ii. of his Literary History of Persia (London 1906). His Divan contains 7,000 verses.

Bibliography: *Awfī, Lubbāl al-‘Abbās (ed. Browne, 1906), i. 80—86; Dawlat Shāh, Ta‘dīr al-Shari‘a‘ (ed. Browne, 1901), p. 87—92; Lutf ‘All Beg, Attāl Rastī (Bombay 1277, no pagination), region of Tūrān; Rijāl Kuli Khan, Ma‘īlī al-Fāshā‘ī (Teheran 1295), i. 222 (copied extracts from the Divan); ‘Aṣī‘ Malik Djiwanī, Tarīkh-i Djiwanī (ed. Muhammad Karwini, Leyden 1910), ii. 6; 11; J. von Hammer, Geschichte d. schōn. Redehaus u. Persia, 1892, and 1919; E. W. G. Browne, Literary History of Persia, i. 124, 399 sqq., 330—335. (Cl. Huart)

WĀṢĪR, 27th or 26th (when it precedes ḥa‘), is a word for a type of Arabic word, selected from the pronoun of the 6th or 7th century. For its palaeographical pedigree, see Hādī, plate i. I. It belongs to the group of the labials (al-ḥārūf al-ḥaʃafu‘īya) as well as to that of the soft letters (al-ḥārūf al-ḥa‘ī). It is pronounced like English w. In the north-Semitic languages and sometimes in Ethiopic, its place at the beginning of words is taken by y. In a few cases it corresponds with m (cf. mughamā‘ “purple” with Aramaic yôn and Hebrew yôn‘).


WAŻIR, vīzīr, title of ministers of state and of the highest dignitaries, especially in the Ottoman empire. The word and the ideas come from Iran. In the Avesta vīrō means “decider, judge”, in Pehlevi i(ī) ‘jāz “judge, decision”. The Arabs undoubtedly took over the term in the Sassanian period and it was only in later times that modern Persian took back ważir from the Arabic as if it were really Arabic. Under the Umayyads the usual name of the secretary of state was kātī; it was later replaced by ważir (cf. Et. Quatremerre, Histoire des sultans Mamlouks de l’Egypte, ii/2, Paris 1845, p. 377 sqq.; W. Björkman, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Staatslehre im islamischen Agypten, Hamburg 1928, p. 6; on the origin of the name cf. also Th. Nöldeke, Geschichte der Perser und Araber zur Zeit der Sassaniden, Leyden 1879, p. 53, note 1 and p. 444, note 3; where for the abstract significance we may compare sūfān). The first ważir was Abū Salama Ḥafs b. Sulaimān al-Khallīl appointed by al-Saffār, who was in office from Rabi‘ I 132 (Nov. 749) but was killed in the 4th Rajab (Feb. 27, 750) (cf. E. v. Zamburi, Manuel, p. 6 and Ibn Khallikan, Kītāb Wa‘īfā‘ī al-‘A‘īn, 4733.)
ważik — wedżilli

transl. by W. MacGuckin de Slane, i. 497). Under the caliph the vizier managed the chancellery (dirvān al-vazīrīn), later, as business increased, jointly with the head of the dīwān. It meant a considerable increase in the power of the vizier when the caliph al-Raṣād gave Diṣḥar b. Yāhāy al-Barmakī (d. 128 = 105) the right to decide petitions (tawfiq 'ala l-ṣaṣṣ; cf. W. Björkman, op. cit., p. 6 sq.). A full list of the viziers under the caliph is given by K. v. Zambur in his Manuel de géologie et de chronologie pour l'histoire de l'Islam, Hannover 1927, p. 6—9. The last was 'Alī al-Dīn Džwālī in 661 (1263).

The name of the viziers of the governors of Baghdad. The highest ranking of the vizier's office (cf. Ibn Bāḍir, ed. R. Dowe, p. 244). A history of the vizierate under the caliph with its varying importance and scope has not yet been written. A list of the more important sources is given in the Bibliography. A history of the vizierate in Persia and under the Sālṭāns, cannot be given here, although the importance of the vizierate was greater than elsewhere, as may be seen from the distinguished names among the Persian and Sālṭāns viziers.

Under the Oṭṭōmanns the first vizier is said to have been 'Alī al-Dīn, brother of the second sultan Urğān. The historians give 726 (1326) or 725 (1325) as the date of the inauguration of this office, with what justice we do not know. Among the Sālṭāns the office was called firāwānī, lit. "command, advice," which is also used in old Ottoman. The power of the earliest Ottoman viziers was considerably restricted. In 786 (1385) Timūṛtash Pāşā appears as the holder of the highest office in the kingdom. He bore three horses as a distinguishing badge. He is regarded as the first grand vizier of the Ottomans (šahīd vazīr) and henceforth every Pāşā of three tails bore the title vizier (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. W., i. 199). The number of the viziers was constantly changing. In the reign of Muḥammad II the number was not allowed to exceed seven but could be less. Down to the conquest of Constatinople there was only one vizier. The viziers with the grand vizier (šahīd vazīr) in xvith century documents and later in popular usage, qādrū or ʿalāmā in official language) were called ṣabīl-ṭāwīlibīrī "viziers of the dome" because they sat with the grand vizier, whose name they shared but not his power, under the same dome in the Diwān (so J. v. Hammer, Des Osmannischen Reiches Staatsverfassung und Staatsverwaltung, ii. 50 sq.). They were called in order of rank, second, third, fourth etc. vizier.

As a rule, vizier in later times was simply a title of the other high officials like the niṣbāni, the defterdar, the Kapudan Pāşā, sometimes even of the Ağha of the Janissaries. The grand vizier was usually chosen from among them. They appeared together before the sultan, only the grand vizier could speak about official business. The other viziers stood silent beside him with hands crossed.

In war time the viziers of the dome commanded armies and were then called sīrād or sev"iše and had extensive powers, such as filling empty offices and siefs. They had even the right to issue firāwān from their camps in the name of the sovereign and to place the sultan's ūqūna (q.v.) upon them. Their income did not exceed 200 aspers. In the reign of Ahmad III the institution of viziers of the dome was abolished on account of the great confusion which they caused and only the Kapudan Pāşā (q.v.) retained the title of vizier (cf. on the preceding J. v. Hammer, Staatsverfassung, etc., ii. 81). Afterwards it was given to the four chief pASHAS of the empire, the governors of Rumelia, Anatolia, Baghdad and Egypt, but has gradually extended to all the governors of the Ottoman empire as soon as they were promoted from the rank of a pASHA of two tails to that of pASHA of three tails. On extraordinary occasions such as the marriage of a sultan's daughter, according to J. v. Hammer, op. cit., p. 82, viziers used to be appointed in whose name only without any official power. With the abolition of the viziership of the dynasty, the power of the grand vizier increased greatly and only began to lose its prestige, with the introduction of reforms in the reign of Selim III. The external symbol of omnipotence among the Ottomans also was the sovereign's seal, which the grand vizier kept and handed on to his successor on his dismissal. On the honours which used to be enjoyed by the grand vizier as well as the insignia of his rank, cf. J. v. Hammer, op. cit., ii. 83 sq.; on the different names, ibid., p. 84.—The history of the grand viziers of the Ottoman empire has been sketched by a number of authors. Cf. the list and biography of the grand viziers in: F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 105, 254 sq., 259, 267, 292, 306, 314, 315, 364, 365, 396, 368. Lutfī Pasha (d. 1564) who had himself been a grand vizier, wrote a special work (Afnahrāče) on the duties of the office of grand vizier; on it cf. F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 80 sq. With the dissolution of the Ottoman empire after the Great War, the office of grand vizier naturally disappeared.


Franz Babinger

Al-Ważik al-Maghribī. [See Al-Maghribī.]

Wedyji, Husain, an Ottoman poet and historian. Husain whose maghribī was Wedji, came from Baghād Serf in the Crimea at an early age to Stambul where he became seal-bearer (muhābīr) to the later grand vizier, then Kapudan Pāşā, Kara Mustafa Pashā. He died in 1671 (Sept. 6, 1660) in Stambul and was buried before the Adriankopel gate. Wedji left a history and a Dāri which has not been printed. The former begins in the year 1047 (beg. May 20 1637) with the description of the conquest of Baghdad under Murād IV, then describes the reign of Ibrahim I fully, as well as the first twelve years of the reign of Muḥammad IV. It ends with the year 1070 (beg. Sept. 18, 1656). The concluding portion for the year 1070 is especially
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valuable because there is a gap here between the works of the imperial historians Nāmis and Rashīd. There are manuscripts of the stuff included chronicle of the period and the note in the Library of St. Mark in Venice entitled: ‘Bonding delle invasioni del genere ‘imperio bizantino nella penisola principianti all’ anno di Miroplitio 677 fino 1277, e dell’Italia Nobile Signori 1280 sino 1290, composta in lingua toscana da Domenico’ (Venetia e tradotta nell’idione Italiano di Giovanni Turina, Drogameno veneto, in Pera de Constantinopoli, il 26 ottobre 1275). Extracts from this Italian translation were published by N. Jorga, in Annali dell’Accademia Romana, xcv. 331.

Husain Wālīšah is sometimes wrongly called Husain Wālī jihād.

Bibliography: F. Babinger, G. O. W., p. 208 and the references there given.

FRANZ BARRÉTH

WEGA (Vega) (al-Nakr al-Wāqf). The Arabic name al-Nakr al-Wāqf, the “falling eagle” — in Latin always reproduced as Volucris cadens, in Greek ἡ αἰρός ἀναβατησίας, although wāqf is undoubtedly the eagle not the vulture — is the name first of the brightest star (first magnitude) in the constellation of the Lyre and secondly of the whole constellation of the Lyre itself. The name Vega, a corruption of wāqf, is found in this form as early as the Almagest of Ptolomeus. *Lucida super papullum defensam et est Alcorae et dicatur Wega*. The expression papilla defensa which here occurs for the first time in the Latin translations from the Arabic is to be explained, as Ideler (Sternnamen, p. 71) has shown, by a confusion of the word wāqf with the similarly sounding wāqf “eye, pupil”: defensa is, especially in mediæval Latin, frequently used synonymously with oculum. The Alcor or the Alkor in the Arabic Alcorān, which again is identical with the classical Greek ἀλκώρ, which was applied to Vega and also to the whole constellation.

The Arabic name al-Salâyq or al-Sulayq [q.v.] also applied to both star and constellation, to which al-Kawzān gives first place, is probably an Arabic corruption of the Greek ἅλκαοπ (or ἅλκατ) “torquoise”, which we find for example in Arabia as a synonym of ἅλκα. The equation of the ἅλκατ and ἅλκαοπ is based on the legend of Mercury, according to which the god made the first lyre from the shell of a tortoise; cf. Hyginus, Hom. in Mercurium. Sulayq (in al-Suffi, Ulugh Beg etc.) is the Arabic name of the tortoise (from Pers. ṣulāq, “tortoise” = ṣūlāq, sūlāq); it is therefore equivalent to al-Salâyq.

For the whole constellation, more rarely for Vega alone, we find in Arabic literature also the names al-ḥarām (“sacred, grove”), al-Mafzūf (“unstrung instrument”) and al-Sarāf (“stringed instrument”); the latter word represents the arabized form of the Persian name of the constellation Capricornus (Greeck zēm). The name is found in the Latin translation of Al-Birūnī as Assange and also from a wrong reading (cf. Ideler, op. cit., p. 382).

In the Arabic conception of the constellations al-Sulayq al-wāqf is a companion piece to the “flying eagle” (al-nakr al-qāf) as an eagle falling down from north to south with wings folded, the two wings being represented by the stars ε and ξ Lyrae which together, according to al-Sufi, are popularly called al-Abārī or “the Triad”.

Figurative representations of a later date frequently show the figure of the flying eagle that of an eagle hovering in the lyre. (Gundel points out [Pauls-Wissowa, Stuttgart 1935, vol. iii, article Lyra] that possibly Abu Ma’shar had already thought of this combination when he in his Arabic text, published by Tyrnoff in Boil, Sphaera, p. 527 mentions the lyre as paranastum to the third decan of Sagittarius and gives the explanatory note: “I.e. the Tortoise, and it is also called the falling eagle.” This assumption however, is not certain for in the text the two pictures are mentioned successively and not as a combination.

The oldest Arabic representation of the sign of the Muslim period, the fresco in the dome of the Kūshār Aīma (cf. Sais-Berel, The Zodiac of Qu我们知道, Oxford, 1932, and art. ANTIQUARIA), shows the constellation as a Lyre; the fine manuscript of King Alfonso X’s Book of Stars and the Arabic globe of the heavens of the 13th century in Florence shows it as a tortoise, as do several other Latin MSS. of astrological works (cf. Boil, Sphaera, p. 432).

Vega was quite well known to the ancient astronomers, among the Babylonians the star (β Lyrae) is identified as “mistress of life” with the goddess Ishtar; (cf. JENNIE, Gotterkultur, p. 283); in Chinese it is often mentioned as chih-ēn (the “woman weaving”). It is one of the brightest stars in the northern heavens and therefore forms an extremely favourable object of observation for the astronomer. Among the Arabs it plays an important part as an astrological star (cf. al-Sufi: al-Kawzān wa l-Salayq; in astrology however, it is of minor importance in view of its great distance from the ecliptic and is only rarely taken into account in horoscopes.


WILĀYA (ṣ.) a maghab for malūk “to have power over something”, according to others a substantive like ḫīla, a general term for any “conserver of power”, generalisation. Tāʾfīf, p. 275, defines it as “the carrying through of a decision affecting a third person whether the latter wishes or not”.

1. In constitutional law it means the sovereign power (ṣūlāt; Ibn al-Sikīn [d. 453 = 857], in Ḳaṣāf, s.v.) or the power delegated by the sovereign, the office of a governor, a malūk. The wilāya is derived from går (v. 62): “O ye who believe, obey God and obey the Prophet and those in authority amongst you” (v. 62). It is regarded as granted by God and is a ṣūlāt “stewardship of the House.” A distinction is made between a general and a special wilāya. The innās (ṣ. v.) or ḥālīfīt (ṣ. v.) possesses the general power. According to Mawrid, the viziers and governors of provinces have the general wilāya, the latter for their provinces. On the other hand,
military commanders, judges, imams (i.e. the lawful ones of the faith), the leaders of the jehdg, financial officials etc. have a special wilaya. The possession of a wilaya must be made of full age (zālij), he in full possession of their mental faculties, have no physical defects, must be 'āli and be fitted by education and knowledge for the office in question; there are also still further conditions for particular offices (e.g. the 'āli must be a free man).

Wilayāt then comes to mean the appointment or the certificate of the appointment of an official. The different kinds are: (i) wilayāt fully by Kallakshandah, Sāhīb al-dāli, Makhāyā, q. (cf. the statement of contents in Rüttmann, Neudruck der Geschicthe des Staatswesens, Hamburg 1928, p. 144 sq.). In this connection we may note the designating of his successor by the reigning caliph, called wilayāt al-mahāz, which was first done by the caliph Sulayman b. 'Abd al-Malik and became the rule in the Aḥmīdī period; every heir apparent is still therefore called wilāt al-mahāz.

Wilaya in has in time come to be applied to the area of a wa'fi's authority: thus in the Mamlūk period in Egypt and Syria it meant the smallest administrative area, at the hand of which was a wa'fi of the rank of a 'āli al-mūlikhān (Kallakshandah, Sāhīb al-dāli, p. 133 sq.). In Persia it means the largest administrative area which provinces are divided; in Turkey, however, whereas in the 19th century the name has been given to the largest administrative units (also called 'āliyād) under Beglarbegi, later waris (Turkish pronunciation wilāyat).

1. In personal law every free man possesses wilāyat (arab. pronouced wila'āt; cf. Liddæ, s.v.), the power of disposing of himself (cf. e.g. Sarāqib, Mak hü, xxv. 137, 138 sq.). In certain cases this power can and must be transferred to another. But even then the Islamic jurists speak simply of a wilāyat. We have this wilāyat in the case of the administrator of wa'fī properties, the executor of a will, a father with respect to his infant children and particularly in the case of wilayāt al-mīthā (see n. 2) and waris al-māt, guardianship. We shall deal only with the latter here.

a. Mālmarsh, himself an orphan, was always in the protection of orphans, e.g. in the later Mamlūk period in Sūr xxvi. 30 = al-3. 153: "Yours is the property of the orphan, except for his good, until he is grown up." In the Medīna period we are told that one should deal fairly with orphans (iv. 216), be good to them (iv. 40; ii. 77, 211) and treat them as brothers (ii. 218-219) and support them for the love of God (ii. 172). Mālmarsh set aside the fifth of the booty for orphans among other objects (viii. 447; cf. lxxii. 7). The principal clause however is Sūr, iv. 234: *And give to the orphans their property; substitute not worthless things for that which is good, and devour not their property after adding it to your own; for this is a great crime.* (4) And entrust not to the incapable (i.e. in money matters; rukūt) your substance which God has placed with you for a support but maintain them therewith and clothe them and speak to them with kindly speech; and (5) and make trial of orphans until they reach the age of marriage; and (6) ye perceive in them a sound judgment (rūh) then hand over their substance to them; but consume ye not wastefully or hastily (6) (out of fear that) they are growing up. And let the rich guardian abstain [from it]; and let him who is poor use it for his support (not of it) with discretion. (7) And when ye make over their substance to them, then take witnesses against them . . . (8) Behold, they who swallow the substance of the orphans wrongfully, shall swallow it only into their bellies and shall burn in the flame*. The pertinent traditions only contain certain developments of the Korānic idea (cf. Wenstink, Handboock, s. v. Wa'il and Waris).

2. The doctrine of the wa'fic in the Fikh.

a. The wa'fi (i.e. the "bound") is either an orphan minor or a mentally deficient person (mubāfīt) or a spendthrift (mutfīt or mukaddikīz). The wa'fi was only added about the end of the first or beginning of the second century A. H. The Korān (cf. above) speaks, it is true, of the wa'fī but not yet in the later technical sense; the oldest exponents of the Korān (Muqaddhīsī [d. 100 = 718], al-Hakam [d. 115 = 732], Kazīs [d. 117 = 736], al-Sudhīr [d. 127 = 744]) only understand thereby women and children or one or two of these two. Tabari still criticises this interpretation at considerable length and defines the wa'fī as "one who on account of the disruption of his fortune, his immorality, his injury to and mismanagement of his fortune requires control" (Tabārī, v. 153). Abd al-Hamīd still refused to put the wa'fī under a guardian.

b. The guardian should be appointed should by law be the paternal father or grandfather, who is also entitled to appoint a guardian by will, the so-called wālī (who may also be the mother). In other cases the guardian (bābiyyā) is appointed by the kāfi. The guardian must be a Muslim, who has attained years of discretion and is in full possession of his mental faculties, of good repute (sāli) and able to understand the office. Guardianship is a religious duty and can only be declined for important reasons approved by the kāfi.

c. The obligations imposed on a guardian.

He has to administer the estate of his ward and act here as wa'fī. Among his powers are that of arranging marriage or divorce and making of a will etc. He has to champion the interests of his ward; he may invest his ward's estate in business enterprises but not in his own business. He can only mortgage or sell land or house and the approval of the kāfi. He cannot enter into any business dealing between himself and his ward and cannot give anything away of his ward's property.

4. The guardianship is ended by the death of the guardian or of the ward, by deposition of the guardian for faultless conduct or when the ward attains years of discretion (mājiza, as a rule at 14) or becomes rādīdī, i.e. capable of administering his estate himself (and according to the Shāfī view also possesses the ability to recognise the true faith). The guardians have then to give his ward an account of his stewardship.

WIRD (Ar. pl. awīrāt). The technical term wīrd (etymologically "to go down to a watering-place"; not to be vocalized wār) means, in a definite time (wāḥēd) of day or night, which the pious believer devotes daily to God in private prayer (in addition to the five prescribed prayers). It also means the formula of prayer recited on this occasion, called properly żākh (pl. żākih; cf. Makkī, ʿĀdīt al-Kabīrī, i. 82), or i. 4)? The simplest wīrd consists of a żākh, with the recitation of a seventh of the Qurʾān, but, very early, in private devotional prayer (ṣalā): Sunna as well as Shiʿī, cf. Kulaiz, Kāfī, at the end — and Ḥadrī, cf. Ḥaddī, Ḥadrī al-Khawāṣṣ, iii. 397—416) there were added litanies, either isolated phrases (ḥammāl, tahīl, ṣabāḥ, ṣaʿīl, ṣaʿīfl, ʿṣāḥīf, ʿṣāḥīfl), or isolated words (Arabic names of God; Allāh, ṣaddīqah, and invented or cabalistic names) because they were found to be efficacious.

When, in the 7th century, Islamic congregations were formed which took up the Sharia laws of the initiated ḍāhirīs, the Sunna to teach the novices on the day of his initiation (ṣalātū ḍāhir = ṣabāḥ al-wīrād) a special wīrd (cf. for the first appearance of this term i. Massagun, K. M. R. 1929, p. 107, i.) which became the distinctive żākh of each congregation.

In practice the wīrd is divided into two: wīrd ʿumūm (żākh ʿumūm), an exoteric formula often of some length (several hundred sūra, ḍāhir, etc. several times a day: after the ḍāhir and maghrīb among the ʿĀlamiyyah, and wīrd ʿumūm ʿumūm ʿumūm, "secret" name of God [e.g. ʿAbd ʿAbd, among the Sunnaḥah], which the ʿĀlamiyyah does not communicate to the initiate as a great mystery (cf. Ḥasan Ḥadī, Ḥadrī al-Khawāṣṣ, p. 27—28; Ḥadrī at the end of the ṣalāt ʿumūm of Ibn ʿAbd al-Muqqālam, Tāmī, Nahḍа, 1339). The term ḍāhir of żākh is used by preference for the assemblies of the brethren for common recitation (old term ʿumūm; now ṣalāt ʿumūm).

Since the sixth century special collections have been put together, in the style of the ṣalāt ʿumūm, containing the wīr of the principal Sunni ṭarīqa with the tenād of the transmission of the imitiation.

The oldest, the Rūḥ al-ṣalāt ʿumūm of Ahmad b. Abī Ḥāmid Ṭawāsh of Akūnāk, compiled shortly after 822 (1419) (cf. Ḥadī, Q. M. R., ii. 75, 109, and Kattānī, Kīrīya, i. 337; ii. 7—174, 506—331, 531—331, remodelled and brought to date successively by the Ṭāhirīs Ḥādīsh and Ḥādīsh, d. 970) = 1562; in Ḥanāfī and Ṭarīqa, Abū l-Muʾmālī Ṣtāwāna (d. at Medina in 1728 = 1629; in ʿArbaʿ al-ʾAbūs, ʿArbaʿ al-Ābās, Ahmad Ḥadī, d. 1661; cf. Ḥadī, Q. M. R., ii. 214—222, and Kattānī, Kīrīya, i. 336—337; ii. 150, 193—195, 396, culminated in the famous manual, still unpublished, of ʿAbd, called al-Ṣalāt ʿumūm (cf. the article ʿArbaʿ and L. Massagun, K. M. R. 1921, p. 159—171) where everything is downed to the "wīrd of the Arabian Virgin". These collections of żākh, brought from Mecca by pilgrims with Ṣtāwāna, have spread them throughout the Muslim world.

Bibliography: The essential work is Abī Ḥāmid Ṭawāsh, Fihār ʿArbaʿ al-Ābās, Fī Ṣaḥīf, 1346, 2 vols. (LOUIS MASSAGUN)

WIRT. In the treatment of ceremonial law in ʿArbaʿ and ʿArbaʿ this term is applied to the odd number of ṭāqīs which are performed at night. For details see below.

I. a. Wirt (ṣabāḥ also is admitted) does not occur in this sense in the Qurʾān, but is often used in ʿArbaʿ, which in this case also discloses to us a piece of the history of the institution, which is probably a continuation of the history of the fixation of the daily ʿṣāḥīf, as the traditions on it presuppose the five daily ʿṣāḥīf. Some traditions even go so far as to call wīr an additional ʿṣāḥīf of an obligatory nature (see also below, II). When Muḥammad b. Džabāl, at his arrival in Syria, perceived that the people of this country did not perform the wīr, he spoke to Muʿawiyah on this subject. When the latter asked him: Is then this also obligatory? Muḥammad answered: Yes, the Apostle of Allah said: My Lord has added a ʿṣāḥīf to those prescribed for me, namely prayer, its time is between ʿṣāḥīf (cf. msgr. 47) and daybreak (Abū Ḥanīfah: Al-Qurūb, v. 242). In accordance with this tradition it is reported that wīr, when it had been forgotten or neglected, had to be recovered (Abū Ḥanīfah, ii. 206; Ibn Mū苇, Ṣtāwāna, b. 122). Ḥādīs al-Ṣanīt [q. v.], on the other hand, denied the obligatory character of wīr, on account of a different tradition (Abū Ḥanīfah, Al-Qurūb, v. 345—347, 349).

A second stage in the position of wīr is expressed in those traditions in which Muḥammad admonishes his people to perform wīr: "Our Allāh is wīr (viz. One), and He loves wīr" [e.g. Abū Ḥanīfah, i. 110].

The third stage of ṭarīqa, which was to become the point of view of all muḥāsāt with: one exception, is represented in those traditions which call this ṭarīqa ṭarīqa. Many traditions of this kind expressly deny its obligatory character and are consequently of a political nature; they are frequently ascribed to 'Ali [e.g. Abū Ḥanīfah, i. 86, 98, 100, 115, 120, 145, 148 etc.]. It may be that this question, like other ceremonial points, belonged to the polemical repertory of the early Sunna.

b. The time of wīr is mentioned in ṭarīqa in connection with different parts of the night. "Wirt consists of parts of ṭāqīs, who either fears ṭāqīs, will have to add a ṭāqīs in order to make the total number odd," [Abū Ḥanīfah, ii. 3, 9, 10, 75]. In other traditions three ṭāqīs are mentioned in order to avoid the ṭāqīs [be-ṭāqīs, al-ṭāqīs bi-fistamāt, e.g. Abū Ḥanīfah, ii. 71]. The number of thirteen ṭāqīs occurs also (Tirmīdī, Wīr, b. 4), and in general wīr is supposed not to be allowed after ṭāqīs al-ṭāqīs (cf. Mālib, Mālibaʾ, Wīr, trad. 24—28, and Ṣaʿīfl, NH, 2192: "No wīr for him who has not performed it before ṭāqīs").

Wīr is also frequently mentioned in connection with the first part of the night [cf. below, II]. Abī Ḥāmid al-Hurayqī performed it before going to sleep, on Muḥammad's order (Tirmīdī, Wīr, b. 3). Muḥammad himself is said to have performed this ṭāqīs in any part of the night [e.g. Tirmīdī, Wīr, b. 4]. The time between ṭāqīs and daybreak appears as the largest space accorded to wīr in ṭarīqa (Abū Ḥanīfah, v. 243). It is prohibited to perform more than one wīr-ṭāqīs in one night (Abū Ḥanīfah, iv. 23 bis).

c. Tradition frequently mentions the ṭāqīs, prayers, invocations and formulas by which wīr has to be followed (e.g. Ṣaʿīfl, Ṣaʿīfl, i. 51, 54; Abū Ḥanīfah, i. 199, 350).

d. The chief regulations of ṭarīqa as fixed by the different muḥāsāt show insignificant divergencies only (see Ṣaʿīfl, p. 198, 429), with the single exception, that wīr is declared obligatory
by the Hindus, whereas in all the other maulidi's it is _maun_ (cf. above, I. a). The rules of the Shi'ah's school are as follows: the number of _raza_ may vary between the odd numbers from one to eleven, _iaja _[q. v.] is required; after every two _raza_ and after the last a _sahaj or _tanbih is performed. The best time is immediately after _tanbih_[q. v.] for those who do not perform this _pratit_ in the first third of the night. In the second half of Ramadán [see _takdir_], it is prohibited by _wafat_[q. v.].

**Bibliography:**


**WIZARA** [See Wala].

**WUPLI** (A.), the minor ritual ablation which gets rid of the condition of "minor" ritual impurity (_haqijah_, q. v.). Regulations for ritual ablutions based on a belief in demons and on animistic ideas were known to the Arabs as a survival from the older Semites but in Muhammad's time they were no longer carefully observed. The regulation in _Surah_ v. 8, of the late Medina period, already betrays Jewish influence: _Ye, who believe, when you purify for the _sahaj_, wash your faces and your hands up to the elbows and rub your heads and your feet up to the ankles_. Muslim regulations for purity based on this _sahaj_ and the next verse v. 9 (in part identical with iv. 38) developed in all details under the influence of the corresponding regulations of Judaism, but on the whole are less exacting than the Jewish system. The material for the study of their origins is contained in an unusually comprehensive body of traditions, in the transmission of which Ahmad b. Hanbal had a particularly large share; in it we find on the one hand às, to some extent, antimasonic tendency and on the other an endeavour to regulate everything in minute detail and lastly the harmonious tendencies of the moderate elements.

The text of the _Karim_ taken literally prescribes a ritual ablation before each _wuzu_. This is actually maintained to be obligatory by the Zaidites and and _Shi'a_. The four orthodox maulidi's however are agreed that a _wuzu_ is only necessary to men if a _pratit_ valid in case of a "minor" _haqijah_. This view, which was even encouraged to support by an insertion in the text of the _Karim_ ("while ye are in the conditions of _haqijah_"), represented a concession to actual practice, which had already been very slack since ancient times. According to the law, a "minor" _haqijah_ is produced by: 1. touching the skin of the other sex (sexual intercourse itself causes _wudu_(_haqijah_)) even as the two persons are related in a way that prohibits marriage; 2. relieving menses; 3. loss of cosmetics and sleep apart from a _wuzu_ while sitting; 4. touching the sexual organs and in several other ways.

The essential elements of the _wuzu_ are according to the Shi'a teaching: 1. washing the face; 2. washing the hands and the forearms up to the elbows; 3. rubbing the wet hands on the head; 4. washing the feet; 5. observing the water in the process; 6. formula or the intention (_niyyah_) performed on the _wuzu_ before beginning. Other actions recommended by the Sunnis are the previous washing of the hands, rinsing of the mouth and clearing the nose (before 3); stroking through the beard with the wet fingers, rubbing the ears and washing the neck (before 4); uttering certain formulae at the separate actions, beginning with the right side of the body and performing certain actions three times. As a rule the _wuzu_ takes barely two minutes to perform; many people do it hurriedly and confine themselves to the essential points. The demands to which the water intended for ritual ablutions must conform, are fully discussed in the _jish_ books. If the believer has no suitable water available or on account of illness or wounds cannot perform the usual _wuzu_, it is sufficient to rub the face, hands, and forearms with sand or dust (fayyamut, q. v.).

All the orthodox maulidi's permit a man who is at a permanent abode, once in twenty-four hours, and if he is on a journey, thrice in twenty-four hours, to rub his foot-covering instead of washing the feet at the _wuzu_. If the feet when last covered were washed clean and put into clean shoes, which must be impermeable and fit tightly. This process of _wasq_ _ala_ _l-haqqah is not permitted by the Kharijites nor by the Shi'a; as one of the most important external distinctions between Sunnis and Shi'a, this has attained a considerable religious significance and among the Sunnis, its recognition is an absolute essential of the profession of faith. The practice of _wasq_ _ala_ _l-haqqah is very old and it is perhaps one of the alleviations of ritual introduced by the Muslim armies. There is besides a difference of opinion regarding the ritual treatment of the feet at the _wuzu_. In the Sunnis, the Kharijites and the Zaidites demand, that they should go on without the _wuzu_ in the other hand, rubbed only; the former view, which is in keeping with the sense of _Surah_ v. 8, is no doubt the original one, while the latter represents an attempt to extend it in keeping with the literal text of the _Karim_, which caused the representatives of the older view to produce tortuous explanations.

WUKUF or WAQAF (A.), "halt!", means in particular the halting of the pilgrims at any spot they choose within the plain of 'Arafah; it begins on the afternoon of the 9th Dhu 'l-Hijjah and lasts till sunset. This wukuf is considered the most essential part of the hajj. The imam of the hajj usually introduces it (before the beginning of the combined '.controllers and 'aar jalal') with a khatbah; his words can of course only be heard by those in his immediate neighbourhood. The pilgrims for their part recite portions of the Koran, say prayers—mainly for forgiveness of sins—and cry labbaik! (q.v.) and other religious formulae. The ceremony ends with the running (tribe) to Muzdalifah. A similar halt, spent in prayer and also called wukuf, is made in the early morning of the 10th Dhu 'l-Hijjah in Muzdalifah before the running to Minah, also on each of the 11th, 12th and 13th Dhu 'l-Hijjah after the throwing of stones on the "little" and "middle" heaps. The stop, spent in prayer on the elevations of al-Safa and al-Marwa in the running (saya) between these two sacred places is also occasionally called wukuf.

The significance of the wukuf in the Muslim hajj is clear: it is a kind of common worship, a "standing before God" (cf. Riff, p. 141). But the form of the ceremony goes back to pre-Islamic rites. For the monotheism preached by Muhammad would in itself have had no reason to invent the sacred rite in 'Arafah and with it the most important part of the hajj. It might however be supposed that Muhammad wished, with the help of this act of worship to fill in gaps which may have arisen from the omission of some ceremonies of the pagan pilgrimage, and to this extent the wukuf may have in a way been a new creation of his. But this hypothesis loses its probability when we reflect that the wukuf (except in the last halt on al-Marwa, which follows the last saya) seems always to precede a ritual running and to be connected with it (cf. ibn al-Athir, viii. 192: wukuf in contrast to "Sahasr"). Now, since the ceremony of ritual running certainly goes back to pre-Islamic rites, the same may be presumed for the wukuf. The original significance of this custom is however not thereby explained. This much nevertheless seems to be probable, that the wukuf took place on holy ground or at least in the neighbourhood of such: the wukuf of 'Arafah was perhaps located at the foot of the hill later called Djbal al-Rahma, the special sanctity of which continued under Islam. The sojourn of the Israelites at the foot of Sinai described in Exodus six might in a way be compared with it. The Muslim theory, according to which the whole of 'Arafah (or Muzdalifah) is musafir (place of wukuf), perhaps points to the very fact that this was not the case before Islam. This statement, it is true, is easily explained as a concession to the multitude of Muslim pilgrims who could not all find a place on a restricted area. It may also from the first have served the purpose of destroying the influence of an old pagan sanctuary within 'Arafah (or Muzdalifah). The repulsion that the wukuf in its original form presupposed the making of a sacrifice cannot be maintained, so far as the present evidence goes.

Y

YĀDĪJĪ, 28th and last letter of the Arabic alphabet with the numerical value of 10. For palaeographical details, see *Arabic*, i. 354, 355, 354a, and plate 1. It belongs to the 6th letter (Gematria of *al*); its pronunciation is that of English y.


YĀDĪJĪ wa-MĀḏĪJĪ (the forms Yādījī and Māḏījī, occur also), *Gog* and *Magog* (cf. *Gen.* 2: 17; Ez. xxxviii. xxxix), two peoples who belong to the outstanding figures of Biblical and Muslim eschatology. Magog in *Gen.* 2. is reckoned among the offspring of Japheth; this name is also found in Arabic sources (e.g. *Baqīṣ* on sûra xiviii. 92. There are different traditions as mentioned); this much only may be said here, that the Bible as well the Arabic sources connect these peoples with the North-East of the ancient world, the dwelling-place of peoples who are to burst forth from their isolation in the Last Days, devastating the world southwards, until they will be destroyed in the land of Israel (cf. H. Graeven, *op. cit.*).

In Muslim eschatology this picture is repeated with many, partly fresh, details, and connected with the reappearance of *Ish* on the earth. Yādījī and Māḏījī will be an enormous that they will drink all the water of the Euphrates and Tigris or of the Lake of Tiberias. When they have killed the inhabitants of the earth they shall shoot their arrows against heaven, whereupon God will send storms into their nostrils, necks or ears, which will kill them to the last man in one night, so that the smell of their corpses will fill the earth (Muslim, *Fitan*, trad. 410; Ibn Māḏījī, *Fitan*, bòb 33, 59; Ahmad b. Hanbal, i. 375; ii. 450; iii, 77; iv. 182; Tabarī, *Tafṣīr*, xvi. 63, 64, 65). Or a host of birds will catch them and drown them in the sea (Tabarī, *Tafṣīr*, xvi. 64). They are cannibals (Chos:al, p. 330) and dwell behind the mountains of Armāniya and Aḏārḏāʾ (Tabarī, *Tafṣīr*, xvi. 12).

The traditions of the Arabic sources are largely connected with sûra xxi. 96: "*until Gog and Magog shall have a passage opened for them in the Last Days* and they shall hasten from every high hill" etc. Here is an allusion to the connection of Gog and Magog with the dam which was built by Alexander the Great, as it is said in sûra xxi. 92 sqq. And be [Alexander] prosecuted his journey from south to north, until he came between the two mountains, beneath which he found certain people, who could scarce understand what was said. And they said, O Dhu ‘l-Khurain, verily Gog and Magog waste the land; shall we then pay their tribute, on condition that thou build a rampart between us and then? He answered, The power wherewith the Lord hath strengthened us is better than your tribute; but assist me strenuously, and I will set a strong wall between you and them. Then the last goes on to relate how Alexander built the dam or gate behind which Yādījī and Māḏījī should therefore be shut up till the Last Days. Every night they will try to dig under the wall in order to escape, and every night the sound of their tools is heard. But God repairs before the morning the breach they have made (Tabarī, *Tafṣīr*, xvii. 64).

Yādījī and Māḏījī are of three kinds: one as tall as cedars; the second as aspect as they are tall; the third can cover their bodies with their ears (Tabarī, xvi. 16).

Tradition relates that one day Muhammad came in a hurry into the room of Zainab bint Jahši b. 'Abd Allāh, saying: So much has been opened of the dam of Yādījī and Māḏījī, making a sign with his thumb and index finger. She said: Shall we perish, there being so many good people? He answered: All evil will be widespread (Baqīṣ, *Hist.*; *Tafṣīr*, b. 23; *Hīdāyāt*, Fītan, b. 94; Ahmad b. Hanbal, ii. 341, 359 sqq.; vi. 428, 429).

According to de Goeje (cf. *Bibligraphy*), the story of the dam (which is found in the Syriac Legend of Alexander; *cf. Bibl.*) refers in reality to the wall which surrounded a part of the Chinese empire, and which had a gate in the South, called the jasper gate. He mentions reports of travellers who visited the wall, especially in the times of the caliphate.

The term *Bāḥr* Yādījī wa-Māḏījī, which occurs in the *Rājī bi Ghānum al-Nasir* (Cairo 1547, ii. 50 sqq.), apparently applies to the Caspian Sea.

Yaffa or Yafa, Joppa, Yaffa, a town on the Mediterranean, the port of Jerusalem. It occurs in the form 'Yfpp in the law of the 4th century B.C., in the list of towns in Palestine taken by Antipater III, W. Max Müller, in M. V. 63 G., xili, 1907, i, p. 31, p. 62. In the Amarna tablets and among the Assyrians, it was called Yappi or Yaffi, in Phoenician inscriptions as Yp, in the Bible Yafah; Yaffah is the present port of Jerusalem in the Bible, to which king Hiram sent in floats the wood destined for the building of the temple. Before the conquest by Senacherib (701 B.C.) it was subject to the king of Ascalon. It was not till the time of the Maccabees that the ancient Canaanite city came under Jewish rule. The legend of Jonah which is localised here and among the Phœbes and Andromeda are probably connected with some very early cult of a fish-god in Yaffa.

In the year 15 (636) Amur b. al-'Aṣīl (according to others Mār'awiyya) took the town (al-Bala'iburt, ed. de Goeje, p. 138). The importance of the old harbour of Jerusalem further increased when the Umayyad Sulaimān b. ʿAbd al-Malik founded the new capital of Jund al-Filiste, in Ramla, some 14 miles S.E. of Yaffa. Yaffa with the rest of Filistein passed in 626 (878) into the hands of Abū Hāmid b. Ṭalhah b. Quraysh a-[q.v.], and remained under the rule of the Fatimids of Egypt until 848. It passed to the Abdhabl al-Makaffar. After Dinār f. Fathā had conquered Syria for the Fatimids of Mu'āwiyah (756), the Karmīmīs penetrated in 360 (971) under Hāsan al-ʿAṣāma as far as Yaffa in which the troops (11,000 men) sent by Dāwābīr b. ʿAbd Allāh were blockaded. After the Karmīmīs had been driven out of Egypt in 362 (971) Yaffa was relieved and the garrison brought back to Egypt. The Turkish emir Atār b. Abū Maʿīn, in 463 (1071), took al-Ramla but Yaffa and Ašdalah did not come into his power.

The possession of the town was hotly disputed during the Crusades. The Franks who made it a vassal of the king of Jerusalem were able to hold it until the Third Crusade (1199-1187). The vizier al-Aṣāl sought by various means to take it from them in 1101, 1105, 1113 and 1115. After his murder, the caliph al-Amir besieged the town in 1122 but it was driven back, and again in 1123 as a result of the destruction of his fleet by the Venetians. After the battle of Ḥīṣn (Aug. 1123) most of the coast towns surrendered to Saladin, and Yaffa to his brother al-Malik al-ʿAdil. Richard of Coeur-de-Lion recaptured it for the Crusaders in 1127 (1114). Saladin besieged it in 1192 and regained it for the Saracens; he could not however take the citadel, and Richard, who hurried to the help of its garrison, drove Saladin's troops out of the town and refurbished it. At the time of al-Ramla the Christians were in possession of Yaffa.

By 593 (1197) however, al-Malik al-ʿAdil had again taken Yaffa, destroying the fortifications and, it is said, killing 20,000 Christians in the fighting. In the following year Saxon and Brabant troops temporarily occupied the town, but abandoned it in 595 again whereupon al-ʿAdil regained it by a coup de main. After the Fourth Crusade (1204) the town was again in the hands of the Franks. The Emperor Frederick II restored the fortifications in 1228; as did Louis IX in 1230 after his release.

In the Mamluk period Yaffa belonged to the district of al-Ramla, one of the four districts of the coast, which were part of the mamluks of Dimashq; for a time however (under Saladin's successors) it was under that of Ghazza (al-Dīnāš, ed. Mehet, p. 250).

Barbars attacked the town unexpectedly on 20th Dāwālīl II 666 (March 8, 1268) and took it and its citadel in one or two days (inscription on the White Mount at Ramla, ed. van Berchem, Inscriptions Arabes de Syrie, Cairo 1897, p. 57-64). It destroyed the town with all its houses, walls and the citadel. A certain emir Dūnād al-Dīn... b. ʿIṣāk, according to an inscription preserved in Yaffa, built there in 736 (1335) the sanctuary of Kuβbat Shāki, Murād which is still in existence (Clermont-Ganneau, Materialia inlektis pour servir à l'histoire des Crusades, Paris 1876; do., Archéological Researches in Palestine during the years 1877-1874, ii., London 1886, p. 154). When the kings of England and France were planning a new crusade in 1336, al-Naṣr had the harbour of Yaffa destroyed to make it impossible for the Franks to land there. For the same reason, the town as well as the harbour, was destroyed in 1345 (Tolkovsky, in Journ. Pal. Orient. Soc., 1925, p. 82-84).

The Arab geographers describe Yaffa as a small, strongly fortified coast town which was the port of Jerusalem and al-Ramla, enjoyed thriving trade and busy markets in times of peace. In times of war it was greatly exposed to enemy raids, in the first centuries of Islam, for example, to attacks by the Byzantine fleet, the Mardamites and the Kiryvragotes. To protect the coast against these raids, watch-towers (aghetti) were built, like those of Byantium from Laodicea to Constantinople, from which were signalled by smoke or fire to the capital, al-Ramla, the approach of Byantine ships, which also used to visit the ports from Ghazza to Acre to ransom prisoners (al-Majdūs, ed. de Goeje, p. 177).

After the battle of Dālib on 922 (1516) the whole of Syria passed to the Ottomans. Yaffa, which was in ruins, only began to revive gradually in the second half of the xviiith century, especially after its quays were built. From 1770 for several years the Pasha of Dimashq fought the English and Aḥī Bey and his followers for the town in which, the Mamluks perpetrated a frightful massacre on May 19, 1776. The French behaved even worse after the capture of the town by Napoleon (March 6, 1799); 4000 prisoners were shot on the shore. Immediately after the entry of the garrison the plaque broke out in the French army which suffered heavily. Dir'ūm Pasha, son of Mehemmed ʿAli, in 1831 occupied Yaffa, which passed to the Turks again in 1840. An earthquake in 1838 destroyed many houses and a portion of the defences.

On Nov. 16, 1917 Yaffa was occupied by the English (Anzac Corps). Since the war the town has grown very little (44,000 inhabitants), but its northern suburb, the Jewish colony of Tel-Aviv, founded in 1909, has rapidly developed into a modern town, which is already the size of the old town. To the northeast of the town are the German Templar colonies of Wilhelm and Saron founded in 1868 and to the south Jewish agricultural colonies. The plan of building a new harbour, accessible to modern ships, instead of the old and useless one which is surrounded by reefs,
has so far not materialised owing to the expense; it would enable the town to compete with Halfa, which is growing rapidly.


(E. Hoigmann)

AL-YAFFI. "Abd Allāh b. Abī N. "Abd al-M. Fallāh al-Shāfīī, Alī b. Abī Dīn Abū al-Sā'īda Abū l-BaRakāt, a Sūfī and an author, was born one or two years between 1300 (1301) in the Yemen though the place of his birth does not appear to be known. He studied first under the tuition of Muhammad b. Abū al-Din al-Baqillānī and Abū al-Hasrā, Kāšf of Abū al-Husnā. These studies comprised probably only the Korān and theology, but his ascetic inclinations must have developed early and have guided his whole life. As early as 712 (1313) he made his first pilgrimage to Mecca and there he associated himself with "Abd al-Tawāḥa whom he remained his chief sheikh. In 1226 he settled in Mecca and married. The following years he spent partly in Mecca and partly in the Hijaz, and in 734 (1335) he made a journey to Jerusalem and Damascus and came also to Egypt. After his return to the Hijaz he remained some time at al-Madinah and then came to Mecca where he married a second time. Later he made a short journey to the Yemen to pay a visit to his old teacher al-Tawāḥa. Sukhī in 747 (1346) made his acquaintance on the occasion of the pilgrimage and it was there that he died on the 29th Dhu al- Ḥijjah 768 (Feb. 21, 1367). Sukhī gives as the date of his death Dhu 1 767, probably an error.

He had rejected the shāhīda of a Sūfī from several masters. Biographers praise his devout mode of living and his kindness towards his pupils, and his reputation as a pious and learned man was widely spread during his lifetime. While the older biography as yet known, nothing of his karābi (q. v.), later works are fairly full on this point. His leisure in Mecca permitted him to write a large number of works, especially upon Sūfism and the principles of faith. He made a point of defending the doctrines of al-Ashārī and among other works wrote a treatise against Ibn Taimīyā, which brought upon him the hostility of the adherents of the latter. He is said to have had a very high opinion of the Spanish Sūfī Ibn al-ʿArabī. The works of al-Yaḳūbī which are accessible prove him to be the main a compiler of the works of the Sūfis with very little originality on his part.

1. His principal work is a treatise entitled Rawl al-Riyāḥān fi Risālah al-Šāfīīī (also called Nahun al-Čūyā al-muwaṣṣar wa-Tahdīl al-Kullāb al-haṣārī) in which he gives biographies of five hundred saints and Sūfīs. Pious narratives outnumber in it by far the historical data. The work has been printed several times (Būlāk 1286; Cairo 1301, 1307 etc.). Of this work a number of abbreviations are in existence and it has in addition served as a source for later works of similar tenor, the latest perhaps the Karūmāt al-Awāliyyā by Yūsūf b. Isāmah al-Nabhānī (printed in Cairo 1329 in two volumes).

2. His historical work Mirāt al-Dīnān wa-Tāʾir al-Yaqqūtā (printed in H̲al̲d̲a̲r̲āb̲ād̲h 1334-1339 in four volumes) serves also principally biographical purposes. As Yaqqūt, according to his own statement, was content with extracting the chronicle of Ibn al-Aṯīr and the works of Ibn Khallikān and Dhabābī, we find hardly anything new in it. The book has however a certain value as long as we have no edition of the large biographical works of Dhabābī. Only at the end of the work he gives a few biographies of his teachers in the Yemen, but in these notices one is hardly able to pick the few historical details out of a volume of empty words; dates are quite a secondary consideration. There are several abbreviations and excerpts of the work in existence, some with later additions, among them the Ghārīb al-Zamān by Abu ʿAbd Allāh Husain b. Abī al-Raḥmān al-Aḥalāl (died 885 =1480), which deals principally with South Arabian saints; also an extract by a certain al-ʿAbbās al-Sūfīlī, who lived about 1100, contained in a Berlin Ms.

Najār al-Maḥāsīn al-ḍallīyya fī Faqī al-Muṣṭalḥ al-Čūyā, mentioned at the end of the Mirāt al-Dīnān. This work has been printed in the margin of the Karūmāt al-Awāliyyā of Nabhānī (see above) and contains like the Rawl al-Riyāḥān accounts of pious Sūfīs and seems to be a first draft of his larger work. The purpose of this work, according to his own statement, was to furnish a proof that the Sūfīs and Sūfism can be made to agree with one another. For this reason he gave to this book the second title of Kīfayat al-Muṣṭalḥ al-Muwaṣṣar di al-Muṣṭalḥ al-Muwaṣṣar (Mirāt, iv. 335).

Markham—H. al-amūnīyya fī Rājī'at Idrī' Idrī' al-Muṣtaṭta fī al-Burhān al-Sūfīs al-waṣfīyya. This work he composed at the instigation of Negānī al-Dīn. 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Yūsūf al-Iṣ̲h̲āfānī (died 750 a. H.), collecting material from all manner of sources, he attempts the refutation of the doctrines of the Muṣťalḥa, which had existed any longer in his time. The work has been printed to the extent of about two thirds in the Bibliotheca Indica, 1910-1911. The title is wrong in Brockelmann, G. A. L., and wrongly corrected on the title-page of the printed edition.

5. Al-Ṭāhir wa l-Tāhir fī Faqī al-Aḥlāf wa-Tarjumāt Kihāyāt l-ʿĀtīf. Composed before the Mirāt, the title indicates the contents.

A short treatise concerning the advantage of reading the Qur’an and of prayer. Printed in Cairo 1322 (1905) and later.

In addition he composed a large number of poems of religious content and generally with long titles, partly preserved in manuscript or only known by name. Two are printed at the end of the Ma‘ṣūmiyyat. Mū’ūṣā ibn Muhāfizāt al-Muḥāfizāt al-Ma‘ṣūmiyya fi Madhī Shuyūkh al-Yaman al-Muṣaffa’ī. 8. Muhāfiz al-Ma‘ṣūmiyya fi Muhāfiz al-Shuyūkh ʿAbd al-Qādir ibn Abī ʿAbdallāh al-Ma‘ṣūmiyya, etc. 9. Muslim al-Ma‘ṣūmiyya. 10. Muslim al-Ma‘ṣūmiyya. 11. Muslim al-Ma‘ṣūmiyya. 12. Muslim al-Ma‘ṣūmiyya. 13. Litterarische Quellen.

In addition several treatises of the contents to which are unknown to me:

Bibliography: al-Durayr al-Shawāhīd, p. 77; Subbāt, Tuhfāt, vi. 103; Brockelmann, G.-L. 4, ii. 176–177; Sarks, Dictionnaire, col. 1952–1953 and later works on the saints of Yemen.

(F. Karrenk)

YĀFĪTH, the Saphet of the Bible, is not mentioned in the Qur’an; but the exegesis of the Qur’an and legend are familiar with the names of the sons of Nūḥ: Sām, Hām, Yafrīth (exceptionally Yafrīth: Tabart, i. 222). The Biblical story (Gen. xix. 20–27) of Hām’s sin and punishment and the blessing given to Sām and Yafrīth is known in Muslim legend but it is silent about Noah’s planting the vines and becoming intoxicated. Al-Kasīr’s completely transforms it: in the Ark Nūḥ could not sleep from anxiety; when he came out he fell asleep on Sām’s bosom; the wind revealed his nakedness, Sām and Yafrīth covered him up but Hām laughed so loudly that Nūḥ was awakened; he uttered the following blessings and curse: prophets shall be born descendents of Sām, kings and heroes of Yafrīth and black slaves of Hām. But Hām’s descendents intermarry with Yafrīth’s family; thus the Abyssinians, Hīdī and Sīdī were born to Kābīr b. Hām; the Cópsis are the descendents of the union of Kūh b. Hām with a descendant of Yafrīth. Nūḥ divided the earth among his three sons: Yafrīth received the district of Fasum (Fashum). His descendents are variously given, either exactly as in the Bible (Tabart, i. 317 sqq.) or partly (al-Kasīr, i. 101) or quite differently. He is usually regarded as the ancestor of Yadjiḍah and Maṣraḥi, the Tarks and Khazars, more rarely of the Ṣaṭākalī [q.v.]. Persia and Rūm are sometimes traced to Sām, sometimes to Yafrīth; to Yafrīth also e.g. Cyrus, who killed Belshazzar b. Evilmerodach b. Nebuchadnezzar, and Yerdigirt. Briefly Sām is said to be the father of the Arabs, Yafrīth of Rūm (or Yadjiḍah-Maṣraḥi), Hām the father of the Slavs.

Of the three, Semitic tradition naturally prefers Sām. But Yafrīth is rarely spoken of unfavourably as in Tabart, i. 232 where we are told that nothing good comes from Yafrīth and his descendents are deformed. On the other hand, the 72 languages are divided as follows: 15 to Sām, 18 to Hām and 36 to Yafrīth. He is the blessed son of Nūḥ.

Bibliography: Tabart, ed. de Goeje, i.

211–235: Thā’lab, ʿArif al-Anṣāri, Cairo 1325, p. 38; al-Kisāʾi, Ṣafī al-Anṣāri, ed. Eisenberg, i. 98–101. See also the art. ʿNūḥ, Sām. (Bernhard Hellek)

YAFUR B. `ABD AL-KĀDIR (also YAFAR) b. KHAIR AL-HAWLĪ (on the disputed vocalisation of the poem in van Andenak [see Bibl.], p. 234, note 3), founder of the dynasty of Yafurids or ʿHawalādīs who claimed to be descended from the Tulbes, the ancient Himyarite kings. Their ancestral home Shihám, called Shihám ʿAbd al-Muʿtāsir or Shihám Kawftán to distinguish it from other places of the same name, is described by geographers as a well cultivated hilly country. In the caliphate of al-Muʿtāsir, i.e. c. 900–927 (842–863), Yafur began to show his independence of the Abbasid governors who were succeeding one another rapidly; in 927 (861) Yafur had succeeded in driving the government Himyar b. al-Hārith out of Ṣanʿah and extending his rule over the highlands southwards as far as Djanad. The accounts, full of obscurities even in the special histories of the Yaman, show at least one thing clearly: the lack of unity in the dynasty from the first. By 956 (870) Yafur’s son Muḥammad appears as lord of Ṣanʿah, as the acknowledged governor for the caliph Muʿtāsir. He was, however, slain about 979 (889) by his own son Ibrāhīm presumably at the instigation of the aged Yafur himself who had been thrust aside by Muḥammad, but he himself henceforth disappears from history. Ibrāhīm’s son ʿAzād was still lord of Ṣanʿah; but the two-fold Aud law penetrated by the Karmanis and Zaidites raised up new enemies, so that he had only two successors in office. Some younger princes established themselves for a time in the Tahmān and in the mountains round Ṣada.


YAGHMÁ DIJANDÁKI, pseudonym of the Persian poet Abu T-Hájan Rahím b. Hādžih Ibrāhīm Kált. He was born about 1156 (1782) in the village of Khātūn in the oasis of Djanad or Biyāhān in the middle of the central desert of Persia. He began his life as a camel-herd but by the age of 7 his natural gifts had been noticed by the owner of the oasis, Ismāʿil Khān ʿArab-i Ṭamīr whose secretary (mamāliq-bāshā) he ultimately became. His first nom de plume was Maḍjūnūn. In 1216 (1802) Ismāʿil Khān after a rising against the government had to flee to Khurāsān, while Djanad was occupied by Duḥu T-Khātūn, representative of the governor of Simān and Dīmghān. Yaghmā was forcibly conscripted as an ordinary soldier but at Simān his gifts obtained him the post of secretary to the governor. In 1808 as a result of a false charge, the poet
received the bastinado and his property was handed over to be plundered (ydžāh) by the soldiers. The poet’s innocence was proved and he regained his freedom but the act of injustice had embittered him. He then assumed the pen-name of Yaghma and composed a satire, Nafdasīn, on Īlba fi-Ṭīlar Khān, full of coarseness beyond all bounds. Exiled, he wandered in Persia and via Khūzestān and Yezd reached Teheran where fortune showed upon him again, and he gained the good graces of Ḥādīṣī Miʿrāz Aḵ̄āṣī, the first Minister of Muhammad Shāh. Yaghmā was appointed wāzi to the governor of Kūhān but a new satirist (Khrāfāt al-sīmāh) against a family of Kāfān nobles made him ostracise again and he was denounced as a hāfiz from the pulpit of the mosque. His wandering life was resumed. We know that he accompanied Muhammad Shāh to Haráz. He only returned to his native land as an octogenarian to die at Khūr in the 16th Raʾīsī II 1276 (Nov. 16, 1859) and was buried near the tomb of Sahlīd Dīnābādī.

Yaghmā’s works in prose and verse were collected in a diwan and published at Teheran (?) in 1283 (1866) with a preface by Ḥāfīẓī Muḥammad Ḥanīfī. (380 fol. pp.)

Yaghmā practised all varieties of verse and his poems (ghazal, jingles, ḥīf, nafdasīn) show a great mastery of language and form. The most original part—perhaps of his work—is in the field of funeral chants (gafl-bāzīn) which he invented. They were obviously intended for the public lamentations in Muharram [cf. Tāʾlīf]. They are in the form of a maqāṣid in which each line is prolonged by a refrain which the audience is intended to murmur as a spontaneous echo. These maqāṣid are composed in simple and unaffected language. E. G. Burchard, op. cit., iv. 540, mentions the popularity of this genre among the poems of the revolutionary period (1905–1911).

Yaghmā’s most characteristic works however are his slanderous and obscene satires. Berthelot sees in them a revolt against the political and social iniquities of old Persia but the poet never seems to rise above his own personal grievances. If his wit is exercised even at the expense of his benefactor Ḥādīṣī Miʿrāz Aḵ̄āṣī it is because the poet is simply carried away by his satirical humour and too fluent tongue. Yaghmā has not yet anything of the revolutionary. His grievances included fits of pessimism and of piety. The Gojūn Museum at Teheran possesses a Kurān written on a single sheet of cloth (about 8 feet x 4½ feet) and arranged in complex geometrical figures. This is ascribed to Yaghmā (cf. the specimen of his hand in Browne, op. cit., v. 174).

Yaghmā made little use of Arabic and in several of his letters set himself the task of writing pure Persian. He considerably added by his annotations to the dictionary Burāhāf-i ṣāḥib, the manuscript of which is in possession of his grandson.


Bibliography: Rüd. Kâtīb Khān, Maqāṣid al-Famāl, ii. 588; Ethel, in Grundrisse der Persischen Sprache, ii. 374; Browne, A Literary History of Persia, iv. 356–344; Berthelot, Oeuvres persanes (Histoire du), Leningrad 1932, p. 98–99; Habib Yaghmā (a grandson of Yaghmā), Shāh-i Ḥājī Yaghmā, Teheran (c. 1927), first appeared in the periodical Arbaʿa, v. 10, no. 7–9; on p. 31 the author quotes a letter from Yaghmā repudiating the authorship of a large number of poems included by his future editor in the collection. This declaration, however, being made by the poet "in his old days" (dar maʿaṣīra-i muʿīn) to escape the denunciation of sensuality is not very convincing.

Yahūd, the Jews. The message which Muhammad as an "admonisher" brought to his people was believed by him to come from the same source of revelation as the Torah and the Gospel. If the "Arabian version" of the new scriptures was only a confirmation of what preceding "scriptures" taught, the new Prophet was referred for instruction to the Jews and Christians. The idea of the "try of judgment" which continually recurs in the early Meccan period, makes him speak of the 19 guardians of the body (in order to confirm those to whom the scripture was given) of the truth of the Kurān (lxvi, 10–12) from which it may be deduced that Muhammad at the beginning of the first Meccan period was already engaged in trying to win over the Jews. Of them he already knew that they "studied" their scriptures. (lviii. 37. dawrana). It is in keeping with this that he also speaks of the prophets Nūḥ and Muṣā (lxviii. 19), i.e. he knew that Jews and Christians ascribed to Abraham the composition of sacred books (Ṭabīṭ, an. 27; Abīl-dārā, 14; Fāṭirin, " méthana, Vett. Text., Hamburg Text, 1840, p. 1–400). Hebrew expressions are already increasing; e.g. il-tawāmūn = il-tawāmūn, al-mākhsūs for mahākhsī (iii. 54), il-fāṣīdān for fāṣīda (lxviii. 18), güm for "garden", wilmūn for "inhabiter" and masūna (lv. 40), which perhaps corresponds to the Talmudic epithet of God, hamūda ("Ashād-i ashād, 40th.

The desire to produce a book of revelation makes Muhammad at the beginning of the second period frequently speak of "books" in which all that has happened is written down (lv. 43, 51–53). The first reference to the "children of Ishrāf" whom Allah saved from Firʿaww and whom he chose "in his knowledge" in preference to all the world (cf. Amos, i. 11; Aphraates, Huma, 16, 2d. Wright, p. 334) is in Sura xiv. 29–32. The story of Mūṣā in Sura xx, which contains Jewish legends (vs. 41–43, 51, 18) thrice mentions the "children of Ishrāf" (verses 40, 42, 55) who Firʿaww is to release, who received the revelation and of whose sin the calf Mūṣā complains to Hārūn. Sura xxxi: four times mentions the "children of Ishrāf" (verses 16, 21, 59, 197) in connection with the story of Firʿaww and the revelation of the Kurān which "is the right road among the children of Ishrāf" (Calvis. Mund. Ishrāfīn = hašāb al-Ībārīn) shall recognise. Sura xiv. 59 mentions "the descendants of Ibrāhim and Ishrāf" whom Allah guided in the right path and in this connection the wulūt līrahka is put alongside of the revelation as of equal worth. Just as Jews and his people are an "example" in the bad sense for later generations (xlili. 56), Ibn who desired
to be nothing but a servant of Allah is an "example" in a good sense for the "children of Israil" (Allii. 57-59). The conception of God, formulated by Muhammad at this time (xxiii. 117), seems to be of purely Jewish origin and be at this time decisively rejects the idea of Christ being the son of God (Allii. 57-93, xvi. 26). The story of Ishrithm destroying the idolaters (Allii. 82), which is now given in detail (xxiv. 97), is also occasionally found among Christians (see. Abraham, ed. Bonneteac, p. 100), and Philostratus, De harvies, p. 97) is therefore rather of Jewish origin (Gen. x. 35-39). Jewish expressions which now appear are hur (xxv. 19), with which we may compare Alter, ii. 5; Yehele 37. The "children of Israil" according to the revelation granted them are to recognize none except Allah (xxv. 2), according to the scripture revealed to them, they shall twice cause ruin (verse 4) on the earth, and once live in the holy land (verse 106). Perhaps it was also Jews, who at this time wished to induce Muhammad to leave his country (verse 8). According to Muhammad's view however, only the Qur'an could succeed over the disagreements among the "children of Israil" (xxxvi. 78). It is in keeping with this that the story of Mshah in this Seria (xxiv. 27) has a distinctly Jewish stamp as has the story of Sutaiman (verse 17 et seq.; cf. Targum Sham). As late as the beginning of the third Meccan period Muhammad was frequently reminding the "children of Israil" of the revelation granted them through Mshah (xxii. 23, 29), but Allah gave them leaders and preferred them but the Israilites fell out among themselves when the "knowledge" came to them, and now Allah has placed Muhammad over them as arbiter in religious matters (xxiv. 15-17). Jewish expressions in the story of Yisraft which (Seria all) like the story of Nuh (xxi. 27 et seq.) can be proved to be of Jewish origin are beh to for "suffer" (xlii. 65, 72) and Yisraft nikiya for Yisraft hasadabi (xlii. 46). The Hebrew word misgul was probably taken over by Muhammad at this time with the meaning of "story" (xxxix. 24). The Meccans however are still only to dispute in the "best fashion" with the "people of the scriptures" to whom they are to closely bound as regards religion (xxxvi. 45). Allah has indeed granted the "children of Israil" a safe habitation, provided them with all good things (x. 93) and gives them the "sevenBasel, the east and the west of the land" (vii. 133). Muhammad however now calls himself the nasir, the prophet of the ummat Nabi-Salama, whose coming was foretold by Tora and Gospel. He now considers the food prohibitions of the Jews as a punishment for their rebellion (vi. 147). The Medina period made Muhammad more acquainted with Jews and Jewish conditions and he gradually drew the barriers between the "peoples of the book" and the new community of Islam. Muhammad then turned to the "children of Israil" with the demand that they should keep their bond with Allah (ii. 38-93), the conscience of their having been chosen, remember they were saved from the hand of Fir'awn (ii. 48). The Jews, if they only believe in Allah and the last judgment, are still mentioned along with beholding Christians and Sabaeans (li. 59) but we already have it indicated that their scriptures are forgeries (li. 70). They write down with their own hands and say: "it is from Allah" (lii. 73). But in reality there are uneducated people among them who do not know their scriptures at all (xxxvii). The punishment of hell which must overtake them is regarded by them as being only temporary (lii. 74). The "children of Israil" have broken their bond with Allah (lii. 77). They drive one another out of the country but on the other hand ransom their prisoners (li. 79). Mockingly they say to themselves: "our hearts are unmanculated" (li. 82). They made ambiguous speeches who against their will they had to accept the Tora (lii. 87: "Samul Na-awais instead of shabrad Na-awais"). They cling to life and many would like to live a thousand years. Instead of the mocking vayt with which they address the prophets, they are to speak clearly aqalana (li. 98). At this time many Jewish ideas came to Muhammad, e.g. sahfaa T-dineel for aseyt doom (lii. 28, 78) and khalid for h'leel Na-khli (li. 96). The Jews believe, the do the Christians, that they alone will enter Paradise, without being able to prove it (li. 105). From this time onwards Muhammad calls the Jews of his time al-Yahud, a term by which they were already known before his time (Allii. 67, 118, 216, 217). Levil. 73; Urwa, xli. 13) uses the root khal, while by "children of Israil" he means their Old Testament ancestors. Muhammad noticed how Jews and Christians reproached each other with the worthlessness of their religion (li. 107) and he sees that neither creed will be satisfied with him until he follows their religion (li. 114). But they are not to profess Judaism or Christianity but only the religion of Israil, which professed the true religion (li. 129). But neither Israil, Isma'il, Iska, Ya'qub nor the tribes were Jews or Christians (li. 134). The Jews now refuse to follow on the path of Allah, that is, to fight in battle for him, and the "children of Israil" acted similarly when they asked for a king after the death of Mshah (li. 247). Yet Allah had always given the "children of Israil" many clear signs (li. 207). An expression taken over from the Jews at this time is fardoon for "distinction" (li. 181). Muhammad had heard the Jews boasting of their scriptures although in his opinion they often did not know them (lii. 73). But the "same" for those who are laden with the Torah and will not carry it is that of an "ass carrying books" (lii. 8: faham war et-torin). The Jews should desire death rather than assert they are the "friends of Allah" (lxii. 6; cf. 1. Chr. xvi. 13 et seq.) Tora and Gospel are only confirmed by the Qur'an which is to be regarded as fardoon (li. 2). Isram has already taught the children of Israil Tora and Gospel "book" and "wisdom" (lii. 43) and Muhammad is the confirmer of the Torah (lii. 44). The dispute about the millata Israilitan is therefore meaningless. Tora and Gospel were only revealed after it (liii. 58) and Israim was neither Jew nor Christian but a Muslim (lii. 60). His real followers are Muhammad and his community (lii. 61). The reference is obviously to the Jews in Seria iii. 69, where there is mention of those among the "people of the scripture" who will not readily give back property entrusted to them, saying "there is no obligation upon us towards the unnasikal (unnasikal Na-Salama). It is they also who are represented by Muhammad as relying upon scriptures which do not belong to the "scripture" at all, the reference is probably to the so-called "oral Tora" (T-din ne-akal lii. 78). In reality the prophets have
already solemnly pledged themselves to recognise the "apostle" who will one day appear (iii. 75), and compared with the Millerite breach all previous revolts are alike (iii. 78). In the dispute with the "children of Israël" regarding what is forbidden or permitted, Muḥammad actually challenges them: "Bring the Tora and read it if you are speaking the truth" (iii. 87). The Jews, however, distort the sense of the words of the scriptures (iv. 48), and if the "people of the scripture" demand from Muḥammad as a sign of his mission that he should bring a book down from heaven (iv. 152) their ancestors once asked Musā to do an even greater thing: as proof of his mission (ibid.). The Jews required Muḥammad to bring back to life one of his followers; they left Allah's way and practiced magic although it was forbidden them (iv. 158—159). Muḥammad however holds out prospect of a great reward to those among them who believe in Allāh, the last judgment and in the new mission (iv. 160). In this period falls the fighting between Muḥammad and the Jewish tribes in which, in spite of their strongholds, numbers of them were forced to emigrate (ix. 2. 336), or were taken prisoners (xxxii. 28). Their land became Muḥammad's booty (xxxii. 27). After he had laid down the boundaries between the new Islaam and the "people of the scripture", he mentions as enemies of the believers Jews, Christians, Saracens, Magians and polytheists (xxxii. 17). Muḥammad in this period attributes hateful things to the Jews. They worship 'Usir as "Allah's son" (ix. 30), cf. Ez. xvi. 9, 14, worship their rabbis as the Christians do their monks along with Allāh, who want to "exterminate Allāh's light with their mouth" (ix. 32). Jews and Christians are wrong in saying "we are the children of Allāh and his favorites" (v. 21), since Allāh punishes them for their sins (ibid.). The Jews to Muḥammad are "listeners to liars and listeners to others" (v. 45), who falsify the words of their scriptures (ibid.) and quote their Tora against Muḥammad's mission (v. 47). But all the apostles of God, who ever legislated truthfully according to the Tora, the prophets, rabbis and teachers, were Muslims (v. 48). Believers should therefore not accept the Jews and Christians as friends (v. 36). The Jews wrongly believe "that Allāh's hand is tied" (v. 69). Muḥammad finally turns to the "people of the scripture" and assures them that they have "nothing to stand upon" if they do not recognise the revelation thrice given in the Tora, in the Gospel and in the Qur'ān (v. 72). But the children of Israël have always followed the apostles of falsehood (v. 74), even to them was only Allāh's servant (v. 76), and the infidels among them were once cursed by Dawūd (v. 82). Muḥammad finally finds that the Jews and idolators are the greatest enemies of the believers, while the Christians are friendly to Muḥammad and his community (v. 85). — The Hebrew expressions and terms used by Muḥammad in the late Meccan period are: ṣaddās from the Jewish liturgical ṣaddās (ix. 23); ṣaddās from ṣaddās (xv. 35); ṣeḥārat for ṣeḥārat (ix. 31, 34); ṣeḥārat for ṣeḥārat (xv. 35); ṣeḥārat for ṣeḥārat (v. 49, 99); ṣeḥārat for ṣeḥārat (v. 48, 68); and frequently ṣeḥārat for ṣeḥārat (iv. 47, 48). — See also the article Dhimma.
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YAHUDI. [See Mithridates.]

YAHYÂ, John the Baptist. This prophet plays a fairly prominent part in the Qur'ān, which mentions him with Jesus, Elijah and other prophets among the just persons who serve as arguments for the oneness of God (Sūra vi. 83). The history in the Gospels of his miraculous birth is twice given (iii. 33—36 and xix. 1 f); God gives him to his parents Zacharias and Elisabeth in spite of their years. There is a kind of announcement to Zacharias: "O Zacharias, we announce a son to thee; his name shall be Yahyâ; no one has borne this name before him" (xix. 7). Yahyâ speaks in his cradle and, like Jesus, has wisdom from his childhood. God gives him the title of lord (miyâd), which according to the commentators means merciful. His characteristic qualities are gentleness and humility. In the plot discussion it is the phrasing in Sūra xix. 13: "O Yahyâ, take the book with steadfastness", which seems to mean thatMuḥammad thought that John had received a revealed book. The commentators, however, do not admit this meaning; they are of the opinion that the book mentioned here is the Tora, the Pentateuch, and that Yahyâ did not receive a special revelation but had as his mission only to "confirm the word of God" (iii. 34). Zarnakhshar simply says that God gave him understanding of the Tora. — The Qur'ān does not mention his role of Baptist, and does not tell the story of his death.

The legend of John the Baptist among the Arabs presents different features according to different authors. Talari says he was the first to believe in Jesus; he makes him survive Jesus and says that he was put to death at the request of Herodias, niece of Herod or daughter of his wife, for having said to the king that he could not marry her. A curious episode developed at length by Talari, is that of the bailing of the blood of the decapitated Baptist. The blood boiled not only in the dish on which the head is presented but on the tomb of the martyred prophet and can only be restored to its normal condition after great calamities. The blood and the decapitated head speak.—The legend is evidently in some way connected with the Nespalian cult of the blood of St. Januarius.

Marzûf relates of Elizabeth, John's mother, the story of the flight into Egypt which the Gospel tells of Mary. Elisabeth fled with her infant son to escape the wrath of a king. John sent to a prophet to the Jews by them and put to death. Later, his "blood" is avenged by a king named Kherdîsh who massacre many
of the Jews. Mas'udi knows the episode of the baptism of Jesus by John, the scene of which he puts in the Lake of Tiberias, or in the Jordan. Al-Biruni mentions among the festivals of the Syrian calendar that "bathing" of John the Baptist on the 29th of the month Xiib, and he records that, according to al-Harawi, there could be seen in front of the "Pillars Gate" in Jerusalem a pile of stones said to have been passed by the passers-by to restore John's blood to a normal state, but the blood would not cease flowing and continuing to do so until a Persian king had sent a general who put many men to death on the prophet's grave. Al-Biruni thinks, like Tabari, that this general was an Aghlabian.

At the present day there is still shown a tomb of John the Baptist in the great mosque of Damascus, where is also a tomb of Zacharias mentioned by the Batuflis.

As to the "Christians of St. John" or Mandaeans, the Kur'an and the Arab writers hardly know them; if they do refer to them, it is not by those names but as "Sabia" [q.v.]. They regard them as a sect intermediating between the Jews and the Christians and admit that they have a "book"; they do not however give them the title of their prophet but Noah.


YAHYA, a Turkish poet of Albanian origin of the time of Soliman. A scion of the noble north Albanian family of Dakagin, to which also belonged the Turkish poet Dokagin-zade Almud Bey, Yahya was taken under the droghirna for the Janissaries and brought to Stamboul. He himself speaks in his Gemedine-i Riz of his being conscripted in this way, a thing that was only to bring him good and when an old man he still recalls his Albanian origin. In Stamboul he was put in the corps of "Adjem-Oghlan, in which officers for the Janissaries and Spahis were trained and he attained the rank of Vaya Bashi and Bilbil Bashi of the Spahis. Sahhâ al-Din, the Kâti of the Janissaries, soon recognised his poetic gifts and allowed him a great deal of freedom for his literary inclinations. Later he gained access to the intellectual coteries of Tim Kemal, Djâf Yelkeni, Kadi Efendi and to those of the two great Macedonians Ibrahim Pasha and Iskender Celebi. When the latter fell into disgrace the poet boldly intervened for him with the grand visier Ibrahim but could not save him.

Yahya was a bitter enemy of the court poet Khayali Bey whom he had first encountered in 945 (1539) and with whom he had a poetical feud as well as with Khatti. He wrote a zaptia against Khayali, which he gave to Soliman on a Persian campaign and it so delighted the grand visier Rustem Pasha, the declared enemy of all poets, simply because of the contempt poured on Kayali in it, that he made Yahya administrator of several foundations in Stamboul and Damascus. But when Yahya, in his usual fearless fashion endeavoured to save a life of prince Magafa, who was popular with army and people alike and felt a victim to the intrigues of the grand visier and the sultan Khurram, but without success, and then wrote an elegy on the prince after his execution which was sent on every one's lips, Rustem did all he could to get Yahya executed but only succeeded in depriving him of his offices. When the grand visier summenced him and prepared a trap with the question, how could he lament a man condemned by the Pasha, he is said to have replied with great presence of mind that he condemned him with the Pasha but loved him like the people. When his enemy Rustem died, Yahya would not lose the opportunity of writing a satirical lament upon him.

The poet later retired to a large fief (ülâmi) of 27,000 ağahe annual income, which he had at Lmrâ in the sandjak of Zvornik in Bosnia. Here the octogenarian worked at the collection of his dîwân, at which the historian Ali found him engaged in 982 (1573), a year before Yahya's death (according to others he did not die till 986 or 990). After his death Ali was given the preface to the dîwân to examine, in keeping with a wish of the deceased.

Besides a dîwân of his ghâzals which does not rise above the average, Yahya left five considerable poems, which placed him beside the great knickers. The five titles are Sahhâ al-Din, a pure love; 4 MSS in Vienna, Fligel, No. 688-691; Yahya ur-Emad (written on the pilgrimage to Mecca), Kilâbî-i Ujûl (or Usâhînâme), Gemedine-i Riz (mystical; on this the poet Nûru Akseki wrote a dîwân of 2,000 verses entitled Sahhâh Sâyi'ah, Gemedine-i Emâr. These are also attributed to him as Nûr al-Niyâs and an unfinished Usâhînâme in 2,000 verses). The three last parts of the ghames are not romances but consist of moral aphorisms on morality and rules of life, etc. The two first which were published at Stamboul in 1284 have only the title in common with the works of Hifâl and Djâmî of the same name, and, besides, treat their subjects in quite an individual and independent fashion. Yahya himself on one occasion says that he has no wish to eat ha'zâm from the dead Persians. This independence along with his frankness and courage is the most notable trait of our Albanian and makes him an attractive figure to us. These qualities are also in keeping with his bravery as a soldier which was celebrated, and which he displayed for example in the fighting at Temesvar, and the Turkish literary historians mention him as representative of a type which admirably combined the sword with the pen. For him the frequently much abused droghirna was the cause of his rise to fame in these days when birth counted for nothing and good luck and particularly not mean anything.
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YAHYA b. 'ALI b. YAHYA b. 'ABD MANSUR b. MUKTAFI, 'ABD AHMAD, was one of the best known theorists of music of the old Arabian (classical) school. He belonged to a learned family who were authors, several of whom wrote on, or were interested in music. His grandfather (d. c. 831) was the famous astronomer at the court of al-Ma'mun [q.v.]. His father (d. 886) had "particular skill in music (ghānīn)" says Ibn Khallikan, writing in his magnificent biographical dictionary of Arabian scholars (al-Muwafaq) [q.v.], and wrote a book entitled Kitāb 'Abhānī fa Ḥabībī fa Ammīnī.[q. v.]. That 'Ali was also acquainted with the theory of music is evident from the fact that so eminent a theorist as Ḥabīb b. Khuras [q.v.] consulted him on the ʾīlim al-muḥāfaqī. His uncle, Muḥammad, was also commended for his "knowledge of music (ghānīn)". Yahya b. 'Ali was born in the year 850, and, like his father, became a "boon companion" of the caliph, beginning this career in the service of al-Muwafaq, the brother of the Caliph al-Mu'tamid [q.v.]. He is praised by most biographers on account of his knowledge of the literature and sciences of the Greeks (awā'il). This evidently gave him his pronounced taste for philosophy, in which sphere he shone as an exponent of the Mu'izzil school. He was also a gifted poet and an accepted theorist of music. He died in the year 912.

According to the Fihrīst, the best known book of Yahya was the Kitāb al-ʿAbhānī ("Book of the Illuminating"), which dealt with the poets who were half-castes. He left it unfinished, but his son completed it. Specimens of his poetry delivered before the caliph al-Mu'tamid [q.v.] and al-Muktafi [q.v.] have been preserved by al-Mu'taṣir. Abu 'l-Farrāj al-ʿAṣrārī [q.v.] quotes a treatise on music by Yahya entitled the Kitāb al-Naḡmān ("Book of Melodies [or Notes]"") in an authoritative sort of way. This is probably the work that has come down to us in the solitary example in the British Museum bearing the title: Risāla fī l-Muṣībī (Treatise concerning Music). This latter is, with the Risāla fi ḡuṣna al-awṣāyins al-Muṣībī of al-Kindī in the Staatsbibliothek, Berlin, the only work that throws any light on the music theory of the old Arabian (classical) school, the technical phrasing of which crowds the pages of the Kitāb al-Aṣrārī of Abu 'l-Farrāj. This treatise, which is of the utmost importance, is being edited by the present writer, and will form a volume of his Collection of Oriental Writers on Music. In its pages will be found a complete explanation of the so-called "Finger Modes" (ghusnî), and their "Courses" (mudāfi'), and divisions (farrūkh), in which the melodies (awṣāma) of the various vocal pieces (ṣūrūt) were composed.

His son, Abu 'l-Hasan 'Abd, a ḍabā (lawyer) of the school of Abu Da'far al-Tabari [q.v.], was famed as a writer. A nephew, 'Ali b. Ḥārith (d. 965), wrote a Risāla fī l-Farrāj bīn Ḥabībī b. al-Muṣībī wa-l-ʿAbhānī al-Muṣībī fī l-Aṣrārī (Concerning the Difference between Ikhtībī, il-Habīb and ʿIshāq al-Muṣībī concerning Music), whilst a copy of the latter compiled a Kitāb Muḥāfaqī fī l-ʿAṣrārī (Book of Choice Songs).
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YAHYA b. KHALID, a Barmakid. In the 'Abbasid caliphate we find Yahya already prominent in the reign of al-Mu'tadid, who in 158 (774-775) appointed him governor of Al-Jaharbadjan or, according to another account, Armenia. Three years later, the caliph al-Mahdi appointed him tutor to his son, the young Harun, and in 163 (779-780) the latter was appointed governor of the western half of the empire, i.e. of all the provinces west of the Euphrates, with the addition of Armenia and Al-Jaharbadjan, and Yahya was put at the head of his chancellery. According to al-Mahdi's original arrangements, his older son Mi'ad was to succeed him on the throne and Harun only to be considered in the second line of succession. Shortly before his death however, he decided to make a change in favour of Harun. Mi'ad however was not satisfied; after the death of al-Mahdi in 169 (Aug. 785), Yahya gave his protege Harun the wise advice to retire voluntarily and pay homage to his brother whereupon Mi'ad was acknowledged as caliph with the name al-Hadi. Nevertheless relations between the latter and Yahya were very strained. The new caliph was thinking of cutting Harun completely out of the succession and having homage paid to a known son Dja'far as the successor designate. This plan however met with vigorous opposition from Yahya which went so far that al-Hadi had him imprisoned. According to the usual story, he was kept in prison until the caliph died in Kafir 1, 170 (Sept. 786). When Harun had ascended the throne, he appointed Yahya as vizier with unlimited power in all branches of the government. Yahya's period of office lasted seventeen years, then the catastrophe—probably long planned—came like a flash of lightning from a clear sky. At the end of Mulhammad or the first night of Safar 187 (Jan. 23, 803) or according to another statement, probably due to a copyist's error, 188, the caliph had his till then practically all-powerful vassal Dja'far b. Yahya suddenly executed without legal proceedings. Soon afterwards Yahya and his other sons were arrested and their property confiscated. Yahya was kept in prison till his death on the 3rd Mulhammad 190 (Nov. 29, 805) in al-Rafid at the age of 70 (G 74). Cf. the article BARMAKI.


(K. V. Zettersteen)
YAKUB, the patriarch, the son of Isaac in the Bible, is in the early Meckan Suras (xxi. 50; xxxi. 72; xxix. 42) the brother of Ishmael, son of Ishmael; the genealogy: Ishmael, Isaac, Ishmael, Yakub, the (12) tribes (b. 1390, 1343), is more true to the Bible. Yakub is numbered among the Prophets (xiv. 50). He is once or twice mentioned in the Yusa Sura: Yakub orders his son not to go through a town (xii. 99); he becomes blind through sorrow and regains his sight when Joseph's coat touches his eye (xii. 93, 94).

Post-Koranic legend relates that Yakub and Esau fought already in their mother's womb, that Yakub was to be born first but to share his mother took second place. Yakub was really entitled to the rights of the first-born (Tabari, 1, 350). Yakub's journey to Haran is mentioned and his stay with Laban are told as in the Bible but in several versions Yakub only marries Rachels after Laban's death. The Yusa Sura receives many embellishments. On hearing that a wolf has torn Yusa to pieces, Yakub wishes to see the wolf; the brothers bring the first wolf they can find, but this beast mauls itself to pieces and exposes its dent. Many reasons are given as to why Yahweh has to suffer. Yakub writes a letter to the king of Egypt. After eighty years of separation, Yakub recognizes a distance of 50 parasangs the heavenly sum of Yusa. The beggar is known according to which, from and in which place, in Markophia, then to meet the blessing, then shall not meet the curse, the curse. (Yusa, 1, 339, very slightly 338; late parallel in Gerber, Legenda der Propheten, p. 374, 442).

YAKUB, B. AL-LAITH. [See Saffah.] YAKUB BEY. [See Gursheh Othman.] AL-YAKUBI AHMAD B. ABU YAKUB B. IBN ISMA'IL AL-ARTABAN, an Arab historian and geographer, a descendant of the YakaB, a Semite and one of the seven nations of the Levant, as well as a number of other Arab tribes. He was the son of 12 years old, and later of his father, the Caliph Al-Mansur, after whom the family takes the name Al-Atrash. Like his ancestor, he as a servant of the Caliph, held his life for the protection which he gave to the Caliph Al-Mansur. After his father's death he abandoned the Al-Mansur and was a student at the University of Al-Mansur. In 1902, he went to the service of the Caliph Al-Mansur, and when he returned, he became a student at the University of Al-Mansur. He was a student at the University of Al-Mansur, where he wrote his history of the world, which he brought down to the year 259 (872) while in the east. It begins with the history of the Patriarchs of Israel, and then goes on to the story of the Messiah and the Apostles, of the rulers of Syria, Amurath and Babylonia, the Indians, Greeks and Romans, Persians, Eastern peoples including the Turks, Chinese, Egyptians, Berbers, Abyssinians, and Greeks. The second part, almost twice as long, begins with the birth of the Prophecy, and is the history of the year 259 down to 259 (872).Besides the 259th anniversary, which he used to mention for himself, he mentions his sources and his account of contemporary events is confined to very few brief references. In addition to the Cambridge MS. from which M. Th. Houtmans edited the work (Lwa'di, see biographical historical 2, vol., Leyden 1883), another is now known in Top Kapu (R.S. iv. 708); cf. M. J. de Googe, Uber den Text und den Stand der Abhandlung, in Travaux de la Soc. de St.-Petersburg 1887, ii. 133-166; M. Klauser, Der Aussage aus der Evangelien bei dem osmotischen Jahai in Furtwangen, zur Einheitsrichtung der Bibeltexte, 1885; cf. Uber die Aussagen aus griechischen Schriften.
After the fall of the Ṭabūrīs, Yaḥyā Ṭubullū went to Egypt where he died in 284/897. In 278/981 he wrote there his geographical work Kitāb al-Buldān, for which he had been collecting material by research in literature and making enquiries of travellers. His interests are predominantly statistical and topographical; he gives the planners only roughly in days' journeys and pays special weight on giving the yields of taxation. He begins with a detailed description of Baghdād and Šāmrār, then goes on to Iran and Tūrān with northern Afghanistan, Kufta with west and south Arabia follow, then Baṣra with Central Arabia, but this part with the description of India, China and the Byzantine Empire is now lost. The description of Syria with its military colonies was followed by that of Egypt, Nubia and the Maghrib. The concluding part is a section on the governors of Siyūqān down to the death of al-Munṣūr, with which this province lost its independence and became amalgamated with Khurāsān, and of Khurāsān to the end of the Tāhrids. His style is simple and his text free from the fables so beloved by the geographers of the time. See M. J. de Goeje, Specimen e litteris orientalibus distinctae descriptionum al-Maghribīorum santonum et literarum regionum al-Jaṣṣaḥ, Leyden 1860; Kitāb al-Buldān mutsara ʿAbd al-Malik bin ʿAbd al-Qaḥṣah bi-Ṭubullū al-Khitāb fi-Ṭubullū al-Jaṣṣaḥ, ed. M. J. de Goeje, B. G. A. vii., ii, 1892. His works quoted on the Geography of the Byzantine Empire and on the history of the conquest of Africa are lost.

**Bibliography:** Yaḥyā, ʿIrshād al-Arbaʿ, ed. Margoliouth, ii, 190; D. S. Margoliouth, Lectures on Arabic Historians, Calcutta 1930, p. 125 sq. (C. Brockelmann)

Yaḥyā al-Rumī, or, according to a genealogy which he assumed later, Shihāb al-Dīn Abū ʿAbd Allāh Yaḥyā bin Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ramāwī, the famous Arab encyclopedist. Born in 757/1359 in Byzantine territory of non-Arab parents (hence his ethnic al-Rumī), he was captured when a boy, sold as a slave in Bagdad and purchased by a certain ʿAskar b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān, a merchant in the capital of the caliphs, ʿAskar gave Yaḥyā, who added to his name his master's ethnic, a good education and a few years later sent him to trade in the Persian Gulf in the island of Kīshān (q.v.), Umān and Syria. Maimaitiri in 596/1199 and estranged for a time from ʿAskar, Yaḥyā took to copying for a living, attended the lectures of the grammarians in al-Ḫubšt (d. 616 = 1219), became reconciled with his old master and resumed his trading journeys for him, settled in Bagdad on his death and became a bookseller. In 610/1215 however, he again resumed his life of travel. We now find him in Tabrīz, next year in Syria and Egypt, and in 612/1215 at Damascus again, where he was nearly lynched for his anti-ʿAlī views but he escaped to Aleppo, Mopsel, Kufta and Marv. He spent nearly 2 years in this town, rantacik the libraries. He now began to put together the material for his principal books. At the end of 615 (1218) he left his studious residence and visited Ḥārār (the modern Ḥārār). Hearing however of the coming of the Mongol hordes led by Čiṅgī-Ḵān in 616 (1219) he fled hurriedly, abandoning all his property, to Mopsel where he arrived completely destitute in Raḏāb 617 (Sept. 1220). He wrote a

**THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLĀM, IV.**
the Turks so long as the latter held firm control of the Yemen.

2. Name of a Mkhīlīf in the Yemen, which included the sphere of influence of the tribe of Yām.

3. Name of a mountain in the Yemen Dīwāl between the wādīs of Ḳhārid and al-Verja.


(Adolf Grohmann)

YAMAK. See JANIBAHRAS.

al-YAMAMA, a district in Central Arabia, which was originally called Dīwāt ("the bottom of a valley"). The name of Yamama is said to go back to the seven Sabītā al-Yamama, who played a prominent part in the story of the decline of the tribes of Tasm and Dīwāt. The district was first of all called after her Dīwāt al-Yamama, then simply al-Yamama. The statement that al-Yamama lies on the long ridge of the Ṭārīq, to which belongs its chief wādī Ṭārīq, which runs through the district, shows, like the long list of place-names and not least the very considerable yield in taxation, 510,000 dinars according to Kudāma b. Dīfār, that it must have been an extensive area, which included a considerable portion of the range now called Dīwīl Tūwaḥ. The boundaries given by Jomard, who understands the statements of Ḳarīf and Abu l-Fida’i to mean that al-Yamama included the provinces of al-Ṭārīq and al-Khuraj, are probably too extensive. It is not however possible to define exactly the limits of this region which was very important in ancient Arabia; the Dāftār however was the frontier on the east.

The name al-Yamama is now given to an oasis in the Wādī Ḥaḍramawt on the southeastern slope of the Dīwīl Tūwaḥ, which consists of a palm-grove, a mile square with four villages, in front of which lies an extensive area covered with the ruins of palaces and dwelling-houses. Herefore seeks to locate the ancient Yamama in the region formed by the Wādīs Ḥanifa and Nīsāh. Its first capital was al-Khīrīma in the Wādī ʿIrāq (or Wādī Ḥanifa), later in the second half of the fourth century A. H. the market town of Ḥaḍr al-Yamama or al-Ḥaḍrj, which was however already in ruins in the time of Ḳurān. The following places in it are also mentioned:

Orientaux, preface to the Geographie d’Abdnalla (Paris 1848), i. cxxxv. 260; in J. d. I. 1860; Het, dichter, geograaf, Quellen in ‘Iṣrāʾ il-ʾAqvāl, Worterbuch (Strassburg 1898); Brockelmann, G. A., i. 479—481; Huart, Litt. arabe, p. 301, 303. (R. Blachere)

YAKUT-AL-MUSTAṢSIM, DIRMĀL-AL-DIN ABDUL MAJID B. ḲABīR AL-ĆALĪF, a famous calligrapher, was a slave of the last ‘Abbasīd caliph of Bagdād, al-Mustaṣsim, who had brought up and educated, whence his surname. His origin is unknown; some say he was a Greek from Amsīa; he was probably carried off on a razia while still very young. He was a cadi. He died at Bagdād in 658 (1260) at the age of 80 (lunar years) which would make him born in 615 (1219). The continuator of Ibn al-Mawlawī, he was called ‘Iṣrāʾ il-ʾAqvāl, "model of calligraphers", and was head of a school; he also wrote in prose and verse; he had by him a Kitāb Akhkhār, an anthology written in 662 (1264) and the Afī‘īṣ al-Huṣainī, a collection of aphorisms (printed at Constantine in 1300). Kurānī, said to be copied by him, are in the following libraries: St. Sofia, 654 (1260); Hamdīyya türbe at Bīgha-Kop (Constantinople, 662 (1264); Cairo (Moritz, Ns. 80); Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds arabe, Ns. 6082; Fesṭel Collection, 681 (1282) etc.

Bibliography: Halib Emdali, Kaṣīf a-Shaṭṭār, Constantinople 1805, p. 31; Mirāt Senāghlī, Imām al-Fadlī, Tabestan 1291, p. 3 sqq. (not paginated); C. Huart, Calligraphes et Miniaturistes, Paris 1906, p. 84 sq.; Quatre-vingt-cinq ans, ii. 140, note 11; Wejers, Orientalia, ii. 291; Beckelmann, G. A., i. 353; Edw. G. Browne, A Literary History of Persia, ii. 487. (C. Huart)
Manfuha, Wahba, al-'Awja, Ghubara, Muhahhamah, al-Ammiriya, Farahin, al-Haddar, Dahik, Tuddib, al-Milkub, al-Sal, Salamia, al-Kuriaya, al-Majdja, Ma'wak and al-Nebb. Al-Khijrma is described as an important town, smaller than al-Madina, but rich in palms and fruit-trees. Among the crops the most important was wheat, which had been sent to the caliph's table (it was known as Bahja' al-Yamania), the harvest also excellent: fruit and dates. The beef was well flavoured as there were fine pastures and the drinking-water excellent. A speciality of al-Yamania was the slave girls who fetched high prices for their complexion — up to as much as 100,000 dirhams.

In the pre-Islamic period al-Yamania was inhabited by the Qudarsi, who had their strongholds in the Idr valley and along with the Tam whose army they destroyed here, were under Himyarite rule. After their defeat, which South Arabian legend narrates fully, we find the Banu Hanifa b. Lufijm who, after being almost annihilated in the battle against the rival prophet Musallima b. Yumama (12 A.H.) submitted to Islam. At a later period al-Yamania was settled by the Numair b. 'Amir b. Abi Jafila b. Ya'fur as well as by the Tami and their clients of other tribes. At this present day the district belongs to the Wahhabite kingdom, has about 2,000 inhabitants and has sunk to a low level. Philby no doubt rightly ascribes the destruction of the old cultivated land to a disastrous flood in the valley of the Hanifa.


al-Yaman, formerly a province, now an imamate in the southwest of the Arabian peninsula. The name is variously explained; some say it was given because the Yaman lies to the right of the Ka'ba or to the right of the sun (al-Bakri, 1556), others because Yaqub b. 'Abir and his companions turned right on separating from the other Arab (B.G.A., v. 331; Yaqubi, iv. 1034), while others again derive the name from the eponymous hero Yaman b. Kahjum (cf. al-Wasi'i, p. 281). Sprenger thinks the Greeks and Romans translated Teman and Yaman by "sana'amon" and "felix" and included under Arabia Felix all the land south of Shattan. This coincides roughly with the delimitation of the Yaman attributed to Mutjammad, who is said to have climbed a mound at Tabbik and pointing to the north said "All this is al-Sham" and turning to the south "All this is al-Yaman" (Sprenger, p. 9).

The greatest extension of the Yaman to the north actually corresponds very well with the boundary of Arabia Felix which, according to Ptolemy, vi. 7, 13 sq., begins about 9 miles south of al-'Aqaba and the northern frontier of which runs from there northwards to the foot of the Sabara range and then turning east, crossing the northern edge of the desert of al-Nafud, ends at al-Najd. Al-Wasi'i (p. 282) also represents al-Yaman as bounded in the east by the Persian Gulf, in the south by the Arabian Sea, in the west by the Red Sea and in the north by the Gulf of Kalma, the Syrian desert and the Irak. The frontiers given by the Arab geographers are considerably narrower. According to Ibn Khardajibb (p. 135, 189) and Idris (p. 143 sq.), the northern frontier of the Yaman ends at the tree called Talat b. al-Malik between al-Muhlijia and Sarum Riff south of Mecca. According to others, it begins below Ta'if, while al-A'ma' (Yaqubi, iv. 1035) makes the northern boundary run from 'Omamah to Najdaj, Hamdani (p. 51), Yaqubi, iv. 1035) more accurately lays it through Yahirin, south of al-Yamania, via al-Hudajara, Ta'if, Djarraj and Kuras to the coast towards Kudummun near Hamiia (175 sq.). Ibn Hawrak (p. 18) who includes two thirds of the Diyaj al-'Arab in the Yaman, puts the northern limit at al-Sirraj, Yalamam, al-Ta'll and makes it run through the highlands to the Persian Gulf; this makes it intelligible why some geographers even include Mecca in the Yaman Thais; towards the east the Yaman extends over Hadramout, al-Shiyar (Mahar), Zafar (Dolfar); even 'Omamah is sometimes included in the Yaman when it is not (as e.g. in Malat, 68) made a separate province. The whole of this extensive territory, which al-Dinwati (p. 216) divides into 24 administrative districts (mirahaf), was in the early days of Islam divided into three: San'a', al-Djanad and Hadramout or Zafar under separate governors. The taxes under the 'Abbsids yielded 600,000 dirhams (B.G.A., iv. 144, 249, 254). After the Yaman broke off from the 'Abbsid empire its area diminished considerably and its administrative divisions varied substantially; sometimes the Sunn Tihama with its capital Zabid was actually independent of the Zaidi highlands with San'a' as capital. When C. Niebuhr travelled in the Yaman he ascertained that the following districts were independent:
1. Yaman in the narrower sense with San'a';
2. 'A'dan with its hinterland;
3. Kawakabah;
4. Hadsah and Bakl;
5. Abi 'Arab; 6. the lands lying between this and the Hidjira; 7. Khaswah;

The geographical definition of the Yaman becomes still narrower under Turkish rule. The wilayet according to the provincial law of 15th Rabii II, 1331 comprised the sandjak of San'a' with the kads of Haraz, Kawakabah, Anis, Hadsah, Jabbars, Yarm, Reba and Amara, the sandjak of al-Hudaydah with the kads of Zabid, Luhiyah, Zaidiya, Jabal Rimah, Hadjir, B't al-Fakhir and Bakil, and the sandjak of Yaf. With the kads of Tabuk, 'Udaim, Ka'bah, Hadjirwah, Makhad and Kasima. In the north it was extended towards 18° N. Lat. by the independent districts of Abi 'Arab, Kasaj, Wada'a, Bal'd Yaman (Najdaj), in the east by the Halad Khaf, Baraj, the oasis of Khabb, al-Djawf with Arlub and Nihm and also Mrib, Khabilin, Harb, Barijan and Yafi as well as the Fuji region, and
in the south by the historical 'Aden, which is under the protectorate of England and since the Anglo-Turkish frontier agreement of 1902-1905 has ambitious to push its boundary northwards, which tendency has been repeatedly opposed by the Muslim Yezidis b. Hadid & Elimi in recent years; its kingdom is bounded in the north by the Jaffa and Nabk, and in the east at about 45° Long. by Hajdomeh which the town regards as within his sphere of influence. The official Turkish estimate of the area of the province of Yaman is 191,100 sq.km, but both higher and lower estimates are given. If we include the hinterland, which is the land of Kainari, Perin, Sokotra and the Yemeni mountains which belong to India (Bombay), we get roughly 213,000 sq.km. The estimate of the population vary quite as much. The English figure is 1,000,000 for the Yemeni, and 100,000 for the protectorate of 'Aden. E. Glaser (Zögervolg, ill., 1846, p. 35) gives the Turkish Yemeni 1,000,000 inhabitants, at war 8,500,000. The population of the Yemen is, apart from about 60,000 Jews and a few Christians, and Persians, entirely Muslim, but of different schools. The highlands between 35°, Yaman and 'Alhaida and the whole of the east including al-Madina are Zaidi, the Yemani, Ta'iz and Hajdomeh, Sharii. The Zaidiyya includes among its followers the musulmans of Nasir, Hamdan, Ta'iz, Hara, Shari and the neighborhood of Yaman. The Yemeni east is followed in the vicinity of the Wadi阿拉伯.

The anthropological classification of the population is not yet settled. There is undoubtedly a strong Hamitic element of the same type as the North Africans, alongside of which the Melrophophalans Semitic race of southern Arabia and the short and broad, large-nosed race of Nabas Asia, nor to mention a Negro element, form a strong component in the racial mixture of South Arabia, at the basis of which there is probably an ancient pigmy people.

The sharp distinction between the low lying coasts and the highlands of the Yemen had already been noticed by the Arab geographers. The former, 25-45 miles in breadth, passes into an unfruitful area of sandy, hilly country with occasional ridges and some standing out like islands, which is succeeded by the bordering expanse of foot hills, then an arid interior thronged, on which abates the curved and broken edge of the Arabian plateau. An inner trench, fruitful in the Yemeni, forms the transition to the eastern highlands.

The Yemeni highlands, the scene of a great upheaval, in the angle of two great depressions, has become a great mountain area which contains the highest peaks in Arabia (about 10,000 feet) and has towns (Matth. San'a) at a level of 3,500 to 7,000 feet. The extensive desert known as Ru' al-Khali which bounds the Yemen on the east and stretches in the form of a wide valley between Nadif and Hajjame, has only been made better known recently through the exploraions of D. Thomas and J. Rehm. Al-Yaman has not unjustly been called the 'Green' (al-Khaja'i). A fairly extensive system of agriculture is possible not only in the plains of the coast (especially producing millet and maize) but also in the bordering foot hills, which are very favourably climatically and have a luxuriant vegetation. An aridous but intensive system of cultivation is carried on artificial terraces. The most valuable article of cultivation is the coffee plant, the eastern slopes of the coast hills are permanently cultivated once perennial BXr and springs ensure irrigation and walls make possible an intensive rear-cultivation. The fertile canyons of the inner valleys have in place led to a dense population than on the outer hills. On the edge of the eastern highlands at the mouths of the valleys there are extensive woods which grow dates (Djow, Marri). The centre of culture in ancient Arabia (Sabat, Mas'ud) grew up here due to the great skills in irrigating works, of which the site of Marri is an example. Among the articles grown may be mentioned wheat, fruit, olives, figs, and dates. The extent of 4,000 feet is cultivated, an average of 1,000 to 2,000 square yards. The chief centres for dates were Ujai, Ta'iz, Khaibam, Dhamra, Ra'ay and al-Subai. The Yemeni still produce 50-400 fold sheep, and soda strasses a.g. the site of Marri could be cultivated, if they had a better system of irrigation. Numerous fruits (apples, quinces, bananas, lemons, apricots, peaches, plums and mangoes etc.) grow in the Yemen, especially in the Wadi Dakh at San'a, the date and vine have also been cultivated some ancient times. Vineyards are often mentioned in the early south Arabian inscriptions and the geographers mention them in San'a, Hadhram, Atakha and in the Wadi Dakh. Among the growing plants are flax and in particular at Marri, wares in trade, the date and honey. A widely distributed plant which leaves of which are used for weaving is fik (Zogervolg, ill., 1846, p. 36). The tree and shrubs which produce drugs and gums, especially of special importance in antiquity, especially frankincense and myrrh. The export of their wares paid for the foundation for the prosperity of South Arabia; these were also the same, as an especially fine quality of which was found in Sokotra; commercial wealth is also to be found in the Yemen. Gold is obtained in considerable quantities from the sands of the rivers and mines, among which varieties of copper and cornelians were esteemed. The high degree of culture also raised the level of local industries. The weaving was particularly good, high prices were paid for striped slacks from San'a and Hibaam. Cotton was made as early as the sixth century A.D. Tanning and the manufacture of leather was general and increased considerably in the period of Persian rule. Yaman leather and book-bindings were greatly appreciated. The chief manufacturing towns were San'a, Sabah, Djabal and Yaman. The manufacture of weapons was also a flourishing one; swords and armor from the Yemen, which were highly prized as were the safety-locks still manufactured there. Other products of the Yemen which were exported were drinking vessels from Hadhram, palm leaf baskets from Dhamra, and copper from Mahdiyay (B. G. A., III. 68). The lowered position of the Yemen as a centre of trade for Indian products and valuable perfumes, which it held down to the middle ages, is now lost, probably for ever. Coffee, indigo, drugs, and textiles still have some importance in the export trade. The most important harbours are 'Aden, al-Hudayda, Marah, Lahj and al-Siba. The internal trade is still mainly confined to caravans. The building of the first railway in the Yemen from al-Hudayda to San'a (begun in 1912) was stopped by the Great War in 1915; the railway from 'Aden via Lahj has only reached
The difficulties in the internal transport of goods occasionally lead to disastrous famines but the economic development of the country is probably only a matter of time.

It is not possible here to trace the varied history of the Yemen through all the stages of its development from the conversion of the land to Islam which began as early as 9 A.D. (cf. the articles ‘An‘a and Sana‘ and the short sketch of ‘Jemen im Islam’ in M. Hartmann, Die arabische Frage, p. 530—541). On the other hand, since conditions in the Yamam are much involved in general questions of Eastern politics, it seems advisable to give an outline of events since the reconquest of the Yamam by the Turks. The incentive to more energetic action against the Yamam, which had been again administered as a vilayet by the Turks since 1849, was given by the opening of the Suez Canal and the desire to command the E. coast of the Red Sea. In 1870 the Wali Hajj Ali Pasha defeated the emir of ‘Aṣir Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allah, who was threatening al-Mahfad. At this time the Turks held only al-Mahfad, Lubayna, Zabid, Bābih al-Ṣa‘īd, Bābih al-Ṣa‘īd, Majrī, Jijāt, and half of Liţāb Rima. The Turkish force was sent out from Ḥudaydah. After a six days’ siege the Turkish commander Redif Pasha was killed, and a force under the Emir ‘Aṣir left to attack the Emir who had established himself there but had to surrender after a six days’ siege. The Turkish commander Redif Pasha had him put to death immediately after his surrender.

‘Aṣir was now occupied by the Turks. Ahmad Mūhammad Pasha had asked for an armistice after Redif Pasha’s death, and the Turkish army crossed the Red Sea. In the south the ‘Asir entered ‘Aṣir, where ‘Aṣir had established himself but he had to surrender after a six days’ siege. The Turkish commander Redif Pasha had ordered him put to death immediately after his surrender.

‘Aṣir was now occupied by the Turks. Ahmad Mūhammad Pasha had asked for an armistice after Redif Pasha’s death, and the Turkish army crossed the Red Sea. In the south the ‘Asir entered ‘Aṣir, where ‘Aṣir had established himself but he had to surrender after a six days’ siege. The Turkish commander Redif Pasha had ordered him put to death immediately after his surrender.

The province was to be divided into two separate vilayets: the one comprising the highlands with ‘Amrāb, Ḥudaydah, ‘Aṣir, and ‘Adan, was to be directly administered by the Imam, the other part including the coast to be put under a new wall. The two governors were to be independent and rule with the assistance of Ḥudaydah and native gendarmerie according to the Shari’a; the net yield from taxation was to be taken to Constantinople and separate accounts kept. ‘Aṣir was to be the main Turkish garrison town. The scheme of reform was upset by new risings in ‘Aṣir, which although put down by the son of the Imam Shara‘ al-Din, Muhammad Abū Na‘īb, gave a pretext to the Turks to resort to force once more. The policy of violence pursued by Muhammad ‘Ali Pasha had a disastrous effect for it produced a general rising, which became all the more dangerous when Sāyi‘id ‘Abd al-‘Azīz also attacked the Turks (1910). The struggle was finally concluded by the agreement of De‘fīn in 1911, which was concluded between ‘Izzat Pasha and Imam Yahyā and contained 20 articles (Wāhi‘, p. 236—239; Sāyihān, p. 98 sq.). In this, the territorial status quo under Ahmad Mūhammad Pasha was recognised, the appointment of Zaidī judges by the Imam and the establishment of a court of appeal recognised; the Imam handed over a tenth to the government according to the Shari‘a, while his territory was recognised as autonomous. The war between the Porte and Italy led to the blockade of the Yemen coast and the bombardment of al-Mahfad, but the military assistance given by the Imam strengthened his relations with the Turks. Sāyi‘id Muḥammad al-Idrīsī, the ally of Italy, was defeated by the Imam’s troops. This alliance was further strengthened by the World War. In 1915 (or even 1914?) Turkish troops and Yemen volunteers led by Sahīd Pasha put down the rebellion but in 1915—1916 war broke out again in the north, and the two following years there was considerable unrest in the land; piracy in the Red Sea even led to a demonstration by Italian cruisers before al-Mahfad (1920). The chaos of isolated actions only produced a serious movement when the present Imam Mahfūz Yahyā b. Humdī al-Din, a fanatic and vigorous man, undertook the leadership in 1904 and proclaimed the dīwān against the Turks. ‘Aṣir was invaded by the forces of the Imam; the fighting outside the town continued against the Turks and in April 1905 an agreement was reached by which ‘Aṣir and the vicinity passed into the hands of the Imam and the Turks agreed to withdraw. Monēshī, Ta‘īr, ‘Abd al-Muqtasir, Kā‘bīyāt and Redī‘ alone remained in Turkish hands; the Porte however did not approve of the conditions of the peace but decided to send Ahmad Faid Pasha to reconquer the lost territory; he retook ‘Aṣir after a march right across Arabia but lost it again after fierce fighting. The losses in men in this, the most serious thing, were so considerable that they were forced to negotiate with the Imam, missions being sent from Constantinople to the Yamam and vice-versa. In the meanwhile the governor Ahmad Faid Pasha was replaced by the politic ‘Isān Ta‘īr Pasha who endeavoured to come to a satisfactory agreement with the Imam. At the Sultan’s request a deputation of Yamam nobles came to Constantinople; the very excited negotiations however came to nothing in spite of the willingness to consider the Imam’s claims to independence. After the victory of the Young Turks (1909) they appeared to be ready in Constantinople to carry through a complete reorganisation of the Yamam.
his capital first to al-Rawda (Aug. 1918) and then to Su‘a'. The English bombarded al-Faradiya which they gave to their friend Suliyy Idri. The Imam that attacked Aden and took several places in the hinterland, but an arrangement was soon come to. In 1934 there was fighting in Salwi with ‘Abd al-Aziz b. Sa‘id, but Yahu‘ succeeded in taking al-Faradiya and al-Thama, and in the following year a treaty was concluded by Sir Gilbert Clayton between England and the Imam. More recently Italy's active policy has involved the Imam in her sphere of interest and this has been emphasized by Italian Yaman now of influence.


**YANBU** (VANBU), a little port and also a town some distance inland on the west coast of Arabia; the former is also called Yanbo' al-Bahr or Sherem Yanbn and the latter, 6-7 hours journey N.E. of it, is called Yanbo' al-Nakhla. The port, which has now replaced the old harbour of al-Dijar as the port of al-Madinah, lies on a shallow bushy flat land with good anchorage and protected from the sea by an island outside it. The town is divided by an arm of the sea into two parts and defended on the land side by a wall with towers, which has two gates, the Bih al-Madinah on the east and the Bih Masr on the north, as well as several others on the sea side. The houses are badly built and the mosques insignificant. The harbour lives mainly by the trade of Al-Madinah which goes through it and does a busy traffic with Sawed, Kusair, and Kene on Upper Egypt by native sailing ships. The inland town of Yanbo', written al-Yanbū, in Ibn Djuhain, is an old settlement and probably identical with the ‘Ummah‘a saq of Ptolemy. The town, which was celebrated for its house, is described by the geographers al-Iṣṭakhbī, Ibn Hawqal and al-Muqaddasi as large, well populated and rich in palaces and had a strong castle. It was inhabited by Amu‘, members of the Banū Djuhain and Lathth, the Prophet is said to have conducted the war in its mosques. The round lies at the foot of a row of hills and owes its prosperity to a stream coming from them. Vegetables, dates and tobacco are grown; the greatest care is devoted to the date palm groves which have been cultivated since these ancient times; the houses lie scattered among them. The tradition that the harbour of Yanbo' is a later foundation from Yanbo' al-Nakhla, where leading Yanbohwans have data-groves and country houses, still survives among the people. The name 'Yanbo' or Yanbo' (spring) is attributed to the wealth of the place in springs.

At the beginning of Islam, the attitude of the Yarubi was that of hostile reserve. They did not dare declare openly against the powerful prophet of Madina. But on his death they were the first to rebel. The prophetess Safiyya (q.v.) was one of them (the tradition which makes her wedding to the Taghlib seems to have little authority). To the Yarubi also belonged the two brothers Musliim and Mutammam bin Sawars whose relations with Khalid b. al-Walid made such a stir. After the suppression of the 'eids, however, the Yarubi like the rest of the Tamim proved faithful to Islam and took an active part in the conquests; but their turbulent and rebellious nature was revealed in the considerable support they gave to the Kharijites: in the Kitab al-Ahka'am, vi. 4, it is noted that at the battle of Dawaib, in 652, where the forces of the Arraqs were crushed, the leaders of the two parties, 'Ubayd Allah b. Baghir al-Sallah and al-Rabi b. Amr al-Ghuzlati were both of Yarubi. The many details that we possess of the deeds of the Yarubi during the wars of the tribal wars of the Islamic period, but survived mainly because these wars are mentioned in the verses of Djarin (who belonged to the clan of the Kulaib b. Yarubi) and also because his commentators discuss them fully.

The Yarubi moreover gave to the poetry of the pre-Muhammadan period and of the first century A.H. quite a number of remarkable poems; in addition to those given at the end of the article TAMIM we may mention Sulaiman b. 'Abd al-Rahman b. al-Alayli (cf. especially Aysnayat, ed. Alwardt, No. 76), Hani b. Badr al-Ghuzlati, al-Sumamari b. Shaik, of the Banu Thalaba b. Yarubi.

Bibliography: see the articles TAMIM.

(G. LEVY DELLA VIDA)

AL-YARUMUK, a river in Syria, now called Shurait al-Mani'dah (from the Bedouin tribe 'Arab al-Mani'dah). It rises in the Haws, flows west through a deeply cut valley of erosion, the Wadi al-Kamal, which describes a flat curve open to the south, to the Ghas, where it flows into the Nahr al-Thurah (the Jordam) below Lake Gennesareth at Djar al-Mudiqar. Pityis calls it (Hist. Nat., v. 74) Hieronum or Hieronima (Godara Hieronem prosternunt, var. Hieronom; the now so popular form "Hieronimus" is not recorded).

On the 12th Rajab 15 (Aug. 20, 636 A. H.) in the celebrated battle on the Yarmuk or army of some 50,000 Byzantines was decisively defeated by an Arab force, probably half as strong, under Khalid b. al-Walid. The battlefield lay near the junction of the Nahr al-Khulud and the Yarmuk not far from al-Wikala (the modern al-Uqla). According to Theophanes (Chron., ed. de Boor, p. 329), the disaster to the Byzantine army took place near wa'ir al-Ghazali (al-Qubayyy, now Ghaswi (q.v.) zur 'esur. This battle was sometimes confused with that of Dhamrada (q.v.) of 28th Djanmash 1, 13 (July 30, 634), perhaps because the battlefield lay not far from Khirbet Yarmuk, this Biblical Yarmuth (I Sam., north of Wadi 'l-Sim'; cf. de Goeje, Mémoires sur la conquête de la Syrie, Leyden 1900, p. 59 sqq.). Castaels explains the confusion in the accounts of the battles as a result of the erroneous assumption that Abu 'Ubaydah was present as early as the first siege of Damascus and proposes, following Mednikov, to emend the otherwise unknown Adjudathin to Dhamraibatin. The accounts of the two battles are fully treated
and analysed in his *Annali dell’ Istana*, iii., p. 24—51, § 17—67 (Adiadies); i:vii., p. 499—
613, § 11—124 (al-Yarmūk). — Near the battle-
field Isy Dair al-Khill, where the Arabs encamped
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(YARUB, Yaʿrub b. *Kahfān* b. Ḥad, the
grandson of the prophet Ḥūd, who is also
regarded as the ancestor of the *Himyarites*,
is one of the mythical rulers of the Yemen.
He is said to have conquered the *Adites* who
occupied Maʿrib and thus to have become the
founder of the Sabean kingdom. His name is
derived by the genealogists from *drub* to speak
correct Arabic (i.e. with the Fr.), as he is also
said to have been the first to speak Arabic,
for his father Kahfān still spoke the original language
of Sām b. Ḥūd.

2. Yaʿrub b. Mūllīk, the ancestor of the
Yaʿrubid dynasty of Umān whose capitals
were al-Rustîk, Yabruʿ and al-Harrām,
they ruled from 1054—1154 (1624—1740). They
succeeded one another as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mūllīk</th>
<th>Saif</th>
<th>Murshid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nāṣîr</td>
<td>2. Saif</td>
<td>3. Abū LʿArab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1034—1049)</td>
<td>(1059—1079)</td>
<td>(1079—1123)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1123—1131)</td>
<td>(1131)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last member of the dynasty, Saif b. Murshid, was set up as a pretender against Saif b.
Saif with the help of Aḥmad b. Saʿīd and chosen imām. The greater part of Umān fell to
him and Saif b. Saif could only hold out in Maṣqat which lost much of its importance to the
rival port of Maṭrjāf favoured by Saif b. Murshid. In fighting with the Persians who came to his
hearts, his opponent Saif b. Murshid was slain and after Saif b. death which took place soon after,
the governor of Saifār, Aḥmad b. Saʿīd, who had

married a daughter of Saif b. Saif, became imām
of Umān (1154 = 1741).
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(YAHHRIB. [See al-MADINA.]

YATIM (AK), the orphan, i.e. fatherless
minor child. The improvement of the social
position of orphans, who were particularly numerous
in ancient Arabia, played a large part in Mu-
hammad’s scheme of social reforms. The vigour
with which the Prophet had to intervene on
their behalf is significant of the conditions which
he found. When relations did not take charge
of them, the care of orphans fell upon the muṣābīh
of the tribe (Lammas, *Arabica de Propheta*,
p. 248); his obligations were based upon the
Prophet as leader of the community (Lammas,
*La Mequje à la veille de l’Hégire*, p. 153). In
Sūra viii. 6, 9 (of the first Meccan period) the
Prophet is reminded that he himself as an orphan
was protected by Allāh and admonished on his
part not to oppress the orphan. The Kūrukic
passages which make good treatment of orphans
a duty and forbid their oppression cover a long
period: Sūra vii. 2; xv. 15; lxxix. 18 (also of the first Meccan period); xvii. 36; lxxvi. 3;
xxvii. 3 (of the second Meccan period); viii.
153 (of the third Meccan period); ii. 77, 175,
211, 218 sq. (of the year 2); iv. 9—11, 40 (of
the years 3—5). In Sūra viii. 43, and lxx. 7 (of
the years 2 and 4 respectively) the orphans are
allotted a share in the fifth part of the *ghamima*
[q.v.] or in the *far‘* [q.v.], Illegal appropriation
of the property of an orphan — apparently by
his guardian — is specially condemned in
Sūra iv. 11 even threatened with the punishment
of death. Sūra iv. 2—7, 126 (also of the year
3—5) is particularly directed against such crimes;
hence we have the fullest reference to orphans:
2. And give to orphans their proper property; substitute
not worthless things in place of their valuable
ones, and devour not their property after adding
them to your own; for this is a great crime. 3. And
if ye are apprehensive that ye shall not deal
fairly with orphans, then, of women who seem
good in your eyes, marry by two, or three, or
four; and if ye still fear that ye shall not act
equitably, then one only; or the slaves whom ye
have acquired: this will make justice on your
part easier... 5. And make trial of orphans until
they reach the age of marriage; and if ye perceive
in them a sound judgment, then hand over their
substance to them; but consume ye it not waste-
fully, or in order to anticipate them before they
grow up. And let the rich guardian not even
touch it; and let him who is poor eat of it with
discretion. 7. And when ye make over their
substance to them, then take witnesses in their
presence; Allāh also maketh a sufficient account”.
Verse 126 apparently refers to verse 3: “Moreover,
they will consult thee in regard to women; say:
Allah shall instruct you about them; and His will is rehearsed to you in the Book, concerning female orphans to whom ye give not their legal due, and whom ye refuse to marry; also with regard to weak children; and that ye deal with fairness towards orphans. Whatever ye do of good, verily God knoweth it. It is probable from this that verse 3 also deals with orphan girls, where marriage with their guardian is in prospect; the exact interpretation is uncertain. The two verses are interpreted in this sense in a tradition ascribed to 'Ali, but the details are not reliable. Another tradition not dependent in wording on the Qur'an (in Ahmad b. Hanbal) forbids the guardian to force an orphan girl who is his ward to marry him. Other traditions simply repeat the substance of the Qur'anic prescriptions, for example paradise is promised as a reward for conscientious performance of one's duties as a guardian, or dishonest administration of the property of an orphan is numbered among the "grave sins".

The idea of protecting the orphan is also at the basis of a hadith, which makes the Prophet dissuade 'Abd Dhu'ran as the type of the pious and experienced man from undertaking a guardianship. In two points the tradition shows a development of the doctrine. In the first place the question is raised when the position of being an orphan may be considered to end (it is out of this that the conception of attaining years of discretion developed; cf. al-Bukhari); various answers, some emphasizing age, others discretion, are put in the mouth of Ibn 'Abbas and 'Ali; of the later law schools the Malikis and Shafis make the power of disposing of his own affairs in one who has attained his majority dependent on his wish, while the Hanafis drop this condition after his 25th year. There were also differences of opinion as to whether the money of orphans (and especially of minors) was liable to sadaq or not; the latter view is still held by the Hanafis and the former by the other schools; it is justified not only by the direct statement that 'Ali in such a case paid sadaq but also by the demand attributed to the Prophet or to 'Omar that the guardian should trade with his ward's money so that the sadaq should not gradually consume it. On the doctrines of the fikhi on orphans cf. the article Wali. It is worth noting that the right of the poor guardian to use the orphan's estate is limited to receiving compensation for his trouble. The Qu'anic command to produce witnesses of character has lost its raison d'être through the fact that the guardian must be a trustworthy person (amun).


YAZD, a town in Persia, in the province of 'Irak, formerly called Katha. It has the name of the area of which it was the capital. This area was formerly in the district of Istakhr in the province of Fars (Ibn Hawqal, Vakht). Katha had a citadel and a suburb on the edge of the desert. It had two iron gates, the Gate of Isid (Izad) and the "gate of the mosque", so-called because it was near the cathedral mosque which was in the suburb. It is surrounded by subterranean channels bringing water into cisterns and reservoirs of remarkable workmanship. It has a temperate climate; the town is very clean, because the refuse is removed daily and taken to the fields as manure. The inhabitants, formerly Shafis, were almost all weavers. Cotton garments used to be exported. At the present day it still produces highly esteemed brocades (Pulak, Persien, l. 105).

Saiyid Ghiyath al-Din 'Ali, minister of Shah Abü Ishâk Indir (d. in 752 = 1351), and Sharaf al-Din 'Ali, author of the Za'far-nâme, were natives of Yazd.
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YAZDÂN (v.), God. This word comes from the sphere of Zoroastrian ideas (cf. Avestan yazata, Sanskrit yastya = "worthy of reverence", a Vedic epithet of gods, e.g. Agni, Indra, Savitar, and also of objects). Old Persian used for "god" the word bâgha (cf. Avestan bagha, Sanskrit bhaga, Pahlavi bagh). The Avestan yazata as an adjective means "worthy of reverence" and as a substantive "god"; it is used of Ahuramazda himself (he is called the "Greatest of the yazatas") as well as of the divine beings subordinate to him, like Mithra, Sraosha etc. (cf. Bartholomae, Ahuramazda, Worterbuch, col. 1279 sq.). In Pahlavi Yazdûn (the plural; this form corresponding to the later Sasanian period) means: "the gods, the good powers, who are under Ohrmazd"; i.e. the same significance as in Avestan. Cf., e.g., from the beginning of the Pandanamak-Zarvûst the sentences: Ohrmazd khvârî hom ayat-î Ahramanâ? Yazdûn khvârî hom ayat-î dhvâna = "Am I Ohrmazd's or Ahraman's? Am I the gods 'or the demons'?" The singular of the word also is found in Pahlavi and survives in the modern Persian zad and in proper names like Yazdîfird. The Pahlavi pronunciation of this singular form at the end of the Sasanian period was probably also zad; the yaz in some proper names must represent an older form.

The meaning of yazdân, in the modern Persian literary language, "God" is the sense of the one God, must have developed already in Pahlavi. The transition in meaning probably took place through the aspects of the powers of the divine beings becoming comprised under yazdân; at least it is very improbable that in the final syllable of the modern Persian word we have a suffix other than the usual Pahlavi and modern Persian plural. The word yazdân in the meaning "God" is already connected with the Madjûs [q. v.] of the middle ages in Shahrastânî (Khihit al-Milal, ed. Cureton, p. 181 sq.); according to this author, Yazdan is the name of the principle of light in contrast to that of darkness, the Ahramanic. The term is therefore synonymous with Ohrmazd. The Kayumariyas sect of the Magians assumed that the principle of good, Yazdan, was uncreated (ibid., p. 182) while the Zoroastrian sect taught that both Yazdan (= Ohrmazd) and Ahraman were created, so that darkness (Ahramân) had to be understood not as a principle but as a necessary consequence of the existence of light (ibid., p. 186).

In the Lexicon Shâhnamânimnûm of 'Abd al-Kâdir al-Baghildî (ed. Salemann, p. 244 sq.) the opposites Yazdân and Ahraman are also attributed to the Manichaean system. The passage from a lexicographer in Vollers, Lexicon, ii. 1515 sq., perhaps
YAZDAN — YAZID b. MU’AWIYA

... goes back to the same source. The Iranian Manichaean actually used the word yazid, plural yazidin, for the "gods" of their system. We also find bag, plural bagdan. In proper names borne by Manichaeans we find the singular yazid (e.g. in Yazidmaz, name of a Manichean priest; cf. W. K. Müller, Ein Doppelblatt aus einem manichäischen Hymnenbuch, p. 16 and 17) as well as the plural (e.g. Yazidanbagh, the name of a Manichean teacher; cf. Fikrit, ed. Flügel, I. 334, 337, 338).

In the modern Persian literary language, yazidi means, as already mentioned, God and is synonymous with šaḏdā. "Abd al-Kādir (cf. zia) glosses the word šaḏdā we-yaṣurāḥu and yazidāb- yaṭarīfī and Allah in the language of the epic (Firdawsi and his imitators), yazidi is the most usual term for God, often with the epithet ẓāhe. In poetry other than epic the word is used along with other names signifying the deity.

Bibliography: References in the article.

(V. F. BUCHNER)

YAZID b. 'ABD AL-MALIK, Omaiyad Caliph, who came to the throne in Feb. 720. The reign of this prince so devoid of energy is a striking contrast to that of his immediate predecessor, the conscientious 'Omar b. 'Abd al-Asir (q.v.). Son of 'Abd al-Malik, grandson of Yazid I through his mother 'Atika, he had inherited none of the qualities of his Saffānī ancestors which had made them popular in Syria. His brother, the caliph Sulaimān, had favoured the Yamaniyya. Yazid was imprudent enough to declare for the Kaisīs and by this tactless step attracted the hostility of the Yamaniyya, i.e., the great majority of the Syrians. The relations of Yazid b. al-Omānibah (q.v.) embraced Maslama, brother of the caliph, and the Syrian troops to leave for the 'Irāq. While they were putting down the rebellion, the impressionable caliph fell under the influence of two women musicians of Medina, Sallāma and Ḥabāla. To escape remonstrances, Yazid withdrew to the district of Balkā' east of Jordan. The death of his favourite Habāba broke his heart. Yazid followed her to the grave a week later, at Bait Rūs (q.v.) after a reign of four years. He died on Jan. 26, 724 and was still under 40.


YAZID b. MU'AWIYA, second Omayyad Caliph and successor of Mu'awiya, born about 642. As a prince he had commanded the Arab army at the siege of Constantinople. Immediately after his accession (April 680) there broke out in the Hindēs the rising which the genius of Mu'awiya had so long prevented. At Medina, 'Abd al-Allāh b. 'Ali and 'Abd al-Allāh b. al-Zubair refused to recognise the new caliph and took refuge in the inviolable territory of Mecca. Very soon letters from old partisans of 'Ali and from the chieftains of the 'Irāq, jealous of the hegemony of Syria, decided his supporters to leave his asylum in Mecca and set out for Kufa with about a hundred relatives and friends. Yazid had ordered the governor of this town, 'Ubayd Allāh b. Ziyād, to take steps to disarm them and prevent them entering the 'Irāq and stirring up trouble there. No one stirred

among the 'Allid partisans in Kufa. Ḥusain and his handful of devoted followers foolishly attacked the very superior forces sent to disarm them; the latter then manoeuvred to surround them and force them to lay down their arms. The son of 'Ali and the more stubborn of his companions only succeeded in meeting their deaths (Oct. 10, 680). This is the tragedy of Karbala' (q.v.) annually commemorated by the Shi'is.

Medina, no less than Kufa disliked Syria; it accused the latter of depriving her of her title as capital. In a great assembly in the chief mosque the Meccan proclaimed Yazid deposed. After having vainly tried negotiations, the caliph had to have recourse to arms. The command of the expedition was entrusted to Muslim b. 'Ukhī (q.v.). This general encamped before Medina, in the Harrā, a plain covered with volcanic debris; hence the battle was known as that of al-Harrā (q.v.). The Meccan were having the best of it at first when a detachment of Syrian cavalry going round the town attacked them in the rear. This was the signal for the collapse of the defence (Aug. 26, 683). The Syrians entered Medina. The three days of loot promised by Yazid and the horrible scenes invented by hostile tradition belong to the domain of legend. Next day, Muslim assembled the citizens to make them renew the oath of loyalty. He then went on to Mecca to suppress Ibn al-Zubair. On the way the illness which had been troubling him since he left Syria took a turn for the worse and he died at Mecca, where his tomb long continued to be stoned. His successor, Muslim b. al-Numair, led the army against Mecca and began the attack on it.

The inhabitants soon found themselves shut up in the town. Siege-artillery was placed on the surrounding hills and hurled a continuous shower of stones on the town. Ibn al-Zubair had made his headquarters in the courtyard of the great mosque. A wooden structure covered with mattresses protected the Ka'ba. The carelessness of a Meccan soldier set this on fire. The burning of the Ka'ba did not interrupt the siege. It had lasted for two months when Yazid died at Huwārah, in Nov. 11, 683. Ibn al-Numair led his men back to Syria.

Yazid was not the frivolous prince, the thoughtless ruler depicted by the historians who are inspired with the rancour of the Shi'is, or the political feuds of the 'Irāq and the Hindēs, or who are too much impressed by the catastrophes of his very short reign. He tried to continue the policy of Mu'awiya and retained his surviving collaborators. A poet himself, and fond of music, he was a Maecenas of poets and artists. He completed the administrative organisation and the military defences of Syria by creating the jund of Kinnasir (q.v.) in the north of the country. He reorganised the finances, lightened the taxation on the Christians of Nadjarin (q.v.) who had been arbitrarily expelled from Arabia by the caliph 'Omar. On the other hand, he abolished the exemption from taxes granted to the Samaritans as a reward for the services they had rendered at the time of the Arab conquest. He was interested in agriculture and completed the system of irrigation of the Ghīyūt (q.v.), the oasis of Damascus, where he dug the upper canal which waters the suburb of Šalihiyya, and is called Nahr Yazid after him. Alone among the caliphs he earned the title of muqaddim, "water-engineer". The author of the Continuatio s. n.
gives a far from commonplace picture of him: 

Vazidi, jucundissimos et cumtur nationalibus regni ejus 

subditis ejus gravissimo habuit, qui nullam uquam 

alius regalis fasculi causa gloriam apud ipsos 

communis ut omnibus civilibus vis. 

Extremem ille uia 

affable, quite devoid of conceit, lowly, and all 

those under his authority, hating the pomp of royalty, 

living among the people, no "citizen... *No 

called*", says Wellhausen, "received such a panec 

fing; it comes from the heart". 

**Bibliography:** Tabari, ed. de Goeje, ii. 

196—247; Mas'udi (Paris), v. 126—165; Kitiš 

al-Aghānī, xvi., 122; xvi. 70; Wellhausen, Das 

arabisch Reich und sein Sturz, p. 88—105; 

Lammens, Le chant des Omeyyades, notes biograp 

hiques et littératures sur le petit arabe chretien 


The remainder of the bibliographical material is 

detailed and utilised in Lammens, Etudes sur 

le rôle du calife omeyyade Mārid al-

ṣāba (dealing with the youth of Vazidi), p. 266—248 (extract 

from M. F. O. R., i. — iii.); do., Le califat du 

Vazidi IV, p. 1—528 (extract from M. F. O. R., v. — vii.). 

(H. Lammens) 

**YAZID B. AL-MUḤALLAB b. AḥD ṢIFRA AL-AZXI, 

GOVERNOR OF KHRURSAH.** Vazidi was born in 

53 (672—673) and after the death of his father al-

ṣūf al-Muḥallab [q. v.] at the end of 52 (702) was 

appointed governor of Khorrasan. With his brother-in-law, the powerful al-Ḥadidjāb b. ʿĀṣuf [q. v.], his relations were strained and in 55 (706) the caliph ʿAbd al-Malik, after some hesitation, was 

persuaded by the latter to remove Vazidi from his office which was given first to his brother al-

ṣūf al-Muḥallab and a few months later to the able Kūtaiba b. Mūslim [q. v.]. In the following year the caliph died and was succeeded by his son al-Walid. In the same year al-Ḥadidjāb had Vazidi thrown into prison where he was exposed to all kinds of humiliation and when his sister Ḥind, wife of al-Ḥadidjāb, showed sympathy for him she was divorced by her husband. It was not 

until 90 (768—769) that Vazidi succeeded in escaping and went to al-Ramlah where Salāmah, the caliph's brother, lived. The latter afforded him protection and interceded for him with al-Walid so that al-

Ḥadidjāb had to leave him in peace. After the 

accession of Salāmah in 96 (715) Vazidi was 

appointed governor of the Ṣafār and settled in 

Waiṣ. The supporters of Ḥadidjāb, who had died in 

the meantime, had now to pay for the decision 

with which he had treated Vazidi. But when Vazidi asked the caliph to relieve him of the administration of the taxation, Salāmah placed an official of the chancellery named ʿṢūd b. ʿAbd al-Ḥakām at the head of the finance department and the latter refused to satisfy Vazidi's extravagant demands on the treasury, so that Vazidi began to turn his eyes towards the adjoining province of Khorrasan. 

He succeeded in being appointed governor of 

Khorrasan while retaining the supreme command in the Ṣafār (97 = 715—716). Shortly after his 

arrival in this province, he permitted all kinds 

of cruelty to be practised on the relations of Kūtaiba and the officials appointed by him. In the following year he undertook a campaign against Dūrūn and Ṣafārūn; the people of Dūrūn escaped on paying a sum of money. But when Vazidi later suffered heavy losses, they rebelled and fell upon the Muslim garrisons which he had left. He had as a result to conclude peace with the lord of 

Ṭabaristan and turning against Dūrūn wreaked a 

bloody vengeance on its people. He made himself 

generally hated by his exertions in his province and Salāmah is said, just before he died, to have been 

thinking of sending some one to Khorrasan 

to have a reckoning with him. After ʿOmar b. 

Abd al-ʿAzīz ascended the throne in 99 (Sept. — Oct. 717) he had Vazidi arrested because 

the latter could not produce the fifth of the booty 

from Ṣafārūn and Ṣafārūn the amount of which he had much exaggerated out of vanity; shortly 

before or after the death of the caliph, he escaped 

from prison and went with a small body of followers 

to al-Bayrā. When the negotiations which he began 

with the governor ʿAṭī b. ʿArjān at first came to 

nothing, the decision had to be left to force of 

arms. In the first encounter ʿAṭī fled and took 

refuge in the citadel. This was stormed and ʿAṭī 

taken prisoner (Rudjaḏan 101 = March—April 720). 

Vazidi then began to preach open war on the 

Omayyads; the rebellion spread and in a short 

time Vazidi seized Waiṣ but was defeated on 

14th (or 12th) 102 (Aug. 24 or 22, 720) at 

al-ʿAṣr near Waiṣ by al-ʿAzīz b. al-Ḥakīm, who 

had come with a large army from Syria. Vazidi 

himself fell and wherever he was everywhere 

outstripped by the greatest vigour. 

**Bibliography:** Ibn Khallīlūn (ed. Wüstenfel 

feld), N° 826 (transl. de Slane, iv. 164); 

Tabari (ed. de Goeje), ii., see Index. Ibn al-

ʿArīf (ed. Tornberg), iv., v., v., v., av., al-ʾAlkābī 

(ed. Houtsma), iii., 339, 341, 344 sqq., 553—555, 

363, 370, 372; al-Masʿūdi, Murūdī al-Dhakhâr 

(ed. Paris), iv., 411, 453 sqq., 506; al-Balādhurī, 

(ed. de Goeje), p. 168, 231, 335—338, 365—67, 

369, 417, 475 sqq., Kitiš al-Aghānī, see 

Guldim, Tablās al-ʾAlkābī, Weil, Geschichte der Cha 

fifen, i., see Index; Mürz, Die Kalifate, ist 

Kisr, Decline, and Fall, p. 338, 343, 374 sqq. 

393, 394, 397, 374 sqq., 375 sqq., 392, 419; Wellhausen, 

Das arabisch Reich, p. 150, 156, 157, 161— 

164, 168, 195—199. 

(K. V. Zettersteen) 

**YAZIDI, Yazıdı, the name of a Kurd 

tribal group and of their peculiar religion which shows 

ancient characteristics.** 

**Area of Distribution.** The Yazidis are 

found scattered over a wide area usually leading a 

settled life but also slipping into nomadic clans: 1. in the district of Ṣafārūn in the northern Ṣafārūn, in Assyrian proper, in the district of Shalik. Special 

mention may be made of: Bāʿidhī b. Bāʿidhī, Bāʿidhī about 40 miles N. of Ṣafārūn, the residence of the chief emir, their political head; three hours 

to the north at Lālles in the valley Shalik ʿAdī 

is the tomb of their chief saint Shalik ʿAdī, their 

national sanctuary and the centre of their national 

and religious life; Bahazantye, north of Alkās 

at the foot of the hill on which is the Chaldaean 

monastery of Rabbūn Hormund; and also Bāʿašīgī 

(Bāʿašīgī, Ba Ḥadīke) N. E. of Ṣafārūn, the centre 

of the tombs of the shaliks; 2. on the Ṣafārūn 

Sinīdar, 100 miles west of Ṣafārūn, a range of 

hills in the middle of the desert, which is the 

great bullwark of their efforts for freedom and 

independence; the chief Sinīdar-Shalik lives in 

the Belid Sinīdar (picture of the citadel in P. 

Schlitt, Zweisammen Nil und Kaukasus, p. 135). 

Formerly its residence was in Milik (Mišir); 3. in 

the district of Dihābaḵ, N. and N. E. of the 

Tigris; 4. in the district of Aλlepo, W. of 

the Euphrates, at Kullis and ʿAʿĩdāb; 5. in
Russian Armenians (Kars, Erivan) and in the Caucasus (at Tiflis)—There are also Yazidis in Persia.

**Numbers.** The total number can only be approximately estimated; there can hardly be more than 60,000-70,000 altogether, while only half a century ago they numbered 20,000-150,000. According to the Turkish census of 1922-1924 (apparently exclusive of Sindjar which was only joined to the *İraq* at the end of 1932) they numbered 26,657 in the *İraq*, while the Turkish census of 1923, which deliberately emphasized the Muhammedan element, only gave 18,000 Yazidis, compared with 264,000, or 450,000 Kurds, which corresponds to the English figures. In 1912 the Turkish statistics for the 6 wilayets in question gave 27,000 Yazidis. Nurī in 1905 estimated 35,000 Yazidis for Sulaimān and Sindjar (Menzel, *Op. cit.*, p. 189). According to figures which are undoubtedly exaggerated, Sindjar which is now joined to the *İraq* contains 36,000 Yazidis (O. M., xii. 502). There are only a few hundreds in Persia.

The Russian census of Dec. 17, 1926 gave for the Caucasus (Tiflis, Erivan and Kars) 14,582 Yazidis compared with 54,000 Kurds. In spite of the ascensions during the war their number has fallen compared with that of the Russian census of Feb. 9, 1897: 44,796 Yazidis and 55,175 Kurds while in 1901 in Russian territory there were 25,000 Yazidis compared with 125,000 Kurds.

As to their numbers at an earlier date, Karow in 1884 gave exact figures based on quite reliable statements of the *Janwās* (Menzel, *Op. cit.*, p. 116).

**Name.** The name Yazidi, which the Yazidis themselves feel to be modern, seems to have nothing to do with Yazid b. Muwilay or with Yazid b. Umama, with whom it is connected, and as little with the name of the Persian city of Yazd. It probably comes from the modern Persian *yazid* (angel, deity), Avestan *yazata* (being worthy of worship), Pahlavi *yazata* (sacrifice). Pahlavi *yazata* appears three times in the name of a God, *Avesta yazata* and *Pahlavi yazata*, yazana of which yazat is the natural phonetic development while yazana represents an Avestan word brought through ritual into modern Persian.

The Azidi, Iszidi or Iszi would therefore be as they themselves say "worshipers of God", an etymology known to the Yazidi, and quoted as early as Campanile, *Storia della regione del Kurdistan*, Naples 1818, p. 145, in *Saggio di yazida* (Iszid). The Yazidi popular etymology of the name from *az da* (*for dām*) baduah ("God created me") is useless, as az or da is not used in Yezidi, only *ma* ("it").

Evolved from the name Yazidi we find in legend an angel *Iszidi* and a yazidam among the ancestors of the Yazidis as well as the term yazidi for the first Yazidis.

With this we may perhaps connect Iszidi, the name of a sandjak in the form of a man made from grapes (Menzel, *Op. cit.*, p. 184).

According to Marr (Zapisiki Vost. Otd. Arch. Oktob. 22, 1999), Celebi was the former name of the Yazidis (cf. Barthold, above i., p. 833). In Neuhauher also Celebi is given as "devil".

The Yazidis call themselves *Dzin, Dzami, Dzami, Dzami*, plu. Dzaw עדין, Dzawżam, *Dzawżam*, probably from the name of an old Nastican diocese. In 1534 Salzba Sulaimān gave the Yazidi chief

Husain Beg Dazlāt, who was later executed, the sandjak of Arbūl and the wilayet of Sohrān. Among the Syrians, the Yazidis are called Dazlātī or to be confused with Dazlātīn, the followers of Bardossam of Edessa; cf. Vargent, in *F.S.O., xi.* 271, among the Armenians, Tchoudiakos and Polichasses. Before the days of Christianity they were called *judjort* (idol-worshippers) according to the *Masbah* note.

The defunct name given them quite unjustly in *judjort* or *ahed-i jorî* ("idol-worshipers") although they should rather be called "angel-worshippers", and *bragh condêv* ("light-eating"), *fêrghi* or *kouderi* ("dog-eating")

**Tribes.** Although the Yazidis hold no communion with the neighbouring tribes and in particular do not intermarry with them, they look exactly like Kurds, even those who live in Syria in the centre of an Arab-speaking area, although the two types are to be distinguished among them: one, their own traditional type, Assyrian-Semite with particularly thick hair and beard and the other more an Indo-Germanic type. In any case traces of the early inhabitants of the country still survive in them. They have some physiological similarities with the earlier Wav Armenians: an Armenian mixture is not to be denied.

Their thick hair earned them from the Turks the nickname *sandàl Ívar* ("shairy Kurds") and *cizî ïhsûf* ("rightfold bearded") because hair grows on the lips, eyes, brows, nostrils and chin.

The Yazidis are a handsome, long-haired, proud type, with the feeling of independence that is characteristic of the mountain-dweller, and usually of powerful physique. The unenvied women have remarkably regular features. The Yezidis were formerly dreaded rebels and brigands who resisted fearlessly all attacks and onslaughts by their neighbours. Their faithfulness to their word and their loyalty was recognized even by their enemies. They are industrious tillers of the soil and cattle-reapers, who are superior to their neighbours in skill and activity. Special mention may be made of the meritorious cleanliness of their persons and houses, which is in great contrast to the filth of the other Kurds.

They are organized like the Kurdish tribes, with an *emir* or chief of the tribe (leegha-n *a*) at the head. According to Karow, the tribe is divided into bodies of elders (*musj'id*). Every family or sect forms a unit by itself. On the tribal organization, the taxes and labour given to the chiefs, the law of inheritance, *prémogoture*, but restricted by the condition of worthlessness, and the patriarchal life of the tribe, settled and nomadic, see Jegensinow, *Kurdish grammatical and *kurd*, in *Zapiski*, xlii., Tiflis 1901, who gives very full data (Menzel, *Op. cit.*, p. 251); also Minorysky above s.v. *kurd*, says Joseph and Lampson.

Language. The language of the Yazidis is almost without exception Kurdish, an idiom related to Persian, with a number of dialects which are particularly closely related to Kurmandjit Kuraic. But the differences are often so great that another language has to be called in to make the parties intelligible to one another, for example Turkish in the case of Goktai Yazidis in intercourse with the Ararat and Bayazid Kurds (Wagner). In consequence of their different religion they form a people sharply distinguished from the Kurds. The Yazidis of the Sindjar also speak Arabic. The supposition that
at least a portion of the Yazidi formerly spoke Arabic and migrated from Syria and Babylonia, as tradition has it, is not to be rejected offhand.

Religion. The origin and evolution of their peculiar synthetic religion have not yet been fully explained but it seems to include old pagan elements (but no worship of the sun and moon), Iranian-Zoroastrian elements (echoes of Persian dualism), Manichaean and Persian gnostic elements (prohibition of certain foods), features from Christian sects, especially the Nestorians (baptism, a kind of euthanizer, breaking of bread, visiting of Christian churches at weddings, permission to drink wine), also Muslim elements (circumcision, fasting, sacrifice, pilgrimage, Muslim inscriptions on tombs), Sufi-Neilotic features (secrecy of doctrine, ecstasy, reverence for a large number of Sufi-Shahiffs), Serai (transmigration of souls) and Shamanistic features (burial, interpretation of dreams, dances).

Sacred Books. The spoken language is used throughout in worship. It is therefore all the more remarkable that the text of the two sacred books, said to have been in existence before the Creation and to have been learned from the original copies, was in Arabic, although only the priests and the šahwis learned some Arabic. These are the Kitab al-Diliwa [q. v.] (Kitab-i Diliwa) "the Book of Revelation" and the Maqaf ʾayat [q. v.] "the Black Book". "Black" seems to imply worthiness of veneration.

One cannot conceal a certain disappointment in becoming acquainted with the sacred books. A hymn in praise of Shaikh Âdi [see šadi] in 80 verses of considerable theological merit, written in Arabic, is also regarded as a kind of sacred book.

Religion. Whether, though it is very improbable, there has survived to the present day in Yazidism a remnant of the old Iranian Zoroastrianism whose views have been in course of time fundamentally altered by the adoption of foreign elements, or whether the Yazidis are former Manichaees or Nestorians and Jacobites or survivors of the old Syriac community, which settled on the Sinjar and in their isolation became contaminated by Muslim and other ideas, is uncertain.

According to Speiro, Yazidism is descended from Manichaees, which has been affected by Assyrian, Persia, Christian and Muslim elements. In any case, the Iranian element plays a considerable part for it appears to be the main basis for the development of Yazidi doctrine, in which many points approximate to Christianity and still more to Islam.

In the actual doctrinal system, the six minor deities seem to disappear completely and to be replaced by the daelims between God and Malak Tânis, the peacocks (angels). God is only the Creator, not the preserver of the world. He is passive and does not trouble about the world. The active, executive organ of the divine will is Malak Tânis, with whom Shaikh Âdi who has risen to divinity through transmigration, seems to form one. Malak Tânis is God's alter ego and is the active aspect of God's being. He is one with God and inseparably bound up with Him. To this extent Yazidism is monotheistic but there are also semi-divine and divine beings, intermediate between God and man.

According to Horton, the religion of the Yazidis is a pure worship of light and represents a victory over the old Persian dualism. Malak Tânis is not the principle of evil but on the contrary the denial of evil at all, which forms an indis-
is cut into the wall at the entrance door of the sanctuary. On the same wall are carved a number of peculiar figures: rings, daggers, a peculiar kind of cross, or a seven-armed sceptre, hands, spoons, crozier, combs. They are probably family or tribal marks, as the little houses for pilgrims scattered all over the valley bear the same marks on the walls.

It is significant that at the present day in Sinjär the quarrels of the emirs for power seem to concentrate around the possession of a sandal, guaranteeing a regular income.

Exclusiveness. The idea of their complete separation from the rest of mankind held by the Yazidis is remarkable. They are convinced that they are descended from a child (Shahid u. Dâyêr) or twins, developed from the seed of Adam only in a jar which was kept closed for nine months, while the jar with the seed of Eve who was disputing for priority produced only vermin. On this is based the belief of the Yazidis in their unique position which does not allow them to mix with the rest of mankind who are descended from Adam of Eve. One cannot become a Yazidi, one must be born one. This strict isolation is intensified by a rigid caste system within the Yazidis.

The most dreadful punishment for a Yazidi, which can only be completely realised when we remember this fact, is excommunication, expulsion from his people, because this also settles the fate of his soul.

Moral, religious usages. In spite of all the slanders of their neighbours, the Yazidis are really on a much higher level of morality than their Christian and Muslim neighbours. The superstitious anxiety of the Yazidis to have a circle described around them by which one can put them on oath seems to be a fact (cf. Goldscheider, Zeitschrift f. Völkerkunde, in the Kuhn-Festschrift and Z. O. M. G., xxx. [1915]).

The prayers consist of a Kurdisti main prayer and a morning prayer at sunrise, which has to be said at a distance from members of other creeds, and turned towards the sun (Creed, art. 3). They ought at the same time to walk round a stone put up for the purpose. The principal prayer is addressed to Malak Tâ'ûs and shows that the latter is regarded as identical with the Christian and Muslim God. The seven divine angels are addressed. The erroneous view that the sun and moon are worshipped arose from the fact that the supreme deity (Malak Tâ'ûs) is called "Lord of the moon and of the darkness" and "Lord of the Sun and Light".

A three days' fast (j, 2, 3) is observed in December, the fast being broken by drinking wine with the proper shaykh or pir. The performance of prayer, however, is—apparently under Sufi influence—not regarded as a strict duty.

According to the Yazidi catechism, Saturday is the day of rest and Wednesday the holy day. Once to three times yearly the Yazidi villages are visited by the sandal amidst great celebrations.

The annual pilgrimage to the tomb of Shait 'Adi on Sept. 15—20 of the Greek-Julian calendar is a strict religious duty. This pilgrimage to the national sanctuary is the principal expression of the national and religious isolation of the Yazidis. The feast of the pilgrimage is celebrated with ritual ablutions: by bathing in the river, by washing or dipping the sandal, with processions, music (haut, drum and tambourine), hymns, ecstatic songs and dances by the priests, which recall the Shaiti jâher and Shamanistic rites, the lighting of hundreds of sesame oil-lamps at all the saints' graves, by offerings and special foods (karis, kawaf), the cooking of a sacrificed ox (kudslaj). The blessing of Shait 'Adi is important for the rites, i.e. little balls of earth or clay from the tomb of the saint, and consecrated water from the water in which the sandal has been dipped for the living and the dead.

The little balls of earth are used as talismans and as a medicine, and as extreme atonement for the dying. All eyewitnesses agree as to the devoutness and dignity of all these ceremonies in the outer court of the sanctuary. The ceremonies within the sanctuary, which seem to include the reading of sacred books, have never been witnessed by an outsider.

Trees, at the sanctuary mulberry trees, are also honoured, surrounded with walls and visited by the sick. These trees have their own personal names.

Non-obligatory pilgrimages are made to the tombs of several other saints, mostly Shait shahids.

The most important festival of the year, the feast of the New Year: sar-i adel, sarâli, sarâliye, on the first Wednesday in April, is celebrated with great solemnity, as among the Harmanis, at the tomb of Shait 'Adi but without music. An attempt has been made to trace this to the Assyrian festival of wagwa. Red flowers over the doors play a great part in it.

The obligatory institution of the brotherhood of the next world, which corresponds to our system of godfathers (each Yazidi must have a brother and sister of the next world), binds one to a daily kiss of the hand and presence in the dying hour. The collar of the new shirt, which unlike other eastern shirts is always buttoned behind, must in any case be opened by a sister of the next world.

In marriage, endogamy is strictly observed and the limitations imposed by the caste system are very marked. Marriage is as a rule monogamous, except in the case of the emir, who is allowed several wives. It is marriage by purchase with simple ceremonies performed by the local shahid or pir, who breaks a loaf in two and gives it to the two parties. The bridegroom on her entering the house gives her a blow with a stone as a sign of her subjection. Drums and files are necessary. Here and there the old system of marriage by capture survives, but it is now forbidden.

The punishment for adultery used to be death. Divorce is rendered difficult through the necessity of having three witnesses. The widow may be remarried six times. If a Yazidi remains more than a year abroad, he cannot live with his wife again nor can he receive another Yazidi woman to wife.

Baptism is a characteristic ceremony: it is performed by a shahid or pir plunging the child three times into the azam-ezam in a dark vault of the sanctuary in the first week after birth. In the case of Yazidis living at some distance away, consecrated water brought by the kawalls is used.

Circumcision, which takes place soon after baptism, seems to be more a matter of choice—"in
some Yazidi tribes it is said to have fallen into disuse some time ago, probably to escape military service.

The burial ceremonies are peculiar. The corpse is buried immediately after death with arms crossed and pointing to the east. In the case of persons of rank, a rough wooden figure is hung with the deceased’s clothes and carried for three days in procession with music. The tomb is repeatedly visited by the mourners. On the 3rd, 7th and 40th day and the anniversary memorial services are held.

After death, an answer to the question of the rebirth of the soul of the deceased is sought from the interpretation of a dream of a priest or köçek. The Kurdish system of blood vengeance exists to the present day in a somewhat milder form among the Yazidis.

Theocratic structure of society: The whole structure of this people, small and scattered but extremely well organised, is theocratic. The Yazidis fall into two very distinct classes:

1. The laity (mardis) who form one great caste whatever be their wealth and among whose members there is no distinction in principles. In spite of the division into common Yazidi notables (emirs), so that marriage between them is possible and frequent. Every Yazidi is the novice or disciple of a definite shaikh or pir, whose hand he must kiss every day, with whom he must break his fast by drinking wine and who has to perform the various rites of worship for him. On the institution of brotherhood of the next world, see above.

II. The clergy, priests, rügan, bahanu, who enjoy extraordinary respect and reverence. The cleric must not cut his beard nor crop his hair. As regards duties the clergy are divided into six classes and as regards exclusiveness into three rigidly marked classes. It is impossible to move from one caste to another and marriages between the different castes are forbidden. Still more unimaginable is it for a layman to enter the clerical class and vice versa. This rigidity is a dogma of belief as the Yazidis rely upon it for the purity of their sects. Every one must live and die in the caste in which he is born. In certain cases the priesthood may pass by inheritance to women.

The rügan are divided into the following classes:

1. The shaikhs who are descended from only five families in all are believed to be descended from pupils or brothers of Shaikh ‘Adi. Their dress is white with a black wound turban; a red and yellow or orange cloth is flung round the body. The houses of the shaikhs serve as the places of worship of their charges.

2. The pirs, priests of less exalted descent. Their dress is black, the turban white with black feather or wound round with red.

The shaikhs and pirs are the regular clergy and pastors, they enjoy immunity of person and various privileges. It is their duty to teach their charges good and restrain them from evil. They have to perform religious duties on festival days, at feasts, at marriages, births, circumcisions, in illness (treatment with sacred earth), at death and in anguries, for which regular fees (syrkat) are due to them.

The so-called motiv or imam, who claims descent from Hassan al-Hasiri, is said alone to have the right to read and write. At one time he had charge of the sacred books but they are now kept for safety in Sindjar.

Writing is strictly forbidden to the common Yazidis by custom, probably in order not to profane it, since according to the Marash, xxxi, God himself puts creation on record.

3. The fahır or harabah ("Blackheads", on account of their black headgear), a kind of order, a voluntary brotherhood, recruited from the shaikhs and pirs and under a head called šâk, "master", who lives in Aleppo and receives the income of the šâkjiš Yazi. They wear a black garment of hair and a turban with red band. They live on alms and play a part as negociators and peace-makers. A fahır is said to act as deputy of the chief emir. There is also said to be a sisterhood called febray, the head of which is called hânà.

4. The hawwals: singers, clergy of minor rank. There is a guild of musicians said to number 50 men, which has to take part in all religious festivals by singing hymns (we have two of these with the music), playing the flute, tambourine or drum. They also act as misrari dominici of the chief shaikh and chief emir. They are farmers of the sacred images, the sanduk, for which they had to pay an annual rent (before the war about £T 6,000) and with which they went regular definite circuits through the different Yazidi districts in order to strengthen the faith of the Yazidis and keep them together and to collect offerings. An undeniable similarity to the ponders is found in the trade which they carry on in balls of earth from the tomb of Shaikh ‘Adi and in holy water. Of the contributions levied on behalf of the emir half goes to the tomb of ‘Adi, a quarter to the emir and a quarter to the hawwals.

They wear white, rarely coloured, dress and black turbans. Many Yazidis consider it meritorious to sanctify their new clothes by giving them to the hawwals for a time.

5. The šâk, dancers, who serve in considerable numbers at the tombs of Shaikh ‘Adi (the estimates vary between 30 and 300) and as ministers of the hawwals carry the sanduk to the villages on their circuits and dance at festivals in frenzied ecstasy with their long hair unbound.

Not to be confused with them are the šokh, who have the same name and crop up occasionally; they were a kind of Mahdi, usually religious fanatics of the nomadic Yazidi tribes, who endeavoured to influence and impress those around them by interpreting dreams, falling into trances and seeing visions and believed they were called upon to play the part of religious leaders. In drought and famine they acted as rain-makers, in rebellions and military enterprises they sought like the old prophets to inflame their people and assume the leadership. At the same time they used to their own advantage the belief that Shaikh ‘Adi will appear once again in a rebirth. For this reason therefore they were hated not only by the Turkish Government but also by the real chiefs themselves and not infrequently betrayed to the Turks, who disposed of them without mercy.

6. The lowest class of clergy: the awbâns or awán (deacons) and abfatân-e oïbek of Shaikh ‘Adi, the servants at the tomb of Shaikh ‘Adi, together with a farrâj (sacristan to look after the oil-lamps) and 4 or 5 hânowtâf (hawwals): doorkeepers who serve in the sanctuary. Each Yazidi village
also has a dâr al-mašrûl to maintain order. The head of the servants at the tomb is the dâr-ül-mesleki of Merke (Menzel, op. cit., p. 147, note 1).

At the top of this theocratic organisation there are a religious and a secular head:

1. The chief Şâli: mîr-i şâlihân, known as Şâlih Nâşir, who is said to be descended from the family of Hasan al-Râki or from a brother of Şâlih 'Adî and lives in Lâlîsh. He takes precedence of every one and the supreme spiritual influence is in him. He is infallible on questions of belief. He is the chief authority on and expositor of the holy scriptures; he alone gives legal decisions, and — with the approval of the chief of the tribe — sentences to the severest punishment, excommunication. He can summon to the holy war — this recalls the gâhidh — but the leadership devolves on the chief emir. The Mîr-i Şâlihân has a claim to thrones but their place is taken by voluntary offerings. He wears white and a black turban. Only the daughters of a family descended from 'Abd al-Kâdir Gilînî are considered equals in rank. His house is the most venerated gârah of the Yazidis next to the tomb of Şâlih 'Adî.

2. The Mirzâ Beg or emîr-i amârâh, the prince of the Yazidis, who according to the Muğhâf is regarded as a descendant of Shapur but is usually called a descendant of Yazid and exercises the highest political and secular power. He lives in Erbil. His person enjoys immunity and he receives voluntary offerings (according to Hroeski ET 8,000 a year). His word is final on all secular matters. He alone represents the Yazidis to the outer world. He occupies the same position with respect to all Yazid tribes that the tribal chief has to the individual Yazidi.

Since the loss of independence in 1352 the emîr has to obtain recognition from the Turkish Government. The present emîr of the Yazidis is Sa’d Beg, son of 'Ali Beg, murdered in 1913, who was the son of Husain Beg (d. 1878), son of 'Ali Beg murdered in 1832.

History. We are quite in the dark regarding the first appearance and early history of this people who reveal so many diverse elements. According to the chief shâlih, the Yazidis, Layard tells us, have a chronology of their own, an era beginning in 292 A.D. which could without difficulty be connected with the year of Manî’s death (276). But as we have no further confirmation and no historical records or annals of the Yazidis are known which might throw some light on the point, the correctness of the statement may legitimately be doubted.

It is not clear what part the caliph Yazid b. Mu‘awiya (60-66 = 680-683) really plays in Yazidiism; according to the origin of the name already given, he can have had nothing to do directly with their foundation. Gudzi howel holds — in contrast to the views hitherto held by European scholars — that the connection of Yazidism with Yazid can no longer be doubted, and regards the Yazidis as having at one time been Muslims, a view which has always been held by Muhammadan theologians.

According to the Yazidi view, Yazid was not the real founder of the Yazidiya, but only the restorer of the original sect, founded by Shâhid b. Djarâkh, the only son of Adam. According to the legend, Yazid abandoned Islam to devote himself exclusively to Syria to the sect named after him. It cannot be denied that there are historical relations in this connection between Syria and the 'Irâq and the Kurdish movement. There are still villages of Yazidis who speak Kurdish near Aleppo. By transmigration Yazid became 'Adî, who will come to earth again. In 1917, when Djarâkh is mentioned, whom God sends from Syria to Lalish, but not Yazid. An attempt has been made to dispose of the difficulties which arise out of the caliph Yazid by making the Yazidi disciples of Yazid b. Umâra, on the authority of a statement in Shahrestâni’s (490–548 = 1091–1153) Kiltî al-Milâz wa-l-Nishâ, mainly because a prophet from Persia was expected by the ’Ashafî sect of the Yazidiya founded by Yazid b. Umâra. But even this does not remove the difficulty.

It seems no less peculiar that the Yazidis should have chosen as a national saint a Shîfi Shâlih like 'Adî b. Musâfir [q. v.] recognised without qualification throughout the whole Muhammadan world, whose orthodoxy, as we find it in his works, could hardly have led to the foundation of a sect so heterodox and foreign to the nature of Islam as Yazidism actually is. It appears impossible that a Muslim Shîfi order could degenerate into a religion so different from Islam as Yazidism is.

In any case, the Yazidi movement seems to have begun in the time of the Umayyads in Syria. According to the tradition still alive among them, they came from Bâara and the lower Euphrates in the time of Timîr at the end of the xivth century and gradually advanced into the Sindjar which they did not inhabit before the xvth century, and into Kurdistan and there became kurdisised.

As, strange to say, unlike Muslims, the Yazidis never laid stress on their possession of sacred books, they were not regarded as privileged Aib al-Kiltî. Down to recent times, they were connected from their name with the hated caliph Yazid and branded as Muslim heretics.

It was from this point of view that the various authoritative fawâis were issued which unanimously declared the land of the Yazidis dâr al-karb and proclaimed the destruction of the Yazidis and the confiscation of all their property permitted and meritorious from the religious point of view. These served as justification for the numerous attempts at conversion and extermination by the Turkish pâshas and the Kurdish tribes. I may mention the fawâis, published by Sha‘râf al-Dîn, of Musulmân Şâlih for Shâlih ‘Abd Allah al-Rubâkî (1) of the year 1159 (1746) and the fawâis of ‘Abd al-Salâm and that of Muhammâd al-Darâkî al-Kurdi.

The memory of these atrocities, which are unparalleled even in the blood-stained history of Kurdistan, may have played a part in the final separation of the Mûsul territory from Turkey. For the Yazidis were as determined as the eastern Christians to migrate if the disputed area became Turkish again. The union with the ‘Irâk was therefore hailed with all the more enthusiasm.

The resolution and strength of character of the Yazidis is remarkable; in spite of centuries of persecution they have never abandoned their identity nor their faith.

Bibliography: I refer the reader to my Yazidi-Bibliography, published in my work Ein Beitrâg zur Kenntnis der Yaziden, in H. Grothe's
As a poet al-Yazidi followed exclusively the classical tradition, especially under the influence of al-Mutanabbi (q.v.), in whose popularity in Syria he was a leader in the ninth century. He has selected material for a commentary on al-Mutanabbi, which was edited after his death by his son Ishāh (al-Aṣyf, al-Bayyad fī Dīwān aḥādīth al-Ṭayyibāt, Bābiṭ 1882). Al-Yazidi's odes are in form and matter modelled exactly on well-known classical metres; even the šāmishkēh type was foreign to him. The elegies are full of stock sentiments. He was particularly fond of chronograms and plays on words in which he could display his extraordinary command of language and form. His poems were collected in three volumes (on the first see Fleischer, in Z.D.M.G., viii., 1893, p. 279); the best edition is that by his son Ishāh (al-Nuḥbāt fī al-Aṣf, Bābiṭ 1904, with the biography written by his grandson Amin al-Haddād; 2. Nuḥbāt al-Kāshānī, Bābiṭ 1898; 3. Ţālīfāt al-Kamārān, Bābiṭ 1903, not mentioned in F. al-Bustānī, cf. cit., p. 452).

Al-Yazidi acquired particular fame in the east and in Europe as the last great representative of the writers of maṯāmah (q.v.). His collection of 60 maṯāmah, Maŷma bi-Ṭabārān, still enjoys great popularity in Syria (first edition, Bārīṭ 1859, the best that by his son Ishāh of 1873 and often reprinted). It arose gradually. Following a question in the Fārāzīs, al-Yazidi, who was a member of the maḏāḥiḥ in Bābīṭ, he began to study the maḏāḥiḥ of Hārī in Silvestre de Sacy's edition (1821–1822) and as a result put together his emanations (ed. by A. F. Mehren as Epistola critica Nāṣir al-Yazidi Berytensis ad Di Sacyrum, Leipzig 1848; s. also Reisner and Dehnan, Les éditions de Hārī, 1855, i. 72 sq.; cf. V. Chauvin, Bibliographie des ouvrages arabis, ix., Libge 1903, p. 150). In the early fifteenth he began to write maṯāmah of his own; the whole collection was finished in 1855 and was very well received in Europe (Chauvin, op. cit., p. 123, 234); one of them had been translated by Fleischer as early as 1851 (Z.D.M.G., v. 1851, p. 96–103; also Russian translation by A. Krymsky, Drevnaya poezia, Moscow 1906, p. 322–328 and fig. Krackowsky, in the periodical沃sto, ii., 1923, p. 31–34). Like those of Hārī his maṯāmah are not only of linguistic and lexicographical interest but they also contain much material of ethnographical value (see also Th. Chemey, The Assemblies of al-Hariri, London 1857, i. 98–104).

Although his own outlook and works were very conservative and traditional, al-Yazidi nevertheless exercised a very great influence on modern Arabic literature. He is with justice reckoned with his younger contemporary Bābīṭ al-Bustānī (q.v.) among the founders of the new movement in Syria. He was not a populariser of European knowledge or European methods like the latter or Riffa' al-Tawfik; language only in the wide sense was his field. By a mastery command of language, by his verses, maṯāmah and schoolbooks, he showed and taught that the old saying al-ʼarabya ʼaš-šāmAṣṣṣqir (the Arabic language cannot be christianised) no longer held true. Every Arabic speaking Christian must as a member of the Arab race play his part in the renaissance of his fatherland. In this respect al-Yazidi did a great deal to pave the way for the later Arab nationalist movement.

2. Several members of the numerous family of
Shaikh Nāṣīf attained a literary reputation. His son Silu (b. March 2, 1847; d. Dec. 28, 1906) is specifically described as an etymologist and a jurist who did a great deal for modern Arabic terminology. He revised or edited many of his father's works and published a number of articles, mainly of a linguistic nature, in the periodicals edited by him in Syria and Egypt (e.g. al-Tāhī, 1884—1888; the article on Dāsu in Dāsu's Supplement was translated by Fleischer in 1881, see Kleinerer Schriften, iii. 605—641; especially al-Bayān, 1897—1898, see M. Hartmann, The Arabic Prize of Egypt, London 1899, p. 56 sq., 60 sq. and O. L. Z., i., 1898, col. 225; al-Dīwān, 1898—1906, see M. Hartmann, O. L. Z., ii., 1899, col. 57—59; iii., 1900, col. 311—316, 340—346); a number of his letters on literary matters and chronograms were collected by his friends (Ruṣū al-ʿAṣīdī, Cairo 1920) as were his poems (al-ḥulul, ibid., n.d. publ. in a facsimile of the original Ms.). Most of his larger works were unfinished. He took a great interest in Arabic printing and even invented, as is mentioned in his letters and signs and monograms, a type which was put up to him in Bairūt in 1924 (see Mach., xxii., 1924, p. 637—638; a description with photographs in the magazine al-Maʾarr al-dīlamīdā, iv., No. 8, p. 336).

3. The youngest son Khālīl (b. 1858, d. Jan. 23, 1889) is best known as the author of one of the first original tragedies in Arabic with a subject from ancient Arabia, al-Murawwābat wa-l-waṣīfī (written in 1876; first produced in 1878; first edition 1884; second Cairo 1902); a second was never printed (see Sarkis, op. cit., col. 1333). In 1881 for a time he edited in Cairo the Miṣr al-Ṣirīk, later went back to his native land where he taught and prepared a new school edition of Kitāb al-Dimma (1885). He is known as a poet from his collection Naṣṣamīl al-Awālīk (Cairo 1888—1890 but never printed as in G.A.L., ii. 695 note—and 1908). His great dictionary of the spoken language was never finished.

A daughter of Shaik Nāṣīf named Wārdā (b. 1838, d. Jan. 28, 1924) was one of the first women writers in Arabic of the sixth century. She married Fransis Shāmīn in 1866 and lived most of her life in Egypt. Her collection of poems (Hudūq al-Ward, Bairūt 1867, 1887, Cairo, n.d. [1332 = 1913]) shows considerable fluency in the style of her father but of course without his power; as regards subject-matter they are mainly mere d'occasion which are of no little value for the chronicles of the ʿAṣīdī family.

5. The Shaik's eldest son Ḥābīb (b. Feb. 15, 1833, d. Dec. 31, 1870), author of a commentary on one of his father's books, was a translator; his death was the occasion of the last elegy written by his father, now crippled with age.


(Yon. Kratschikowsky)

YAZIDJÎ-OGHŁU or YAZIDJÎ-ZADE, the epithet of two early Ottoman poets and mystics, both sons of a certain Yāzidi (i. e. kātib) Šalāḥ al-Din. He is said to have come from Boli and spent most of his later life in Angora. Šalāḥ al-Din wrote in addition to works on mysticism, a treatise on medicine called Semeiyah and a poetical calendar of 3,000 couples of no literary value, but perhaps of linguistic interest, on the omens of certain phenomena in the heavens such as rainbows, eclipses, lunar rings, falling stars etc. The work was published in 814 (1412) and dedicated to a certain Kaṣīb 'All. The author mentions the celebrated physician Hādijī Pasha as his patron. It seems to be better known under the title Malhim; manuscripts are rather rare (cf. J. v. Hammer, G. O. D., i. 73 n. 99 with details of contents). There are old and good copies in Berlin,
there is also a French MS. translation, and Vienna).
2. Arrowr al-Kāshīn completed at the beginning of
Muhammad 855 (Feb. 1451) in Gallipoli, a Turkish
poetic version of his brother's Arabic Maqālib
al-Zamān (see above). The work has been repeatedly
printed: Stambl 1261, Karan 1861, Stambl (1291 lit.), and Biliş 1300. A detailed account
of its contents is given by J. v. Hammer in the
3. Ardijr al-Maḥijjāt, dealing with the wonders
of creation. In the introduction the author says
that in the time of Alexander the Great, the wise
men of the earth arranged to describe the wonders
of the universe. In the time of the Imam Shāhī,
this book was translated from Hebrew into Arabic.
He himself, at the suggestion of Hāджījī Bairām,
translated it, he says, into Turkish for the benefit
of his countrymen who did not know Arabic, at
the time when Sultan Mahommed captured Stambl,
i.e. 857 (1452). A superficial comparison
with Kârin's book of the same name shows its complete
dependency on it, as Kâin has clearly shown
(Cat. of Turkish MSS. in the Brit. Mus., p. 106 ff.).
The book is quite common in MS. e.g. in Dresden,
Leipzig, London, Upsala and Vienna. 4. Mustaṣâb,
a mystical work on the exact content of which
nothing has been published. There was a manu-
script in the bookshop of Kâhil Efevin in Stambl.

Bibliography: v. Hammer, G. O. D., i. 127 sqq.,
do, G. O. N., i. 497, 501; Glubb, H. O. P., i. 391 sqq. and 395 sqq. (with further
references and many extracts from 'Alī's Kāmil
al-Kūthār), Taḥšīkhūrūmī, Şahāfet al-War-mari'm, Turk. transl. of Medji, l. 127 sq. and
128 sq.; Sa'd al-Din, Tasfi al-Tawārikh, lvi. 460
and the sources mentioned in the text.

(FRANZ BANGERLE)

YAZURI, ABU MUHAMMAD AL-HUSAYN B. 'A]()
YAZURI, ABU MUHAMMAD AL-HUSAYN B. 'ALI, vizier and chief kāfī of the Fatimid
caliph al-Mustanṣir bi 'llah. His father was a vizier in comfortable circumstances of Yazuri,
Were a little town in Palestine near Ramla. It was in his native town that he began his administrative
career in the office of kāfī. In this capacity he
attained the attention of an officer in the service
of al-Mustanṣir's mother, by reporting to him an in-
justice done by the chief kāfī of Egypt and it was
even probably as a result of this that he was transferred
to the capital and a post in the official hierarchy.

After the assassination of the Jew Abū Sa'd al-Tustar, superintendent of the estates of the
Caliph's mother, in 439 (1047), Yazuri was appointed to succeed him. His ambition seems now to have
become apparent, for the grand vizier Abu 'b Barakāt al-Husayn Dja'alījī appointed him in 441 (1049)
chief kāfī, purposely to exclude him from the
visirate Yazuri retained his post as superinten-
dent, the duties of which were performed by his
eldest son Muhammad.

In the following year the caliph gave him the
visirate, which he was to hold for eight years.
This period was marked by important events in
foreign politics. The year 445 (1051) saw the
break between the Zirids and the Fatimid empire.
Yazuri in revenge sent the Beni Hilal and the Beni
Salaim to ravage North Africa. A rising of the
tribes of the Benahia was suppressed. In the east
there was the rising of Arab al-Baṣāri against the
Abbasid caliph al-Kāfīn, to which Yazuri gave considerable financial assistance. These events
are related elsewhere; we need only mention that
the taking of Bagdad by the Turkish adventurer caused the authorities in Cairo to lose their heads. To receive the captive 'Abbasid in the Egyptian capital, the caliph Mustansir hurriedly had a new palace built. This unfortunate step was to have serious consequences for the Sufi lords of Egypt. The Salsongs were not content with reestablishing the 'Abbasid caliphate in Mesopotamia, but a few years later extended the boundaries of the empire as far as Damascus.

This affair also had a more direct result, the execution of Yezdigar. Did he put to his own use a part of the considerable sums allotted to the enterprise or did he perhaps play a double game by conducting secret negotiations with sultan Tughril Beg in spite of his official position? Both charges weigh upon his memory. The caliph threw him into prison with all his family in Muhamrram 450 (March 1058), and the following month the former vizier was executed at Tinnis.

The rise to power of Yezdigar marks the first disastrous stage in the reign of Mustansir which began so well: cf. for example the enthusiastic descriptions by Nizari Khusrav who spent the first year of Yezdigar's vizierate in Cairo, Yezdigar exhausted the resources of the state, as we have seen. The year 454 (1064) was also marked by a serious famine.

The Arab historians say that Yezdigar's name was put on the coins but so far no such coin has been found. On the other hand, his name appears on a piece of cloth in the Elahberg collection, as "Abu Muhammad al-Husayn ibn 'Ali ibn 'Abd [al-] Kullämun" (J.R.A.S., 1930, p. 765 and pl. xii).


(See Janissaries.)

YEŞİL-İRMAK (written "green river"), a river in Asia Minor (the ancient Ionia) formed by the confluence of the Gligit coming from Kara-Hisar-Shahr and Nigisâr and the Tuzâl from the west, i.e. from the direction of Amasia. It runs straight north, enters the sandjak of Dünjk (willâyet of Trebizond) and flows into the Black Sea opposite Samsûn. Its length is about 60 miles from the confluence of the two rivers.

Bibliography: Sâmit-Bey, Kâmil-al-Âlem, vi, 4709.

(See Janissaries.)

YEZDEGERD. [See Sassanians.]

YILDIZ KÖŞKÜ (written "Yildiz Kiosk", properly the "Kiosk of the Star" or more popularly in Turkish usage, "Yildiz Sarayı" "Palace of the Star", or simply Yildiz, the imperial residence consisting of a vast and somewhat chaotic agglomeration of pavilions and gardens situated in the northeast of Istanbul (Constantinople) on the heights which command Beşiktaş (Begiktaş) and Ortaköy.

The surrounding walls is adjoined in the east by the Ortaköy quarters, in the south by the Çerâgan (Çeragan) quarter and in the west by the slopes known as Sirriye Bey yeşilhâs. Yildiz may be reached from above by the gate (gates: Kastil-bâbâ, Selçuklu s., Harem-bâbâ, Sâmit-bâbâ), passing the Hamidiye mosque, which belongs to the palace, on the right, or from below (gate: Meşidye bâbâ), by the gardens which run down almost to the road running along the European bank of the Bosphorus between Beşiktaş and Ortaköy. For the topography see the map of Dolfina-Baghe in Baedeker, Konstantinopol und Klein-Asien, Leipzig 1905, p. 84-5.

It was under Sultan 'Abd al-Hamid II that Yildiz attained its greatest development and its greatest renown (up to 12,000 occupants), but at the beginning of the xixe century it was already a park as is evident from a fountain bearing the tughrâ [g.v.] of Sultan Selim III (1806-1807) (information supplied by Selim Nûrîyet Bey).

The earliest buildings date from Sultan Mahmûd II who surrounded them with a garden. According to Doryas, they were built in 1814; but in reality they are before 1826, for Andréeoyos mentions "Yildiziaziokou" [as served by the Baghe-Köy aqueduct] in his work Constantinople et le Bosphore de Thrace pendant les ans 1824, 1813 et 1814 et pendant l'année 1826, Paris 1828, p. 424.

Mahmûd II's kiosk was demolished by his son and successor 'Abd al-Majid (1829-61) and replaced by others which were called Molla koçlu, Cadır b. (Kiosk of the Tent) and Atçam k. (Persian Kiosk) or Yeâr koçlu (New Kiosk). According to Doryas and Osman Nûrî who wrongly followed him, the k. and the Cadır k. were only built under 'Abd al-'Azîz; according to the Guide Jeanne, the same is true of the Yeâr koçlu.

Sultan 'Abd al-'Azîz (1861-76) built the palace of Mâyvon (the Court). It was he also who joined the Çerâgan palace built in 1874 to the Yildiz park by a bridge over the Beşiktaş-Ortaköy road (Osman Nûrî, ii, 450).

All the other buildings belong to 'Abd al-Hamid II (1876-1909). This ruler, who never built a palace in the proper sense of the word, delighted in multiplying light buildings, often of cement, and these pavilions, chalets and kiosks were sometimes run up very quickly.

Before his time, Yildiz was a pleasure resort: only the mother of 'Abd al-Majid, the Wâlide Sultan Bezî-îlem (d. 1853), seems to have lived there regularly (Moritz Busch, Die Türkei, in Lloyd's Reisestudien, vi, Trieste 1860, p. 199).

'Abd al-Hamid II moved there soon after the beginning of the Russo-Turkish war. He gradually stayed there more and more until he finally never left it and made a fortified camp and a regular town out of it. The park was extended and the surrounding wall raised (in 1868). The name of Yildiz contrasted or superimposed on that of Sublime Porte, became a synonym for the government of the Palace and the Hamidian régime.

Three main portions of Yildiz are distinguished:

1. the Palace proper with its immediate annexes,
2. the Inner Garden (or Park) (Il bâchî) and 3. the Outer Garden (or Park) (Açlık bâchî).

1. The buildings of the Palace in the strict sense comprise:

Mâyvon, already mentioned, an elegant building, the largest in the Yildiz (whence its name of Büyük Mâyvon), situated outside the walls so that it is seen in its entirety on arriving from the west, on the left of the Hamidiye mosque. 'Abd al-Hamid set it aside for the private secretaries (müfleymiç) of the Palace. It was also called the "Ambassadory's pavilion" or Yildiz par excellence (see illustration).

Selâmîh, private apartments of the sultan (þanîlah).
played 60 workmen and produced most of the
furniture of Yıldız kiosk. (Abd al-Hamid had a
passion for carpentry at which he himself worked).

Merkmil "imperial stable"; there were
five kiosk (arlante "kiosks") at Yıldız (Abd
al-Hamid had a passion for horses).

Museum of (staffed) animals, near the Merkmil
kiosk, dovecotes, poultry houses, not to mention
greenhouses, menagerie, bird cages, kennels, hospital
for dogs, horse training ground, hamams.

The palace had two mosques, a large work
department (ta'mir kiosk), with saw-mill, foundry,
locksmiths' shops etc. which employed 300 workmen
not counting the foremen; the princes used to work
there sometimes.

The domestic staff (hendegân, çadıkes) lived
near the palace, but outside the walls.

Independent of the buildings above mentioned,
two were which we have not identified:
Ferhan kiosk and the Little Trianon.

There were two ponds in the Outer Park, one
called Ceviz kiosk, "pond of the valley" (between
Büşhâvan and Orazköy), 500 feet long and 30-
100 broad; the other near Ceviz kiosk, about
5,000 sq. yards.

In the Inner Garden is a pond or rather an
artificial stream, 300 yards long and 80 broad.

Yıldız now belongs to the prefecture of Istanbul (J. Sekretni) which has leased a part of it
(Merkmil kiosk) to a casino.

There is some talk of the resumption of the
Merkmil kiosk again by the municipality to give
it to the National Assembly of Turkey which would
make it a meeting-place for international conferences
(Athens, May 10, 1933). Several schools are
established in the old buildings or annexes of
Yıldız: Harbi akademisi "Military school", Milliye
mektebi "School of political sciences" (in the old
seviller dairesi "rooms lodgings"), Polis mektebi
"Police-school", Harimiyeti milleye gazet kiosk
"Boarding-school of national sovereignty".

Bibliography: P. de Rêgas, La Turquie officielle, Paris 1889, p. 41–59; G. Dorys,
(some reproduced in: G. Rizzo, Les Mystères de Yûldiz ou Abdul-Hamid, Constantinople,
Elamary Press, 1900); Osmân Nûr, "Abd al-Hamid-i Sâmi we-Derw-i Selçukî, "Abd al-
Rûmî, Istanbul, Kübbâhînî-İ İslâm we-askeri, 1327, II. 449 no. Yûldiz Sarihî; Guisâ-ı
Dî Paris à Constantinople, Paris; Tahîn Pasha,
Akhbâmâtî we-Yûldiz Hâdîtalârî, "Abd, and the
souvenirs of Yûldiz", Muallim Ahmet Halît Köprü-
hanesi, Istanbul, p. 15–24: Yûldizî Tâbihâtî,
Sefer Bey, Yûldiz, in La Revue (formerly
Reseau des Revues) of Oct. 1, 1907, p. 53–63
(of no interest); Ch. de Moury, Lettres de Belgique,
Paris 1879, p. 240–30; Catalogue des pêcles,
pliocrates, fûnes et objets d'art précieux,
le tout ayant appartenu à S. M. le Sultan Abdul
Hamid II et dont le vente aura lieu à Paris... -
Les bancs...".

The melancholy reputation of Yıldız has
produced several novels and pamphlets which
however contain no information of definite value:
Paul de Rêgas, Les secrets d'Yûldiz, novel in-8,
2nd edition; Mourad Bey, former imperial
commissioner of the Ottoman Public Debt, Le Palais
de Yûldiz et la Sublime Porte; - Le véritable
and Dirham al-Mawjul (d. 842) are said to have been his pupils. Among his books were a Kithā
darfurra Yūnus (“The Unique Book of Yūnus”), a Kithā al-Kifān (“Book of Singing Girls”),
and a Kithā al-Nughayl (“Book of Melodies”).

As a composer Yūnūs has a place among the
great musicians of the classical era, as we know
from the high esteem accorded his Zaynāb. As
a singer, he must have had considerable ability
to have roused the jealousy of so great a performer
as Ibn Kithā. It is however rather an account
of his “famous books on songs and singers” as the
author of the Fihrist says, that Yūnūs deserves
particular praise. Abu T-Farej al-Iṣḥāq, the
author of the Kithā al-Aṣḥāb, testifies that Yūnūs’
book concerning the songs was one of his chief
sources of information. It was, in fact, the first
attempt made to collect the Arabic versified
melodies (ṣāḥib) and rhythms (ṣūba) of songs.

Bibliography: Kithā al-Aṣḥāb, ed. Bakās,
iv. 114-115; vi. 7, 15; Fihrist, ed. Flügel,
p. 149; Al-Ladūnust al-Latīnī (1923), iv.
285; Rosegarten, Liber consonantum magusonii,
p. 17-18; Caussin de Leceuxal, Notices musicales
sur le principe musiciens araba (74, 117,
Dec. 1873); Farmer, History of Arabic Music,
p. 83-84, and index. (H. G. Farmer)

Yūnūs b. Mattāl, the prophet Jonah,
son of Amittai (II Kings xiv. 25). In the
Kūfah he is four times mentioned as Yūnūs, with
his father’s name being given, once as Dhu l-Nūn
(xxi. 87), once (xxviii. 45) as ṣāḥib al-ḥāl, “he of
the fish”. The Fihrist explains why Yūnūs is
the only one of the major and minor prophets
who is mentioned in the Kūfah; a prophet who is
swallowed by a fish naturally attracts attention. Mahμμad names Yūnūs among the apostles of God (iv.
161; vi. 86). Surā x. is called after Yūnūs, and
tells of the town which comes to believe and
therefore its fate is averted from it (x. 98). Yūnūs,
an apostle of God, fled on a ship which was over-
loaded. He was condemned by lot and a fish
swallowed him. He was worthy of blame. If he
had not praised God he would have remained in
the fish’s belly until the resurrection. So We threw
him sick upon a barren shore, and caused a gourd
to grow up over him, sent him to a hundred
thousand people; and they believed and We gave
them respite for a further period (xxviii. 139-142).
Rasūls Dhu l-Nūn, how he departed in wrath and
thought We could exercise no power over him;
then he called out of the darkness: There is no
God but Thee, praise be unto Thee, I was one
of the sinners. Then We heard him and rescued
him (xxi. 87-88). Await patiently the judgment
of thy Lord; be not like him of the fish, who
tried out when he was in distress; had the grace
of his God not been granted to him; he would
have been shamefully cast upon the barren shore
but the Lord heard him and he became one of
the righteous (lxviii. 48, 49).

Buhārī and Nawawī also quote as divine
revelation not put in the Kūfah the utterance:
“No one can say he is better than Yūnūs b. Mattāl,
even if his genealogy goes back to his father”
(Nöldeke-Schwally, Geschichte des Islam, b. 257); Muslim legend further develops this material.
Why was Yūnus enraged? 1. He was angry with the sinners; 2. he was angry because the calamity he had prophesied was delayed at the last minute and he appeared as a liar worthy of death; 3. because the angel Gabriel did not even allow him time to mount a steed or put on a shoe. His ship could go neither forward nor backward. He confessed his guilt but the sailors would not throw him into the sea; three times the last lots and then threw him into the waves (Thaläh). Finally Yūnus threw himself into the jaws of the whale (Ibn al-Áthir), which says he has come from India on account of Yūnus (Kisā'ī). God commands the whale, saying: I do not give thee Yūnus as food, I give thee him that you may shelter him as in a mosque (Tabari, Annals, i. 683). The threefold darkness of the fish, the sea, and the night envelops Yūnus. The fish is swallowed by another fish (Tabari, Tafsír, etc.). God makes the fish transparent so that Yūnus can see the wonders of the deep. He hears the songs of praise of the seamounts just as the angels hear his from the inside of the fish. It is disputed whether Yūnus remained 3, 7, 20 or 40 days in the fish. Hurled out upon the shore he is given shade by a gourd tree, and suckled by a goat (Ibn al-Áthir), or antelope (Thaläh), or a gazelle (Kisā'ī). When they disappear Yūnus laments. Then God reproaches him for not having had sympathy with over 100,000 people. This admonition is imposed upon him deeply by other ways also; by fruit-tree tarts up, by the example of a potter who is anxious about his pots and a sower who is anxious about his seeds. The city of the prophet is in despair because he does not come back. Then Yūnus has a shepherd announce his approach: the earth, a tree, an animal of his herd, all bear witness to the truth of the message.

Al-Kisā'ī extends the miraculous to the earlier history of the Prophet. His father was 70 when Yūnus was born. His mother, who became a widow soon after, had nothing left but a wooden spoon, which proves to be a cornucopia. As a result of a miraculous dream he marries the daughter of Zakariyyah b. Yahyā. He loses his wife, both his sons and his property. He therefore will not pray with the others on the ship. Everything is miraculously restored to him.


BERNHARD HELLER

YŪRŪKS, the general term for the wandering Turkish tribes in Asia Minor, also found sporadically on the Balkan peninsula. The name in Turkish means "wanderers", i.e. nomads in general, and some scholars (first v. Strahlenberg 1730), then J. v. Hammer and H. Kiepert) held the view that the same word was contained in the name of the Yūrūk (Yörük), a people described by Herodotus (iv. 22), who lived by hunting, roughly in the southern Ural. J. H. Nordmann has similarly referred the account by Kimma in the annals driven by the Emperor Manuel I in 1575 from the region of Eski-Sháhr (q.v.) to the Yūrūks. According to Hasluck, the word Yūrūk was first applied by Ryzant, to the nomads of the Trodin (History of the Turks [1857], ii. 138).

The Anatolian nomads are usually called by the settled Turks, Yūrūks, Gōčes or Türkmen, or after the tribal confederation to which they belong (e.g. Afşāhr, Bāyātā, Kāzātā, Shekliāt, Warakāt, etc.) or after the particular tribe (e.g. Aδīnī, Anamasī, Gīk Munālī, Harmandārī, Kārā-Kečīlī, Karā-Koyulan, Kūrzmī, Kosamī, Sarī-Kečīlī, Zīlī, etc.). The tribal organisation is rather important. A tribal confederation (naktur) at the head of which is a bey or šākh is divided into clans (kabba) and again into septs (mnahīl).

A strong tribe often subdues a weak one and even down to the Tanẓamāt [q.v.] the Yūrūks were usually ruled by their own boys. Some of these boys in Rumelia were given fiefs (išğāt; q.v.) (cf. 'Ain-i 'Alt, in Tischendorf, Das Lehrbuch etc., p. 63 and Ewliya Celebi, III. 394).

In his monograph on the Yūrūks Dr. M. Tzykyrov has given a full list of 88 tribes (reproduced by Hasluck, ii. 475–477) of whom the majority were in his official district of Sivas and the adjoining wilayet of Aδīnī. There are also numerous Yūrūk tribes in Southern Anatolia (around Mentešche oder (Mugala), Adalia, Alaiye and Adama) in the districts of Sivas and Konya; also in east and southeast Anatolia (in the wilayets of Urfa, Diyābār and Mārdīn); their distribution is connected with the distribution of pastures.

As early as Bāyārīn Ta's reign, the Yūrūks were coming to Europe (to the district of Philippopolis (Plovdiy) and in time they spread over Thrace and Macedonia as a number of place-names show. Since the wars of recent years, however, these Yūrūks have for the most part gone back.

Although they do not form a single homogeneous stock, the Yūrūks are predominantly Turks and have retained the old Turkish type, as well as many old words better, than the settled Ottomans. They speak as a rule different "coarse" Turkish dialects, which are as a rule not essentially different from those of their settled neighbours (cf. i.e., p. 921): only a few tribes speak Kurdish.

On the religion of the Yūrūks nothing certain is known. Under the influence of Sunni or Şī'ī propaganda they have become nominally Muslims, but they are more attached to their primitive animistic religion, in which the worship of trees, shrubs, springs and mountains plays an important part. In any case they pay more heed to their old rites and customs than to the prescriptions of Islam.

The occupations of the Yūrūks are decided by local conditions. In the steppes and along the coast where they spend the winter, they rear sheep and goats, and sometimes cattle, which they take in the summer to high-lying pastures. Some tribes are good breeders of horses and camels. In forest country the Yūrūks are more frequently woodcutters (tahafād; q.v.). Many tribes are hunters and in certain circumstances practise a little agriculture. The women engage in cooking, making clothes, spinning, basketwork, weaving, weaving of felt, mats and carpets. The Yūrūks live in tents woven of dark goats' wool or in primitive huts.
Their total number is estimated at 300,000. According to ‘Ain-i ‘Ali (op. cit.), the Rumelian Yürük in the xviiith century had 1,204 of the same, i.e. 33,840 men (1 adalı = 30 men). In the xviiith century they provided a contingent of 57,000 troopers under their own leaders (Perry in Hasluck, p. 130).

All attempts by the Turkish government to make the Yürük settle permanently have had very little success for obvious reasons.

**Bibliography:**

(FEHİM BAŞKARTAKİYEV)

**YÜŞHA** s. **NÜN**, the *Joshua of the Bible*. The Koran does not mention him by name but alludes to him. When Moses wished to lead his people into the holy land and Israel was afraid to fight with the giants, they were encouraged by two God-fearing men (v. 27-29), who may be recognized as Joshua and Caleb. Neither can it be doubted that the young man (v. 28, 30, Exod. xxxii. 11) who accompanied Moses on a journey to Khaḍir (not named) (Sura xviii. 59-64) is no other than Joshua.

Muslim legend has supplied the figure of Yüsha' with features not found in the Bible. Yüsha' is given the task of summoning the Egyptians to their final fate. To enable Moses to depart this life without anxiety, Yüsha' is installed as prophet in his lifetime. The Arab tradition varies as to whether the victory over the giants was won in the time of Moses or not till that of Yüsha'. The credit is usually given to Yüsha', Balaam supports the giants (in Ibn al-Athir the story is embellished: Balaam’s wife is bribed to incite him to evil). When Yüsha' is successfully fighting the giants, Friday evening comes. If the Sabbath begins, the fighting cannot be continued and the victory will be incomplete. Yüsha' wishes to stop the sun but first it refuses, saying it is fulfilling divine orders just as Yüsha' does; finally the sun agrees. After the victory Yüsha' collects the booty as a sacrifice but no flame comes down from heaven to consume it. There has been some dishonesty. Moses summons the heads of the tribes. The hand of the sinner sticks to the hand of Moses (al-Kısa‘i records another divine judgement; each tribe has a mark on Aarón’s robe and the mark of the guilty tribe becomes twisted). A bull’s head studded with pearls and jewels is found in the sinner’s possession and added to the booty. Flames now consume the booty, the bull’s head along with the sinner. Yüsha' cannot cross the Jordan for 40 days. At his prayer the two hills on the banks become a bridge, across which the people pass (al-Kısa‘i). Jericho is besieged for six months and in the seventh the walls fall at the blowing of trumpets.

In Tabari (Leyden, t. 558) we have the isolated tradition that the dead man conjured up by Tātūt (Saul) was Yüsha'.

**Bibliography:**

**YÜSUF I.** [see also Al-Mahdi (s. *Al-Mahdi*).]

YÜSUF bin MUHAMMAD AL-HAKAM b. Abī ‘Abd al-Mu’min al-Saffah, governor of the *Irāq*. Yüsuf was a parent of the famous al-Ḥajjāḍī b. Yüsuf, q.v. and governed the province of the Yemen for many years before he was transferred to the *Irāq* by the caliph al-Hāshim b. ‘Abd al-Malik. On Ramāḍān 27, 106 (Feb. 15, 725) he arrived as governor in the Yemen and in Dhu‘ al-Hijjah 1, 120 (April–May 728) he was appointed governor of the *Irāq*, and took up his quarters in al-Ḥira while his son al-Salṭ remained as his deputy in the Yemen. In al-Ḥira he acquired the reputation of a blood-thirsty tyrant; all kinds of stories, some almost incredible, were told of his cruelty. The first notable victim of his hatred was the former governor of the *Irāq*, Khaṭṭāb b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Kārī, q.v. In 122 (740) the ‘Alā‘ Zāhī b. al-Husayn b. ‘Alī raised a dangerous rebellion in al-Kūf which, however, ended in a fiasco [cf. HISHĀM b. ‘ARUJ AL-MALIK]. After order had been restored, Yüsuf is said to have asked the caliph for permission to lay waste the town of al-Kūf, but the caliph refused. He endeavoured to bring suspicion upon the able Naṣr b. Sā‘yār, whom Hāshim had appointed governor of Khurāsān on the fall of Khaṭṭāb, in the hope that he would succeed in getting him dismissed, and then combining his governorship with his own. For this purpose in 123 (740-741) he sent al-Jaḥām b. al-Salṭ to the caliph to turn him against Naṣr and ingratiate himself with him. Hāshim, however, was not deceived but left Naṣr in office. After the assassination of al-Walīd II, the Khūţabī, Djamāhur was appointed governor of the *Irāq* and as Yüsuf found no support among the government troops and the Khūţabī made common cause with the Khūţabī, there was nothing left for him but to take to flight. He set out for Syria and reaching al-Balḵ in Transjordania, he tried to hide among the women of the harem but was discovered by the soldiers of the caliph Yazīd III and brought to Damascus. Here he was imprisoned and remained there till the outbreak of civil war on the death of Yazīd. But when Marwān b. Muhammad, q.v., after his victory over Sulaymān b. Hāshim, who led the followers of the late caliph, approached the capital, Sulaymān had Yüsuf as well as Walīd II’s two sons murdered before himself seeking escape in flight. This happened in Dhu ‘l-Hijjah 126 (Sept.-Oct. 744), or according to another statement not till the following year (beg. Oct. 744). Yüsuf was then about 60. According to the Muslim historians, he did not lack literary training; as to his appearance we are told that he was small in stature and had an unusually long head.
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(K. V. ZETTERBERG)

**YûSUF b. TâSHFîN.** [see ALMIRAVIUS.]

**YûSUF b. YÁKîB, the Joseph of the Bible,** is a favourite subject of Muslim legend. In Sûra xii. Muhammed deals with the whole of Yûsuf's story, claiming that it is the most beautiful of stories. It is the real foundation of the Tâshfîns, because of the lesson concealed in it, on account of Yûsuf's generosity and its wealth of matter, in which prophets, angels, devils, djâns, men, animals, birds, rulers and subjects play a part.

Yûsuf in the Kûrân. Yûsuf is mentioned twice outside of Sûra xii. Once (v. 84) as one of the pious ancestors; farther in Sûra xli. 36: Yûsuf came with clear proofs but they doubted him and after his death it was thought that God would never send another prophet, Sûra xili. contains more and less than the Bible. Let us first consider the additions to the Biblical story.

Yûsuf is warned not to tell his brothers his dream (verse 5). Yaâqûb is afraid for Yûsuf on account of the wolf (15). Yaâqûb does not believe the story of his death (17, 18). Yûsuf returns the love of the temptress; only a sign from his Lord keeps him from sin (24). Yûsuf's coat is torn from behind and a windstorm proves his innocence from this (25—28). The nation who speak evil of Yûsuf's temptresses are so dazzled by the angelic beauty of Yûsuf when he comes in that they cut their own fingers instead of the food (31). Yûsuf proclaims the true faith in prison (37—40). The seven fat and seven lean years are followed by a prolific year with a good rainfall (49). Yûsuf interprets Pharaoh's dreams while still in prison and will not come to court until his innocence is recognised (50, 51). Yûsuf asks Pharaoh to appoint him over the treasures of Egypt (55).

Yaâqûb orders his sons not all to come in at one gate (67). Yûsuf at once reveals himself to Benjamin (69). When the goblet is found in Benjamin's sack the brothers cry out: If he be a thief, his brother has already been a thief (77). Yûsuf sends his coat to his father, Yaâqûb recognises the smell of it from a distance and regains his sight from it (93—95). Yûsuf's parents bow down before him thus fulfilling his dream (101).

For most of these additions to the Biblical story, Geiger, Grünbaum, Neumann and Schapiro have shown a Haggadic origin; on the other hand, we find Muhammadan influence in the later Jewish legend.

On the other hand, we do not have in the Kûrân the description of his character. Remarkable also is the omission of the dream of the brothers' sheaves which bow down before Joseph's sheaf (Gen. xxxvi. 5—7). This dream is replaced in post-Kûrânic legend by a miracle. A tree grows near Yaâqûb's house, on which a new branch sprouts whenever a son is born to him. None grows near Yûsuf's birth. At Yaâqûb's prayer, Gabriel brings a branch from Paradise, which surpasses the others and blooms and bears fruit. The Yûsuf Sûra is strikingly uncertain and hesitating in that it mentions no one by name except Yaâqûb and Yûsuf and gives no numbers or times. The only references are to one of the brothers or at best the eldest of the brothers, a king, a noble, his wife, a witness. Yûsuf is sold for a paltry sum; the number of his brothers is not given. This gives the expositors of the Kûrân an opportunity to search for the anonymous and undefined (muhkamât) (see vol. 14, *Die Richtungen der islamischen Koranallegorie*, Leiden 1919, index, s. v. Muhrakâm).

**Yûsuf in post-Kûrâní legend.** When the Kûrân cautiously says "one of the brothers was sold or did something", in legend we find Reuben, Judah, Simeon and in Zâshîr and Benâjâl also. During the course of time we have Benjamin with his ten or three sons. Sometimes Judah, sometimes Reuben, sometimes Simeon is represented as possessing a terrific temper which can only be calmed by a hand of the house of Jacob. The man who buys Joseph from his brethren is called Mâlik b. Da'r and the Egyptian to whom he is sold Kitâf, Iftâr, Iftân, Kitâsr, Kittiân, Kitifân; his wife is called Râ'il, later (as in Firdawûs and Kitâvâ'z Zâlîka, Zulâika. The king of Egypt: whom Yûsuf converts to Isâlam, is called Kâyân b. Wâlid, his butler Nâbû, his baker Ma'dîlîb. The abjâd, the witness, becomes a relative of the tempers or even a baby who miraculously proves Joseph's innocence from his cradle. Even the names of the eleven stars which bow down before Joseph are given. Muslim legend knows how old Yûsuf was at the time of the dream, how long he was kept in the well, where the well was and what he was sold for on each occasion. The letter telling him and Yaâqûb's letter to Yûsuf are both given, though not full.

A reason is given for everything that is unexplained in the Kûrân. Why did Yaâqûb suffer? Because he killed a calf before the eyes of his mother, because on one occasion he did not share his meal with a hungry man, because he separated a slave from her parents. — Why does Yûsuf suffer? Because of his vanity; later, because he appeals to the butler instead of to God. — When Yûsuf is warned not to communicate his dream, how do the brothers learn of it nevertheless? From Yûsuf's aunt, and so on.

We also find the legend developed by the storyteller's art without any foundation in Kûrân or Haggadah. Yaâqûb touchingly recommends the little Yûsuf to the cure of his brothers. They pretend to be very gentle when in sight of the father but very soon ill-treat him, break the jug out of which he wants to drink, tear his coat from his back, which he begs as a shroud, and tell him to appeal to the sun, moon and stars of his dreams. Gabriel takes pity on the deserted boy, finds him the cloak with which Abrahâm was protected from the burning flame. A caravane loses its way and comes to the well. The brothers ask the purchaser to put Yûsuf in chains, nevertheless Yûsuf takes leave of them with dignity. On the way he throws himself from his camel on to the tomb of his mother Rachel, which they pass. — The efforts to seduce him are described in glowing language. Yûsuf sells corn to the Egyptians. During the years of famine however, Yûsuf starves also so that he may feel what it is like to be hungry: he partakes only lightly of Pharaoh's banquets. When Yûsuf is questioning the alleged magic cup, Benjamin asks him to enquire if Yûsuf still lives. — He lives, you will see him. — When
Ya'kub receives a message from Yüsuf, he asks how it is with Yüsuf? — He is king of Egypt. — That is not what I am asking; I mean how is it with his faith? — He is a Muslim. — Then my happiness is perfect. — Yüsuf enquires how his father could abandon himself completely to grief, as he did not believe in a reunion after the resurrection? — I believe in it but I was anxious lest you had abandoned your faith so that we should remain separated in the next world.

The Kur'an tells nothing of Yüsuf's death and sarcophagus. Muslim legend, however, has taken stories of this from Haggada. Yüsuf's sarcophagus was sunk in the Nile. At the Exodus Moses went to take it with him but could not find it until an old woman (Serrach, a daughter of Asher) showed it to him. In Itsam, the legend seems to have been further developed; it tells of the people living on the banks of the Nile disputing over the sarcophagus, which is finally sunk exactly in the middle of the river so that both sides may equally share its virtues.

Islam is very proud of its story of Yüsuf. The Hadith says that the Yüsuf Sûra surpasses the Topšû Ringût. The Kısî tells us that God has given the Yüsuf Sûra to every prophet, but the Jews concealed it until Muhammad revealed it as evidence that he was a prophet. — The Sûra do not recognise Sûra xii.


YÜSUF KHAŞŞ HAĐİB of Balkashghu, a Turkish author, who wrote the mirror of princes, Kütaşhâdî Bîlîg in 468 (1070—1070) for the sultan of Kâshghar. Tawarghâ KhaBân Abû 'Ali Hasan b. Sulâman Arâdân [see BUGHÂRÂN] and was given the title of chamberlain as a reward. This, the first classic of the Turkish poetry of Central Asia, is completely under the influence of Persian literature. The author no longer uses the symbolic measure of Turkish popular poetry but experiments with a new and somewhat clumsy imitation of the mutâbâh and says in his preface that the Iranians would call his work a Sâhâhâna. In style also he is influenced by the Persian lyric, especially in the song of spring with which he introduces the praise of his prince. Whether the elaborate form which he has given his work is his own invention or what model he followed has not yet been discovered. There is no proof of the influence of Chinese literature which was at one time suspected. The author puts his instruction into the mouth of allegorical figures: the prince Kân-'Toghân, who represents justice, the vizier 'Alî-'Îsdî, the representative of good fortune, his son Öktûrûmîn and his friends 'Alîg and Öktûrmîn. For his social ethics and occasional medical references, the author is completely dependent on Ibn Sinâ, as O. Alberts first pointed out. The author cannot be denied a certain originality for the way in which he applies these principles to the conditions of his people. In spite of all their pedantry his expositions are a valuable source for the sociology of the Turks of Central Asia. The language of the book appears to be that of Kâshghar, but it is an artificial language which had become strictly conventional in form in court circles under Iranian influence and was already superior to the dialects; it is based on a somewhat younger form of Turkish than that which Kâshghar gives in his Divân Lâgâhî al-Turkî; really it is not strictly Uighur as was once thought. On the other hand, one cannot say with certainty in what script the work was originally written, whether in the so-called Uighur, which is based on the Nestorian Syriac alphabet, in which the Vienna MS., the only one known down to 1897, is written, or in the Arabic script used for the fragment in the National Library in Cairo and the manuscript found by Zeki Welldî Bey in 1914 at Nemesân. Sections of the Vienna MS. were published by Vânsbîr as Ùrgsîc Sprîçmûnimmânt u-des Kudatû Bîlîg, Uighûr. Text with Transcription and Übersetzung 1. Ùrgsîc-Deutsch, 2. Ùrgsîc, 1870. W. Radloff published a facsimile of the whole manuscript St. Petersburg 1890, the text in transcription in 1891 and in 1900 text and translation from the MSS. in Vienna and Cairo followed. While Radloff in his transcription and in the form of the title Kudatû Bîlîg had used the pronunciation of the northern dialects, V. Thomsen in his essay Sur le système des consonnes dans sa langue ougovire, in Ëskîl Sîmêc, ii. 241 sqq. showed from the rhymes of the Kûtâshâdî Bîlîg, that it had completely preserved the phonetic system of the Orkhan inscriptions with its wealth of sonants and spirants, which was confirmed by the MS. in Arabic script.


(C. Brockelmann)

MAWLANA YÜSUF, manûshî of the Great Moghul Humâyûn (1530—1556), probably identical with Yüsuf b. Muhammad Yüsuf Harâsî, the celebrated physician of Bâbur and Humâyûn. He acquired a place in Indian literature with his well-known letter-writer Badî'û al-Insâfi, which he composed in 940 (1532—1533) for his son Râfî al-Dîn Husain and several other fûllâs. The book begins with a mukaddima on the different
YUSUF — AL-ZAB

kinds of modes of address which must be regulated by the relation of the correspondents to one another in rank; Yüsuf then divides the different kinds of correspondence (mağâne) into three parts: letters to persons of higher rank (mağan-i hâs), of the same rank (mağan-i ahd) and to those of lower rank (râfîh). Then comes a series of forms of letters which are divided into sections, such as Sultan to Sultan of higher, equal or lower rank, princes to Sultans and princes, princes to princes, amirs, grand-viziers, viziers, officials of the Divan, secretaries (mağâne), sayyids (sâlât), shaikhs, judges, poets and astronomers. Then come what one might call private letters: to relations and friends on various occasions, e.g. if a reply has not been received when on a journey, or on grief at separation, longing for home, the tone of the letters showing faithlessness, reconciliation, excuses, congratulations, condolences etc. A hâfiz gives examples of addresses (fânâwâ). The book, which is also known as "İnâkiy Yüsufi," was lithographed in Delhi (1845); manuscripts are fairly common. If Yüsuf is really the same man as the physician Yüsufi, he is also the author of a number of medical works among which we may mention the "Tibb-i Yüsufi" (lit. Cawnpore 1874), "Tibb-i Al-Mawli (lit. 1863), Muğâbârî, Tihib-i Al-Mawli (lit. 1879), Dalvâr al-Nâbî (lit. 1874).


Z

ZAB, ZAB, 11th letter of the Arabic alphabet, with the numerical value of 7. For its phonographical pedigree, see ARABIA, plate 1. It belongs to the abjad, the "abjad-i anâni," and corresponds to the same sound in the other Semitic languages. It is pronounced like English and French z. In the spoken Arabic of to-day z may also represent other sounds of the classical language, such as dā and f. In Persia and Turkey Arabic z is often pronounced z. Bibliography: W. Wright, Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages, Cambridge 1890, p. 57; A. Schande, Sûhâbirî's Lautlehre, Leyden 1911, index; C. Brockelmann, Grundriss der vergl. Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen, Berlin 1908, l. 128 sqq.; id., Précis de linguistique témérite, transl. by W. Marçais and M. Cohen, Paris 1918, p. 71; Lidin al-Arab, vii. 167. (A. J. Wensink)

AL-ZAB, the name of two left bank tributaries of the Tigris.
1. The Upper or Great Zab (Zab al-dûr or al-âkar) was known already to the Assyrians as Zabû izzû, the "Upper Zab." The Greeks called it Lyhas (Weissbach, s. v., No. 12 in Fauly-Wissowa, R. E., vol. xii., col. 2391 sqq.; on the name see J. Markwart, Südarmenien, Vienna 1930, p. 429 sqq.), the Byzantines however have again Zâsâs (Theophylact, Chron., ed. de Boor, p. 318, 320). In Syriac it was called Zâghab, in Armenian Zav (Thomas Arcrumi, ed. Parkinson, iii/iv, p. 145; transl. Broset, in "Collection d'hist. Arméniens, l. 123"). The Kurds at the present day call it Zâbû (C. Hoffmann, Ausflugs, p. 236, note 1884). On account of its torrentous course the Arabs called it Al-Musabîr. According to the Arab geographers, it rises in the mountains of Alkabârî and in Al-Musabîr, Al-Musabîr, p. 52 and Yâkhû (Mufâjam, ii. 902

read this for Mughârî and cf. G. Hoffmann, op. cit. p. 228). Its water is said to be red at first (cf. however G. Hoffmann, p. 234, note 1886). It then flows via Zarkûn and Bâdgâsh (Sy. Bîth Baghâsh in Hzâràysh, now probably Bich Kûf in Albûkk, then via Bisharrat, two days journey from Al-Mawli, to the district of Hâfîn, where it makes a turn before leaving the hills and flows through the Jârâ of al-Marjâ until finally it enters the Tigris at the monastery of Unîr Bârkanî below Al-Mawli, a farasîr above al-Haditha. Hâfizî Khalîfî says it is formed by the streams of Kâwâr (now Nehîl-es) and Djârîl. After their junction it flows along the hills past the Sandjak (in the turn of the river to the S. E.) and through the district of Zâfâr of the region of al-Tâmahî. Then it turns again S. W. at its junction with the Râwandcles. Shortly before joining the Djîdîs below Nîmîrûd, the ruined site of the Assyrian Kalakh, it is joined by its right bank tributary, the Khâzîr, which has previously been increased by the waters of the Gömeîl-es (Greek: Buomolos) from Tell Gömeîl (Gaagombala).

The Great Zâb plays an important part in military history. It is several times mentioned in the campaigns of Maurice and Heraclius (Theophylact, Simok., ed. de Boor, iv. 117, according to whom the lower course is navigable iurâ, see, p. 150), p. 9, 11 v. 5, 6, 6, 6, 8, 8, 8; Geor. Kadren, ed. Bonn, i. 730, Theophylact, Chron., loc. cit.). On its tributary al-Khâzîr was fought in Muhammed (Aug. 686) the battle between Ibrahim and Ubâdî Allah (Cantini, Chronografa islamica, Fasc. v. 781, a. h. 67, 7, 2). On the Great Zâb itself Marwan was decisively defeated in the battle of 2nd-11th Djumâda II 132 (January 16-25, 750) (Haarr, Hist. des Arabes, i. 259 sqq.; Cantini, op. cit., p. 1696 sqq., a. h. 132, 12).
2. The Lower or Little Zab (al-Zab al-aṣīfah or al-aṣāfah) is called in Assyrian Zabu ḥaṣpāṭu, "the lower Zab", in Greek Καπνίς (Weissbach, art. Καπνίς, No. 2 in Pauly-Wissowa's Realenzyklopädie, vol. x., col. 2121, Byzantine Greek ἱππίς Zabas; (Theophan, Chron. ed. de Boor, p. 320, according to whom there were four bridges over it) or ἱππίς Zabas; (Theophyl. Simok., ed. de Boor, v. 8, 9). According to the Arab geographers, its source was in the district of Dahrut (Syrac. .DataType.débar, Débar, on the modern Dibbûr-yah near Sidikin) and in the mountains of Sallakh (Syra. Sallakh) in Adharbajjân not far from Shahrizur, and it flowed into the Tigris at milî above al-Sinâ (Syra. Şenââ) at Dair Ibn Gamih (Syra. Dâir Bâr Gâmih). The Little Zab is formed by the confluence of a number of small streams, which rise in the hills between Lâhidjân south of Lake Urmia and the pass of Awromân. The main stream is now called Altûm, in its upper course Aşâr or Kâlî. On the lower course is Mûnûnpûr, just below its junction with the Tigris is Kalat Dâhabî.


(E. Honigmann)

ZAB, a region of Algeria. The name Zab (plur. Zîbûn) is given to the area around Biskra measuring about 125 miles from W. to E. and 30 to 40 from N. to S. It is a rather flat plain sheding in the south into the Sahara and bordered on the north by the southern slopes of the Saharan Atlas, but having easy communication with the depression of the Hôdina and the plateau of Constantine through a wide gap which opens up between the hills of Zab and the Ahras. Being subject to desert influences Zab has only rare and irregular rainfall, insufficient in ordinary times for the cultivation of cereals, but the streams from the mountains and subterranean supplies Sustain an oasis vegetation at many places, which contain nearly 800,000 palma.

Three parts of Zab are usually distinguished: Zab Şarîk or Eastern Z., between the foot of the Ahras and the Shôçî Mêhrî; the Dahrut or northern Z., between the hills of Zab and the Wâd Dîjî, and lastly Zab Gueblî (םוֹבִּל). Southern Zab, separated from the preceding by a strip of sand and marshes, Zab Şarîk is watered by the waters of the Ahras, Wâd al-Âbiyâd, Wâd al-Ârab which irrigate on leaving the mountains the oases of Zerîblât al-Wâd, Badis and in the plain those of Sidî İbrahîm, Seriâna and Oumâich. The Zab Dahrut, owing to the springs which are dotted along the foot of the hills, contains the most prosperous oases, Bu Shiblûn, Ishaman, Farâar and particularly Tolga, which is regarded as the capital of this part of the country. To Zab Gueblî belong the oases of Wâd Dîjî, Oureilal and Doucen, the magnificent palm-groves of which form a striking contrast to the miserable oases of Millû and Bigû which are half buried in sand.

The population (93,000, not counting the inhabitants of the commune de plain exercise of Biskra) is for the most part settled in the oases but we also find in the Zîbûn wandering shepherds belonging almost all to the tribes of the Arab Sherags, who in the spring go up into the Hodina and the Tell with their flocks. The settled population does not find sufficient resources in the country. They have therefore always been in the habit of migrating temporarily to the towns of the Tell. In the Turkish period natives of the Zîbûn under the name of Biskra formed an important corporation in Algiers, where there are still about 2,000 of their compatriots.

History. We know practically nothing about Zab in the pre-Islamic period and during the first four centuries of the Hulja. The Romans never occupied and colonised the country but were content to establish forts on the Wâd Dîjî, at Biskra and at the southern exit of the valleys of the Ahras. As to the name Zab itself, it should perhaps be connected with Zabi, a Roman town in the region of Hodina, which was in the fifth century A.D. the see of a bishop. Al-Bakri (Marâlàh, p. 64, transl. Fagnum, p. 133) mentions among the towns of Zab, Toluna, Tolga, Talhûda, Doucen; Idris (transl. de Goeje, p. 109) describes Tobuna [q.v.] as the capital of Zab. It seems however that at this period, or in any case in the period immediately after it, political preponderance passed to Biskra [q.v.] in which lived influential families like the Banû Kummân and the Banû Sidiâj, who controlled the region's affairs in turn. The country suffered greatly from the Arab invasions of the 7th and 8th centuries. A Hâlîlît group, the Athîbî, ravaged the country and drove out a number of the former inhabitants. Driven back into the south at the beginning of the 9th century by the Almohads, they abandoned their nomadic for a sedentary life; they were forced to recognise the suzerainty of the Wâd Muhammad (Dawâwida), a section of the Sulam, who settled in Western Zab while another group, the Karrû, settled in Eastern Zab. An Āthîbî family finally became supreme; this was the Banû Mozni to whom the Ḩâfîds entrusted the government of Zab and who took advantage of the troubled times in the 9th century to make themselves almost independent (cf. Ibn Khallûdîn, Barberis, transl. de Sânî, iii. 155: History of the Beni Mozni). In this period the name of Zab is no longer applied only to the region south of the Atlas between Doucen to the S. W. and Badis in the N. E. Ibn Khallûdîn credits it with a hundred villages each called Zab distinguished as Zab of Tolga, Zab of Biskra etc.; cf. Ibn Khallûdîn, esp. cit., i. 77). Leo Africanus gives Zab the same boundaries as Ibn Khallûdîn and mentions in it 25 towns in addition to large
numbers of villages (Les Afriques, Description de l'Afrique, ed. Scheffer, iii. 250).

Freed from Hajihi's authority, Zab escaped Turkish rule in this part of the country, although a garrison was established at Bikstra. Effective agitation for two centuries and a half was in the hands of the chief of the Arab family of Bit Okkar to whom the Turks allowed the title of Shihkh al-Arab but against whom in the second half of the sixteenth century, they opposed another family, that of the Ben-Gann. The rivalry of these two families kept the country in a state of anarchy, aggravated between 1835 and 1840 by the intervention of Abd el-Kadir. Disorder came to an end only in 1844 with the occupation of Bikstra by the French and the suppression of the rebellion stirred up in 1845 by Bu Zian at Zaachia, from which date the Ziban may be regarded as definitely pacified.

Bibliography: Delattre, Excursions dans le Zab oriental (Recueil des Notices et Mémoires de la Société archéologique, historique et géographique de Constantine, 1889); G. Marquis, Les Arabes en Barbès, Constantine 1913; Magdonou, Monographies historique et géographique de quelques districts du Ziban (Recueil...), Constantine 1911; Moussis, Organisation hydraulique des oasis saharoises, Algiers 1922, Plessis, Voyages aux Ziban (Bulletin de la Société archéologique et d'archéologie d'Oran, 1885). — Cf. also the Bibliography to the article Bikstra.

(G. Yver)

ZABAG (ذا), inaccurately transcribed Zaboj < Sanskrit Javaka, the name of an island. The Arabic transcription, so far as I am aware, goes back to the ninth century A.D. We do not know why the Arabic has rendered by a sonant the guttural occlusive sound of the Sanskrit. The fact that we might be dealing with a form borrowed from a highly sonorous Prakrit hardly seems to me to require to be considered here. The Chinese knew this place-name as early as the seventh century under various forms which are reproduced in Chinese characters in L'Empire sommatrani de Činjaya: She-li Feshe < Skr. Sṛt Vījaya or shortened form Fe-sh < Skr. Vījaya (Ying-shing, Hoé-sing and Vajrabodhi); She-lē Feshe = Sṛt Vījaya (Sin t'ang chun, T'ang hui yao, Tō fu yun kuai); San-fē-lē (Cui fan le of Čau Ju-kue, Sung chie or History of the Second Sung, Ming she or History of the Ming, Tae yu le of Wang Ts'ai, Ying yai chang lau of Ma Huan, Foo Shing (fan of Fei Sin, Tung yu chang la)). In Malay, the island of Sumatra is called Pillaw Emas "Island of Gold" (cf. Chin, kinh tuow, Arabic sawmā darb, an arabisced form of the Sanskrit svamāraṇa, with the same meaning). We only know the early history of Čavaka = Zaboj = Sṛtivijaya = She-li Feshe from inscriptions and a few oriental texts. We need not then be surprised that there are many lacunae.

At the beginning of our era, the Raṣmāyapa, composed some time earlier not definitely known, places in the Far East a Yava-dvīpa "Island of Yava!", the island of gold and of silver (cانا māryāyabadhāyum), embellished with gold mines (svamārayaśāsaṃśātan), which has usually been identified with Java. Its wealth in gold however makes me identify it with Sumatra for which alone we have evidence of extraordinary wealth in precious metals. In 132 A.D. Chinese texts mention an embassy from the king of Ye-tiao, old pro-
nunciation *Yap-dir = Yavadvipa = Sumatra, to the court of China. It is this form that Ptolemy reproduces some years later in the Prakrit form *tajahēo < Yavadvipa: 140—250 B.C. In the surviving fragments of the Fou-san lū yin tao of Kang T'ai, there are several references to the land of Ča-po, old pronunciation Ča-hak, defective transcription of *Zab-o < Skr. Žabaka. It was probably about this time that Madagascar was colonised by Sumatrans who had been influenced by Hindu culture. The modern Malagasy language still bears clear traces of this.

In 410 on the occasion of the Synod of Isaac, there is mentioned a metropolitans of Dāheg and of Ča and Manas (J. B. Chabot, Synodal of orientalis, Paris 1902, p. 620). Four years later, Fa-Hsien returning from India via Ceylon arrived in a country which he calls Ysjo-po = Yavadvipa, which I also locate in Sumatra, as well as the She-li Feshe mentioned in the Kao yung iwan composed in 319.

According to a Malay inscription of 605 Saka = 683 A.D., an unnamed ruler who ruled in Sṛtivijaya went on an expedition to institute a magic ritual, i.e. to seize the suzerain state of which he was a vassal. In Saka 606 = 684 A.D., a king of Sṛtivijaya (read: Sṛtiyanaga) ordered a garden to be made called Žarakesa = "auspicious field". In 608 Saka = 686 A.D. another Malay inscription records that the stone was engraved at the time when the army of Sṛtivijaya was setting out against the land of Java which was not in subjection to Sṛtivijaya.

From 670 to 741, the She-li Feshe sent embassies to China. In 742, She-li Fos-pao = Skr. Sṛtivadavanam, king of Sṛtivijaya, sent an ambassador to China. In 742, the king of Feshe = Vījaya, Linh-t'eng-wei-kong (?), sent his son to the Chinese court.

At a date which is uncertain, the Tamil poem Maippinchatamí mentions a town Nāgāpuram (city of the nāga), in Čavaka-nūru or land of Čavaka < Skr. Čavaka and the names of two of its kings: Bīhamākbara and Puyyuraja, who claimed descent from Indra.

In 671—692 A.D., the famous Chinese monk Vi-neng went from India to China and back. He wrote his travel stay of six months in She-li Feshe in 671—672 and another of four years in 685—689 and a third, equally long, on his return from Canton. There he studied Sanskrit grammar. "In the fortified town of Fo-Sha", he says, "there are over a thousand Buddhist priests, whose thoughts are devoted to study and good deeds. They examine and study all possible subjects just as in India; the rules and ceremonies there are identical [to those in India]. If a Chinese priest wishes to go to India to hear lectures there and read the original Buddhist texts, he would do well to spend [first] a year or two at Fo-sha and to practise the proper rules there; he could then go on to Central India". But this is not all. This mastery in the teaching of Malay, of Sanskrit and of the Law which is a sure sign of a high level of intellectual development was accompanied by equal skill in naval and military matters. Trade and the mercantile marine were no less flourishing. Lastly, if we may judge by the attitude of the mahārāja of Zaboj to the conquered Cambodians, the noble morality and political wisdom of these Sailendra rulers can-
not be too highly admired. Such was the position of the Sumatran empire at the end of the seventh century A.D.

In 717, Srivaśiṇa was visited by the monk Vajrabodhi and probably about the same time by the Chinese monk Hui-jie on his way from China to India.

A Sanskrit inscription found in Java of 654 Saka = 733 A.D. mentions "an excellent island, incomparable, called Yava, fertile in cereals and other grains, rich in gold mines (kamakābharā)"...

This looks like a repetition of the Rāmāyana.

A Sanskrit inscription from Ligor (eastern Malay peninsula) and dated 775 A.D. celebrates a supreme king of kings, head of the family of the Silendara, called Śri Mahārāja (the rest is fragmenting).

In 844-846 we have the first mention known to me of the Mahārāja of Zābāg in an Arabic text (Ibn Khurdabāb). The merchant Sulaimān (851) also mentions Zābāg and adds that the land of Kalih (= Kar) on the western Malay peninsula and Zābāg are ruled by the same king, Iḥāt b. Iḥrin, d. in 907, and mentions the camphor of Zābāg. Ibn al-Fakhrī (902) and Ibn Rosteh (ca. 903) give some information about the location, products and customs of Zābāg. Abū Zaid al-Husān (ca. 916) gives a somewhat detailed description of Zābāg and the mahārāja's court, and tells how the victorious campaign of the mahārāja against Cambodia was carried through (Mas'ūdī, Pātraitīs d'or, l. 169 sqq., expresses himself in identical terms). Cf. on this subject my suggestions in J. A., Oct.-Dec. 1932, p. 275 note. The Lieux des mervelles de l'Inde (ed. van der Lith, transl. Marcel Devic, p. 174-175) records that in 334 (945) the Wawūk (q.v.) i.e. Sumatrans, came with a thousand ships on a raid on the east coast of Africa to procure the products of the country and Zandj slaves (cf. J. A., Oct.-Dec. 1923, p. 298).

In 960 and 961, the king Śri Hira du-ta Hia-li-lian = Malay: Śri kuda Harijana (not) sent an embassy to the court of China. In the following year another embassy was sent by the king Śri Hira Wu-ye = Skr. Śri Vija (not). Other embassies arrived from China from Hia-le = old Malay hadji “king” in 980 and 983. In 1003, the king Śri-Śri Cū-la-mu-nil-i-ma-ni-tos-ku-nu = Skr. Śrīcūlamaviyavarmava and his son and successor Śri-Śri Mu-lo-fi’s (sic) = Skr. Śrīcūlamaviyayottovagavarnav in 1008 sent an embassy to the emperor of China. These two Sumatran sovereigns are also known from the Tamil inscription known as the “large Leyden scroll” which commemorates the donation of a village to a Buddhist temple at Negapattam. The building of this temple was begun by Cūlamaviyavarmava and finished by his son and successor. It may be noted that this temple was built at the town of the nuqṣa and that the Malay rulers who built it, belonged to a royal family, the Silendara, who were descended from a nūqṣ. The choice of this Indian town was a very natural one for their pious works.

In 1017 there came to the court of China, ambassadors from Hia-le Su-nil-i-pu-mi = Hadji Sumatrahatthinī “king of the land of Sumatra”. The modern name of the island appears here for the first time.

In his geography of the world compiled in 1154, Idrisi records that “the people of the isles of Zābāg come to the land of the Zandj on small and large ships... for they understand one another’s languages”. And also: “The people of Komī (= Madagascar) and the merchants of the land of the Mahārāja (= Sumatra) come among them (the people of Sūfāla and the east coast of Africa), are well received and trade with them (J. A., Oct.-Dec. 1932, p. 299-300).

The other Arabic and Persian texts (Vākīl 1224, Kāzwinī 1203-1204, Ibn Sa'alī the XIIth century, Kūth al-Dīn al-Shārdhī d. 1311, Dimashqī c. 1325, Ibn Al Fī discharge 1273-1325, Ḥāmid Allāh in Muṣfurâl 1340, Ibn al-Wardī c. 1340, Ibn Muṣfurâl at the beginning of the XVIth century, and al-Misirī, only supply a few notes on the natural or imaginary flora and fauna of Sumatra and the products of the country, especially gold and camphor. We have to come down to the XVIIth and XVIIIth centuries to get accurate and detailed information in theNarrativa Mutilatique of Ibn Mūḍīq and Sulaimān al-Mahīr which I have translated and published.

From the XVIIIth century, the oriental texts of other origins should be studied and annotated again. They will be given in the Bibliography but no use has been made of them here as our space is limited.

Ces Kûllî’s in his King Wai-ti-su ta (1778) and Cao Jo-ku in his Cu fan tu (1295) deal at length with Xam-fu-tî. The latter includes even the foreign countries dependent on him and mentions Ceylon among his conquests, which is unexpected and does not appear to be confirmed by history. The statement that the Mahārāja is king of the islands like Zābāg, Kalah (= Kar on the eastern Malay peninsula), Sirindib (= Ceylon) etc., three centuries before the publication of the Cu fan tu is also devoid of historical value. The only thing that seems certain is that in the XVIIIth century A.D., the glorious Sumatran empire collapsed. Malay in the help of the Javanese regained her former suzerainty which had been lost in the seventh century; and the Thais of Sukhothay came down on the lower Menam and seized all the colonial possessions of San-fu-ni on the Malay peninsula.


(GABRIEL FERRAND)

ZABANIYA. [See MALÌTIK] ZABID, a town in the Tihāma of Yaman, on the road running from north to south from Mecca to Aden, halfway between the Yaman highlands and the Red Sea, about 16 miles from the coast. At this distance the country is suitable for agriculture in view of the better water-supply, and the town itself is adjoined by two wādīs, in the north the Wâdr Rima’ and the south the perennial Wâdr Zabid, from which it has taken the name which has replaced the original al-Husain. In contrast to the rest of the Tihāma it is famous for its gardens with date-palms,
a little corn, indigo and various medicinal plants; the hides of Zabūd are also well known. Along with Bait al-Faţīhī and a few smaller places, it is an important centre for the weaving of garments.

Zabūd has always been the capital of a district (miḥlāt). It adopted Islam in the year 10 (631) and its first governor was Khālid b. Sa‘d b. ‘Abd-Azīz. It took no part in the Nījiṣa wars. It became important under the Ziyādids as the capital of an independent province. Muhammad, a descendant of Ziyād b. Abī Sufyān (b. Abī Huibah), granted the Tihāma by the caliph al-Mu‘āmin, gave the town in Shā'bān 204 (beg. 820). its circular form with four towers (it is still called al-Mu‘ammmara) and made the squaddīs from the wāis al-Ṭihāma were followed from 954 (1026-1029) by the Abyssinian Mamlikūs, the Bani Naṣīr b. Abī Sufyān. Both dynasties remained under ‘Abbāsid suzerainty and were Sanṭṭe, but the capital itself was for a time in ‘Umayyad hands; at the end of the third century it was burned by the Kaṭāranī ‘Abī b. ‘Abd-Azīz and about 579 (898) taken for a time by ‘Abd Allah b. Kaḥfūn of the Bani Ya‘fur [q.v.]. The latter acknowledged the Fāṭimid caliphate, as did the Ṣuḥālī [q.v.] who came down from the highlands and interrupted the rule of the Bani Naṣīr in Zabūd for the greater part of the years 452-481 (1060-1088). They did not however become their successors; but after the interlude of the Khālid Muhādīs [q.v.] the Egyptian successor of the Fāṭimids, the Ayyūbīd Saladin, sent his brother Tīrāshīnāsh there at the beginning of 570 (1175), and he had the Mahdī Abī al-Nabī executed. When the third Ayyūbī of the Yaman, Ismā‘īl b. Yaghūqīn, who wanted to play the part of an independent caliph, came down in 580 (1201) by his own Kurdish soldiers at Zabūd, rule practically passed into the hands of the ‘Abbāsids until Umar, son of ‘Abī b. Ṣarāf, the Ayyūbīd governor of Mecca, in 620 (1220) founded the Rasa’ilī sūfīkhahīn. This was followed in 858 (1454) by the Tahiri who claimed to be ‘Umayyad descended from the caliph ‘Umār b. ‘Abd al-Aswā. After a temporary occupation by the Meccan ‘Abhīrāb Abū Nūnīn Muhāmmad (922-1316) and then by irregular troops during the fighting between the Egyptian Mamlikūs and the Ottomans, the latter had governors there from 943-1045 (1536-1635). The Zaidis [q.v.], the only Yaman power that had survived all previous dynasties and had made a previous attempt to gain a footing in the Tihāma, were able to drive the Turks from the coast also.

After the second Ottoman occupation (1529-1358 = 1872-1918), the Zaidis again became lords of the Tihāma after fighting the Ikhrids [q.v.] of Aswā. Zabūd has many important buildings dating from the days in which this town was a royal residence. These buildings have stood very well as they are mostly built of brick, which gives the town a rather gloomy look. Even in Niebuhr's time however, the town had decayed considerably and the chronicles record much damage by fire and also from wars and even numerous showers of volcanic ash that have fallen upon it. When the Turks moved the capital to the Tihāma and made the road run further north, starting from the fort of Hodālā [q.v.] and later founding Zabūd, its trade fell considerably. In the adult Zaidi state which has expanded into the kingdom of Yaman, Zabūd is merely a provincial town. It retains a certain importance as the home of Sufī's tradition, from which the spiritual welfare of the non-Zaidi part of the country is cared for. The nīkāh Zabūdī is still a common one among Yaman scholars.


(R. Skrothmann)

**ZABŪR (n.),** probably a loanword from the South, but already used by pre-Islamic poets in the sense of: "will"; in this sense it is still found in al-Farandāz, Nadīh b. MA.XX.I. From the second Makkān period onwards, Muhammad uses the plural sabīr in order to denote the revealed books (Surās 181; xvi. 46; xxiv. 23) as well as the heavenly writings, in which human deeds are recorded (Surās 43, 52). The singular sabūr, on the other hand, occurs in the Qur'ān exclusively in connection with Dāwūd. In the early Qur'ān xvii. 57 Muhammad says that Allah has given Dāwūd one sabūr. The same sabūr he mentions another time, vix. in Surā iv. 161, and in Surā xxi. 95 he quotes from this sabūr Psalm xxxviii. 28, in an almost literal translation. Possibly the pre-Islamic poets were already acquainted with Dāwūd as the author of the sabūr; it is e. g. not impossible that this is meant by Imra‘ al-Ka‘ī when he mentions a "sabūr in the books of the monks" (ku‘āhā sabūr ‘alā fi masjīdī hu allahū, lxi. 4). At any rate, this use of the term sabūr (apart from the question whether Muhammad was the first to make use of it) is based on its affinity in sound with Hebrew masūrān, Syriac masūrān, Arabic masūrārīn, and in analogy with Arabic sabūr, was identified with the latter's meaning "writ". Apart from Surā xxi. 95 the Qur'ān contains other passages bearing a close resemblance to verses from the Psalms, even from Psalm civ. Moreover the majority of the passages in the Qur'ān which remind us, by sense or sound, of the Bible, are from the Psalms. The commentators on the Qur'ān recognise that the sabūr mentioned in Surā iv. 161 is the book of Dāwūd bearing this name; it is only some of the Kūfīn commentators who propose to read the plural sabīr in the sense of "writings". Tabari rejects this view (Tabari, Tafsir, vi. 15). Ahmād b. Abī Allīh b. Sa‘lām, a sabūr of the caliph Hārūn, it is said, identifies the sabūr with the masūrārīn.
ZACHARIAS. [See ZAKARIYAH.] 

ZAPAR, 1. now a group of towns near an insignificant village in southern Yaman, about 10 miles S.W. of Yarith, celebrated in ancient times as the capital of the Himyar kingdom (also called ZAPAR'; see Yarth, Muq'im, iii. 576; i. 196; South Arabian inscriptions give the radicals r-f-f-r; it is reproduced in Ethiopic as ZAFAR). The royal city is mentioned by Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* vi. 104 as regia Sappara and in the *Periplus Mar. Erythrae*, § 23 as *Σαφαρ*, to which *μαζευτα* (Kara'ot) ["king of the Homerites (Himyar) and Sabaeans"] referred. Of that dynasty, which, succeeding the kings of *Saba* under the name "kings of *Saba* and *Qud Ridda*" was predominant in South Arabia from earliest times, the last of the second century B.C. According to this evidence of the *Periplus*, the Sabaeans were already subjects of the Himyar kings and there was still a Himyar kingdom in the time of Pliny's sources.

The next reference to the capital Zafar in Graeco-Roman literature is *Ptolemy*, v. 7, 41 (viii. 22, 16) where among the towns of the interior of Arabia Felix *Σαφαρ* (vulg. Σαφαρ) is noted which is mentioned i.e. exactly as in the *Periplus*. Of the two variants in the MSS. for the longitude in *Ptolemy*, 78° and 88°, the former is to be preferred: it is also given by al-Hambani, *Sia Djawat al-^Arab* (ed. D. H. Müller, Leyden 1884, p. 28) while in his *Titi* (in D. H. Müller, *Die Burgen und Schlösser Süd arabiens*, in *S. A. Ab. Wiss., xci.* [1879], 417) he gives "77°. As the coast town *Mecca* in *Ptolemy* has the longitude 87° 30' (var. 88° 10' and 88° 30') and the same latitude 14° as Zafar, E. Glaser, *Die Geschichte und Geographie Arabiens*, Berlin 1890, ii. 180 said this variant in the longitude of Zafar was clearly only a mistake by a copyist of the post-Ptolemaic period, who confused this Yaman Zafar with the Zafar which had meanwhile arisen in the east near Moscha. This supposition is based on Glaser's erroneous location of Moscha (see No. 3); it is also from the first probable that in the transmission of *Ptolemy* we have had a mistake in the numeral for 7 just as in the variant in the longitude of Moscha. His statement that "we can only allocate to the Sabaeans the Metrocopi mentioned by *Ptolemy*, because its situation will not fit the then undoubtedly very limited Himyar territories" and that "in the period of the 'kings of *Saba* and *Qud Ridda* Mardii was undoubtedly the royal residence" and that this city had been in ruins "for centuries by *Ptolemy's time" (*op. cit.*, p. 240, 242) are only the results of his views on the chronology of the development of the Himyar kingdom and are moreover in contradiction to the testimony of the classical sources just quoted, with which latter the inscriptions can best be reconciled (cf. also the article MARDII).

The *Σαφαρία* (in most MSS. Σαφαρία) according to *Ptolemy*, v. 7, 45 living near the Homerites were the inhabitants of the town and district around it, i.e. the ruling stock. There are no references to Zafar as a district in Arabic literature, e.g. in *Jārist*, but it is no longer found as a tribal name (*Spranger, Die alte Geographie Arabiens*, Berne 1875, p. 311). A road may have branched off to Yarith and Zafar from the road mentioned in the *Periplus* which led east from the port of Mokhā; that the capital played a part in commerce is intelligible. On the road in *Ptolemy's* map see *Spranger*, *op. cit.*, p. 183 sq.

It is to this Zafar that Philostorgius (first third of the fifth century), *Hist. eccl.* iii. 4, refers in telling of the conversion of the Homerites to Christianity c. 354-355 in the time of Constantius II (357-361; cf. the extract in *Nicene Histories Callistus*, ix. 18) at whose insigilation Theophilus,
later bishop, obtained from the Himyar rulers permission to erect churches in Täqṣaṣ, 'Aden and Hormut. In opposition to this definite statement, Glaser (op. cit., p. 181) considered that Täqṣaṣ did not mean the Himyar city but the one on the coast (No. 2), a term similar to Himyar, Bertholdo, Berlin 1840, viii/xii, p. 65). There is however not the slightest probability that Philostorgius was wrong in identifying this Zafr with Yathrib. The conversion of the Himyar king to Christianity is put by Theocharidou, xp, 217 (cf. Nicephoros, xxxii, 37) in the reign of Anastasius (491-518). A Syriac geographical literature is connected with the name of Gorgonius, bishop of Zafr about the middle of the sixth century, Zafr is also mentioned by Amainius Marcellinus (end of the fourth century) xxiii, as Taphurah, and by the Ravenna geographer (seventh century), ii, 6, as Tafra; the latter calls Himyar Omalitita; it finally appears as Taphra in Stephano's Byzantine s.v., who, as a grammatical, is only concerned with the form of the name.

About the middle of the fourth century the Himyar kingdom had been conquered by the Axumites, but by the last quarter of the century most kings again gained the upper hand. The ruler of Zafr mentioned by Philostorgius as friendly to the Christians was therefore either a governor appointed by the Axumites (cf. macedeni, macedeni: Glaser, De Albigensi in Arabi et Africa, Munich 1893, p. 160) like Samsah in the year 525, or the reconquest of the country, the rulers of which were still the Axumites according to an inscription put up shortly before 356 (cf. Saba, iv, p. 49) had already been successfully begun by the Himyar between 355. It was not till 525 that the Abyssinians again won supremacy over Himyar but about 570 they were overthrown by the Persians. Tull then Zafr had been the capital of South Arabia. The last Persian governor in Sana was a convert to Islam in 628.

According to Ibn Khurdadshlim, p. 143; al-Mašídi, Muruj, iii, 175; Yakh, iii, 577 (ii, 234) there was an inscription on the gate of Zafr to this effect: "Who held royal sway over Zafr? The excellent Himyar. Who became lord afterwards? The wicked Abyssinians, Who came next? The noble Persians. For whom had they to make way? The Kurashi, the traders. Who will next win the lordship of Zafr? It will again fall to the Himyar." This expresses very neatly the history of the changes in the hegemony of South Arabia. That Zafr was the capital of the Himyar kings is testified, in enumeration of the Greek and Roman authors, by the Arab geographers, historians and lexicographers, e.g., Ibn Khurdadshlim, vi, 140; al-Ma'ésteddi, ii, 177; Jazawari, s.v.; Yakh, iii, 577 (812 in the quotation from a poet); the Kamar, s.v.; Tad al-'Arab, iii, 370; the Lakhm-nawadd. The royal capital of Raidah in Zafr is mentioned by Ibn Khurdadshlim, p. 140, who notes the verse of Imron's K-kaiz (206a) in Ashurād, Tih Dhuwar, al-Hamdani in Jih, p. 410 and 414 (in the verse from A'sad Tubba), al-Bakri's Maqāla, s.v.; Yakh, ii, 385; iii, 442. (where the form Zaidan is altered by D. H. Müller in Jih, p. 410, as a mss. reading, to Raidan [of the same form in Ritter, xii, 253 from Istidi]).

Sāh There is below on Glaser's explanation of the Raidah (the inscriptions). Iridi, I, 478 sq. (ed. Jaubert, Paris 1856) also describes Zafr as one of the most important and most celebrated towns in Yemen, which was the residence of the kings of Yemen. According to him, it is in the district of Yathrib, which was also called Zafr. Ma'gidshla, H.G., iii, 70 (55) in his survey of the two parts of the Yemen, al-Thāima and al-Najjar, mention Zafr among the towns of Najdi. Sprenge, Die Pest und Reisezweige der Ostrom, ii, 435, L. Kunde der Morgenl., iii, 3, Leipzig 1864, p. 109 though this referred to Zafr. This identification which is also found in H. C. Kay, Tawar, its early medieval History, London 1894, p. 246 (and on his map) is not convincing; he also wrongly writes Yathrib. Yathrib (Yahṣib) is the name of Māighdi (cf. besides Iridi also Yakh, ii, 385), who says the city of Raidah is in this Māighdi and gives the further detail that in Zafr was in Yahṣib and quotes the verses of A'sad Tubba in Jih, op. cit., p. 414, according to which Zafr with the tribal capital of Raidah lay in the plain of Yathrib. According to Jih, p. 410, Zafr was known as Ḥāl (plateau) of Yathrib. In Ṭab, iv, 436 there is a reference to Yathrib al-Aw, Zafr. Sprenge's explanation of the statement in Ibn Khurdadshlim (op. cit.; "Yathrib is the name of the town and the castle where the king..." is called Zafr") (Perestemo, op. cit., p. 147) is wrong. The meaning is rather: "Yathrib, in it (of the town of Zafr and its castle Raddah)."

According to Iridi, this castle was in his time a remnant of the royal palace there; he speaks also of other traces of its ancient prosperity. In Tabari, ed. de Goeje, i, 326, the foundation of Zafr is traced to the Himyar kings; al-Hamdani gives in Jih (op. cit., p. 412) a description of the situation of Zafr on the slope of a hill near the town of the Sakhir (Mankath; there are still ruins in the village of Munkat, near Zafr with Himyarite inscriptions found by Seetzen; cf. D. H. Müller, op. cit., p. 370) he quotes there (p. 414) a line of "Amz b. Tutha" who mentions inscriptions in Zafr and lines from "Alkama which refer in laudatory terms to Zafr. In the Siba, p. 203, he mentions Zafr among the celebrated places of the Yemen with old castles. As an illustration of his remarks on the reduction of degrees of longitude in Ptolomy, to those of the eastern astronomers, he chooses the position of Zafr and deals (op. cit., p. 27) with the Ptolemaic positions of this town and of Sana, both of which are on the same meridian (so also p. 28 and 44; cf. also 45), Zafr being about 3 days' journey farther south (which on the whole agrees with Niebuhr's estimate that Zafr is 21 south of Sana). On p. 201 he gives from the geographical point of view nothing more definite than that Zafr is in the neighbourhood of Sana, similarly Yakh, iii, 577 (where he adds that some hold the view that Zafr was Sana itself), the Khudami, s.v. (cf. Jazawari, s.v.) and the Tad al-'Arab, iii, 370, which quotes Yakh. D. H. Müller, Burschev, p. 69 shows that Yakh, iii, 422 compares Zafr with Sana ' (but see No. 3). The Arab tradition of the history and genealogy of the Himyar kings, the Tuba's, is for the most part unhistorical.

Yakh distinguishes in the Muqaddim (cf. iii, 577) between this Zafr and the place of the same name on the coast (No. 4) in the Muqaddim.
distinction is not pointed out. Arab writers occasionally confused the two towns, as have some modern authorities. C. Niebuhr, Beschreibung von Arabien, Copenhagen 1772, p. 230 and Ritter, cit., p. 254 and others have lamented this; the latter however makes the same mistake, cf. p. 65 and 253. Abu 'l-Fida' in his description which confuses the two towns (other cases under No. 2) only says that Zafar is in Yaman; all his other statements apply to the coast town.

Al-Hamdani in ittîbil, op. cit., p. 416 and with variations, al-Bakri, op. cit., p. 464 and Yâkût, ill. 577 give in the form of a brief anecdote to explain the saying “Who comes to Zafar must understand Himyar” (or “Zafar belongs to the Himyars”) as an example of specifically Himyar idiom. The Arabs distinguish between the sons of the older, younger and nearest Himyars, i.e. between Himyars, in the widest, usual and strictest sense (Sprunger, Geographie, p. 72 cf.). One may only speak of a Himyar dialect (on some peculiarities, see Sprunger, p. 74) among the Himyars in the narrowest use of the name. In the tenth century AB. are mentioned as districts in which pure Himyar was spoken, the territory west of San'a, and south of Hadramaut as far as Ḥaḍītā (ill. an area which includes Yârîm and Zafar (references for Himyar areas in Sprunger, Das Leben... der Mohammaden, Berlin 1863, ill. 438). Himyar and the mixed speech of the adjoining districts used, according to Frennel, to be inaccurately called Yâkût, a term which was wrongly extended also to Mehri and the Ḫaḍîr dialect (Ḥaḍîr) or to what Glaser calls Shâhr. The language of the old Himyar inscriptions in the strict sense is closer to Saqaf than the language of the second great group of South Arabian inscriptions, Minaean.

These two pure Himyar districts are fertile and well suited for agriculture. The soil of Zafar also yields a semi-precious stone: the onyx of Zafar is mentioned by al-Hamdani, ittîbil, p. 415 (with quotations from the poets); Dżahwarî, Yâkût, ill. 577; Lütne al-'Arab, vi. 192; Kâmilî, Tâbîb, loc. cit. (cf. Lane in. v. gata on the meaning of the word and Sprunger, op. cit., p. 62).

After the last occupation of Zafar by the Abyssinians, of which we have a full account in the Martyrium Aethiopum and after the extinction of the South Arabian kingdom and still more after the rise of Islam the former royal capital gradually fell into decay, especially as it was cut off from the main routes of traffic. In the later history of the Yaman it plays with its mountainous surrounding a subordinate role as a fortified place in connection with military operations. When, for example, after the Ziyâdî dynasty had died out (409 = 1018) and naqājî had taken Zabid and assumed the royal title (412), the walis there held out in their strongholds in the mountains; among these were (according to 'Ummâr al-Hakami, Tâbîb al-Yaman, ed. Kay, op. cit., p. 12) al-Nâqîl ("pass"), which Kay, p. 246 explains as Naqîl Sumâra near Zafar.

The information supplied by modern travellers agrees with the statements of the Arab authors. Cf. also: Niebuhr, Beschreibung von Arabien, Copenhagen 1772, p. 94, 236, 290; Ritter, Beschreibung von Arabien, 1. 400; the article SABA', iv. p. 15-18; D. H. Müllner, Sabaïsche Denkmäler, Vienna 1883, p. 85; Plate VI (inscription); W. Harris, A Journey through the Yaman, Edinburgh-London, p. 35; Glaser, Die Abessinier, p. 58, 100, 116; do., in M. V. A. G., 1897, iv. 41; do., Skt. s. ii. 41; Schramm, Handbuch der altarabischen Altertumskunde, Copenhagen-Paris-London 1927, p. 21, 88; Hommel, Ethnologie und Geographie der Alten Orienten, Munich 1926, p. 650, 711; Onniander, in Z. D. M. G., xix. 1865, p. 180; C. J. S., iv. 8, No. 312.

2. A ruined site S.W. of San'a. The Tâbi' al-'Arabs (ill. 370) mentions from al-Saghâma, in addition to the two towns of the same name (see No. 4), also two castles named Zafar, one north, the other south of San'a.

3. A fortified hill about 20 miles N.W. of San'a near Kawakabân.

4. Name of a very old town, which has been in ruins since the end of the middle ages, and of the plain around it, in the corner of S. Arabia on the Indian Ocean now usually reckoned to Mahra. Ibn Khalidî, Tâbîb (see the extract in Kay, op. cit., p. 133) gives the localisation Zafar and al-Mâqîrî, De valle Hadramaut, ed. Berlin 1866, p. 69, says it should be pronounced Zofar as does Maluza in the introduction to his edition of Wende's Reise in Hadramaut, Brunswick 1873, p. 24, 39; it is pronounced Zâfīr, Z robe and now occasionally also Zofar. That the town is already referred to in Greek literature is practically certain; it is to be sought among the places mentioned by Ptolemy on the sea-coast. Sprunger, who emphasises that Ptolemy used information given by travellers from India and along the Arabian coast for his description of the south east coast of Arabia, is probably right (Geographie, p. 95 sq.) in pointing to the place on Ptolemy's map (vi. 7, 11) which corresponds to the location of Zafar, namely the monteîn A'rabîsî, mentioned among the towns of the Eyyûzûn which contains a translation of al-Kammar ("Diana") which we also find in Dżâbîl al-Kammar "Mountains of the Moon", Ghubbat al-Kammar "Bay of the Moon", on which Zafar actually lies. The position of the "Oracle of the Moon" according to Ptolemy's statements brings us quite near Raisîl (called Kârnâz [Parœën] in Ptolemy just before), the former port. From this place stretches a well watered plain about 9 hours' journey in length and an hour's journey wide at Tâka, where it is broadest. It also runs into the hills and is now called Zafar (Sprunger, op. cit., p. 96). Carter (see below) found the ruins of some six towns there. Whether these were the successive capitals of Zafar, as Sprunger thought, is another question which can no longer be answered.

Sprunger also conceded the impossibility of ascertaining where the "Oracle of the Moon" had been situated. With reference to the statement of Ibn Bâjî, op. cit., ii. 203 that there was a sanctuary with the tomb of Had (see also i. 205) half a day's journey from the latter: Zafar (i.e. Manfra) and a mosque on the coast in a fishing village, Sprunger thought that this mosque and tomb were the "Temple of the Moon". The latter however could only be recognised in one of the two buildings, presumably only in the former. Its position, according to Sprunger, agrees with Tâka in 54° 22' East Long., 17° 2' N. Lat., "on an inlet, which could be used as a harbour for rafts and boats". This location should be modified in the light of Bent's statements and the ancient
Zafar he sought in a ruined site east of Taka (see below).

We cannot support Glaser's view (Stenz, ii. 97, 180) that the Abinaa wall mentioned by Ptolemy immediately after μαυρίων ἀρχιπελάγος which Sprunger, op. cit., p. 97 said was the port of Zafar and identified with Mirbat, was Zafar itself and Moscha, Periplus, p. 32, its harbour (the latter already suggested in Rüter, op. cit., xii. 329; also Glaser, Abessinien, p. 90 sq.; Hommel, Ethnologie, p. 654); identical with Khor el-Beidh, and that the name Zafar probably only appeared in the district after the time of Ptolemy, either for Abissa polys or for Moscha (Stenz, p. 180; Abessinien, p. 187 sq.), against these topographical arguments, which, by the way, still leave undecided the place to which the name Zafar is said to have been transferred, is the fact that there is not the slightest probability in its favour and also that it is in direct contradiction to Ptolemy's map and that of the Periplus and that, as Glaser himself has to confess, Moscha, which Ptolemy puts west of Cape Syagros (Ras al-Fartak) must, according to the Periplus, which Sprunger prefers to Ptolemy for the description of the Shīrīr coast, be sought about 10 miles west of Mirbat. There is now no harbour at Khor el-Beidh, but a lagoon (Glaser, Stenz, p. 181); on the other hand Moscha in Ptolemy as well as in the Periplus is described as καιρός and this significance is particularly emphasised in the latter. Moscha is probably Maqishi, a harbour in East Long. 51° 52' 'less than an hour's journey west of Ras Fartak and sheltered from the south wind' (Sprunger, op. cit., p. 85). Sprunger's assumption that in the transmission of Ptolemy the true position of Moscha has been dropped out is possible but not, it seems, necessary. His location agrees with the statement of the Arab authors, e.g. Yalghi, iii. 577; iv. 481, that the harbour of Zafar which had no suitable anchorage (so also Ibn Khalduhn, op. cit., p. 135 ed. Kay) was Mirbat, about 5 parasangs distant and much visited by merchants, and also with the fact that the Ras Fartak near which he would locate Moscha and of which Ibn al-Mudjāwar tells us that it is built at the entrance to the 'Gulf of the Moon' and that there is a landing-place there for ships from India, is in modern times the first landmark for which steamers from Bombay make (Sprunger, op. cit.). New material for a confirmation of this view is given, in part unintentionally and unconsciously, by Th. Bent, Southern Arabia, London 1900, p. 240 sqq. He says it is certain that the ruins on the coast at the modern al-Balad (el-Beld, according to Glaser, Stenz, p. 181; also Abessinien, p. 184 [so also Fresnel, Attil of the English chart]) about 2 miles east of the present capital al-Ḥāfa (Dhufar) are those of the old capital of this territory. When he adds that there is no difficulty in following Sprunger in identifying this town with the μαυρίων ἀρχιπελάγος, he is inaccurate in as much as Sprunger expressly distinguishes Taka, where he sought the original Zafar, from al-Balad to the west of it, the presumed site of the later Mançuṣ. This ruined site, according to Bent, containing ruinins of Sabean temples, last inhabited during the Persian invasion about 500 A. D., is the largest and most interesting in the whole plain. Bent who (p. 265) gives inaccurately Glaser's identification of Abissa polys and Moscha, further says that the point on the coast near the river Kori, which is particularly broad at its mouth (so in the map he gives of the Zafar territory [*from a survey by Imam Shairsh, Khan Bahadur*, his travelling companion]; the description of the water as Kho Koury in Bent, p. 270 is wrong; see Glaser, Abessinien, p. 185; the English chart has Kho Reeri, Crutcheden: Khoore Kiri) and the rocky island of Khatiya on the coast is Abissa polys and also Moscha. But only a little west of this point in 54° 25' is Taka (54° 22') at which Sprunger sought to locate the μαυρίων ἀρχιπελάγος and later Glaser, Abessinien, p. 187, Abissa polys, which left him for 'the Oracle of the Moon', which Bent very arbitrarily thought lay in the ruins of a Himyar town in the Wadi Naḥas not far from al-Ḥafṣ, "only Alkabūd or Robat or one of the ruined sites farther inland, e.g. in the Wadi Nefsa" which is not plausible. We may look for the site of the ancient Zafar and of the *Oracle of the Moon*, perhaps also of the sanctuary mentioned by Ibn Battuta, in the ruins which Bent (p. 269) found east of Taka a little further west than Sprunger and at the adjacent river mouth, the Khor Kori, the landing place for the town. Glaser's statement (Stenz, p. 184) "the ruins of Zafar are at Alkabud, Alkhabūd, Ṭallūd and Khor el-Beidh" is insufficent. Bent was also wrong about Mārṣqa, which he identified with Mokhi, "as not unusual name for harbours on the Arabian coast". He took no account of the inaccuracy of the statements about the Shīrīr coast in the text of the Periplus as transmitted to us (§ 32). That the latter means Raṣīṭ by the centre of the Sachallite frankincense trade is not so certain as it is usually assumed to be. The mistake, which is repeated by Bent, arises from the fact that this place is called Moscha.

The lord of the frankincense country under Himyar rule at the time of the Periplus, § 32, was the king of Ḥaṭramūt. That Ptolemy refers to Ḥaṭramūtians between the Omanites and the merchants of al-Maḥramūt does not justify the deduction that the frankincense coast properly (from Zafarward) was wholly or in part a Ḥaṭramūtian colony.

The coast town of Zafar is most probably older than the Himyar capital, it was long ago with great probability identified with "Sephar, a mount of the east" of Genesis x. 30.

The Araš sometimes place Zafar in Mahra, with which the present attribution agrees, sometimes, which comes to the same thing, in the Shīrīr territory (coast of Mahra), so Yalghi, iii. 577, Abu l-Fida (see Hommel, op. cit., p. 30), Ibn Khalduhn (ed. Kay, op. cit., p. 132), Tāfriḥ, iii. 370, sometimes, less accurately, in Oman (Sprunger, Geographie, p. 92). According to Ibn Battuta, ii. 196, it is at the extreme end of Yaman (l. 205, it is simply called a town of Yaman); in a note in a manuscript of the Maragid (quoted by Wustenfeld, Arab. Studi, v. 24) it is described as the remotest town of Yaman; Mahra [q.v.] is included in the Arab geography of Yaman. Yalghi, iii. 577, after mentioning the capital of Yaman, speaks of the celebrated town of his time by the same name on the coast of the Indian Ocean (this location also in iii. 432, iv. 481 [where the form Zifr is used; cf. the reading in Ibn Khurāṣhī, B.G.A., vi. 146], in Ibn Battuta and Tāfriḥ, iii. 370); in the last mentioned passage Yalghi describes it in general terms as situated between Ḥaṭramūt and Oman (cf. l. 196 and the addenda in B.G.A., iv. 432 to Ibn Hawṣkal, p. 32 [also on the distance between
Zafar and Mirbajj, the Zaman briefly; near Mirbajj.
In the principal passage, Yakut tells us that in the mountains at some distance from the town of Zafar, frankincense grows and a share in the proceeds is given to the independent lord of the town who has established a monopoly of trade in it; then follows remarks on the gathering of the frankincense which has to be taken to the town (a similar account briefly in iv. 481).

Zafar is in the frankincense district proper; its extent as given in Yakut is much too small, as is evident from the statements of other Arab geographers and especially from Carter's investigations, whose western boundary at 52° 47' to 55° 23' East Long, is too far east, as we know from Glaser's survey, who corrected his own figures in course of time and from Bent, Hirsch and the South Arabian expedition of the Vienna Academy.

The name Zafar ("aromatic plant") originally perhaps meant simply the idea which the Greeks expressed by Αἴθαυρα. Fresnel's idea (Sur la géographie de l'Arabie, Lettre, iv., in J. As., sec. iii., vol. iv., 1858, p. 518), followed by Ritter (xii. 252, 260), that the Himyar town was called Zafar after the coast town out of rivalry of it, was wrong. Probably this name was used for the former in another sense, as the "victorious", as in the lines of As'ad 'Tabba', Dibbil, op. cit., p. 410 (= Al-Bakri, p. 464). Accounts of the frankincense country were brought to Europe by Portuguese seafarers; we find an echo of these in Camoës, Os Lusiadas, x. 101, s.: "Olha Dofar insignes, porque manda O mais cheiroso incenso pera nos".

Yakut (li. 881) speaks in almost the same words as al-Hamdani (Qashrati, p. 51) of a coast road that leads from 'Aden via Zafar passing Raïat on the left to Omân, Ibn al-Mud'jar who visited Zafar c. 619 A.H. gives the various stages on the road from Shiham in Hadramout to Zafar with the distances (fuller details in Spruner, Portraits, p. 144: do., Geographie, p. 164). He observed that pepper, sugar-cane and numerous kinds of fruit flourish at Zafar and that between Hadramout and 'Oman there were traces of old terraces on which the frankincense tree had been planted; this latter remark is confirmed by Bent. He tells of a safe caravan route from Baghdad to Zafar, by which the Beduins twice a year bring horses which they exchange for spices and costly robes. According to him, Ahmad b. Abû Allah (618 = 1221) destroyed Zafar and built Mahfûr not far from it to which the name Zafar later passed; in his time the district was in possession of the Hadramoutis. According to Ibn Khalidin (Kay, op. cit., p. 133), the destruction took place in 619 and the name (al-Ahmadiya) of the new Zafar was given from the name of the destroyer.

In Abu l-Fida's account, the confusion in which (see above) was recognised by Niebuhr, Beschreibung, p. 236 and Hommel, op. cit., p. 30 sqq. (with references to the earlier literature) showed in more detail, without being himself completely free from errors, we are told of the coast town in addition to what has already been mentioned, that it lies at the top of a gulf and has trade with India, is surrounded by gardens (cf. Ibn al-Fakhri, B.G.A., v. 109) and betel and cocoa grow there. Ibn Batuta's description is similar (li. 196 sqq.). The latter about 730 (1329-1330) sailed from Kilwa to Zafar, over a century after the destruction of the old town. He tells us that the town stood isolated on a wide plain (cf. Yakut, iv. 481) but gives noteworthy details about the rich orchards and spice yielding trees and plants (betel, cocoa) in the neighbourhood and their economic importance. The Zafar described by Ibn Batuta was also an important commercial centre.

With reference to the ancient history we may here mention a suggestion by Glaser, that Zafar was the old Hābabī capital (cf. Khīra, p. 181; Hommel, Ethnologie, p. 654). It is certain that in the early middle ages, like South Arabia generally, it passed for a time under Persian influence. Its importance at a later date was the Persian attempt at invasion in 665 (1265) when the emir Maḥmūd b. Ahmad al-Kūst, lord of Hormūz, conquered and plundered Zafar. Soon afterwards Shāh b. Idris, ruler of Zafar, quarrelled with al-Maqsūr, the second ruler of the Muqaffarid dynasty. His troops were defeated by those of Yaman in 678 (1278) and Zafar surrendered (Kay, op. cit., p. 311, on Ibn Khalidin, p. 132). In Ibn Batuta's time, Zafar was independent of Yaman.

Marco Polo, the contemporary of Abu 'l-Fida, had heard of Zafar as one of the most important sources of frankincense. Niebuhr, Beschreibung, p. 236, 262, rightly distinguishes between the two towns of the same name but he could learn nothing of the second except that there was "on the S.E. coast of Arabia a town and harbour" of Zafar, similarly p. 286 where he refers to the export of frankincense (p. 143 sqq. on the growing of frankincense). The first more accurate particulars of this region in modern times were given by the English Coast Survey Commission, J. R. Wellsted who came here in 1833, describes Mirbat and the coast west of it (Travels in Arabia, London 1838, ii. 453 sqq. and Travels to the City of the Caliphs, London 1840, ii. 129 sqq.). In 1837 C. J. Cruttenden went by land from Mirbat to al-Dakhira, the chief town of the coast region of Zafar (see Journal of an Excursion from Marseill to Dyre, in Proceed. of Bombay Geog. Soc., 1837, p. 70 sqq. [Transactions... 1844, p. 184 sqq.]). He established what Fresnel from his information in Ldidda and Haines confirmed that in his time there was no longer a town of Zafar but that, as is still true, the district from Mirbat to Raïat bears this name.

At about the same time Fresnel (see his Lettres, op. cit., p. 251 sqq.) learned from Muljain, his adviser on linguistic points, that the ruins at el-Belid which the latter had visited, still retained traces of the splendid of an old city of Zafar (i.e. probably Mansīt) and that there were now only three or four houses standing. Fresnel wrongly took this Zafar for the Himyar capital (like Ibn Khalidin) and el-Belid for its harbour. Wellsted's Travels are supplemented by Capt. S. B. Haines, Memoir of the South and East Coasts of Arabia, J.R.G.S., London 1845, xv. 104 sqq. Wellsted's information came partly from the observations made by Haines's expedition and published preliminary but without the latter's authority (see Ritter, xli. 668 and the extract p. 645 sqq.). H. J. Carter, whose account (A Description of the frankincense tree of Arabia, in J. Bombay Br. R.A.S., 1847, lii. 380 sqq.) was too late for Ritter, xlii. 356 sqq. to use, gave further details of the occurrence of the frankincense tree. Glaser gives (Skicse, p. 180 sqq;
Abeyesiner, p. 184 sq.) from his own explorations several places on the coast called Zafar of which the only evidence has been mentioned by Fresnel, Curtenden and Haines.

Our knowledge of the plain of Zafar was simplified by Bent who travelled in 1849-1850 along the coast (see the section Dhour and the Gour Mountains in his book p. 237 sqq.). He gives several places hitherto unknown and fixes the frankincense area more definitely; its size, he says, is not much bigger than that of the island of Wight. The Wāt of al-Haṣa is the de facto lord of the plain of Zafar; the land is only nominally under the sultan of ʿOman, as belonging to the inamite of Masqūt (cf. also Glaser, Abeyesiner, p. 126). Yākūṭ, Ibn al-Mudājāwir and Ibn Raffīl (see above) also mention an independent sultan of Zafar and of modern travellers, Niebuhr. (op. cit., p. 287) already mentions the "independent shah" there. The district never came under Turkish rule; the Tur- kish attempt to subdue it towards the end of the last century failed. Bent describes the frankincense trade as unimportant; the Khāz Beduins (Glaser, Abeyesiner, p. 185 also gives the native pronunciation Khāz) bring the frankincense from the mountains to the coast on camels (this recalls ʿUqayl, iii. 357). He saw stores of frankincense at al-Haṣa. The road to the mountains runs through an area which is full of frankincense trees and has a rich vegetation generally. In ancient times the cultivation of frankincense was probably not much more extensive, Myrrh also is found in the mountains. He tells us, like Carter, that the savage Beduins live in caves in the mountains; this gives modern confirmation of the statement in the Fihrist, § 32 regarding the Troglodytes [see wanJā]. They seem to be the representatives of the earliest inhabitants. Their language is not understood by the Arabs; this recalls what al-Ṭāḥāṣīr, al-Dīri and Ibn al- Mudājāwir say about Ṭehā [see MAHRA]. — Bent is supplemented by C. Cranford, The Dhour District, in Geogr. Journ., London 1919 (p. 101 sqq., a description of the ruins of al-Badlī). Glaser was the first to devote attention to the language of the people of the plain and mountains of Zafar (cf. Abeyesiner, p. 182 sqq.) on his accurate reproductions of ʿArabī see Hommel, Ethnologie, p. 153. The specimens of language in Bent, op. cit., p. 275 sq. are to be used with a certain amount of caution. A series of texts was taken down by N. Rhodokanakis from the mouth of a native in 1904 in Vienna; they are published in vol. viii. of the Sūkrūbarī Expedition, Vienna 1908 (Der sudanarabische Dialekt im Ṭafir (Zafār); vol. x. 1911) contains the glossary and grammar. In vol. vii. of the same series D. H. Müller published texts in the language of the hill people from the same native authority (Sawārī-Texte, 1907); see also M. Bittner, Studien zur Ṭafir-Sprache, 1-iv., in S. E. Ak. Wien, 1919-1925.

Bibliography: The information in the Arabic, Greek and Roman authors and the works of Sprenger, D. H. Müller (Glaser, Hommel) has already been quoted with bibliographical details. We may further mention on 1 and 4 the references to earlier literature in Ritter, xii, 64 sq., 251 sqq., 260 sqq., 293 sqq., 311, 343, 650 sqq., 728, 770 (with many inaccuracies in view of the insufficiency of his sources, quoted in the index to vol. xii. under 10 different heads) and in A. Zehme, Arabien und die Araber

640-642, Halle 1875, passim. On 1 see the article ḪIMĀR, ii., p. 310-311 by J. H. Mordtmann, on 1 and 4 my full treatment of many details in Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll's Realen, der klass. Altertumswiss., v. 7, Saha (col. 1372 sqq., 1378-1379, 1437 sqq., 1452 sqq., etc., HABR, iv., p. 3-151); on 4, the article The Exploration of Southern Arabia, in Townsend, The Advancement of Science, 1895, p. 492 sqq., Exploration of the Frankincense Country, Southern Arabia, in Geogr. Journ., London 1895, vi. 199 sqq.; The Land of Frankincense and Myrrh, in Nineteenth Century, 1895, p. 595 sqq.; finally the Bibliography to MAHRA.

J. TESACH

AL-ZAFAYAN, nickname of the rājār poet Aṭāqib, b. ʿUṣāid Abū 'l-Ḥaṣb (according to another reading: Miṣkām). He belonged to the Banū ʿUṣāra, a branch of the tribe of Sūd b. Zaid Manāt b. Tawm, whence he was known as al-Sūdī or al-Tamūn. It is clear from one of his poems that he went through the rising of Abī Fudālik (738-792) and was roughly a contemporary of al-ʿAdīddi.


AL-ZAFIR. [See ʿAṬIMAT.]

AL-ZAHIR. [See ʿABDALLAH, ʿAṬIMAT.]

AL-ZAHIR AL-AMAR ALLĀH ABĪ ṢĀID MUḤAMMAD B. AL-NĀṢIR, an ʿAbbāsid Caliph. As early as Šaṭfall 585 (March-April 1189) the caliph al-Nāṣir had designated his eldest son Muhammad as his successor. Later however, he changed his mind in favour of his younger son ʿAlī but since the latter died in 612 (1215-1216) and al-Nāṣir had no other male heirs, he had to come back to Muhammad and again have homage paid to him as heir-apparent. Regarding the treatment given the future commander of the faithful in his father's house we are told in Ibn al-ʿAlīrī, xii. 287: "He was watched and guarded and could do nothing of his own accord." After the death of al-Nāṣir at the end of Ramadan 622 (beg. October 1225), Muhammad ascended the caliph's throne with the name al-Zahir bi-Amr Allāh but his reign lasted only nine months and fourteen days; for he died on 14th Rajab 623 (July 11, 1226). He was succeeded by his eldest son al-Mustasir. The Muslim historians bestow the highest praise on al-Zahir for his high moral qualities. He is described as god-fearing, benevolent, just and gentle and compared with the Umayyad ʿOmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAziz who is celebrated for his piety. In politics however, he played an insignificant and subordinate part, after his accession ʿAbd al-ʿAziz, and he exercised no influence worth mentioning on the course of affairs.


AL-MALIK AL-ZAHIR ʿUṣāid, an ʿAṭīfāhī, second son of Saladin [q.v.]. Born in 568 (1172-1173) he was installed as nominal governor of ʿHlab immediately after its conquest by Saladin at the beginning of 579 (1183), but a few months later Saladin handed over the town to his brother al-ʿAdīl [q.v.]. Three years later al-
Zahir was definitely given Halah and several other towns so that his rule extended northwards to the frontier of Armenia, eastwards as far as the Euphrates (at Manbij) and southwards to near Hama. He therefore had the task of defending the northern frontiers against any invasions of Byzantines, Armenians and Crusaders; he strengthened the fortifications [cf. ii. p. 233] and Halab remained a bulwark of Islam and one of the most prosperous places in the Ayyubid kingdom. In the wars with the Crusaders he loyally assisted his father and later his brother al-Afdal [q.v.] and his uncle al-Afdal [q.v.] in Jumhuriyya II 584 (Aug. 1188) he took the fortress of Sarmin from the Christians, liberated many hundreds of prisoners and had all the inhabitants who could pay their ransom massacred and the defences razed to the ground. In the fighting that followed for 'Akka and Jaffa al-Zahir played an energetic part and displayed great bravery. After the death of Saladin on the 27th Safar 589 (March 4, 1193) he hesitated in loyalty between al-Afdal, who had inherited Damascus and Syria, and al-Adil who had received the two fortresses of al-Karak [q.v.] and al-Shawbak [q.v.] with other places in Mosul and who played the part of mediator in the war between his nephews. After al-Afdal in 921 (1195-1196) had given up Damascus and Saladin's third son, al-Aziz who had inherited Egypt, had been killed in Muharam 595 (Nov. 1198), there was nothing left for al-Zahir but to recognize al-'Adil's suzerainty along with the other members of the family; nevertheless he supported his attempt to reconquer Damascus. At the end of 597 (1201) the two brothers besieged this town which might have fallen into their hands if they had not quarrelled and al-Afdal disbanded the troops under his command, and when al-'Adil threatened Halab in the following year, al-Zahir was forced to submit once more and surrender some of his possessions. In Shaban 599 (April/May 1203) by threats he forced al-Afdal to surrender 'Kallat Nadjin to him without compensation. Al-Zahir died on the 7th Jumhuriyya II 613 (Sept. 3. 1215) after arranging that his three year old son al-Malik al-'Aziz Muhammed, with whom his wife Dufa, the daughter of al-'Adil, had presented him, should succeed him to the exclusion of an older son. His stattbeg Shihab al-Din Toghril took over the government as guardian of the young prince. Another daughter of al-'Adil's, al-Ghawsia, whom al-Zahir had married in 582 (1186-1187), had succeeded him without leaving male heirs. Ibn al-Athir praises al-Zahir for his benevolence to poets and for his eminent political gifts, but at the same time says he was hard hearted and scrupulous in his choice of means.


AL-ZAHIR [See the articles Bairar I, Barqis, Fathishe, Supra, i. 955]

Zahir al-Din (Saiyid) al-Mar'ashi, son of the Saiyid Nasir al-Din, descendant of a family of Saiyids, Persian statesman and historian, born in 815 (1412), was at the court of Muhammad, Sultan of Gisâr, for whose son Kâgî Mîrzâ 'Ali he composed the Chronicle of Tabaristan from the earliest times to 881 (1476). The sovereign employed him on various missions, sent him to the help of Malik Iskandar, son of Malik Kayonarm of Rustamdar, who was fighting his brother Malik Ka'ib and entrusted him with other military expeditions; among these he led an army against the fortress of Nîr which he besieged unsuccessfully in 868 (1463).

Zahir-i Fârâbî, Abu 'l-Fadl 'Ali Muhammad, a Persian poet of the 10th century, born at Fârâb near Bakht in 551 (1156), a pupil of Kâhidhi of Sarnâshand, entered the service of Ardâshir b. Hasan, sipâh-bashi of Mâzandarân (d. 607 = 1210), then went to the court of Toghân, prince of Nishâpur (d. 582 = 1186); after being imprisoned for six years, he left Khurâsân for 'Irâq 'Adâmî where he wrote panegyrics on the Atabek Kâhid-ı Arslân b. Idigira about 583 (1187). Towards the end of his life, he retired from the world and led a life of devotion in Tabriz where he died at the end of 598 (1201) and was buried in the cemetery of Sârûsh-Abî; he was a Sunni. His Divan includes fâqih, some ghazals and a few fragments, in all 115 pieces and 97 quatrains. His style resembles that of the court poets; it is polished and graceful but somewhat insipid. On him was made the verse which has become a proverb: "If you find Zahir's Divân, steal it, even in the Ka'ba".


CL. Huart

Zahir al-OMAR. In Syria he is called Zahir (local pronunciation of Zahir) al-OMar, from the name of his father ' Omar, a shi of the Banû Zaidât, nomads who had settled in the district of Sa'ad [q.v.]. In 1750, Zahir lord of Tiberias and the upper Jordan, came to an arrangement with the Metwals of Galilee to drive out the Turkish officials by degrees; after which he seized the ruined port of 'Akka which was to serve him as an outlet for the export of cotton and silk. He repopulated the town and hurriedly rebuilt the strong walls made by the Crusaders, which were not completely demolished at their departure. Zahir did not wish to break with the Porte, to whom he continued to pay the taxes (mirâj) without their going through the hands of Turkish agents. He bore no resemblance to the typical marauding Beduin. Wishing his authority to endure, he endeavoured to base it on the prosperity of the country. He protected the peasants and encouraged their industry. Tremendously active, spending his life on horseback, he was never daunted by reverses.

His establishment in 'Akka earned him the hostility of the Divan at Stamboul. To help him
to face the storm, Zahtir entered into relations with 'Ali Bey (q.v.) who had just revived in Egypt the government of the beys of Mamluk. Abī Dīkah, 'Ali Bey's lieutenant, hurried to Syria, took Damascus and then rebelled against 'Ali Bey whom he forced to seek refuge with Zahtir, his recent ally. The latter quite unlaunched began by routing the troops of ʿOthmana Pasha, Turkish governor of Damascus; after which he took Saïda. The Porte raised a large army; Zahtir could rely on the help of the Mamluks of a few hundreds of Mamluks who had accompanied ʿAli Bey, and finally on the Russian squadron under Admiral Orlow which had been cruising in the eastern Mediterranean since 1770. The encounter took place along the coast, near Saïda. The fire of the Russian ships decided the day (May 1772). The Russians then went on to bombard Bairut which they plundered. Taking advantage of this great success, Zahtir hastened to extend his authority over the Palestinian provinces. From Saïda to Ramla all the country acknowledged his authority. The tide now began to turn against him. ʿAli Bey foolishly allowed himself to be drawn back to Egypt, where he was defeated and put to death. ʿAli Bey being disposed of, Abī Dīkah reappeared in Palestine. After taking the places on the coast which belonged to Zahtir, he was advancing on Akka, when death overtook him (June 1775). The Turkish fleet however after taking Saïda, blockaded Akka, where Zahtir had shut himself up. The bombardment had no effect on the old walls built by the Crusaders but Turkish gold had more success. During a mutiny in the garrison a shot killed instantaneously the old Beūmi chief (Aug. 1775) who had for over a quarter of a century directed the authority of the Porte. His name remained popular in Syria. The Christians whom he had protected were not the last to regret him.

Bibliography: Djarbirt, Turāšt, Cairo 1850, I. 371 sqq., 413 sqq.; Tamūs Shidyak, Abhār al-Fiṣr al-Dūal arradān, Baitūt 1859, p. 300—301, 384—391; Volney, Voyage en Syrie et en Égypte, Paris 1807, II. 5 sqq.; Abbè Mariti, Voyage dans l'ile de Chypre, la Syrie et la Palestine, Paris 1791, II. 85 sqq.; Ed. Lockroy, Madame de Beauchesne, la Syrie et l'Égypte au xvxiiie siècle, Paris 1885; interesting for its local colour; otherwise valueless. References to manuscript authorities are given in H. Lammons, La Syrie, précis historique, Baitūt 1921, II. 103—112. (H. Lammons)

AL-ZAHTIRYA, a school of law, which would derive the law only from the literal text (ṣāhir) of the Kurān and Sunna. In the "branches" of law (fuṣūl al-ṣāhir) it still further increased the number of canonically detailed regulations by many divergences peculiar to it alone. More important is its significance for the principles of legislation (māhil al-ṣāhir), the development and elucidation of which it considerably furthered by its uncompromising fight against rūf al-fikr, ishāq dāh, istiḥkām unt akhād (q.v.). In the Ṭūbīt the Zahtir waṣīfh, also called Daʿūd after its founder [see Dāʿūd b. Ǧalāl], became organised as a regular school the influence of which spread to Beirut and Khurṣan while in Spain Ibn Ḥasan remained practically isolated. Only in the reign of the Almoravid Yaʿqūb al-Manṣūr (580—594 = 1184—1199), was the Zahtir school recognised as the state code. But there had always been Zahtirs in outlook, although not organised as a school or called one, and there continued to be such, after the school itself, in spite of all the concessions it was forced to make to the principles of its rivals, had failed in the solution of problems, which had not cropped up in the circle of the Prophet or the earlier transmitters of the Sunna. As late as 728 (1330) a Zahtir outbreak is recorded in Syria, where the waṣīfh itself never was and in Egypt we still find Maʿārī in writing in the Zahtir spirit. The Zahtirya attitude could be maintained, especially in theory, by people who were not in contact with the little matters of everyday life and disliking the cannuities and quarrels of the schools did not adhere to a particular school. It is therefore not remarkable that it is a mystic, Shaqīz (q.v., no. 1), who has preserved many decisions of the historical Zahtirya. It is true that commentators on the Kurān, notably Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, and on the collections of traditions (ṣaḥīḥ) in particular the party of Zahtir, but especially, but on the other hand, the later jurists no longer take their former rivals seriously and are silent about them, at least in the special literature of the ḏahīd al-Fīlāḥ that has survived. Shaqīz however puts Dāʿūd in the radiant rossete in his Mīrāb (see Bībik), p. 44, between Ibn Ḥanbal and Salīḥ b. ʿUyain and on the parallel roads to the gate of Paradise (p. 47) between Ibn Ḥanbal and Abū Lālī b. Saʿd. As no manuscripts of a Zahtir lawbook are available we give as specimens of the distinctive features mentioned by Shaqīz from Book I those relating to ritual purity.

Details. P. 98, 92: Gold and silver vessels are forbidden for eating and drinking. According to Nawawī, commenting on the Sunna of Muslim (Cairo 1854), iv. 416 and Abū Ḥanīfa and Abū Ḥanīfa; Ammānī (ed. Rask, ii. 262), the Zahtirs on the authority of the ḏahīd in question, which only mentions drinking, permitted eating from such vessels. — P. 98, 93: The use of the toothstick is necessary; according to Ḥabīb b. Rāhwāli, Daʿūd's teacher, [the Syrian] jurists, and some of his contemporaries, neglect of this actually renders the practice invalid. — P. 99, 99 sqq., and ii. 163, 164: Saltine is not impurity and forbidden. — P. 103, 107, 107: A person in a state of minor ritual impurity (ḏahāt, q.v.) may take up and carry a copy of the Kurān. — P. 105, 107: Any contact of a man with a strange female, even a baby girl of an hour old, produces ḏahāt and the minor ablation (waṣīd) is necessary. — P. 107, 107: There is no regulation that in relieving nature we should turn the face or the back in the direction of the bībā; it is therefore permitted. — P. 108, 108 and 113, 108: T. Ṣawīla is according to Ḥabīb Allāh al-Qabīṣ, a Zahtir ṣawīla in Khurṣan (d. 376 = 986), only valid for 5 prayers (a certain Ḥabīb b. ʿUmar laid it down that it was only valid for one). — P. 109, 109: The mentioning of the name of God at the ṣawīla is not only recommended but necessary. — P. 109, 109: According to some authors, this also applies to the washing of the hands whenever purification is necessary. — P. 110, 110: The Ṣawīla does not extend to the elbows (Zafr b. Ḥudhail, d. 258 [774], who was in close contact with Abū Hanbal, however also held the opposite view). — P. 113, 113: The major ritual ablation (ḏahāt, q.v.) is only necessary after actual effluvia semenis. — P. 114, 114: If a woman is in a state of major ritual impurity (ḏahāt, q.v.) and then enters
the שד [q. v.] she must perform two שד. —
P. 114, 32 and 122, 22: In spite of שדAnyone any
one, even a woman during שד, may recite the
פּרָגָן as he pleases. — P. 115 ff.: Rubbing with
sand (סְפֶלֶק, q. v.) actually removes a
שד. — P. 120, 31: The wearing of only the
foot-gear is valid even if it is much torn. — P. 122,
3: A similar partial שד suffices for the woman to
fulfil the demands of פּרָגָן ii. 222 so that
intercourse is permitted even during the שד (to
also אֲשָר).

As these examples show, the שבת המָכָה
cannot be briefly summed up as "light or heavy". שֵׁרִית has sometimes to describe it as the
mildest and sometimes as the strictest of all.
The field in which many of the jurists found
their main object, to make allowances, was one
it could not enter upon and for example it insisted
upon the literal text of the passages in the
פּרָגָן and Tradition against unbelievers to
a degree of complete intolerance. It does not work
systematically, for it forbade inquiry into the
reason for a regulation and did not allow it to be
extended to an analogous case or from the
individual to the class. It absolutely refused to
weaken the words of the religious sources by
parallels from passages in pagan poets and aimed
at creating the true שד al-שדית out of the
religious texts, with the assistance of a special
Muslim philology and lexicography. That of מַלְק seemed to it to be שד equally with that of אֶבֶן
חַנְשֶׁת; שֵׁרִית, from whom it had itself started,
had only disciplined, not abolished שד. שדית
(q. v.) could only be defined as the consensus of
the Early Companions. It made no distinction in
degrees of prohibition or commandment; the
impressive, in other systems not infrequently interpreted
as mere permission and recommendation or simple
disapproval, meant for the absolutely obligatory
or completely forbidden. It naturally used a great
mass of Tradition and it has been charged with
not examining carefully what it took over; on the
other hand, it was itself forced to criticism of
tradition against many שדית favourable to שד
which were finding recognition or against that of
difference of opinion as a grace, but the school
saw in this rather the disruptive influence
of subjective methods against which it regarded itself
as the champion of the lost unity of primitive
Islam. In spite of Ibn Ḥazm, the שביתuya never
attained theological unity. In general it maintained
an attitude of cautious neutrality and aloofness
in theological disputes and in keeping with its
intention for the literal sacred text accepted the
utterances about God without going into any
exegesis.

Bibliography: שֵׁרִית, al-Miṣnawi, Cairo
1317; 353; Ibn al-Nadim, al-Fihrist, ed. Flügel,
I. 216—219; Sanʿa, Kitāb al-Fihrist (in G. M.
S., vol. v., s. v. דְשָכִית, fol. 220b, s. y., ed. 220v,
5, further s. v. מַלְק, fol. 376v, s. y., Ibn
al-Malik, al-Kamil, ed. Tornberg, xi. 95; I.
Goldzweig, Die Zafiṣṭiten. Ihr Lehrsystem
und ihre Geschichte, Leipzig 1884. — Cf. also
the art. דְשָכִית by H. Kafka and Ibn Ḥazm.

(R. Strothmann)

ZAID b. 'ALI ZAIN AL-'ABIDIN [q. v.] gives
his name to the Zaidiyah [q. v.], who reveres
him as a political and religious martyr; he was the first 'Ali after the catastrophe which
overwhelmed his grandfather al-Husain b. 'Ali
[q. v.] at Karbela to endeavour to deprive the
Umayyads of the caliphate by armed rebellion when
he placed himself at the disposal of the קַצְרָא as
Îmām. Except for an interval of two months when
he was secretly seeking adherents in Baṣra, he spent
a year in preparation in Kūfa, hidden in constantly
changing hiding-places. But when he was ready
to begin, the governor يافع b. ' Omar al-Thākif, although at the time away in Ḥira, proved so
well prepared that only a few hundred men joined Zaid,
although many thousands had taken the oath of
loyalty to him. After several days' street fighting
he was mortally wounded; the place of conceal-
ment of his body buried under water was betrayed
and the body exhibited in Kūfa, the head in
Damascus, Mecca and Medina. Tabari has preserved
from Abū Mūhammad very vivid and full accounts
from the few survivors of the details of the fighting.
The date, beginning of 122 (740), is however not
quite certain, apparently because Zaid had to begin
his revolt a few days before the date arranged in
view of the excellence of the official secret service;
when 121 or even 120 is given, it is suspiciously
neglects the long period of preparation. The Umayyad
police force, by no means large, owed its success
to the remarkable irresolution of the Kūfān
conspirators. They had gathered together in the great
mosque, allowed themselves to be shut in and did
not support Zaid's efforts, which several times prom-
ised to be successful, to release them. They were
not homogeneous but simply a mass of discontented
opponents of the government, including even
Khāridjīs, while further all those who simply wanted
an 'Alīd to be caliph did not come to the support
of Zaid, although the story that many deserters
appealed to his brother Muhammad al-Bukhārī as
true Îmām is probably coloured by ante-dating
later troubles within the Shi'a. Moreover Zaid
himself was not the real leader of the movement; he
did not come to Kūfa of his own accord. He was
in al-Rūṣafī with the caliph Hishām b.
'Abd al-Malik [q. v., to whom he had turned in
his poverty, when the governor had summoned
him to Kūfa about a debt case. Zaid himself had
misgivings about his prospects; after the first four
months he wanted to withdraw completely from
the enterprise and had reached al-Kārânah on his
way back to his native city of Medina, when he
was persuaded to return by some Shi'a who had
hurried after him.

A number of writings and fragments have
survived which go under Zaid's name; these
include elucidations of passages of the קַצְרָא, and
of problems of the îmām and the pilgrimage
and especially a complete compendium of
fīḥ; but in its present form, they contain too
many theological, ritual, legal and political contra-
dictions within themselves and to such principles
of the later Zaidi literature as are given the
authority of Zaid. There is however the same evidence
that he had a certain amount of learning; while
we need lay no special stress on his honorary
title, בָּשד al-Kūfān, or on the Zaidi tradition
that Abū Hanîfah studied under him and supported
him in the rising by a few words and money, yet it is evidence of
legal experience that he conducted as a skilled
advocate for the Husainids long suits against the
Husainids about the family endowments.

Zaid was much celebrated in song, even as
early as by al-Sayyi'd al-Himayr [q. v.] and in
old muṣṭaf books (martyrologies); legend endeav-
Though dead before Islam, Zaid was considered by *hadīth* a true believer; Muhammad, declaring him to be in heaven, allowed prayers to be said for him.


**Zaid b. Hāritah b. Shahrūn al-Kalbī, Aḥū Usamah, was brought as a slave to Makka by Hākim b. Ḥizām b. Khuwairil, a nephew of Khadijā, who had bought him in Syria and sold him to her. Khadijā made him a gift of friend to Muhammad before his mission. His father Hāríth came to Makka to obtain his freedom, but Zaid refused to leave Muhammad, who thereupon freed him and adopted him. He was thenforward known as Zaid b. Muhammad, and was often associated in his adopted father’s commercial enterprises.

About ten years younger than Muhammad, Zaid was one of the very first converts to Islam, perhaps the first. He came from a tribe settled near Dūmat al-Ḍandal, where converts to Christianity were plentiful and Jewish influences felt; his influence on the Prophet’s religious development may have been considerable.

In Madīna Zaid was joined in brotherhood to Ḥanūfa b. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib. In 1 a. h. he went to Makka to accompany Sawāda bint Za‘um and Muhammad’s daughters to Madīna. A brave warrior, Zaid fought at Badr, Uhud, al-Khandaq, was at al-Hudaybiya, commanded several expeditions (al-Andalus in 2 a. h., al-Djauṭīn and al-Itis in 6, etc.) and was often left in command at Madīna when Muhammad was on some military expedition. For his marriage to, and divorce from, Zainah bint Djaḥḥah see Zainah. Following this divorce, the verse in the Qur’ān abolishing adoption (xxix, 40) was revealed. After Zainah, Zaid married Umm Kullāh bint Ḥaṣa, who bore him Zaid and Kušaylī, and Durr bint Abī Lāhah, both of whom he divorced; Hind bint al-Awrawk and Muhammad’s freedwoman, the negroid Umʿ Abūn, who bore him Usma.

Zaid died in 8 a. h., aged about 55, as commander and standard-bearer, of the unfortunate expedition of Mu‘a. Muhammad mourned him and planned to avenge him (see IṣLAMA b. ZAIĐ).

His place in *hadīth* is important, both on account of Muhammad’s affection for him, which induces orthodox tradition to set him up as the Prophet’s favourite, against his dislike by the Qur’ānic form, and by his reason of the name being mentioned in the Qur’ān.


(V. VACCAN)

**Zaid b. Ṭabīb, Aḥū Ṭabīb b. Abī Munkir b. Abī Dafūl al-Aṣāfri, one of the Companions of Muhammad, best known through his part in the editing of the Qur’ān. His father was killed in the battle of Bu‘āth (q. v.), five years before the *hidra*, when Zaid was six years old. His
mother was al-Nawār, daughter of Mālik b. Muʾāwiya b. ʿAdi, also of a Madīndjdl family.

It is said that the boy knew already a number of Sūra when Muhammad settled in al-Madīna. At any rate he became his secretary, who recorded part of the revelation and settled the correspondence with the Jews, whose language or script he is said to have learned in 17 days or less. His quickness of understanding, his sagacity and his knowledge are praised by his contemporaries; he was called "the rabbi of the community".

After the death of Muhammad, Zaid acted in several capacities of greater or lesser importance. He was entrusted with the government of al-Madīna by ʿUmar and by ʿUthmān, when they went to perform the ḥajj. He accompanied ʿUmar to Syria. He regulated the division of the booty after the battle of the Yarmūk [q.v.]. He made the lists of those who were inscribed in the ḍawwār, when ʿUmar founded this institution. He was kāfī in al-Madīna and finance minister to ʿUthmān. After the latter's death he kept aloof from ʿAbd, although he showed him due honour. It is said, however (Tabari, b. 3070, 3072), that he refused to do homage to him. He is known as the part he took in the editing of the Kūfī [cf. kufi, §§ 7, 8]. — He was a specialist on the subject of hereditary law.

Zaid died in 45 (663–666); the years 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, and 56 are also mentioned. The qāfī over his corpse was held by Marwān b. al-Hakam.


(A. J. Wensinck)

ZAIĐĀN (in modern pronunciation Ẓālīn), Dājūq, an Arab scholar, journalist and man of letters, born in Bāhirāt on Dec. 14, 1861, died in Cairo on Aug. 21, 1914. Born in a poor Christian family, he had no regular education and in almost all branches of learning he was self-taught. He spent some time at the Protestant College and received the diploma in pharmacy. Soon afterwards he went to Egypt where for about a year he was on the staff of the newspaper al-Zawīla. In 1884 he served as a delegate on the expedition to the Siida to the relief of Gordon, and then returned to Bāhirāt. After a brief stay in London (1885), he finally settled in Cairo where for some years he taught and was on the staff of the al-Mahkūmah newspaper. Except for his two journeys to Europe (1886, 1913), his literary activity was in Egypt; for political reasons it was only after the revolution that he was able to visit Turkey (Stambul 1908, Palestine 1913).

His first work was of a linguistic nature: "Philosophy of Language and the Arabic Language" (1886, 2nd ed. 1904). Rather naive on some points, it represents the first meritorious effort to apply the principles of comparative philology to the Arabic language. He returned again to the same subject in his book "The History of the Arabic Language" (1904). He then turned to historical works and textbooks: "History of Modern Egypt" (2 vols., 1889), "History of Free-masonry" (1889), "General History" (first vol.), "History of Greece and Rome", "History of England", "Geography of Egypt", "Genealogy among the ancient Arabs". They had no great success. — In 1891 appeared his first historical novel "The last Mamlūk" (German transl., by Martin Thilo, Barnem 1917), and in 1892 he began the publication of his literary periodical al-Miḥrāb. From this date till his premature death his life was closely bound up with this work. He displayed tremendous activity. Not only were the majority of the articles written by himself (the most important of them were republished by his sons in three vols. Miḥrāb, 1919–21; he himself collected and published the articles of a biographical nature in 2 vols. 1900–1923; 2nd ed. 1910; 3rd ed. 1922). Every year he wrote a new novel and a volume of a popular educational nature. Al-Miḥrāb gradually became the most widely circulated Arabic periodical and Zaiḍān's name as a novelist and historian became known not only in Arab speaking countries but throughout the Muslim east.

The majority (17) of his novels (22 in number) deal with the earlier history of Islam from the Arab conquest to the dynasty of the Mamlūks (xiiith cent.). The scene of three others is laid in the xvith–xviith centuries, one in the nineties in Egypt and in the period of the Turkish revolution. Several were written through several (up to four) editions; almost all were translated into Persian, Turkish, Hindustani and Aqṣābatbājī, some into other Oriental and European languages (besides Thilo's translation cf., for example *Le sourc du Khaliṣ* with Claude Farrère's introduction, Paris 1912, and *Allah veuille*, Paris 1924). The main value of these works lies in their popularising of history. Written in easy and fluent language, they afford pleasant and interesting reading. To European literary tastes they do not appeal greatly. Their style of composition is somewhat old fashioned and sentimental.

Of his numerous historical works by far the most important is his "History of Muslim Civilisation" (5 vols. 1902–1906). It is based on the well known European works by Seddīlīt, Krémer, Goldziher and others with many additons from Arabic sources and supplemented by the author's knowledge of the modern life of the east. For Muslim lands it was an achievement of the first rank and it was natural for the book to be translated into other languages (Persian, Turkish, Hindustani) (cf. Bouvet in J. A. ser. x., vol. xix., 1912, p. 401–402). Even a European scholar can frequently find details which are not given elsewhere (cf. de Goeje, in J. A. ser. x., vol. xxii, 1904, p. 356–359). The fourth volume was translated into English by D. S. Margoliouth (G. M. S. iv., Leyden 1907). A supplement to this work is his unfinished "History of the Arabs before Islam" (1908) which has all the merits and defects of the larger work.

No less important for the east was his last great work "History of Arabic Literature" (4 vols. 1911–1914, with index 1922; abbreviated edition
in one vol. (1924). This was the first work in Arabic, designed on European principles. Basing his work on those of Brockelmann, Haart etc., Zaidân also used Egyptian collections of MSS. and here and there produced new materials for European scholarship. His use of the European sources is not always above criticism as was shown by the reviews by Shakhâh (al-Muhtâb, iv., 1914, p. 392–395; xv, 1925, p. 561–560; xvi, 1925, p. 572–574) and P. Anastase (Laqâgî al-Ârâbî, i, 1912, p. 392–397; ii, 1913, p. 52–62, 139–146, 205–209; iv, 1913, p. 82–90; cf. also M. J. Haikal, Fi Arbat al-Firâq, Cairo 1925, p. 221–227). The fourth volume is the most important for European scholarship; it gives a good survey of Arabic literature in the sixteenth century and with the corresponding works of Shakhî and Tarrâzî is our only source for the study of this period.

Of his other works the following may be mentioned: "Science of Physiology", "Categories of Nations", "Wonders of Nature" and the description of his journey to Europe (in al-Hilâl, reprinted separately 1923). His "Memoirs" which he left, and which to judge from the extracts published are very interesting, are shortly to be published by his sons, who are continuing the publication of al-Hilâl.

Zaidân was not an original investigator yet he was of epoch-making significance for Arabic speaking countries, acquainted with European methods. He made accessible many and varied subjects and showed that every Arab must take an interest not only in the advance of European technique and exact sciences but also in his history and literature. He was no revolutionary in the intellectual field, but of a very fine and noble character. The sharp criticism, which his works frequently met, was for the most part superficial (cf. e.g. Antar al-Madani, Nahkh al-Hadhâyân min Târîkh Dîjirî Zaidân, Bombay 1907, or Vâsif Tabâhi, al-Burûbân fî 'ulûm Riwâyat 'Adhâr Kwarîq, Cairo 1900, and particularly Shibli al-Nu'manî, Tanbih Kull Târîkh al-Tamaddun al-Islâmî, Cairo 1930). Conservatism Muslims could not forgive the fact that he, a Christian, wrote on specifically Muslim subjects, as was amply shown by the attacks on his being offered a professorship in the Universitè Égyptienne. The purists (like Ibrahim al-Ya'qût) criticised his language and style in the most fault-finding spirit. The first quarter of the sixteenth century has shown how great a part Zaidân played; his name will never be forgotten in the history of modern Arabic literature and society.


A general characterisation and biography based on personal relations with special reference to his novels is given by Ign. Krautkowsky in the article "Der hebräische Roman in der modern arabischen Literatur," Leipzîg 1930 (= W. L., v. 11, p. 60–79); the Arabic biography with portrait in Iyân Zaidhî, Murâd al-Ârîf ft. Târîkh wa-nahwîn abîdî al-Ifâdh li-Ma'i, Cairo 1867, p. 457–464 and in the appendix to the fourth posthumous volume of his History of Arabic Literature (Cairo 1914, p. 325–326; a list of his works is also given there). The biography has been reproduced in an extended form (with five portraits) as an introduction to the first volume of his Ma'ârîf (Cairo 1914, p. 1–512); cf. also al-Hilâl fî 'arbâ'ah Sana (Cairo 1937, p. 9–40). His personality is undoubtedly worthy of a systematic monograph.

(Leo Kratzkowsky)

AL-ZAIDÎYA, THE PRACTICAL GROUP OF THE Sîrîts, distinguished from the Ithnâ 'Ashîyâ [q.v.] and the Sahâba [q.v.] by the recognition of Zaidân b. 'All. After the latter's death they took part in several 'Alid risings but were not united. Writers on heresy distinguish eight schools among them: from Abu 'l-Dîrî, who combined warfare activity with apologetics of the imams and belief in a Mahdî, to Salama b. Kuhlai whose Zaidânism was watered down to a simple Sîrît point of view.

It was the same as regards theology. The Zaidîs only became a united community when 'Alid claimants to the imamate themselves took over the spiritual leadership. As far as can be ascertained this was the work of two men: 1. al-Hassan b. Zaidân [q.v.], founder about 250 (864) of a Zaidist state in the south of the Caucassian Sea, and 2. al-Kasîm al-Rasîd, Ibn Ibrahim Tahâsh b. Ibrahîm al-Dîwâdî b. Ibrahim b. al-Hassan b. al-Hassan b. 'All b. Abî Târif (d. 246 = 859). While the works of al-Hassan b. Zaidân are only known indirectly from quotations, we possess some by al-Kasîm, who was however quite inaccurate in the political sphere, although his name has not yet become better known in connection with his polemics against the Christianos (Di Matteo, in A.S.O., xx, 191–1923, p. 301–364) and against Ibn al-Mukaffâs (M. Gaidal, La lettre tra l'Islam e il manichëismo, Rome 1927). The school founded by al-Kasîm and developed by his successors, now the only surviving school, is Mu' tazil in theology, in ethics anti-Murtûzî with a puritanical trait in its rejection of mysticism; indeed orders are forbidden in the modern Zaidist state. In worship it has certain 'sectarian' features in common with the other Sîrîts: the call to prayer "come to the best of works"; the fivefold 'ghâthî in the funeral service; rejection of the mock 'ala 'l-šâbûfain (wiping the covered foot as a substitute for washing), of the impious leader at prayer and of the eating of the meat, killed by a non-Muslim. In family law they prohibit mixed marriages, on the other hand they do not allow wara' [q.v.]. As their opponents were almost entirely Muslims they observed in theory, at least, the regulations for dealing with Makhrî, those who refused obedience to the imams; but as there was in addition the distinction Muslims and Munafikûn and Sunnîs, the Zaidîs only allowed wara' to the believers in contrast to them just as they called their wars ghâthî with the corresponding legal consequences. As a result of the scattered distribution of the original Zaidân, we find the most
diverse views on legal questions, which were not fundamental for the sect as such. These are registered by later writers without the accusation of heresy in their simple delight in ijtihād al-ḥakīk, and we find individual Zaidis appearing with individual Sunnis against other Zaidis and other Sunnis in changing combinations, so that the Zaidi mautkhāb practice is a fifth alongside of the four. The Zaidi Abu 'l-Ḥasan 'Abd Allāh b. Mīthāf gives a vivid picture of this in his al-Muntakbāt al-mukātkār min al-Qādī mālātā mālātā (vol. I, Cairo 1328).

In the present day Zaidi state there must of course be greater uniformity: this is brought about by the use of al-Askār fi Fīh al-ʾAmmār al-tārikh (Broekelman, G. A. L., ii, 187, v, s) of Ahmad b. Yahyā b. Muṣṭafā [see below] and al-Ruwāt al-maṭlaʾ (see Bihār) as official text-books.

The essential demands on the imām are: a. Membership of the Abī al-Batū with no distinction between Ḥasanids and Ḥusainids, i.e. no succession by inheritance; b. ability to resort to the sword if necessary for offence or defence so that neither a child nor a concealed Mahdi can be considered; c. the necessary learning: how seriously this is taken, is shown by the vast mass of writings of imāms at all times. As there could therefore be no dynastic tradition, and individual success was in the end the deciding factor, we have no series of imāms without a break; we find rather the possibility of an age without an imām recognised with a sense of the realities, while we also have the opposite: several imāms at one time, i.e. the frequent appearance of an anti-imām; if the latter can oust his predecessor, the former's deposition or abdication is recognised as legal: if there is a turn in the tide he however comes back. If the qualifications for the imāmate are not completely possessed, he cannot be recognised as full imām; we thus have imāms of war or of learning only. Leaders whose strength is only sufficient to keep alive the Zaidi claim are called ṣāḥib al-tikāḥ, ṣāḥib al-tikāḥ, etc. The uncertainty as to who is really to be considered an imām is seen in the list of those among 'Alī pretenders who have been chosen by the later Zaidiyas as a state to preserve a connection with the original Shīʿa. In the first list preserved, that of the founder of the Zaidi kingdom in the Yemen, we have: 1. Allāh; 2. al-Ḥasan and 3. al-Ḥusayn; then 4. Zaid b. 'Allāh; 5. his son 5. Yahyā; then the three brothers 6. Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāh [q.v.]; 7. 'Ibrāhīm [q.v.], also 9. Yahyā who appeared in Dailam after fighting alongside 8. al-Ḥusayn b. 'Allāh b. al-Ḥasan; lastly 10. Muhammad b. Ibrāhīm, who rebelled with Abu l-Sarḥayyā and 12. his brother, the already mentioned al-Kāsim al-Ṣaḥīḥī; later lists add as many as 10 more names; among them the most interesting for the theory of the imāmate is Idīrās [q.v.], another brother of 6, 7 and 9, who, although he fulfilled the qualifications for an imām, founded a kingdom in the Maghrib which remained Sunni.

The political ambitions of the Zaidiyas have been realised in two places: On the Caesian Sunnites, see part al-tikāh; in the Zaidi state of the Yemen was al-Ḥusayn b. 'Ibrāhīm, grandson of al-Kāsim al-Ṣaḥīḥī. It has survived all the kingdoms of the Yemen although it has frequently been driven back into its starting point Ṣa'da, for example at the beginning of the fourth (tenth) century on the death of al-Najīr ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib b. al-Mahdi al-Ṣaḥīḥī, who had died in 618 (1223) in a battle against the Malakites (q.v.); he was called al-Daʿī because his original sphere of activity had been among the Caesarian Zaidis. He was a descendant of Zaid b. ʿAlī; it is therefore inaccurate to describe the Yemen imāms as Rassīhī. It was not till 518 (1123) that a successor to him appeared (vii 566 = 1170) in al-Mutawakkilī b. Ṣulaymān of the family of al-Ḥadī; in addition to his military campaigns which took him as far as Nadirān, he conducted a literary campaign against the theological heresy of the Muṣṭafis. The disorder of the tenth (eleventh) century is seen in the fact that al-Mahdi ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn of the family of Abu 'l-Barakāt b. Muḥammad b. al-Kāsim al-Ṣaḥīḥī was murdered in 618 (1223) by his own people after being imām for ten years. Al-Mahdi Ibraḥīm b. Tādī al-Din ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib had the rival imām in Yahyā b. Muḥammad of a quite unknown Ḥasanī family of al-Ṣaḥīḥī and he himself fell in the prison of the Rasūlīd [q.v.] al-Muṣṭafār Sālāb in Taʾās while al-Mutawakkilī b. Yahyā, again of al-Ḥadī's line (d. 699 = 1299), is famous as al-Muṣṭafār b. ʿIṣāma, because a cloud enabled him to escape from the pursuers Rasūlīd al-Muʾayyad Dāwūd when he was on a dangerous retreat into Khawās. The succession in the imāmate to his son al-Mahdi Muḥammad and his grandson al-Muṭṭahar was interrupted by several strangers, for example al-Muʾayyad Yahyā b. Ḥanām, descendant of the “Twelve” imām ʿAlī al-Ridā [q.v.]; his writings filled “as many sheets of paper as there were days in his life”. No less prolific as a writer was al-Mahdi Ahmad b. Yahyā b. al-Muṣṭafā (d. 856 = 1452), imām for several days only. After several imāms had fought with one another and with the Ṣāḥibīs, his grandson al-Muṭṭawakkil Yahyā Sharaf al-Dīn had to retire for a time to Tulhī before the invading generals of the Egyptian Mamlūkī (in 933 = 1527). His son al-Muṭṭahar was temporarily able to regain all land lost as far as al-Tīmān. In the meanwhile Ottoman suzerainty had been established and his grandson entered in prison in Stambul, as did in 1004 (1595) al-Najīr al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī of a different line from al-Ḥadī, after maintaining himself in al-Ahmānī for seven years as imām.

At the end of this year al-Muṣṭafā b. Muḥammad, also of the house of al-Ḥadī, opened a new era in Zaidi history with his call to arms and fought successfully till his death in 1029 (1620), and in the reign of his son al-Muʾayyad Muḥammad (d. 1054 = 1644) the Ottomans abandoned the Yemen (1045 = 1635). As a rule, the imāms since then have belonged to the family
of this al-Kāsim, although genuine Zaidī families which had once produced imāms, successfully came to the front again after centuries; there were however from the domestic fields in which the different Arab tribes were played off against each other. The death of al-Muṣayyad Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Walī b. al-Kāsim (1097 = 1686) was for example attributed to poisoning by his nearest relatives. A state of order was restored under al-Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Muḥammad b. al-Manṣūr al-Ḥasan (d. 1159 = 1755); Ṣaʿīd b. ʿAbd al-Muḥammad b. al-Manṣūr b. al-Ḥasan (d. 1124 = 1809) in whose time the Wahhābīs penetrated to al-Tihāmah, was incapable, his grandson al-Muṭawakkil ʿAbd al-Muḥammad was able to restore order in Šanān, although al-Tihāmah passed to the Khalifate of Mecca; he built a treasury and a university. The latter's grandson al-Manṣūr ʿAlī b. al-Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh (from 1525 = 1853) is as unfavourably described even by the Zaidī themselves as by C. J. Ruttenstein, who calls him a drunkard (F. A. G. S., viii., 1838, p. 284). His by no means innocent grandson Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh, threatened by an anti-imām, took the fatal step of summoning the Turks from al-Tihāmah and they entered Šanān in 1624 (1817) but were driven out by the people who had risen in rebellion. Risings of the tribes and raids by the Karmāṭians increased the general disorder. Then three deceased imāms, originally enemies, joined against the imām al-Muṭawakkil Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Muḥammad and on Safar 16, 1289 (April 25, 1812) played Šanān again into the hands of the Turks. While Muḥammad's son Muḥammad wanted to be imām there with Turkish approval and in Turkish pay, the Ḥasanīd al-Ḥādī Ṣafar al-Dīn Muḥammad, a descendant of the above mentioned Ṣayyid b. Ḥamza of the viith (xvith) century, maintained an independent imamate in al-Ḥaṣm and Šaḍa from 1296 to 1307 (1879–1890). Then al-Manṣūr Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh Ṣaʿīd al-Dīn, starting from Šaḍa and al-Ḥaṣm by much fighting and also diplomatic negotiations with the Turks contended for the right of the Zaidīs in Yemen generally to live according to the Zaidī Sharīʿa. His son al-Muṭawakkil ʿAbd Allāh who succeeded on Rabīʿ I 1320, 1332 (June 4, 1904) was still more vigorous. In obedience to his summons the tribes at once attacked the Turkish strongholds. Šaʿīd b. ʿAbd Allāh was surrendered in 1904 and could only be reconquered after a regular war. ʿAbd Allāh did not take advantage of Turkey's difficulties after the war in Tripol, but on Safar 1337 (Nov. 1918) he was able to occupy Šaʿīd. In 1341 (1923) he successfully resumed his fight for Šaʿīd with the Idrīsids of Ḍirāṣ. This proximity to the protectors of Šaʿīd involved the new king of the Māran, Zaidī imām and şowr al-mawṣūma, in the wider sphere of international politics. His latest attempt at expansion is directed against the Karmāṭians of Najdīstān just as one of his earliest victories was the ʿaṣf of the Karmāṭians around Menṣūka. This fighting made the imāmate of the present Šaʿīd recall, as is in many other points, even the true Zaidī tenor of his encyclopaedia (see in ʿAbd al-Walī, c. Bibl., that of the first Šaʿīd al-Ḥādī). He is reckoned — which may help to throw light on the theory of the imāmate — his descendant in the 26th generation, but counting partially recognized and anti-imāms about his 100th successor in office. Of his ancestors his father al-Manṣūr Muḥammad was an imām. His grandfather Ṣayyid Ḥamīd al-Dīn was a visier and in 1293 (1875) was imprisoned by the Turks in Šanān with many other scholars and notables. For ancestors of note we have to go back to the seventh, Muḥammad, and the eighth, ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn, both learned commentators on legal works; it is not till the ninth that we have a new imām, Ṣaʿīd al-Kāsim (d. 1029 = 1620) who fought the Turks. Going further back still we find in the ninth (xixith) century, the eleventh ancestor al-Ḥusayn al-Ṣaḥbar, who had however only the rank of emir and as imām, whose title was however not indissolubly, in the fourth (xith) century the 22nd ancestor al-Kāsim, the 23rd dāʾir Yūsuf and the 24th Šaʿīd; the 25th was the full imām al-Nūrī Ṣaʿīd and the 26th al-Ḥādī Šaʿīd himself.


(ER. STROTHMANN)

ZAILA', a port on the African coast o t he Gulf of S Dead. It lies on a narrow tongue of land, which is cut off from the mainland at high water and is the only harbour of importance in British Somaliland. Formerly an important trading centre and one of the largest ports of export for the slave trade with Arabia, the town now only possesses modest remains of buildings of the middle of the xixth century like the tomb of ʿAbd al-Ḥaṣan ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥaṣan, which is decorated with the west of it by the Indian government, the palace of ʿAbd al-Ḥaṣan ʿAlī of which only the ground-floor and the first story survive and a mosque. Alongside of the ruins of the old Arab houses, which only one or two are habitable, stand hundreds of rectangular huts of straw (ʿaral). The town covers an area of 40–50 acres, the part below of stone covers barely a fifth of this. The town was formerly surrounded by a stone wall; its ruins were used to build the quay of the harbour which can only be approached by
Arab sailing ships at high water. At the entrance to the harbour is the customhouse and the gourdhouse as well as the old residency, southeast of this was a mission station which later fell into ruins. Numerous tombs of sheikhs surround the town, among which that of Shaikh Dinn b. Sa’d al-Din is held in special veneration. The population reveals a considerable mixture of Hamitic and Semitic blood and is estimated at 7,000. The coral reefs around Zaila, which contain many pearl oysters, give the inhabitants a remunerative industry. Merchants of Zaila finance the pearl fishers who come from Zaila and the opposite Arabian coast. The yield is quite considerable. Until the rise of Djibuti about 35 miles N.W. of Zaila, which is now connected by railway with Harar, Zaila was the port of export of Abyssinian coffee, but its trade has now declined considerably. The main articles of export are the smaller domestic animals and hides, which go mainly to India.

In ancient times the ancient site of Zaila; it attained increasing importance after the foundation of the Axumite kingdom and was in direct relations with India. The Arab geographers Istakhri, Ibn Hawqal and al-Mukaddasi describe Zaila as the port of Abyssinia for trade with the Yaman and Hijaz. Goat-skins were the chief exports, which were calculated in great quantities with the tremendous development of the leather industry under Turkish rule.

When Ibn Battuta visited the town, it was considered the metropolis of the kingdom of Adal; at the beginning of the xvi century, it fell into the hands of the Turks, who were defeated in 1516 by the Portuguese, who burned the town. About 1525 it attained a new importance under Muhammad Grai, [q.v.], ruler of Adal, then passed into dependence on the sherifs of Makkah. In 1848, it passed to Ali Sharmakali, who paid tribute to the governor of Makkah. On his death it went to Abukr Muhammad Pasha, whom conquered by Egyptian troops in 1870 and visited by General Gordon in 1875. The town was then very prosperous and controlled the whole trade with the interior. In 1884 the Egyptian troops evacuated the town and since 1885 it has been an English possession first under the India Office, then the Foreign Office and now under the Colonial Office.


(Visited by A. Grooman)

ZAIN Al-ABIDIN. [See Ali, Al-Abidin, Al-Tunisl.]

ZAIN Al-DIN AL-BAKR Muhammad ibn Muhammad Al-KHAWAFI, founder of an order called after him Al-Zainiyah, which traced itself to Djunaad, was born in 737 (1336) at Khawaf (between Bughaddj and Zazan) in Khurasan, and was buried in 838 (1435) at the village Malin (two parasangs from Herat); whence his remains were transferred to Darwischbad, and thence to the Idgah of Herat, where a mosque was built over them. He obtained authorization (jihat) in Egypt from Nur al-Din 'Abd al-Rahman al-Milzat (Nasif al-Usir, No. 505), and returned to Central Asia, but visited Egypt again, whence he sent in 822 (1419) a gravestone for Khwaja Muhammad Pasha, who died in Madina, and from one of whose letters our authorities derive some of their information about him. In Egypt he made a disciple of 'Abd al-Rahim b. al-Amir al-Marrifinli, who accompanied him to his home; in Jerusalem of 'Abd al-Latif b. 'Abd al-Rahman al-Makbuli, and one 'Abd al-Muttalib, a Maghribi. A fourth disciple was Khwaja Sa'd al-Din of Kashghar, the most celebrated native of that place. (I. 340 = 1456; Relation de l'ambassade au Khurram, transl. C. Schefer, 1879, p. 164.)

ZAIN Al-Din was the author of several works: Risala al-Wajiz al-Khadija, composed in Jerusalem, al-Aswar al-Zainiyah, and a treatise on asceticism. A grandson of his, also called Zain Al-Din, was a courtier of Babur, and translated his Memoires into Persian.


ZAINAB. [See Al-Mu'ayyad, son of Muhammad, husband of the Prophet's daughter Fatima.]

ZAINAB BINT DJA'BH B. RUKH, Muslima, one of the Prophet's wives, was the daughter of Ummay bin 'Abd al-Muttalib; her kunya was Um'm al-Hakam and her name had been Barra. One of the first emigrants to Madina, she was a virgins (some traditions say a widow) when the Prophet gave her in marriage to his freedman and adopted son Zaid b. Haritha.

In 4 a.H. Muhammad, calling on Zaid in his home, saw Zainab alone and fell in love with her. Zaid divorced her in order that the Prophet might marry her; the latter's scruples were set at rest by the revelation of Kur'an xxxiii. 30–39. Zainab received a dowry of 400 dirhams. She was proud of the circumstances of her marriage, and used to say that Muhammad's other wives had been given to him by their fathers and brothers, while her union had been brought about by special divine revelation. The Ayyat al-Kursi (xxxiii. 53) is said to have been revealed on the occasion of Zainab's wedding feast and Kur'an lixi. 1 is also referred to by some to Zainab and to the other wives' envy of her.

Zainab was a friend of Khadija's, and, next to her, Muhammad's favorite. She accompanied him on the expedition against Khawar. Her charity is celebrated; Muhammad's prediction "the longest-handed of my wives shall be the first to join me in paradise" alludes to this. She had received 12,000 dirhams from 'Omar in 20 a.H., but left no money, having given all to the poor.

Zainab was about 35 on her marriage to Muhammad, and died at about 50, in 20 or 21 A.H.

The episode of the Prophet's infatuation with her adopted son's wife was made much of by Christian propagandists (see Maracci, Reptutio Alcorani, p. 562); modern Muslim biographers and commentators of the Kur'an have tried to present the episode in a seemlier light, e.g. Muhammad 'Abdul in Tafsir al-Fakih wa-Muhammad al-Kur'an, Cairo 1330, in the chapter entitled Taruff Masarullah Zaid we Zainab; and Mawlawi Muhammad 'Ali in his biography Muhammad the Prophet, Lahore 1924, p. 249–250.

Bibliography: Ibn Sa'd, ed. Sachau, viii. 71–82; Caetani, Annali dell' Islam, 1 a.H.
ZAINAB BINT KHUZZAIMA, one of Muhammed's wives, had borne the name of 'Umm al-Maṣūkīn since the Diḥḍhiltiyya. Her first husband, al-Tufail b. al-Harith, had divorced her; the second, 'Ubayda b. al-Ḫithir, was killed at Badr. Muḥammed married her in Ramadān 4 A.H. and gave her a dowry of 400 dirhams; she died 2 or 8 months later, the first of his Madīnan wives to die before him, and was buried in the cemetery of al-Makārah. Bibilography: Ibn Sa'd, ed. Sachau, viii., 82; Caustani, Annuari dell' Israim, 4 A.H., p. 16 and § 22; al-Tabari, ed. de Goeje, i. 1775—1776; Ibn al-Athir, Usd al-Qāhira, v. 466—467. (V. VACCA)

ZAINAB BINT MUHAMMAD, one of the Prophet's daughters, said to have been the eldest, was married before her father's mission to her maternal cousin Abu 'l-Ḫaṣṣ b. al-Rahbi. She was in al-Timār, at the time of Muhammed's Aggra, and did not follow him to Madīna; her husband, still a pagan, was taken prisoner at Badr. Zainab sent a necklace which had belonged to Khadūj to ransom him, and Muhammed freed him on condition that Zainab should come to Madīna. On her way thither she was maltreated by al-Ḫalībūs b. al-Aswad, and had a fall which caused her to miscarry (some authors place this accident in 8 A.H. and attribute her death to it). Her husband was taken prisoner a second time in 6 A.H. in the expedition of al-Ḫāzir, and freed by his wife's intercession. He became a Muslim in 7 and was reunited to his wife by a second marriage. Zainab died in Madīna in 8 A.H. She had two children, 'Ali who died in infancy, and Umāma, married to 'Ali b. Abī Ṭalib after Fāṭima's death. Bibliography: Ibn Sa'd, ed. Sachau, viii., 20—248; Caustani, Annuari dell' Israim, Intro., § 160, NO. 1; § 349, NO. 1; § 20; 8 A.H., § 9; 7 A.H., § 3; 8 A.H., § 85, 81, 201; al-Tabari, ed. de Goeje, ii. 2307—2307; H. Lammens, Fatimah et les filles de Mahomet, Paris. (V. VACCA)

AL-ZAINABI, Abū 'l-Ḫaṣṣ 'Ali b. Ṭirāz b. Muhammed, a vizier of the 'Abbāsid. He and his family had the name Zainabi because they were descended from Zainab bint Salsalimah b. 'Ali b. 'Abd Allāh b. Aba Ḫaṭṭāb, the cousin of the two first 'Abbāsids, who was held in great honor among the 'Abbāsids. In Rādīq 453 (July—Aug. 1061) his father Ṭirāz was appointed chief inspector (nasība al-Ḫalifah) of the 'Abbāsid sharifs and after his death, in Shawwāl 491 (Sept. 1098), 'Ali al-Zainabi inherited this office with which was combined in 517 (1123—1124) that of the Alīid chief inspectorate (mašūba al-Ḫalifah). After the dismissal of the vizier Ḥašib al-Din b. Ṣadıkā in Djamāl 316 (July—Aug. 1122), al-Zainabi administered the vizierate for some months but was not actually appointed vizier. It was not till Rabī' II, 572 (April 1162) that the caliph al-Mustarshid gave him this office; in 526 (1131—1132) however, al-Zainabi was dismissed and Amīrābāward b. Šahāl appointed in his place. In the meanwhile al-Mustarshid was assassinated and his son al-Raḥīl succeeded him (529—1135). But the very next year the latter was declared unfit to rule by an official fatwā of a number of theologians and legins at the instigation of al-Zainabi and when the Sāḥib Sulṭān Mas′ūd b. Muḥamad applied to al-Zainabi to ask who was best fitted to be caliph he proposed al-Raḥīl's uncle Muḥamad b. al-Muṣṭahfi, and the latter was proclaimed commander of the faithful under the name of al-Muṣṭafī; then he made al-Zainabi his vizier. But the new caliph and his vizier quarreled after a time. The latter therefore went to the court of Sulṭān Mas′ūd with whom he appeared to be in particular good terms and although the caliph summoned him to return and recom- mend himself to the court, of which he had been dismissed, he refused to return. He was therefore dismissed in 534 (1140—1140). Through the intervention of Sulṭān Mas′ūd however, a reconciliation took place and in 536 (1141—1142) al-Zainabi was allowed to return to Bābil. The caliph however had no further need for him and in Ramadān 538 (March—April 1144) al-Zainabi died in great poverty. Bibliography: Ibn al-Alḥiṣr, al-Kamīl (ed. Tornberg), v. 431; vi. 310; XI. 1251, 191, 507, 357, 425, 455, 460, 480; XI. 27, 75, 35, 59, 64; Ibn al-T Ḫāqān, al-Fihrist (ed. Demerouche), p. 406, 411 ii. 414—418; de Slane in his translation of Ibn Kathirīhā, iii. 153 ff. (K. V. ZETTERSTEN)

ZAITÜN, a town in the southeast of Asia Minor. It is the chief town in a land of the wildyets (formerly sandjaks) of Marāš and is (or was before the recent persecutions) inhabited for the most part by Armenians, who call it Ježou or Unia, usually however simply Kehş (hillage). The name Ulni (Unia) is also used for the whole of the mountainous country on the Djebān between Karatula (S. W.; of Albistan) and Be בצ. Whether Unia was originally the name of Zaitūn or Furnus to the S. W. of it, in the neighborhood of which is mentioned a monastery of the martyr Stephen of Ulni, is doubtful. An Aplough, i. e. Abū al-Karīf, of Fornos is mentioned at the beginning of the reign of Leon I of Little Armenian (1129—1137) (Rec. Hist. Creæn., Doc. Arm., i. 636; iii. 636). On the other hand, the town of Zaitūn is first mentioned after the capture of the last Kupenid (1375). According to local tradition, the inhabitants came from the fortress of Ani or Ani-ďazor, which probably lay in the Cilician plain. The earliest mention of the town which Alighiā could find is in 1326 (Bishop Nasars of Zejian; Stiicmm., p. 199, 201). Paul of Aleppo calls Zaitūn in 1669 "the well-known town of the Armenians". The inhabitants, a brave, liberty-loving, mountainous people, were for long (till about 1864) able to maintain a certain independence. A rising broke out in 1819 as a protest against the heavy taxes imposed by the Porte. The people of Zaitūn resisted İbrahīm Paşa on behalf of the Turks. The troubles of 1863 lasted till 1872 and broke out again in 1878 and 1884. In the summer of 1876 the residence of the governor was burned down; it was rebuilt in 1877. The confiscations of Sept. 22, 1884 and July 26, 1887 were much worse and almost the whole of the town was destroyed. New unrest was caused by the outbreak of smallpox, from which 400 children in Zaitūn died in 1890; its spread was ascribed to the carelessness of the Turkish doctor. The worst was the rising in 1895—
The editors of the Encyclopaedia propose to issue the Supplement immediately after the completion of vol. IV, in fascicles the number of which is estimated at 4—5.
was translated into French in 1886 by O. Houzé under the title: Le Maroc de 1811 à 1852 (P.E.O.R., 2nd series, vol. xviii). It is a narrative, in parts a résumé, of events in Morocco from the foundation of the 'Alid dynasty to the early years of the 19th century. A more detailed version of this part of the Tarjumâna, in which he dealt specially with events in which he had himself played a part or of which he had been a witness, was later prepared by al-Zayâni, and he gave it two different titles: Douârat Awâlîd Mamlûkîyya ‘Ali ibn Yûsuf, and al-Rawâfa‘ul-mirâbihîyya fi Dhîrik Miftâh al-Dawla bi-hamâ‘a‘ala wa-man tadhabûrma min al-Dawal bi-tahlîlîyya. — Another important work by al-
Zayâni was à very full account of his various journeys to which he added all kinds of digressions, literary, historical, and biographical, and gave it the title of al-Tarjumâna al-sabîra al-Àli al-dâwâri‘i‘i Akhâr Mudân al-Ashâr bârîn ma-bârîn. This book which is of the nature of both riba‘î and fahûma is also a very curious geographical treatise, with maps (e.g. a map of the sea, which is reproduced in my Historien des Chrest, between p. 188 and 189). All these works of al-Zayâni are to be found in manuscript in Morocco in various private libraries. A complete list is given, ibid., p. 167-168.

Al-Zayâni’s work is the principal source we possess, with the recent Kifâyat al-istiqâb of al-
Nâṣir al-Sulâiwarî (cf. the article al-Sulâiwarî), for the history of the ‘Alid dynasty of Morocco. It is full of valuable details and deserves serious study. It gives throughout an impression of accuracy and precision in historical as well as topographical matters. Information is given about migrations and social reforms and about the monumental history of the towns of Morocco. Al-Zayâni also shows a very remarkable acquaintance with events in Europe. Finally all that he tells us about what he saw on his journeys to Constantinople is worth publishing in full.


ZAKÂNI ‘UBAID. [See ‘UBAID ZAKÂNI.]

ZAKÂRIYÂ, the father of John the Baptist, is reckoned in the Korâne (v. 65) along with John, Jesus and Elisî among the righteous. Muhammad gives the substance of Luke i. 5-75 as follows: Zakâriyâ guards the Virgin Mary and the name (nâmê) and always finds fresh fruits there. He prays to God; angels announce to him that a son will be born to him, Yahyâ, a name never previously given to anyone, a pious man, a prophet, Yahyâ’s heir, pleasing to God. Zakâriyâ thinks he is too old. As a sign to him he is struck dumb for three days (Sûra iii. 32, 36; v. 1-15; xxi, 59-90).

Later legend expands the Gospel story and says that Yahyâ was the announcer (Luke i. 16) and that ‘Zakâriyâ was struck dumb as a punishment for his doubts (v. 20). It elaborates the details as follows: 19 people anxious to take charge of Maryam write their names on a reed; these are thrown into the pool of Siloam, and the reed with Yahyâ’s name comes to the top. Zakâriyâ now old and resigns his office of custodian which Kalâmasus gives to Joseph the carpenter (Thalathâ, p. 236). In Mary’s niche there is winter fruit in summer and summer fruit in winter; this encourages Zakâriyâ to pray that his aged body also may be fruitful out of season (Thalathâ, p. 237).

Muslim legend makes Zakâriyâ as a prophet die the death of a martyr. After Yahyâ’s death he escapes into a tree which opens for him. But the hen of his coop remains outside the tree. Ilahi betrays him, the tree is drawn down and with it Zakâriyâ (Thalathâ, p. 240; Ibn al-Athîr, p. 120). This is modelled on the Haggada and the martyrdom of Isaiah (Pal. Sabathî, s. v. 286; Ebel, Sabathî, p. 1018; Kântzsch, Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen, ii. 123; Isaiah, Djemâliûd, Zakâriyâ).

Muslim legend seems to identify the Zakâriyâ of the Gospel with the prophet Zachariah of whom the Haggada records that his blood boiled until Nebuchadnezzar’s general Nebuzaradann came. The latter sought to calm it with the blood of the sacrificed victim and with the best of Israel, but in vain. Only his appeal calms it. Muslim legend tells this of the blood of Yahyâ b. Zakâriyâ.

Bibliography: Jaharî, ed. Luiden, i. 2, 213 sqq., 719 sqq.; Thalathî, Khosrau al-
Abbâsî, Cairo 1325, p. 234-240; Ibn al-Athîr, al-
Abbâsî, Beirut 1363, p. 117-120; al-Kisâ‘, Khâzîn al-

ZAKÂT (a), the zimzât, one of the principal obligations of Islam. By this the law means a tax, which is levied on definite forms of property and is distributed to eight categories of persons. Muslim scholars explain the word from Arabic as meaning “purity” or “increase”. In reality it was borrowed in a much wider sense by Muhammad from Jewish usage (Hebrew-Aramaic zimzât). In the east among the religiously inclined, the giving away of worldly possessions was regarded as a particularly pious act, the possession of earthly riches on the other hand almost as an obstacle to salvation; the same word that denoted virtue and righteousness in general could therefore also be used for benevolence and charitable gifts. Muhammad, who had become acquainted with this form of pious acts as one of the marks of the religion of revelation, from the first laid stress on the practice of benevolence as one of the chief virtues of the true believer; cf. Sûra xxii, 22; xxxvi, 26: “those (who have of what we have given them spend out secretly and openly)” (many similar passages); Sûra lxx. 24 sq. “those, who acknowledge that the beggar and the needy have a determined claim on their possessions”; also
passage became the basis for the later laws about the distribution of the zakāt. The collectors hence mentioned had to receive the zakāt of the Bedouin tribes who had adopted Islam; for the latter the zakāt from the first was hardly anything but an obligatory impost, the amount of which was usually fixed definitely in the agreements made with the Prophet; the reluctance of many Beduins to pay it is fought in Sūra ix. 99 ṣy. The transformation of the zakāt into a state treasury, now beginning, was limited by Muhammad to the irreducible minimum; essential elements of the later regulation are unknown to the Kūrān and a part of the traditions. The Kūrān answers the question of the believers as to what they should give without any limitations: "the superfluity" (Sūra ii. 217), and a further revelation of the last year of the Prophet's life threatens with the punishment of hell "those who hoard gold and silver and do not spend it for Allāh's purposes" (Sūra ix. 54 ṣy.). Tradition also ascribes to the Prophet utterances which imply no limitation to the obligation of zakāt; among the Companions of the Prophet, Abu Dāhir is held to have championed the view that one should only keep as much property as one needs. 'Alī is said to have fixed the maximum value of property allowed at 4,000 dirhams, and the opinion is even ascribed to so late an authority as Mālik b. Anas that all wealth is forbidden (būrān). The Kūrān (e.g. Sūra ii. 211) and Tradition repeatedly describe as recipients of the zakāt parents, relatives, orphans, poor, travellers, beggars and slaves; but according to Tradition, a zakāt given to the rich, thieves and prostitutes can also be meritorious, since it is the mere fact of giving which is the first consideration. The nature of the objects liable to zakāt is not further defined in the Kūrān. Tradition knows of cases of paying zakāt, which cannot be fitted into the later system. In any case, the character of zakāt in the time of the Prophet was still vague and it did not represent any of the taxes demanded by religion. After Muhammad's death many Bedouin tribes therefore refused to continue to pay zakāt and they considered their agreements cancelled by the death of the Prophet, and many believers, among them 'Omar himself, were inclined to agree with this. Only the energy of Abu Bakr made the zakāt as a regular tax a permanent institution, which through the establishment of a state treasury contributed greatly to the expansion of Muslim power. Ardent believers continued as before to regard it as their right to bestow their zakāt as they thought fit; but very soon the development and centralisation of the state made this impossible in practice. When the obligations of a Muslim had been definitely laid down the zakāt was established as a religious tax and regulated in all its details; the views put forward on this occasion have left their effect in Tradition. In this connection may be mentioned the detailed regulation of zakāt, which is usually ascribed to Abu Bakr, sometimes to the Prophet or to 'Omar or 'Alī.

According to the Shāfiʿi school, the main regulations of the zakāt laws are as follows (On Muslims pay zakāt (according to this Hanafis only those who have attained years of discretion and are in full possession of their faculties) and on the following kinds of property: 1. fruits of the field, which are planted for food; 2. fruits, grapes and dates being especially mentioned in Tradition; 3. cattle, i.e. camels, oxen and smaller domestic
animals (according to the Hanafis also horses); 4. gold and silver; 5. merchandise. On the two first classes the zakat is to be paid at once at the harvest, on the last three, after one year's uninterrupted possession; a condition for liability to zakat is the possession of a certain minimum (mizab). On the first and second class the mizab is 10/15 (when artificial irrigation is used 5/15), the mizab for 5 camel-loads (waqid). There are complicated rules for the third category, which are based mainly on Al-Hakim Bakh's zakat ordinance and take into consideration not only the number but also the kind of animals; the mizab is 5 camels, or 20 cattle, or 40 smaller animals; the animals are only liable to zakat if they have grazed freely during the whole year and not been used for any work. The zakat on the fourth and fifth category is 3/15; the mizab for precious metals is calculated according to the weight and amounts for gold to 30 milrad (or dinar = c. 84 grammes = 1,320 grams), for silver seven times this, 200 dirhams (for gold and silver ornaments the commercial value is the deciding factor); the value of merchandise must be estimated at the end of the year in gold and silver; in this case also there is no liability to zakat if the precious metal or merchandise has not been kept for a full year unused as treasure. Hence the surrender of precious metals obtained from mines as well as of treasure trove is regarded by the best authorities as zakat (cf. F. F. Schmidt, Die scapura im islamischen Recht, in Isr., i. sect. iv. and v.). It is permitted to hand the zakat direct to the persons who have claimed it; it is however preferable to hand it to the Muslim authorities for regulated distribution. If the zakat is collected by the government, one is bound to pay it to the collector (amil) even if the character of the government is no guarantee of a proper distribution (according to some, especially Hanafi scholars, in this case to satisfy one's conscience, the zakat should be collected a second time and distributed direct). The right of the government to demand the zakat is however limited to the so-called zahir possessions, i.e. the visible articles of the first three categories; in the case of which the amil can fix the amount of the zakat from his own observation; the so-called batin properties on the other hand, i.e. the hidden articles of the two last categories, are expressly withheld from this control and the zakat is left entirely to the conscience of the individual. — The yield of the zakat is destined only for the eight classes mentioned in Sura ix. 60 (excluding the family of the Prophet, in contrast to the ghastina and fas), and after deducting a fixed salary for the collectors is to be distributed in equal parts to the other seven categories so as they exist in the country (so according to the Shafi'is, while according to the other schools various necessities may be considered). The distinction that is made between "poor" and "needy" is quite an arbitrary one; at any rate, the legislists usually interpret the definition in such a way that they themselves belong to one of these classes. Whether after the time of the Prophet there were still persons "whose hearts have to be conciliated" is disputed among the schools. By the slaves who have a claim to a share in the zakat are understood (except by the Malikis, such as have concluded a contract to purchase their liberty (mukatta), by debtors (with the Shafi'is) especially such as have taken upon themselves to wipe out a debt for God's sake. The part set aside "for Allah's purposes" is to be devoted to the fighters for the faith who voluntarily take part in the jihadi for not belonging to the regular troops. These categories have been drawn up as a result of a schematic interpretation of the passage in the Koran. — The articles (bint) to avoid payment of zakat are according to the Maliki and Hanbalis invalid, according to the Hanafis and Shafi'is sinful but valid.

Actual practice differed considerably from the theory of zakat in the different Muslim countries. The high imposts and taxes (munakat) not foresaw by the Shafi'is made the collection of the zakat usually difficult or impossible so that it, particularly on khatim property, was either not paid at all or not to the prescribed extent. Frequently its collection led to extortion and other abuses. Nor was the yield in the majority of cases applied according to the law; the collectors themselves or the amils kept the larger portion. Sometimes the zakat on the fruits of the field under the name of "tithe" (mizab; q. v.) became a purely secular tax. Nevertheless the legal obligation to pay zakat is everywhere recognised and where the peasant is not overburdened with other taxes, he pays it at least on khatim property as far as circumstances permit, although with many abuses in details. By zakat al-fitr (zakat of the breaking of the fast) is meant the obligatory gift of possessions at the end of the month of Ramadan, which according to Tradition was ordered by the Prophet in the year 2 and fixed as regards the amount (the latter is however not certainly historical). There were differences of opinion regarding the relation of this zakat to the general one and regarding the question whether it was obligatory. According to the view which finally prevailed, the zakat al-fitr is obligatory (according to the Maliki only under the most exceptional circumstances permit, although with many abuses in details).

By zakat al-fitr (zakat of the breaking of the fast) is meant the obligatory gift of possessions at the end of the month of Ramadan, which according to Tradition was ordered by the Prophet in the year 2 and fixed as regards the amount (the latter is however not certainly historical). There were differences of opinion regarding the relation of this zakat to the general one and regarding the question whether it was obligatory. According to the view which finally prevailed, the zakat al-fitr is obligatory (according to the Maliki only under the most exceptional circumstances permit, although with many abuses in details).

ZAKÁZÍK, an unimpressive, but busy commercial town in the Egyptian Delta, in the administrative division (mutatawya) of Sharkiya. Along with Damahirr it is one of the towns which do not constitute fiscal units for purposes of land tax. The town, an important railway centre, has an extensive trade in grain and cotton. There are oil refineries and a large market for dates, oranges and onions. It is 48 miles from Cairo, and is connected with it by rail. Its inhabitants in the time of Boinet Bey numbered 35,715, but in 1927 the total population had increased to 54,351. Tuesday is market day. There are several mosques and a modern Theological Institute (opened 1925); while the various Christian bodies, Coptic, Greek, Catholic, Maronite and Protestant (American) have their places of worship. There are also government and community schools, hospitals and missions. The place is well supplied with and irrigated by canals which join with the Nile. The Ma'âz Canal (Mahr Ma’as) is the former Tanitic branch. A certain kind of small fish which is caught thereabout is called a zákàrt. The situation of the town is very favourable owing to the fertility of the surrounding country. Within the last century it has accordingly developed considerably in importance and wealth. In the neighbourhood are the ruins of Tell Bajia (the ancient Baharth), where amid fallen granite blocks and masonry lies all that remains of the famous Temple of Bast.


ZAKRÜM. (See Djabaham.)

AL-ZALÁLKA, the name given by the Muslim historians to the place near the town of Badojus (q.v.) or Abtalyame, where the armies of the Almoravid sultan Yüsuf b. Tashfin (q.v.), assisted by Andalusian contingents, inflicted a memorable and severe defeat on the troops of Alfonso VI of Castile on Friday 12th Radjab 479 (Oct. 25, 1086). This famous battlefield is now known as Sagrassas on the banks of the Rio Guerero about 8 miles N. E. of Badojus. Almost all the Muslim historians of Spain devote a large space in their works to the account of the battle of al-Zaláhlka, but the most circumstantial account is that incorporated by Ibn 'Abd al-Mun'im al-Himyari in his historical and geographical compilation entitled al-Rawāf al-mu'tar which reproduced almost in its entirety in his Naft al-Tib. On the circumstances which led up to the battle of al-Zaláhlka and resulted in the landing of Yusuf b. Tashfin in Spain as well as for an account of the battle itself see the article VUSUR in VANDENPLAS.


AL-ZALZALA, the title of the Sura xlix., taken from the opening words.

AL-ZAMAKHSHARI, Abu 'l-Khâmîs Mâmilûd 'Omar, a Persian born Arabic scholar, theologian and philologist. Born in Khâshzîm on 27th Radjab 467 (March 8, 1075), in the course of his travels as a student he came to Mecca, where he stayed for some time as a pupil of Wâhâsh, hence his epithet Dâ'ûr al-âlûh. He must however have achieved a literary reputation before this; when he passed through Bagdad, he was received with hospitality. He died in al-Dhahrûn in Khâshzîm on the day of 'Arafa 538 (June 14, 1144). Ibn Bajâsî (Paris ed., iii. 6) was still able to see his tomb there.

His principal work, completed in 528 (1134), is his commentary on the Qur'an, al-Kashshâf 'an Hâchî al-Tawâlî, which in spite of its Ma'arif bias — at the very beginning he declares the Qur'an created — was widely read in orthodox circles. The author devotes most attention to dogmatic exegesis of a philosophical nature, paying only slight attention to tradition. Besides giving the purely grammatical exposition, he devotes special attention to pointing out rhetorical beauties and thus supporting the doctrine of the Rûqàa of the Qur'an. He gives particular care to the lexicographical side of his work; going fully into the readings and supporting his explanations by ample extracts from the old poetry. His work still retained a place in literature when Bâlûqawi produced his own as the orthodox counterpart and tried to surpass him in the accuracy of the grammatical exposition and in quoting variant readings. Even in the western lands of Islâm, where his dogmatic point of view gave particular offence to the Ma'istik, Ibn Khaldûn placed it high above other commentators; it is not however an accident that manuscript copies of his work are rarer in the west than in Islam. The first edition by W. Nasau Leiden, the Mawlâws Khâdîm Ùsâin and 'Abd al-Hâli (Calculta 1856, 2 vols.) was followed by the printed editions at Bâlûq, Cairo 1307, 1308, 1318. To the 15 glosses quoted in Brockelmann, G. A. L., i. 290, of which that of 'Ali al-Dhajarî (3486 = 1413) was printed on the margin of the Cairo editions of 1308 and 1318 we may add — setting aside uncertain statements in

A Khâlî al-Kaibih fî l-Kaibih, 99 as far as I know nowhere else, is according to R.A.D., vili. 738 in the library of Khâtîb al-Sayîfî, ‘Oghmân in Tunis.

Of his grammatical works, al-Mu’affqâl written in 513—515 (1119—1121) has become celebrated for its succinct yet exhaustive and logical exposition; it was published by J. B. Broch, Christiania 1829, 1879, with glosses and appendices by Muhammad Va’qîl Râshî, Delhi 1891, by Hamza Fâth Allâh, Alexandria 1201, Cairo 1323, with Shawâdîl commentary by Muhammad Ba’r al-Dîn Abî Firdâs al-Nâsîr al-Hâlî, to the commentaries mentioned in G.A.L., l. 209, of which one published by G. Jahn, Leipzig 1882 in 2 vols., written by Ibn Ya’qûb (d. 643 = 1245) is the best known, may be added: 1. al-Mu’affqâl by Abu l-Hâlîh ‘Abd Allâh b. Abî ‘L-Hâlî Allâh Hassan al-Ukhûtî (d. 616 = 1219), ‘Ifrîjît, Cairo, l. 157; 2. al-Mu’affqâl by ‘Abîl-Walîd b. Abî al-Anfîl, Escorial, Denkbourg, N° 61; 3. al-Mu’affqâl by Muhammad b. Sa’d al-Marvâzî (Hâlîbî Khaliﬁ, vi. 38—39), Brill—Houtsma, N° 1344; 4. Qâlib Ma’sûr al-Mu’affqâl ‘ad al-Mu’affqâl by Ibn Ma’llîk (d. 673 = 1273) in Damascus, A. Ziyâyî, Khâtîb’în al-Kutub, 64—55, on the versets by Fakhr al-Dîn al-Karîmî, ibid., p. 86, 87; 6. by Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Fâhîl al-Farrâshî, Brit. Mus. Or. 7472 (Descre. Or. N° 50); 7. al-Mu’affqâl fi Shâhî al-Mu’affqâl by Muhammad Abî al-Ghâmi, Calcutta 1322 (1904) by Abî ‘L-Hâlî Muhammad al-Siddîqî al-Andalusî in Stambul, Salim Agha, N° 1157. An imitation of the Mu’affqâl with the same title was written in 670 (1271) by ‘Abînâ’îh b. Bahrîn h. Mâlîqî, MS. in the Brit. Mus., s. Oriental Studies presented to E. G. Browne, p. 148, N° 826. In addition to a treatise on syntax, al-Mu’affqâl fî l-Mu’affqâl, which had a small circulation and is known only from the Stambul MSS. Köprülü, N° 1393, Liliçî, N° 5740 (see Reischer, in M.S.O., xiv. 31), he also wrote the short handbook al-Ummâlahâfî, which attained great popularity; see de Sacy, Anthologie grammarica, p. 99 sqq.; A. Fischer, in Centurio s. n. s. n.s. 3, p. 151. It was also autographed by Fakhîr, Christiania 1857, pr. Thirât (1) 1269, Thirât (1) 1275, Cairo 1289, Stambul 1299 (following al-Madînî’s Nâssî al-Kaibîh, in a ‘Lamînî al-Muhammedî, Thirât 1883). Among the commentaries on it, the best known is that of Muhammad b. ‘Abîl-Ghâmi al-Andalusî, whose date of death is not known (certainly not 647, as in the Fakhîrît, Cairo 4, l. 123, as no MS. is known before the year 1000), printed Bullât 1256, in a Persian Masudi’s 1279, in the Arabic 1310, in the manuscript of ‘Abî ‘L-Hâlî al-Muhammedî, 1290. In addition to the commentary on Sa’d al-Dîn al-Bardâ’s (for MSS. see G.A.L., l. 791) may now be mentioned that by his pupil DIjjî al-Dîn al-Masûkî, Brit. Mus. Or. 6290 and the two modern ones al-Fârî al-Shâhî al-Ummâlahâfî by Muhammad Ul. A."Akar, Cairo 1299, and Oneât al-Sarîrî by ‘Ibrâhîm b. Sa’d al-Kâibih, written in 1298 (1880), Bullât 1312. For a work on grammatical pithies and another on prosody see G.A.L., loc. cit. Here also may be mentioned his commentary on the Nâsîrî al-‘Arabî of Shâhîrî: ‘Abîr al-‘Afbâf fi Sharh Nâsîrî al-‘Arabî, printed with the commentary of Muhammad, Stambul (Djâwâbi) 1300, alone Cairo 1324, together with a series of other commentaries, Cairo 1328.


His wonderful knowledge of the language was shown in a series of collections of sayings which enjoyed great popularity. A collection of old proverbs is contained in the still unprinted al-Mu’affqâl fî l-Mu’affqâl, which exists in numerous MSS. in Stambul, in addition to those given in G.A.L., l. 292 (see Reischer, in M.S.O., xvi. 23, R.O., iv. 708, M.O., vii. 97, 102), in Brusa (cf. Z. Z. M. G., xvii. 56) and Scutari (ibid., 58) a selection from it entitled Zabîl al-Mu’affqâl was made by M. ‘Umarî al-Galîpolî (l. 1024 = 1615) in 999 (1591) with Persian commentary and Turkish glosses (see G.A.L., l. 425). He made three collections of apophthegmas, composed by
himself with particular care and all the fine artificialities of rhetoric: 1. Nawbiágh al-Kalím (Anthologia cententellarum orientalium cith scholia Zamačwari, ed., verit, illustrat. H. A. Schultens, Leyden 1772; Les Poesies de Z, texte arabe, ..., par C. Barbir de Meynard, in J. A. ser. viii, vol. vi., p. 313 sqq.; cf. de Goeje, in Z. D. M. G., xxx, 369 sqq.; lib. Stambul 1866; pr. Cairo 1287, 1303; Bafrîr 1306). Of the commentary the best known is that of Sa’d al-Din al-Taftânî (d. 792 = 1390) entitled Nuzhâ al-Muqaddâmât, lib. Stambul 1831, Cairo 1287, with glosses by Muhammad al-Bairîrî, Bafrîr 1306; that of Abu l-Hasan b. Obâl al-Wahhâb al-Khaîwâî, written about 770 (1368), was printed in Kâsim in 1314. In addition to the commentaries mentioned in G. A. L., i. 302 by al-Khayrî (8th century), the prince of Yaman al-Nâsir li l-Haqq al-Mulûm, written in 728 (1328), and, by al-Khosâî about 1000 (1591), we have also those of Muhammad b. Dîhânhâl al-Nasîfî, which Schultess, loc. cit., mentions, and that of Muhammad b. Ibrahim al-Kabîrâ (d. 972 = 1564; see G. A. L., ii. 368), written in 976 (1560), by Lévi-Provençal, Les Mus. arabs. de Rabat, No. 421, and the Turk. transl. by Yusuf Sidîkfeh Etendi, pr. Stambul 1283: 2. Kâbîl al-Abrâm zül-wâsara 3-l-Kâminât wa l-Affâr (cf. v. Hummer, Winter Jahrb., iii. Ann. Bl., ii. 331), pr. Cairo 1292, a synopsis with additions from other sources prepared by Muhammad b. al-Khayrî al-Kâsimî (d. 940 = 1533; see G. A. L., ii. 429) and entitled Nuzhâ al-Mukhtáz, Bârûr 1279, 1288, Cairo 1327, 1328, 1329: 3. Aâshâf al-Diniân (Samâwîsh al-Mukhâshârân, Wadihâli Dahlan, Bârûr), compiled by the unknown Ahmad b. Muhammad b. Muhammad al-Nâsîrî, who was also cited in the Kâmâshât, in Leyden MSS. No. 2153 and Brit. Mus. Suppl. No. 100 (see de Goeje, in Z. D. M. G., xxx, 569), pr. Bârûr 1324, with Turk. transl. Stambul 1286, with commentary Kâbîl al-Abrâm zül-wâsara 3-l-Kâminât wa l-Affâr by Muhammad al-Nâsîrî, pr. Cairo 1327, 1328. Speculations on time (or space) as the highest principle of the world, with which Islam was acquainted from Hellenistic and Persian tradition, were of course strictly avoided. The doctrine that time, like space, was one of the five principles of the All was widely known, if it found little acceptance. Similar sentiments, with different components and names, are found among different the philosophical and hermetic wisdom (cf. J. Kroll, Die Lehren der teut. Philosophen, in Bôr. u. Gesch. d. Philosoph. d. M. A., xii. 2-4, Münster 1914, p. 67 sqq.), among the âshâfîs and al-Qâdîs, among the iqâmîs, the al-Qâdirîs, the ādîs, the Ahmadis, etc. (S. Guzîr, Fragmente relativis à la doctrine des islamîs, in N. É., xxiii, Paris 1874, p. 331 sqq. and Der Druze, in Kâbul 1306, ed. C. Schott, Leipzig 1802, p. 68). The physician Râzî (d. 932 or 933) gives them in the following order: 1. God-Creator; 2. World-Soul; 3. Original Matter; 4. Absolute Space; 5. Absolute Time (Allâtâni’s “India, ed. E. Sachau, London 1887, p. 163; Ibn Heath, Kâbul al-Mâlih wa l-Nîshâbî, Cairo 1317, i. 14 sq. [where mulla should be read mullah for absolute time]). As, according to Muslim belief, only God is absolute, infinite eternal, this doctrine was condemned as heresy.

The metaphysical potential (God, etc.) found an analogy in physics. Al-Yâ’âbî (second half of the third or second century) says with reference to the Aristotelian system of physics that there are five things (nâshîh) in all the beings of nature, namely matter, form, space, motion and time; the last three however are accidents (al-Yâ’âbî, ed. Houtsma, i. 148). Al-Kindî (d. after 870 = 1466) wrote a small book, which survives only in the Latin
between the separate acts (a'ni') (Dis diegnatlichen Lehren der Araber des Islam von al-Bahr'), ed. H. Ritter (Bibl. Isl., IV), Constantinople 1930, ii, 443). Similarly Maqtab al-Sif al-Makdisi says that in the Muslim view time (samâ) is the movement of the sphere of heaven and ma'âd between actions (af'd). (Le livre de la creation et de l'histoire d'Abou Ezê Ahmad ben Sahl el-Rakkhi, ed. C. Huart, Paris 1899, i, 41). On the other hand, musâda means duration in the Kifâ Mas'ûlî al-Uilm (ed. G. van Vloten, Leyden 1895, p. 177 sq.) where we read: "Time is a duration (musâda) which is counted i.e. measured, by movement, as by the motion of the spheres of the stars and other things in motion". Strictly we have the above mentioned distinction between perceptible time measured by bodily motion and abstract duration which cannot be measured, but is perceived by the soul and directly experienced (cf. H. Bergson's distinction between temps and durée; musâda is also found in Kâûn's terminology (cf. al-Burûjî, op. cit.), and the Ikhwân al-Safa'. In the Sûbâ l-x., already mentioned, they speak of [physical] time as a duration which is measured by the motion of the sphere of heaven).

Musâda as the pure duration of life of the soul should probably be described as a mean between samâ (accident of bodily motion) and dâhâr (duration of the spirit). This leads us to metaphysical considerations of the relation between time and eternity. The terminology here varies not only because they endeavour to bring Aristotle and Plato into harmony with one another but also because each writer and especially the mystic likes to use his own terms.

In a metaphor in the Timâûs Platon conceives of time as the image and emblem of eternity (cf. Die vergangenen Theologie des Aristoteles, ed. F. Dieterich, Leipzig 1882, p. 107, with Timothei, p. 39 sq., and H. Leisegang, Die Begriffe der Zeit und Ewigkeit im späten Platonismus (Brill. a. Geiss. d. Philos. im M. A., xiii, 4), Munich 1939, p. 195 sq.). Only after the creation of the world-soul did the argument of the chaotic matter of the world did time begin with the regular movement of the sphere of heaven. The beautifully planned world and with it time will probably not come to an end. From Platonic tradition, especially through the intermediary of the Pseudo-Plutarch and Galen, came the doctrine of beginning without end, and also speculations about time as identical with the motion of the sphere of heaven or with the sphere of heaven itself or even with the world-soul. If time was identified with the sphere of heaven and with the world-soul, it was called a substance (contrary to Aristotle who called it an accident).

After Aristotle became known, the suspect philosopher was recognized by his doctrine of the beginninglessness of time. Following the neo-Platonists, the followers of this doctrine were convinced that it was a reality. In the form of a stage-case and it was therefore obvious that every kind of being has its own time or eternity. Only God is in the proper sense eternal, not supereternal. That being and doing coalesce in the first cause (God) was certain to the philosophers, following Aristotle. God is eternal and therefore removes the world. The first creation, intelligence (jâh: Le livre de la creation [see above], i, 154 sq. gives it as a Muslim conception, that higher time was the first creation,
ZAMÂN (pl. azəmən, azəmun, azəmənlə), time.

As a guide to the distinction in use between azəmən (common to the Semitic languages) and wakt (only Arabic with the meaning of "time") the following rules may be deduced from the Arabic works of a scientific nature, although they appear to be not infrequently broken even in works that have been compiled with great care. Zəmən is used predominantly for time as a philosophical or mathematical conception in contrast to mağazən, "space" (the similarity in sound between these two words has possibly not been without influence on the preference given to azəmun over wakt in this connection), for longer periods, centuries, length of reign of dynasties, historical epochs, and also in astronomical usage for the numerical value of a period of time which is variable by nature, e.g. the longitude, which differs with latitude and season of the year, of the "temporal hours" (al-əṣṣat al-səmənən, Gr. ἀπὸ καινοῦτος, Lat. horæ temporales sex inaequalis) which, in contrast to our "equinoctial hours" which are always of the same length (ṣūbaṭ al-ti'dāl, Gr. ἐπαυσί προμήγιον, Lat. horæ aequinoctiales), are obtained by dividing the period of daylight into twelve; in this case they also talk of azəmən (more rarely wakt) əṣṣat azəmun ve lajızən al-səmənən. In contrast to this, wakt (pl. waktə) means in astronomy definite points in time, also (usually constant) spaces of time (wakt ədviq əl-waktə, the astronomical noon; wakt ədviq əl-lajızə, midnight; both meanings are found together in al-Battānī, Opus Astronomicum, ed. Nallino, iii. 192; al-wakt ["space of time"] ədviq al-ti'dāl, ədviq əl-lajızə, ədviq əl-kənənt əfərə wakt ["point of time"] at-ti'siṣal), and in general, periods of time of short duration, e.g. the length of a man's life or of a generation. Wakt is also used with the meaning of wakțə for the "correct time"; it may also mean the astronomical time of observation, but in this meaning the technical term wəṣṣāt (pl. wəṣṣənə) from the same root is more usual, which in turn can also mean the art of compiling calendars and the time of prayer [see əfəqər]. Zəmən and wakt are also both found meaning "seasons of the year" as synonyms of wakt.

In his Amrərə al-Tanəsəl ve Arərə al-Tau'əsil (ed. Fleischer, Leipzig 1846, i. 105) al-Ba'da, discussing the word wəṣṣāt in the Kənən, Sūra ii. 185, gives the following definition of mənəda, zuwənən and wəṣṣa: al-mənəda means, strictly speaking, the period of revolution of the sphere from beginning to end (i.e. it means the totality of time, "from eternity to eternity"); al-zəmən is subdivided mənəda (i.e. a considerable space of time) and al-wakt the zəmən chosen for any purpose (i.e. wakt arises out of zəmən by further subdivision and means definite shorter intervals or points)." This schematic definition coincides in essentials with that above given.

Calculation of time. a. The pre-Muhâmadan Calendar. Our knowledge of the early Arab method of reckoning time is based on scattered references in what remains of the old poetry; it is still very incomplete and cannot by any means be regarded as satisfactory on all points. There is much in favour of the view — especially the meaning of the majority of the old names of the months (Ṣafar I, Ḳa'b I, Rabi'I II, Džumādā I, II,
ZAMĀN

Ramaḍān) — that the old Arab year was lunar in character and resembled in some degree the Jewish year (‘Tīght year’). We must however make this limitation that it is hardly safe to assume a uniform division of time for the whole of Arabia in the early period. Among the Arab Bedouin tribes as well as among other nomad peoples, there was originally a calendar based on the moon only — a so-called pure lunar year, and the adaptation to the solar year only took place later. This assumption is also supported by the statements of various Muslim scholars (used by Mahmoud Efendi in his article in ‘Abd, 1856, ser. v., vol. XI); for example al-Biruni (Al-Qāhirah, 1857-1878) regarding with Abd Ma‘shār ibn ‘AbdAllāh al-Balighī (Kitāb al-‘Uṣūl fī Bayāt al-Nulūd) with whose work he was acquainted, mentions that the transition from pure lunar years to lunar-solar years took place about two centuries before the Hijrīa under the influence of the Jewish year. The later theory adopted by F. K. Gmelin (Chronologie, i. 245) from Mahmoud Efendi (Mém. des savants étrangers de l'Académie royale de Belgique, xxx., 1861) which assumes the existence of a pure lunar year in the period immediately before the Hijrīa cannot be quoted as a sound argument against the preceding, as it is not sufficiently established that the conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in March 571 — the ‘conjunction of religions’ (dirān al-dīn) — actually took place before the birth of the Prophet and that we have not here to deal with a later conjunction. The Arab lunar year, like the Jewish, began in autumn; the year itself consisted of 12, in later years 13 months, which were reckoned from al-‘Uṣūl al-Nulūd (new moon). The intercalation of the thirteenth month which was necessary to fix the beginning of the year at a definite period in the solar year was done empirically from time to time, on the average every two or three years. The much disputed word wāri (Sūra ix. 37) indicates, as Moberg has recently conclusively shown (Axel Moberg, An-Ne’er in der türkischen Tradition, Lund 1931), this intercalation of the extra month; this was first expressly prohibited by Muhammad in the year 10 A. H. (Kurān, loc. cit.). The time of the hādhā [q. v.] originally associated with autumn — i.e. fixed by the solar year — was fixed presumably by the cosmic setting (anvār; pl. anvāl) of one of the 28 stations of the moon (mukātāl); this method of fixing the lunar dates is also found at a later period (cf. the Calendar of Corregid de l'année 976’, ed. Doyé, Leyden 1873) and we find it also in early periods in other parts of the world (China, India, Egypt). In Muhammad’s time however as a result of an insufficient skill in observing and intercalating, the lunar year had advanced so far in front of the solar year that the beginning of the year, with the month Dhu ’l-Hijdāj which preceded it and the time of the hādhā fell in the spring. In the later period of the Djihiyya the names of the months were already fixed as we know them in the Muslim period, except that al-Muharram [q.v.] in the latter took the place of Ṣafar; they were Ṣafar I, Šafar II, Ṣaḥr I, Ṣaḥr II, Djamādār I, Djamādār II, Rajab, Sha‘bān, Ramaḍān, Shawwāl, Dhu ’l-Ka‘da, Dhu ’l-Hijdāj; it is to be noted that the first half year consisted of three double months. The names of the early Arab years as given by al-Birunī are quite different; these, supplanted by those just mentioned, were: al-Mu‘āmār ( = Šafar I), Djamādār, Huwa‘, Ṣaḥr, Shawa‘r, Ṣaḥr, Djamādār, Rajab, Šamā‘r, Ramaḍān, Shawwāl, Dhu ’l-Ka‘da, Dhu ’l-Hijdāj. In addition to these, al-Birunī, al-Ma‘ārif and the Sahāsīh inscriptions give many other names of months, which differ considerably with the different tribes and sources so that no deductions can be made from them about the earliest period of the Arab calendar.

According to Wellhausen (Revis. arabisch. Heidentumms, Berlin 1897, p. 96 sq.), the year was originally divided into three months: the period of rain, of drought and of heat. In the old Arab poetry we find a division into four, Khurṣ or Rabī‘, Shawwāl, Dhu ’l-Hijdāj and Rajab, roughly corresponding to our autumn, spring and summer; it is possible there was also a fivefold division into Rabī‘ (late harvest), Khurṣ (autumn), Shawwāl (winter), al-Rabī‘ al-thānī (early harvest), Saf (early summer) and Ka‘b (summer).

The use of the week of seven days can be proved to have existed at a very early period among the pagan Arabs. According to al-Birunī (Al-Qāhirah, p. 64), the old names of the days of the week were Awwal (Sunday), Ahwān, Djihiyya, Djihiyya, ‘Arba‘a, Khurṣ and Shahār. It should not however be assumed that the seven day week was an original invention of the Arabs; on the contrary, many things point to its having been taken from Babylonia or the Jews, among whom it was established at a very early period.

The days were grouped within the month into ten groups of three each, the names of which, reckoned from the new moon (al-‘Uṣūl) were Ghurar, Nasīt, Tussa’; ‘Ushar, Djihiyya, Dhu’l-Qa‘da, Dhu’l-Muha‘arram, Dhu’l-Muha‘arram and Muharram (cf. al-Birunī, op. cit., p. 65 sq.). The day itself began at sunrise among the Jews and as was later the custom in Islam. There is no evidence of the division of the day into 24 hours in the pre-Muhammadan period.

Epochs. The fixed points or epochs used in the pre-Muhammadan period from which to reckon years seem to have been very numerous. Al-Birunī mentions: battles, memorable events, the year of the restoration of the Ka'b etc.; as epochs of the different tribes (op. cit., p. 34). More general seems to have been the reckoning from the "days of treason", anṣār al-Đagār (probably between 585 and 591 A.D.), and from the year of the Elephant, anṣār al-Đalīl (probably about 570 A.D.), the latter, being according to some authors, the year of Muhammad's birth (571).

The Calendar in Islam. By the already mentioned prohibition of the wāri' in the year 10 A. H. by Muhammad there came into use the system of reckoning by pure lunar months which is characteristic of Islam (one pure lunar month = 29 days; 12 synodic months of 29.5 44.2 in 3 = 354.5 48.1 56 are the term lunar year is really stupid). An adaptation to the actual course of the sun was now no longer possible and the beginning of the Muhammadan year therefore falls about 11 days behind each solar year, coming back to the same solar time in about 33 years; 33 lunar years are therefore almost equivalent to 32 solar years. From this proportion we get the approximation formulæ
for transforming years A. H. into years A. D. and vice versa:

A. D. = 4 1/2 A. H. + 622 or A. H. = 4 1/2 (A. D. — 622).

For exact calculations the Vergleichstafelten by Wüsteufeld and Mahler are indispensable (see Bibli.).

According to the Kari (Sirs x, 5, etc.) which expressly makes the moon the measure of time, the beginning of the month and of the year must be established as in ancient times by actual observation of the new moon and as a matter of fact the popular calendar still does this at the present day. For reasons which are readily intelligible, at quite an early period a cyclic reckoning established itself which, starting from the fact that the period of two lunations is approximately 59 days, gave the months alternately a length of 30 and 29 days so that 1 (Muharam), 3, 5, 7, 9, 11 have each 30 days and 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12 have 29 days. The ordinary year thus has 354 days. The difference of 30 48 36 (almost exactly 11 days) by which the astronomical lunar year is longer was made good by intercalating 11 days (yawm al-hijah) in every 30 lunar years. The most widely disseminated in Muslim lands is the practice of making 2, 5, 7, 10, 13, 16, 18, 21, 24, 26 and 29 in the cycle of 30 leap years (jana kalbata). The intercalated day itself is always given to the month Dhu 'l-Hijja which in the ordinary year has 29, in leap year 30 days (on other systems of intercalation, especially the Turkish eight year cycle, see Ginzel, Chronologie, 1, 255).

The day (i.e. the yawn al-hashem, al-yawm bi-lashrith) in the period of the Dzhihliya was reckoned from sunset; as al-Farghatan emphasizes, this method of counting comes from the fact that the first day of the month is fixed by the hili (first light of new moon) which is always to be observed at sunset. The division of the yawn al-hashem into 24 hours is however to be traced to Greek influence. In ordinary reckoning of time temporal hours (see above) alone are used, on the other hand the astronomers very often use equinoctial hours and always expressly describe them as such.

Instead of the old names of the days of the week, we find in Islam simply the cardinal numbers in altered form (from Sunday to Thursday), Friday becomes "the day of assembly" and Saturday the "Sabbath", as follows: Yawm al-Ahmad (Sunday), Yawm al-Ijman (Monday), Yawm al-Thulathah (Tuesday), Yawm al-Arba'ah (Wednesday), Yawm al-Khamis (Thursday), Yawm al-Juma'a (Friday), Yawm al-Sabt (Saturday). (In the days of the week it should be remembered as already explained that Yawm al-Ahmad begins on the evening of our Saturday, Yawm al-Ijman on the evening of Sunday, and so on so that the Arabic and European names do not cover exactly the same 24 hours).

In Muslim chronology the year begins on 1st Muharram of the year in which the Prophet made his Hijra from Mecca to Yathrib (not the day of the Hijra itself or of the arrival in Medina, which is usually taken to be the 8th of Rabi' I, i.e. Sept. 20, 622). It was Thursday (Yawm al-Khamis) July 18, 622 A. D., called Tahir al-Hijra (in the Julian reckoning by days, day 1, 648, 439). The introduction of this era only took place under the Caliph 'Umair.

Besides the reckoning by years from the Hijra, the most varied foreign era were also in use [see Tahir]. The most important was the Alexandrian era (called Tahir al-Khit — "Copts", Egyptians — or Tahir al-Shahid — "of the Martyrs") reckoned by the ghakar al-Khit which was the earliest in use. This is a solar era, unlike the Muslim. The year, the length of which, like the Julian, is 365 1/4 days, has 12 months of 30 days not dependent on the phases of the moon, in which 5 days were added to the last month and 6 in leap years. Every fourth year is a leap year. The Egyptian names of the months, some in corrupt form, were used. According to al-Battani (Op. Att., II, 160) they were: Tis (in the Greek historians 220), Darya (222), Atur (225), Kiyakh (229), Tilin (231), Amahr (234), Barnnath (238), Barnin (242), Afkh (246), Mihr (249). The five or six intercalated days were called as among the Copts the "little month", al-ghakar al-shaghir. The years of this era are generally reckoned from 254 A. D., the year of the accession of the emperor Diocletian; on the other hand in al-Battani from Friday, Aug. 18, 359, c. (Nallino, i, 244 gives an explanation of this). — Another era in frequent use is the Seleucid called Tahir al-Khit or Tahir al-Ishkar, usually Tahir al-Dzi l-Karmean after the "two-horned Alexander". It is usually reckoned from Monday, Oct. 1 (in al-Battani, from Saturday, Sept. 1) 312 A. D. and uses the Julian year and the Julian intercalation, with the Syrian-Arabic names of the months, ghakar al-Khit, so-called because each of these months corresponds to one in the Roman calendar, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syrian Name</th>
<th>Roman Name</th>
<th>Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tsisiru al-aswul</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsisiru al-hum</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamin al-aswul</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamin al-hum</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shabat</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhar</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisam</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajrur</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazirn</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamis</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ab</td>
<td>August</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aful</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These names of months are also used in the calendar of the Syrian Christians. On other eras see al-Battani, ch. xxxii. and Nallino's notes, i, 244 sqq.

The Arabo-Egyptian land-tax year (al-zama al-kharaziybe), which was introduced after the conquest of Egypt by the Arabs and used for long periods, was a solar year, the beginning of which coincided with that of the Egyptian solar year. The years were counted from the date of the Hijra; there thus arose differences between the number of Hijra years and those of the kharaz-year, which frequently caused confusion in dating. In Egypt itself this form of year was also in everyday use among the people (for further information see Ginzel, op. cit., i, p. 264—265).

The Turkish financial year (milley year) which, along with the Hijra (lunar) year used mainly for religious purposes, was the official year, is in form — apart from its date of commencement — identical with the Julian year. The names of the months have slight variations the same as those of the Syrian-Arab year already mentioned. The year begins on March 17; Feb. 29 is the intercalated day and also the last day of the year;
there again, the šāhīd, in 378 (988-989) after taking Leon, laid siege to the Christian prince in Zamora; Bermudo fled and the inhabitants handed the town over to al-Mansūr. A little later in 385 (1099), the šāhīd placed a Muslim population in Zamora and gave the government of the town to Abu 'l-Aywy Ma'n b. 'Abd al-'Azīz [q.v.] al-Tudjīt. This occupation did not last long, for Zamora was attacked by the second 'Amīrīd šāhīd 'Abd al-Malik al-Muṣaffar in his expedition of 395 (1095) against Galicia. After this the Muslim chroniclers make no mention of Zamora, which was now to play an important part in Castilian history down to the end of the middle ages, especially in the period of the Cid.


ZAMORA, the sacred well of Mecca, also called the well of Ismā'īl. It is in al-kabrī al-sharīf S. E. of the Ka'ba opposite the corner of the sanctuary in which the Black Stone is inserted. It is 140 feet deep and is surrounded by an elegant dome. The pilgrims drink its water as health-giving and take it home with them to give it to the sick. Zamora in Arabic means "abundant water" and zamaam "to drink by little gulps" and "to mutter through the teeth".

Muslim tradition connects the origin of this well with the story of Abraham. It was opened by the angel Gabriel to save Hagar and her son Ismā'īl, who were dying of thirst in the desert. Hagar was the first to catch its water by building a well around it. It is at least certain that it was held in reverence at a very early period. In the pre-Islamic period the Persians used to come there as a line of an old poet says: "The Persians muttered their prayers around the well of Zamora from the earliest times". According to another poet, the well was visited by Sāsān son of Bāshād, the ancestor of the Sāsānids.

In the period of paganism, the Djūrhumis filled in Zamora and threw all their treasure into it. Mas'ūdī however remarks that the Djūrhumis were poor and that the treasures buried there must have been brought not by them, but by the Persians.

The well was rediscovered and dug out by 'Abd al-Muṭjilla, the ancestor of the Prophet, who provided it with walls of masonry; he took out of it two galleys of gold, some "Ka'īya" swords and some cuirasses. With the swords he made the door of the Ka'ba, which he covered with plates of gold made from one of the galleys and he put the other inside the sanctuary. The water of the well was distributed to the inhabitants of Mecca.
In 297 (909) Zamzam overflowed, a thing which had never been known before and several pilgrims were drowned.


ZANDAKA. [See ZINDA.]

ZANDJ, the name of the negro tribes of the east coast of Africa, given by the Arab historians to the rebel slaves who, having previously rebelled in 75 (994), for fifteen years (255-270 = 868-883) terrorised lower Mesopotamia.

This rising is very important for it is a war of a classical type, a regular "social war" directed against Baghdâd like those of Eunus (140 B.C.) and Spartacus (73-71 B.C.) against Rome, like that of Toussaint Louverture in Haiti (1794-1801), like the strikes of Natal coolies led by Gandhi (1906-1913) against European colonisation.

The rebels were, according to Tabari, our principal source, employed as navvies (zamin); the task was to make lower Mesopotamia amble, to remove the zêlick and to pile it up in mounds to make the nitric lands of the Shat-‘al-‘Arab cultivable (zâhrîfyya, from zâhara, niter, a Persian term used also in Omân; cf. de Goeje, Glossaire de Tabari, s. v. hâ-m, following the Kitâb al-‘Uyûn).

They were mainly recruited from imported negro slaves and from the peasants of the country, grouped in gangs of 500-5,000 labourers and penned there homeless and hopeless, all their food being a few handfuls of "flour, semolina and dates*. Through contact with the islâm of their masters, by a process of spiritual induction, these unfortunate creatures learned that they had a right to exist and to a minimum of justice; the influence of the Muslim cénobites of the neighbouring hermitages of 'Abâbdîd was perhaps also felt. These slaves then found a leader who was resolved to put an end to their misery, an 'Alîd pretender with a disputed but perhaps genuine pedigree, for al-Brûnû says that the Shi‘îs still celebrated his festival on Ramazân 26; he took the name of ‘Ali b. Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Isâ b. Zaid b. 'Abd b. ‘Ali b. Husain b. ‘Ali and was called al-Burkûtî "the veiled*). Assisted by a certain Rashîd Kûrmutî (perhaps connected with the Karmâchi propaganda then just beginning), by a miller and a lemonade seller, he had the oath of fealty sworn to him by his runaway slaves (akhbâd) in an oath bi 't-‘âlîk in the Karmâchi fashion [cf. Karmâchais, sura-Kiyya], he raised the standard of rebellion on the 7th Ramazân 255 (868) and uttered the Kûrnic verse called of the shu‘rât (ix. 112) devoting himself to war to the knife (khâfîd ghâfîd bi ‘lâh).

Our sources unfortunately give few details of his system of government which was of a communist type. They refer almost exclusively to the course of the war which was waged mercilessly on the Zandj by the ‘Abâbdîd regent Muwaffâk. Setting out from Dîhsbâd, the Zandj leader divided his forces, armed with slings, into two divisions (i. the Zandj in the strict sense, 2. fûrâtina, Karmâchāya, Nûba) and supported by the Arab tribe of the Banû Tamîm with a fleet he took in succession Ubu'll, ‘Abâbdîd, southern Ahwâz and finally the great city of Basra. He advanced as far as Wâstî (264 = 877), Dîhsbâd, Nû’matiya, Dîhsbâd‘ayn and Ramûnmarûn, the regent, realising the greatness of the danger, mobilised all his forces for a second offensive. It took him three years to finish the war; first he broke through the five encirclements of the camp of Man‘îr, then laid siege to the Zandj headquarters at Makhtûrâ (268 = 884) on the canal Abu ‘l-Khaṣth south of Basra; it only capitulated in 269 (882) and al-Burkûtî was killed on 2nd Safar 270 (883). The rebellion was savagely suppressed, those who had fled returned and the old order was restored.


ZANDJÂN, a town in the northern Persia, capital of the province of Khâms which lies between Khâwîn, Hamadân, Adâbarbâdîn and Ghûmân.

Geography. The town of Zandjân is situated on the river Zandjârût (the old name of which, according to the Nuskhâ al-Kulûb, p. 221, was Mâlûrd), which runs from east to west and joins the Safîf-rûd [q. v.] on its right bank. Zandjân is an important station on the great road from Adâbarbâdîn to Khâwîn and thence to Tîhrân and Khûrûsan. Zandjân is also at the junction of several other roads: to the north, that to Ardabûl [cf. tâkon] and Ghûmân (via Masûla); to the S. W., that to Marâghâ [q. v.] and to Sa‘ûn-Kal’a [q. v., No. 1]; to the south, that to Hamadân. This last road used occasionally to be used by pilgrims coming from the north who wished to avoid the proximity of Kûrîlîn.

The country to the south of Zandjân which is under it has been rarely visited by travellers but is represented on our maps with sufficient clearness. In 1880 several engineers worked there on behalf of the Persian government, who had learned that there were deposits of gold there.

The 17 districts of the province of Khâms are as a rule named after the rivers of the Safîf-rûd basin (H. Schindler): Adâbar-rûd (cf. Ya'kût, i. 104, in Persân; Awhûr, explained as "mill water"); its waters flow to the plain of Khâwîn, Do-dânge, Khoštâbândel, Sadvâr-rûd (cf. Ya'kût, ii. 40 and Ispâhâr, p. 196; the present capital is Madjâl-dîbâd), Sohraward (Ya'kût, iii. 205: سرود شهربانوی, i.e. often confused with شهربنای, Shahrâsûn; q. v.), Idjarût (to the south of the Zandjân–Tâjkhî-Sulâmân road), Khîslâ-ghârî-rûd, Angûrûn, Oryûn (Oyrat), Gûlûbâr-rûd, Bûzûn-rûd, Kûnî-bâlû, Armaghûn, Tûrîm [q. v.], Khûyûn-wây, Gûrmen, Zandjânâtârîn.

Although Zandjân lies considerably to the east of Adâbarbâdîn, it belongs to the Turkish linguistic zone (cf. Forbes'ce, The Western Elburz, in G. Z. 1924, April, p. 310). The province is mainly inhabited by Adâbars [q. v.] whose amirs were still able to play a part in politics in 1914-1916. Besides the Afghûs, there is the tribe of Doweyrûn, who consider themselves Shât-sewûn [q. v.].

History. Andreas (Pâuly-Wissowa, Realencycl., i. 731) has very ingeniously identified Zandjân with
ZANDJAN — ZANZIBAR

AL-ZANDJANI, ITC AL-DIN 'ABD AL-WASSENA "IRHAMIN 'ABD AL-WASSENA 'ABD AL-MAL 'A AL-KHAJAJIBI, also called AL-TI, an Arabic grammatical, who lived in the first half of the 13th (al-ti) century. The place and date of his birth are unknown and the date of his death is also uncertain. The few facts that we know of his life are given us by Haidji Khalifa, who in giving the works of al-Zandjani adds what the latter says about their date and place of composition. We thus know that he stayed in Mysal in 637 (1239) where he finished his al-Mu'rib "Arifin al-Sahih = al-Mu'rib, a work on the dictionaries Sahih and al-Maghrib. Later he was in Baghdad, where, as he tells us at the end of the works, he finished the commentary called al-Ihati on his grammatical work Mubalaj. He died in 654 (1256) and the two volume commentary al-Ka'fis on his grammatical work al-Hadii = al-Nasakhi. He also finished his Minas al-Hadii = al-Nasakhi = al-Tafari at the same time. Next year he completed a commentary on the Kanusi = al-Nasakhi of al-Zamakshari, called Tajribi = al-Musajjir = al-Nasakhi. According to Haidji Khalifa, he died some time after 655 (1257) but we do not know the exact date. Besides these other works on grammar, he wrote a book on the use of the astrolabe and made a collection of Arabic poems. The latter book, called al-Majdil bihi ala ghairi Alahi, is an anthology on the lines of the Hamam of Abu Tamunah or of al-Bahjani. It contains verses by Arab poets of the time of the Djihlyas, of the Maghazamis [see Maghazam] and of the post-classical period, which he took from their diwans and earlier anthologies. A commentary on it was written by 'Ubayd Allah b. 'Abd al-Kafi b. 'Abd al-Majdil al-Bahjani. Neither Haidji Khalifa nor al-Suyuti, who mentions al-Zandjali in the Bughyat al-Wa'izi fi Tahqiq al-Lughayatin wa'l-Nasakhi (Cairo 1326, p. 318), mentions this collection.


ZANDJAN. [See ZANJ].

ZANZIBAR (AL-ZANJIBAR), capital of the island of the same name, which lies off the east coast of Africa in 6° South Lat. The town is on the west side of the island 26 miles N.E. of the harbour of Hagamoyo in 6° 9' S. Lat. and 35° 15' East Long, and forms a triangular peninsula 1/4 miles in length, which runs from west to east and affords a rocky anchorage, one of the best in Africa. The peninsula is connected with the mainland of the island by a narrow isthmus on which there is a cemetery; on the bay is the native quarter of 'Gamo and there is also an Indian and a European quarter. The town which, since the Anglo-German Agreement of July 1, 1890, has been the centre of the judicial, military and administrative authorities of the English protection and at the last census (1931) had 43,470 inhabitants, owes its rise to Sultan Sayid Sa'id of Muskat and Zanzibar who made it his capital in 1832 and by able policy made it the principal commercial centre of
East Africa from Cape Guardafui to Delagoa Bay. He and his successors have also done a great deal for the architectural development of the town. Sa'id himself built a palace in Zanzibar and at Mtoni, three miles away, Sultan Barghash built a new palace in Chukwani, which was connected with Zanzibar by a railway, and other buildings in the town and brought water from Mtoni to Zanzibar. The town is noted for its fruits: bananas, lemons, mangoes, oranges, cocoa-nuts; it is connected by good motor roads with the towns of Mkokotoni, Chwaka, and Pumbaa and by seven miles of railway with Babubu. The Eastern Telegraph Company maintains a cable between Mombasa [q.v.] (Mombasa) and Zanzibar which secures communication with the ports of East and South Africa, *Aden*, Egypt, India, China and Europe. There is wireless telegraphy between Pemba and Zanzibar, which are also connected by telephone. Connections by sea are maintained by a number of steamship lines, such as the Clan—Ellerman—Harrison and Ellerman—Bucknall lines, the German East Africa line from Hamburg via the Cape of Good Hope and Suez, the Compagnia Italiana Transatlantica with Genoa, Majawwa, *Aden*, Italian Benadir and Kenya, the Navigazione Libera Triestina with Venice via the Cape of Good Hope and Suez, the United Netherlands Navigation Company with the Dutch Indies and Holland, the Koninklijke Paketvaartmaatschappij with Java, the Osaka Shikai Kaisha with Japan and South America, the Cowesjee Dinshaw & Brothers with Kismayo, the British India Steam Navigation Company with Bombay and Durban. In 1921, 346 ocean steamers with a total tonnage of 1,407,000 tons called at Zanzibar as well as 316 coaster steamers of 125,000 tons, 5,562 schooners with a total of 69,000 tons. The principle article of commerce is the cloves, the cultivation of which was introduced by the Arabs in 1820, and copra. It is to these that Zanzibar owes its wealth. The other local products play a smaller part in the export trade, hides and leather, pepper, soap and copal. Articles imported for export to the mainland are cotton goods, rice, colonial products, petroleum, soap and provisions. Imports from Africa consist mainly of copra, ivory, hides, leather, copal resin, which are sent to England, India, America and Europe. The harbor is a base for whale-fishers in the Antarctic seas and as such of considerable importance. Zanzibar is also the headquarters of all the firms that trade with the mainland, English, German, Portuguese and Indian. Among the population the industrious Indians with 10,000 take second place after the 22,468 Africans. The Persians, mainly from Bombay, are the largest contingent. Some of them engage in intellectual professions but they are mainly merchant officials and officials in the English service. The Muslim population is Sunni of the Shafi'i school; only the ruling dynasty and its relatives are of the Ibadhi sect [see ARABIANS]. Zanzibar has three Christian missions. The Church of England's Mission to Central Africa (founded 1854) maintains a hospital, a training school for teachers and a high school; there is also a cathedral. The Roman Catholic Père du Saint-Esprit have had a mission in Zanzibar since 1856.


II. The Swahili population.

Swahili, a name nowadays generally accepted to mean the mixed race—a blend of the aboriginal coast natives, slaves brought from the up-country region, and Arabs— which lives in most of the towns on the coast and in Zanzibar" (Ingrams, p. 30; for a list of the principal tribes referred to, see p. 220). The word is evidently derived from Sawaandé (pl. of Sawa), a name used from the earliest times by Arab writers to denote the east coast of Africa, but it is not clear when it was first applied to the people, who are usually called Zandy [q.v.]. Strandes points out (p. 161) that the name "Swahili" nowhere occurs in the Portuguese records. The mixed race originated as early as the beginning of the Christian era, probably earlier; since the author of the Papyrus mentions it as an established fact that Arab traders settled on the coast and married nativen women (Schoff, p. 28). Of post-Islamic settlements, the most northerly would seem to be the oldest; Pate, if tradition can be trusted, was founded in 69 (889). Swahili in general seem to look to this northern area as the country of their origin (mchi ya asi) and consider the dialects of Lamu and Mombasa as, in a sense, classical. The language of the older poems, which has supplied the conventions of modern poetry, is called Kingwa and is said to have been spoken in the district about Maitindi (Steere). Durante Barbosa mentions that the "Moors" of Kilwa spoke Arabic, and this has continued to be the case with recent immigrants and those Arab families who have kept this descent unmixed; but, with the prevalence of slavery and the multiplication of half-castes, many, if not most, whom attained the status of free men, a language gradually grew up, African in structure, but strongly influenced.

As regards vocabulary, the language, naturally, would vary locally, according to the tribes with whom the Arab settlers were chiefly brought in contact, or whence their slaves were drawn, but it is clear that these were mainly, if not entirely, Bantu-speaking. It is true that, according to Lamu tradition, the natives found by the first settlers on the island of Pate were Balononi, a hunting tribe who still inhabit the forests of the Tana Valley, speaking a non-Bantu language, of which very little has hitherto been recorded. Whether this is so or not, no trace of Bantu speech seems to be discoverable in Swahili.

It is clear that no distinct "Swahili" tribe existed prior to and apart from the extraneous infiltrations above indicated—Arab, Persian (possibly pre-Islamic and certainly dating from, at least, the settlement of Kilwa, 977 A.D.; Ingrams, p. 76, 146; Hollis, p. 275, 253) possibly Indian and Indonesian. — A Swahili, at the present day, may be pure African, without a trace of Arab or other foreign descent.

As might be expected from the circumstances, there is no uniform physical type, but nearly all,
except a minority of pure Arabs, show definite African characteristics. Within the same family there may be various gradations of colour, while some members have woolly hair and others wavy or straight. Burton's description (p. 414 sqq.) appears somewhat of a caricature, and this applies still more to his account of their character; but he was apt to look on everything African with a jaundiced eye (cf. Ingram's, ch. xivii.). All Swahili, with a few insignificant exceptions (conversions to Christianity are very few), are professed Muslims, usually Sunniis of the Shafi' school; the Arabs are all, or mostly, Du'ali (Ingrams, p. 188—193, 433). But, as elsewhere, among the less instructed, there is a considerable infusion of animism. At Mombasa, e.g., vows and offerings are made at the grave of a saint known as Shebe Jundani, usually in order to injure some enemy. Ingrans (p. 435 sqq.) enumerates various superstitions and magical practices, with references (p. 501, 505) to some abnormal occurrences (apparently related on good authority), which have never been satisfactorily explained.

The Swahili language, as already stated, is essentially African — and specifically Bantu — in structure, though it cannot be said to be based on any one Bantu language. The Pokomo of the Tana Valley would probably be the tribe with whom the early settlers of Pate and Lamu came most in contact, and, certainly, the influence of their language on the Lamu dialect of Swahili is unmistakable. On a superficial view it would seem that they were the only Bantu-speaking tribe within the reach of the northern Arab settlements until the sixteenth century, when, according to their tradition, the "Nyika" tribes moved south-westward from "Shungwaya". But there is no evidence that this place (now included in Italian Somaliland) was their original home. There is no reason to doubt that this migration was preceded by unrecorded movements from the south or the west. Ingrans's argument (p. 64) that the natives mentioned in the Periplus could not have been Bantu is hardly conclusive; it must be borne in mind, inter alia, that "Bantu" is no more a racial designation than "English-speaking peoples" would be.

The general characteristics of the Bantu languages may be summed up as: aggregative structure, the system of noun-classes and absence of grammatical gender. The noun-classes in Swahili have undergone considerable attrition, indicating a long course of development and, also, extensive foreign contact. One is struck by the comparative rarity of vocal images (Lautbilder), so remarkable a feature in e.g., Zulu, Nyanja and Yao, and also by the development of the relative clause — a stumbling-block to European students, which is absent in the more primitive forms of Bantu speech.

Of foreign elements in the Swahili vocabulary, the Arabic is obviously the most conspicuous. It has played the same part in Swahili as Latin in the Teutonic tongues, more especially in English. As might be expected, many are technical terms of the theology or ritual: dawu, usuali (beg the invariable prefix), kusayfu, imani, horuba, etc. The adoption of such words as yamini, umini, dola is an obvious necessity, also names of objects introduced by the Arabs: sabani = plate, safarini = metal pot, ofo = upper story of a house, jumba = sailing-ship, and many more. In some cases the introduction of an Arabic word seems quite unnecessary, e.g. amadi, for the old Swahili and = fish (found in Pokomo as muni), wali for jka = arrive, wali for nka = return (cf. Zala = barya), amadi for bale = long ago, sabali for pontos = place. Arabic influence on Swahili grammar is confined to the introduction of prepositions and conjunctions (parts of speech noticeably wanting in Bantu), such as hata, lhatini, muda, (kwa) zabolli, hila, etc., which may be said to supply a felt want and certainly facilitate literary composition.

The pronunciation of Arabic words has, naturally, been considerably modified, largely by the introduction of vowels between two consonants, as riziki, from rizik. Since all Swahili syllables are open. An interesting point emerges in connection with the words karafu (asf) and karafu (arinu, where the aspirate, in popular pronunciation, has taken the place of -it is omitted by some speakers, which, indeed, is considered more correct). Elsewhere -i is reduced to a mere glottal stop, or simply disregarded; -ë — except by pedantic Arabizers — is pronounced sometimes as 0, sometimes as k. The vocalisation of Arabic verbs has occasioned some perplexity: uwekha from raspia, safiri from safara. But, as Seldel has pointed out (p. 104), Arabic verbs in Swahili are taken from the imperfect, not from the ground-form. Persian loan-words occur sporadically, some, possibly, imported at an early stage, e.g., boma, "a fortified enclosure"; pomba, "cotton"; biduo, "hippopotamus" (but primarily the whip made from the animal's hide), from bidub. Some have probably come through Arabic, as soroali, "trowsers"; swarufi, "corsal"; swataki, "garment". Loan-words from Portuguese are not numerous: mesa, "table"; gericu, derived from igreja, but now used to mean "fort" or "prison"; soroa, from vinhos, and several words connected with card-games. Recently there have been extensive borrowings from English.

It is uncertain how long the Arabic script has been in use for writing Swahili. Though yet discovered would appear to be more than 200 years old, yet such a poem as the Isimbihaghi, which Taylor (Stigand, p. 94) conjectures to have been composed earlier than 1498, can hardly have been orally transmitted, and, in fact, presupposes a long period of culture. The Arabic script is still extensively used for correspondence, especially at Zanzibar and the towns north of Mombasa, though an increasing acquaintance with the Roman character, acquired in Mission and Government schools, is tending to displace it, indeed, is far better adapted for rendering the sounds of Swahili.

The Persian  and  are very generally used for  and  j, though less educated writers sometimes employ  and  j, e.g., f, for jest, vitu. C. (fi) is rendered, sometimes by  j, j, sometimes, chiefly by Northern scribes, by  j, j by  j occasionally by  j, and  j by  j. A nasal before another consonant (as in the common combinations m, n, m) is usually omitted (thus nyamu is written  nyama), but nd is frequently rendered by the sign  j (  j for kwenda). It follows that Swahili in Arabic script cannot be read with-
out the vowel-points, and even with them, if carelessly placed. An example of the confusion thus produced is quoted by Steere (p. 6).

The existing Swahili literature (apart from that produced, under European encouragement, during the last few decades) is confined to poetry. The lyrics ascribed to Liongo Fumo, if genuine, probably go back to the sixteenth century at latest. Of the numerous poems collected by the late C. J. Büttner, three were published by him in *Anthologie*, and one, since his death, by Meinhold, in *E. A.* (1897, 1899). The collections of the late W. E. Taylor still remain in MS. The art of poetry is still being cultivated, as shown by the recent work of Muhammad b. Abū Bakar b. ʻUmar (Kijima) at Lamu and Iwana Silimut at Mombasa.

The metric system, originally borrowed from Arabia, has been modified in accordance with the genius of the language, with its uniform penultimate stress and richness of vocalisation.

It must not be forgotten that, side by side with these products of conscious literary art, we find a living stream of folk-poetry, comparable to that of Southern Europe. Specimens of such folk-songs have been collected by Zach, Velten and others.


(Alice Werner)

**ZAR** is in Arabic a loanword from Amharic, as the popular beliefs in the genus *zur* were imported from Abyssinia into the Islamic world. Similar ideas about genii who may temporarily become incarnate in particular human beings, are found in various Muslim countries of Asia and Africa where they have special names: such as *biri* (Nigeria and Tripolitania) and *amoh* (Malaya). This article, however, is concerned only with the habits of the *zur* adopted with that name in Egypt, Hijāz and ʻOmān, besides Abyssinia.

In *Abyssinia* itself the name *zur* is of non-Semitic origin. *Zar* is very probably derived from the name of the supreme deity of the pagan Khruits, the God-Heaven called in Agnaw (Bitena): *yde*; and in Sidra languages (Kaffa): *yad*; (Burno): *dor*. The ancient pagan god became in christianized Abyssinia a malevolent genius; and in this way the animistic practices, which in the paganism of the Khruits were directed only to the minor superhuman beings, passed into Abyssinian Christianity (and then into Islam) with the proper name of the God-Heaven who had been reduced to a minor rank.

In Abyssinia Christians and Muslims believe that the *zur* (who lives especially in rivers, streams and other running waters) may be driven out of the body of the possessed person by the incantations of amanets or rites common to both religions. During these rites the *zur* is summoned to tell his name; because that would cause him to lose his power.

By the peoples of Southern Ethiopia (Galla and Sidama), however, besides these exorcistic rites, there are other ceremonies intended to force the evil spirit to enter the bodies of initiated persons. When the evil spirit has possessed these persons, they prophesy and each word or gesture by them is believed to be a revelation by the spirit.

In *Egypt* the ceremonies connected with the *zur* were probably imported in the sixteenth century; and their Amharic name *zur* and their exorcistic character are clear evidence of their origin from Northern (Semitic) Abyssinia. (The popular Arabic etymology recorded by Zurner for *zur* because he is a ["minor"] visitor" has of course, no real basis.) The exorcistic ceremony is often conducted by a woman: the *zākābā* or *hārija al-thikē*.

The spirit must be differently treated according to its place of origin (they distinguish genii from Cairo, Upper Egypt, Su'dan etc.). It is necessary, therefore, to get the right melody, the right song and right clothes", all these things being different for the Cairnese or Sudanese etc. spirits. The songs are accompanied by little drums and dances. A sacrifice of fowls is also usually offered to the spirit. The ceremony may last, in special cases, many nights. Pamphlets condemning the *zur* practices have been printed in Cairo.

In the *Hijāz* the belief in the *zur* was imported, according to Snouck Hurgronje, by Abyssinian slaves. It has the same characteristics as in Egypt and is widely diffused among Neccan women. The *zākābā*, who conducts the rites, tries to ascertain the nationality of the *zur* by questioning him either in vulgar Arabic or in a particular language known only to initiated persons.

To ʻOmān the *zur* has come in the same way. A plural (ṣūrīn) of the name *zur* in the dialect of ʻOmān seems to be unknown elsewhere.

In *Somaliland* only do we find, besides the exorcistic rites, other ceremonies intended to procure the incarnation of the genus (called in Somali: *zur*).


(Enrico Cerulli)
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ZARANDJ, a town in Farsia, the former capital and principal town of Sūlānštān on the south of Hāṣt, at a distance of ten days’ journey in a desert traversed by canals led from the river Hindmend (Hilmend). Attacked by al-Rādi b. Ziyād al-Ḫāṣibi in 30 (655), he left it to the Saracens on payment of 200 slaves, each carrying a basin of gold. At the end of 41/42 years, al-Rādi was replaced by ‘Abd al-Rāḥmān b. Nāṣr who besieged the town in the citadel and made peace on payment of 2,000,000 dirhams and 2,000 slaves. At one time fortified and surrounded by a ditch as was its suburb, it had five iron gates: the new gate and the old on the Esfān side in the west, the gate of Karkūy on the Khudān side in the north, the gate of Nīkāk on the Hūst side and the gate of Ta’am towards the villages. The houses were built in vaulted porticoes of brick (mādī mawštāda) because wood was there eaten by ants. It had been a palace of Yabhū b. Lāṭṭī, the white Saffārīd [cf. Sāfīrīd] and of his brother ‘Amr inside the town was a building called Arag (fortress), erra] which was the treasury built by ‘Amr. There were markets around the principal mosque; one of them was built by ‘Amar who made it a waqf of the mosque; a hospital, and a mosque called Ḥusnā. There were canals inside the town. Two great reservoirs of running water supplied the greater part of the private houses and gardens. The two minarets of the great mosque were famous.

It was taken by Tūthūr in 285 (1383) and destroyed; its inhabitants were massacred. Its ruins lie around the modern villages of Zāhādīn (remains of a tower) and Ṣhahrānī, along the old bed of one of the canals led from the Hindmend and dried up since the middle ages.

Zarandj was, in early times, the name of the province (tāwūla) and of the people who inhabited it (Zarandj, Ardian).

Bibliography: Yāšt, Muṣājam, ii. 926 = Barlier de Meynard, Dict. de la Perse, p. 284; B. G. A., l. 239; ii. 2977; iii. 359; Barthoul, p. 393, 394; transl. Murgotton, p. 141–144; Yaštū, B. G. A., viii. 221; Haud Allah Mūsawī, p. 142; transl. Le Strange, p. 141; All Yazdi, l. 362; Dimāḵkāsh, transl. Mehr, p. 119, 237; H. Rawlinson, in J.R.G.S., 1873, p. 280, 283, 284; F. Goldsmid, Eastern Persia, i. 301; A. H. Sayce, Landor, Across Crete, Lands, ii. 228 (map); Sykes, Persia, p. 375, 352, 383; Le Strange, The Land of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 333. [Cl. Hoart]

al-ZARUNDJI, ḪurṭIK al-Dīn, Ṭabab Abū al-אמנות, Chef des écoles, 1295. His name is not known and his period can only be approximately stated. Alward was in the Berlin Catalogue under B. 114, says that ʿAlī b. Sāliḥ al-Kaffawī (d. 990 = 1585) in his Alīn al-Asbūr min Fuḥūk al-Mamlūk bān performing in the twelfth century of the Šāfīites and from this calculation that he flourished about 620 (1223). In agreement with this is the fact that ʿAlī b. ʿAbd al-Rāziq b. Ziyād b. Aḥmad al-Mīrī (d. 1070), as a pupil of the author of the Hibd, the Niʿmat al-Ṣafī, i.e. ʿAbd al-Rādo b. Aḥmad b. Farghūl al-Marghwānī (q.v.). The latter died in 592 (1193); and al-Zarundji in fact quotes him in his Tawāsim al-Muṣālāmīn several times as his teacher and with the analogy for the dead. The other authorities cited in this book, so far as their dates are known, also confirm Alward’s date. For example al-Zarundji mentions ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd al-Ḥāmīd b. Māʾṣūr al-Farghūl of the Faḥūk (q.v.), who died in 592 (1193), as his teacher. In another passage he records that the ʿAlī b. ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd al-Ḥāmīd b. Māʾṣūr al-Farghūl received verses before him (i.e. Tūthūr), G. A. L., i. 439. It is not surprising that the ʿAlī b. ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd al-Ḥāmīd b. Māʾṣūr al-Farghūl received something to him and according to G. A. L., i. 439, he lived about 600 (1205). If we take all these data together, we come to the conclusion that our author flourished a little earlier than Alward thought but his work was certainly composed after 593.

The only known and only surviving work of Al-Zarundji, Tawāsim al-Muṣālāmīn, is a little vadumeum for students to teach them the ethical outlook of the man of learning. The whole book consists simply of utterances of earlier writers but they are not unskilfully chosen and presented in an attractive way. This fact and the brevity of the book are the causes of its tremendous popularity, on the details of which see G. A. L., i. 432. It is interesting to notice that the authorities cited by the author, so far as they do not belong to the first century, are almost without exception Ḥanafī, although the subject matter has practically nothing to do with the doctrine of any maḥkāb – i.e. Isnādī’s commentary was printed at Cairo in 1311.

Bibliography: given in the article.

ZĀTĪ, one of the most important Ottoman poets of the preparatory classical period. His real name was ʿĪsā b. al-Abbas or Yakhūt (according to Lattī). Born in 876 (1472) in Balkhù (in the Afghan) he followed the same trade. He had no education, in spite of all obstacles his poetical ability displayed itself. He was a born poet. In the time of Sulṭān Bāṣārī he came to Constantinople. As his original plan of becoming a kūfi after some training fell through on account of his deafness, which also prevented him from obtaining any public appointment, he lived the life of an unattached poet, supporting himself by the presents his poems brought him from the sultan and the nobles. He dedicated Ḵātūā to the three Sulṭāns in whose reigns he wrote, Sulṭān Bāṣārī, Selīm I and Selīmīn al-Ḵānānī, in return for which he received presents and even a fief which was however later taken from him as he did not give military service.

His talent brought him a large number of patrons and friends, among the grand vizier ʿAlī Pāšā, the Kāpākhaner Muḥāṣṣel-e, the Nīqānīs-e, the Tāalīs of the Īsāfār Celebi, the Deftdār and later grand vizier Pārī Pāšā, Kāfī Efendi, etc. But as they in turn lost their offices or their lives, he was left penniless. He therefore worked as a scribes, and wrote matuls (safak-e, q.v.). He had his booth first of all in the court of the Bāṣārī mosque and later besides Koṭī-i Lāḥīmī Bāšā’s baths. There the intellect of Constantinople used
to gather, including the poets Khayat, Vahiy, Bâlî, and others. Zâtî was for a period a recognised leader and master. He lived in great poverty, besides he drank. He was celebrated for his ready wit and in spite of his ugliness was a popular companion. He died in Ramadân 953 (Nov. 1546) and was buried outside of the A’drianople Gate.

Zâtî’s poetic output was prodigious. This was partly the result of his poverty which forced him to write. Lajîf credits him with 3,000 ghazals, 500 qaṣidas and 1,000 râhî’s and čîṣa’s. Zâtî’s own figures however are 1,600 ghazals and over 400 qaṣidas (according to Kínâlî-râde). In the Diwân collected by Firi Čelebi there are 600 ghazals and 50 qaṣidas."

Zâtî also wrote two menâwîs: Şohîw-êr Përvûnêt (Kenhî) and Añêzêt-i Mêhêmûd (rëylî); a Şeh-nêvûks of A’drianople, a Ferâh-nâmê; Pâ-i Füdr-i Szîrê-rêhêti; Şhâr-i Nîhî; a Mêvûǜlê; Lâqûlîs (puzzles); a Mûfûdî-i Lâfu ‘îfî; and a collection of anecdotes about his contemporaries. None of his works has been printed. His Diwân is very scarce; there is a copy in the Hamdîye Library in Constantinople.

In view of his lack of training and education, Zâtî’s high poetic gifts are surprising: the vigour of his poems and the power and richness of his language especially in his best period. Later he became feeble and artificial and continually repeats himself. With Ahmäd Pâhü and Nêflûti he is considered a master in the use of proverbs. Many of his sayings have in their turn become proverbial.

Zâtî was the chief of those who prepared the way for the perfect classical style, as typified in Bîhî. After Ahmäd Pâhü and Nêflûti, he is the third-founder of the Ottomân poetic language. He surpassed all his predecessors in power of language and poetic conception. The depth of his religious conviction, which is evident in his poems, may be mentioned. He belonged to the Welfî order.


(TH. MENKEL)

**ZATI (ıSLAAMîN), a Şfît Oott ottoman poet, of Gallipoli (not Brassa, as often stated), khalîfa of Shaikh Isâmîl Hâkki. He died in 1151 (1738) as pîşt-i-rûmî of the Khalîfî monastery in Kêshan. He left a Diwân with Şftî poems and a treatise in verse: Sarnîbî-i Iwanûlîvî fi Mu’âzî fi A’nasîr (printed together); and two prose works: 23 Edres-i mülkâyavânîsî ezrâvû-nâmê and Mîtrîh al-Masîlî.

**Bibliography:** Brusell Mehméd Tahir, ‘O’mmênîl Mu’âzîlîrî, i., 72–73; Thûrîgî, Edresî, ‘Ommênîl Mu’âzîlîrî, ii., 342; Samî, Khâmîa al-A’âmîn, iii., 2224.

(TH. MENKEL)

**NASA, a town in Persia, in Khûrân-nâr, near Nasûhî. In the time of Ūmahaddîs, it was a rural district which did not contain a town; but later (sixth century) there was a fine town there with a citadel built of brick. It contains the tomb of the shaikh Kûbî al-Dîn Hâdîsî, who was still alive in 617 (1220) whence the name of Turbat-ı Hâdîsî now given to the town. Ūmahaddîs mentions a town of the same name near Gihîza (B.G.A., iii., 50, 297).


(CL. HUARD)

**AZAWA.** [See ins Mu’tî.]

**ZAWILA, the name of two towns in North Africa.**

1. Zawîlat al-Muhîdîya (according to al-Bakri: Zuwilla) built by the Fâtîmid Ubûd Allah al-Mahîdî (d. 1001) 21 miles 322 situate a bowshot distant from al-Muhîdîya, of which it was a suburb. According to Idrîsî the two towns formed one. It had fine bazaars and buildings and many merchants resided there who went to their businesses in Mahdyia in the day. The town was surrounded by a wall even on the side facing the sea; the last side was further protected by a great ditch. The wall built by al-Mu’izz b. Bîdî Şhîrîf al-Dawla (d. 1015) 143 was 2 miles long and had iron gates weighing 1,000 cwt, 30 spans high, each studied with 6 lbs. of heavy nails. In the vicinity of Zawila were hamlets, farms and country houses, belonging to the people of the town who practised agriculture and cattle-rearing here; the principal products were barley and olives, the oil went to the Levant.

2. Zawîlat al-Sûdân (according to Idrîsî: Zawilla), capital of Fazzân, 10 days’ journey north of Wadaûn on that frontier of the ûlûd al-Sûdân which adjoins the province of Africa. The town, which lay at an important road junction in the middle of the desert, had no walls, had a mosque, baths and bazaars, palmgroves and cornfields, which were watered by canals. The Muslims who lived here were ûlûd. Many traders from Khûrân-nâr, al-Kûfà and Ba’sra used to come here. The export was slaves and merchandise. The town was taken by Ujba b. Nârî, a general of Amr al-As. The poet Diûlî b. ‘Ali al-Khûzî is buried here.


(A. GROTHMANN)
ZAWIYA, properly the corner of a building, was at first applied to the cell of the Christian monk (cf. the Greek ὥτασις), then to a small mosque or praying room; the word still has this meaning in the Muslim east in contrast to a more important mosque (μουσέος or ἱλικόν). On the other hand the term zawiya has retained a much more general meaning in North Africa and is applied to a building or group of buildings of a religious nature, which resembles a monastery and a school. An excellent definition of the Maghribi zawiya was given as early as 1847 by Daumas (La Kabylie, p. 60) and it seems to be in essentials appropriate at the present day (cf. the quotation in Mr. E. de Saulles's work). All or several of the following are found in a zawiya: a room for prayer with a nibāgha, the museom on a marabout or Shari'anic saint, which is surmounted by a dome (kubba): a room set aside exclusively for the recitation of the Qur'an; a maktab or Qur'an school; finally rooms for the guests of the zawiya, pilgrims, travellers and students. The zawiya is usually adjoined by a cemetery with the tombs of those who have during their lifetime expressed a wish to be buried there. "The zawiya," says Daumas, "is to sum up a religious school and a free hostel, in these two respects it has much in common with the medersa monastery." The conception of a zawiya has, it seems, undergone a somewhat characteristic change since the middle ages, at least in the Muslim west; in the east on the other hand the term very soon acquired a definite meaning so that it was applied only to the more humble mosques and is not there used as a substitute for the more precise terms like dar, khanaka or na'ībā, which are used particularly for monastic institutions which as a rule owe their origin to Persian Muslim mysticism. In the Maghrib on the other hand the term zawiya appears about the xiith century as synonymous with rībā, i.e. hermitage, to which a holy man retired and where he lived surrounded by his pupils and devotees (cf. G. S. Colin, transl. of al-Budda's Maqāmāt, in A. M., xxvi. [1926], p. 240, s. v.). This zawiya of rībā is however not always identical with the rībā, an institution which served another purpose and was primarily of a military character. In this connection however we may note a statement of Ibn Marritk of Tiemcen (d. 781 = 1379), who in his monograph on the Marinid Sultan Abu'l-Hassan 'Ali, al-Munawād al-wadā al-hassan, devotes the 42nd chapter to the zawiya built by this ruler and says the zawiya corresponds to what in the east is called Rūbā or Khānūkā. It may be added that the word rūbā is also found in Morocco used for institutions in which the military activity was particularly directed to spreading Islam among heretics with the sword: this for example was the case with the rībā Asfi (cf. Asfī) and Siddi-Sherker on the Wādi-Tansaf. The first zawiya hermitages undoubtedly developed very quickly and became not only places of refuge from the world but also centres of religious and mystic life, where the togausouf, hitherto the sole possession of urban scholars, was to be brought nearer the masses. They now became centres of attraction, religious schools and to some extent free hostels for travellers in search of spiritual perfection. This explains how Ibn Marritk could say when speaking of the zawiya of his time: "It is clear that with us in the Maghrib the zawiya serve to give shelter to wanderers and food to travellers" (cf. also Asfī). In Muslim Spain we find no zawiya before the time of the Nasüids of Granada. They therefore belong to the same time as those of the Marinid sultan Abu'l-Hassan and their foundation must have met the same needs. In 990 W. and G. Mārqaṭ put forward the attractive hypothesis that the Maghribi madrasa were in the intention of their founders, the Marinid and Ābd al-Wālid rulers of the xivith century, only an "official recognition" of the schools attached to the zawiya. It is perhaps more possible that these rulers endeavoured by their foundations alongside of the great centres of religious instruction (notably the Djamāl al-Karawīyīn in Fās) to weaken to some degree the competition already caused in the towns and outside of them by the zawiya schools.

At the present day the most important North African zawiya, whether they are now in the large towns or in the country — where little townships have almost always grown up around them — are the mother houses of branch settlements of the Marabout or Shari'anic religious brotherhoods (see ẓarīqa and shajara).

In addition to their religious and intellectual influence the zawiya of the Muslim west have exercised a direct political influence on the population of the country in areas remote from the seat of the central government. The most striking example of this is the zawiya al-Dīthi (in the district of Tādā, in Central Morocco on the banks of the Umm Kālib), the heads of which took advantage of the troubled times after the fall of the Sche'īd dynasties (in the second half of the xvith century) to extend their secular power over the greater part of the district which was dependent on Fās. In more recent times the example of the Berber zawiya of Iltih in Tāhurt and Aḥānjīl in the Central Atlas can be quoted.


— On the modern North African zawiya there are a number of monographs, e.g. E. Douste, Les Maraboutes, Paris 1900; L. Rumm, Marabout en Khom. Algiers 1884; O. Depom and H. Coppolani, Les confréries religieuses maraboutes, Algiers 1897. (E. LÉVI-PROVENÇAL)

ZAY. [See ẒAY.]

ZAYANIDS (BANU ZAYAN or BANU ZIYĀN), the two vocalisations of the names and zayān are classical; we also find zayam, a Berber dynasty of kings of Tiemcen, who reigned over central Maghrib from the xith to the xith century A.D., whose claim to noble descent from Idris is disputed (cf. Hist. des Berbères, transl. de Slane, iii, 348 and simil., the words attributed to Yaghourrūa). They are called by the chronicles also 'Abd al-Wālid al-Sālihi and Zayān were two of the ancestors of the kings of Tīmīčen, centuries apart however, the former living before Idris and the latter being the father of Yaghourrūa (end of the xith [xiiith] century).
ZAYANIDZ — ZE'AMET

After Yaghmurraan (first independent king of the dynasty from 633 = 1236) and beginning with his son Abu Sa'id 'Othman I, four kings, all direct descendants of Yaghmurraan, occupied the throne in succession till 737 (1337). The kingdom of Tlemcen was then twice conquered and occupied by the Marinids from 737 to 749 (1337-1348) and from 753 to 760 (1352-1359).

The first Zayand restoration (749 = 1348) brought to the throne the brothers Abu Sa'id 'Othman II and Abu Tahlib but it was their nephew Abu Hammi I (son of their brother Abu Ya'qub 'Yaqub) who in 760 (1359) restored the dynasty to its old position; his descendants ruled till the Turkish conquest in 962 (1554).

The only genealogical difference between the two ruling branches of this dynasty is that the first consisted of the direct descendants of Yaghmurraan, through his eldest son 'Othman I while the second line consisted of the direct descendants of his younger son 'Abd al-Rahman.

There is no reason — and no document to justify it — to believe with Barges (cf. Tlemcen, anc. cap. etc., p. 194 and Hist. des B. Zeïyan, transl. Introd., p. xii.) that it was only the kings of the younger line who took the name of Banu Zayyan (from 794 = 1348); all being direct descendants of Yaghmurraan, were Zayandids as well as 'Abd al-Wadids, for both lines included among their ancestors 'Abd al-Wad and Zayzan.

As to the relationship of these kings to the Marinids (q. v.) of Fizan, it has been established by the Muslim genealogists who place Wasin, grandfather of Abu al-Wad, among the ancestors of Marin b. Wurtajin, ancestor of the Marinids (cf. especially Ibn Khaldun, Hist. des Berberes, ii. 240; transl. iv. 25; al-Dhahabi al-Aswani, p. 10).


ZAYIRDA, an astrological magic table common in Morocco, the making and use of which is usually described by Ibn Khaldun in the Muqaddima. The word is connected with Ziyd (q. v.); its fuller name is Zayjirut al-Alam. The invention is said to have been the work of Abu Tahir al-Attar, (i.e. of Cenya) who lived in the time of the Almohad Ya'qub al-Mansur, i.e. at the end of the vih (sixth) century. The table has on one side a system of concentric circles with divisions corresponding to the signs of the zodiac and others for telling fortunes and answering questions on important matters, with a corresponding system of zadi, filled with numerals and letters. On the reverse of the table is a rectangle, divided into 55,131 small compartments, some empty, some with letters in them. Two verses by Malik b. Wuhail are used in connection with it; the letters in them are used as starting points in the consultation.

Bibliography: Ibn Khaldun, Muqaddima, transl. de Slane, i. 245-253 and iii. 199-205; Doss, Suppl. n. v. (J. Ruka)
from the Byzantines but from the Saldžiık. I ought indeed to have mentioned the latter (cf. c. 1574, p. 462) and it was quite natural for the institution to have been transmitted from them to the Ottomans.

It is nevertheless true that it is difficult to admit that an occupation, so closely bound up with the soil as this could have disappeared from Anatolia with the fall of the Byzantine empire to be replaced by another of the same kind. The Byzantine organisation was not only amalgamated with the Saldžiık organisation but continued to operate its influence on that which the successors of the Saldžiık in Asia Minor adopted. The fiscal system of the املی bears clear traces of this. This Byzantine influence was perhaps less strong than in the west, but it is not, however certain that the organisation of the military fiefs of the Saldžiık themselves was not influenced by that of the Byzantines who preceded them (the use of cuirassiers, in full armour or گیش, in particular, goes back to Rome itself). At the present day, we can see how easily military practices are borrowed from one country by another and Turkish military organisation as a very early period attained a perfection which enabled it to accept improvements from foreign countries without hurting the national amour-propre.

While giving due credit to the importance of the Saldžiık organisation we would ask that the Byzantine elements should not be omitted in a study of the Turkish املی.

The few notes that follow are intended to supplement the article املی.

زئبک — According to a MS. note by the late René Basset in his copy of Kazımirkâl's Arabic-French dictionary, the word زئبک also means "superior" or "convict guard" (Ghanawârâ, p. 4). It would have to be investigated how far this term is connected with امت or maritime fiefs. The same remark applies to the word امت used for a kind of ship in the Red Sea.

A Turkish saying has it: امک اکن امت اوچم چهصی "He is dressed like a امت text"; cf. the French "un homme une chasse" (Tekeşade: M. Sait [Sa'd], Adayite, 1348, p. 55). This saying shows that the tents of the امت were very luxurious.

There was a style of head-dressing called امت (cf. Ahmet Rasim, Osmanlılar, p. 236 and 473).

The name امت is given to the امت of the Palace chosen from the امت of the province. Cf. Ahmad Rafii, Fâtihine sarayə, ibid.: dârûnm of June 8, and 12, 1923.

A specimen of an imperial era granting a امت is given in Belin, Du régime des fiefs... p. 109.

طیم کریز — Köprüüsizâde Mehmed Fu'a'd (op. cit., p. 238-239, note) observes rightly that, contrary to what I have said, the word امت has in Saldžiık texts the meaning of "grant of land" but he himself admits that this term has a vague meaning in the passages cited. The same vague meaning is found in texts referring to the beginnings of the Ottoman Empire (cf. Aslıpşahzade, passim).

On the expression امکام امک "to pay homage" cf. Aslıpşahzade, ed. Giese, p. 56, l. 15.

Bibliography: Cf. the bibliographies to the articles 1574, تیمک and تیمک. We may add: K. V. Scala, in Heimbottz, Weltgeschichte, vol. v. (cited by Köprüüsizâde Mehmed Fu'a'd); Sokolov, Zemlyana obshchyna v Turci ii s Transkaspia, Novlyd Vostok, Moscow 1922, No. 7 (cf. also the same periodical, 1925, No. 8—9), Jouannin and van Gaster, Turquie (L'Univers), Paris 1840, p. 353 à propos of the belt đđđđćć; cf. however: امت đđđđđć ینم in نمی, ç., p. 8 (events of the year 1866); Hamburger, Historie, 365 of the French edition (à propos of the demi-fiefs created by Mehmed I); Historical Travels in Chataldagh, 1662, l. 1, illustrations... coll. 100; J. H. Ceyms, Imperi Turcii, images des turcs chasseurs de Soltz bach, 1663, p. 151; W. Böjkman, Ofis ve Türkçesiz, p. 85; C. Jirecek, Le civilisation turque au Moyen-Âge, French transal. by Eisen mann, Paris 1920; article كاراسی, supra (after the conquest of كاراسی in 735—736, the fiefs were left to the Timurids); de la Guittière, Athénas anciennes et modernes, Paris 1675 (first edition of this year), p. 354 sqq., 438; Rich. Pococke (Puckecke), Voyages, French transal., l. 202; Alfo Grassi, Charies Turques, 2nd ed., Paris 1826, l. 104—154; K. J. Jirecek in Brit. Museum Catalogue. (J. Deby)

ZEIEBEK, the name of a Turkish tribe in the region of Smyrna. The origin of the Zeibeck has not yet been fully explained. Just as it is used to be the custom to say the Tchakchi [q.v.], were descendants of the earliest inhabitants of Asia Minor, so the ancestors of the Zeibeck were sought in the remnants of Thracians who had settled around Trailes. In favour of this we have also the fact that they were called جام by orthodox Turks (Lord Keppel, op. cit., l. 256). This view, however, is undoubtedly wrong; we must rather see in the Zeibeck one of those Vlach tribes, who settled in considerable numbers in the west of Anatolia although their descent still requires elucidation in detail. Religious usages may have played a part in the settlement of the Vlachs [q.v.] in the particular district of Aidin eli [q.v.] and F. W. Hasluck has called attention to the connection in his study Hetudos Tribes of Asia Minor (in the Journal of the Royal Anthropological Society, li. [1921], p. 310 sqq., reprinted in Christianity and Islam under the Seljuks, in Oxford 1934, p. 134 sqq., cf. esp. p. 127; cf. at the same time F. Babinger in It., xi. [1921], 100 and xii. [1923], 103). Older views on the origin of the Zeibeck have been collected by M. Taskyrogli in his little book Hesl Ioovuna (Athenaustin, 1903), p. 13 sqq. and 22. The name has been connected in meaning with the Greek παλικαρί (παλικαρί) (cf. W. V. Dietz, Reisen und Forschungen im westlichen Kleinasien, i. 27), but hardly with justice. So far we have no early notices of the coming of these warlike and turbulent highlanders whose peculiar dress — disproportionately high head-dress, short trousers, which leave most of the legs uncovered, heavily coloured coats, richly embroidered, called امت — distinguishes them from their neighbours. The earliest references to them are found in the travellers of the xvith and xivth centuries. It looks as if the Zeibeck were at one time connected with the Derebey [q.v.], around Smyrna and with the Kar [Qo'man-oglu] [q.v.] and served them as
soldiers. With the disappearance of this family under Sulṭan Murād II the Zeibek military was disbanded; the Ottoman governor Şehir Pasha forbade them to serve as soldiers and also prohibited their striking dress. The result was a dangerous rising under their leader (cefe) Kel Mehmèd, in the course of which many Zeibeks lost their lives and they had finally to yield to superior force. Down to modern times the Zeibeks were recruited as a kind of auxiliary police to support the zaptiya, whose chief duty was to convey travellers. They were remarkable not only for their dress but also for their usually slim, powerful figures. Gradually they lost all the features of their neighbours and their picturesque dress fell more and more into disuse. In the post-War period the name Zeibek again attained notoriety when the Turkish president Mustafà Kemal Pasha endeavoured to make the dance peculiar to this tribe (zeibek ajm) a Turkish national dance.


Further literature is given by W. Heßening, in *Isth., xiii. 251*, where reference is made to further illustrations; J. H. Mordtmann, in *Vier Verträge über Vorderasien und die Türkei*, Berlin 1917, p. 101 (according to whom there were also Zeibeks in the wilayet of Brussa).

( Franz Baringer)

**ZENATÁ.** The Arab historians of the middle ages give this name to one of the two great groups into which the population of Barbary falls. According to the genealogical fiction which formed the frame-work of their ethnical classification, the Zenata, who are descended from Madigia al-Aatár, are distinguished from the Sanhajia who are descended from Borens; Borens and Madigia were the sons of one father, Berr. Other theories connect the Zenata with a certain Shara or Djana, who was said to be either the line of Kana'en, son of Shem, or of that of Goliat (Djibri). The desire to have an imposing Biblical pedigree is sufficient to explain this claim which seemed to be to some extent justified by the kind of existence led by the majority of the Zenata. While the majority of the Sanhajia led a settled life, the Zenata groups were mainly nomads, "in the manner of the Araris", rearing camels and living in tents. They were found scattered throughout Barbary but mainly in the steppes and deserts from Ghadames to the extreme Maghrib. The west of the central Maghrib and the adjoining Saharan regions seemed to be and were to remain their particular domain. They were distinguished from other groups by language. The Berber dialects spoken in the oases of M'aâr, Warghès, Wed Righ, in the west of Algeria, including the massif of Wassenis, and in the east of Morocco are still called Zenatitga.

As in the case of the Sanhajia [q.v.], the chroniclers distinguish several Zenata stocks or rather several waves of population which after living obscurely in the nomad state emerged in succession to the light of history, favourable circumstances enabling them to found empires or impose themselves upon the great existing empires, either as allies or as enemies.

To the first stock of Zenata belonged the Djarrwa, the Banû Ifren, the Maghrāwa, the Wassan and the Bajri. The Djarrwa were said to have their main centre in the Awaras, where the celebrated Khân (q.v.), their queen, played in the second (viii.ii) century, her well known part in the resistance to the Arab conquest. When this resistance, of which the Awaras was one of the strongholds, took the form of the Kibris, the Zenata Banû Ifren (q.v.) were its most stubborn champions. Abû Kirra the Ifrenid founded in the second (vii.b) century a Kibris kingdom at Tiemcen. In the fourth (v.b) century the Ifrenid Abû Yazid, "the man with the ass" (q.v.), raised the people of eastern Barbary, including the Awaras, against the Fâtimid caliphs in the name of the ancient heresy. At the same time Igân (12 miles S. W. of Mascara) and Shelia near the site of the future Rabat were capitals of two principalities of the Banû Ifren.

The most powerful of the Zenata of the first wave were those who belonged to the great tribe of the Maghrāwa. Among the latter special mention may be made of the Banû Kazhar, whose lands lay in the plains of Orania and eastern Morocco. Vassals of the Omeyyads of Cordova, they resisted not without difficulty throughout the tenth century and a part of the eleventh (i.e. 9th A.H.) the repeated attacks of the Sanhajia, supporters of the Fâtimids of Ifriqiya. One of the chiefs of the Banû Kazhar, Zirî b. Aṭiya, had installed himself in Fès, after the fall of the Ifrīsids, and held out there till the coming of the Almoravids (445 = 1053). The eleventh century also saw the flourishing of the other little Maghribi kingdoms, that of the Banû Yâṭî of Tiemcen, that of the Banû Khardjīn of Sidj mâlsâ, to which the Almoravid conquest was to put an end.

After this, the history of the Zenata of the Central Maghrib enters upon a obscure period. We have a struggle between two claims of the same stock: the Umayyad and the Wasmâni. The latter were to bring the Almohads into the country of Tiemcen.

The Zenata only became important again with the decline of the successors of Abû al-Mu'āmin, when the Zenata of the second wave came to the front. They were regarded as forming part of the group of the Banû Wâsân, whom the thrust of the nomad Arabs (Banû Hilal), at first lords of Ifriqiya, had driven westwards, in the south of Orania and Morocco. In the course of the first half of the viiith (xii.) century, the Zenata Banû Wâsân, who had only just abandoned a nomadic life, took from the Almohads the central Maghrib and the extreme Maghrib. The Meridins founded the kingdom of Fès (q.v.), the 'Abd al-Wâlaids the kingdom of Tiemcen (q.v.). The latter who were in the traditional territory of the Zenata tribes, had much difficulty in subduing their brethren,
especially the Banat Tadjik. The latter, much weakened in the plains where they had become the serfs of the nomad Arabs, were still quite powerful in the Wursenai, but they led a settled existence there. Their descendants are still to be found in these mountains. The name given to the Berber dialect which they speak survives as one of the few memories retained by the Zenda of the period of their glory.


(M. Streek)

ZELEND-ÈU, one of the principal rivers of central Persia. Its source lies about 60 miles W. of Isfahan in the province of ‘Abbasia (Khuzistan) in the Zardest-Kh e, "the yellow hills" (i.e. called after the yellow limestone found there) which are included among the Bakhtrian mountains, in which also rises the Kuran (q.v.), the greatest river of southern Persia. After leaving the mountains the Zende-Rûd flows through the district of Isfahan after which it is often called Isfahan-Rûd, "the river of Isfahan," and flows about 30 miles E. S. E. of Isfahan into a large backwater swamp called Gâño Khâneh. According to the erroneous view of the mediæval Arab and Persian geographers, the river continued on a subterranean course and reappeared about 60 farsâb (= ca. 40 miles) from where it disappeared and then flowed to the sea. Hamd Allah Mustawfi was the first to point out this error (cf. thereon: Schwartz, op. cit., iii. 216–217).

On entering Isfahan the Zende-Rûd separates Isfahan proper from its north bank from its southern suburb, Djalif (q.v.) or New Djalif. The connection between the two is maintained by three great bridges (cf. ii, p. 529 and also the description in A. Macauley, op. cit.; Stack, op. cit., p. 233; C. J. Wills, In the Land of the Lion and Sun, London 1883, p. 194 sqq.; J. Deneufoy, La Perse, la Chaldaie et la Susiane, Paris 1887, p. 154–155; J. Bassett, Persia, the Land of the Persians, London 1887, p. 154–155; Carussin, op. cit., ii, 44–50 and E. Aubin, La Perse d’aujourd’hui, Paris 1908, p. 289). In Isfahan during the summer months the bed of the river, which is much used for irrigation purposes, is frequently dried up completely. The river-system of the Zende-Rûd, especially its upper part, still requires more careful exploration; cf. Stack, op. cit., ii, 23, 84 sqq. and Bishop.

The name Zende (Zenda-Rûd) (cf. Vullers, Lexicon Persico-Latinum, i. 151, 152) means "river of life," for the Zæynde (Zayende-Rûd) is "life-giving river," i.e. the river that invigorates or fertilizes the land, is now more common. At an earlier period we also find the name Zamm-Rûd = "golden river," and the reason for this name nothing definite is known; it may be added that a valley quite near the source of this river is called Zamin valley (cf. Bishop, op. cit., i. 265).


ZENG6I, BAŠI al-DIN b. KAMIS AL-DAWLA AL-ASOQOR b. ABU AL-MAWI al-JALÁL al-DIN, 1241–1259, 1256–1260, 1282–1283, and 1284–1285. He was the son of Al-Mu‘ammād ibn Al-Mu‘awwād, one of the most distinguished emirs of the Saljuq period. He was the son of Asoqor al-Hājib ("the chamberlain"). A Turkish Mamluk in the service of Sultan Malikshah [q.v.], had received from the latter the town of Halab as a fief; but when Asoqor on the death of Malikshah rebelled against his brother Tunsh [q.v.], he was taken prisoner and put to death (287 = 1094) and the young Zengi, who was then only ten years old, lost his father's estates which went to Tunsh and the emirs who had sided with him. Zengi several times distinguished himself under the next ruler of al-Mawṣil and as a result was appointed governor of Halab in 1121 (1122–1123) by the governor of Baghdad. Asoqor al-Burakk, who then supervised the whole of Iraq, and later received in addition the governorship of Baṣra. In 1124–1125 Asoqor was transferred from Baghdad to al-Mawṣil but in Dhu l-Kadhāb 520 (Nov. 1126) he fell a victim to the dagger of the Assassins, who hated him as an ardent supporter of the caliphs and Saljuqs. In the following year his son Malikshah also died, probably poisoned by one of the Syriac princes with whom he was on terms of enmity. A minor brother of Malikshah now came forward as heir to the governorship of al-Mawṣil and his claims were supported by the command in al-Mawṣil, one of Asoqor's Mamluks, named al-Dīwān. When the latter sent men of al-Mawṣil to Baghdad to recommend Malikshah's young brother to the sultan Malikshah, the two envoys to whom al-Dīwān's plans seemed by no means free from difficulties, were won over by a relative of Zengi's to his side and he was appointed governor of al-Mawṣil and made his formal entrance into the city in Ramadān 521 (Sept.–Oct. 1127). The sultan gave him his two sons Alp Arslan and Fara ḫuṣṣān to educate and Zengi therefore received the title of al-Dīwān. In the same year he took possession of Dżirayr Ibn 'Umar, Naftân, Sinjâr and Harrân. In Maḥmûrd 522 (Jan. 1128) he took the town of Halab [q.v.] where utter anarchy reigned until Zengi appeared and restored order. In the following year he got possession of Hamāt [q.v.] through treachery; on the other hand, he fell against Himâ and Damascus. Of his other enterprises in this period special mention may be made of the capture and destruction of the fortress of al-Aḫārîsh between Halab and Anṭîkh, which was occupied by the Crusaders. In the struggle for the sultanate between the Saljuq prince Malikshah b. Muḥammad [q.v.] and his brother Saliḫ, Zengi sided with
the former (526 = 1131—1134) and when the uncle of the two brothers Sandjar [q. v.] wished to exert his suzerainty he was joined by Zengi and Dubais b. Sadaqa [q. v.]. The attacks of the two latter on Baghda were however unsuccessful and the caliph al-Mustarshid was equally unsuccessful in his attempt to take al-Mawsil, which he besieged for three months (537 = 1132-1133).

When his successor al-Ra‘id quarrelled with Sul‘tan Mas‘ud, Zengi at first joined the former but was persuaded to approve of the deposition of al-Ra‘id and paid homage to al-Mu‘tazli. In 531 (1137) Zengi after besieging Himy for several months in vain, attacked the fortress of Ba‘rini (Monserrandus). The Christian commander appealed for help to King Fulko of Jerusalem but the latter was routed and Ba‘rini had to surrender. A new enemy now appeared in the field, namely the emperor John II of Constantinople, who had first of all intended to reduce to obedience the rebel ruler Leo of Little Armenia and his ally Raymond of Antioch, but after making peace he made an alliance with the leaders of the Crusaders. After taking the fortress of Bussa, he advanced against Halab but soon abandoned his plan of subduing it by a long siege and attacked Shiraz. But when the inhabitants defended themselves bravely, the emperor accepted the commander’s terms and returned to Antioch (Rasmidin 532 = May—June 1138) pursued by Zengi who took many prisoners and much booty. In the same year after long negotiations, the ruler of Damascus Shihah al-Din Mahmud handed over to Zengi the town of Himy. In Dhu ‘l-Qa‘da 533 (July 1139) Zengi undertook a campaign against Basalbek; after a vigorous resistance the garrison had to capitulate and were for the most part massacred, although Zengi had promised them liberty to depart. The object of all his efforts was still however the rich city of Damascus and in Rakhi‘ 534 (Oct.—Nov. 1139) he laid siege to the town. The ruler of Damascus Djamal al-Din Mu‘ammad was not inclined to exchange Damascus for Himy and Basalbek and after what had happened at the latter town could not fully trust Zengi. When he died a few months later, the new commander Mu‘in al-Din who acted for the minor Mudjar al-Din b. Djamal al-Din applied to the Crusaders and offered them the town of Basalbek if they would assist him, whereupon Zengi raised the siege and returned to al-Mawsil. After he had taken several strongholds in Northern Mesopotamia, he quarrelled with Sul‘tan Mas‘ud, who finally declared war on him. Zengi gave in however and purchased peace (535 = 1143—1144). In Dhu‘l-Qa‘da 535 (December 1144) he took the important town of Edessa from the Crusaders and two years later attacked Ka‘st Dja‘bar in Mesopotamia when he was murdered by some Mamlikas on the night of 4th—5th Rahib II (Sept. 13—14), or according to another story, on the 15th Rahib II 541 (Sept. 24, 1146). He was succeeded in al-Mawsil by his son Salf al-Din Ghizir I and in al-Halab by another son, Nur al-Din Mahmud. The Oriental historians bestow the highest praise on the political qualities of astheg Zengi; on the other hand they are well aware of his unscrupulousness. Ibn al-Akhir (xi. 72) vividly describes how prosperity returned under his care to lands which had been threatened by the Franks and impoverished by the exertions and frequent changes of governors.

Bibliography: Ibn Khalil, Wafayat al-Ayn, ed. Wattenfeld, N°. 244 (transl. de Shane, i. 539 sqq.); Ibn al-Athir, al-Kamil, ed. Tornberg, x. i., passim; Recueil des Historiens des Crusade's, Historiens orientaux, i.—iii., see Index; Houtsma, Recueil de textes relatifs à l’histoire des Seljeslides, ii. 179—181, 195, 204—212; Weil, Gesch. d. Chalifen, iii. 193, 199, 215, 221, 226—228, 244—255, 257—260, 280—290; H. A. R. Gibb, The Damascus Chronicle of the Crusades, London 1932; Rühricht, Geschicht des Königreichs Jerusalem, see Index; Lane Poole, The Mohammedan Dynasties, p. 652 sqq.; Khalil Elbi, Die Welt als erlosend, p. 252 sqq.; de Zamboas, Manuel de geologie et de chronologie, see Index. (K. V. ZETTESTEIN)

ZENITH, the vertical point, i.e. the highest point in the visible sphere of the heavens in the direction of the vertical (plumb line) above the observer, at the same time the upper (visible) pole of the horizon.

The technical astronomical term for zenith in Arabic is samt al-ar‘a‘ or samt al-ar‘at, which means "direction (samt) of the hand", corresponding to the Greek κέφαλις or κέφαλις κεφαλής. Plato Thratinus reproduces samt al-ar‘a‘ in his Latin translation as zenith capitii or zenith capitum, the Spanish translation of al-Battani by el somet (el somet) de la cabeza (el al-Battani, Opus astronomium, ed. Nallino, ii. 337, i. 294) and was Golius early noticed, the form zemit seems to owe its origin to a slip of the pen which made the in samt (zemit) into ni: somet > zenith. The same word samt — in the plural samui — is found in the astronomical term asuun [q. v.], Ar. samt, i.e. mien d‘irat al-ar‘a‘, "direction on the circle of the horizon", calculated in degrees. Libros de sabios a astronomia translate samt usually by somte, and samt al-ar‘a‘ by cenit.

The (invisible) pole of the horizon directly under the observer, the counter-pole of the zenith, is called nadir [q. v.], from Ar. matr. The largest circles which go through zenith and nadir are called vertical circles; among them two are specially distinguished, the meridian (jalab mi‘t al-nahar, & mu‘allaqas) in whose plane the axis of the earth lies and which cuts the horizon in the south and north points and the first vertical which stands perpendicular on the plane of the meridian, cutting the horizon in east and west. The east and west points are also the poles of the meridian, south and north points the poles of the first vertical.

The spherical coordinates of a star calculated in the horizon-zenith system are azimuth (al-samt) and altitude (irtif‘a‘, i.e. ‘u‘m d‘irat al-ar‘a‘); while modern astronomy defines the azimuth as the length of the arc between the vertical circle covered by the star and the meridian, measured on the horizon from S. to W. N., E. to S. from O°—360° — or, if the direction in the heavens is given, from S. via W. and S. via E. to 180° — the Arab astronomers (which it is important to remember) take the first vertical as the circle of reference, i.e. reckoning from the east or west point of the vertical. The a l i t i t u d e of the star is the length of the arc of the star from the horizon, measured on the vertical circle which passes through the star. It is calculated from O° (on the horizon) to +90° (on the zenith) or —90° (on the nadir); negative altitudes are frequently called depressions. The altitude is
frequently replaced by its complement, the distance of the zenith which represents the length of the arc measured on the same vertical circle from the zenith. The zenith distance of the pole of the heavens is equal to the altitude of the equator in the meridian and equal to the complement of the altitude of the pole or geographical latitude \( \phi \), i.e. \( 90^\circ - \phi \).

A plane parallel to the horizon intersects the visible sphere of the heavens in a circle, which connects all points of the same altitude. Such a circle is called in astronomy a horizontal circle or — using an Arabic loanword — Al-nukastarat (i.e. al-nukastarat) [q. v.].

(WILLY HARTNER)

ZENTA (formerly Hungarian Szenta; Turkish زانتا), [Xamli al-As'han, iv. 2425] and also جنتا [in Khalil Edhem, Dicweli ishanniyah, 1927, p. 332; Serbo-Croat Senta], a flourishing town on the right bank of the Theiss in the Bačka (since 1929 in the Danube banate) in Jugoslavia, with 30,044 inhabitants (1931), first mentioned in 1218 and made a free city in 1351. After the battle of Mohacs (1526) Zenta became Turkish and belonged to the sajdeg of Szigetvd (Szigető; cf. e.g. Fekete, Türkeische Schriften, der Hafiz II., 1552, p. 110 and 324). Ewlija Celebi (vii. 363) who visited Zenta in the 13th century, describes it as a small palanka (fortress) in the above mentioned sajdeg and proposes a childish etymology (ستنی باست) of its name.

Zenta is celebrated in history as a battle-field. When Mușața II was retiring from Peterovtsi, when Prince Eugène of Savoy had shut himself up, after an unsuccessful siege, he wished at first to attack Szigető but soon decided to cross the Theiss at Zenta and go to Temesvár. Káčuk Djă'ar Pasha (on him see Siddihat, id. cit., ii. 75) was taken prisoner by Prince Eugène and was threatened with death by the Sultan's plans. Prince Eugène then advanced rapidly to Zenta and surprised the grandvizier Elnás Mehmed Pasha (cf. above iii. p. 692 and the article Muhammed Esse"l Esma) just as he was about to cross the river (the greater part) of his army to the left bank. After the onslaught of the imperial troops, the Turks made a wild rush for the bridge, which was being heavily bombarded and it soon collapsed; the Turks were thus cut in two and by evening utterly routed (Sept. 11, 1697). Besides the grandviziers, four other viziers, 13 beglerbegs and about 30,000 men fell or were drowned. The Sultan himself only escaped with difficulty. In the popular mind this defeat became a synonym for any disaster, as may be seen from the Serbo-Croat proverb Prvekepas ban turki can ou Senti ['he has met the fate of the Turkish emperor at Zenta']. The defeat at Zenta forced the Turks to the peace of Carlowitz [q. v.] and meant that they were now definitely driven back into the Balkan Peninsula.


(FEHIM BAJRAKETOVIC)

ZER MAHBÜB, "beloved gold", a Turkish gold coin (sequin). In the reign of Ahmed III (1145—1145 = 1703—1707) a new gold sequin was issued weighing 40 grains (2.6 grammes), in addition to the older sequin of 53 grains (3.44 grammes) (fıngul altadlı) which continued to be issued alongside of it. This coin, known as the zer mahbûb, remained in circulation till the great Mejlûly recasting of 1250 (1844), being reduced in weight to 37 grains (2.44 grammes) by Selim III (1253—1257 = 1839—1847) and to 35 grains (2.65 grammes) in the last years of Mahmud II (1253—1255 = 1839—1853). Double, quadruple and half and quarter pieces of this denomination were also issued.


(J. ALLAN)

ZI'A'IJA. [See Zu'xMET.]

ZIKRAWAII b. MIHRAWAII, a Karmažian. After 'Abdân, the brother-in-law and secretary of the founder of the Karmazan sect Hamdân Karmaz [q. v.], had been disposed of in 286 (899), Zikrawah took his place as a Karmazan missionary. Out of fear of the energetic caliph Al-Mu'tašid [q. v.], he had however to remain in concealment and is said to have lived in a hiding-place for four years and only to have come out into the light of day after Al-Mu'tašid's death in Rabî' II 289 (April 902). In the meanwhile the Karmazan emissaries had succeeded in winning numerous followers among the Bani 'Ulayla, a clan of the great Beduin tribe of Kalb b. Wabar in the Syrian desert, and towards the end of 289 (902) a large army set out against Damascus. Syria was at this time under the rule of the Tâlibun, but the general Tughdid in Damascus was almost independent of the central government in Egypt. On the approach of the Karmazan troops he set out against them but underestimated the greatness of the danger and when he came to give battle, was forced to flee and return to the capital. Soon afterwards the grand vizier of the Karmazans (al-zihî al-âshâr) fell at the siege of Damascus: he was succeeded by his brother, the al-zihî al-khari, who forced the people of Damascus to purchase peace and then continued northwards, plundering and murdering as he went. Several towns like Hamât, Ma'arrat-al-Nu'mân, Belbeik and Salamyin were sacked, the men massacred and the women and children carried off as slaves. Finally however, the new caliph's general Muhammed b. Subâla succeeded in completely defeating the Karmazans; the al-zihî al-khari was taken prisoner and brought to Bagdad where he was killed. The caliph had him executed in the cruelest fashion. But the power of the Syro-Irânian Karmazans was not broken. A disciple of Zikrawa's, Ahtân b. Allah b. Sa'd, who had taken the name Nayr, stirred up the Kalb Beduins; they joined the Karmanzans proper and ravaged the country east of the river Jordan as far as Damascus. When the caliph's troops approached, the Karmazans retired into the desert, filling up the wells so that their pursuers could not reach them for want of water. But when an army under Muhammad b. Ishâq b. Kandâjîk finally penetrated to their
camps in the desert, they had to give in, murdered Nga and sent his head as a token of submission to the victor, Zikrawaih then at last came out of his hiding-place, appointed al-Kāsim ib. Ahmad leader of the Irākī Karmājans and had himself worshipped as a saint, never allowing himself to be seen unveiled. In Ḍu‘u ‘l-Hijjāj 293 (Oct. 906) they advanced on Kffa, entered the town and massacred the people in the streets but after desperate fighting with the troops of the governor Ishāq b. Imam had to give way and return to the district of Kādīiya. In the very same month an army which the caliph sent against the Karmājans at Ishāq’s request was defeated near Kādīiya; but when al-Mukaffa equipped a new army under the command of Muḥammad b. Ishāq b. Kusālādā, they retired into the desert to waylay caravans. In Maharram of the following year (Oct.—Nov. 906) Zikrawaih fell upon the great pilgrim caravan returning from Mecca; his people killed not only the men but also a number of the women and carried off the rest. In Rab‘i‘ I, according to the most probable statement on the 22nd (Jan. 10, 907), the caliph’s troops led by Wāsif b. Sūmnārgin came upon the Karmājans near Kha‘fān in the district of al-Kādīiya and fought them till sunset without a decision being reached. On the following day Zikrawaih was wounded in the head, whereupon his followers fled on all sides. On the way to Baghdād he succumbed to his wounds and his corpse was exhibited in the capital. — Cf. also the article Karmājans.


ZINĀ (A.), fornication, i.e. any sexual intercourse between persons who are not in a state of legal matrimony or concubinage. To the pre-Islamic Arabs, zinā was not a sin but regarded in certain circumstances as an injury to the rights of property of a fellow-traveller. In the Kur‘ān, however, apparently under Jewish or Christian influence, warnings are uttered against zinā and chastity represented as a mark of the believer, e.g. Sura xvii. 34; xxv. 68; xxxiii. 30. Zinā is then dealt with more fully in Sura iv. (probably of the period after the battle of Uhud in the year 3). *(10)* If your women be guilty of whoredom, then bring four witnesses against them from among yourselves: and if they bear witness to it, shut them up in their houses until death releases them or Allah gives them a way. *(20)* Punish both of these among you who commit this sin; but if they repent and mend their ways, let them be for Allah is the pardoner and the merciful: *(29)* *(The believing slave-girls whom you marry) shall be chaste and modest and have no lovers*. Verse 20 is sometimes with less probability referred to sodomy. A new law was made as a result of ‘Abigail’s celebrated adventure in the year 6 in Sura xxiv.: *(2)* Scourge each of the fornicators with a hundred lashes and have no mercy upon them in Allah’s religion, if you believe in Allah and the last day; a number of the believers shall attend their punishment. *(3)* The whoremonger shall only marry a whore or an idolatress and the whore shall only marry a whoremonger or an idolator. Such marriages are forbidden to the believers*. Sura iv. 30 must be later than the law in xxiv. 2, of which it is a continuation: *But if after marriage they commit adultery then inflict upon them half the punishment of chaste (free married) women*. Sura xxxii. 30 (probably dating from the last part of 5 A.H.) refers to the punishment in the other world. Sura xxiv. 33 cannot be exactly dated but certainly Medinese *(Force not your slave-girls to prostitution, if they wish to remain chaste, from a desire for gain in this life; if any one forces them, then after they have been compelled, Allah will be forgiving to them)* and Sura lxv. 1 is also later (divorced women must not be driven out of their houses during the *idda unless they have committed proved adultery*). The so-called *verse of the stoning* is said to have been an original part of the Kur‘ān as it was acknowledged as such by the caliph ‘Omar: *If a man and women who by have reached years of discretion commit adultery, stone them in every case, as Allah’s punishment*. It is improbable that this verse is genuine, the traditions relating to it and the mention of ‘Omar are clearly tendentious; the stories that the Prophet punished by stoning are also unworthy of credence. This punishment, which must have entered Ḥadīth quite early, certainly comes from Jewish law (Deut. xxii. 23) as can still be seen in a hadīth. Other traditions emphasize the rules of the ‘Arab and develop them; zinā is not compatible with belief, profit from zinā and prostitution is uncleanness; sodomy etc. are included under zinā; the stoning, which remained as a punishment alongside of stoning is combined with a year’s banishment. In the system of ‘ādām and already in many traditions stoning and flogging are separated as *ḥadd* punishment for zinā in two categories of criminals, according as they are mukābān or not. By mukābān the law means in this case every individual who has reached years of discretion, is in possession of his faculties, is free and has had sexual intercourse in a legal marriage; they however always remain mukābān even after their marriage is dissolved; the distinction is therefore not based on any moral grounds. According to Ḥanafīs and Ḥanбалts, both the guilty parties must fulfill these conditions; the Ḥanafīs also demand that the mukābān should be a Muslim, while the Mālikīs consider neither of the punishments applicable to a non-Muslim. The banishment for a year after the flogging is limited by the Mālikits to the man, by the Ḥanafī left to the discretion of the impresario. Slaves are punished with fifty lashes, and according to the ‘Ashāfīs banishment for six months. Zinā can only be proved by the evidence of four male, competent witnesses; as they must report all the details of the incident and, if their evidence is not sufficient, are liable to the *ḥadd* for zinā [q.v.], the *ḥadd* for zinā in practice can hardly ever be inflicted, unless the culprit himself confesses his guilt. According to the Ḥanafīs and Ḥanbalts, this confession must also be made four times, and according to the general teaching can be withdrawn. Marriage within the forbidden degrees is simply zinā as is rape, which can also be regarded as doing bodily harm. If the husband kills the guilty couple in *flagrante delicto* he is not liable to punishment. In practice the place of the legal regulations was often taken by summary and usually secret action either by the authorities
or by the relatives of the guilty woman; in this case drowning was a common form of punishment.

Bibliography: Lamme, Li-Berçoum de l'Islam, p. 379; Noldeke-Schwall, Geschichte des Korans, I, 248 sqq.; Wenstuck, Handsch of Early Muslim Tradition, i.e. Zaid; Juynboll, Handbuch der islamischen Geistes, p. 301 sqq.; recal, Handbuch der islamischen Geistes, p. 205 sqq.; Khanshar, Edite Sehieh d'islamique, in Z. D. M. G., VIII, 1901 sqq.; Hughes, Dictionary of Islam, s.v. alchemy and alchemy; Laue, Merchants and Customs of the Modern Egyptians, chap. VII (end) and xii. (towards the end). (Joseph Schacht)

ZINDIK (pl. zindikah; abstract zindak), the term used in Muslim criminal law to describe the heretic whose teaching becomes a danger to the state; this crime is liable to capital punishment (by the application of tâlîf v. 37: xxvi. 40; cf. K. M. M., 1909, ix. 99–103) and to damnation (the Maliks think it useless to ask the culprit to recant [fitna] contrary to the Hanafis; tabfi, often (theoretical), is not strong a term as zindak).

The term was borrowed in the tr. of the Fr. translation of the Shi'i administration; Schwedt, correcting Darmesteter, has shown that Mas'ud (followed by Haydari) was right in saying that among the Madaens, zindak was the heretic, who introduced a new gloss, an allegorical interpretation of a passage in the Avesta (cf. in the ninth century, the zindik Al-Othli, studied by Barthelmé; cf. Mithridat, xxvi. 16: Shahyati & Shahyati, vi. 7); and more especially the Manichaean, follower of Mani (testimony of the Armenian writer on heretics Eznik, of the fifth century, transl. Schmidt, p. 95), or, in a more restricted sense still, the follower of the Manichaean schismatic Mazzad (according to Khawarizmi).

The term being of Arabic, A. Siddiqi has shown that we must reject the Aramaic etymology (naddik) suggested by Bevan as well as the Greek (yewrysth) proposed by Vellera. The word zindik must have become arabeised in the mixed Arabo-Islamic society of the mawali Hamara of Hira and Kufa (cf. the exiling of the Madaens to Hira, in which we can see the explanation of the Shi'i gnostic of Kufa in the following century). Indeed it appears for the first time in the Irak in 125 (742) in connection with the execution of Djjd b. Djamal; then from 167 (785) to 170 (788) as an official inquisition was instituted by the 'Abd Allah caliph under a special order (urj); it was then that Bashir b. Burd and Sidi b. 'Abd al-Khaddar were executed. The term became a technical one and literary tradition designates three famous writers, Ibn al-Rawandi, Tawhid and 'Abd as the three zindikah of Islam'. But in general use, the term lost its precision and if the official definition of the zindik (a dualist ascetic, then a Muslim who is secretly a Manichaean), according to the caliph Mahdi (Tabari, ed. de Goeje, iii. 588), is already carelessly applied to the three first men executed mentioned above, it is clear that it does not at all explain the psychology of the three zindikah of Islam'. In practice, the polemics of the conservative describe as a zindik or 'free thinker' any one whose external profession of Islam seems to them not sufficiently sincere (cf. the poet D. S. Zahabi in Baghdad or the critic Taha Husain in Cairo). This is the meaning in which it is already used by 'Abd in his Risala al-Ghafiri. The chief works representing this free, radical way of thinking have been brought to light by P. Kram (Ernighazi, Abu 'Isha Wazir, Ibn al-Rawandi, Rumi, Thughuri); they are preserved in Ismailite refutations.

The evolution of the term is explained by its political character; it brands the heresy which imperils the Muslim state (this is already clear in the trial of al-Halladji); and as the only crime systematically punished by the Prophet himself by death had been zab al-rastil, the jurists more and more made zindak an intellectual rebellion insulting the Prophet's honour (cf. Ibn Taimiya and Ibn Hadjar al-Haitami).

The stage of this evolution can be better closer together by summing up the definitions given of the word zindak by the various Muslim schools.

The Hanbalis, according to Khawarizmi (d. 535 = 877), recognise five sects of zindikah: mawalli, who deny the creation and the Creator, reducing the world to an unstable mixture of the four elements; mawaliyya (Manichaean) and mawaliyya (what dualists; 'asabiyah (vegetarian Ismai ascetics of Kufa; cf. Massignon, Revue, vii. 11–12) and tawhidiyah (four sects ecclesiastics, who seek to free themselves from the constraint of observances and laws by an amorous union of the soul with God, a union denounced as implying identity of nature between the Creator and his creatures; in this Sunni mystics like Rabih and Rabi'a are ranged alongside of an Ismai alchemist like Ibn Hayydan. Ibn Hanbal himself describes Djam as a zindik for having maintained that the spirit of God is an immaterial emanation, therefore divine.

The Maliks of the west (Spain and Morocco) studied by Millot and Lavi-Provengal and institutes of zindak, especially for 'insults to the honour of the Prophet' (trial of Abu 'I-Khair at Cordova in the reign of al-Hakam II, of Ibn Hatim al-Andalusi at Toledo in 457 (1064) and later of Ibn Zakari at Fes). Similarly the Hanafis, especially during the Ottoman empire (futwah against the Shī'at al-Kabīr in 934 (1527); cf. Nabulsi, Ghiyath al-Ma'ani, Ms. folio 77).

As to the theologians, the term 'naddik in first sanaa an amorous devotion, seeking liberation from obligatory duties (cf. Thumma, in al-Baghdadi, Fark, aab. and ed. Hitt, p. 105), then a tendency to the khala of the Khurramis; Ghazzli defines it as a tendency to asceticism.

The Shi'is were early persecuted as zindakah in view of their doctrine of the divine love (trial in the year 262 (875) of Nuri; execution of al-Halladji); al-Halladji (cf. Tawhid, v. 2) himself recognises in a curious psychological analysis that on the threshold of transforming union, mysticism obtains a feeling of identity with God, which is zindak (Akhbar, No. 35, p. 89, I. 7).

The moderate Shi'is like to describe the extremist Shi'is, for an analogous reason, as zindak (emotions that unite with the divine: dunya al-'ur'udiyah). The Zaidi imam Kays is credited with the authorship of a refutation of the zindik Ibn al-Ma'asri (v. v.) which Guidi has edited and translated.

Lastly, in his Fikrist (ed. Filz, p. 338), Ibn al-Nadim has given a very heterogeneous list of zindak (the value of which is sometimes overestimated, it is already imaginative; G. Vajda is
preparing a critical study of this subject) in which Marwān II. and the Barmeccides are found alongside of Isma'īlīs, like Abū Sa‘īd Allī and Džāhilān, an Imāmī like Nāṣīrī and an independent critical faction like Abū ʻĪsā al-Warrāq [q.v.].


(Louis Massignon)

ZINDJIRLI, a village in Northern Syria in the valley of the Karashī between the Amān and the Kur Dagh not far from Işlāhye. Near the village is a tell, the ruins of the old Aramaean town of Sham'al, the capital of the little North Syrian state of Yādī (Assyr. Yandī). It was discovered in 1883 by Hamdī Bey, E. v. Laschān and O. Puchstein and excavated in 1888, 1890-1891, 1894 and 1902 by the Berlin Orientkommitee under the leadership of K. Humann, E. v. Laschān and F. Winter with the co-operation of J. Euting and W. Koldewey.

The citadel of Sham'al was surrounded by two concentric circular walls. In addition to the remains of earlier fortifications, columns and bulla, there were found at Zindjirli and the adjoining tells of Ğerđīn (Gerđīn) and Tābkit Bīyar several Aramaic inscriptions in old Canaanean script and a stele of Assaradding of Assyrā in which we learn the names of several rulers of the 6th and 7th centuries B.C. of Sham'al-Yaḏī, namely Gabbārū, Bāmušu, Khiγyā, Shu‘ā, Kīlamāwā, Kusāl, Panāmagā (Pa-μuμaγa) I, Bāzūr, Panāmagā II and Barkekk. The finds from Zindjirli are for the most part preserved in the Vorderasiatische Abteilung of the State Museums in Berlin; the remainder are in the Museum in Stamūlī.

In the Arab period there is no trace of Zindjirli rulers unless we have a corruption of this name in that of the fortress of Zandjīra mentioned in al-Nuwindī, Paris Bibl. Nat., Ma. arab., No. 1579, fol. 161r, quoted in Muṣafādāl b. Abī l-Faṣṭīlī, Histoiire des Sultans Mamelouks, ed. Blochet, in Païœnt. Orient., xiv. (1920), 602, note 2).


(Zirids, the name of two medieval dynasties of the Muslim west. 1. The Zirids or Bani Ziri, a Berber dynasty which held a part of Eastern Barbary from the end of the fourth (tenth) century to the middle of the sixth (sixth) century. The Zirids were connected with the great confederation of the Sanhājāt [q.v.] and led a settled existence in the central Maghrib. Zir b. Manṣūr had founded Aṣḥār [q.v.] in the mountains of Titteri about 940. He made it the capital of his territory and a bulwark against the attacks of the Zanjids Maghrib [q.v.]. The rule of the Umayyads of Cordova by the resistance to the Zanjids, the Zirids rendered considerable service to the plans of the Fatimids of Iḥrījīya. Their most signal service was the relief of al-Mahdiyya when it was besieged by the Kharāji agitator Abū Za‘īd. The timely assistance which they rendered to the Fatimids on this and several other occasions was rewarded. When the Umayyad caliph al-Ma‘ṣūr left Iḥrījīya for Egypt in 973 he appointed Bulqagī b. Ziri governor of Iḥrījīya and gave him by anticipation investiture all the lands which he might conquer from the Zanjids. Against these hereditary enemies the struggle was continued under Bulqagīn [cf. Bulqagīn] who marched victoriously through the Maghrib and seized all the important towns with the exception of Ceuta, under al-Maṣūr b. Bulqīgīn (373-385 = 984-995) and under Bādīs b. al-Maṣūr (385–406 = 995–1016). During the latter emir’s reign took place the division of the Zirids into two kingdoms: one in the west went to the Hamālīs who lived in the Kasa and the other in the east to the Zirds with Kafrāwān as capital. An amicable arrangement regularising the division was made in 408 (1017) under al-Ma‘ṣūr b. Bādīs [q.v.]. In spite of this loss of territory, eastern Barbary enjoyed an undeniable economic prosperity during the reign of al-Ma‘ṣūr (406–454 = 1010–1062) which enabled the emir to enrich Kafrāwān and Shāb, the official city, with very fine buildings (ceilings and maqṣūra of the great mosque of Kafrāwān). This wealth encouraged al-Ma‘ṣūr to cast off Fatimidd suzerainty and to repudiate their doctrine which the people of Iḥrījīya had only accepted with great reluctance. The caliph in Cairo punished this sedition by sending in 444 (1054) against the rebels the Arab nomad tribes of the Bani Hilīl and Bani Ṣulas [q.v.]. This was the great disaster. The open country was rained completely; al-Ma‘ṣūr had to leave Kafrāwān.
and seek refuge in al-Mahdiya. While the Arabs held the plains, the towns formed republics and independent little principalities. Al-Ma'in's son Tamim (545-561 = 1102-1118) tried without much success to regain possession of his kingdom and to thwart the ambition of the Hamudaids. His successes were to continue this difficult task. What really gives interest to the later Zirids, Tamim b. al-Ma'in, Ya'qub b. Tamim (591-609 = 1156-1174), Ali b. Ya'qub (509-515 = 1116-1121), al-Hasan b. Ali (515-563 = 1121-1167), is the maritime activity developed by these former nomads now pasty at the main harbours and the repeated attempts made by them to recapture the command of the sea from the Normans of Sicily. This struggle which generally took the form of pleasant enterprises did not however end to the advantage of the Zirids. After an effort to come to an agreement with the Normans, the emirs could not prevent the enemy raiding the coast of Ifsikiyah and plundering the coast towns. In 543 (1148) al-Mahdiya was taken by George of Antioch. Al-Hasan driven from his capital sought refuge at Tlemcen, then in Algiers. He was reinstated in al-Mahdiya by the Almohad caliph Abi al-Mu'min and spent eight years there before being again exiled, to die in obscurity in the extreme Maghrib in 563 (1167).


2. ZIRIDS OF SPAIN, a secondary branch of the Berber family of the Banū Zirr of Ifsikiyah, who founded an independent principality with Granada as capital at the time of the dismemberment of the Umayyad caliphate of Cordova. The establishment in Spain of the Şahbadd family had taken place only a few years previously. It originated in the rebellion in Ifsikiyah of the members of the family of the Zirid princes Balqubq and al-Maṣīlī who had been deprived of their positions. These malcontents gathered round one of Zirr's sons, Zawi, who persuaded them to leave Ifsikiyah. They offered their services, which were at first welcomed, to the 'Amirid Ḥassāq of Cordova, Abi al-Malik al-Maṣūfarr [q.v.]; accompanied by numerous followers they went to Spain where they soon played an important part in the Berber army raised by the 'Amirids in which they formed one of the main elements. When the caliph Sulaiman al-Musta'in at the beginning of the 6th (10th) century distributed lands to his principal auxiliaries, he gave the Banū Zirr the district of Elvira [q.v.], the old capital of which was gradually being supplanted by Granada, a town of quite recent foundation mainly peopled by Jews. Zawi b. Zirr without adopting the sovereign title at once began to act as an independent ruler in Granada. Taking up the cause of the pretender to the caliphate 'Abi b. Ḥasan (q.v.), he invited on the supporters of another candidate, Abi al-Rahman al-Muradiyy, in 1007 (1016-1017) a serious defeat in the region of Granada. His authority was naturally strengthened by this success; it is therefore all the more difficult to explain the decision he soon took to abandon his principality and return to his native land of Ifsikiyah. It was dictated no doubt by the ancient hatred, still alive in Spain, which had divided Africs into anti-Fāṭimids and pro-Fāṭimids. The Zemprut was daily gaining ground in Spain, where they occupied the mountainous region of the centre and west of Andalusia. Zawi however retook Kairouan with only a very small body of followers in 410 (1025).

On the departure of Zawi b. Zirr, his nephew Ḥabīb b. Mabkis assumed command of the Zirids in Granada. He adopted a sovereign title, that of Ḥassāq, and the honorific Ḥabb b. Saif al-Dawla. He reigned for over 10 years until 429 (1038). He concluded alliances with the petty neighbourhoods of Andalusia and at his death had increased his kingdom by the districts of Jaen (q.v.) and Cabra. He entrusted the conduct of his kingdom to a Jewish vizier, Samuel Ibn Naghão, a thing unprecedented in Muslim Spain. The name of this vizier, not yet an able minister, but author of many original works in Hebrew, spread far, and in 1027 the Jews of Spain revived for him the princely title of naghdī.

On the death of Ḥabīb b. Mabkis, power passed to his son Bādis b. Ḥabīb, whose long reign marks the culminating point of Zirid power in Spain. He began by inflicting a bloody defeat on the prince of Almeria, his former ally Zabārī [q.v.], who lost his life in the battle fought in the pass of Alpuente (429). Emboldened by this success and by the victories which he won without difficulty over the troops of the prince of Valencia and Seville, Bādis b. Ḥabīb threw off the suzerainty (at best only nominal) of the petty Hamūnīdd caliph of Malaga and annexed his dominions (c. 450 = 1058). The years following were marked by the anti-Berber policies of the Arab king of Seville, al-Muṭarjad [q.v.]. Ibn 'Abdāb, who successfully annexed the little Berber kingdoms of Ronda [q.v.], Jerez (Ar. Sharqī [q.v.]) and Acins. As a result the power of the Arabs in Spain increased considerably and the only bloc of Berber resistance which was still really solid was that of the Šahbadd Zirids of Granada. Bādis could not help being disturbed by this advance of the 'Abbādīd kingdom in the east of Andalusia and at the same time by the increasingly marked signs of dissatisfaction among his own Arab subjects. Bādis in these improprious circumstances and against the advice of the vizier Samuel, whom he had retained on his accession, went to war with Seville, but without success. A Seville army led by the prince al-Muṭarjad was fortunately checked in its advance on Malaga.

On the death of the vizier Samuel, his son Joseph succeeded him as Bādis's first minister. Unlike his father, the new vizier soon turned against himself not only the Arabs of the Zirid kingdom but also the Berbers themselves, by his extravagance and the luxury with which he surrounded himself and the favours he bestowed on his co-religionists. If
we may believe: the Arab historians, his ambitions increasing, he had the heir presumptive of Bâdis poisoned, his son Bâlûq âi, succeeded in excusing himself with his master and for a time thought of creating a Jewish kingdom in Spain for his own advantage. He was in secret correspondence with the lord of Almeria, Ibn Sumâdî, and offered to surrender Granada to him, on condition that Almeria became the capital of a Jewish principality of which he should be ruler. The reaction was inevitable and rapid. On the appeal of the Arab poet Abû Isâq al-Ibrî in a poem that became famous, a conspiracy was got up against the Jews of Granada and on 6th (March) Dec. 1066 Joseph Ibn Naghâli and 3,000 Granada Jews were massacred and their houses plundered.

The reign of Bâdis b. Hâbûs lasted till 468 (1073). Granada now became an important city grouped around the citadel which stood on the west bank of the Darro; it had been built by Hâbûs b. Mâkûs and enlarged by Bâdis. The residence of the latter, according to local tradition, was called "house of the weathercock" (jâr ilâh ul-ihrâh) which is preserved in that of "casella del Gallo". A bridge over the Darro still called "Puente del Caillo" was built in 447 (1055) by the Ulama of Granada Ali b. Muhammad b. Tawba. A maqâla of Bâdis b. Hâbûs, Mu'amâl, left his memorial in Granada in several public works also built in the Zirid period.

When Bâdis b. Hâbûs died, he left two grandsons, Ta'mâm, then governor of Malaga, and "Abd Allâh b. 'Abd Allâh the latter assumed power in Granada while his brother set up as an independent ruler in Malaga. This division was to be maintained till the end of the Zirid dynasty. Events were however soon to move rapidly with the advance of Christian arms. The taking of Toledo [q. v.] in 1085 by Alfonso VI was followed next year by the famous victory won by Yûsuf b. Ta'bûs at al-Zallaqâ [q. v.] in which Tamûm and "Abd Allâh took part with their contingents. When in 1090, Yûsuf returned to Spain, one of his first cares, after the failure of the siege of Aledo, was, on the advice of the Ulama of Granada Abû Dja'tar al-Kulâi, to seize Granada and dethrone "Abd Allâh. The latter abandoned by all had to go to the Almoravid sulûk who made him a prisoner and soon afterwards dethroned his brother Tamûm in Malaga. "Abd Allâh was exiled to Aghmât [q. v.] on the northern borders of the Moroccan Great Atlas. Tamûm was forced to live in Marrakesh where he died in 488 (1093). Almoravid governors were installed at Granada and Malaga to mark the completeness of the fall of the Zirid dynasty in Spain.


ZIYÀ GÖK ÂLP [Mehmed Ziya Bey], Turkish author and poet, sociologist and nationalist leader. Born in Diyarbekr in 1875, from a family of Ottoman government officials, he attended the veterinary school in Constantinople; becoming compromised through his relations with the Revolutionary Committee, he was obliged to leave the capital, and return to his province. After the revolution of 1908 he figured among the members of the Union and Progress Committee, took part in the Salonic Congress (1909), and began to spread his social and nationalist ideas through the review Genç Kültürel, which was published in that city. From 1913 he occupied the chair of Sociology at the University of Constantinople, was among Enver Pasha's supporters during the European war, and was exiled to Malta during the Allied occupation of Constantinople.

In spring of 1917 he returned to Anatolia and remained a year at Diyarbekr, where he published the review Kültürel Meşrûmâ; he was then appointed president of the "Translation and Composition Committee" at Angora; he was among the heralds and supporters of the People's Party (Kültürel Fırâhî), founded by Muşâtâ Kemâl Pasha, and resumed his teaching at the University of Constantinople, where he died, still young, October 25, 1924. His funeral, celebrated by the Great National Assembly of Angora, to which he belonged as member for Constantinople, was a tribute from the whole nation to his memory. Ziya Gök Alp was a son of his times, and in a certain sense an anticipator of events, which his strong national feeling foresaw in examining the history of the people and the fortunes of the Ottoman Empire. Especially after his death he was recognised as the father of Turkish nationalism. There is however an evolution in his thought from 1908 to 1924, which bears a relation to the events in his country. From his early manifestation of a spirit of modernism and freedom, justified by "Abd al-Hamid's tyranny, he passed, under the influence of books and of currents already dominating the westernized Turkish classes, to the preaching of Panturanism. This programme appears in almost all his early works, it still prevails in the later, and is embodied especially in the poem Turku, published in 1914 in the collection Kâtîb Elma, which ends with the lines: "The fatherland of the Turks is neither Turkey nor Turkestan, our fatherland is a great and eternal country: Turan". Ziya Gök Alp dreamed of a Turkish fatherland, an Ottoman empire, comprising the provinces it still possessed in 1914, a Muslim empire with a constitutional Sulûk, where Ottomans would be preeminent politically and intellectually, and which would give rise to a new civilization, capable of influencing the other peoples of Turkish race, and absorbing them to the point of creating an immense Turanian empire. These same ideas are poetically rendered in the poem Kâtîb Elma, which gives the volume its title, and in the prose writings mentioned below. Prose and poetry, for Ziya Gök Alp, are slightly different expressions of an identical idea.

In his later years, after the loss of the Ottoman
Empire's provinces, the writer's hopes centred around Mustafa Kemal's form of democratic dictatorship; the Panasorean ideas remain in the distance, as a far-away goal, and he tries to strengthen a pure Turkish nationalism, modernising and westernising: Ziya Gök Alp departs from the Edibübey-i Şefiye school and opens the contemporary movement; he has, however, a singular individuality, which distinguishes him from his contemporaries and from his predecessors. He is a narrator in his works, which are the fruit of individual study and feeling; it is not difficult to discern the influence of European writers, especially French, whom he mentions, e.g. the sociologists G. Tarde and E. Durkheim, and, in history, L. Cahen. An interesting side of his literary activity is its simple and melodious form; some of his poems seem deliberately written with a pedagogical purpose, but they are inspired by strong feeling, and between the lines flash bold conceptions.

Ziya Gök Alp is also one of the first, if not the first, Turkish writer to have perceived the importance of folk literature as a fount of inspiration for a sincere national culture; in his works are also to be noticed mystical motives. In language, he favours simplicity and a thoroughly Turkish vocabulary and syntax.

He was a supporter of modernisation in religious and political matters; in this he has been far surpassed by recent Turkish Reforms.

Works: Ziya Gök Alp's writings are scattered in many Turkish reviews of the last 20 years, some of which, like Zorlu Kaynak, Yeni Medemülük, and Türk Zevki, received from him their special character. Many of these articles have been reprinted in his chief works, which we enumerate in chronological order:


to the ground, his eye ever open for events happening in his immense viceroyalty. Amirls and collectors of aphiornias frequently hesitate between the two, when they do not quote both, to point a lesson of high politics; Ziyād is numbered among the four dāhīyas, great statesmen, of the century. The other three are Muḥammad (q.v.), al-Mughṭira b. Šuʿba (q.v.) and ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ (q.v.). In Kūfa he had to keep an eye on the 'Alīd meetings. He came into conflict there with the agitator Ḥudīr b. 'Adi (q.v.), an everyday incident exaggerated out of all proportion by anti-Omayyad tradition, especially by the šiʿa. He checkedmate the 'Alīd opposition and that of the Arab tribes settled in the irāq, Ziyād had recourse to transplantation. He moved 50,000 Beduins to Ḥurraṣān. He died of the plague at Kūfa in 53–57.

For our information about Ziyād we have to rely upon the historical school of the Ṣīrāk. The bias of the Ṣīrāk annalists, very hostile to Ziyād, is inclined to place his birth several years after the Hidjra, in order to be able to dispute his claim to the title of ṣaḥābī, Companion of the Prophet. As, on the other hand, he could not have been born long before the Hidjra we may credit him with being about 60 at his death. The best testimony to Ziyād's ability is seen in Muʿawiyah's decision to hand over to his charge the eastern half of the Arab empire, notoriously the most difficult to govern, the most rebellious against Omayyad ideas. The great manager of men, the active ruler, so strongly will to do his own relative, summoned Ziyād to assist him in the exercise of his power and imposed upon himself, so to speak, the tolerance of not interfering in the affairs of the Ṣīrāk in the lifetime of his lieutenant. The constant favour, the loyal support given by Ziyād to the Omayyad dynasty are sufficient to explain the bitterness of the 'Alīd writers against the memory of the Ṣaḥīfa statesman.


ZIYĀD ALLĀH b. IBRĀHĪM. [See Aḥżāb LABIDERS.]

ZIYĀDĪ, a Yamani dynasty of 204 to 371 (819–921) or 409 (1018) with capital in Zabīd (q.v.). They were regarded as descendants of Ziyād b. Abīth b. Abīth. But as the latter's genealogy is uncertain, so not even the name of the father of the founder of the dynasty, Muḥammad, has been handed down with certainty. The caliph Maʿnūn was harassed by his uncle Ibrāhīm b. al-Mahdī; at the same time tribes in the Yamani became rebellious. The fact that there were 'Alīd schemes about there and indeed shortly before Ibrāhīm al-Djāzār, a brother of 'Ali al-Riṣā (q.v.), had been plundering in ʿSanʿa', may have decided the caliph to abandon completely his previous 'Alīd policy and to entrust the affairs of the Yamani to a member of the Banī Ziyād, whose hostility to the family of ʿAli was well known, even if he had been himself in the service of the house of Omayya. A scion of the latter house was associated with Muḥammad, as was Muḥammad b. Ḥārīn of the tribe of Ṭagḥīb, whose descendants, the Banī Abī ʿĀṣāma, held the office of kāfīn in Zabīd during the whole rule of the Ziyāds and of the Banī Nadīm who followed them. The execution of all three men may have been already decided upon in the interests of 'Abbasid policy; they now oblige its supporters. The Ziyāds always recognised the suzerainty of 'Abbasid.

Accompanied by trustworthy Kjurākūn troops and cavalry and in particular supported by an able freedman Djaʿfar, Muḥammad b. . . . Ziyād was able to get a firm grasp on the coast, as far, it is said, as Shīb in Ḥajramawt. The lords of the fortresses in the highlands, in Djanad and al-Mudāṣkhārīkha, recognised him. But in the interior of the highlands the Baghdād government continued to send special governors to ʿSanʿa' until the Banī Yaʿfūr (q.v.) made themselves independent there from 247 to 289 (859–901). The second Ziyādī, Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad (245–289 = 859–901), had to hand over Ḥajramawt and Djanad to Muḥammad b. Yaʿfūr, although in return for tribute. The first interruption followed Ibrāhīm's death. While the possession of ʿSanʿa' alternated between Zabīd and Karmaṭjīn Shīpas, the latter under 'Ali b. al-Faṣād took possession not only of Djanad and al-Mudāṣkhārīkha but for a time of Zabīd itself also, neither the name nor the length of reign nor fate of the third Ziyādī is exactly known. The dynasty revived under Ibrāhīm's other son Abū 'l-Dījaḥ Ibrāhīm in his 80 years' reign (c. 291–371 = 904–981). About 350 (961) even the Ḥamūdī chief al-Dahāḥakī, then lord of ʿSanʿa', paid homage to him, but in 379 (989) Abū ʿAbd Allāh b. Kāṭb, who restored the power of the Banī Yaʿfūr for a short time, by taking and burning Zabīd put an end to the dynasty of the Ziyāds. The actual ruler was by now no longer the young fifth Ziyādī, whose name also is uncertain, who followed Abū 'l-Dījaḥ, but the Abyssinian Mamālīk vīzīr al-Husayn b. Salāmīa, who was able again to save the land from catastrophe and secured a fame which has lasted to this day by making pilgrim roads with mosques and domes through the mountains and the plain. Of no importance was the transfer of the title to a sixth minor Ziyādī, probably Ibrāhīm II, as Ibn Salāmīa was followed by his Mamālīk Muḥammad as independent vizier, who in turn divided the government between his two slaves: Nadīm in the northern provinces and Naṣir (or Anis) for the southern including the capital. The latter seized the crown himself and had the young king and his aunt Hind immured alive (409 = 1018). It was however not that he founded a dynasty but Nadiḥ (q.v.).

Bibliography: see that of the article ZAVID, especially Kay; also E. v. Zaunbaur, Manuel de généalogie et de chronologie, Hanover, 1921, p. 115. (R. Strothmann)

ZIYĀNIDS. [See ZAYNIDS.]

ZIYĀNIYA, branch of the Shāḥbīl Order, has its headquarters at Kandahār; lists of the heads are given by Rinn, loc. cit., Dupont and Coppulani, Confrérie, p. 498, and Cour, loc. cit.;
in the second work a specimen is given of the diploma of *mushaffad* conferred by the hand of the order, with seal. Their practice is said to differ from those of the other Shāfi‘īs only in details; their ordinary *gākhr* is reproduced by Rīnū, loc. cit., p. 411, and consists in the repetition of certain formulas, a hundred, others a thousand times. Their speciality is the guiding and protection of caravans and travellers against brigands; in Rīnū’s time (1854) “no trader would venture to send a consignment of goods southwards” without having assured protection in the form of a Ziyārī rider bearing a letter with the seal of a *mushaffad*, whom the brigands would be afraid to offend.

Hence he calls them the pillars of the Sahabah. Much the same is said by A. Bernard, writing in 1815, &c. (Le Maroc, p. 205). The community appears to be a little known outside French Africa; lists of their saūsīyā in Algeria with an account of their diffusion in Morocco are given by Depont and Coppolani, loc. cit.

The order was founded by Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān Ibn Abū Ziyān, died 1145 (1733). In the R. M. M. *sül.* 360–379 and 571–590, A. Cuir published in French some extracts from a MS. biography called Ṭabāruit al-Afnās wa l-Arāb al-qawāf al-fintarniyah wa l-Ṭarīqah al-Ziyāniyyah al-Shāfi‘iyah, itself an abridgment of an earlier work. This is chiefly a record of miracles, but furnishes certain details supplementing those collected by L. Rieu, Marabouts et Khalūn (1884, p. 408–415). He was born at Thatha near Kenfūs (S. W. of Fesigue in Morocco), studied with Sidi Mubārk b. ‘Aza in Sīdījlūs and after his death went to Fes, where he studied for eight years under Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Karīm al-Firān (died 1140 = 1724). Al-Ḥāmid b. al-Muḥīdī (died 1199 = 1787), and others; according to Rīnū, he was expelled from Fes by the emperor on the ground of sorcery, fled to Tūfīl, where the *mushaffad* of the Naṣīyyah branch of the Shāfi‘is ūd admitted him to the order, after which he made the pilgrimage to Mecca, and then on his return established himself at Kenfūs, where he founded a saūsīyā. Besides introducing some modifications into the Shāfi‘i ritual, and acquiring a reputation for saintliness, he appears to have dug wells and organized irrigation; his most celebrated miracle, which determined the future of his community, consisted in the suppression of brigands. His fame and talents attracted numerous visitors, who presently formed a flourishing colony. Like other Islamic saints, he was the head of a family, and left the headship of his order to his son.

*Biography:* given in the article.

(See *History of Islam*, vol. iii, p. 219.)

**ZIYĀRĀ (A.), visit, in the religious sense the visit to a holy place or to the tomb of a saint, especially to Muḥammad’s tomb in the mosque of al-Madīna, which even under the Wahḥābi rule is paid by those who perform the ḥajj [q. v.]. The *ziyāz* paid to the tombs of the saints was among the *hida* which were combated by Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Wahḥāb [cf. WAKHNA]. For details cf. W. R. van Dijck, Der heer der Wahhabsiten, doctoral dissertation, Leyden 1927. That the Wahhābis were not the first in Islam to question the legality of visiting tombs, and of the practices connected therewith, appears from the materials preserved in *hādith* [cf. Wensinck, A Handbook of Early Muḥammedan Tradition, *a. v.* Grave(s) and from later literature [cf. Taimiyya].

(A. J. Wensinck)

**ZIYĀRĪS, a dynasty of vassals of the Sāmānīs [q. v.], which reigned over Ἰράκ, Adjami, and Ta‘bārisan, then over Qurāya from 316 to 470 (928–1077). It took its name from Ziyār, father of Wāridhīn, vassal of Gīlūs, who was the father of Mardawīd, its founder. The following is the genealogical table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Mardāwīd</th>
<th>2. Wāridhīn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>316–327 (928–935)</td>
<td>328–356 (935–967)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FAKHRĀD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Sūrūn</th>
<th>4. Kānsī 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>336–360 (967–976)</td>
<td>Shams al-Ma‘āli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366–403 (976–1012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|-------------|---------------|-----------|

1. Mardāwīd, see the separate article.
2. Wāridhīn, see the separate article.
3. His son Zāhir al-Dawla Abū Ma‘ājīr Barūfīn made peace with Rukk al-Dawla; he died in 368 (976) in the town of Qurāya.
4. Kānsī 1, see the separate article.
5. Minūchīr, by arrangement with ‘Alī al-Dawla, had returned to Kāṣī; there he was attacked by Sulṭān Muḥammad who pursued him into the mountains but made peace on payment of 3,000,000 dirhams and recognized Muḥammad as his suzerain (420 = 1039). It was to this prince that the poet Minūchīr [q. v.] dedicated his early poems and from him he took his name.
6. Anūsī-Rawān [cf. Anūsī-Rawān] recognized the suzerainty of Ma‘ālī, son and successor of Muḥammad; but in 433 (1041–1042) he was attacked by Tughrīl Beg the Sūçīqkh who took Qurāya from him. He shut himself up in a fortress where he died in 441 (1049). During his reign his uncle Dārā, also called Iskandar, was governor of Qurāya and Ta‘bārisan in the name of Sulṭān Ma‘ālī (426 = 1035).
7. The son of Dārā, Kānsī 2 ‘Unsur al-Ma‘āli, son-in-law of Sulṭān Muḥammad, accompanied the latter on his Indian campaigns. He died on an expedition led by the emir Fālidūn Abū T-Sawār of the dynasty of the Banū Shi‘ād against the Abbāsīd, which ended disastrously in 462 (1069). He was the author of the *Al-Ahmar-nama*, a book of good advice addressed to his son Gilīn-Shāh, which was translated into German by Fr. v. Diez (Berlin 1811) and into French by A. Querüy (Paris 1856).
8. His son Gilīn-Shāh reigned over the moun-
tamous country only, for Tughril Bey before marching on Baghdad had occupied Tabaristan. He was deposed by Malik-Shah and died in 470 (1077).

Farhad is given as the son of Mandawid but his paternity is uncertain and he was not summoned to succeed his father or any of his cousins. In 414 (1023), when he must have been at least 88, we find him a vassal (muktaf) in Borsagird. In 417 (1026) he accompanied Al-Ash Shamsi the Khayyam on his campaign against the Kurds and remained his faithful ally. He fell in battle against the army of Sultan Mas'ud (425 = 1034).


(CI. Huart)

ZOTT (pronounced Zoff in Damascus), the name of a people [cf. also NAWZ]. The etymology is certain: zoff >Pers. Jost (for a similar change cf. Pers. khwm *home >Arabic khun = *rubb-lin*).

Firdawsi (d. 1024) relates in his Shahnamah that Bahram Gur, king of Persia (420-438 A.D.), asked the king of India to send him 10,000 Luri, men and women, expert at playing the lute (transl. Mohi, vi. 60 sqq.).

In his Geschichte der Perser und Araber zur Zeit der Sassaniden, transl. from the Arabic text of Tabari (829-832), Noldeke has full confidence in this tradition. De Goeje quotes his opinion and adds that there is no reason to suspect Firdawsi's statement (cf. the contrary view expressed by John Sampson, The Dialect of the Gypsies of Wales, Oxford 1926, p. 29, note 1, who wrongly regards the statements as pure legend).

At an earlier date than the Persian poet, Badraddi (d. 892) says that the Saiyadibads [q.v.] had been settled in the ports [of the Persian Gulf since] before Islam. It was the same with the Zott' ed. de Goeje, p. 373, i. 2 infra.

The historian Hamza al-Ijshah (early tenth century) who, he tells us, was very well acquainted with the history of the Sassanids, says the same thing (ed. and transl. by M. E. Gottwald, p. 55 text and p. 40 transl.) as Firdawsi who wrote half a century later.

Many Zott had settled in the marshes between Wasiit and Basra. In the reign of al-Mu'tamid (813-833) they were strong enough to rise in open rebellion against the caliph's authority and cut communications between Basra and Bagdad; they only submitted in 834 on condition that their lives and property were spared (de Goeje, p. 23 sqq.).

In his Memoire sur les migrations des Turges a travers l'Asie (Leyden 1903), de Goeje used the texts which he supplemented from the Littoral, the Tadj al-Arabs and a number of Arab geographers. As the title of his Memoire shows, he follows the migrations of the gypsies through Asia, which I need not do here. We need only remember that, according to Arabic and Persian texts, the Zott migrated for some reason or other from India into Persia and from Persia into Hitber Asia and Europe.

On the east coast of Madagascar there is a tribe called Ondaditi, generally written in Arabo-Malagasy ADtt or odt. The old pronunciation of the three forms is *un-daditi*. Ond- (pron. s-), is the Malagasy toneless article; daded, in modern Malagasy, goes regular, back to an original tadi (the change of t->d in a toneless final is regular).

These are a people, whose ancestors came, they say, from beyond the sea. Although I have been in personal relations with them for several years, I have a feeling that they have not informed me fully about their manners and customs; they have always shown themselves reticent. Their Malagasy neighbours in the southeast say that the Ondaziti practice incest in secret. The identity of the forms Ondaziti, Dadd and Zotta is too complete to be accidental; it is worth recording.

The region in Asia in which the modern Djas are mainly found is defined roughly as follows: in the north by the lower ranges of the Himalaya; in the west by the Indus; in the south by a line extending from Hindurabd (South) to Ajmer and Bhopal; in the east by the Ganges. Beyond the Indus there are a few Djas at Pathaawar, in Baluchistan and even west a few Djas at Pathawar, in South India making the Talum range. Finally in Kirmun and the 'trak we have a mixed population of Ljuds and gypsies. There are some 50,000 more in Makran and Afghanistan (Kalika-Kanjjan Qumando, History of the Jats, Calcutta 1925, i. 1).

Bibliography: given in the article.

(Gabriel F. Ferrand)

ZUBAIDA BINT DQAR B. AB DQAR AL-MANJUK, UMM DQAR, wife of the caliph Harun al-Rashid and mother of his successor Muhammad al-Amin [q.v.]. She was born in 762 (782-793) and her real name was Amat al-Asia "the slave of the Almighty", but on account of her youthful and fresh complexion she was nicknamed by her grandfather, the caliph al-Mansur, and despite (diminutive of salwa *cream*), "fresh butter"; also the name of a plant (Zotou). Her marriage with Harun was celebrated 765 (781-782) and she died in Bagdad in Djamad I 216 (June—July 831). On account of her love of splendour, her liberality to poets and scholars and the public works carried out by her, she is little less famous than her husband. Among other things, she had an aqueduct ten miles long laid into Mecca, when it was suffering from a dreadful lack of water.


(K. V. Zetteker)

AL-ZUBAIR B. AL-ÀWWAM B. KHWIALID

B. ASCAD B. AB AL-ÀWWAM B. KHWIALID, B. ASCAD, B. AL-ÀWWAM, B. ASCAD, B. AL-ÀWWAM, with the surname of al-Jawwadi (i.e. the Apostle, an Aethiopic loanword). His mother was Saffiya bint Ab al-Mutzalab, so that he was a cousin of Muhammad and a nephew of Khalid (hus Khowialid). Al-Zubair was one of the earliest converts to Islam; according to tradition, he was the fifth who, while still a child, recognised Muhammad as a
prophet; he is also one of the ten to whom Paradise was promised by Muhammad.

Of his seven Aqsa, the daughter of Abu Bakr, is renowned for her Spartan attitude to her son 'Abd Allah [q.v.]. Another son she bore him was 'Umay [q.v.]. The third of al-Zubair's sons who also plays a part in the history of Idrisi is Mujaah [q.v.]. Al-Zubair is said to have stuck to Muhammad under hardships and to have taken part in the two hijjas to Abyan. He also accompanied his kinsman to Madina. He is recorded in broderhood with Ibn Mas'ud, or, according to other reports, with 'Ali or with Ka'b b. Mālik. He further took part in all the great battles and campaigns during Muhammad's career, being renowned for his gallantry. His epithet al-Haswari (cf. above) was given him by Muhammad on account of his services as a spy in the conflict with the Kuraishi [q.v.], with the words: "Every prophet has an apostle and my apostle is al-Zubair." For his attitude, exploits and death (the latter took place in the Battle of the Camel, at an age which is given with variations from 50 to 67) under the caliphate of Abu Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthman, we may refer to the art, fatāli, because what is said of the latter holds also good of al-Zubair.

Tradition emphasizes the high esteem in which Muhammad held him, by pointing to the fact that Mas'ud is speaking to him, once made use of the formula latka al-mummi. He obtained, it is said, special permission to wear silk. For his testament, cf. Ibn Sa'd, iii.75 sqq.; Boháč, Khurās, tabs 13.


ZUBUR. [See ZUBAK].

ZUHAIR b. ABĪ SULMA RAIS b. RAṢĀḤ b. QIYARA b. MUQAM (the genealogy in Ibn Kuttal is wrong, as it is frequently the case) was an Arabic poet of the time before Idrisi and by native critics considered, together with Irna b. al-Kāsid and al-Ṭalhah, as one of the three great poets of antiquity. Though he was of the tribe of Mun tallah, he was born among the tribe of 'Abd Allah b. Ghaṭafān and spent the whole of his life among them. His father Rais' had married a sister of a certain Ka'b b. Hasād of the clan of Murra b. 'Āwī b. Sa'd b. Dughaym and had settled among them. He left them owing to a quarrel over some plunder taken in a raid under the tribe of Ṭayy and took up his residence among the kindred tribe of 'Abd Allah b. Ghaṭafān. Here Zuhair was born and married his first wife, a sister of the poet Baghīla b. al-Ghadrī. This may be the Emn 'Awī whom he mentions in several of his poems, and to whom he addressed a poem of regret when he had divorced her. All children by this wife died in infancy. The second wife, Kārīb bint Annas, of the tribe of 'Abd Allah b. Ghaṭafān, was the mother of his sons Ka'b, Qadd and Sakīn. The first and second were princes of the tribe of their father and lived in the days of Idrisi. Zuair being an early convert, while Ka'b [q.v.] failed to atone for his hostility to the Prophet by his celebrated poem, often called the Rūmī. The third son, Sakīn, died as a youth through falling from a horse sent to his father as a present. Zuair lived during the period of the disastrous war between 'Abd and Qubayn, two clans of Ghaṭafān, called the war of Dūbās. His most celebrated poem, which has found a place in the collection of the Muṣallāt, is in praise of the two chiefs of the tribe of Murra b. Ghaṭafān, al-Ḥārith b. 'Awī and Harīm b. Sātiq. They had undertaken to pay the whole of the blood-money due to families in both clans for those slain in the fratricidal struggle and even undertook a further payment when the action of al-Ḥanās b. Qubayn nearly doomed the treaty of peace to failure. In earlier poems Zuair celebrates the father of one of these two chiefs, Sātiq b. Abī Ḥārith, and his Īsā also contains an elegy upon his death. His poems, as far as they are contained in the collections preserved, do not contain a single poem dealing with his own tribe of Mun tallah, though his poems are perhaps preserved better than those of any other ancient Arabic poet. Nearly all his poems refer to affairs of the tribe of Ghaṭafān or personal events. There are three poems concerning a slave and cattle robbed from him by al-Ḥārith b. Wārīq al-Saidawī of the tribe of Azad. Others are addressed to various tribes with a view of deterring them from making raids against Ghaṭafān; one is addressed to the tribe of Tamūn (Ahlwardt, No. 63), another to the Banū Shijāh (Ahlwardt, No. 19) and another to the Banū Sulaq. There is also one poem addressed to the king of al-Hira, al-Nu'man b. al-Mundhir (Ahlwardt, No. 37), but according to al-Aṣma'i it is not in the style of Zuair and is by Suma al-Anṣārī, a poet otherwise unknown. Two poems in the collections of his poetry are also attributed to his son Ka'b (Thulab, No. 17 and 41). Of the former verses are cited in the Liwan al-ʿArab, and elsewhere sometimes in the name of one or the other. As Zuair is stated to have been a man of wealth, we do not find in his Šīrīm, poems in which he tries to obtain praise from rich person. Native critics praise him for not indulging in undue praise nor using uncommon words in his verses. In his poems we find also a pious strain which has by some modern critics been assumed to be an indication of his being a Christian, but all we can assert is, that probably he may have been influenced by Christian thought, which must have been not unknown in the Arabian steppe. In Zuair and his family we have an example of the art of poetry inherited for several generations, an instance which is by no means isolated in early Arabic poetry. Zuair is reputed to have been the riṣālet, transmitter of poetry, of Anwār b. Ḥudayr, who in turn was riṣālet of Ṭūfāl al-Ghazawī, but from several sources we
learn: that he inherited the art from his brother-in-law Bashāma b. al-Ḍalīlī. As already stated, his two sons Ka'b and Budair were poets, so his father had been before him, and so was his sister Salmā (Kitāb al-Ḍalīlī, p. 12). His grandsons Sa‘īd and ‘Ukba, his sons al-Mu‘āmar and al-Ḍawwār, were also poets, so were his great-grandsons ‘Amr b. Sa‘īd and al-Sawwār and al-‘Awārī, sons of ‘Ukba. The latter three had forsaken the desert and lived in al-Baṣra and with them the poetical talent seems to have died out in the family. The poems of Zuhair have come down to us, apart from the Mu‘āllaqā, in three collections, the oldest by al-Sukkārī (died 275 = 888) preserved in the unique MS. Socin in the possession of the German Oriental Society, the recension by the Kāfīr grammarians Thālab (d. 291 = 904) preserved in two manuscripts in the Escorial and two or three copies in Stambul and a third abbreviated text with the commentary of the Spanish scholar al-‘Aṣān (d. 476 = 1085). The printed editions all are based upon the latter, which is supposed to contain the text as edited by the Bāṣṭānī grammarian al-Asma‘ī. As the latter employed methods which obscured the ancient tradition more than elucidated it, by making selections, it is highly desirable that we should have a new edition of the poems of Zuhair based upon the two older recensions, which are in the spirit of the older school of Arabic scholars. The work of K. Dyroff has only partly cleared the issue, especially as he did not recognise that we had two entirely different recensions in the texts which he used.


The name of Zuhair is not uncommon among Arabic poets and as their verses are sometimes incorporated among the fragments added to the Divīn, as e.g. by Alwardt, a short notice of the most important may be added.

**Zuhair b. Dīnār b. Hūba al-Kalīmi**, also a poet of the time before Islam and belonging to a generation earlier than Zuhair b. Abī Salmā, he is reckoned among the long-lived umma (su‘amārūrān) and as he is brought into contact with Kulaib Wā‘lī and Mahallī he must have lived in the later part of the sixth century of the Christian era. The accounts concerning his life are however so legendary that no reliance can be placed upon them. Also in his family the art of poetry was inherited for several generations and Abu ‘l-Faraj al-Iṣbahānī enumerates several, the latest in date being perhaps al-Musayyab b. Risāfī b. Hārūth al-Dīnār b. Ka‘b al-Kalīmi b. Dīnār b. Zuhair b. Dīnār who in some verses, cited in the Kitāb al-Ḍalīlī, boasts that one of the members of his family had slain Yāsīd b. al-Mu‘allāhīn in 112 a.h. (Kitāb al-Ḍalīlī, xxi, 93-104; Muṣafahāyat, ed. Lyall, Nō. 117).

**Zuhair b. Dājūma b. Rawḍūz al-Kalīmi**, one of the chiefs of the tribe of ‘Abs, was slain by Kālid b. Ka‘b (Nabūdah, p. 284; Muṣafahāyat, ed. Lyall, p. 788; Kitāb al-Ḍalīlī, x. 12-17).


**Zuhair b. ‘Ala‘ al-Durā‘ī, better known by his nickname al-Musayyab (Muṣafahāyat, ed. Lyall, Nō. 91).**

**Zuhair b. Ma‘ṣūd al-Darībi (Kitāb al-Tamā‘ūs, al-Babi al-Bakri, ed. Shāhānī, Nō. 22).**

The native lexicons cite verses of all these poets.

**Zeal.**

The native lexicons cite verses of all these poets.

**F. KARKOW.**

**ZUHAL, the planet Saturn.** Zuhal (without nunciation) is derived from the Arabic root 31-63 “to remove”; the planet takes its name, according to the Tājī al-Aʿrābī, from the fact that it is “far removed, in the seventh heaven”. Another name found in texts from Spain and N. W. Africa is al-Maḥrīl “the warlike”, just as we have there al-Ḳāṭīb “the writer” alongside of the usual name Ḥurūbūr for the planet Mercury (cf. the note on al-Ḳāṭīb in the article 31-63). In Sumner’s, according to Kugler, the name of Saturn was Lu‘ūm, in Accadian Lu·bat Sīqat = Kūmmān (Kūrum); the latter is obviously the source of the Hebrew name of the planet 31-63 Kūrum (Amos v. 26) = 31-63 and the modern Persian 31-63 Kūram. According to Maspero, Hist. asc. des peuples de l’Orient, Paris 1884, p. 78, the Egyptians called Saturn Har ha-her, i.e. “the Creator from above”, but according to the same author in his Hist. asc. des peuples de l’Orient classique, published 15 years later, they called it Ḫūrīrī (cf. L. M. Antonini, L’astronomie égyptienne, Paris 1934, p. 94). Achilles Tatius in his Logegor, ch. 17, mentions that the Egyptians called Saturn “star of Nemea” (ἐν Νεμέαν), i.e. that it was sacred to the corresponding Egyptian deity. The Greek name of Saturn is Φαύρος, “the brilliant”, also (but only in the later period) τὸ Φαύρος ἄκρος; the first name, according to Achilles Tatius, loc. cit., was also used in Egypt “in spite of the low degree of its brilliance”. The Latin name is stella Saturni or Saturnia. In the Talmud it is called Shabbatot.

In Arabic astronomy, Saturn (as in Pythagoras and Ptolemy) is placed in the seventh sphere (falaqā) from within, which is also the outermost sphere of the planets; its inner surface is bounded by the sphere of Jupiter. While its outer surface touches the sphere of the fixed stars. The period of sidereal revolution of Saturn is, according to Kauwitz, 31-63, 29 years, 5 months and 6 days; a total of 10,750 days; this is about 9 days less than the true figure (10,759 days, 24 hours). Al-Battānī (Opus astronomicon, ed. Nallino, ch. 50) observes that the apparent diameters of the planets in perigee and apogee are as 13:12, i.e. 7:5. From this he calculates, on a basis of the distance of the apogee of Jupiter which he—however, it is taken to be identical with the perigee distance of Saturn—had previously calculated to be 1,200,240 radii of the earth on a basis of successive reckonings by
analogy (cf. AL-MUSHxrT), the distance of Saturn in apogee at 18,094 radii of the earth and from these two data he gets the mean distance from the earth as 15,509 radii of the earth. The actual
geocentric distance is about 14 times larger (224,000 radii of the earth). The corresponding figures of other Arab writers for the least, greatest and mean distance of Saturn are given in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Least distance</th>
<th>Mean distance</th>
<th>Greatest distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Perige)</td>
<td>radii of the earth</td>
<td>radii of the earth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Battāt</td>
<td>12,924</td>
<td>15,509</td>
<td>18,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Fargānī</td>
<td>14,405</td>
<td>17,257</td>
<td>20,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Rusta</td>
<td>14,187</td>
<td>17,033</td>
<td>19,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar Hiyāḥ</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>15,200</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>17,733</td>
<td>15,447⅔</td>
<td>17,161⅔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(al-Bīrūnī)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>224,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(for the authority for the above figures and for the assumptions of the various authors regarding the magnitude of the earth's radius, see the article AL-MUSHxrT).

The apparent diameter of Saturn in mean distance is, according to al-Battāt, following Ptolemy and later authors, 1/6 of the sun's diameter. From this he calculates with the help of the numerical value of the distance the true diameter at 47/4 times the diameter of the earth (modern: 9.4 radii of the earth); this figure raised to the third power gives the volume of Saturn as 79 times that of the earth (modern: 850 times).

The motion of Saturn is represented, as in the Almagest, by four circles ("epheres" αερῆ) (cf. al-Battāt, Op. attr., ch. 31). The astronomical tables take for its mean daily sidereal motion the value 2'.

The greatest observed northern geocentric latitude is given by al-Battāt (ch. 47) as 3° 2', the greatest southern at 3° 5' (according to Ptolemy).

Zuhal in astrology. Zuhal is ruler of the Нуwyd al-Djatdy (Capricorn, daytime) and al-Dalat (Aquarius, nighthouse), also day-ruler of the third muthallatha (triplye) consisting of al-Qwma (Gemini), al-Munā (Libra) and al-Dalat, the night-ruler of which is Mercury. He is also the companion (σελήνη) of the ruler of the first muthallatha. He has its χαρτώ (exaltation) in the 21st degree in Pliny, Firmicus and the Hindu Varahā-mihira erroneously in the 20th degree) of al-Maṣū, his ḥaṭb (declination) in 21st of al-Hamal (Aries). According to al-Kazwīnī, μενέλας (p. 27, "the astrologers call Zuhal "the larger star of misfortune"
(αλ-μας al-ahbar), because its malevolent influence is greater than that of Mars (called al-maṣ al-ahbar) and they ascribe to it "devastation, ruin, grief and cares". The Arab astronomers refer to Saturn and Mars together as al-Nuwhyd "the two planets of misfortune" and contrast them with the "two planets of good fortune", Venus and Jupiter, al-Ṣolṭān (q.v.). In alchemy Zuhal means lead.

Bibliography: see the articles "CEFAR" and MUNTA." (Willy Hartert.)

ZUHARA, THE PLANET VENUS. The Arabic name comes from the root s-h-r "to shine, to illuminate" and is given on account of the extraordinary brilliance of the planet. In Samerian it was called (according to Kugler, Sternhaufen und Sternsichten in Babylon, 218, in Accadian Dilbat (see also with Fenzler in Heschel's, v. 558). The Egyptians called it (according to Maspero, Hist. anc. des peuples de l'Orient classiques, Bonn "bird", and as evening star Uloth and as morning star Tuw-nustiri. (Maspero, Hist. anc. des peuples de l'Orient of 1884, gives Bimou as evening star and Doh as morning star: cf. E. M. Antonianî, L'astronomie égyptienne, Paris 1934). According to Achille Tatianus, ἔργον, ch. 17, and Plutarch, "Euvnéphas", ch. 19, Venus was worshipped by the Egyptians and Greeks as the personified goddess of love (μόρφος Ἀφογης; Aristotle also uses this term as well as Ἀφογης, "l'Amour"). The Greek name of the planet is: Ευρεφής or Φούρεφής (for Venus as morning star): we also find (in Plato Epsilon) Ευνήψ (evening star). Býkus is said by Achilles Tatianus to have contradicted the two names Ευρεφής and Ευνήψ into one. In Latin the planet is called Stella Veneris or simply Venus; Pliny (Hist. Nat., ii. 8, 9) further gives the synonymus Lucifer, Vesper, Iberus (see this article in Paulus-Wissowa, Realencyclopädie, also Stella lu-neris, modris deum, Iustus. In Persian, Venus was called Nāthūs, in Hebrew Mōlah ha-Shomayim, "Queen of the Heavens", Ḥešr ben Ṣabāḥ, "the morning-star" (Is. xiv. 12) is sometimes identified with Venus and sometimes also with the moon (⇒ Arabic Ḥiṣr, "new moon"; in the text of the Bible however the reference can only be to the crescent of the old moon visible in the morning sky) or with the sun; the assumption that Möni (1 Es. iv. 11) refers to Venus is hardly tenable (cf. B. Suter in Enc. Toud., Vol. III. art., ASTRONOMICS). The Talmud calls Venus Kechebet "star" or Negu "splendens" or Kecheb Nege. Venus in astronomy. The identity of the morning with the evening star was well known to the ancients — Babylonians, Egyptians and Greeks — and we very rarely find the same name applied to both appearances of this planet. In Pythagoras, Ptolemy and the Arab astronomers, Venus occupies the third position from the centre (in the geocentric system). Its sphere (σφαῖρα) is bounded on the inner side by that of Mercury and on the outside by that of the sphere of the sun. This arrangement was already familiar to the Egyptians (according to Dio Cassius, Hist. Rom., xxxvii. 19); on the other hand Macrobius (Comm. in Somn. Scip., l. 19) gives the following order: "Moon, Sun, Mercury, Venus, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn", but mentions immediately following — in a way that is not quite clear — that Mercury and Venus according to the Egyptians appear sometimes above and sometimes below the sun; it would certainly be going too far if we were to deduce from this passage alone that the Egyptians regarded these two planets as satellites of the sun and had broken down the geocentric system. The Babylonians moved Venus to the second innermost place: "Moon, Venus, Mercury, Sun, Mars etc. Plato (Timaeus and Epiméthēs) gives Venus and Mars as evening star and Doh as morning star: cf. E. M. Antonianî, L'astronomie égyptienne, Paris 1934). According to Achilles Tatianus, ἔργον, ch. 17, and Plutarch, the following table gives a view of the least,
mean and greatest distances of Venus from the centre of the earth, expressed in terms of radii of the earth, according to al-Battânî, al-Farghânî, Ibn Rusta, Abûhâmîn bar Hiya, also for India, according to al-Bîtiţî; in the last row we give for comparison the modern values (for the references and the length of the earth's radius in the authors named see the articles AL-MUGHÂRÂT AND 'UṯûR).  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Least distance</th>
<th>Greatest distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Perigee)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(Apogee)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Battânî</td>
<td>166 rad of the earth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Farghânî</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Rusta</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar Hiya</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>256×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(al-Bîtiţî)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modern</strong></td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Arab values are only about 1/40 of the correct values; it should be observed however that the figure of the proportion of the least to the greatest distance (1/30) as given by al-Battânî, with the help of which the latter was calculated from the former, agrees remarkably with the modern figure. Al-Battânî gives the apparent diameter of the Sun as 8° (Opera Astr., ed. Nallino, ch. 50) as 1/50 of the diameter of the Sun; the true diameter of the sphere as 1/50 of the diameter of the earth (both from the Almagest); from this the volume of Venus is calculated at 1/30 of the volume of the earth (modern figures, proportion of diameter of Venus to that of the earth = 0.97, proportion of the volumes = 0.91).

The motion of Venus is represented like that of the other planets by Ptolemy. From the inclination of the deferent measures 36° 30', that of the epicyclic 4° 30', the maximum value of the observed Northern or Southern latitudes is according to al-Battânî (Opera Astr., ch. 47) 5° 36'. For the mean daily motion in anomaly the tables give 3°. This corresponds to a synodic period of revolution of 534 days, which agrees with the actual figure (the synodic period of revolution of Venus was already known with considerable accuracy to the ancients; it is given as 537 days in Assyro-Babylonian texts).

Venus in Astrology. Zuharâ is ruler (rabū') of the Sign of Libra (Libra, day-house) and al-Thawr (Taurus, night-house), also day-ruler of the second mutthuqata (triplet), consisting of al-Thawr, al-'Ashūr (Virgo) and al-Diyya (Capricornus) as also day-ruler of the fourth mutthuqata (al-Sarafin, Cancer, al-'Akhūr, Scorpio and al-'Asr, Pisces). Zuharā has its qayyūf (exaltation) in 27° of al-Hūr, its khabûd (declination) in 27° of al-'Aṣakh. The astrologers call it (according to al-Kawthari, Ahl) "the smaller star of good fortune," al-Sâd al-Allâh, in contrast to al-Mughattat (Jupiter), "the larger star of good fortune," al-Sâd al-Abhar; the two auspicious planets are comprised under the term al-Sâd al-'Abhar (q.v.).

In alchemy al-Zuhara means copper.

**Bibliography:** See BIBLIOGRAPHY. For the articles ZUHRA and MISHRA are the articles AL-MUSHTIÝYAT and ZUHRA.

(WILLY HARTNER)  

**ZUHD, a technical term in Muslim mysticism,** the virtue of a dalam (pl. dalâîm, zâhidh; Sûrâ xli. 20 seems very far from this meaning); abstinance: at first from sin, from what is superfluous, from all that estranges from God (this is the extreme that the Hanbalis admit); then abstinance from all perishable things by detachment of the heart (and here we enter into the mystic), complete asceticism, renunciation of all that is created. Thus the term zuhd, taking the place of misk (its synonym in the older texts), clearly means more not only than bâdâ' (abstention and control of one's desires), but also than wârâ', scrupulous abstention from the use of everything doubtfull in law (a Hanbali virtue). In arranging the gradation of the virtues, Miṣrî notes that the "stage of wârâ' brings one to misk" which Qâzâîl places after fâsîr and before tawâkhl.  

It was in the second century of our era that the conception of misk, deepened from Ḥasan al-Baṣrî to Dârânî, became fixed; renunciation not only of dress, lodging, and pleasant food but also of women (Dârânî). Then introspective analysis progressing with Mâhâsîlî (and with the Metamathya), stress is laid on inner and subjective asceticism, renunciation of intentions and desires, which leads to the concept of tawâkhl.  

Interesting examples of misk taken from the biographies of the most illustrious Šûfis will be found presented in an ironical and hostile way in Ibn al-Djâwri, and in the Shâïhîl Ibn Abîabd Rûndî a carefully considered collection of cases of ascetic conscience. On the question of borrowing by Šâîlî of ascetic observances from Christianity, Manicheism or Hinduism, cf. L. Massignon, Essai sur les origines du lexique technique, Paris 1922, p. 45-80.  

**Bibliography:** Makki, Kât al-Kulhâ, i. 243-271; Khârîgî, Taḥlîl, MS. Berlin, No. 2819, i. 53'; Kâshârî, Rûsta, i. 67 (and Hartmann, Darstellung, s. v.); Hûdîwî, Kûfî, al-Mugâhîlî, transl. Nicholson, index, s. v.; Qâzâîl, al-Hasîn, ed. al-Dim, ed. 1322, iv. 154-171 (résumé by Aînî, Palacios, in M. F. O., vol. vii. [1940], p. 82-84 and Tschauetschiner, Geschichte der Wissenschaften, 1953); Ibn al-Djâwri, Tâbiîn, ed. 1340, p. 312-315 (Dârânî), p. 374-388; Ibn 'Arabî, Fuzûlî, Makâhî, l. ii. 197; Ibn Abîabd Rûndî, Rûndî, l. ii. hôsîl (analysed by Aînî, Palacios, in Rinde Carbó, April 1922, p. 113-127 and in Aînî, Tâbiîn, Madrid, i. 1933, p. 7-107; cf. esp. p. 122; cf. L. Massignon, Recueil de textes intèires, p. 146-149 and p. 17 (for Miṣrî).  

(LOUIS MASSIGNON)  

**AL-ZUHÎRî, MUHAMMAD b. MUSLîM b. 'UBâDA ALLâH b. 'ABD ALLâH b. SHIbîH, known as Abû Shuîb, a celebrated traditionist, was born probably in 50 (670) or 51 — according to others, 56, 57, 58 — and received his niha as a member of the Meccan clan of Zuhra. His grandfather had taught at Badr on the side of the Kuraish against Muhammad and inflicted a wound on the Prophet at Uthmân; his father had been a partisan of 'Abd Allâh b. al-Zuhîr but the son made his peace with the Umayyads. When still quite a youth, he had paid his respects to Marwân**
As a result of his untiring enquiries among young and old, men and women, high and low, al-Zuhri collected vast masses of traditions and not only endeavoured to establish the genuineness of the Prophet but also that of the Companions. He is described as the first to fix hadith in writing; but this was only done under pressure from his Western contemporaries; in an utterance given by his pupil Ma'mar, he says: "We had a disassociation to write down the knowledge, but these men forced us to do so". Unlike many of his teachers, who could only be brought to speak with difficulty, al-Zuhri was very ready to communicate his knowledge to others; he even went so far as to allow his hearers who had copied down the traditions given by him to transmit them again without waiting to examine their copies. Among his teachers, even specially mentioned 'Urwa b. al-Salih and Sa'd b. al-Musayyib; for two years he never left the latter's side (Ibn Sa'd, ii. 131). When he had added his own knowledge to that of his teachers, he was regarded as the most learned traditionist by later generations. "What a man is al-Zuhri, would that he had not harmed himself by intercourse with princes" says Makhzūmī. Al-Zuhri's interests were not entirely devoted to the transmission of hadith; he also dealt with chronology and was a critic of poetry (see above); cf. also Fischer, Biographien, p. 71. He is also one of the chief authorities for the Sunna and was Ibn Ishāq's most important teacher. The latter, like al-Wāhīdī, Ibn Sa'd and Tabarī, owes much of his information to al-Zuhri; in Tabarī he also appears not infrequently as an authority for the events of the two first decades after the death of the Prophet. According to older authorities, he only wrote one book, a Kāfīk Nāmā Khumāshī. Khālidī Khallīfī Khallīfī is the first to credit him with a Kāfīk al-Margsūsī, but it is clear that al-Zuhri's compilations were confined to collections of traditions; he did not write a regular book like his pupil Ibn Ishāq. In the stories traced to him he often gives his authorities but as frequently omits them; and when he gets from several authorities a record that agrees in essentials in all of them, he does not separate the different versions but makes one out of them, giving the names of all the authorities; this was the first modest attempt at an independent editing of the material transmitted.

Z.D.M.G., l. 474; Sachau, introduction to Ibn Sa‘d, iii, xi, xii; do., in M. S. O. S. A., vii. 11 sqq.; Fück, Muḥammad Ibn Ṣa‘d, p. 9 (J. H. Kovenite).

ZUḤŪRĪ Nūn ʿal-Dīn Muḥammad Tūḥūqalī, a Persian poet of the school of Herš, who lived for a long time in India and was assassinated in a rising in the Deccan at the same time as his father-in-law Malik of Kunm (1024 = 1615, 1025 = 1616 or 1027 = 1618). His poetry is not much esteemed in Persia but is admired in India as is especially his prose with its very florid phrasology. His chief works are a Dīwān, Gulzūr-i Ṣurūk, Khalqī, Khilqāt, Abūlīyā, lithographed several times in India, and a Sahāmīnī, "Book of the Cup-bearers", dedicated to Burkhān Nāṣīr Shāh ii of Aḥmadnāsh. (999 = 1590–1594) His works in prose have been annotated by Abu l-Yāmin ʿAbd al-Karāzāk b. Muhammad Ṣa‘īd Ḥusaynī Sirātī (lithographed at Cawnpore 1873).


ZULĀʿI, a Persian poet at the court of Shāh ʿAbbās ii, born at Khūnāsūr to the north of Isfahān, died in 1024 (1615), wrote seven muḥâjah which were collected after his death under the title Saʿdī Sayyāra, "The seven Planets"; they include Majmūʿ u-Ayar, begun in 1001 (1502–1503), finished shortly before his death in 1024 (1615), lithographed at Lucknow in 1290, Maihānī "The Tavern" and Ḥarrār u-Khawāridh "The Atom and the Sun". — Luft ʿAlī Beg (ʿAṣḵābād, p. 139) mentions a poet of the same name, born at Heršī.


ZŪN, an Indian deity, of whom there was a famous idol at Zamin-Dāwar in the country of Zābul, east of Sistān.

In 33 (654–55) ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Samura, appointed governor of Sistān, arrived at Dāwar and laid siege to the hill of Zūn (ʿUmar al-Zūn). He entered the sanctuary of Zūn where there was an idol of gold with two rubies for eyes. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān cut off an arm and took away the rubies but left the remainder to the local mūazzamīn, saying that his only object was to show the impotence of the idol (Baladghūri, p. 394).

Marquart found in Chinese sources a mention of the temple of Deve Sa‘n in the kingdom of Tso (= Zābul) before, which was placed the skeleton of an enormous fish through the ribs of which one could ride on horseback. The king of Tso wore a crown decorated with the head of a fish in gold and sat on a throne adorned with a golden horse (Peti-shī, ch. 97, fol. 3, where the position of Tso is not well indicated). On the other hand, Christian sources also mention a stronghold of Yūnana (Theophanes, Chronography, ed. de Boué, p. 163) or of Zanabaz (Vizcarit Tales Medemplemenes chronic, Chron. minora, ed. Mommsen, ii, 194). Marquart restores these names as Zamin-Dāwar and Zūn the Judge and thus derives the name of the district of Zamin-Dāwar (in Arabic Bīlūd Dāwar) as well as that of king Zābūl or Zanabīl (i.e., in place of Ruthul given by al-Djavālī, al-Mawāra, ed. Sachau, p. 73).

The name of the god Zūn sometimes zul has been mentioned in the Arab poets such as Ḥusain and Ḍáir and it seems that there was another sanctuary of this Indian deity in the Ḍā, which was a port which traded with India (cf. Abu l-Fath Naṣr b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Ikandāri, d. in 360 [1164–1165], quoted in Yākūt, ii. 960). According to the Liʾān al-ʿArabi, xvii, 16, in Persian the name al-Zūn is pronounced Zūn. Marquart locates the sanctuary of Zūn north of Ḥilmand, east of Ḍīlahān.


ZUNNĀR. In the form zuwnār this word occurs in Aramaic; in Syria it is as old as Ephraem and means a girdle worn by monks. It comes obviously from a derivative of the Greek τόμη. In classical Arabic it denotes any girdle, especially that worn by ḥālāzim, Christians, Jews, Magians, etc. (As a rule only one or two of the protected religions are named by our authorities but, unless the contrary is stated, it is to be assumed that the statements apply to all.) In modern Arabic it means the looks of hair worn by Jews at the "corners of the head" (Lev. xii. 17, in Persian the sacred thread of the Brahman and in Sufi poetry the external practices of religion. The zuwnār was thick and it is usually distinguished from mintāba. Ṭabārī also uses it as a synonym though properly it means the patch worn on the dress and not the belt. The Patriarch Māramma (c. 26 = 647) is said to have hidden scholars wear the zuwnār (Pat. Or. 13, 630).

The imposition of this badge was commonly ascribed to ʿUmar i, but it is not mentioned in the early treaties. If these are later fabrications, the argument against the early use of the zuwnār is strengthened. In 89 (705) the Ḥijādījīs bound themselves to wear Arab dress. So we must agree with the conclusion reached by Caestani: "I do not think it possible to accept the traditional statement that he (ʿUmar) imposed on the conquered the use of a distinctive dress". Baladghūri says that ʿUmar ii. vexed the Christians, forbidding them to ride on saddles and to wear the dress of soldiers, i.e., Arabs. It is also stated in the Ḥiṣb afṣārī that he forbade Christians to wear turbans or to copy the dress of the Muslims in any way. Ḥārūn al-Raṣīd ordered the ḥālāzim in Baghdaḏ to differ from the Muslims in dress and manner of riding. Apparently then ʿUmar II forbade the ḥālāzim to copy Arab dress and Ḥārūn introduced distinctive badges for them. Later the enforcement
of these rules depended on the temper of the ruler, who was either caliph or governor. The colour peculiar to the ḍhimṣs was that of honey-yellow. In the time of Mutawakkil they had to wear yellow scarves (jausūma) with belts, and two lustrous on the tall cap (balamun) and their slaves had to wear two yellow patches, one on the front and the other on the back of the outer garment. So Christians were called “special”. The colour of the cap was different from that worn by Muslimas.

In Egypt yellow was at first the ḍhimṣs's colour, though blue is mentioned, but under al-Ḥakim the Copts wore black turbans and belts. At one time he ordered the Christians to wear their neck-covers across one cubit long and five raṭḥs in weight and the Jews to wear black turbans and to carry hiltets of wood weighing five raṭḥs. He also commanded the Christians to wear crosses and the Jews bells in the baths. At times ḍhimṣs were not allowed to wear the Persian jacket (šīlā) or turbans or silk clothes.

Other restrictions were imposed on them. They might use only a special kind of saddle, or marked with two bells behind it, donkeys or horses. They had to cut their hair short on the forehead. When tribute was due they were marked by a leaden seal on the wrist; this, it seems, was removed when the whole payment was made. It is possible that some of these regulations were in force at one time and all over the caliphate.

Other meanings of the word will be found in the dictionaries.

Bibliography: al-Ṭabar, ed. de Goeje, iii. 712, 1389, 1419; Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam, Fūtūḫ Minṣr, p. 151; al-Kindī, Government and Judges in Egypt, ed. Guest, p. 390, 424; Abu ‘l-Mahāsin, ed. Popper, ii. 64; Makritz, Kairo, Cairo 1270, i. 76; ii. 949 sqq., 498; Ibn ‘Abd al-Rahmīn, al-Thā al-Firdawī, ii. 3391; al-Dājūlī, al-Bayūn, Cairo 1213, i. 41; Ibn ‘Asfūr, Danuqu, Cairo 1239, p. 178; Ibn Yusuf Ya’mūs, Kitāb al-Khārāj, Cairo 1302, p. 72; al-Abshīri, al-Muntakhib, i. 124; Ibn Iyās, Tarīḵ Minṣr, Cairo 1311, i. 52; Dardīn, Tiṣrūf al-Kalībī, i. 395; Bar Hebræus, Chron. Syr., Paris 1890, p. 117, 155, 204, 595; Syriac Chronicles (Corp. Script. Christ. Or. 1989), ix. coll. 14; i. 307; Bâkīhi, Fūtūḫ al-Bâkīhī, P. 1565; Castani, Antiquit. dell’ Islām, 17 ii. 224, 217, 174, 23; A. H., 3935; von Kremer, Kalim-worden, i. 425; i. 167; Men. Renaissance des Islams, p. 45 sqq., 54; Browne, A Year among the Persians, p. 370; Abū Sāṣīlī, Chemists of Egypt, transl., p. 142.

(A. S. Tarrton)

Zūrkhānā (v.), "house of strength", the Persian gymnasion. There are zūrkhānā in many Persian towns and are often also in several quarters of a large town. From the architectural point of view these gymnasiom recall an eastern bath lit by a skylight in the centre of the little dome. The area (qānd) lies below the level of the floor. The superstructure and the spectators take their places in niches cut in the walls; sometimes there is a kind of gallery reserved for the public.

Among the members of a zūrkhānā various degrees are distinguished: a nūtse "novice", nūm-bārī: "beginner", pākūthūnu: "athlete", wāṣīdī: "referee and instructor" (usually the champion of the establishment), wāṣīdī: "director" (also called

khanī: "director") who conducts the exercises by beating a little drum and reciting appropriate verses (the quatrains are called gīrū:). The wrestlers wear drawers (long) or short trousers of heather or some white material (jenkūn) on which the hand is often represented (that of Allah). These are supported by the strap of the belt with which the wrestlers catch one another (this is unknown in western wrestling). From the arms are hung amulets against the evil eye and with the same object the wāṣıdī hangs seeds of wild rue (ṣāqūhī).

The programme at each performance begins with exercises for suppleness and exercises with weights (Ṣāqūhī) and with Italian clubs (qāli). The wrestling comes at the end of the performance; it goes on until one of the competitors touches the ground with his shoulder blades (ṣāqūhī: "is made to count the starn"). The wrestling is followed by exercises with a kind of bow on the cord of which are strung very heavy rings (ṣāqūhī); the bow is not drawn but is moved from side to side above the head.

The organisation of the zūrkhānā is marked by a very elaborate terminology, by a spirit of chivalry and by a strictly observed semi-religious ritual.

In putting on or taking off the costume, the combatants embrace (cf. šīrāzī). Only the perturbed bows may be used; the contest finished, the wrestlers touch their foreheads; the one who has been wrestling with the wāṣīdī kisses his hand.

There are a number of patron saints of wrestling whose names are invoked. The principal patron of wrestlers is Pātraya (?) Wašt. Among famous wrestlers, Husain Wašī mentions the Prophet who wrestled with Abū Djal; the imām Ḥasan and Ḥusain; the goetic (ṣirīf) Mahmūd Makhkār (or Bīlyūr) and the Shāhī Šāh al-Dīn Ḥıbrān Ḥamān. The same author distinguishes two kinds of wrestling: ḫaṣī (or ḫhasī-mūt) in vogue in Shūrān and the Ṭīrā or Ṭīrā (or dalām-Ṭīrā) cultivated in Dalām and Shīrāz.

Wrestling is a noble exercise. In Niebuhr's time the notables of Shīrāz devoted the mornings to it and their afternoons to riding. A monument in the form of a lion used to be built on a champion's tomb.

The beginnings of wrestling in Persia go back to a very early period. In the Ṣāh-nāma (ed. Möhl, iii. 303—4 = Valbers, ii. 1049) the heroes are shown wrestling by seizing one another's hands (hant dān kādūh yāq yāq); and three gripping one another by the girdle (ṭīrā-yāq khān). In Sa'd's Gulistan, the old wrestler is represented as knowing 360 tricks (cf. in Husain Wāšī: 1081 = 360 × 3); cf. several other quotations in Canard.

The organisation of the zūrkhānā gives wrestling very special features. As M. Canard rightly points out, the zūrkhānā seems to have grown up out of the corporate movement and its special chivalry (futunwās). This movement is closely related to the Shīʿite mysticism. In the course of a performance a collection (ṣirāj) is taken twelve times in the name of each of the 12 imāms. It is worth noting that H. Wāšī's treatise is called Futunwāt-nāma; cf. Thornong, Hellige s. Konvintz d. islām. Veröffentlichungen, Berlin 1913 and the articles Futūwā and Shīrāz; Tanscher, Futunwā-Studien, in Islamica, v, 1933, p. 285-333; ibid., Die islamischen Futunwānen, in Z. D. M. G., 1933, p. 6—49.
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